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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation or Acronym</th>
<th>Full name</th>
<th>Abbreviation or Acronym</th>
<th>Full name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGD</td>
<td>Attorney General’s Department</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Bar Association</td>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBRN</td>
<td>Chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear</td>
<td>OSCE</td>
<td>Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>Criminal Investigation Department</td>
<td>POLKA</td>
<td>Project Office Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Counter Terrorism</td>
<td>P/CVE</td>
<td>Preventing/Countering Violent Extremism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTED</td>
<td>Counterterrorism Executive Directorate</td>
<td>PPE</td>
<td>Personal Protective Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Prevention of Terrorism Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>Foreign Terrorist Fighter</td>
<td>ROEA</td>
<td>Regional Office East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMCP</td>
<td>Global Maritime Crime Programme</td>
<td>ROSA</td>
<td>Regional Office South Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Global Project</td>
<td>ROSEA</td>
<td>Regional Office South East Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Regional Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IcSP</td>
<td>Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace</td>
<td>SoP</td>
<td>Standard Operating Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IED</td>
<td>Improvised Explosive Device</td>
<td>TPB</td>
<td>Terrorism Prevention Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INL</td>
<td>Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (USA)</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISIL</td>
<td>Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant</td>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoJ</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>UNRC</td>
<td>United Nations Resident Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams at: UNODC Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), Division for Treaty Affairs (DTA), Vienna; UNODC Global Maritime Crime Programme (GMCP), Sri Lanka; and the UNODC Project Office in Colombo, Sri Lanka (POLKA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Management Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Sustainability</strong>: Integrate sustainability more comprehensively in project planning and strengthen sustainability by means of a) ensuring a long-term capacity-building strategy for counterparts under the GMCP and TPB components, if relevant; b) offer a sustainability plan for the different components in the final progress report; c) start a dialogue on the maintenance of the equipment given to the Analyst’s Department (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Internal coherence</strong>: a) Advocate for and require a coordinated response in a sensitive working environment, including by means of promoting a one UNODC approach; b) ensure that technical experts based in headquarters have access to relevant government representative to tailor assistance (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>External coherence</strong>: Ensure that partnerships, including with respect to agreeing to project partners, liaising with the UNRC and other UN agencies in future design and implementation, continue to be sufficiently considered (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Efficiency (Human Resources)</strong>: Ensure that human resource management adequately considers diversity, gender balance, administrative/financial personnel, ranking, coordination and human rights due diligence capacity and project team location in future project design (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams together with Division for Operations (Do), Division for Treaty Affairs (DTA), and Human Resources Management Service (HRMS)).</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Relevance (Project design)</strong>: Ensure that comprehensive contextual analysis, inclusive consultative processes, continuous relationship management and including a sustainability strategy and an exit strategy is considered in project design (see also recommendation 1) (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. This is just a short synopsis of the recommendation, please refer to the respective chapter in the main body of the report for the full recommendation.

2. Accepted/partially accepted or rejected for each recommendation. For any recommendation that is partially accepted or rejected, a short justification is to be added.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations¹</th>
<th>Management Response²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Gender Equality:</strong> Advance gender equality principles and strengthen gender mainstreaming by: (a) ensuring gender equity in international and national staff and consultants’ recruitment &amp; geographical balance; (b) continue promoting gender balance in activities; (c) undertaking gender-sensitive and sex-disaggregated data collection, analysis and reporting (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Human Rights:</strong> Continue with the application of human rights standards and principles and consider a) systematically applying human rights due diligence principles in the design and implementation of technical assistance, such as with respect to equipment; b) ensuring sufficient staff capacity to undertake due diligence; c) review carefully the framing of CT projects in sensitive environments (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Leaving No One Behind:</strong> Continue with the application of the principle of leaving no one behind in prison reform and apply the principle of leaving no one behind across all project components (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Efficiency (Monitoring and reporting):</strong> Systematize data collection and analysis for monitoring and reporting, incl. sex-disaggregated data, across all areas (see 6), and set up a knowledge repository for internal purposes including evaluations (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Terrorism threatens peace, security and development. The Easter Sunday attacks in Sri Lanka on 21 April 2019 have been the first and thus far only terrorist activity of this nature associated with Muslim extremism in Sri Lanka, causing havoc to society and killing hundreds of persons. The attacks showcased weaknesses in national prevention capacity, and fragmented intra and interagency coordination.3 This analysis informed the design of the project ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter Terrorism’ (hereinafter the project) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), which was developed and implemented with Interpol as partner. Funding was provided by the European Union (EU) under its Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The project has been implemented by the Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), located in the Division for Treaty Affairs (DTA), Vienna, Austria, the UNODC Global Maritime Crime Programme (GMCP), based in Colombo, Sri Lanka, and the UNODC Project Office in Colombo, Sri Lanka (POLKA). Interpol took care of outcome 1 (law enforcement), and UNODC of outcome 2 (criminal justice actors), outcome 3 (navy) and 4 (prison department) under two UNODC Global Projects (GPs), respectively ‘Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism’ (GLOR35), and the ‘Global Maritime Crime Programme’ (GMCP) (GLOW63), The project had an overall budget of USD 5,022,321.43. The initiative was implemented in parallel to the project ‘Support to Maldives on Counter-Terrorism’, also carried out with funding by the EU and concluded on 31 July 2021. The project’s objective was to ‘increase the capacity of criminal justice and law enforcement officials to effectively investigate, prosecute and adjudicate terrorism cases in Sri Lanka, in line with the relevant international legal instruments and human rights norms, standards and good practices.

PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION

This independent final project evaluation has been undertaken for accountability and learning, with the main objective of obtaining good practices and lessons learned. The geographical scope of this evaluation centred on Sri Lanka. The period considered was from 1 February 2020 until 21 February 2022 when the data-collection phase was completed. The following evaluation criteria were considered: relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and human rights, gender equality and leaving no-one behind. The main stakeholders of this final project evaluation were the project team, UNODC senior management, representatives of other UN bodies, the Government of Sri Lanka and the donor. The gender-balanced evaluation team was composed of an independent international evaluation team leader, and an independent international counter-terrorism (CT) expert from the Netherlands and Ghana, respectively, with combined expertise in leading and conducting complex and strategic evaluations in the field of terrorism prevention and violent extremism (VE).

As a field mission was not feasible considering global travel restrictions and quarantine rules due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the mixed method methodology included online semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions in addition to the desk review. A gender-sensitive approach was used in all evaluation phases. Quantitative methods were applied to generate descriptive statistics and data, and method and source triangulation for qualitative analysis. A total of 304 UNODC sources were reviewed, and 15 external documents. A total of 67 persons (42 M; 25 F) were consulted during this evaluation.

MAIN FINDINGS

Relevance. The project has been relevant considering its alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), especially SDG 5, 16 and 17, and with UNODC, Interpol and EU strategic objectives and strategies and identified needs of the Government of Sri Lanka. While the objectives and structure of the project were given in the project proposal, followed by two programming missions to update the earlier identified needs of the government counterparts, triangulated data conveyed that the design was adapted profoundly because of the Covid-19 pandemic, the change in political leadership in Sri Lanka and the rather late initiation of planning for the criminal justice component because of the delayed arrival of international staff in the field, and remote management challenges because of the pandemic. Additionally, the project could have benefited from further fine-tuning in the early stages in close consultation with some relevant government counterparts. The evaluation found that the overall needs of targeted government counterparts were, nevertheless, addressed over time, although with a wider range of views for the criminal justice component.

Efficiency. The project has been implemented efficiently to the extent possible, considering the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, parliamentary elections and the end of the administrative agreement with UNDP. The UNODC delivery rate was 82 percent on 31 January 2022. Project management had responded creatively to the various challenges, for instance by seeking other locations for training and moving to online platforms in order to be able to continue with implementation. The on-site presence of the project team supported flexibility in adapting design to circumstances and needs. The GMCP and TPB sub-teams operated in parallel. The management structure without clear reporting lines and the limited administrative support on location had an impact on coordination and oversight. Activity reporting was undertaken systematically, but monitoring, evaluation and reporting at output and outcome level to a limited degree only. Visibility was satisfactory but limited following close coordination on this issue with the donor in the second year of implementation. Inputs and outputs were viewed satisfactory to some extent as more tailoring to the local context and actual needs could have taken place in different components.

Coherence. Synergies were sought and used within UNODC and with UN entities, bilateral agencies and other international entities. In view of UNODC’s programming architecture, internal coherence was affected by country level coordination challenges, the unavailability of a strategy or operational plan for Sri Lanka, and the level of understanding regarding the need for such coordination in a politically sensitive environment as well as the required human rights due diligence checks. The continuous and close cooperation with the UNRC and OHCHR was viewed as a necessity and added value in such an operational environment. Cooperation with Interpol had been highly limited as bilateral meetings had only been held on a few occasions, and limited information sharing had taking place between the two organisations. The Steering Committee meetings were viewed as an effective mechanism to build ownership of and support planning with counterparts, while also providing a platform for a coordinated message on human rights.

Effectiveness. The project has been effective to some extent because of the challenging operational environment, the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and the project’s limited duration, amongst others. The project has delivered under all four outcome areas, although this has only in some instances resulted in strengthened capabilities. Only the work undertaken under the last two outcomes on strengthening the dynamic, procedural and physical security in selected prisons and with respect to littoral border control were found to be effective.

Impact. The project had a limited time-frame and was implemented in parallel with the Covid-19 pandemic. These factors have contributed to a project which in the end had neither the envisaged impact as formulated in the project’s objective nor a more effective terrorism prevention and response.

Sustainability. Sustainability has been considered by promoting ownership by means of participatory planning and monitoring, such as visible in Steering Committee meetings. However, a stronger focus on institutionalization and more joint planning with counterparts from the very beginning, including with respect to training content as well as the maintenance and use of equipment, could have led to a higher degree of
sustainability. Only the component on littoral border control appeared to be sustainable. GMCP has planned for follow-up activities, and been able to allocate funds, for longer term assistance.

Human rights, gender equality and leaving no-one behind. Human rights, gender equality and leaving no-one behind have been mainstreamed in project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting, albeit in varying degrees. Human rights were integrated into project design and implementation, such as in training offered to prosecutors and lawyers, and in capacity-building sessions on the Nelson Mandela Rules (NMR) and the Bangkok Rules to staff of the Prison Department. Human rights due diligence was assessed for UNODC components with respect to participants lists for training, equipment and in the handover notes of equipment, in close cooperation with the OHCHR. In comparison, gender has to a lesser extent been mainstreamed in inputs and outputs, and could have been more systematically considered in design, implementation, monitoring and reporting. While in communication with government counterparts the advice for gender balance in meetings was given, sex-disaggregated data were not systematically collected to monitor this in practice. The principle of ‘leaving no one behind’ has predominantly been considered in prison reform component, by means of the development of SoPs and the provision of training and PPE kits, in order to ensure equal access to health care during the Covid-19 pandemic.

MAIN CONCLUSIONS
At the time of designing the project ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism’, nothing could have predicted that a pandemic of global proportions would take place in 2020 and 2021. This crisis, combined with the change in political leadership, and the slow start of the criminal justice component, had a direct impact on the efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of this highly ambitious project. The consequence was that only two of the five objectives of Thematic Area 4 ‘Preventing and Countering Terrorism’ of the UNODC Strategy 2021-2025 were addressed by the project, with the promotion of field presence also laying bare several internal coordination challenges. Human rights had become a predominant theme in a polarized operational environment. The partnership with the UNRC Office had been a response to this situation, and had prompted coordination in order to speak with one voice on human rights, the need to reform the CT framework and the repeal of the PTA. The continued engagement with the Government of Sri Lanka was considered pivotal for advancing human rights in the longer term.

MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS
For the GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams at: UNODC Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), Division for Treaty Affairs (DTA), Vienna; UNODC Global Maritime Crime Programme (GMCP), Sri Lanka; and the UNODC Project Office in Colombo, Sri Lanka (POLKA).

RECOMMENDATION 1 – SUSTAINABILITY
Integrate sustainability more comprehensively in project planning in future designs and strengthen sustainability by means of a) ensuring a long-term capacity-building strategy for relevant counterparts under the GMCP and TPB components, if relevant; b) offer a sustainability plan for the different components in the final progress report; c) start a dialogue on the maintenance of the equipment given to the Analyst’s Department.

RECOMMENDATION 2 – INTERNAL COHERENCE
Advocate for and require a coordinated response in a politically sensitive working environment, including by means of promoting a one-UNODC approach; b) ensure that technical experts based in headquarters have access to relevant government representative to tailor assistance.
RECOMMENDATION 3 – EXTERNAL COHERENCE

Ensure that partnerships, including with respect to agreeing to project partners, liaising with the UNRC and other UN agencies in future design and implementation, are sufficiently considered.

MAIN LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

The main lessons learned of the evaluation have been taken forward in recommendations on internal coherence, efficiency, and sustainability. Good practices were found in the field-centric nature of the project, with on-site project teams, the use of long-term consultants and local staff supporting implementation, trust-building with counterparts and investing in and consolidating partnerships, including with the UNRC Office. Additionally, the application of human rights principles was also considered a good practice, which was not only visible in the training offered to different criminal justice actors, but also in close cooperation with the OHCHR to integrate human rights due diligence considerations into the review of participants’ lists and in procurement decisions.
## SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For the GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams at: UNODC Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), Division for Treaty Affairs (DTA), Vienna; UNODC Global Maritime Crime Programme (GMCP), Sri Lanka; and the UNODC Project Office in Colombo, Sri Lanka (POLKA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sustainability of results has only been considered to a limited extent. While the short-term nature of the project has been a challenge in achieving the use of knowledge and skills acquired by training, this could have been considered in the design, including by preparing a comprehensive sustainability and exit strategy. Dialogue on sustainability could still be undertaken with counterparts that recently received equipment. Only work with the navy, coast guard and prisons will be continuing under the GMCP after project completion. While a more comprehensive approach could have been used for training, jointly and in parallel to different criminal justice actors, the partnering with the SLBA and the Analyst’s Office was a good practice because of a wider coverage of relevant criminal justice actors.</td>
<td>Data triangulation based on desk review, key informant interviews and focus group discussions</td>
<td><strong>1. Sustainability:</strong> Integrate sustainability more comprehensively in project planning in future designs and strengthen sustainability by means of a) ensuring a long-term capacity-building strategy for relevant counterparts under the GMCP and TPB components, if relevant; b) offer a sustainability plan for the different components in the final progress report; c) start a dialogue on maintenance of the equipment given to the Analyst’s Department (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Internal UNODC coordination has posed challenges in the field, especially as the sensitive working environment required a coordinated response to partners. Staff working in other locations did not always relate to the need for a one-UNODC instead of a project-based response. Additionally, the field team has sometimes limited liaison of remote expert staff with counterparts to tailor technical assistance.</td>
<td>Data triangulation based on desk review and key informant interviews</td>
<td><strong>2. Internal coherence:</strong> a) Ensure a coordinated response in a politically sensitive working environment, including by means of promoting a one-UNODC approach; b) ensure that technical experts based in headquarters have access to relevant government representative to tailor assistance (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 General sources that substantiate the findings.

5 Should include the specific target group of implementing recipient(s) at UNODC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Partnerships with the UNRC Office were viewed as a good practice, supporting cooperation, and allowing for joint navigation on difficult operational waters.</td>
<td>Data triangulation based on desk review and key informant interviews</td>
<td>3. <strong>External coherence</strong>: Ensure that partnerships, including with respect to agreeing to project partners, liaising with the UNRC and other UN agencies in future design and implementation, continue to be sufficiently considered (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The composition of the field-based team was not diverse in terms of background and gender balance. Additionally, the team did neither have a finance officer nor were clear arrangements made on a division of roles, responsibilities and reporting lines (leading to other P5 staff). Internal coordination and human rights due diligence was not adequately considered in staffing capacity, and earlier inclusion of relevant local capacity could have been considered to strengthen liaison with one of the local counterparts.</td>
<td>Data triangulation based on desk review and key informant interviews</td>
<td>4. <strong>Efficiency (Human Resources)</strong>: Ensure that human resource management adequately considers diversity, gender balance, administrative/financial personnel, ranking, coordination and local liaison capacity, human rights due diligence capacity and project team location in future project design (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams together with Division for Operations (Do), Division for Treaty Affairs (DTA), and Human Resources Management Service (HRMS)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Although contextual analysis was undertaken, some gaps were identified as a result of limited consultative processes with beneficiaries (see also above on sustainability).</td>
<td>Data triangulation based on desk review and key informant interviews</td>
<td>5. <strong>Relevance (Project design)</strong>: Ensure that comprehensive contextual analysis, inclusive consultative processes, and continuous relationship management is considered in project design (see also recommendation 1) (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender was not systematically mainstreamed in human resources, inputs for activities and monitoring and reporting, including the collection of sex-disaggregated data. Gender was, however, mainstreamed in training on stereotypes in terrorism and in body search training</td>
<td>Data triangulation based on desk review and key informant interviews</td>
<td>6. <strong>Gender Equality</strong>: Advance gender equality principles and strengthen gender mainstreaming by: (a) ensuring gender equity in international and national staff and consultants ‘recruitment (&amp; geographical balance); (b) continuing to promote gender balance in activities; (c) undertaking gender-sensitive and sex-disaggregated data collection, analysis, and reporting (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Human rights standards and principles were applied across the project. Human rights due diligence principles were recognised as a critical component of the project, and increasingly applied in close coordination with OHCHR. The human rights-sensitive environment posed challenges to the team, which raised the question about CT project framing.</td>
<td>Data triangulation based on desk review and key informant interviews</td>
<td><strong>Human Rights:</strong> Continue with the application of human rights standards and principles and consider a) systematically applying human rights due diligence principles in the design and implementation of technical assistance, such as with respect to equipment; b) ensuring sufficient staff capacity for due diligence; c) review carefully the framing of CT projects in sensitive environments (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The principle of leaving no one behind was only applied in the prison reform component under outcome 4, and not in other areas covered by the project (see also key finding and recommendation 6)</td>
<td>Data triangulation based on desk review and key informant interviews</td>
<td><strong>Leaving No One Behind:</strong> Continue with the application of the principle of leaving no one behind in prison reform and apply the principle of leaving no one behind across all project components (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Monitoring has been undertaken by providing weekly activity reports to the donor, yet pre- and post- evaluation of training activities or the collection of sex-disaggregated data was not done. A project-wide monitoring system was not set up to support data collection for results-based management in a systematic manner, and also archiving has not been done consistently.</td>
<td>Data triangulation based on desk review and key informant interviews</td>
<td><strong>Efficiency (Monitoring and reporting):</strong> Systematize data collection and analysis for monitoring and reporting, incl. sex-disaggregated data, across all areas (see recommendation 6), and set up a knowledge repository for internal purposes and for forthcoming evaluations (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT
On 21 April 2019, Easter Sunday, eight suicide bombers attacked Catholic churches and high-end hotels in Sri Lanka’s capital Colombo and Batticaloa with person-borne improvised explosive devices (PB-IEDs). A total of 266 persons were killed, and at least 500 persons were injured by this series of coordinated terrorist suicide bombings. These assaults were the worst terror attack the country had ever seen. Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) claimed responsibility for the attack, with the perpetrators pledging allegiance to former ISIL-leader Abu Bakr al –Baghdadi.6

Sri Lanka’s experience with politically and religiously motivated violence has a long history. After 25 years of interethnic violence, the civil war, driven mainly by ethnic rivalry, ended. Furthermore, Sri Lanka has also been afflicted by Buddhist extremist actions, including propagated and incited violence against minorities7. It was public knowledge that there was some level of support for Islamic terrorist groups among the minority Muslim population in Sri Lanka and that some of them had gone off to fight for ISIL in Syria. The attacks were carried out by Sri Lankan suicide bombers and most of the 76 persons arrested were also Sri Lankans along with some foreign Muslims who reportedly belonged to ISIL 8

According to experts, the probability of a terrorist attack in Sri Lanka was known. Foreign intelligence agencies had even warned of indicators that pointed to the high possibility of a major attack being planned in Sri Lanka. However, these intelligence assessments were not acted upon. Several reasons explain this intelligence and operational failure, including some weaknesses in information sharing mechanisms and less effective intra- and inter-agency cooperation.9 As a result of the attacks and the exposure of the gaps in intra and inter-agency collaboration, bilateral and multilateral partners have supported the Sri Lankan government by providing training and by offering other capacity building support and equipment to respond to the potential threats posed by further terrorist attacks.10

In addition, the Report of the High Commissioner for Human Rights noted in early 2020 the following with respect to the Prevention of Terrorism Act: ‘In the wake of the attacks of April 2019, the Government did not finalize or proceed with the counter-terrorism bill that had been drafted to replace the Prevention of Terrorism Act. On 4 January 2020, it announced that it would be withdrawn. The Act has continued to be used, and was used as the basis for the arrest of individuals believed to be linked to the organizations responsible for the attacks. As of January 2020, more than 200 individuals were in detention and under judicial custody under the Act, including in relation to the attacks of April 2019. ’ [...]The High Commissioner encourages the

---

7 Chas Morrison. 2019. ‘Buddhist extremism, anti-Muslim violence and civil war legacies in Sri Lanka’, Asian Ethnicity, Vol.21, No.1, pp. 137-159, DOI: 10.1080/14631369.2019.1610937 See for example, ‘Country Reports on Terrorism 2020: Sri Lanka’, State Department, which argues that, ‘While ISIS-inspired terrorists are considered the main terrorist threat in Sri Lanka, the government has expressed concerns about diaspora groups linked to LTTE, a designated Foreign Terrorist Organisation’, p. 1  
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Government to urgently proceed with the review and repeal of the Prevention of Terrorism Act and to engage with the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, the United Nations and the Human Rights Commission of Sri Lanka in finalizing new legislation that is compliant with international human rights norms and standards.11

The causes of the attack also led to the design of the project ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter Terrorism’ (hereinafter the Project) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), which was developed and implemented with Interpol as partner. The initiative was implemented in parallel to the project ‘Support to Maldives on Counter-Terrorism’, which was concluded on 31 July 2021. Both projects were funded by the European Union (EU) under its Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP).

MAP OF Sri Lanka12).
OVERALL CONCEPT AND DESIGN

The objective of the project ‘Support to Sri Lanka on counter terrorism’ was to ‘increase the capacity of criminal justice and law enforcement officials to effectively investigate, prosecute and adjudicate terrorism cases in Sri Lanka, in line with the relevant international legal instruments and human rights norms, standards and good practices’. Furthermore, the following four outcomes had been formulated in the project document:

1) Developed and strengthened law enforcement capabilities to prevent and disrupt terrorism and/or terrorism-related activities including effective border protection, increased information exchange, strengthened coordination among intelligence, law enforcement and prosecution agencies to investigate and prosecute terrorism-related cases [Interpol];

2) Support the Government of Sri Lanka in developing a comprehensive policy and legislative framework for counter-terrorism that is fully compliant with the rule of law, human rights standards and fundamental freedoms, as well as enhancing the capacities of criminal justice actors to ensure their effective implementation [GLOR35];

3) Capacity developed in Sri Lanka to strengthen littoral border control including the detection of explosives and IED components [GLOW63];

4) Dynamic, procedural and physical security strengthened in selected prison facilities [GLOW63].

The intervention logic was a sequential flow of outcomes that covered different actors of the criminal justice chain and that therefore fed into the overall objective of the project. The four outcome areas were formulated as complementary, and mutually exclusive, with all focusing on different stakeholders with particular sets of responsibilities. The outcome areas had not been reformulated in addendum 1 of the donor agreement, but outputs were added to all four outcomes. UNODC and INTERPOL made revisions to project interventions, inserting/removing/adjusting activities during the extension request process, while maintaining the same outputs and outcomes (as per EU programming rules) to ensure delivery of the project.

Human rights had been considered in the project’s design, including in descriptions of results in the logframe, and as one of the potential risks of the project.

Gender mainstreaming had been one of the chapters given in the ‘Description of the Action, and included a description on women and terrorism, and actions to implement a gender-sensitive approach. This covered, for instance, the following activities: Define the implementation and monitoring requirements concerning gender in agreements with any potential partner organisations; Generate and disseminate gender-disaggregated data through monitoring and evaluation in the process of the implementation of its logical framework and related targets; Provide equitable access to project resources and opportunities to men and women, both individually and in groups; Take measures to ensure women and men’s equitable access to and full participation in power structures and decision-making in the project, and ; Contribute to the goal of gender equality in staffing.

The principle of leaving no one behind was not included in project design before the start of the project.

The project has been implemented by the UNODC Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), located in the Division for Treaty Affairs in Vienna, Austria, the UNODC Global Maritime Crime Programme (GMCP), based in Colombo, Sri Lanka, the UNODC Project Office in Sri Lanka (POLKA) and Interpol. Interpol was responsible for the law enforcement component covered by outcome 1. The UNODC component of the project had been segmented into of the following two UNODC Global Projects (GPs) ‘Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism’ (GLOR35) and the ‘Global Maritime Crime Programme’ (GMCP) (GLOW63), which respectively covered outcome 2 (criminal justice actors) and outcome 3 (navy) and 4 (prison department).
The project was liaising with and offering support to several counterparts spanning the criminal justice chain, including the Sri Lanka Police Criminal Investigation Department (CID), within which the National Central Bureau (local agency connected to INTERPOL policing capabilities) is situated, under Outcome 1; numerous criminal justice stakeholders with counter-terrorism mandates and responsibilities, including the Attorney General’s Department, Bar Association of Sri Lanka, the Foreign Ministry and Government Analyst’s Department (Ministry of Justice), under Outcome 2; the Sri Lanka Navy Special Boat Squadron (Ministry of Defence) under Outcome 3; and the Department of Prisons (Ministry of Justice) under Outcome 4.

The EU Contribution Agreement was signed in December 2019, the Agreement between the UN and Interpol early 2020 and the Addendum to the Contribution Agreement in June 2021. The project originally had a duration of 18 months, namely from 1 February 2020 up to 31 July, 2021, and was extended by another six months by means of a no-cost extension until 31 January 2022. The project had a total budget of USD 5,022,321.43 (EUR 4,500,000), with UNODC entitled to receiving 78 percent of the budget and Interpol 22 percent.

As provided for in the ‘Description of the Action’ (annex I to the Grant Agreement), and as per UNODC evaluation norms and standards, an independent final evaluation is required before completion of the project.

**PURPOSE AND SCOPE**

The evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) outlined the following objectives of this final project evaluation:

‘The final independent project evaluation will assess the design, delivery and impact of the activities carried out under the project toward the achievement of the overall planned objective and relevant SDGs. The evaluation will be conducted through a human rights and gender-attentive lens and will appraise partnerships and other forms of cooperation with national and international stakeholders, lessons learned and best practices. The evaluation team will gauge the extent the project facilitated a baseline for follow-up actions in the country and the short/long-term impacts of the initiative and resulting sustainability.’

The evaluation team has also been taking note of the objective of the evaluation to contribute to the institutional memory of TPB and the GMCP, and the objective to support the donor in decision-making on possible follow-up activities. The objective of this independent project evaluation was also to provide good practices and lessons learned for UNODC, key stakeholders and the donor. This evaluation was therefore undertaken for the purposes of both accountability and learning.

This independent final evaluation covered the project ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism’. This evaluation covered the time period from 1 February 2020 until the end of February 2022. The geographical coverage of the evaluation was Sri Lanka, although interviews were also undertaken with interlocutors based in Europe and other parts of Asia. A field mission was not feasible considering global travel restrictions and quarantine rules due to the Covid-19 pandemic.
The main stakeholders of this final project evaluation were managers of the project, senior management of UNODC, representatives of the Government and civil society organizations based in Sri Lanka, and the donor.

The following evaluation criteria, made standard by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC), have been considered during this evaluation: relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and human rights, gender equality and leaving no-one behind. The evaluation also identified good practices and lessons learned, which have been provided in chapter six of this report.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team comprised of an independent, external international evaluation team leader, and an independent, external international counter-terrorism expert from the Netherlands and Ghana, respectively. This gender-balanced team has expertise in leading and conducting complex and strategic evaluations in the field of terrorism prevention, including at the global/international level, and a strong background in applying quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This Independent Final Evaluation of the project ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism’ has been undertaken by means of a mixed-methods, gender-sensitive and inclusive approach comprising: (a) desk review; (b) online semi-structured interviews; and (c) online focus group discussions. Qualitative and quantitative methods have been used during the data collection and analysis phases to generate descriptive statistics and in-depth content analysis. By means of the desk review, interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) data were obtained, reviewed, analysed and triangulated across data collection methods and sources in order to respond to the specific questions given for each evaluation criteria. During the data collection and analysis phases, due regard has been given to collecting sex-disaggregated statistics and gender-related information, which has been included in the relevant chapter sections.

A desk review has been conducted of material from UNODC sources, and those of external sources. A total of 304 UNODC sources were reviewed, including the grant agreement, description of the action, budget and project log frame, addendum 1 to the agreement, weekly reports to donors and activity documentation. A total of 15 external documents were reviewed including reports of the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Global Terrorism Index 2019, 2020, 2021. A complete list of reviewed sources has been provided in Annex III.

Due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, only online data collection efforts could be undertaken as a field mission was still not possible in early 2022 due the unpredictability of the pandemic and the consequent restricted travel and lockdowns. Therefore, only online semi-structured interviews have been conducted with relevant stakeholders, namely UNODC staff and consultants, partners, representatives of the recipient government and the donor with Microsoft Teams. Additionally, also four online focus group discussions were held with participants of training activities, namely one with respectively lawyers and navy personnel (all-male FGDs) and two with prison staff (one all male; one with one female participant). A total of 67 persons (42 M; 25 F) were consulted during these interviews and the four focus group discussions held with prison staff, Bar Association members and Navy officials (see the section on limitations).
**INTRODUCTION**

The independent final project evaluation has had several limitations. The limitations and mitigation measures have been provided in the table below.

### Limitations to the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitations to the evaluation</th>
<th>Mitigations measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**LIMITATIONS TO THE EVALUATION**

The independent final project evaluation has had several limitations. The limitations and mitigation measures have been provided in the table below.

**Figure 2: Number of stakeholders consulted per stakeholder group (Total/Male/Female)**

The generic interview guide given in Annex II provided the overall direction to these interviews, and questions were further tailored to the background, function, and level of involvement of the respondents. In the same Annex, also the Focus Group Discussion guide can be found.

Quantitative analysis has been done with Excel. Quantitative data include training/meeting evaluation data, financial data, and participant lists of training activities/expert meetings, including sex-disaggregated information.

Qualitative analysis has been undertaken by means of the classification of data obtained during the desk review, semi-structured interviews, and group discussions followed by sources and methods triangulation.

The methods applied have been gender-sensitive, and inclusive. Gender analysis has been done on the basis of the following data sources: staff/positions, participants training/events, teachers/facilitators, gender mainstreaming in publications and interviewees (see graph 1).

The evaluation team was responsible for safeguarding and ensuring ethics at all stages of the evaluation. All team members were cognizant of the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System and Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. Two key requirements are to safeguard the independence of the team and to safeguard the rights and interests of its informants. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring informed consent, protecting privacy, confidentiality and anonymity of participants, ensuring cultural sensitivity, respecting the autonomy of participants, ensuring fair recruitment of participants (including women) and ensuring that the evaluation results do no harm to participants. The evaluation team recognized UNODC’s strict policy of zero tolerance concerning unethical, unprofessional or fraudulent acts.
Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, and the direct consequences for international travel, in-country movements and in-person meetings, the evaluation was home-based.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRODUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, and the direct consequences for international travel, in-country movements and in-person meetings, the evaluation was home-based.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online communication tools (Microsoft teams) have been used to hold online interviews and FGDs. While the evaluation team is confident that robust data have been collected this way, online tools will never entirely be able to replace onsite visits and in-person interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation team was only able to cover to some extent the project component for which Interpol was responsible. The Contribution Agreement signed by the EU, UNODC and Interpol stipulated that both Organisations shall apply their own accounting, internal control and audit systems as well as their own procurement procedures (article 13), and in the Agreement signed between the UN and Interpol, the requirement of submitting narrative and financial reports by Interpol in accordance with a reporting schedule was mentioned in section D. Beneficiaries of this organization could not be interviewed despite efforts to seek their inclusion.
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<tr>
<td><strong>The evaluation team was only able to cover to some extent the project component for which Interpol was responsible. The Contribution Agreement signed by the EU, UNODC and Interpol stipulated that both Organisations shall apply their own accounting, internal control and audit systems as well as their own procurement procedures (article 13), and in the Agreement signed between the UN and Interpol, the requirement of submitting narrative and financial reports by Interpol in accordance with a reporting schedule was mentioned in section D. Beneficiaries of this organization could not be interviewed despite efforts to seek their inclusion.</strong></td>
<td>Interpol provided data to the evaluation team about its overall performance, and interviews were conducted with the Interpol project team, including consultants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This evaluation has not been able to include representatives of indirect beneficiaries as respondents/informants in the data-collection phase because of limited to no access, and security concerns.

<p>| | |</p>
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<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This evaluation has not been able to include representatives of indirect beneficiaries as respondents/informants in the data-collection phase because of limited to no access, and security concerns.</strong></td>
<td>The evaluation team has interviewed criminal justice actors and consultants, and during these interviews further information has been requested on the impact of project results for these indirect beneficiaries, to the extent possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation has not assessed the project’s contribution towards the achievement of relevant SDGs.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The evaluation has not assessed the project’s contribution towards the achievement of relevant SDGs.</strong></td>
<td>There are no mitigation measures. UNODC has no indicators yet that can be used to measure the contribution of project results towards achieving the SDGs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation team did not have access to the necessary sources to measure all results with quantitative data considering that baseline data were not established. Additionally, no rationale had been provided for available targets, ranging from 20, 25 and up to 80 percent, and the formulation of some targets limited the measurement of indicators (e.g. objective). Relatedly, the overall limited availability of data on the impact of the capacity-building components posed limitations on measuring results for effectiveness, impact and sustainability.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The evaluation team did not have access to the necessary sources to measure all results with quantitative data considering that baseline data were not established. Additionally, no rationale had been provided for available targets, ranging from 20, 25 and up to 80 percent, and the formulation of some targets limited the measurement of indicators (e.g. objective). Relatedly, the overall limited availability of data on the impact of the capacity-building components posed limitations on measuring results for effectiveness, impact and sustainability.</strong></td>
<td>The evaluation team used available quantitative data and collected data based on the (self) perception of interviewees. Project results could therefore predominantly be found at the output level, with limited effects to be observed in relation to outcomes and the project’s objective as well as with respect to impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

RELEVANCE

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

1. To what extent has the project been relevant to stakeholder needs and priorities, including the Government of Sri Lanka and UN agencies?

2. To what extent were adjustments made throughout implementation to adapt the project to changes in circumstances, including COVID-19, and ensure continuity of its relevance?

The project has been relevant, and continues to be relevant considering the alignment with the identified needs of criminal justice actors of the Government of Sri Lanka, UNODC, Interpol and EU strategic objectives. The project has been aligned with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 5 (gender equality), 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions) and 17 (partnerships for the goals). For instance, the whole thrust of the counter-terrorism support provided under the project, planned as well as implemented, has been to contribute towards strong law enforcement and criminal justice institutions, and to peace as a whole, by addressing needs and support provided under partnerships with different government bodies and criminal justice actors. The project has been aligned with the UNODC Strategy 2021-2025 (Thematic Area 4: Preventing and Countering Terrorism), and the Regional Programme for South Asia (2018-2022), Sub-Programme 4: Terrorism Prevention. Previously, the project linked to United Nations Sustainable Development Framework 2018-2022.13

The relevance of the project was underscored by the fact that it allowed for the continued engagement of the UN with the Government of Sri Lanka on CT, with some results in the end. The capacity building components aimed to address weaknesses in criminal justice and law enforcement capacities and coordination, with the latter identified in the analysis of causes of the Easter Sunday attacks.

13 Driver 1: Towards Improved Data, Knowledge Management and Evidence-Based Policy; Driver 2: Strengthened, Innovative Public Institutions and Engagement Towards a Lasting Peace). Following agreement by UNCT to move from Drivers to Results Groups, the project does not contribute to any Results Group.

This validated and necessitated such a project. the project provided assistance to strengthen data collection and sharing for the intelligence function of the police, which had been reorganized following the Easter
Sunday attacks. Capacity strengthening of the navy by means of training in detection and vessel boarding methods and the provision of modern equipment was further relevant considering that evidence showed that explosive and detonators for the Easter attacks had come into the country via sea. Yet, the overall limited availability of data on the impact of the capacity-building component of Interpol, and the effects of the training on inter-agency cooperation, have compromised the assessment of the relevance and also effectiveness of the project in this field.

Prison reform had been viewed as highly relevant. The Sri Lankan Department of Prisons (Ministry of Justice) had requested for support to strengthen the management of high-risk prisoners and Violent Extremist Prisoners, including by means of dynamic security training for all levels of officers. The importance of this area became even more obvious when prison riots took place in 2020, and the expert on the ground offered support in handling the post-riot situation. Additionally, the project had supported rehabilitation of prisoners by means of vocational training assistance. The continued relevance of these and also health-related assistance and overall guidance on the implementation of the Nelson Mandela Rules (NMR) and the Bangkok Rules was confirmed in the ‘Prison Reforms Five Year Plan (2021-2025).’ Nevertheless, the original design was not fully based on the operational reality, with hardly access to violent extremist prisoners as they were on remand.

Other components of the project received a more mixed review. The parts combined in the project’s second outcome were only considered relevant to some extent. While one of the main purposes of the project had been to reform the legislative framework of Sri Lanka, the change in political leadership of the country in 2019 during the design phase of the project, however, had directly affected opportunities to support the Government of Sri Lanka to draft a new terrorism legislative framework combined with the repeal of the Prevention of Terrorism Act (PTA), which had legitimized gross human rights violations. The objective to do this in an 18-month period was also ambitious, especially as the second half of this outcome was built on training on the new legislation. In addition, at the start of the project several actors were no longer interested in the support provided under this EU-funded project. This concerned the judiciary as well as the countering the financing of terrorism component for the Financial Intelligence Unit (FIU) of the Central Bank of Sri Lanka. These planned activities had been informed by UNODC’s previous work in this field in Sri Lanka. By the time contact was sought with the FIU in July/August 2020 to start planning, the World Bank had stepped in and had already begun with offering the requested technical assistance to the Central Bank. Instead of supporting the establishment of an Internet Referral Unit, as foreseen in the project’s design, only a feasibility study on potential future setup was undertaken in light of due diligence concerns. Other components included in the original design, such as the technical assistance on special investigative techniques and open-source intelligence were considered relevant by the various stakeholders interviewed during this evaluation, as well as newly introduced activities, such as the provision of forensic equipment to the Analyst’s Department of the MoJ and the training sessions held for members of the Bar Association.

The different project components were designed in close cooperation with the Sri Lankan stakeholders to some extent, and further defined and tailored to needs in the early phases of project implementation by means of two inception missions and the first Steering Committee meeting which took place in February 2020. The navy and prison reform components had been developed in close consultation with national stakeholders with GMCP already on the ground, and in contact with their future counterparts. The importance of UNODC’s presence on the ground cannot be underestimated. The GMCP’s office in Colombo was able to respond quickly, and their work had already established confidence in UNODC’s emblem and the Office as a neutral actor with donors and counterparts. The component that addressed the criminal justice chain, however, was designed remotely, from Vienna, and especially this component could have benefited from earlier and further consultations with government counterparts in order to jumpstart and fine-tune the various activities in order to optimize their relevance and utilization. The relatively late recruitment of the TPB-funded project team staff, the Covid-19 pandemic which further hindered the arrival of the project team (see the chapter on

efficiency) and the partially intended remote and mission-based delivery of activities of the GLOR35 project component have further contributed to this effect. The project’s relevance has been confirmed by the flexibility of the counterparts during the pandemic to postpone, adapt and change activities for instance to hybrid or online modalities, and by offering support to the Sri Lanka Prison Department in the area of hygienic supplies to lower the risk of Covid-19.

The relevance of the project for supporting the investigation and prosecution of the Easter bombings was less strong considering that the project actually started almost a year after the attacks. EU procedures have been one reason for this time frame as well as the elections in Sri Lanka. While soft earmarked funds, if available, could have provide a source for a rapid support mechanism, the question is if this is always or at all needed considering other international and bilateral actors offering instant support. While the investigation process had moved into the next phase, only one of the three trials had actually started at the end of the project.15

The initial priority to address these capacity issues and be a recipient of CT support had also changed with the Covid-19 pandemic taking over during these two years. Nevertheless, the project has been part of a larger international effort to support the Government of Sri Lanka to strengthen their capacities to prevent and counter violent extremism and terrorism in addition to sustained pressure by part of the UN, bilateral actors and civil society to reform the CT framework that continued to legitimize human rights violations.16

SUMMARY – RELEVANCE
The project has been relevant considering its stated strategic objectives and continued needs of the Government of Sri Lanka, partially reflected in the analysis on the chain of events and institutional capacities leading up to the Easter attacks. While attention in the design phase had been given to tailoring and fine-tuning assistance needs, and matching these with project capacity, in some areas more timely and consultative efforts could have increased relevance and supported cooperation and ownership of results. Relevance was confirmed by the flexibility of some partners to continue to support implementation, despite the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, and the design changes which allowed for the training and the provision of PPE kits to offer protection to prison staff and prisoners.

EFFICIENCY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:
To what extent has the project delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner, and meeting the expected standards?
Did implementation of the project adequately adapt to the situation caused by the COVID-19 pandemic in order to support the achievement of the intended outcomes?
Has the project been managed and governed efficiently and effectively?

Project performance has been efficient in light of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the timely implementation of the planned activities. The first year of implementation showed an expenditure rate of 29.13 percent for the UNODC and Interpol components combined, which is low for project with a duration


of only 18 months. In addition to time needed to gain traction, which is often symptomatic for a first year, the pandemic caused additional delays. While ‘operating and other direct costs’ (45.39 percent) and ‘staff and other personnel costs’ (34.78%) were comparatively high, expenditures in other budget lines only ranged from 11.27 to 16.38 percent. Following the no-cost extension of six months, UNODC expenditures reached 82 percent of the total budget (on 31 January 2022).

**Figure 3: Combined UNODC/Interpol project expenditures (as of 31 January 2021)**

![Graph showing combined UNODC/Interpol project expenditures (as of 31 January 2021)](image_url)

*Source: Elaborated by the evaluation team during the analysis*

The Covid-19 pandemic led to drastic reductions in international and local travel, mandatory quarantine periods, and major disruptions in social and economic life, in accordance with Government of Sri Lanka regulations and the UN Secretary General’s instructions to limit international missions to only essential matters. The consequences were profound on staff arrival and availability, with project staff arriving on location late (see below) especially as the start of the project coincided with the onset of the pandemic. This may have had a negative effect on outcome 2 delivery combined with the remote and mission-based delivery model. Shorter missions for TPB-driven activities were deemed outside the realm of possibilities, which was however in contrast with the field missions for the GMCP activities, with long-term consultants agreeing to be quarantined in accordance with local regulations.

Overall, the project team showed commitment and flexibility in their response to these unforeseen circumstances, and adapted project design to continue with the work under the different components. The timely delivery of activities was, however, highly effected, and trainings were cancelled, delayed and/or moved to online platforms or other locations. For instance, the two trainings held for the Sri Lankan navy and coast guard under outcome 3 were conducted on a small uninhabited island in front of the Trincomalee harbour, which allowed for a protected environment during these 10 day in-person trainings. Training for prison staff was done outside prison environments; access to...
prisons was not given to international experts because of the high number of Covid-19 cases as well as mistrust towards expats. This affected the implementation of the security audits. A portion of the budget was redirected to allow for extra support for the Prison Department to deal with the additional set of challenges created by the pandemic. Operational guidelines were completed, training on prevention and containment of viruses in prison settings provided, and PPE kits, including masks, sanitizers, disposable gloves and disinfecting spray, handed over to the Prison Department.

The shift was made to online training platforms in the beginning in order to proceed with some of the training, especially under outcome 2. However, the negative effect of online events on the receptiveness of participants informed the request of the Government of Sri Lanka to conduct hybrid trainings, with the participants gathered in one location and trainers connecting remotely. This remained far from ideal considering the limited room for interaction between experts and participants, and for the experts to be able to connect with their audience, and fine-tune their inputs, especially with respect to tuning into possible culturally sensitive issues, such as with respect to stereotypes and gender relations.

Other external factors affecting the overall performance of the project were the parliamentary elections held on 5 August 2020 in Sri Lanka, which initially limited stakeholder availability for events and then required the fostering of new relationships with counterparts following the turnover of Government officials.

Delays in implementation were also found in the procurement of equipment, with the pandemic bringing about new government regulations that slowed down customs clearing processes. Administrative rules were adapted, and more authority given to the project team on the ground by increasing the ceiling from USD 10,000.00 to USD 40,000.00 to mitigate some of these consequences. On top of this, the UNODC-UNDP agreement on the provision of services expired in 2020, which caused additional challenges before procurement was moved to UNOPS, which was reportedly a more cost-effective arrangement but only became effective mid 2021.

The project management structure was determined by the two GPs. GMCP staff was already in Colombo at the start of the project, and the P5 Project Coordinator/Head of Office a.i. specifically recruited for the two EU-funded and the German project, took on his responsibilities in April 2020. He arrived in Colombo in July 2020. Additionally, a P2 Associate Programme Officer arrived in September, 2020. The P3 Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer covered by GLOR35 and located in the Maldives also assisted in the design and implementation of some of the project’s activities. The criminal justice expert in the UNODC Regional Office South Asia (ROSA) was omitted (see the chapter on coherence). Two local staff members supporting project activities were partially covered by this project and partially by a CT project funded by the German government.

The management structure of the project had two P5 staff in Colombo, namely the project coordinator and the GMCP Chief, and within the project management structure there were originally five P5 managers in a hierarchical relationship to each other. This was partially solved by shifting one reporting line to a D1 position in the overall reporting structure. The GMCP and TPB components operated in parallel to each other, with no regular meetings and with separate offices in Sri Lanka’s capital (which was a consequence of the lack of available space in the UN compound at the time of setting up the office).

Arguably, the solution sought to recruit a project coordinator a.i. had been the only option available to create a separate project structure in

---

19 The project team and GMCP had separate offices in Colombo, with the latter already having a project office prior to the start of the project in the UN compound. This mirrored to some extent the management set up of the UNODC-managed part of the project. Because of limited space and the new Covid-19 regulations, the new project team could not be allocated office space in the compound, and a separate project office was therefore established into an office building which already hosted other UN agencies for security reasons.
Colombo in order to give a more prominent profile to UNODC CT programming in the country considering lengthy recruitment procedures for more permanent positions.

The geographically-stretched reporting and communication lines, and the programmatic architecture underpinning these, had an impact on strategic planning, coordination and efficiency (see also the section on internal coherence. Combined with limited on-site financial capacity, this had resulted in a situation with limited oversight at the level of the newly established project office. Additionally, the second local administrative officer (the first had left before the end of the project) could not be given access to Umoja as she could not obtain the necessary certifications within the duration of her contract of a few months. One main lesson is that field-based staff need to be given the resources for coordination, oversight and management in order to be held administratively and accountable, and that strengths and assets must be leveraged to efficiently and effectively get the job on the ground done.

The ‘project team’ had programming experts with criminal justice expertise in Colombo. The P3 programme officer with a solid criminal justice and human rights background from the Maldives was able to offer his expertise in support of some activities, especially in the first year of implementation. Technical experts were either GMCP consultants (long-term for the prison component), TPB headquarter-based staff combined with short-term consultants (including staff/partners of the UNODC Nigeria office CONIG on two occasions) and staff of bilateral partners (outcome 2 and outcome 3). The implication of the move to limit the programmatic and geographically stretched management of the project was that staff responsible for particular thematic areas/sub-projects based in Vienna had no longer direct access to counterparts to discuss technical issues. While a more inclusive approach could have mitigated some of these concerns, the importance of on-the-ground capacity cannot be underestimated for the efficient coordination of programmatic activities in politically-sensitive environments, including to sufficiently consider human rights due diligence in planning and implementation. Additionally, the inclusion of local staff in project teams cannot be underestimated for facilitating relationships with counterparts, as was visible in POLKA. A similar observation was made for the prison component which had greatly benefited from the recruitment of a local consultant for easing communication and facilitating close interaction with the counterpart.

Diversity and gender balance could have been more seriously considered in recruitment. International project staff in POLKA were all Western men. The GMCP team had female and male managers with Western and Asian backgrounds. The local staff composition in POLKA was more gender-balanced with initially one female and one male staff. A good practice was the implementation of a team workplace/sexual harassment risk assessment which highlighted some security concerns of female staff (working alone in the office after office hours and limited lightning parking), which were addressed by management. Additionally, one international and one national focal point was appointed to offer a mechanism to discuss concerns, and address these, and sexual harassment training had been mandatory to all staff.

Planning, monitoring and reporting has been undertaken at different levels by the two GPs. Two contingency plans prepared in April and August 2020 adapted the original planning of activities given in the project design, and the revised ‘Description of the Action’ and Logframe had introduced new outputs aligned with budgetary revisions. Monitoring and reporting were done at the activity and output level by means of weekly reports to the EU, two two-pages achievement reports for respectively 2020 and 2021, and one annual progress report. Reporting was therefore generally considered to be satisfactory, although less comprehensive reporting was noted in the first half of 2021 when project implementation continued to be faced with the challenges outlined above. Monitoring was however not done systematically. Additionally, pre-training and post-training evaluation questionnaires were neither available nor used under all outcomes. Online events also contributed to a lower response rate of evaluation questionnaires. Additionally, the data of the five-point Likert scale (1 to 5) used in evaluation questionnaires were not reported on separately, but the middle range of the values 2 to 4 were collated into the value neutral in the reports. This could possibly have obscured some more critical reflections by participants on these trainings. Sex-disaggregated data were also not collected and analysed in a systematic manner. A project-wide approach to planning, monitoring and evaluation would have supported consistency on data collection and presentation across all outcomes.
Triangulated data confirmed that visibility of the project and its activities, and of the donor, was dealt with satisfactorily. Visibility was minimized in-country and globally in online platforms in response to the fierce criticism by civil society organizations on providing technical CT support to the Sri Lankan government because of the precarious human rights situation in the country.

**SUMMARY – EFFICIENCY**

The project took off slowly because of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, the change in administrative support provider and because of internal management challenges, but the delivery rate accelerated with the no-cost extension. The stretched management structure without a clear reporting hierarchy and the limited admin-financial support on location have had an impact on coordination and oversight while the on-site presence of the project team supported flexibility in adapting design to circumstances and needs to some extent. Activity reporting was undertaken systematically, but monitoring, evaluation and reporting at output and outcome level to a limited degree only.

**COHERENCE**

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

Was cooperation and coordination, and appropriate synergies, sought within UNODC, within the project and with external partners and projects?

The project has been internally coherent to some extent with the outcomes that UNODC was responsible for being complementary in nature. The distribution of three of the four project outcomes to two GPs was overall logical considering their respective mandates, previous experience and location. The different components were implemented as stand-alone components, although different criminal justice actors were included in different activities to support inter-agency cooperation. Other segments of GLOR35 funded by the Government of Japan and the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) complemented particular activities and offered resources for joint activities. Counterparts of the comparatively smaller EU-funded project ‘Support to Maldives on Counter Terrorism’, also implemented by UNODC and Interpol, took part in some joint activities as well as in some regional activities together with other Asian countries.

The German Sri Lanka CT project, which was a ROSA project[^20], and other GMCP segments with Japanese and INL funding supplemented activities under outcome 3 and 4, as well as the judiciary component of the German Sri Lanka CT project, were implemented in synergy with the project in Sri Lanka. Synergies appeared to exist too with UNODC headquarters, ROSA and ROSEAP-supported activities in Sri Lanka carried out by consultants in the field of corruption, human trafficking, legal aid, container control, drugs and prison reform. These could have been made more explicit in order to examine the added value of such activities to UNODC’s work under the project, streamline contacts with counterparts and make and present the organization more coherently to counterparts and partners. A country level strategy or operational document bringing all the different activities together to support planning and support coherence was not available.

The importance of a coherent approach for organizational credibility in addition to efficiency and effectiveness was possibly underestimated to some extent because of insufficient understanding about the political sensitive situation in Sri Lanka. Additionally, on-the-ground presence also required more coordination of activities of a wide range of UNODC global and regional projects, which was not always appreciated by staff.

of these projects project teams in addition to the capacity needed to undertake the added requirement of human rights due diligence checks.

**External coherence.** The project has been designed and implemented in coordination with partners. At the request of the donor, Interpol was added to the project to cover the law enforcement component. Coordination with Interpol, however, remained highly limited in Sri Lanka despite the three Steering Committee meetings that took place in the two years of implementation. The two organizations worked along different activity lines although cooperation with UNODC took place under outcome 2 on open-source intelligence in September 2020. As highly limited information was available on Interpol activities, opportunities to coordinate and synergize project elements might have been missed for that reason, including by connecting different parts of the criminal justice chain and strengthening cooperation between law enforcement and criminal justice actors. The Interpol component therefore remained a standalone component within the project, which may have affected the overall results and their added value to UNODC’s work and vice versa.

Triangulated data further confirmed close coordination between POLKA and the UN Resident Coordinator (RC)’s Office and OHCHR. The human rights situation in Sri Lanka required continuous close coordination, including to speak with ‘one voice’ on the human rights situation in the country. This was, for instance, visible in Steering Committee meetings when EU and UN representatives reiterated the same messages to Sri Lankan government representatives.

The Steering Committee meetings had been viewed as an effective mechanism to consolidate project ownership and support coordination, as representatives of several stakeholders of the Sri Lankan government had also been present. The first two Steering Committee meetings were to reflect on the performance of the project and the complementary project on preventing and countering violent extremism (P/CVE) of UNDP, which was also funded by the EU. No cooperation took place between the two organizations outside these meetings for different reasons outside the scope of this evaluation. Cooperation took place with the International Committee for the Red Cross (ICRC) in the context of the work undertaken in prison settings. In addition, cooperation with bilateral actors also took place in support of project activities, such as with the Government of Denmark which provided two experts to support training the navy and coast guard, the Government of Australia and the Government of the USA, with in-country specialists lending their expertise in training.

**SUMMARY – COHERENCE**

Synergies were sought, maintained and used within the project to some extent, involving UNODC, UN entities, bilateral actors and the ICRC. Cooperation with the UNRC and OHCHR was considered an added value and highly supportive in such a sensitive operational environment, while the highly limited synergies and cooperation with Interpol may have had an overall adverse effect on strengthening cooperation in the criminal justice chain. Internal coherence in UNODC’s programming architecture was affected by the challenges with respect to coordination at the country level, the absence of a country-level strategy or operational plan, and the level of understanding regarding the need for such coordination in a sensitive political environment and required human rights due diligence checks.
EFFECTIVENESS

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:
To what extent did the intervention achieve its intended outcomes?
What have been the facilitating or hindering factors in achievement of expected and actual results?

Triangulated data support the findings that the project has delivered under all four outcome areas, although the outputs achieved have only in some instances led to the utilization of strengthened capabilities. Through interviews it was confirmed that training and equipment have contributed to enhanced detection capacity of the navy and coast guard on land and at sea, the implementation of a dynamic security regime in some prisons and enhanced capacity to manage a pandemic in prison settings, which supported a more effective management of the Covid-19 pandemic in this environment. Factors that have affected the project’s overall effectiveness have in particular been the change in the political environment which was not conducive to initiatives to reform the legislative framework on CT, the consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic, and a change in partners selected. The achievement of results under the four outcomes has been facilitated by ownership of project counterparts, partnerships and project team and experts’ presence and inputs in Sri Lanka, and the overall relevance of the different elements of the project.

Law enforcement capabilities to prevent and disrupt terrorism and/or terrorist-related activities were developed and strengthened by means of the provision of specialised equipment and training. Yet the extent to which interagency cooperation and operational effectiveness has been strengthened by means of Interpol’s inputs and outputs could not be assessed during this evaluation (see the methodology chapter for further information).

A comprehensive policy and legislative framework for CT was not developed for reasons outlined above. Instead, capacities were trained of different criminal justice actors on CT in general, the financing of terrorism and with respect to open-source intelligence and special investigative skills. Also, a three-day table top exercise was completed in December 2021 on domestic inter-agency information-sharing. Equipment was further provided to the Analyst’s Department of the MoJ, which however still had to be assembled because of the late delivery at the time of this evaluation.

Trainings conducted were evaluated by participants in a positive light by those who had submitted their assessments and were interviewed for this evaluation. Triangulated data further conveyed that the English language was occasionally deemed a challenge for some participants, such as by those occupying lower ranks in law enforcement and prisons, and more systematic attention to accessibility needs to be given by UNODC in general. While training content and publications were overall considered to be adequately tailored to the Sri Lankan context under outcome 3 and 4, more efforts could have been made to replicate this in realms covered under outcome 2. These could have been achieved by means of utilizing experts with a background in common law and by offering real examples/case-studies from common law countries instead of utilizing imaginary case-studies. At the same time, some of the specialized training offered to prosecutors by international experts was also highly appreciated.

Additionally, the two batches of five trainings offered to staff of the Attorney General’s Department (AGD) appeared different in scope and content, with more inputs offered by TPB staff from Vienna in the first batch, and with an interesting example of capitalizing on UNODC expertise in another region. Yet coordinating the design of curricula of different trainers could have been given further attention because of some repetition and limited tailoring to the local context. This could have one of the reasons contributing to a gradual reduction in interested attorneys in these training courses (see figure 4). In addition to some of the challenges of online and hybrid training already highlighted above, the view was also expressed that the training schedule
could have been more considerate to the existing workload and responsibilities of lawyers and attorneys, with a preference for training during evenings and weekends. A more sustained capacity-building strategy appeared to be implemented for prison staff, navy and coast guard, which considered and utilized mentoring in addition to group training as part of a (multi-donor) longer-term strategy. The donated equipment was considered very useful and highly appreciated (see for further information on handbooks, the chapters on effectiveness and sustainability).

**Source**: Elaborated by the evaluation team during the analysis

Evidence was however neither found on the use of acquired knowledge, skills and equipment nor enhanced inter-agency information-sharing, despite the confidence in the direct application of the concepts and the usefulness of training for the daily work of respectively prosecutors and investigators, as conveyed during the evaluation of the training.

The Sri Lankan Navies’ and Coast Guard’s capacity was strengthened by means of capacity-building support for littoral border control on land and at sea, including by means of two trainings on the detection of IED, and the handover of four portable backscatter x-ray machines. A pocket handbook on IEDs was completed for the navy, and a pocket handbook on CBRN terrorism awareness was also completed. The techniques and tactics that were taught during training as well as the received x-ray machines have been put to use in day-to-day operational activities.

The use of dynamic security and crisis management skills and knowledge, combined with the new SoPs and equipment, such as signal test equipment (metal detection equipment) and videos in visitation centres, led to a more secure environment for prison staff and prisoners. This was a major change from a situation characterized by a lack of operational guidance and systematic and written documentation. Additionally, materials and vocational training were supplied to four prisons for prison-based rehabilitation, and ten computers provided to prisons in the Western Province to facilitate communication between prisoners and their families. Last but not least, SoPs and contingency plans for the management of the Covid-19 pandemic were prepared, approved by the Ministry of Health, and subsequently applied together with the PPE kits that were handed over to the Prison Department for staff and prisoners alike.
SUMMARY – EFFECTIVENESS

The project has been effective to some extent because of the challenging operational environment, the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and the project’s limited duration, amongst others. Only the components on strengthening the dynamic, procedural and physical security in selected prisons and with respect to littoral border control were found to be effective.

IMPACT

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

To what extent has the project reached its overall objective, and therefore its intended impact?

To what extent has the project generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects?

What impact did the project have on the counter-terrorism landscape in Sri Lanka?

Impact of the ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-terrorism’ project refers to the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, effects through the delivery of the project objectives. The objective to ‘Increase [the] capacity of criminal justice and law enforcement officials to effectively investigate, prosecute and adjudicate terrorism cases in Sri Lanka, in line with the relevant international legal instruments and human rights norms, standards and good practices’ has been achieved to a limited extent in view of evidence collected. The consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic combined with the ambitious nature of the project, its short time-frame, changes in the political environment and some weaknesses in the project’s design have had a direct impact on the project’s effectiveness. These factors directly impacted on the consolidation of results that could have contributed to a strengthened criminal justice response to terrorism cases.

The project has contributed to the CT landscape in Sri Lanka in the period 2020-2021, but had limited to no impact on a more effective response in the prevention and response to terrorism. At that same time, the project has contributed to continuing engagement and dialogue with the government on CT issues as part of an overall effort of the international community, which could potentially have a longer-term effect, including with the repeal of the PTA and the development of a legislative framework in line with international human rights norms. The training provided to different criminal justice actors might have led to a shift in framing CT and supported building confidence among agencies by enhancing their capacities and knowledge, including about the rule of law and human rights.

SUMMARY – IMPACT

The project had a limited time-frame and was implemented in parallel with the Covid-19 pandemic. These factors have contributed to a project which in the end neither had the envisaged impact as formulated in the project’s objective nor a more effective response in terrorism prevention and response.
SUSTAINABILITY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

To what extent were the results sustainable, and, by their nature and delivery modalities, appropriate to ensure long-term sustainability of the intervention?

To what extent has local ownership been achieved through the establishment of solid partnerships with beneficiaries as well as national and regional stakeholders?

Government ownership has been invited, promoted and sought in the course of the project’s design and implementation. This was visible in the level of participation in Steering Committee meetings, for instance, and the efforts to capitalize on already existing relationships with some criminal justice actors and the navy and coast guard, and in building on a shared vision for reform, such as in the case of the actors supported by the GMCP. Apart from the built capacity of the navy and the coast guard, the overarching observation is that the results achieved thus far can only become sustainable with continued technical support considering the short-term and ambitious nature of the project, and the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on project results. Capacity-building requires a long-term approach, and the comprehensive training approach used for prison staff, with class room training, exercises and mentoring, was considered effective. This requires a long-term investment, such as which was visible with respect to the navy under various GLOW63 segments; Sri Lankan navy officers had been invited to be trainers in other countries in the region within the framework of UNODC’s GMCP.

The development of manuals and guidance material have also been done under the different components, with pocket handbooks for the navy and the ‘Practical guide for requesting electronic evidence across borders’ for Sri Lanka, a guide which has been developed specifically for the country. The practical guide is in the process of being finalized. A follow-up plan for its dissemination and application still had to be made at the time of this evaluation. The use of manuals for training and managing viruses in places of detention was further promoted by translating these into Sinhala and Tamil.

Equipment provided to different stakeholders has been utilized, such as in prison environments and by the navy and coast guard, or is in the process of being assembled with the intention of its utilization clearly conveyed in the data collection process. For instance, the equipment provided to the Analysts Department still had to be assembled for use, which was delayed because of the Covid-19 pandemic. Yet a stronger effort needs to be made to plan projects together with counterparts, and include discussions on hardware, such as licencing, maintenance, accessibility of existing manuals and fuel.
An exit plan combined with one that outlines the different activities required to reach sustainable results was not prepared by UNODC. There will not be a phase II of the project considering that there was not sufficient ‘traction’. Furthermore, funding will be contingent on an improved human rights situation and the repeal of the PTA. The government of Germany has provided funding for a third phase of a CT project which was implemented in parallel to the EU project, which will continue to offer support for prison reform, with the focus on drug addiction offering the entry point to work with high-risk prisoners and promote the NMR and the Bangkok rules. This will be implemented by the GMCP team, which will also be in a position to offer further support with funds from Japan and USA to reduce overcrowding in prisons, for instance, and continue with building capacity of the navy and coast guard while continuing to make efforts to institutionalize such training.

**SUMMARY – SUSTAINABILITY**

Sustainability has been considered by promoting ownership, such as visible in Steering Committee meetings, although requiring more joint planning from the very beginning. Only the component on littoral border control appears to be sustainable. The overall conclusion is that continued support is needed to obtain results that will last, while only a GMCP plan for follow-up activities, and corresponding funds, is available to offer such long-term assistance.

**HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUALITY AND LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND**

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

To what extent has the project design and implementation fully considered human rights, gender equality and leaving no one behind?

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

Human rights, gender equality and leaving no-one behind have been mainstreamed in project design and implementation to some extent.

The project team has advocated for the repeal of the controversial PTA, and the development of new legislation in line with international human rights standards, albeit to no direct effect. Human rights were mainstreamed in the UNODC components of the project by means of human rights due diligence and in training activities to some extent. Human rights due diligence was considered by means of reviewing participants’ lists and planned procurement by the OHCHR. The handover of equipment came with a contract with a human rights clause about the usage of equipment, which the receiving agency had to sign. While this was not in place in the very beginning, mitigating measures were put in place by UNODC when the situation deteriorated. Additionally, instead of the actual setting up of an Internet Referral Unit, which had been one of the outputs in the project document, only preparatory work was performed which led to the conclusion that setting up the unit could not be supported.

In trainings given to criminal justice practitioners, human rights were mainstreamed in curricula in varying degrees. For instance, three one day training courses were held for defence lawyers of the Sri Lankan Bar Association (SLBA) in 2021 on anti-torture; admissibility of evidence tainted by HR violations; confessions and allegations of coercion. Similar issues were addressed in training provided to prosecutors. In training on open-source investigations, human rights were considered in the topic of privacy rights, for instance. Training was provided on the NMR and the Bangkok rules to staff of the Sri Lanka Prison Department, although it is too early to observe noticeable changes for prisoners.
GENDER EQUALITY

Gender equality has to a lesser extent been mainstreamed in the project. The project proposal provided further detail on the gender-sensitive approaches that UNODC intended to apply in the project, including equal access to resources and opportunities for men and women, both individually and in groups, but in practice gender was only mainstreamed in the project to a limited extent. The inclusion of women and the promotion of gender balance in training was requested in letters, but the composition of the groups of stakeholders targeted in the project limited opportunities to invite a gender balance in training activities. For instance, training for prison staff always required 20 percent female participants, but in practice only a few attended the trainings, with a higher likelihood of female participants with Admin and Rehabilitation backgrounds. Most prisons had no female staff and also the coast guard had no female staff. In contrast, the navy has some female officers, which had been given guard and search duties, especially in search operations involving women and children. Thus, officers were trained on the importance of utilizing female staff for women in search operations. The AGO and the Bar Association also had more opportunities to select female participants but monitoring data on the gender balance in the different activities were neither readily available nor systematically collected. In one training on CT to prosecutors, a session was dedicated to stereotypes, including male and female stereotypes of persons associated with terrorism and victims.

Figure 5: Sex-disaggregated data of participants training outcome 2, 3 and 4

Source: Elaborated by the evaluation team during the analysis

LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

Highly limited information has been provided on the principle ‘leaving no one behind’ and has predominantly been considered in the prison component with respect to coverage, and with respect to the provision of a guidance note and related health training and PPE kits to ensure equal access of staff and prisoners to protection.
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SUMMARY – HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUALITY AND LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

Human rights standards and principles have been applied across the project, with human rights due diligence principles applied in the selection of participants for training and equipment and human rights has been mainstreamed in training to a large extent. While good practices were noted in prison reform, the principle of leaving no one behind has not been systematically applied across all outcomes. Gender equality has been applied to a limited extent, with the principle not mainstreamed in an equally balanced manner under the different outcomes.
III. CONCLUSIONS

At the time of designing the project ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism’, there was nothing that could have predicted that a pandemic of global proportions would take place in parallel with the project. The same observation can be made with respect to the change in political leadership in the country late 2019 which put the overall design, and the relevance of the different activities, in a different light. These events have had a direct impact on efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of a project which already had been too ambitious at the outset. With the extension of the duration of the project to two years, the overall expenditure rate showed a steep increase in the latter half of the project. The consequence of the above developments, combined with a late initiation of planning for outputs under the criminal justice component, was that only two of the five objectives of Thematic Area 4 ‘Preventing and Countering Terrorism’ UNODC Strategy 2021-2025, had been addressed by the project. Particular attention was given to strengthening Sri Lanka’s criminal justice systems to address issues related to countering and preventing terrorism in a manner that complies with human rights obligations, and expanding on the ground presence to support Sri Lanka to respond to emerging issues. This has been visible in the move to different training modalities to deal with the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, and the support offered on dynamic security in the field of prison reform following the prison riots. Legislative reform and the strengthening of mechanisms to counter the financing of acts of terrorism received less priority and different input because of reasons explained above.

The same applied to the work with relevant partners to prevent violent extremism albeit for other reasons, with limited work in this field undertaken during the period. Cooperation with partners predominantly took shape with the UNRC Office, the OHCHR and ICRC, with the partnership with Interpol operationalized in such a way that meetings between the two project partners were rare in these two years. Field-level cooperation had been highly considerate of UN country coordination mechanisms. However, internal coordination of UNODC had been more challenging because of the organization’s programming architecture based on global, regional and country-level projects with personnel not fully cognizant of the need for cooperation with the project team in POLKA in order to streamline activities with different government partners, even more so considering the challenging operational environment, and the limited acknowledgement in-house that such coordination required sufficient capacity to do this in a responsible and effective manner. The two UNODC project teams representing the two global projects were operating in parallel, targeting different parts of the criminal justice chain. The absence of an operational planning tool at the country level was symptomatic of this architecture.

A predominant recurring theme was human rights, while gender equality and leaving no one behind were only considered much less profoundly. The change in political leadership in Sri Lanka following the Easter Sunday attacks in 2019 introduced a different, and especially much more polarized, operational environment for the project, with opportunities to offer support for a new legislative framework on CT annulled. The close partnership with the UN was the appropriate mechanism to pre-empt some human rights criticism on the work of the UNODC, and to communicate in one voice about the need to repeal the PTA, in a context characterized by different views on the role of UNODC on advancing human rights. While the project did not have the envisaged results in this field, the mainstreaming of human rights in activities under the project might contribute to their integration in the work of different groups of criminal justice experts in the longer term, in addition to the necessary legislative reform and the repeal of the PTA. The continued engagement with the Government of Sri Lanka, within the overall framework of different themes but with the overall objective to strengthen the criminal justice chain, is pivotal for advancing human rights in the longer term.

The conclusions of this evaluation are best summarized with the help of the SWOT analysis given in Table 2.
### Table 2 - SWOT analysis of the project ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Relevant to UNODC mandates and stakeholders’ needs;</td>
<td>✗ Short-term nature project;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Established neutrality;</td>
<td>✗ Internal coordination challenges;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Flexible and efficient approaches;</td>
<td>✗ Fragmented quality and financial control;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Quality inputs and outputs;</td>
<td>✗ Highly limited monitoring;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Some utilization of results despite short duration project;</td>
<td>✗ Limited sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Field-based project team;</td>
<td>✗ Limited integration of gender equality and leaving no-one behind principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Close partnership UNRC and OHCHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats/Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ UNODC’s expertise in the criminal justice response to terrorism and maritime crime;</td>
<td>✗ Strong identity global/regional and national projects;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Field presence of project teams;</td>
<td>✗ Polarisation of human rights;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Partnership UN-country team;</td>
<td>✗ Capacity for national-level coordination;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Continued engagement with Government of Sri Lanka.</td>
<td>✗ Some internal cognizance for necessity to operate as one-UNODC at national level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Elaborated by the evaluation team during the analysis*
For the GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams at: UNODC Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), Division for Treaty Affairs (DTA), Vienna; UNODC Global Maritime Crime Programme (GMCP), Sri Lanka; and the UNODC Project Office in Colombo, Sri Lanka (POLKA).

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1 – SUSTAINABILITY

Integrate sustainability more comprehensively in project planning and strengthen sustainability by means of a) ensuring a long-term capacity-building strategy for counterparts under the GMCP and TPB components, if relevant; b) offer a sustainability plan for the different components in the final progress report; c) start a dialogue on the maintenance of the equipment given to the Analyst’s Department (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).

RECOMMENDATION 2 – INTERNAL COHERENCE

a) Advocate for and require a coordinated response in a sensitive working environment, including by means of promoting a one UNODC approach; b) ensure that technical experts based in headquarters have access to relevant government representative to tailor assistance. (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).

RECOMMENDATION 3 – EXTERNAL COHERENCE

Ensure that partnerships, including with respect to agreeing to project partners, liaising with the UNRC and other UN agencies in future design and implementation, are sufficiently considered. (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).

RECOMMENDATION 4 – EFFICIENCY (HUMAN RESOURCES)

Ensure that human resource management adequately considers diversity, gender balance, administrative/financial personnel, ranking, coordination and human rights due diligence capacity and project team location in future project design (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams together with Division for Operations (Do), Division for Treaty Affairs (DTA), and Human Resources Management Service (HRMS)).

RECOMMENDATION 5 – RELEVANCE (PROJECT DESIGN)

Ensure that comprehensive contextual analysis, inclusive consultative processes, continuous relationship management and including a sustainability strategy and an exit strategy is considered in project design (see also recommendation 1) (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).

RECOMMENDATION 6 – GENDER EQUALITY

Advance gender equality principles and strengthen gender mainstreaming by: (a) ensuring gender equity in international and national staff and consultants’ recruitment (& geographical balance); (b) continue promoting gender balance in activities; (c) undertaking gender-sensitive and sex-disaggregated data collection, analysis and reporting (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).
RECOMMENDATION 7 – HUMAN RIGHTS

Continue with the application of human rights standards and principles and consider a) systematically applying human rights due diligence principles in the design and implementation of technical assistance, such as with respect to equipment; b) ensuring sufficient staff capacity to undertake due diligence; c) review carefully the framing of CT projects in sensitive environments (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).

RECOMMENDATION 8 – LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

Continue with the application of the principle of leaving no one behind in prison reform and apply the principle of leaving no one behind across all project components (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).

RECOMMENDATION 9 – EFFICIENCY (MONITORING AND REPORTING)

Systematize data collection and analysis for monitoring and reporting, incl. sex-disaggregated data, across all areas (see 6), and set up a knowledge repository for internal purposes including evaluations (GLOR35 and GLOW63 project teams).
LESSONS LEARNED

The integrated programming model offers a model for global, regional and national-level projects operating in an integrated manner. This model, however, does not directly address internal coordination challenges at the field level and with relevant counterparts, especially when the same government bodies are targeted by different project teams. The risks associated with fragmented, limited and no internal coherence cannot be underestimated, especially in politically sensitive and volatile operational environments where close coordination within UNODC, with the UN and with other actors is paramount to act with one voice and pursue one common agenda to advance peace, security and human rights.

Another key lesson concerns the composition of field-based project teams which ought to consider diversity, gender, ranking and technical expertise, with sufficient integration of financial administration as well as criminal justice, human rights and gender equality expertise. Achieving a balance between managerial and technical expertise is key, and the different sets of roles and responsibilities of headquarters-based sections, regional offices and field-based project teams must be considered when designing projects. The consequences of the reliance on administrative staff in the regional office and in headquarters, for oversight at the field-level is a major lesson learned.

Another lesson is to provide a more comprehensive training package to different criminal justice actors in parallel and also jointly, considering the interconnected nature of the work of the different actors, such as with respect to open-source investigation capacity building to prosecutors as well as investigators and the judiciary. In addition, the inclusion of other actors, such as the Bar Association and legal aid providers, needs to be considered in order to achieve a more comprehensive coverage of the criminal justice chain to support effectiveness and impact.

BEST PRACTICES

The Covid-19 pandemic brought out a recalibration of project staff availability and capacity, as field missions had become more restricted because of travel and quarantine rules in Sri Lanka and Austria. The presence of a team in the field mitigated some of the consequences and allowed for a greater degree of flexibility in adjusting the project because of direct, regular contact with counterparts.

The use of international experts on long-term assignments in combination with local liaison capacity turned out to be highly beneficial. The long-term engagement with counterparts, facilitated by the local expert, allowed for confidence-building and provided them with pivotal knowledge about operational strengths and challenges, while also offering instant opportunities to respond, adapt, limit and expand assistance. Additionally, local staff are indispensable for initiating and nurturing partnerships with government bodies.

The application of human rights standards and principles can be identified as a good practice, which was visible in human rights due diligence monitoring in close cooperation with the OHCHR, and in the training offered to different criminal justice actors taking on different positions, roles and responsibilities in the criminal justice chain. This concerned the integration of international human rights instruments and standards, such as the NMR and the Bangkok Rules, in outputs.

The development of tools, such as the electronic evidence guide for Sri Lanka, in close collaboration with partners on the basis of a synergized approach that have a multiplier effect and can be replicated and utilized in different contexts was also considered a good practice.
## Background and Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project/Programme number:</strong></th>
<th>GLOR35 and GLOW63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project/Programme title:</strong></td>
<td>Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration (dd/mm/yyyy-dd/mm/yyyy):</strong></td>
<td>01/02/2020-31/07/2021 01/08/2021-31/07/2022 (extension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linkages to Country, Regional and Thematic Programmes:</strong></td>
<td>Regional Programme for South Asia (2018-2021) Sub-Programme 4: Terrorism Prevention UNODC Strategy 2021-2025 Thematic Area 4: Preventing and Countering Terrorism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Linkages to UNDAF’s strategic outcomes to which the project/programme contributes:**

Previously, the project linked to United Nations Sustainable Development Framework 2018-2022

Driver 1: Towards Improved Data, Knowledge Management and Evidence-Based Policy

Driver 2: Strengthened, Innovative Public Institutions and Engagement Towards a Lasting Peace

Following agreement by UNCT to move from Drivers to Results Groups, the project now does not currently contribute to any Results Group.

**Linkages to the SDG targets to which the project contributes:**

SDG 5 “Gender equality”

SDG 16 “Peace, justice and strong institutions”

SDG 17 “Partnership for the goals”

**Executing Agency (UNODC office/section/unit):**

UNODC Programme Office for Sri Lanka (POLKA)
UNODC Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB)
UNODC Global Maritime Crime Programme (GMCP)

**Partner Organizations:**

INTERPOL

**Total Approved Budget (USD):**

Total: USD 5,022,321.43 (EUR 4,500,000)

UNODC: USD 3,906,250 (EUR 3,500,000)
INTERPOL: USD 1,116,071.43 (EUR 1,000,000)

**Total Overall Budget (USD):**

Total: USD 5,022,321.43 (EUR 4,500,000)

---

21 United Nations Development Assistance Framework
## UNODC: USD 3,906,250 (EUR 3,500,000)

### INTERPOL: USD 1,116,071.43 (EUR 1,000,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>UNODC</th>
<th>INTERPOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure by date of initiation of evaluation (USD):</td>
<td>UNODC: USD 2,788,458.26</td>
<td>USD 1,116,071.43 (EUR 1,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Commitments and Actuals as of 8 September 2021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor(s):</td>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and title of Project/Programme Manager and UNODC office/section/unit:</td>
<td>Mr. Troels Vester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head of Office a.i.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme Offices for Sri Lanka and the Maldives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type and time frame of evaluation:</td>
<td>Final Independent Project Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Independent Project Evaluation/In-depth Evaluation/mid-term/final)</td>
<td>1 February 2022 – 1 July 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame of the project covered by the evaluation (until the end of the evaluation field mission/data collection phase):</td>
<td>1 February 2020 – 30 March 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage of the evaluation:</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget for this evaluation in USD:</td>
<td>USD 60,000 (as per IES budget matrix)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of independent evaluators planned for this evaluation:</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type and year of past evaluations (if any):</td>
<td>Independent Mid-Term In-Depth Evaluation of the Global Programme on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism (GLOR35) (2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Term Cluster Independent In-Depth Evaluation: Global Maritime Crime Programme (2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent In-Depth Evaluation: Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism (GLO/R35) (2021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

22 Including fees for evaluation team, travel, printing, editing, translation, interpretation, etc.

23 Please note that the minimum for any UNODC evaluation is two independent evaluators, i.e. one Evaluation Expert and one Substantive Expert in the subject area of the project to be evaluated.
**Project overview**

Implemented in partnership with INTERPOL and funded by the European Union, the project “Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism” aims at institutional capacity-building to effectively prevent/detect, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate terrorism cases in Sri Lanka, in line with the relevant international legal instruments and human rights norms, standards and good practices. To do so, UNODC and INTERPOL deliver four complementary outcomes. Outcome 1, implemented by INTERPOL, focuses on developing and strengthening law enforcement capabilities to prevent and disrupt terrorism and/or terrorist related activities. Delivered by the UNODC Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), Outcome 2 supports the Government in developing a comprehensive policy and legislative framework for counter-terrorism that is fully compliant with the rule of law, human rights standards and fundamental freedoms, as well as enhancing the capacities of criminal justice actors to ensure their effective implementation. Under Outcome 3, the UNODC Global Maritime Crime Programme (GMCP) support the development of capacity to strengthen littoral border control, including the detection of explosives and improvised explosive device (IED) components. Outcome 4, also implemented by GMCP, aims at strengthening dynamic, procedural and physical security in selected prison facilities and introducing a classification system for prisoners. The main beneficiaries of the project comprise: the Sri Lanka Police Criminal Investigation Department (CID), within which the National Central Bureau (local agency connected to INTERPOL policing capabilities) is situated, under Outcome 1; numerous criminal justice stakeholders with counter-terrorism mandates and responsibilities, including the Attorney General’s Department, Bar Association of Sri Lanka, Foreign Ministry and Government Analyst’s Department, under Outcome 2; the Sri Lanka Navy Special Boat Squadron under Outcome 3; and the Department of Prisons under Outcome 4.

The delivery modality of activities varies depending on the most applicable method for each intervention, such as: procurement of specialized equipment and delivery follow-up capacity-building; extension of relevant databases; national consultative meetings; development of tailored technical tools; targeted training series; regional and cross-regional events; and mentorship programmes. However, with the spread of COVID-19 aligning almost exactly with the start of the project, the adaptation of many interventions to online/virtual delivery has been required. The pandemic also caused significant delays to activity implementation across all four outcomes, eventually resulting in a no-cost extension of the project being requested and approved in June 2021, increasing the timeline from 18 to 24 months (now concluding on 31 January 2022). During the extension request process, UNODC and INTERPOL made revisions to project interventions, inserting/removing/adjusting activities while maintaining the same outputs and outcomes (as per European Union programming rules) to ensure delivery of the project to the maximum extent possible in the ongoing pandemic.

The project adopts a human rights-based approach, coordinating its implementation and deliverables with the United Nations 2030 Agenda Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 5, SDG 16 and SDG 17. The project also works to further the recently adopted United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution 46/1 “Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka”. Specifically requesting the Government of Sri Lanka to review the controversial Prevention of Terrorism Act (PTA), the resolution acts as a platform for UNODC’s capacity-building, ensuring technical assistance remains focused on bringing Sri Lanka’s counter-terrorism frameworks in line with international human rights standards. A risk assessment as part of the United Nations Human Rights Due Diligence Policy (HRDDP) was also performed during the initial project inception, and again following the approved extension of its timeframe and revision of deliverables. The project also responds to calls made by the United Nations General Assembly “to shape, review and implement all counter terrorism measures in accordance with the principles of gender equality and non-discrimination” (Res 68/178) and to mainstream gender perspectives into criminal justice responses to terrorism (Res 72/194). Accordingly, the project integrates a gender-sensitive approach, ensuring that relevant aspects are appropriately included and discussed whenever applicable, accounting for the many ways gender intersects with terrorism. The project thus ensures that gender issues are adequately taken into consideration when addressing both substantive and administrative matters.
I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

In conformity with the project document, in line with UNODC standard evaluation practices and in agreement with the European Union, a final evaluation of the initiative is required. The final independent project evaluation will assess the design, delivery and impact of the activities carried out under the project toward the achievement of the overall planned objective and relevant SDGs. The evaluation will be conducted through a human rights and gender-attentive lens and will appraise partnerships and other forms of cooperation with national and international stakeholders, lessons learned and best practices. The evaluation team will gauge the extent the project facilitated a baseline for follow-up actions in the country and the short/long-term impacts of the initiative and resulting sustainability.

The final evaluation will complement parallel and ad hoc efforts to assess the impact of single activities. The outcomes of the evaluation will be carefully analysed by TPB and GMCP UNODC, expanding institutional memory for the implementation of similar or related initiatives in the future. TPB and GMCP management at both headquarters and field level will benefit from the evaluation, through the highlighting of the intervention’s strengths and areas for improvement linked to the thematic focus areas and delivery modalities.

The final evaluation will also provide the European Union with a project implementation outline, thus informing the design of follow-up activities in the country and region. To the advisable extent, the main findings of the evaluation will also be discussed with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders, establishing a baseline for further UNODC intervention. The evaluation will assess all activities carried out under the four outcomes of the project by UNODC and its implementing partner INTERPOL and will cover the overall project duration, from 1 February 2020 to the end of the data collection phase/field mission. The evaluation will be limited to assess the extent to whether the intended impact of the action in Sri Lanka was reached, regardless of whether activities were implemented at the national, regional or cross-regional level.

II. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation will be conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, as well as human rights, gender equality and leaving no one behind, and lesson learned and best practices. All evaluations must include gender, human rights and no one left behind. Ideally these are mainstreamed within the evaluation questions. The criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability can be addressed as relevant to the evaluation purpose. Evaluation criteria and questions should be selected to meet the needs of the stakeholders and evaluation context. The evaluation criteria and questions will be further refined by the Evaluation Team in the drafting of the Inception Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance:24 Is the intervention doing the right thing?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent has the project been relevant to stakeholder (e.g., governments, Member States, etc.) needs and priorities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent were adjustments made throughout implementation to adapt the intervention to changes in circumstances, including COVID-19, and ensure continuity of its relevance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Coherence:25 How well does the intervention fit? |

24 Includes the previous criterion of design.

25 Includes the previous criteria of partnerships and cooperation.
The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the country, sector or institution

3. To what extent did the project contradict or reinforce other counter-terrorism initiatives in Sri Lanka?
4. To what extent did the project cooperate with partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) in the achievement of results?

**Efficiency: How well are resources being used?**

The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

5. To what extent has the project delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner?
6. Did implementation of the project adequately adapt to the situation caused by the COVID-19 pandemic in order to support the achievement of the intended outcomes?

**Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?**

The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.

7. To what extent did the intervention achieve its intended outcomes and overall objective?
8. What have been the facilitating or hindering factors in the achievement of expected results?

**Impact: What difference does the intervention make?**

The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.

9. To what extent has the project generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects?
10. What impact did the project have on the counter-terrorism landscape in Sri Lanka?

**Sustainability: Will the benefits last?**

The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

11. To what extent were the implemented activities, by their nature and delivery modalities, appropriate to ensure long-term sustainability of the intervention?
12. To what extent has local ownership been achieved through the establishment of solid partnerships with beneficiaries as well as national and regional stakeholders?

**Human rights, gender equality, and leaving no one behind: Has the intervention been inclusive and human rights based?**

The extent to which the project/programme has mainstreamed human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups, including those with disabilities.

13. To what extent has the project design and implementation fully considered human rights, gender equality and marginalized groups, including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities?

**Lessons learned and best practices**

Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/programme.

14. What are the key lessons learned and best practices of the project?
15. How can these be used to further the UNODC Strategy 2021-2025, particularly Thematic Area 4: Preventing and Countering Terrorism?
III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The methods used to collect and analyse data

This evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR and further refined in the Inception Report, as well as the availability of stakeholders. In all cases, the evaluation team is expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, thematic programmes, internal review reports, programme files, evaluation reports (if available), financial reports and any other additional documents that may provide further evidence for triangulation, on which their conclusions will be based. The evaluation team is also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation. While maintaining independence, the evaluation will be carried out based with a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all parties identified as the stakeholders of the project.

The evaluation team will be asked to present a summarized methodology (including an evaluation matrix) in the Inception Report outlining 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 as well as the UNODC Evaluation Policy, Norms and Standards.

While the evaluation team shall fine-tune the methodology for the evaluation in an Inception Report, a mixed-methods approach of qualitative and quantitative methods is mandatory due to its appropriateness to ensure a gender-sensitive, inclusive, respectful and participatory approach and methodology to capture disability and gender equality issues, as well as voices and opinions of both men, women and other marginalised groups, ensuring gender related and disaggregated data (e.g. age, sex, countries, etc.). Special attention shall be paid to an unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories. The limitations to the evaluation need to be identified and discussed by the evaluation team in the Inception Report, e.g. data constraints (such as missing baseline and monitoring data). Potential limitations as well as the chosen mitigating measures should be discussed.

The main elements of the evaluation process are the following:

- Preparation and submission of an Inception Report (containing a desk review summary, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments, sampling strategy, limitations to the evaluation, and timetable) to IES through Unite Evaluations (https://evaluations.unodc.org) for review and clearance at least one week before any field mission/data collection phase may take place (may entail several rounds of comments);
- Initial meetings and interviews, either in person or online, with the Overall Programme Coordinator and other UNODC staff as well as stakeholders during the data collection phase;
- Interviews (face-to-face or by telephone/skype/Teams etc.), with key project stakeholders and beneficiaries, both individually and (as appropriate) in small groups/focus groups, as well as using surveys/questionnaires or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation (respecting potential COVID-related restrictions on travel and in-person meetings);
- Analysis of all available information;
- Preparation of the draft evaluation report (based on the Template Report). The Evaluation Expert submits the draft report to IES only through Unite Evaluations for review and clearance (may entail several rounds of comments). A briefing on the draft report with project/programme management may also be organized. This will be based on discussion with IES and project/programme management.
- Preparation of the final evaluation report and an Evaluation Brief (2-pager) (based on the Template Brief) including full proofreading and editing, submission to IES through Unite Evaluations for review
and clearance (may entail several rounds of comments). It further includes a PowerPoint presentation on final evaluation findings and recommendations;

- Presentation of final evaluation report with its findings and recommendations to the target audience, stakeholders etc. (in person or if necessary, through Skype/Teams etc.);
- In conducting the evaluation, the UNODC and the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards are to be taken into account; and
- All tools, norms and templates to be mandatorily used in the evaluation process can be found on the IES website: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/guidelines-and-templates.html

### IV. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation stage</th>
<th>Start date (dd/mm/yy)</th>
<th>End date (dd/mm/yy)</th>
<th>Subsumed tasks, roles</th>
<th>Guidance / Process description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report (3-5 weeks)</td>
<td>01/01/22</td>
<td>01/03/22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes 2 weeks for review by IES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection (incl. field missions) [3 to 6 weeks]</td>
<td>02/03/22</td>
<td>30/03/22</td>
<td>Drafting of report; by evaluators</td>
<td>Field missions; observation; interviews; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report (6-9 weeks)</td>
<td>31/03/22</td>
<td>28/04/22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes 2 weeks for review by IES, 1 week by PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report for CLP comments (2 weeks)</td>
<td>29/04/22</td>
<td>20/05/22</td>
<td>Compilation of Comments will be comments by IES shared by IES with evaluators</td>
<td>Review by IES; review by PM; revision of draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report, Brief and PowerPoint Slides (3-4 weeks)</td>
<td>23/05/22</td>
<td>06/06/22</td>
<td>Revision by eval; review/approval by IES; completion of MR and EFP by PM</td>
<td>Draft IR; Review by IES, PM; Final IR Evaluation report, Brief and slides are finalised. Includes 1 week for review by IES and 1 week for PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (1 day)</td>
<td>01/07/22</td>
<td>01/07/22</td>
<td>Presentation organised; Date of presentation of final results to be agreed with PM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UNODC Independent Evaluation Section may change the evaluation process, timeline, approach, etc. as necessary at any point throughout the evaluation process.
V. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of consultants26 (national/international)</th>
<th>Specific expertise required27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Expert</td>
<td>1 (International Consultant)</td>
<td>Evaluation Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Expert</td>
<td>1 (International Consultant)</td>
<td>Counter-Terrorism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation team will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial. The qualifications and responsibilities for each evaluation team member are specified in the respective job descriptions attached to these Terms of Reference (Annex 1). The evaluation team will report exclusively to the Chief or Deputy Chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section, who are the exclusive clearing entity for all evaluation deliverables and products.

**Absence of Conflict of Interest**

According to UNODC rules, the evaluation team must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project or theme under evaluation.

Furthermore, the evaluation team shall respect and follow the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for conducting evaluations in a sensitive and ethical manner.

VI. MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

**Roles and responsibilities of the Project/Programme Manager**

The Project/Programme Manager is responsible for:
- managing the evaluation process;
- drafting and finalizing the ToR;
- identifying stakeholders and selecting Core Learning Partners (representing a balance of men, women and other marginalised groups) and informing them of their role;
- recruiting the evaluation team following clearance by IES, ensuring issued contracts ahead of the start of the evaluation process in line with the cleared ToR. In case of any delay, IES and the evaluation team are to be immediately notified;
- compiling and providing desk review materials (including data and information on men, women and other marginalised groups) to the evaluation;
- reviewing the draft report and draft Evaluation Brief for factual errors;
- completing the Management Response (MR) and the Evaluation Follow-up Plan (EFP) for usage of the evaluation results;
- facilitating the presentation of final evaluation results;
- disseminating the final evaluation report and Evaluation Brief and communicating evaluation results to relevant stakeholders; and
- recording of the status of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations in Unite Evaluations (to be updated once per year).

26 Please note that an evaluation team needs to consist of at least 2 independent evaluators – at least one Evaluation Expert and one Substantive Expert

27 Please add the specific technical expertise needed (e.g. expertise in anti-corruption; counter terrorism; etc.) – please note that at least one evaluation team member needs to have expertise in human rights and gender equality.
The Project/Programme Manager will be in charge of providing logistical support to the evaluation team including arranging the field missions of the evaluation team, including but not limited to:

- All logistical arrangements for the travel/data collection phase including travel details; DSA-payments; transportation; etc.;
- All logistical arrangement for the meetings/interviews/focus groups/etc., (respecting potential COVID-related restrictions on travel and in-person meetings), ensuring interview partners adequately represent men, women and other marginalised groups and arrangements for the presentation of the evaluation results; and
- Ensure timely payment of all fees/DSA/etc. (payments for the evaluation team must be released within 5 working days after the respective deliverable is cleared by IES).

Roles and responsibilities of the Independent Evaluation Section

The Independent Evaluation Section (IES) provides mandatory normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process. Furthermore, IES provides guidance, quality assurance and evaluation expertise, as well as interacts with the project manager and the evaluation team throughout the evaluation process. IES may change the evaluation process, timeline, approach, etc. as necessary at any point throughout the evaluation process.

IES reviews, comments on and clears all steps and deliverables during the evaluation process: Terms of Reference; Selection of the evaluation team, Inception Report; Draft Evaluation Report; Final Evaluation Report, Evaluation Brief and PowerPoint slides on the final evaluation results; Evaluation Follow-up Plan. IES further publishes the final evaluation report and the Evaluation Brief on the UNODC website, as well as sends the final evaluation report to an external evaluation quality assurance provider.

VII. PAYMENT MODALITIES

The evaluation team will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNODC rules and regulations. The payment will be made by deliverable and only once cleared by IES. Moreover, 75 per cent of the daily subsistence allowance and terminals is paid in advance before travelling. The balance is paid after the travel has taken place, upon presentation of boarding passes and the completed travel claim forms. Deliverables which do not meet UNODC and UNEG evaluation norms and standards will not be cleared by IES.

IES is the sole entity to request payments to be released in relation to evaluation. Project/Programme Management must fulfil any such request within 5 working days to ensure the independence of this evaluation process. Non-compliance by Project/Programme Management may result in the decision to discontinue the evaluation by IES.

---

ANNEX II: EVALUATION TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES

Interview guide

The following interview protocol online interviews is preliminary. Interviewers should customize and adapt questions for each interview based on interviewee’s role, time constraints, response, and level of knowledge/familiarity with topics revealed during interviews. (Note that all interviews should start with informed consent. The interviewee should be made aware that the information they provide will remain confidential and anonymous, they should be told how the information will be used and for what purpose, and they should agree to continue the interview.)

Script Introduction

This interview is for the evaluation of the EU-funded project ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism’. The project is implemented by UNODC and Interpol, with UNODC covering 3 and Interpol 1 outcome of the project. The evaluation is an independent project evaluation with the evaluation team composed of two independent consultants, namely one evaluation expert/lead and one CT expert. The evaluation will be guided by the following evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, coherence, sustainability, human rights/gender equality and leaving no one behind. Good practices and lessons learned will also be collected, and recommendations will be given to UNODC on the possible continuation/strengthening of their work on CT. The interview is voluntary, and the information collected shall be treated confidentially and not be shared outside the evaluation team. Evaluation data will only be presented in aggregated form in the evaluation report as to ensure anonymity. The evaluation report will be a public document and put on the UNODC website. The evaluation follows UNEG evaluation ethics and standards.

Name Interviewee(s):

Organization and position:

Location/time:

1. What is your role in connection with the UNODC/Interpol project ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism’? Which of its components have you interacted with / implemented since early 2020?

2a. From the perspective of your office or organization, what major outcomes is the project expected to achieve? How would you know if it is delivering those outcomes? Has it achieved these outcomes/results, and how are these measured (what evidence)?

2b. What are the main obstacles to achieving results in the field? How could those obstacles be overcome?

3. What has been the relevance of the project, and how has it continued to be relevant during its implementation and at this point in time, including during the Covid-19 pandemic?

4. To what extent does the project meet the needs identified in the various project documents? How have these needs been identified?
5a. What has been the rational for the integrated programming model of the project? What has worked well, and which areas could be further improved on? Has there been duplication of efforts?

5b. Has coordination worked well in Sri Lanka, between the different GPs and the HQ-based branches, the regional office and POLKA?

6. What type of support (strategic, operational, programmatic, results reporting, inter alia) have you received from HQ/field/RO? (Modify according to interviewee) How could this be improved?

7. What do you expect to gain from this evaluation? What would make it most useful for you and your office/organization? (Scoping question)

8. Have the right partnerships been established for the project?

9. Describe your office’s cooperation with national stakeholders/UNODC/partners. Which lessons learned could be drawn from this cooperation?

10. From the perspective of your office/organization, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the project?

11. How do you ensure that the work has been implemented in an efficient and cost-effective way, and that inputs are converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner? What is the role of your office?

12. What has been the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on project design and implementation? Has the project been flexible and adjusted well to the changed circumstances?

13. What has been the impact of the human rights situation on project design and implementation? Has the project been flexible and adjusted well to the changed circumstances?

14. Has adequate attention been given to visibility? Has attention been given on the possible security consequences of visibility?

15. How was project monitoring and reporting done? What could be done differently to improve project monitoring and reporting?

16. Are you satisfied with the capacity-building efforts of UNODC? Could you provide individual examples of changes which have occurred due to training delivered?

17. How and to what extent has the project incorporated human rights, gender dimensions and ‘leaving no-one behind’? How satisfied are you with HR and related efforts? What could be done differently or significantly improved?

18. To what extent are the results of the project sustainable in the long-term? Which results are sustainable at this point in time? How can this be improved?

19. What new opportunities and threats are emerging that UNODC should be aware of in shaping its work in the future? Have you seen any best practices or lessons that should replicated elsewhere?

19. What are good practices, lessons learned and recommendations to UNODC?
Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

Script for participants of training implemented under the project ‘Support to Sri Lanka on Counter-Terrorism’

Introduction

A focus group discussion (FGD) used to collect data for the in-depth independent project evaluation of GLOR35 is an online open discussion of four to five participants led by a skilled moderator or facilitator in a specified timeframe (approx. 90 minutes).

The objective of the FGDs is to get factual information on the positions of the participants, and obtain their views on the overall design and performance of the project, strengths and weaknesses, challenges, good practices and lessons learned. The evaluation criteria will structure this open discussion, and the moderator/facilitator will prompt in order to invite the participants to share their views in the group setting, which should be a safe environment for the discussion.

The participants for these FGDs will be participants of training activities held under the project. The groups will be composed by staff of one agency, with male and female staff will be mixed together.

The invitation to the FGD, which will be send out by the project team, will clearly state the purpose and objectives of the FGD, and offer the option to have an individual interview with the evaluation team instead, if preferred.

Tools

- FGD Script
- Microsoft Teams
- Recording software

FGD Script

1. Introduction

Introduce the following topics to the participants:

- The evaluation of the project – evaluation team, timeframe, methodology, evaluation ethics (voluntary nature participation FGD, confidentiality, findings will be anonymous), final outputs.
- Purpose of the FGD - to collect information for the independent project evaluation.
- Division of responsibilities - present evaluation team members.
- Request for permission to recording FGD. Explain purpose (for transcription only), use of data/confidentiality (only shared within the evaluation team) and deletion record file after transcription. If not all participants of the FGD agree with this option then notes will be taken instead.

Give ground rules

- Participation in the FGD is voluntary
- No one is obligated to respond to any questions if s/he does not wish to do so
- Participants can leave the discussion at any time
- No one is obligated to share personal experiences if s/he does not wish to do so
- Avoid providing names when sharing examples or experiences of others
• There are no right or wrong answers
• Be respectful when others speak
• Keep all information shared during the discussion confidential; everything discussed in the group should remain within the group
• Do not share details of the discussion later, whether with people who are present or not
  • Introduce the topics of the FGD
  • Give space for questions

Ask participants to introduce themselves, and fill out the table with information on the profile of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department/government body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Topics FGD

Relevance
Has the training been relevant? How? Has it addressed your individual needs/of your institution? What has been the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on your work, including the areas of your work covered by the training? Has the training addressed these issues?

Coherence
Has the training been the first time that you received training on this topic/topics? If not, please explain how it relates to other initiatives.

Efficiency
Was the training implemented in a timely manner?

Was the training adapted to the Covid-19 pandemic context? How?

Were you satisfied with the training, the topics addressed in the training, the trainers and the final results of the training?

Effectiveness/impact
What have been the main results of the training for you? And for your work? And your colleagues?

Did the training have an impact in any possible way indirect beneficiaries (victims, witnesses, offenders associated with terrorism)
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**Sustainability**

Have you been able to use the acquired knowledge/skills? Please explain.

What are possible challenges in this respect?

Were you able to address these challenges? How?

**Human rights/gender equality/leaving no one behind**

Have human rights been addressed in the training? How?

Have gender equality and women’s rights been adequately addressed in the training? How?

**Concluding questions**

What recommendations would you like to give to UNODC?

What are main lessons learned?

What are main good practices?

What are main strengths and weaknesses (if not already discussed earlier)?

**3. Concluding the FGD**

- Ask participants if they have questions and/or further information relevant for the evaluation.
- Thank participants for their time and their contribution.
- Repeat what you will do with the information, and what purpose it will eventually serve.
- Remind participants of their agreement to confidentiality.
## UNODC DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year publication</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant agreement, incl. annexes</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addendum grant agreement, incl. annexes</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpol-UNODC agreement</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified annual financial statement project 2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial data 2021-2022</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Progress Report CTSAM Interpol</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project contingency plans</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Mission report TPB 6-11 Feb 2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Mission report GMCP</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation ToR</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly donor reports</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report EU Maldives/Sri Lanka achievements and challenges</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Progress Report EU 2020</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes, agendas, attendance lists and PPTs Steering Committee meetings</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20210323 workplace sexual harassment risk assessment POLKA GMCP</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organogram POLKA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC-UNOPS agreement</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC strategy 2021-2025</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC Regional Programme for South Asia 2018-2021</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 Meeting agendas</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 Lists of participants</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 Course evaluation data</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 PPTs used in training/consultative meetings etc.</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 Concept notes/outcome documents</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 Consultant contracts &amp; related documentation</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 UNODC web stories</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 Draft publications</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2 Other (e.g. talking points Chief a.i., RC, letters on nominations, emails)</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3 Training agendas</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3 Training evaluation reports</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3 List of participants</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 3 Equipment (hand-held X-ray machines) 2020/2021 6
Outcome 4 Procurement notice 2021 1
Outcome 4 List of participants 2021 1
Outcome 4 Evaluation form 2021 1
Outcome 4 PPE kits procurement and handover documents 2020 7
Outcome 4 Consultants’ monthly reports 2020/2021 24

**Total number of UNODC documents reviewed: 304**

### EXTERNAL DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year publication</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Economics and Peace</td>
<td>Global Terrorism Index 2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Terrorism Index 2020</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global Terrorism Index 2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Rights Due Diligence Policy (HRDDP) Implementation in Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka, A/HRC/RES/30/1, 14 October 2015</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka, A/HRC/RES/40/1, 4 April 2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promoting reconciliation, accountability and human rights in Sri Lanka, A/HRC/RES/46/1, 26 March 2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTED</td>
<td>The impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on terrorism, counter terrorism and countering violent extremism</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>UN Sustainable Development Framework Sri Lanka 2018-2022</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>SC Results Group documents</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total number of external documents reviewed: 15**
## ANNEX IV: STAKEHOLDERS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of interviewees</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Type of stakeholder (see note below)</th>
<th>Sex disaggregated data</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>UNODC (staff and independent consultants)</td>
<td>Project implementer</td>
<td>Male: 11</td>
<td>Austria, Maldives, Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EU, Interpol, UNRCO, OHCHR, UNDP</td>
<td>Partners, incl. donor</td>
<td>Male: 3</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Defence/Navy, Ministry of Justice/Analysts’ Department, AGO, Bar Association, Prison Department, Bureau General of Rehabilitation, Ministry of Public Security</td>
<td>Counterparts/Recipients of assistance</td>
<td>Male: 28</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female: 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: 67</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Male: 42</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Female: 25</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** A stakeholder could be a Civil Society Organisation; Project/Programme implementer; Government recipient; Donor; Academia/Research institute; etc.