

ANNEXES TO THE REPORT

| | |
|---|----|
| ANNEX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE | 2 |
| ANNEX II: EVALUATION TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES | 21 |
| ANNEX III: DESK REVIEW LIST | 57 |
| ANNEX IV: STAKEHOLDERS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION | 61 |
| ANNEX V: SUMMARY EVALUATION MATRIX FOR THE FIVE PROGRAMMES | 62 |
| ANNEX VI: PROGRAMME STRUCTURE OF THE FIVE PROGRAMMES | 82 |
| ANNEX VII: PROGRAMME SUMMARY OF THE FIVE PROGRAMMES | 85 |
| ANNEX VIII: DISBURSEMENT HISTORY OF THE FIVE PROGRAMMES..... | 89 |
| ANNEX IX: THE EVALUATION TEAM | 90 |

ANNEX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference for the Final In-depth Cluster Evaluation of UNODC Programming in West and Central Asia

(including Country Programme for Afghanistan, Country Programme for Pakistan, Country Partnership Programme in the Islamic Republic of Iran, Programme for Central Asia and Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries)

Projects: AFGF98, AFGZ87, AFGZ88, AFGZ89, AFGZ97, IRNZ76, IRNZ77, IRNZ78, IRNZ79, PAKJ85, PAKW20, PAKW50, PAKW51, PAKW52

XACZ47, XACZ60, XACZ61, XACZ62, XACZ63, RERV07, RERV08, RERV09, RERV10

April 2020

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Project/Programme number: | AFGF98, AFGZ87, AFGZ88, AFGZ89, AFGZ97 IRNZ76, IRNZ77, IRNZ78, IRNZ79 PAKJ85, PAKW20, PAKW50, PAKW51, PAKW52 XACZ47, XACZ60, XACZ61, XACZ62, XACZ63 XACK22, TAJH03, TAJE24, RERH22, RERF23, KGZK50, KGZT90, XCEA0, UZBU57 RERV07, RERV08, RERV09, RERV10 |
| Project/Programme title and duration: | Country Programme for Afghanistan (2016-2020) Country Programme for Pakistan (2016-2020) Country Partnership Programme in (I.R. of) Iran (2015-2020) Programme for Central Asia (2015-2020) Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (2016-2020) |
| Location: | West and Central Asia |
| Linkages to Thematic Programmes: | Countering Transnational Organised Crime and Illicit Trafficking Anti-Corruption Terrorism Prevention Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform Health and livelihoods Research and trend analysis |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Linkages to UNDAF ¹ | The Programmes to be evaluated are related to all UNDAFs developed in the West and Central Asian Region |
| Linkages to the SDGs | 3, 4, 5,11, 12, 15,16 and 17 |
| Executing Agency: | UNODC |
| Partner Organizations: | |
| Total Approved Budget: | <p>Afghanistan:</p> <p>AFGF98 - \$ 37,391,137</p> <p>AFGZ87 - \$ 14,092,656</p> <p>AFGZ88 – \$ 2,912,615</p> <p>AFGZ89 – \$ 22,233,402</p> <p>AFGZ97 - \$ 116,667</p> <p>Islamic Republic of Iran:</p> <p>IRNZ76 - \$ 2,463,753</p> <p>IRNZ77 - \$ 1,496,048</p> <p>IRNZ78 - \$ 818,627</p> <p>IRNZ79 - \$ 210,959</p> <p>Pakistan:</p> <p>PAKJ85 – \$ 3,076,881</p> <p>PAKW20 – \$ 8,229,898</p> <p>PAKW50 - \$ 8,656,362</p> <p>PAKW51 - \$ 8,935,731</p> <p>PAKW52 – N/A</p> <p>Central Asia:</p> <p>XACZ47 - \$ 1,529,960</p> <p>XACZ60 - \$ 18,572,470</p> <p>XACZ61 - \$ 8.216,738</p> <p>XACZ62 - \$ 1,805,575</p> <p>XACZ63 - \$ 1,063,239</p> <p>(The following UNODC projects has also contributed to the Programme for Central Asia during 2015-2019 and have been integrated into the Programme for Central Asia:</p> <p>XACK22 – \$ 3,067,646</p> <p>TAJH03 – \$ 1,266,254</p> <p>TAJE24 – \$ 1,497,252</p> <p>RERH22 – \$ 5,338,103</p> <p>RERF23 – \$ 659,229</p> <p>KGZK50 – \$ 1,763,988</p> |

¹ United Nations Development Assistance Framework

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| | <p>KGZT90 - \$ 3,016,589</p> <p>XCEA01 – 699,360</p> <p>UZBU57 – 269,015</p> <p>Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries:</p> <p>RERV07 - \$ 13,311,910</p> <p>RERV08 - \$ 8,924,592</p> <p>RERV09 - \$ 9,485,591</p> <p>RERV10 - \$ 7,404,929</p> |
| Total Overall Budget | <p>Afghanistan:</p> <p>AFGF98 - \$39,510,180</p> <p>AFGZ87 - \$20,000,000</p> <p>AFGZ88 - \$ 8,000,000</p> <p>AFGZ89 - \$ 28,000,000</p> <p>AFGZ97 - \$ 500,000</p> <p>Islamic Republic of Iran:</p> <p>IRNZ76 - \$ 8,000,000</p> <p>IRNZ77 - \$ 4,000,000</p> <p>IRNZ78 - \$ 4,000,000</p> <p>IRNZ79 - \$ 4,000,000</p> <p>Pakistan:</p> <p>PAKJ85 - \$3,774,323</p> <p>PAKW20 - \$ 7429,890</p> <p>PAKW50 - \$ 35,000,000</p> <p>PAKW51 - \$ 20,000,000</p> <p>PAKW52 - \$ 15,000,000</p> <p>Central Asia:</p> <p>XACZ47 - \$ 2,979,248</p> <p>XACZ60 - \$ 30,400,000</p> <p>XACZ61 - \$18,300,000</p> <p>XACZ62 - \$ 3,018,432</p> <p>XACZ63 - \$ 1,995,383</p> <p>Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries:</p> <p>RERV07 - \$ 17,820,976</p> <p>RERV08 - \$ 13,641,000</p> <p>RERV09 - \$ 15,860,600</p> <p>RERV10 - \$13,766,000</p> |
| Donors: | <p>Austria, Australia, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, NATO, Netherlands, Norway, OFID (OPEC Fund for International Development), Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sweden, UNAIDS, United Kingdom, United States, UN Women</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | |
|--|--|
| Project Manager/ Coordinator: | Mark Colhoun, Country Representative, UNODC Country Office in Afghanistan Ashita Mittal, Regional Representative, UNODC Regional Office for Central Asia Alexander Fedulov, Country Representative, UNODC Country Office in Iran Jeremy Milsom, Country Representative, UNODC Country Office in Pakistan / Senior Programme Coordinator (a.i.), UNODC Regional Programme for Afghanistan and neighbouring Countries |
| Type and time frame of evaluation: (Independent Project Evaluation/In-depth Evaluation/mid- term/final) | Final in-depth cluster evaluation, 1 April – 16 October 2020 |
| Time frame of the project covered by the evaluation: | 2015 until end of evaluation mission (tentatively 3 July 2020) |
| Geographical coverage of the evaluation: | Afghanistan, Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan. |
| Budget for this evaluation in USD: | TBC (approx. USD 350,000) |
| Number of independent evaluators planned for this evaluation ² : | One Lead evaluator Three Thematic Experts Four national/regional evaluators |
| Type and year of past evaluations (if any): | In-depth thematic cluster evaluation of Law Enforcement and Border Control in Central Asia (Sub-programme XAC/Z60 and projects TAJ/E24, TAJ/H03, RER/H22, and XAC/K22) – 2018 Mid-term Evaluation: Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (2011-2015) – 2015. Mid-term Evaluation: Country Programme Promoting the Rule of Law and Public Health in Pakistan (2010-2015) – 2015. Mid-term Evaluation: Country Programme of the Islamic Republic of Iran (2011- 2015) – 2014 |
| Core Learning Partners ³ (entities): | UNODC senior management (COAFG, COIRA, COPAK and ROCA and HQ) UNODC Project staff, Programme Steering Committees members, officials of the beneficiary Member States, Partner Organisations (UN, other International and Regional organisations as well as NGOs) and donors. |

² Please note that the minimum for any UNODC evaluation is two independent evaluators, i.e. one lead evaluator and one team member.

³ The CLPs are the main stakeholders, i.e. a limited number of those deemed as particularly relevant to be involved throughout the evaluation process, i.e. in reviewing and commenting on the TOR and the evaluation questions, reviewing and commenting on the draft evaluation report, as well as facilitating the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action. Stakeholders include all those to be invited to participate in the interviews and surveys, including the CLPs.

PROGRAMME OVERVIEW AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Aiming to assist the Member State in their efforts to address the security, economic, governance and development challenges in the region of West and Central Asia, which are of an interrelated nature, UNODC has developed approaches for the region at different levels: country, regional and inter-regional. Historically, regional strategies have included the Rainbow Strategy, in 2007, a first attempt to market UNODC work in the region. The *UNODC One Concerted Approach for Europe, West and Central Asia* also worked to bring together the achievements and impacts of relevant country, regional and global programmes in an integrated manner, building on lessons learned and focusing on key areas where UNODC has the greatest added value and impact. The HARP (harmonised approach) also aimed to bring together achievements and impact at country, regional and global levels in an integrated way, building on lessons learned and focusing on areas where UNODC has the greatest potential for adding value. The HARP focused on common deliverables in Law Enforcement Cooperation, Criminal Justice and Judicial Cooperation and Social and Human Development.

There are five programmes operating in Central and West Asia. One is a regional programme focused on regional initiatives – the Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries. In addition, UNODC has the Programme for Central Asia, which works in five countries in Central Asia. Working at the country level UNODC is represented by the Country Programme for Afghanistan, the Country Programme for Pakistan and the Country Partnership Programme for the Islamic Republic of Iran. These are further described below.

The *Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries* (Regional Programme) is currently implementing its second phase, which runs from 2016 to 2020 (first phase: 2011-2015). The Regional Programme was designed in consultation with Member States to provide a platform for better coordination and facilitation of counter-narcotics efforts across the West and Central Asian Region, bringing coherence to activities conducted by UNODC. Since its launch, the Regional Programme has become the core mechanism for UNODC to promote regional responses in West and Central Asia to achieve concrete regional cooperation in the fight against drug trafficking and trans-national organised crime. During its first phase the Regional Programme was successful in supporting several initiatives that strengthened law enforcement and legal cooperation and bringing together countries in the region to share experiences and best practice in drug demand reduction. The Regional Programme is strongly linked to all the other programmes operating in West and Central Asia, specifically the Country Programmes for Afghanistan, Islamic Republic of Iran and Pakistan and the Programme for Central Asia.

Programme for Central Asia. UNODC's presence in Central Asia dates back to 1993 with the establishment of the Regional Office for Central Asia in Tashkent, Uzbekistan. Central Asian countries recognised the need for international cooperation to address drugs and crime related threats to the region through an MoU that was signed in 1996 and which laid the ground for launching coordinated regional initiatives aimed at strengthening national and sub-regional capacities, including for information sharing, joint operations, legal harmonisation and sharing of best practices. Based on best practices of existing programmes and projects in the region, as well as to better support the implementation of national priorities, UNODC introduced integrated programme approach in Central Asia in 2015. The current Programme for Central Asia aims to enhance law enforcement, criminal justice, health and research capacities across the region, including through targeted interventions at national level in a country-specific context, better coordination of regional cooperation as well as better allocation of resources and provision of technical assistance for regional cooperation by the international community to the countries of the region. Over the last years the Programme has established itself as main strategic cooperation framework both at national and regional levels with high degrees of harmonization and coherence with individual national priorities and other regional configurations. Review consultations with key national counterparts and international stakeholders take place on annual basis to ensure that programmatic responses meet the needs of Central Asian states.

The abovementioned contributes to the effectiveness and relevance of the Programme in implementing UNODC's global initiatives equally to tailored regional interventions.

Country Programme for Afghanistan. UNODC has a strong presence and a long history of partnership with the Government of Afghanistan in providing specialised expertise in drug law enforcement, criminal justice, drug demand reduction, HIV/AIDS among drug users and alternative livelihoods. Despite a recent decline in poppy cultivation (World Drug Report 2019), Afghanistan remains the largest producer of illicit opium and heroin, fuelling organised crime and drug consumption. In this context, UNODC through its Country Programme for Afghanistan aims to contribute to stability and development of Afghanistan by strengthening the criminal justice system, counter narcotics and drug demand reduction efforts and capacity building of the Government, including in research.

Country Partnership Programme for the Islamic Republic of Iran. The Country Partnership Programme continues to support Iran's efforts to respond to challenges posed by drugs and crime with main emphasis being placed on capacity building related to countering illicit trafficking, drug demand reduction, criminal justice, anti-corruption and alternative development. The programme seeks maximum synergy with UNODC's Thematic and Global Programmes, as well as with the Country Programmes for Afghanistan and Pakistan, the Programme for Central Asia and the Regional Programme for Afghanistan and neighbouring countries.

Country Programme for Pakistan. Like the other UNODC Field Offices in West and Central Asian Region, the UNODC Country Office in Pakistan moved in 2010 from stand-alone projects to an integrated programming approach. The Country Programme for Pakistan aims to promote the rule of law and public health. Like its predecessor the current Country Programme focuses on three main areas of work: i) illicit trafficking and border management; ii) criminal justice and legal reforms, and iii) drug demand reduction, prevention and treatment. Common strategies in each of the three areas are: enhance national capacities and promote international cooperation and good practices. These are delivered through a focus on achieving outcomes, governed cooperatively and flexibility to adapt to emerging needs and opportunities. The Country Programme aims to increase the responsiveness, efficiency and effectiveness of UNODC's support to Pakistan.

PROJECT DOCUMENTS AND REVISIONS TO ORIGINAL PROJECT DOCUMENTS

The Regional Programme, the Programme for Central Asia and the Country Programmes for Afghanistan, Pakistan and the Islamic Republic of Iran have all been extended to 31 December 2020 by decision of the Programme Review Committee and related Inter-office Memo from the Director for Operations of 30 May 2019.

MAIN OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES OF THE PROGRAMMES

Each of the programmes contain a detailed results framework along with indicators of achievement. However, the regional and country programmes do not necessarily have an overall objective. The long-term results from each programme are identified below. (see ANNEX V for more detail).

Expected Accomplishments of the *Regional Programme* (as per programme document):

- Member States are equipped to take effective action against transnational organized crime, including: drug trafficking; money-laundering; trafficking in persons; smuggling of migrants; illicit manufacturing and trafficking of firearms; and emerging policy issues as mentioned in General Assembly resolution 64/179.

- Enhanced capacity of Member States to develop and maintain fair, humane and accountable domestic criminal justice systems in accordance with the United Nations standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice and relevant international instruments.
- Increased implementation at the national level of evidence-based services related to drug use in the community.
- Enhanced knowledge of trends, including emerging trends in drugs and specific crime issues, available to Member States and the international community

Vision of the *Country Programme for Afghanistan* (as per programme document):

- The vision of the County Programme is to strengthen the capacity of the Government, assist with the policy framework and provide accurate data and information to counter the consequences of drugs and crime in the country in line with the new National Unity Government's "Realizing Self-Reliance" strategy put forward at the London Conference held on 4 December 2014.

Aims of the *Country Programme for Pakistan* (as per programme document):

- Continue the focus of the Country Programme on achieving outcomes which prioritise key drug and crime related challenges as identified in partnership with the Government
- Stress capacity building of relevant Government of Pakistan institutions and communities to enhance the ability of the GOP to respect, protect and fulfil human rights obligations in accordance with international human rights standards
- Increase the accountability of duty bearers and empower people living in Pakistan in order to implement a rights-based approach to human development within the mandated areas of the UNODC

Objective of the *Country Partnership Programme in the Islamic Republic of Iran* (as per programme document):

- Support the enhancement of national capacities, policies, and programmes to respond to the pressing challenges of drugs and crime in Iran. It will also aim at the reduction of illicit drugs supply and demand. This will be achieved through an integrated and balanced approach based on international cooperation and capacity-building.

Objective of the *Programme for Central Asia* (as per programme document):

- Contribute to healthy and safe communities, transparently governed, free from the scourges of organised crime and drugs, secure in the knowledge that governments are capable of dealing with transnational threats in a coordinated manner, confident in the integrity of their criminal justice systems and with access to fair and equitable justice.

CONTRIBUTION TO UNODC'S THEMATIC PROGRAMME(S)

The Programmes in the West and Central Asian Region contribute to the following UNODC Thematic Programmes:

- Countering Transnational Organised Crime and Illicit Trafficking
- Anti-Corruption
- Terrorism Prevention
- Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform

- Health and livelihoods
- Research and trend analysis

DISBURSEMENT HISTORY

| | Total Approved Budget | Expenditure (up until 11 November 2019) | Exp. in % |
|--|-----------------------|---|-----------|
| Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (RERV07, RERV08, RERV09, RERV10) | \$ 39,127,022 | \$ 35, 524,877 | 91% |
| Programme for Central Asia (XACZ47, XACZ60, XACZ61, XACZ62, XACZ63, XACK22, TAJH03, TAJE24, RERH22, RERF23, KGZK50, KGZT90, XCEA01, UZBU57)) | \$ 48,765,418 | \$ 40,655,9494 | 83% |
| Country Programme for Afghanistan (AFGF98, AFGZ87, AFGZ88, AFGZ89, AFGZ97) | \$ 76,746,476 | \$ 64, 010,605 | 83% |
| Country Programme for Iran (IRNZ76, IRNZ77, IRNZ78, IRNZ79) | \$ 4,989,387 | \$ 3, 292,262 | 66% |
| Country Programme for Pakistan: (PAKJ85, PAKW20, PAKW50, PAKW51, PAKW52) | \$ 28,898,872 | \$ 22,094,448 | 76% |

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, the Country Programme for Afghanistan (2016-2020), the Country Partnership Programme in the Islamic Republic of Iran (2015-2020), the Country Programme for Pakistan (2016-2020), the Programme for Central Asia (2015-2020) and the Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (2016-2020) all require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion. These evaluations will be undertaken as a cluster, to ensure a utilization-focused evaluation addressing accountability and learning and the development of the next phases of the programmes, with a contribution to the strategic future thinking for the region.

The overall purpose of the evaluation will be to understand the extent to which the UNODC programming in West and Central Asia addresses the specific context and national needs while contributing to addressing regional and inter-regional issues related to transnational organized crime, trafficking and terrorism threats.⁵ The evaluation will deliver a comprehensive picture of UNODC work in the region and identify how the implementation of the various programmes contributes to regional and intra-regional initiatives, promotes networking and relationship-building and addresses national needs in UNODC mandated areas.

While each programme in the region will be individually assessed as part of the evaluation, the cluster evaluation will be particularly useful to guide strategic planning and programming in the region, including the development of the next phase of programming. The rationale for undertaking an in-depth cluster evaluation is further indicated as the programmes in the region are strongly inter-linked in

⁴ The total expenditure for ROCA, including delivery of global programmes in the region would be \$56,687,177. Though global programmes are not part of ROCA Programme, they were delivered by staff in the field office for the countries in the region.

⁵ One UNODC Concerted Approach: Interconnecting Europe with West and Central Asia

addressing existing and emerging challenges of transnational organised crime, border management and trafficking, counter-terrorism, anti-money laundering, law enforcement and criminal justice, drug use prevention, treatment and related issues including alternative development and health. In this context the evaluation may identify opportunities to further strengthen coherence of responses, including through regional and interregional connectivity.

The evaluation will assess the benefits/ added value that the various levels of programming (national, regional and global) bring by analysing their individual and collective results, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability, and will then derive recommendations and lessons learned from the programmes and identify areas of improvement.

The purpose of the in-depth cluster evaluation is to:

- Contribute to organisational learning by identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the programmes in West and Central Asia;
- Identify the existing footprint of UNODC on the ground and the strengths that should be further promoted and moved forward;
- Assess the work of the programmes on capacity development of national counterparts and sustainability of such interventions;
- Identify areas of interventions for further strengthening of cooperation with national partners;
- Contribute to accountability for all stakeholders by assessing the achievements and results made by UNODC in the region, including each programme;
- Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the interactions of global programmes with the programmes in the region;
- Assess the role of the programmes in supporting the achievement of national SDGs and alignment with UNDAFs/ UNSDCF;
- Assess the opportunities and risks in the alignment of UNODC programmes in the region;
- Assess the alignment of UNODC’s position in the region to the UNSDCF process, and the SDGs;
- Provide an analysis of the current alignment and future opportunities of UNODC Programmes with regional initiatives.
- Identify the vehicles and best practice through which the programmes deliver support to Member States;
- Document best practice on strategic policy influence of the programmes.

The following DAC criteria will be assessed during the evaluation: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. In addition, established partnerships and cooperation, as well as aspects of human rights and gender mainstreaming, will be assessed. The evaluation will specifically assess how gender aspects have been mainstreamed into the project.

The intended main users of the evaluation are UNODC management, recipient Governments and their respective beneficiaries, the Programme Coordinators, and project managers, and donors.

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This strategic cluster evaluation is expected to provide an overview of UNODC’s intervention in the West and Central Asian region as a whole and not look in detail at each subprogramme of the 5 Programmes in the region.

| | |
|---|--|
| Unit of analysis (full project/programme/ parts of the | UNODC Programming in West and Central Asia to include: Programme for Central Asia 2015-2020 (XACZ47, XACZ60, XACZ61, XACZ62, XACZ63) |
|---|--|

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | |
|--|---|
| project/programme; etc.) | Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries 2016-2020 (RERV07, RERV08, RERV09, RERV10) Country Programme for Afghanistan 2016-2020 (AFGF98, AFGZ87, AFGZ88, AFGZ89, AFGZ97) Country Partnership Programme in the Islamic Republic of Iran 2015-2020 (IRNZ76, IRNZ77, IRNZ78, IRNZ79) Country Programme for Pakistan 2016-2020 (PAKJ85, PAKW20, PAKW50, PAKW51, PAKW52) |
| Time period of the project/programme covered by the evaluation | Country Programme for Afghanistan (2016-2020) Country Partnership Programme in the Islamic Republic of Iran (2015-2020) Country Programme for Pakistan (2016-2020) Programme for Central Asia (2015-2020) Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (2016-2020) 2015 – 3 July 2020 (end of field mission) |
| Geographical coverage of the evaluation | Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan. |

KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation will be conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, as well as design, partnerships and cooperation, human rights, gender equality and leaving no one behind as well as lesson learned and best practices.

(The questions should consider these criteria for the region as a whole and not for the individual subprogramme level. The questions will be further refined by the Evaluation Team during the inception phase.)

| |
|---|
| Design |
| The Design of a project or programme measures the extent to which the logical framework approach was adopted. |
| 1. Were the programmes designed based on evidence (research; lessons learned from past programming; evaluations)? |
| Relevance |
| Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor. |
| 2. To what extent are the objectives of the programmes aligned with regional priorities and UNDAFs/ UNSDCFs/ SDGs? |
| 3. To what extent do the programmes respond to the changing and emerging regional and national (Member State) priorities and needs? |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| |
|--|
| Efficiency |
| Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs. |
| 4. Were the resources and inputs converted to outputs and outcomes in a timely and cost-effective manner? What are the consequences of office costs (project support costs and the full cost recovery policy) on the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the programmes? To what extent are business operation strategies being used in implementation of the programmes? |
| Effectiveness |
| Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives. |
| 5. To what extent were the objectives and outcomes stated in programme documents achieved? What were the facilitating and hindering factors in achieving results? |
| 6. How effectively did the programmes address the national and regional needs and priorities? |
| 7. To what extent are the programmes effective in strengthening and promoting cross-border cooperation and collaboration with regional entities? |
| Impact |
| Impact is the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. |
| 8. To what extent did the programmes contribute to counterpart implementation of relevant international Conventions, UN standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice and other instruments? |
| 9. To what extent can long-term sustainable results be expected from current programme implementation? |
| Sustainability |
| Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. |
| 10. How have the programmes generated national ownership of the programmes? What factors have hindered or facilitated this ownership? |
| 11. How have the programmes developed national capacity to support sustainability of effort and benefit? |
| 12. To what extent did the programmes contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals? |
| Partnerships and cooperation |
| The evaluation assesses the partnerships and cooperation established during the project/ programme as well as their functioning and value. |
| 13. To what extent did the programmes develop or strengthen existing and new partnerships at bilateral, regional and international levels? |
| 14. To what extent do the programmes cooperate with partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) in the achievement of results? |
| 15. To what extent do the programmes contribute to the One UN, UNDAF, and other UN system-wide coordination mechanisms (e.g. participation in UN Country Team) and the extent to which UNODC participation in UN activities influences its performance. |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| |
|---|
| 16. To what extent is UNODC prepared for the UN reforms, including participation in UN Country Teams and contributions to UNDAFS and UNSDCF. |
| Human rights, gender equality, and leaving no one behind |
| The evaluation needs to assess the mainstreaming throughout the project/programme of human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups. |
| Human rights |
| 17. To what extent were human rights considerations included in the design and implementation of the programmes? |
| Gender equality and leaving no one behind |
| 18. To what extent were considerations of gender equality and vulnerable groups included in the design and implementation of the programmes? |
| Lessons learned and best practices |
| Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/ programme. |
| 19. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the programmes in order to improve performance, results and effectiveness in the future? |
| 20. What lessons can be learned from the design and implementation of the programmes to inform future programme design? |
| 21. What good practices can be identified in UNODC programming in the region? |

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation analysis will include a chapter on each of the 4 programmes. The inception phase will determine the structure and depth of these chapters. The evaluation will also include an overall analysis of UNODC work in the region according to the evaluation questions.

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 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 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 on a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all parties identified as the key stakeholders of the programmes, including the Core Learning Partners (CLP).

The present ToR provides basic information as regards to the methodology, which should not be understood as exhaustive. It is rather meant to guide the evaluation team in elaborating an effective,

efficient, and appropriate evaluation methodology that should be proposed, explained and justified in the Inception Report.

In addition, 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 and human-rights based methodology. Special attention shall be paid to an unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories. Indeed, information stemming from secondary sources will be cross-checked and triangulated through data retrieved from primary research methods. Primary data collection methods need to be gender sensitive as well as inclusive.

The credibility of the data collection and analysis are key to the evaluation. 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.

When designing the evaluation data collection tools and instruments, the evaluation team needs to consider the analysis of certain relevant or innovative topics in the form of short case studies, analyses, etc. that would benefit the evaluation results. The evaluation team should clearly identify a methodology and approach which will highlight and provide an assessment, based on the evaluation questions. This includes the regional programme model, the country programme model as well as the programme model deployed in Central Asia. This may take the form of case studies, but the specific approach and methodology will be determined by the evaluation team in consultation with the programme management during the inception phase. The methodology and approach must ensure that the specific context of each programme is represented in the evaluation, including addressing the specific requirements for working in a conflict/post-conflict environment.

The main elements of the evaluation process are the following:

- Scoping mission to UNODC HQ, Vienna by lead evaluator
- Desk review of all relevant project documentation, (Annex II of the evaluation ToR), as provided by the Regional Section/Field Representatives and as further requested by the evaluation team, as well as relevant external documents (e.g. UNDAFs; SDGs; UN and national/global/regional strategies; etc.);
- Stakeholder mapping process and analysis;
- Preparation and submission of an Inception Report (containing an assessment of the desk review materials, stakeholder analysis, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments, sampling strategy, limitations to the evaluation, and timetable). Submission to IES through Unite Evaluations for review. This may entail several rounds of review and comments by IES. Clearance of the final Inception Report at least one week before any field mission may take place;
- Meetings and interviews will be held at the four Field Offices covered by the Programmes (ROCA, COAFG, COIRA and COPAK), with staff from the Regional Section and other UNODC staff at Vienna HQ, as well as Programme Managers and other stakeholders during the field missions and field visits to technical delivery sites;

- Interviews (face-to-face or by telephone/skype), 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;
- Oral briefing of initial observations to internal stakeholders (if applicable);
- Analysis of all available information;
- Preparation of the draft evaluation report (based on Guidelines for Evaluation Report and Template Report to be found on the IES website <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>). The lead evaluator submits the draft report through Unite Evaluations to IES for review and quality assurance. This may entail various rounds of comments by IES. The evaluation team incorporates the comments by IES into a revised draft report. The revised draft report is shared with Programme Management for review of factual errors. The evaluation team considers comments by the Programme Management and submits a revised draft report through Unite Evaluations to IES for review. Subsequently IES shares the final draft report with all CLPs for comments.
- Preparation of the final evaluation report and an Evaluation Brief (2-pager), including full proofreading and editing, submission to IES through Unite Evaluations. The evaluation team incorporates the necessary and requested changes and finalizes the evaluation report and the Brief in accordance with the feedback received from IES and CLPs. 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).
- In conducting the evaluation, the UNODC and the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards will be met. All tools, norms and templates to be mandatorily used in the evaluation process can be found on the IES website: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>.

THE SOURCES OF DATA

The evaluation will utilize a mixture of primary and secondary sources of data. The primary sources include, among others, interviews with key stakeholders (face-to-face or by telephone), the use of surveys and questionnaires, field missions for case studies, focus group interviews, observation and other participatory techniques. Secondary data sources will include project documents and their revisions, progress and monitoring reports, UNODC research, national statistical data, external reports and strategies (e.g. UNDAFs; SDGs; country/regional/global strategies; etc.) and all other relevant documents, including visual information (e.g. eLearning, pictures, videos, etc.).

DESK REVIEW

The evaluation team will perform a desk review of all existing documentation (please see the preliminary list of documents to be consulted in Annex II of the evaluation ToR). This list is however not to be regarded as exhaustive as additional documentation may be requested by the evaluation team. The evaluation team needs to ensure that sufficient external documentation is used for the desk review.

PHONE INTERVIEWS / FACE-TO-FACE CONSULTATIONS

The evaluation team will conduct phone interviews / face-to-face consultations with identified individuals from the following groups of stakeholders:

- Member States (including recipients and donors);
- relevant international and regional organizations, including implementing partners;
- Non-governmental organizations working with UNODC;
- UNODC management and staff at HQ and in the field;
- UN Resident Coordinators and UN CT representatives

- Participants in UNODC work in the region

Specific stakeholders will be identified during the desk review and inception phase and confirmed with programme management prior to data collection.

QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire (on-line) is to be developed and used in order to help collect the views of additional stakeholders (e.g. trainees, counterparts, partners, etc.), if deemed appropriate.

TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

| Duties | Time frame | Location | Deliverables |
|---|---|---|---|
| Scoping Mission to UNODC HQ, Vienna, Desk review and drafting of Scoping Mission Report Scoping Mission (discussion with RS and Field Representatives via VTC) | 12-13 February 2020 (5 working days for lead evaluator) | Vienna | Scoping mission report in line with UNODC evaluation norms and standards ⁶ |
| Desk review and drafting of Inception Report; submission to IES through Unite Evaluations | 1 April 2020 – 30 April 2020 (20 w/d for lead evaluator, 10 for International team members and 5 for national team members) | Home base | Draft Inception report in line with UNODC evaluation norms and standards ⁷ |
| Review of draft Inception Report by IES | 4 May 2020 to 8 May 2020 (1 week for IES review) | | Comments on the draft Inception Report to the evaluation team |
| Incorporation of comments from IES (can entail various rounds of comments from IES) | 11 May 2020 to 19 May 2020 (3 w/d for lead evaluator and 2 for team members) (1 week for IES review) | Home base | Revised draft Inception Report |
| Deliverable A: Final Inception Report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates | By 19 May 2020 (overall 25 w/d for lead evaluator, 12 for international team member and 5 for national team members) | | Final Inception report to be cleared by IES at least one week before the field mission can get started |
| Evaluation Data Collection Coordination and Training Mission | 1 June – 2 June 2020 2 days all team members | Location to be confirmed. Potentially Almaty. | Coordinated data collection plan for all missions |
| Evaluation mission: briefing, interviews with staff at UNODC HQ/FO and other stakeholders (including by phone/skype); | 25 May 2020 to 12 June 2020 (16 w/d for lead evaluator, 16 w/d for team members and 7 | UNODC/HQ; Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan, | Interviews and data collection |

⁶ https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html#Inception_Report

⁷ https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html#Inception_Report

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| observation; focus groups; oral briefing of initial observations to internal stakeholders (if applicable) | for national team members) | Uzbekistan (other Central Asian countries TBC). | |
| Drafting of the evaluation report; submission to IES through Unite Evaluations; | 15 June 2020 – 6 July 2020 (15 w/d for lead evaluator, 15 for team members and 5 for national team members) | Home base | Draft evaluation report |
| Review of IES for quality assurance | 7 July-14 July 2020 (1 week for review) | | Comments on the draft evaluation report to the evaluation team |
| Incorporation of comments from IES (can entail various rounds of comments from IES) | 15 -21 July 2020 (3 w/d for lead evaluator and 2 for team members) + 1 week for IES review | Home base | Revised draft evaluation report |
| Review of Project Management for factual errors | 22 July – 17 August (3 weeks) | | |
| Consideration of comments from Project Management | 18 August – 25 August 2020 (2 w/d for lead evaluator and 1 for team members) | | |
| Review of IES for quality assurance ((can entail various rounds of comments from IES) | 3 September – 11 September (2 w/d for lead evaluator and 1 for team members + 1 week IES) | | |
| Deliverable B: Draft Evaluation Report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates | By 11 September 2020 (overall 38 w/d for lead evaluator, 36 w/d for team members and 12 for national team members) | | Draft evaluation report, to be cleared by IES |
| IES to share draft evaluation report with Core Learning Partners for comments | 14 September -25 September 2020 (2 weeks) | | Comments of CLPs on the draft report |
| Consideration of comments from Core Learning Partners and preparation of draft Evaluation Brief; submission to IES through Unite Evaluations. | 28 September -2 October 2020 (4 w/d for lead evaluator, 2 for team members and 1 for national team members) | Home base | Revised draft evaluation report |
| Final review by IES; incorporation of comments and finalization of report and Evaluation Brief (can entail | 5 October – 16 October 2020 (4 w/d for lead evaluator, 2 for team members and 2 for | Home base | Revised draft evaluation report; draft Evaluation Brief |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| various rounds of comments from IES) | national team members+ 1 week for IES review) | | |
| Deliverable C: Final evaluation report; presentation of evaluation results; Evaluation Brief (2-pager) | By 16 October 2020 (overall 10 w/d (incl. 2 w/d for presentation) for lead evaluator, 4 w/d for team members and 3 for national team members) | | Final evaluation report; Evaluation Brief and presentation of evaluation results, both to be cleared by IES |
| Presentation of evaluation results (to be reviewed and cleared by IES) | Tentative: end October 2020 (2 w/d for lead evaluator) | | Presentation of evaluation results |
| Project Management: Finalise Evaluation Follow-up Plan online evaluation application | By 23 October 2020 | | Final Evaluation Follow-up Plan to be cleared by IES |
| Project Management: Disseminate final evaluation report | By 6 November 2020 | | Final evaluation report disseminated to internal and external stakeholders |
| IES: facilitate the external Evaluation Quality Assessment of the Final Report | | | |

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

EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will report exclusively to the Chief or Deputy Chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section

| Role | Number of consultants/ evaluators (national/international) | Specific expertise required |
|----------------|--|---|
| Lead evaluator | 1 international consultant | Evaluation methodology |
| Team members | 1 Thematic Expert 1 Thematic Expert 1 Thematic Expert | Law enforcement, transnational organized crime and border control Criminal justice and legal systems Social, and human development and health |
| Team members | 1 National Evaluator 1 National Evaluator 1 National Evaluator 1 Regional Evaluator | Afghanistan Iran Pakistan Central Asia |

The evaluators will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial. The qualifications and responsibilities for each evaluator 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 evaluators 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 evaluators shall respect and follow the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for conducting evaluations in a sensitive and ethical manner.

MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF RSEWCA MANAGEMENT, WITH SUPPORT FROM PROGRAMME MANAGERS

The RSEWCA Management and the Evaluation Focal Point are responsible for:

- drafting and finalizing the ToR,
- 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,
- providing desk review materials (including data and information on men, women and other marginalised groups) to the evaluation team including the full TOR,
- liaising with the Core Learning Partners,
- reviewing the draft report for factual errors only,
- developing a follow-up plan for the usage of the evaluation results and recording of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations (to be updated once per year),
- disseminate the final evaluation report and communicate evaluation results to relevant stakeholders as well as facilitate the presentation of evaluation results;
- ensure that all payments related to the evaluation are fulfilled within 5 working days after IES's request - non-compliance by Project/Programme Management may result in the decision to discontinue the evaluation by IES.

The RSEWCA Management and the Evaluation Focal Point, with support from the Country Programme Managers will be in charge of **providing logistical support** to the evaluation team and IES staff participating in this evaluation including arranging the field missions of the evaluation team, including but not limited to:

- All logistical arrangements for the travel, including for IES staff (including travel details; DSA-payments; transportation; etc.)
- All logistical arrangement for the meetings/interviews/focus groups/etc., ensuring interview partners adequately represent men, women and other marginalised groups (including independent translator/interpreter if needed); set-up of interview schedules; arrangement of ad-hoc meetings as requested by the evaluation team; transportation from/to the interview venues; scheduling sufficient time for the interviews (around 45 minutes); ensuring that members of the evaluation team and the respective interviewees are present during the interviews; etc.)
- All logistical arrangements for the presentation of the evaluation results;
- 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 EVALUATION STAKEHOLDERS

Members of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) are identified by the project managers. The CLPs are the main stakeholders, i.e. a limited number of those deemed as particularly relevant to be involved throughout the evaluation process, i.e. in reviewing and commenting on the TOR and the evaluation questions, reviewing and commenting on the draft evaluation report, as well as facilitating the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action. Stakeholders include all those to be invited to participate in the interviews and surveys, including the CLPs.

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. Please find the respective tools on the IES web site <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html>. 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. Specific responsibilities are included below:

- Manage the evaluation process
- Oversee the work of the evaluation team in all stages of the evaluation process;
- Contribute to the development of the evaluation methodology;
- Provide quality assurance throughout the evaluation-process;
- Participate in field missions and jointly carry out interviews;
- Participate in the data analysis process;
- Review all deliverables of the evaluation;
- Final clearance of all deliverables of the evaluation;
- Ensure that the evaluation is disseminated according to IES guidelines;
- Ensure that the evaluation findings are shared simultaneously with management and external stakeholders as per the respective resolution and IES guidelines;
- Ensure that recommendations are followed by an action plan, which will detail how and when recommendations will be implemented.

ANNEX II: EVALUATION TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES

INTERVIEW GUIDES

INTRODUCTION

The guides below were used with each different stakeholder type during the interview process. They are guides and were varied for each specific interview subject to the interviewees subject matter expertise and programme knowledge and history. Notes from interviews were saved in the appropriate cell, facilitating later synthesis and analysis. Note: the question numbering in the guides correlates with the numbers of the agreed evaluation questions – i.e., they are not intended to be numbered consecutively.

GOVERNMENT COUNTERPART INTERVIEW GUIDE

The focus of participants in this group were the key partners, with the most extensive knowledge and experience of programme activities. They were selected in conversation with programme staff.

INTERVIEW INTRODUCTION

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, the Country Programme for Afghanistan, the Country Partnership Programme in the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Country Programme for Pakistan, the Programme for Central Asia and the Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries all require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion. These evaluations are being undertaken as a cluster.

The evaluation is focused on accountability, on learning and on utility (usefulness). The work of the evaluation is intended to be of specific value to the Programmes in the planning for their next phases, as well as of specific value in formulating the ongoing regional approach (if that is seen as valuable by stakeholders).

It is important to the quality of our work that you are able to speak freely to us. Our evaluation approach (and UNODC policy) ensure that the comments you make to us remain confidential. I will be making notes, but my notes will not be available to anyone outside the evaluation team. As importantly, in any oral and written reporting we do for the evaluation any information or commentary you make to us that is used in the report will be anonymous. There will be nothing in the report to identify individuals.

Is that all clear? Are you happy to proceed?

| | |
|---|--|
| Interviewee name, organisation, position | |
| Interviewer name (s) | |
| Date, time, method of interview | |

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS – INTERVIEWEE

| Question | Notes on response |
|--|-------------------|
| 2. To what extent does the defined regional programme structure align with practice and future directions? | |
| 3. To what extent are the objectives of the programmes aligned with regional priorities and UNDAFs/ UNSDCFs/ SDGs? | |
| <p>4. To what extent do the programmes respond to the changing and emerging regional and national (Member State) priorities and needs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your view, how does the programme respond to the real needs of the country/ region? • Do the project objectives, outcomes and outputs respond to present circumstances? • Have those circumstances changed - was the project able to adjust to the new circumstances? | |
| <p>5. To what extent did the programmes develop or strengthen existing and new partnerships at bilateral, regional and international levels?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has partnership with government(s) improved? • What are steps taken by UNODC to overcome any political sensitivities? Is it reasonable to believe these can be influenced by the programme? • Were the programme’s conducive to the development of agency partnerships at the bilateral and multi-lateral level? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ between agencies within the same country? ○ with other national and international partners? ○ internationally? • What weaknesses are there in partnership and cohesion – how can cooperation/ partnership be improved? | |
| <p>7. To what extent were the objectives and outcomes stated in programme documents achieved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you consider the project successful? • What were the facilitating and hindering factors in achieving results? • What are the indicators used to measure success? | |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Question | Notes on response |
|---|-------------------|
| <p>8. How effectively did the programmes address national and regional needs and priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what degree were the programme’s outcomes and objectives achieved, or are the anticipated to be achieved? • What were the main factors responsible for the achievement or failure of objectives? • Are gender and/ or human rights emerging as a regional/ national need or priority? • How could the project planning be improved? • How could the effectiveness of the project be further increased in the future? | |
| <p>9. To what extent are the programmes effective in strengthening and promoting cross-border cooperation and collaboration with regional entities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are you able to absorb assistance provided by the UNODC in reference to building cooperation and collaboration across borders? • What are the obstacles preventing or hindering such cooperation? | |
| <p>11. To what extent did the programmes contribute to counterpart implementation of relevant international Conventions and other instruments?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did the programmes contribute to legislative or policy change? • Anything specifically in reference to G/HR/VG? • Normative: accession to relevant international Conventions and other instruments and implementation in national legislation and regulations; • Agency: evidence of use and enduring impact on work of government agencies or services, including borders, investigations, prosecution, judicial, etc.; • Beneficiary: evidence of enduring change in relation to target groups, including in relations to cross-cutting themes of human rights, gender, vulnerability and disability and the overarching principle of leaving no one behind. | |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Question | Notes on response |
|---|-------------------|
| <p>12. To what extent can long-term sustainable results be expected for all stakeholders from current programme implementation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the anticipated impact been reached by the project? Are there changes in legislation; policy; staffing; budget and MoUs / agreements that can be seen as indicators of sustainable results? | |
| <p>14. Has national ownership of the programmes been generated? In what ways? What factors have hindered or facilitated this ownership?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent does the government provide its own funding to maintain the work of the programme? • Are there changes in legislation; policy; staffing (recruitment/ rotation/ retention); budget and MoUs/ agreements that can be seen as indicators of ownership? | |
| <p>15. How have the programmes developed national capacity to support sustainability of effort and benefit?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think project gains will be sustained after the end of the programme? • If donor funding was withdrawn, which initiatives and gains would be sustained? Which would be lost? | |
| <p>17. To what extent have specific measures been taken to address the needs and priorities of human rights, gender and vulnerable groups during implementation of the programmes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the way the programme is governed and managed facilitating human rights and gender parity and capacity/ HRG mainstreaming, and including some level of representation of vulnerable groups? • Has the programme initiated change in reference to the recognition and mainstreaming of HRG issues and the needs of vulnerable groups? If so, how? • What have been the major achievements and major shortcomings in addressing HRG issues/ vulnerable group needs, including any facilitating or hindering factors in this regard? | |

DONOR INTERVIEW GUIDE

Selected through the stakeholder mapping process.

INTERVIEW INTRODUCTION

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, the Country Programme for Afghanistan, the Country Partnership Programme in the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Country Programme for Pakistan, the Programme for Central Asia and the Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries all require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion. These evaluations are being undertaken as a cluster.

The evaluation is focused on accountability, on learning and on utility (usefulness). The work of the evaluation is intended to be of specific value to the Programmes in the planning for their next phases, as well as of specific value in formulating the ongoing regional approach (if that is seen as valuable by stakeholders).

It is important to the quality of our work that you are able to speak freely to us. Our evaluation approach (and UNODC policy) ensure that the comments you make to us remain confidential. I will be making notes, but my notes will not be available to anyone outside the evaluation team. As importantly, in any oral and written reporting we do for the evaluation any information or commentary you make to us that is used in the report will be anonymous. There will be nothing in the report to identify individuals.

Is that all clear? Are you happy to proceed?

| | |
|--|--|
| Interviewee name, organisation, position | |
| Interviewer name (s) | |
| Date, time, method of interview | |

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS – INTERVIEWEE

| Question | Notes on response |
|---|-------------------|
| 2. To what extent does the RP framework align with your perspectives of future priorities and indicated directions? | |
| 3. To what extent are the <i>objectives of the programme</i> aligned with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your priorities? • National and regional priorities? • SDGs? | |
| 4. How well does the programme respond to your needs and priorities as a donor? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well does the programme respond to the real needs of the country/ region? | |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Question | Notes on response |
|--|-------------------|
| <p>5. Is the programme conducive to the development of agency partnerships at the bilateral and multi-lateral level?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • between agencies within the same country? • with other national and international partners? • internationally? | |
| <p>7. Do you consider the programme successful?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what degree were the programme's outcomes and objectives achieved? • What were the facilitating and hindering factors in achieving results? • Are there areas where UNODC is working that are more appropriate to other UN Agencies or international organisations? | |
| <p>17. To what extent have specific measures been taken to address the needs and priorities of human rights, gender and vulnerable groups?</p> | |
| <p>9. To what extent are the programmes effective in strengthening and promoting cross-border cooperation and collaboration with regional entities?</p> | |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Question | Notes on response |
|--|-------------------|
| <p>10. Were your resources and inputs converted to outputs and outcomes in a timely and cost-effective manner?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did they spend their budgets? Did they try and use tools and systems that encourage cost-effective use of resources? Were there decreases in costs as a result of systems and processes? • What modalities of training delivery were used – do they focus on use of national trainers and provide specific examples of a focus on cost-effectiveness? Are national researchers being used in place of international resources? • Were resources (financial, time, people, expertise) allocated strategically to achieve human rights and/or address gender and vulnerable group related needs? • What are the consequences of office costs (project support costs and the full cost recovery policy) on the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the programmes? • Do they undertake risk analysis, regularly update this analysis, and make specific plans for mitigating identified risks? • Do the programme have results frameworks, including well-defined indicators? Were results frameworks used in a defined and resourced monitoring system? Do results frameworks inform reporting? Planning? | |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Question | Notes on response |
|---|-------------------|
| <p>11. To what extent did the programmes contribute to counterpart implementation of relevant international Conventions and other instruments?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did the programmes contribute to legislative or policy change? • Anything specifically in reference to G/HR/VG? • Normative: accession to relevant international Conventions and other instruments and implementation in national legislation and regulations; • Agency: evidence of use and enduring impact on work of government agencies or services, including borders, investigations, prosecution, judicial, etc.; • Beneficiary: evidence of enduring change in relation to target groups, including in relations to cross-cutting themes of human rights, gender, vulnerability and disability and the overarching principle of leaving no one behind. | |
| <p>12. To what extent can long-term sustainable results be expected for all stakeholders from current programme implementation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the anticipated impact been reached by the project? Are there changes in legislation; policy; staffing; budget and MoUs / agreements that can be seen as indicators of sustainable results? | |
| <p>18. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the programmes in order to improve performance, results and effectiveness in the future?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been learned in the course of the project implementation? What elements could be strengthened? What opportunities were missed? • What are the lessons learned for future project implementation? | |

UNODC STAFF INTERVIEW GUIDE

UNODC staff (management and programme, at headquarters and in field offices)

INTERVIEW INTRODUCTION

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, the Country Programme for Afghanistan, the Country Partnership Programme in the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Country Programme for Pakistan, the Programme for

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

Central Asia and the Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries all require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion. These evaluations are being undertaken as a cluster.

The evaluation is focused on accountability, on learning and on utility (usefulness). The work of the evaluation is intended to be of specific value to the Programmes in the planning for their next phases, as well as of specific value in formulating the ongoing regional approach (if that is seen as valuable by stakeholders).

It is important to the quality of our work that you are able to speak freely to us. Our evaluation approach (and UNODC policy) ensure that the comments you make to us remain confidential. I will be making notes, but my notes will not be available to anyone outside the evaluation team. As importantly, in any oral and written reporting we do for the evaluation any information or commentary you make to us that is used in the report will be anonymous. There will be nothing in the report to identify individuals.

Is that all clear? Are you happy to proceed?

| | |
|---|--|
| Interviewee name, organisation, position | |
| Interviewer name (s) | |
| Date, time, method of interview | |

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS – INTERVIEWEE

| Question | Notes on response |
|---|-------------------|
| <p>1. Were the programmes designed based on evidence (research, lessons learned from past programming, evaluations)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How was the project planned? • How did previous evaluations redirect priorities/ influence the strategic direction of the program, if at all? Strategies toward program implementation? • Was there a needs assessment done for this project? If yes, how was it conducted and when? If no, why not? Other than government counterparts which other stakeholder’s needs were assessed (beneficiaries, civil society orgs)? | |
| <p>2. To what extent does the defined regional programme structure align with practice and future directions?</p> | |
| <p>3. To what extent are the objectives of the programmes aligned with regional priorities and UNDAFs/ UNSDCF/ SDGs?</p> | |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Question | Notes on response |
|--|-------------------|
| <p>4. To what extent do the programmes respond to the changing and emerging regional and national (Member State) priorities and needs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your view, how does the programme respond to the real needs of the country/ region? • How do the project objectives, outcomes and outputs respond to present circumstances? • Have those circumstances changed - was the project able to adjust to the new circumstances? | |
| <p>5. To what extent did the programmes develop or strengthen existing and new partnerships at bilateral, regional and international levels?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has partnership with government(s) improved? • What are steps taken by UNODC to overcome any political sensitivities? Is it reasonable to believe these can be influenced by the programme? • Were the programme's conducive to the development of agency partnerships at the bilateral and multi-lateral level? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ between agencies within the same country? ○ with other national and international partners? ○ internationally? • What weaknesses are there in partnership and cohesion – how can cooperation/ partnership be improved? | |
| <p>6. To what extent do the programmes contribute to the One UN, UNDAF, and other UN system-wide coordination mechanisms (e.g. participation in UN Country Team) and the extent to which UNODC participation in UN activities influences its performance?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you formally participate in UN groupings such as UNCTs? • How does your office contribute to UNDAFs/ UNSDCFs? | |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Question | Notes on response |
|--|-------------------|
| <p>7. To what extent were the objectives and outcomes stated in programme documents achieved?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you consider the project successful? • What were the facilitating and hindering factors in achieving results? • What are the indicators used to measure success? | |
| <p>8. How effectively did the programmes address national and regional needs and priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what degree were the programme's outcomes and objectives achieved, or are the anticipated to be achieved? • What were the main factors responsible for the achievement or failure of objectives? • Are gender and/ or human rights emerging as a regional/ national need or priority? • How could the project planning be improved? • How could the effectiveness of the project be further increased in the future? | |
| <p>9. To what extent are the programmes effective in strengthening and promoting cross-border cooperation and collaboration with regional entities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are counterparts willing and able to absorb assistance provided by the UNODC in reference to building cooperation and collaboration across borders? • What are the obstacles preventing or hindering such cooperation? | |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Question | Notes on response |
|--|-------------------|
| <p>10. Were the resources and inputs converted to outputs and outcomes in a timely and cost-effective manner?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did you spend your budgets? Did you try and use tools and systems that encourage cost-effective use of resources? Were there decreases in costs as a result of systems and processes? • What modalities of training delivery were used – do they focus on use of national trainers and provide specific examples of a focus on cost-effectiveness? Are national researchers being used in place of international resources? • Were resources (financial, time, people, expertise) allocated strategically to achieve HR and/or gender related needs? • What are the consequences of office costs (project support costs and the full cost recovery policy) on the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the programmes? • How does the relationship between HQ and FOs work, in the sense of efficiency? • Do you undertake risk analysis, regularly update this analysis, and make specific plans for mitigating identified risks? • Do you have results frameworks, including well-defined indicators? Were results frameworks used in a defined and resourced monitoring system? Do results frameworks inform reporting? Planning? | |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Question | Notes on response |
|---|-------------------|
| <p>11. To what extent did the programmes contribute to counterpart implementation of relevant international Conventions and other instruments?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did the programmes contribute to legislative or policy change? • Anything specifically in reference to G/HR/VG? • Normative: accession to relevant international Conventions and other instruments and implementation in national legislation and regulations; • Agency: evidence of use and enduring impact on work of government agencies or services, including borders, investigations, prosecution, judicial, etc.; • Beneficiary: evidence of enduring change in relation to target groups, including in relations to cross-cutting themes of human rights, gender, vulnerability and disability and the overarching principle of leaving no one behind. | |
| <p>12. To what extent can long-term sustainable results be expected for all stakeholders from current programme implementation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the anticipated impact been reached by the project? Are there changes in legislation; policy; staffing; budget and MoUs / agreements that can be seen as indicators of sustainable results? | |
| <p>13. To what extent did the programmes <i>contribute</i> to the Sustainable Development Goals?</p> | |
| <p>14. Has national ownership of the programmes been generated? In what ways? What factors have hindered or facilitated this ownership?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent does the government provide its own funding to maintain the work of the programme? • Are there changes in legislation; policy; staffing (recruitment/ rotation/ retention); budget and MoUs/ agreements that can be seen as indicators of ownership? | |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Question | Notes on response |
|---|-------------------|
| <p>15. How have the programmes developed national capacity to support sustainability of effort and benefit?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you think project gains will be sustained after the end of the programme? • If donor funding was withdrawn, which initiatives and gains would be sustained? Which would be lost? | |
| <p>16. To what extent have human rights and gender priorities and principles, including the needs of vulnerable groups, guided programme design (reference framework, planning structure)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are HR/G/VG considerations included in programme development? • Are HRG and vulnerable group perspectives integrated into the programme's logical framework? • Is HR/G/VG disaggregated data available? If so, how is it utilised? | |
| <p>17. To what extent have specific measures been taken to address the needs and priorities of human rights, gender and vulnerable groups during implementation of the programmes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the way the programme is governed and managed facilitating human rights and gender parity and capacity/ HRG mainstreaming, and including some level of representation of vulnerable groups? • Has the programme initiated change in reference to the recognition and mainstreaming of HRG issues and the needs of vulnerable groups? If so, how? • What have been the major achievements and major shortcomings in addressing HRG issues/ vulnerable group needs, including any facilitating or hindering factors in this regard? | |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Question | Notes on response |
|---|-------------------|
| <p>18. What lessons can be learned from the implementation of the programmes in order to improve performance, results and effectiveness in the future?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What have you learned in the course of the project implementation? What elements could be strengthened? What opportunities were missed? • What were the main challenges in project implementation? • Have any lessons learned been applied and which are still to be implied? • What are the lessons learned for future project implementation? | |
| <p>19. What lessons can be learned from the design and implementation of the programmes to inform future programme design?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effective are the project's governing structures? • Did observation and feedback alter delivery? | |
| <p>20. What good practices can be identified in UNODC programming in the region?</p> | |

INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION/ UN AGENCY INTERVIEW GUIDE

Selected through the stakeholder mapping process.

INTERVIEW INTRODUCTION

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, the Country Programme for Afghanistan, the Country Partnership Programme in the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Country Programme for Pakistan, the Programme for Central Asia and the Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries all require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion. These evaluations are being undertaken as a cluster.

The evaluation is focused on accountability, on learning and on utility (usefulness). The work of the evaluation is intended to be of specific value to the Programmes in the planning for their next phases, as well as of specific value in formulating the ongoing regional approach (if that is seen as valuable by stakeholders).

It is important to the quality of our work that you are able to speak freely to us. Our evaluation approach (and UNODC policy) ensure that the comments you make to us remain confidential. I will be making notes, but my notes will not be available to anyone outside the evaluation team. As importantly, in any oral and written reporting we do for the evaluation any information or commentary you make to us that is used in the report will be anonymous. There will be nothing in the report to identify individuals.

Is that all clear? Are you happy to proceed?

| | |
|---|--|
| Interviewee name, organisation, position | |
|---|--|

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | |
|--|--|
| Interviewer name (s) | |
| Date, time, method of interview | |

| Question | Notes on response |
|---|-------------------|
| 8. How effectively do the programmes address national and regional needs and priorities? | |
| 5. To what extent did the programmes develop or strengthen existing and new partnerships at bilateral, regional and international levels? | |
| 9. To what extent are the programmes effective in strengthening and promoting cross-border cooperation and collaboration with regional entities? | |
| 4. To what extent do the programmes respond to the <i>changing and emerging</i> regional and national (Member State) priorities and needs? | |
| <p>11. To what extent did the programmes contribute to counterpart implementation of relevant international Conventions and other instruments?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Normative: accession to relevant international Conventions and other instruments and implementation in national legislation and regulations; • Agency: evidence of use and enduring impact on work of government agencies or services, including borders, investigations, prosecution, judicial, etc.; • Beneficiary: evidence of enduring change in relation to target groups, including in relations to cross-cutting themes of human rights, gender, vulnerability and disability and the overarching principle of leaving no one behind. | |
| 17. To what extent have specific measures been taken to address the needs and priorities of human rights, gender and vulnerable groups during implementation of the programmes? | |

| Question | Notes on response |
|--|-------------------|
| <p>FOR UN AGENCIES – RCs etc.</p> <p>6. To what extent do the programmes contribute to the One UN, UNDAF, and other UN system-wide coordination mechanisms (e.g. participation in UN Country Team) and the extent to which UNODC participation in UN activities influences its performance?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you formally participate in UN groupings such as UNCTs? • How does your office contribute to UNDAFs/ UNSDCFs? | |
| <p>12. To what extent can long-term sustainable results be expected for all stakeholders from current programme implementation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there changes in legislation; policy; staffing; budget and MoUs / agreements that can be seen as indicators of sustainable results? | |
| <p>15. How have the programmes developed national capacity to support sustainability of effort and benefit?</p> | |
| <p>14. Has national ownership of the programmes been generated? In what ways? What factors have hindered or facilitated this ownership?</p> | |

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES

Evaluation questionnaires were provided to two stakeholder groups: government counterparts who were not interviewed and some implementing partners. Both questionnaires included a mix of qualitative and quantitative questions.

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

WHAT IS THIS QUESTIONNAIRE?

As part of its evaluation policy, UNODC regularly evaluates its programmes - this questionnaire is part of an evaluation of the work of UNODC in West and Central Asia. The evaluation is determining how well UNODC's programmes address national and regional priorities related to transnational organised crime, trafficking and terrorism threats.

This is an evaluation of UNODC's work, not of you, as a programme participant/ stakeholder and is in line with international standards.

As a stakeholder in this programming, your perspective is vital for our evaluation. We have prepared a short questionnaire and would very much appreciate your help by responding to our questions.

We are looking for your perspective on the work of UNODC.

WHAT SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES ARE BEING EVALUATED?

UNODC operates five programmes in Central and West Asia:

- The Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries
- The Programme for Central Asia, which works in five countries in Central Asia
- The Country Programme for Afghanistan
- The Country Programme for Pakistan
- The Country Partnership Programme for the Islamic Republic of Iran.

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, all of these programmes require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion. These evaluations are being undertaken as a cluster to ensure a utilisation-focused evaluation addressing accountability and learning and the development of the next phases of the programmes, with a contribution to the strategic future thinking for the region.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE ANSWERS YOU PROVIDE?

As soon as we receive your completed questionnaire, we will anonymise it, removing anything that identifies you. Your responses will be pooled with those of all other respondents. In this way, any information you provide will be completely confidential - it will not be possible for anyone outside the evaluation team to see who wrote what on their questionnaire. At the conclusion of the evaluation the questionnaires will be destroyed.

For a start, please tell us a little about yourself

Mark an X in the appropriate box

Male Female

Your country: _____

Your institution/department/agency: _____

Years working in connection with UNODC programmes: _____

Which Sub-Programme do you have most to do with? (mark an X in the corresponding box)

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sub-Programme 1 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sub-Programme 2 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sub-Programme 3 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Sub-Programme 4 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | The overall Country Programme |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | The overall Regional Programme for Central Asia |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | |
|---|---|
|  | The overall Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries |
|---|---|

Can you tell us briefly what your connection/role is in relation to the Sub-Programme, Country Programme or Regional Programme you have identified above?

Now, thinking about your involvement with the Sub-Programme, Country Programme or Regional Programme you have listed above:

Please circle the number that best reflects your view

1. To what extent do the programme's goals respond to the changing and emerging priorities and needs of your country and the region?

| | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

2. In your view, what are the key needs and priorities – nationally and regionally – that this programme is designed to address?

At national level

Regionally

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

3. To what extent were the objectives and outcomes of the programme achieved?

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

4. Thinking about your response to Question 3, what were the key factors that facilitated or hindered the programme in achieving results?

Facilitating factors

Hindering factors

| | |
|-------|-------|
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ |

5. How effectively did the programme you work with address the needs and priorities of your country and the region?

| | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|--------|----------------------|------------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Very effectively | Somewhat effectively | Unsure | Not very effectively | Not at all effectively |

6. Ultimately, what do you think will be the main, concrete and enduring impacts that the programme you work with is making in your country and/or the region?

| |
|-------|
| _____ |
| _____ |
| _____ |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

7. To what extent is the programme effective in strengthening and promoting cross-border cooperation and collaboration with regional entities (eg., CARICC, JPC, IRDC, TI)?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

If your work does not relate to international Conventions and other instruments skip to Question 10.

8. To what extent does the programme contribute to your country's implementation of relevant international conventions and other instruments (eg, UNTOC, UNCAC, CEDAW)?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

9. Thinking about your last response, what are the main ways the programme has contributed to implementing these conventions or other instruments?

10. To what extent can long-term sustainable results be expected for all stakeholders (eg., government, partners, end beneficiaries) from the current programme?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

11. What, in your view, are the key things needed to ensure programme sustainability over the longer term?

12. To what extent did the programme you work with contribute to the SDGs?

| | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Very much | A little | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

13. Can you elaborate on this SDG-contribution for us? Which goals did the programme assist with and can you give examples of exactly how the contribution was made?

14. Has national ownership of the programme you work with been generated?

| | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Very much | A little | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

15. Thinking about your answer above, can you describe some of the ways that national ownership can be observed?

16. Still thinking about national ownership of the programme, what factors have hindered or facilitated this ownership?

Hindered ownership

Facilitated ownership

| | |
|-------|-------|
| <hr/> | <hr/> |
| <hr/> | <hr/> |
| <hr/> | <hr/> |
| <hr/> | <hr/> |
| <hr/> | <hr/> |
| <hr/> | <hr/> |
| <hr/> | <hr/> |

17. How has the programme developed your country's capacity to sustain the effort and benefits it is delivering?

18. To what extent have human rights and gender priorities and principles, including the needs of vulnerable groups, guided the design (reference framework, planning structure) of the programme you work with?

Human rights priorities and principles have guided the programme design?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

Gender priorities and principles have guided the programme design?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

Vulnerable groups, including those groups hardest to reach, priorities and principles have guided the programme design?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

Disabled groups (eg, vision impaired, intellectually disabled, mental health conditions, physically disabled) priorities and principles have guided the programme design?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

19. To what extent have specific measures been taken to address the needs and priorities of human rights, gender, vulnerable groups and the disabled during implementation of the programme?

Specific measures to address human rights needs and priorities?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

Specific measures to address gender needs and priorities?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

Specific measures to address vulnerable groups' needs and priorities?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

Specific measures to address disabled groups' needs and priorities?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

20. From your experience working with the programme, can you think of any lessons to be learned that would improve its performance, results and effectiveness in the future?

21. Are there any lessons to be learned relating specifically to the programme's design and implementation that could inform future programmes?

22. What good practices can you identify in UNODC programming in the region, including in relation to 'leaving no one behind' principles?

Finally, do you have any comments you would like to make on the programme you have worked with? If so please write in the space below.

Thank you very much for your participation!

SURVEYS

INTRODUCTION

Two surveys were undertaken, one with a selection of UNODC staff using SurveyMonkey and one with a group of final beneficiaries of SP3 in Afghanistan. Surveys were translated as appropriate for each stakeholder group.

UNODC STAFF SURVEY

WHAT IS THIS SURVEY?

We are contacting you as part of an in-depth final-evaluation evaluation of a cluster of UNODC programmes. Assisted by the Independent Evaluation Section of UNODC we are seeking to understand the extent to which the UNODC programming in West and Central Asia addresses the specific context and national needs while contributing to addressing regional and inter-regional issues related to transnational organized crime, trafficking and terrorism threats.

As a member of UNODC with a role this programming, your views and perspectives are vital for informing our evaluation. We have prepared a short survey, which you can click through to below. First, however, we provide some broad background to the evaluation and inform you about how your data will be handled should you agree to participate.

WHAT SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES ARE BEING EVALUATED?

The UNODC operates five programmes in Central and West Asia. One is a regional programme focused on regional initiatives – the Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries. In addition, UNODC has the Programme for Central Asia, which works in five countries in Central Asia. Working at the country level UNODC is represented by the Country Programme for Afghanistan, the Country Programme for Pakistan and the Country Partnership Programme for the Islamic Republic of Iran.

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, all of these programmes require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion. These evaluations are being undertaken as a cluster to ensure a utilization-focused evaluation addressing accountability and learning and the development of the next phases of the programmes, with a contribution to the strategic future thinking for the region.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE ANSWERS I PROVIDE?

Completion of this survey will be taken as consent to participate. Your responses will be anonymous, but we will ask you to provide us with some information about you and the programme or sub-programme you work most with. This information will help us analyse the data more effectively and will not be combined with your open-text responses in a way that will allow you to be identified. The responses you provide to us will thus be confidential. If you have any concerns about the survey you are completely free to choose not to complete it and we will have no record of who has or hasn't made that choice.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- In which UNODC office do you work?
 - Free text box: response
- Gender
 - Male
 - Female
 - Do not want to say
- With which programme do you work the most?

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | The Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | The Programme for Central Asia |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | The Country Programme for Afghanistan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | The Country Programme for Iran |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | The Country Programme for Pakistan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | My work is spread across all of the West and Central Asia Programmes |

- How many years have you been working in connection with UNODC programmes in West and Central Asia
 - Free text box: response
- Please provide a brief description of your connection with/ role in relation to the Programme/ Programmes identified above
 - Free text box: response
- Please specify the activities in which you are involved, including thematic areas of contribution
 - Free text box: response

As you complete this survey, we would like you to give your responses in relation to the programme or sub-programme you specified above, with which you work most.

To begin, we would like to ask you some questions about *coherence and coordination with partners*.

1. To what extent did the programme you most work with develop or strengthen existing and new partnerships at bilateral, regional and international levels?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

2. Can you describe some examples of *particularly effective partnership* between the programme you work with and each of the levels below? If you have no engagement with one of these, please leave the box empty.

- Free text box: UN Global Programmes
- Free text box: International partner programmes, eg., EU funded projects

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

- Free text box: Neighbouring country partnerships, eg., Joint Planning Cell
- Free text box: In-country partnerships, eg., civil society organisations
- Free text box: Other partnerships you would like to mention

3. While partnerships are an important feature of many programmes, they are sometimes difficult to sustain or to operate most effectively. In the box below, can you provide examples of where partnership has been difficult, and/ or indicate any lessons on partnership that have been learned?

- Free text box: examples and lessons

4. In your view, how effective in reinforcing partnerships are the programmes you have been involved in in West and Central Asia?

| | 1 Extremely effective | 2 Quite effective | 3 Effective to a certain extent | 4 Needs improvement | 5 Not at all |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| With UN agencies | | | | | |
| With Donors | | | | | |
| With government counterparts across the region | | | | | |
| With civil society organisations | | | | | |

Thinking now about the *coherence of the programme* you work most with within the UN system.

5. To what extent does the programme you work with contribute to the One UN, UNDAF, and other UN system-wide coordination mechanisms (e.g. participation in UN Country Team)?

| | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 5 Great extent | 4 Some extent | 3 Unsure | 2 Not much | 1 Not at all |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|

6. Can you identify some of the *key positives of integration of UNODC* programming into these wider UN coordination mechanisms?

- Free text box: response

7. What are the challenges the UNODC faces in working toward such *system-wide coordination* goals?

- Free text box: response

8. To what extent does UNODC *participation in wider UN frameworks*, such as UNDAFs, influence the performance of the programme you work most with?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

9. Can you explain your answer?

- Free text box: response

We will move on now to some questions of *efficiency and the use of resources*, remembering that we are asking you these questions in respect of the programme you *work with the most*.

10. With respect to your programme, to what extent were the resources and inputs converted to outputs and outcomes in a timely and cost-effective manner?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

11. We are interested in understanding the types of resources that have been found useful for delivering efficient in-country activities - some discussed resources include international trainers, international consultants, national trainers, national researchers, other local service providers, local civil society organisations and a variety of digital solutions/ resources. Have these, or other, resources been found useful by you in programme design or delivery?

Free text box: response

12. To what extent were resources (financial, time, people, expertise) sufficiently allocated to achieve objectives relating to human rights, gender equality and the special needs of vulnerable populations?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

Moving now to think about the *leave no one behind principles*, we would like you to reflect upon how your programme supported these and if there are any lessons we might take away.

13. To what extent did your programme contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

14. Can you please elaborate on this SDG-contribution? Which goals did the programme assist with and can you give examples of exactly how the contribution was made?

- Free text box: response

15. To what extent were there clear linkages between SDG goals in programme design and their importance and visibility in programme implementation and reporting?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

16. To what extent have specific measures been taken to address the *needs and priorities of human rights, gender and vulnerable groups during implementation* of the programme you work most with

| | Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |
|--|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| <i>Human rights needs and priorities</i> | | | | | |
| <i>Gender equality needs and priorities</i> | | | | | |
| <i>Vulnerable groups, including prisoners, drug users</i> | | | | | |
| <i>Disabled, including vision, physical, mental health</i> | | | | | |

- Free text box: response

17. Are there specific populations that require more attention in your programme based upon leaving no one behind principles? If so, can you briefly list and describe how this is so?

- Free text box: response

Finally, we invite you to add any thoughts or comments you might have on your experience with this programme you work with and that you think might be useful to our evaluation.

- Free text box: response

Thank you very much for your contribution!

BENEFICIARY SURVEY

A survey was undertaken with beneficiaries in two provinces in Afghanistan, participants in alternative development initiatives of the programme in Afghanistan. The survey was issued in the field by an implementing partner in Afghanistan and surveyed 80 beneficiaries – 40 in each province. Responses to the survey were returned directly to the national evaluator and were analysed by the evaluation team, ensuring objectivity and confidentiality.

UNODC Programming in West and Central Asia

Indicative survey questionnaire for final beneficiaries of Alternative development interventions in Afghanistan

We are contacting you as part of an in-depth final evaluation of a cluster of UNODC programmes. Assisted by the Independent Evaluation Section of UNODC, UNODC Country office in Afghanistan and its partners in the country, we are seeking to understand the extent to which UNODC supported interventions and programming in West and Central Asia addresses the specific context and national needs, including at the community level, while contributing to addressing regional and inter-regional issues related to transnational organized crime and trafficking threats.

As a participant in a UNODC supported programme, your views and perspectives are vital for informing our evaluation and understand the relevance and usefulness of supported interventions in the region. We have prepared a short questionnaire as well as some background elements to the evaluation and information about how your responses will be handled should you agree to participate.

WHAT SPECIFIC PROGRAMMES ARE BEING EVALUATED?

The UNODC operates five programmes in Central and West Asia. One is a regional programme focused on regional initiatives – the Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries. In addition, UNODC has the Programme for Central Asia, which works in five countries in Central Asia. Working at the country level UNODC is represented by the Country Programme for Afghanistan, the Country Programme for Pakistan and the Country Partnership Programme for the Islamic Republic of Iran. In line with UNODC evaluation policy, all of these programmes require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion, to ensure a utilization-focused evaluation addressing accountability and learning for the development of the next phases of the programmes. This survey is part of this evaluation process.

In Afghanistan, specific Alternative development interventions have been developed and implemented to strengthen and diversify licit livelihoods of small households. These projects were designed to ensure an increase in productivity, employment and economic growth that is sustainable in the long term. They aim at supporting and strengthening selected value chains in production and market linkages, as well as the technical and entrepreneurial capacity of both farmers and farm-based associations. To ensure the proposed interventions respond to your needs and achieve the set objectives, we would highly appreciate your views on the accomplishments and the level of satisfaction of those results.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO THE ANSWERS I PROVIDE?

Completion of this survey will be taken as consent to participate. The Implementing Partner kindly agreed to administrate this questionnaire as main implementer. Your responses will be anonymous, but we will ask you to provide us with some information about your background and the way you benefited

from the intervention. The responses you provide to us will thus be confidential. If you have any concerns about the survey you are completely free to choose not to complete it or respond to all the questions, and we will have no record of who has or hasn't made that choice. Thank you for your participation.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This section is for us to get to know your background and your situation.

- Could you please specify your gender?
 - Male
 - Female
 - Do not want to say
- Could you please specify and describe the land particularities of your geographic area (namely, how the area has been used in the past, what type of activity do you feel best appropriate to develop in your area etc)?

- From your perspective, do you consider your geographic area is sufficiently equipped with basic services such as health dispensaries, schools, etc?

Please circle the answer ----- Yes/ No

Please explain in which area you would benefit for increased access to basic services:

- How many people are you supporting in your household (i.e., number of people in living/eating at home daily)? _____
- How many women and men compose your household? Above 18? Below 18? _____
- Could you please tell us about your main work activities? Have you changed activities in the course of your participation to the programme?

- How many household members are involved in the activity? _____
- Is it the first time you attend a training or benefit from any technical assistance provided by an NGOs/ the Government/ or any other relevant stakeholder?
Please circle the answer ----- Yes/ No

SATISFACTION AND USEFULNESS OF PROVIDED SUPPORT

This section asks about your perception of the services and assistance provided. It aims at collecting information about your satisfaction with the interventions and how they responded to your needs.

- In which area have you received specific assistance?
 - Farming, Crop, vegetable, and fruit
 - Dairy (milk and milk products)
 - Meat production (selling of live animals for meat)
 - Poultry (include live birds and eggs)
 - Tailoring/handicraft

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

- Other: _____

- What type of assistance was provided in your area?
 - Training and technical support
 - Infrastructure building
 - Provision of construction materials or tools
 - Provision of vegetable seed, farming and vegetable collection tools
 - Provision of veterinary assistance / chickens
 - Others:
- For how long?
 - Few months
 - More than a year
 - More than 2 years
- During your participation to the programme, have you been in contact more than once with representatives of the following entities? *Please circle the answer*
 - NGOs ---- Yes/ No
 - Experts or professionals in your field --- Yes/ No
 - UNODC staff --- Yes/ No
 - Provincial authority --- Yes/ No
 - National authorities/ Government --- Yes / No
 - Others --- Yes/No -----If Yes, could you specify: _____
 - Do not know
- What were the key needs and priorities that this programme helped you to best address?

Income generation - *Please specify if possible:* _____

Sufficient food for your household needs

Substantive production for selling

Equipment, material provision and technical assistance

Skills and training

Entrepreneurship support / business training

Other: _____

- Overall, have you been satisfied with the assistance provided?

Please rate on a scale from 1 to 5, 5 being the maximum of satisfaction and 1 the minimum.

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

- Overall, have you been satisfied with the way the service provided addressed the needs of women and/or child in your household/ your community? *Please rate on a scale from 1 to 5, 5 being the maximum of satisfaction and 1 the minimum*

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

SUSTAINABILITY OF ACHIEVEMENTS

This section asks about how the programmes addressed particular needs and your perceptions of their impact on your situation.

- To what extent has the programme consulted you or members of your community in the development of the current activities?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

- To what extent has the programme provided adequate support to enable you to increase your productivity?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

- To what extent has the programme provided adequate support to enable you to diversify your activity on a long term?

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |

- To what extent has the programme provided adequate support to enhance your access to the national market?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | | | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|
| Great extent | Some extent | Unsure | Not much | Not at all |
|--------------|-------------|--------|----------|------------|

- Do you believe your current activity can be sustained in the future?
 - Over the next year
 - Over the next 2 years
 - Longer

Could you please specify why so?

- Hypothetically speaking, if the support provided were to be withdrawn, to what extent do you think it would impact your-self? your country? Your community?

- What other kind of assistance would you like, to improve your income and economic status? Your living conditions at large?

Thank you for your assistance.

ANNEX III: DESK REVIEW LIST

This list includes all documents listed in the Terms of Reference as well as other documents provided subsequently or collected independently by the evaluation team.

UNODC DOCUMENTS

| Document – name | Reviewed (y/n) | Comments |
|--|----------------|----------------------------------|
| UNODC One Concerted Approach for Europe, West and Central Asia ⁸ | Y | |
| Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (2016 -2020) | Y | |
| Country Programme for Afghanistan (2016-2020) | Y | |
| Country Partnership Programme in the Islamic Republic of Iran (2015-2020) | Y | |
| Country Programme for Pakistan (2016-2020) | Y | |
| Programme for Central Asia 2015-2020 | Y | |
| NATO-UNODC project documents | Y | |
| World Drug Report - https://wdr.unodc.org/wdr2019/ | Y | |
| Research and reports of the Afghan Opiate Trade Project ⁹ | Y | |
| Illicit Crop Monitoring Reports ¹⁰ | Y | |
| Logical Framework SP1- Countering Transnational Crime and illicit drug trafficking, and preventing terrorism | Y | |
| Country and Regional Programs and programmatic actions ROCA 2018 FINAL | Y | |
| Country Factsheets 2018 | Y | Programme for Central Asia only. |
| Project documents and revisions of AFGF98, AFGZ87, AFGZ88, AFGZ89, AFGZ97, IRNZ76, IRNZ77, IRNZ78, IRNZ79, PAKW50, PAKW51, PAKW52, PAKJ85, PAKW20, XACZ47, XACZ60, XACZ61, XACZ62, XACZ63 XACK22, TAJH03, TAJE24, RERH22, RERV07, RERV08, RERV09, and RERV10 | Y | |
| Semi-annual and annual progress reports of AFGF98, AFGZ87, AFGZ88, AFGZ89, AFGZ97, IRNZ76, IRNZ77, IRNZ78, IRNZ79, PAKJ85, PAKW20, PAKW50, PAKW51, XACZ47, TAJH03, TAJE24, RERH22, KGZK50, RERV07, RERV08, RERV09, and RERV10 | Y | |
| Project documents and revisions of RERF23, KGZK50, KGZT90, XCEA0, UZBU57 | y | |

⁸

[https://www.unodc.org/documents/rpanc/Publications/other_publications/Brochure_One_UNODC_Concerted_Approach.p
df](https://www.unodc.org/documents/rpanc/Publications/other_publications/Brochure_One_UNODC_Concerted_Approach.pdf)

⁹ <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/aotp.html>

¹⁰ <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crop-monitoring/index.html?tag=Afghanistan>

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Document – name | Reviewed (y/n) | Comments |
|---|----------------|---|
| Semi-annual and annual progress reports of XACZ61, XACZ62, XACZ63, RERF23, KGZT90, XCEA0, UZBU57 | Y | |
| UNODC organigram | N | Not provided |
| Paris Pact Initiative-related background information ¹¹ | Y | |
| Relevant Global Programme documents and progress reports | Y | |
| Key programme figures and data, including information on men, women and other marginalised group. | N | Not provided as separate documentation – considered within Prodocs etc. |
| Donor reports and financial statements of the project | Y | |
| Relevant audit reports | N | |
| Relevant evaluation reports of donors, UNODC, etc. | Y | |
| UNODC website: UNODC and the Sustainable Development Goals ¹² | Y | |
| UNODC brochure: UNODC and the Sustainable Development Goals ¹³ | Y | |
| UNODC brochure: Better Data to monitor violence, trafficking, corruption and access to Justice (2017) ¹⁴ | Y | |
| UNODC Research Brief: Global Overview of Alternative Development (2013-2017) ¹⁵ | Y | |
| UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit: Meta-Analysis 2011-2014 ¹⁶ | Y | |
| UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit: Meta-Analysis 2015-2016 ¹⁷ | Y | |
| UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit: Meta-Analysis 2017-2018 | Y | |
| UNODC Inception Report Guidelines and Template ¹⁸ | Y | |
| UNODC Evaluation Report Guidelines and Template ¹⁹ | Y | |
| UNODC Evaluation Quality Assessment ²⁰ | Y | |
| Guidance Note on Gender Mainstreaming in UNODC (2013) ²¹ | Y | |

¹¹ <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/drug-trafficking/paris-pact-initiative.html>

¹² <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/about-unodc/sustainable-development-goals/sdgs-index.html>

¹³ https://www.unodc.org/documents/SDGs/UNODC-SDG_brochure_LORES.pdf

¹⁴ http://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/Crime-statistics/Brochure_goal16_2017_web.pdf

¹⁵ https://www.unodc.org/documents/crop-monitoring/Research_brief_Overview_of_AD.pdf

¹⁶ http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Meta-Analysis/UNODC_Evaluation_Meta-Analysis_2011-2014.pdf

¹⁷ http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Meta-Analysis/UNODC_IEU_Evaluation_Meta-Analysis_2015-2016.pdf

¹⁸ https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html#Inception_Report

¹⁹ https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html#Eval_Report

²⁰ <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/Evaluation-based-knowledge-products.html#EQAs>

²¹ <https://www.un.org/womenwatch/directory/docs/UNODC-GuidanceNote-GenderMainstreaming.pdf>

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Document – name | Reviewed (y/n) | Comments |
|---|----------------|----------|
| UNODC evaluation guidelines, templates, handbook, policy ²² | Y | |
| UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit: Evaluation-based analysis of good practices in UNODC's approach to capacity building ²³ | Y | |
| UNODC Position Paper on Human Rights (2011) ²⁴ | Y | |
| 2016_UNODC_Annual_Report | Y | |
| UNODC brochure: Better Data to monitor violence, trafficking, corruption and access to Justice (2017) ²⁵ | Y | |
| IOM confirming electronic endorsement 21 June 2019.pdf | Y | |
| UNODC-IES_brief_gender-responsive_evaluations_guidance_for_evaluators.pdf | Y | |

EXTERNAL DOCUMENTS

| Document – name | Reviewed (y/n) | Comments |
|---|----------------|----------|
| UNEG: Integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation ²⁶ | Y | |
| UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016) ²⁷ | Y | |
| UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation ²⁸ | Y | |
| United Nations Development Assistance Framework Guidance (2017) ²⁹ | Y | |
| UN Women-evaluation-handbook-en.pdf | Y | |
| UNDP-WhatsApp survey of Syrian refugees-2018 | Y | |
| IASC Gender Marker.docx | Y | |
| Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation toward UNEG Guidance.pdf | Y | |
| NKWAKE2013_chapter_evaluatingcomplexdevelopmentpr | Y | |
| NKWAKE2013_chapter_theoryinevaluation | Y | |
| OECD DAC criteria definitions | Y | |
| The chain of results.pptx | Y | |
| Gender Results Effectiveness Scale.docx | Y | |

²²<https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html>

²³https://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Knowledge-Products/UNODC_IEU_Evaluation-based_Capacity_Building_Analysis_final_October_2017.pdf
http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Knowledge-Products/UNODC_IEU_Evaluation-based_Capacity_Building_Analysis_final_October_2017.pdf

²⁴ http://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/UNODC_Human_rights_position_paper_2012.pdf

²⁵ http://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/Crime-statistics/Brochure_goal16_2017_web.pdf

²⁶ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/980>

²⁷ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

²⁸ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>

²⁹ <https://unsdg.un.org/resources/united-nations-development-assistance-framework-guidance>

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Document – name | Reviewed (y/n) | Comments |
|---|----------------|--|
| Doing Fieldwork in a pandemic.pdf ³⁰ | Y | |
| UNODC mandate ³¹ | Y | |
| Relevant “Voluntary National Reviews” of the SDGs | Y | Afghanistan 2017; Kazakhstan 2019; Kyrgyzstan 2020; Tajikistan 2017; Turkmenistan 2019; Uzbekistan 2020 |
| ECOSOC Report of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators-(E/CN.3/2017/2*) | Y | |
| ROCA Annual Report 2018 | Y | |
| The Fourth PSC outcome document (minutes) | Y | |
| Outcome document of SDG workshop (November 2018) | Y | |
| Project documents of initiatives on Human trafficking | Y | |
| CASC project documents | Y | |
| Matrix of initiatives in Central Asia on terrorism prevention | Y | |
| MOU, signed in the region (SCO, GPO-Uz, GPO-Kz, MOI-Uz, Roadmap-Uz and Tm, etc.) | Y | |
| 11th MOU meeting outcome document and declaration | Y | |
| MOU Meetings history document | Y | |
| Outcome document of the meeting of the working group of railway authorities | Y | |
| Outcome document of the Samarkand Conference on Afghanistan | Y | |
| List of CSOs that UNODC ROCA works | Y | |
| https://fragilestatesindex.org/ | Y | |
| http://visionofhumanity.org/indexes/global-peace-index/ | Y | |
| https://hiik.de/conflict-barometer/current-version/?lang=en | Y | |
| https://worldjusticeproject.org/our-work/wjp-rule-law-index | Y | |

³⁰ <https://nwssdtpacuk.files.wordpress.com/2020/04/doing-fieldwork-in-a-pandemic2-google-docs.pdf>

³¹ <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/Human-rights/unodc-mandates---more.html>

ANNEX IV: STAKEHOLDERS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION

| Number of Stakeholders providing inputs | Type of stakeholder (see note below) | Sex disaggregated data | Country ³² |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| 133 | Government counterpart | Male: 94 Female: 18 No response: 21 | Various |
| 79 | International organisation | Male: 49 Female: 29 No response: 1 | Various |
| 11 | UN Agency | Male: 4 Female: 7 No response: | Various |
| 9 | Implementing Partner | Male: 6 Female: 3 No response: | Various |
| 19 | Donor | Male: 15 Female: 4 No response: | Various |
| 6 | Final beneficiary | Male: 4 Female: 2 No response: | Various |
| Total: 256 | | Male: 172 Female: 62 No response: 22 | |

³² In order to ensure anonymity, the numbers for partners have been merged, rather than showing country-by-country totals.

ANNEX V: SUMMARY EVALUATION MATRIX FOR THE FIVE PROGRAMMES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| Relevance | 1. Were the programmes designed based on evidence (research, lessons learned from past programming, evaluations)? | <p>Design documents (Prodocs) should reference the basis of their design: research (UNODC/ UN/ other), specific references to reports from earlier programmes or evaluations indicating use of learning.</p> <p>Prodocs should show a clear thread between a well-researched problem statement and each component of the result logic (activity-output-outcome).</p> <p>Was the conflict or fragility context considered in programme design?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instability, border, violence etc. 2. Were escalating/deescalating factors identified (structural changes, destabilising behaviours.) 3. How was design adapted to these? | <p>Programme design does not include a conflict-sensitive contexting.</p> <p>Design processes across the programmes were well informed, with GCs reporting strong engagement with UNODC in defining priorities. Programme designs, to varying degrees, were based on research, experience with previous programming, evidence, lessons learned, best practices, relevant situational and risk analyses, post-project surveys, the establishment of baselines against which progress could be measured, and previous evaluations. UNODC engaged in significant consultations with GC through formal and informal dialogue mechanisms with a wide range of actors including civil society, working groups created to represent GC and donors and involving the participation of an international expert to further inform design. It is noted that programme lacked long-term thinking (i.e. beyond the 5-year programming) in design documentation. Programme designs are coherent while also sufficiently tailored manner to ensure alignment with both regional and national priorities and needs.</p> <p>AFG- SP 1, design of the current Country Programme shifted from pure Counter Narcotics to cover all border activity, opening the scope of activities to greater focus on transnational organised crime, including money laundering and people smuggling. Design flexibility allowed for cooperation between sub-programme 2 and the Global Programme against Money Laundering (GPML), in the face of funding challenges and a change in MS priorities. Issues with programme funding has resulted in focusing sub-programme 3 largely in the direction of alternative livelihood components and objectives.</p> <p>IRAN- Programming has introduced initiatives responsive to country conditions, including new focuses on terrorism and trafficking in antiquities, even within a less flexible programming environment. It was noted in the 2014 mid-term evaluation and apparently not addressed, the results framework continues to be weak in capturing progress on change processes that are not subject to easy quantification.</p> <p>UNODC exit strategies need to be included in design</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
| | 2. To what extent does the defined structure of programmes in the region align with current regional practice and future directions? | <p>Data on the interactions of the CPs and Programme for CA with the RP ANC: Donor/ funding benefits, coordination; Planning and strategy processes and results; Coordination.</p> <p>Changes (if any) in strategic priorities and how these impact on regional UNODC programmatic structures.</p> <p>Alignment of the regional programme with MS regional priorities, practice and future directions.</p> <p>Descriptions of the opportunities and risks in the alignment of UNODC programmes in the region.</p> | <p>GC and UNODC across all programmes describe a good alignment with their needs, with flexibility demonstrated by the UNODC in its ability to address changing circumstances. Across the region (with the noted exception of Iran) GCs were overwhelmingly supportive of the alignment of the Regional Programme with their needs, its role in facilitating regional concerns in the face of changing circumstances</p> <p>GC support an increase in regional programming and view it as a way to add value to programming. GC value UNODC a global organisation that provides relevant support in the “bridging of similar colleagues across the region.” All feel that participation in RP outreach platforms, bringing Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iran, and some of Central Asia to the same table, is seen as critical, in particular to counter narcotic strategies. Challenges due to a lack of alignment and synergy exist with the RP to varying degrees - as well as a level of competition. A specific example was provided in relation to the Triangular Initiative, activities of which appear under both RP and Country Programme work plans.</p> <p>IRAN-Inputs from Iran indicate that the RP and Country Programme are aligned programmatically, but the Country Programme feels that the RP aligns itself with Country Programme activities. Government mentoring and continued dialogue were vital in ensuring the continuity of the programme.</p> <p>AFG-The Country Programme’s design includes a strong focus on regional dimensions and structures, taking into significant consideration the position of Afghanistan in illicit drug markets.</p> <p>Within Alternative Livelihoods, clear potential exists, and is being discussed, for the exchange of good practice as well as for potential markets for agriculture products emanating from projects.</p> <p>PAK- Country Programme works to align current activities with regional frameworks - the cross-cutting programs with the RP and global thematic areas of UNODC. There is a point of interaction between the Country Programme and the RP in the area of AML.</p> <p>Support tailored to Pakistan governance structure and institutional cultures, policy visions and specific and emerging needs of partner agencies related to HIV and drug demand reduction, prevention and treatment.</p> <p>PCA- GC confirm this alignment but noted some negative impacts of transition from project to programmatic approach.</p> <p>The long-standing initiative on prison reform work in Kyrgyzstan has grown into a wider programme of criminal justice reform across the region. Despite uneven funding, it addresses reforms in several</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>areas, resting on a foundation of legislation supporting criminalisation, law enforcement and criminal procedure and punishment.</p> <p>Initiatives on naloxone distribution and prevention of overdose, rehabilitation of former and current prisoners, methadone programmes and the development alternatives to incarceration for people who use drugs are all active areas and areas in which the Programme is a preferred partner.</p> <p>SP3 under the RP functions as both a complement to ongoing assistance at the national and sub-regional levels and a strategic dialogue avenue (nationally and regionally) to reach common ground on the prioritisation of DDR and HIV prevention, including the vulnerable population.</p> |
| | <p>3. To what extent are the objectives of the Programmes aligned with regional priorities and UNDAFs/ UNSDCFs/ SDGs?</p> | <p>Well-expressed descriptions of strategic linkages/ alignment to these frameworks in Prodocs, from problem statements through to output and outcome statements.</p> <p>Linkages in Prodocs to UN global and regional strategic documents such as the PPI.</p> <p>Clear discussion of contributions to SDGs, including specifically addressing SDG 5 (Gender equality), SDG 3 (Health and well-being) and SDG 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions).</p> <p>Visibility in design documents of strategic policy influences.</p> <p>Clearly expressed linkages from activities to intended results in relation to regional and global priorities that address results as well as objectives.</p> | <p>The objectives of the Programmes are fully aligned regionally, notably with relation to narcotics and related trafficking as these are clearly regional, even global, priorities.</p> <p>IRAN-UNODC has been and remains active in UN coordination mechanisms in Iran. In this context, the UNDAF programme mirrors UNODC priorities. UNODC is the lead agency in Iran under Pillar 4 of the UNDAF, as it related to drug control.</p> <p>AFG- There is a clear and strong alignment of the Country Programme with SDG 16 - peace, justice and strong institutions. The narcotics trade and the insurgency in Afghanistan undermine institutions – the Country Programme is addressing these issues.</p> <p>PAK- According to inputs from field work, the UNDAF was taken into consideration of the design of the programme and the Programme is aligned UNDAFs and strategic development frameworks. However, there is almost no reference to the UNDAF in the programme document and none at all in the Programme’s results framework, activities, outcomes or indicators.</p> <p>The Country Programme contributes to UNODC visibility, credibility and positioning as a leading agency on drugs use and HIV prevention, treatment and care services among PWID in prison settings.</p> <p>Across the Country Programme’s sub-programmes there is also a specific alignment with SDGs 2 – eradication of hunger, 3 – health and well-being, 5 – gender equality, 8 – decent work and 12 – responsible production.</p> <p>There is a view that the research and advocacy work associated with sub-programme 4 – research could grow in activity and influence in the region.</p> <p>The PCA has a strong alignment with SDG 16 and alignment to some extent with both SDG 5 and SDG 3. Programme design documents and reporting note alignment with the UNDAFs of countries in the region but with very little of what this alignment looks like or how it affects activities and results. The</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>evaluation heard a range of comments from stakeholders on the Programme’s concerted efforts to align with UNDAFs, with specific commentary on how this is visible in participation in UNCTs across Central Asia.</p> <p>The Regional Programme document states that the RP is in full alignment with UNDAFs, and driven by the SDGs, particularly SDG 16 with a focus on security matters, peace, and protection of human rights in the region, including security matters. Feedback from Country Teams feeds into RP planning, but there is a lack of clarity as to how UNDAFs (and in the future, UNSDCF) inform RP programming. In relation to the SDGs, reporting notes the establishment of the Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network (ARIN) as a contribution to SDG 16.4 and 16.5. The Strengthening Families Programme is also pointed to as a direct contributor to SDG 3.5, as well as SDGs 16, 5 and 10.³³</p> |
| | <p>4. To what extent do the programmes respond to the changing and emerging regional and national (Member State) priorities and needs?</p> | <p>Well-expressed descriptions of MS priorities and needs in Prodocs and related reports, from problem statements through to output and outcome statements.</p> <p>Extent to which the context (political, institutional, cultural) is conducive to gender and human rights mainstreaming in regional and/ or national priorities.</p> <p>Indications from PS and external commentary that Programmes are related to MS priorities.</p> <p>Indications from MS of the relevance of the Programmes to their priorities and needs.</p> <p>Indications from PS and external commentary on regional initiatives – responsiveness to needs, etc.</p> | <p>GC note that programming addresses real needs, at both country and regional levels and in full consultation and cooperation with GCs. Specifically, it is noted that programmes need to have built-in flexibility and the ability to respond to shifts in GC needs and priorities – rapidly changing landscapes require the ability of the programmes to respond in this context. GC confirmed they were satisfied with demonstrated programme flexibility as needed. The exception to this is Iran, where the rigidity of programming agreements and programming oversight made programming flexibility a challenge.</p> <p>In Iran, the current political environment, (the relationship with the international community and the strong influence of donor priorities), detracts from programme effectiveness, with particular note made of a lack of progress on UNCAC implementation. However, UNODC flexibility is noted to the extent possible, including efforts to address the conclusions and recommendations of earlier evaluations in relation to programme structure and monitoring (reporting matrix and indicators).</p> <p>AFG- GC see some areas of improvement in design that would improve relevance, including:</p> <p>Greater alignment with the national priorities in investigations and intelligence training, and in the documentation needed for judicial purposes.</p> <p>A shift in priority on interventions and capacities in provinces and rural areas.</p> <p>Political sensitivities as well as a general fatigue among both the donor community and national counterparts to deal with anti-narcotic priorities was also noted, underlining the need for increased</p> |

³³ 2018. Annual Programme Progress Report – Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries.

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Relevance of regional initiatives (e.g. CARICC) in PR; in MS discussions; in OUN comments.</p> <p>Confirmatory responses of MS, in quantitative surveys, regarding both national and regional initiatives.</p> | <p>attention to developing future programming with more comprehensive rationales. Further, the withdrawal of international actors has left a gap that Afghanistan is looking to UNODC to fill</p> <p>GC specifically mention the growing regional focus on anti-money laundering and asset recovery. Alternative development programme design is based in sound assessments of need and pre-existing conditions in the fields of interventions, within targeted communities, contributing to programme relevance as well as effectiveness.</p> <p>PAK- The Country Programme addressed areas of capacity building of law enforcement agencies, preparation of legal frameworks and the national action plan on human trafficking and the smuggling of migrants and made efforts to bring regional players together.</p> <p>Sub-programme 2 has a stronger national level focus, encouraging partnership and learning across provinces. RoL initiatives have met with overwhelming support in responses from GCs to the evaluation. of the government in financial crimes area.</p> <p>The focus on PWID and expertise of UNODC on drug use and HIV prevention in prison settings constituted an added value to adequately respond to the specificities and evolutions of HIV epidemic among vulnerable populations in Pakistan.</p> <p>PCA -Significant alignment challenges noted between GC needs and priorities of donors. Donor restrictions can impede PCA from being as flexible as needed, due to rapidly evolving political situation in the region.</p> <p>These elements are particularly opportune in contexts of high cultural and political sensitivities and stigmatization of drug use and concerned populations, and low levels of understanding and legitimization of DDR measures such as substitution therapied and overdose treatments.</p> <p>GC still have strong focus on the acquisition of hardware, PCA making efforts to move priorities towards a more strategic approach.</p> <p>RP- GC report strong alignment with their national counternarcotic strategies, recognising the programme as a critical platform to bring MS together, especially in light of political sensitivities- “It is the only way we can talk to one another”</p> <p>Support particularly appreciated in areas where national-level expertise is low or absent, such as methods of complex financial crime.</p> |
| Coherence | 5. To what extent did | Analyse the extent to which the programmes cooperate with partners | The relationship between the RP and PCA is not functioning, with a range of conflicting views on the effectiveness and coherence between the two. Some PCA staff state they are unclear what the RP’s |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | <p>the programmes develop or strengthen existing and new partnerships at bilateral, regional and international levels?</p> | <p>(including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, and those dealing with HR and gender issues such as UN Women, women’s NGOs and gender/ human rights specialised researchers) in the achievement of results.</p> <p>Indications may include Agreements/ MoUs, the accessing of research and products of research and the use of these partners as training resources in the provision of capacity-building activities for MS or PS and/ or IP.</p> <p>As programme documentation mentions weaknesses in certain areas of partnership and cohesion – areas where cooperation could be improved – this will be addressed specifically as well.</p> | <p>role is, as they understand the PCA as a regional programme and in that respect self-sufficient. GCs and donors are both aware of this lack of cohesion but practical impacts appear more important internally to UNODC. Both GC and UNODC staff note concern over potential duplication of efforts and lack of clear coordination between PCA and the RP.</p> <p>In Central Asia, GC feel Afghanistan/West Asia is at arm’s length, creating gaps in national and regional counter narcotics strategies All 5 Programmes and GC have a firm, mutual understanding of the complexities behind regional cooperation and partnership, with UNODC seen as the only platform to building bridges between MS. While GC find support at the country and regional level to be very good, political priorities impact negatively on cross-border partnership development. UNODC’s role as a neutral partner is in this regard is critical, able to convey needs, visions and concerns of NGO and GCs, NGO’s and other relevant stakeholders to each other.</p> <p>IRAN- The developing relationship of the Country Programme team with its GC is noted for its contribution to forwarding the partnership programme. There is demonstrable good cooperation between GC and the Country Programme team, providing opportunities for GC to cooperate with the international community.</p> <p>There is a clear focus in activities around the UNCAC, MLA and FATF. There are clear demonstrations of beneficial exchange through the regional events hosted in Teheran or attended by Iranian experts.</p> <p>Iran’s experience in methadone therapy places the country as a example of good practice, something which can be developed in the region.</p> <p>AFG- There are varying perspectives on cohesion and alignment between the Country Programme and the RP – generally, while coordination is seen as at a good level, perspectives are that programmatic cohesion is insufficient and waning. Relevant aspects to this finding include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Country Programme in isolation cannot be as effective as a Country Programme within an overarching framework. • Operational synergies between the Country Programme and the RP are not currently articulated effectively. • Funding constraints in different aspects of the Country Programme detract from alignment with regional practice and directions. • Both donors and GC note some lack of clarity on alignment, seeing both the Country Programme and the RP as to operating within the same bubble. |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>There has been a significantly increased cooperation between national agencies/ ministries through the establishment of the Airport Interdiction Unit and the Counter Narcotics Police lab.</p> <p>Afghanistan is still not a full member of CARICC, an organisation viewed by GC in Afghanistan critical to counternarcotic strategies.</p> <p>PAK- the Country Programme contributes to the UNDAF, and on SDG 5 and SDG 16. The Programme is well integrated into a developing One UN structure and approach within the country, engaging with WHO, UNAIDS, UNHCR, IOM and UNICEF improving the overall relevance of its work, reports on its activities and results to the UNCT in the framework of the UNDAF.</p> <p>The RoL initiative is a signature project in developing partnership at the national level. FATF support has promoted and supported the country's engagement in the international monetary system.</p> <p>Evidence of coordination and integration is wide and deep, from work on financial crimes to prisons and non-custodial alternatives, AML, crime prevention education, work with civil society/ NGOs as implementing partners. This helped to engage stakeholders in developing a shared understanding of DDR to the country's needs, supporting a higher level of prioritisation of DDR interventions.</p> <p>RP- While synergies have been pursued with UNODC Global and Country initiatives, stakeholders underlined the need to clarify mandates and avenues of cooperation Creation of the Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network for West and Central Asia (ARIN-WCA) widely noted as valued by national counterparts. Networking opportunities, such as increasing engagement with the Heart of Asia initiative, have been created.</p> |
| | 6. To what extent do the programmes contribute to the One UN, UNDAF, and other UN system-wide coordination mechanisms | <p>Analyse the extent to which UNODC is prepared for UN reforms, including participation in UN Country Teams and contributions to UNDAFS and UNSDCFs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UN reforms will be specifically addressed, including descriptions in design documentation, reporting or from interviews with key informants of | <p>The value of One UN approach is seen and perceived to be beneficial to UNODC in the longer term, but as a small agency capacity and funding undermine participation. While programs prioritize close working relationships with UN counterparts active, field work data supports the existence of both cooperation and competition with other UN agencies in both project focus and for donor resources.</p> <p>The Iran Country Office is a member of the UN Country Team, UN Crisis Management Team and UN Security Management Team. The UNODC Representative serves as an alternative UN Resident Coordinator and Designated Official for Security. The Country Office is recognised by sister UN agencies as an active supporter of the One UN and active participant in all inter-agency working groups and task forces, such as the UN M&E Group, JUNTA, UN Cares, the PSEA Task Force, the UN Communications Group, and the Operations Management Team. UNODC Chairs the UNDAF Pillar Group on Drug Control and is actively promoting joint approaches and joint programming and South-South and Triangular Cooperation. The Country Office serves as liaison focal point for the UN-</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|---|--|---|
| | (e.g. participation in UN Country Team) and the extent to which UNODC participation in UN activities influences its performance ? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Programme participation in and contribution to UNDAFs and UNSDCFs 2. Formal participation in UN groupings (UNCT etc.) 2. Contributions of PS and FO management to strategy formulation and planning both at UNCT and regional levels. 3. References in reporting to participation in UNCT and similar and references to outputs/ outcomes of this participation. | <p>International Community Open Working Group established in 2019 to facilitate collective engagement with Iran in multilateralism, dialogue and collaboration. UNODC, through its work on UNDAF Pillar 4, will collaborate with other UN agencies on the EU Multi Agency Programme to respond to emerging needs and to enhance the resilience of the most vulnerable, especially children, youth, and women</p> <p>The AFG Country Programme works effectively with UN partners in a range of initiatives related to the UNDAF and is noted as a ‘good partner in the UNCT’, in relation to the work being done on support to peace processes with neighbouring countries and through regional economic development. The Country Office has membership in four of the six One UN pillars, and is the co-Chair of one. The Country Office points to a number of UNODC HQ units as contributing to coherence and effectiveness, including the gender desk and the strategy unit. The Country Programme document only references the UNDAF in a contextual or framing sense – there is no detail in outputs and outcomes that specifically describe contributions to the UNDAF.</p> <p>PAK contributes to the One UN, engaging and coordinating with other UN agencies including IOM, UNHCR, UNICEF and the UNCT. Potential for greater cooperation with UN partners exists, notably with regards to reducing the prevalence of HIV and Hepatitis C among drug users, including youth, outside of a criminal justice framework. Cooperation with WHO and UNAIDS has been mainly based on shared mandate related to substance abuse.</p> <p>Contribution to UN Country Team processes and activities across Central Asia is commented on in a positive fashion in all countries. Visible commitment to One UN principles and processes in offices of UNODC in the 5 Member States; the Global Fund, WHO, UNDP and UNICEF remain the main partners. UNODC lacks sufficient presence among the UN family working on HIV prevention and contributing to drug use prevention and treatment. There is strong documentary alignment with UNDAFs but practical contributions are somewhat limited in many countries – contributing through a sharing of expertise, rather than a strategic engagement.</p> <p>RP report challenges in creating linkages to other UN programs in the RP-due largely in part to the specificity of the UNODC mandate. Despite some positive experiences at country levels (Iran), there is limited information on how far the RP contributes to ONE UN mechanisms. The absence of a regional secretariat for the RP may constitute an explanatory factor.</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
| Effectiveness | 7. To what extent were the objectives and outcomes stated in programme documents achieved? | <p>Achievement of planned results (looking at both outputs and outcomes).</p> <p>What were the facilitating and hindering factors in achieving results?</p> | <p>GCs perceive successes to be broad based, from soft results including experience and insight from travel, meetings and training, capacity to work across borders, increased counter narcotics capacities, support of important national-level change such as legislative and policy development and institutional reform.</p> <p>Some areas show strong progress, including prisons, alternatives to prison, education for lawful lives, the regional establishment of BLO network, increasing capacities of CARICC, in integrating family education and development into preventive programme framework, increase national capacities from national professionals (law enforcement and health specialists) to non-governmental structures (technical assistance and training participation).</p> <p>GC attribute much of this change to the technical advice provided through the programme, including related to legislation, technical design and statistics, and in training provided in workshops or one-on-one interactions, creating positive impacts on national and regional partnerships. UNODC recognised that programming was unlikely to be fully implemented, perceived as a menu of options, based on MS demands and programme coherence, for donors to choose from.</p> <p>The RP was effective in providing policy and decision makers and practitioners with knowledge, structures and skills for the development of comprehensive evidence-based drug use prevention programmes and systems (output 1). In that line, the SFP and FAST programmes were successful examples. Key GC and UNODC stakeholders encouraged continued efforts to advocate and dissemination International Prevention and Treatment Standards, as recommended by UNODC and WHO. However, evaluating concrete translation of the knowledge learned and the policy decision made at the operational level proved challenging. Diverging political visions and cultural stigmatisation of drug use and users impacts negatively on sub-programme 3 successes.</p> <p>PCA program document reflects a results framework with achievable, sustainable, timely measures, but lack of data from GC makes measuring effectiveness difficult. Building of partnership and cooperation achieved through large- and small-scale initiatives, ranging from ARIN-WCA network to bilateral MOUs that speed information flows and reduce barriers to cooperation.</p> <p>The RP was effective in providing policy and decision makers and practitioners with knowledge, structures and skills for the development of comprehensive evidence-based drug use prevention programmes and systems (output 1). In that line, the SFP and FAST programmes were successful examples. Key GC and UNODC stakeholders stressed on UNODC continued efforts to advocate and dissemination International Prevention and Treatment Standards as recommended by UNODC and</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | WHO, however it was difficult to evaluate the concrete translation of the knowledge learned and the policy decision made at the operational level. |
| | 8. How effectively did the programmes address national and regional needs and priorities? | <p>Achievement of planned results (looking at both outputs and outcomes) that specifically reference national and regional priorities.</p> <p>Reference Q4: response to the changing and emerging regional and national priorities and needs.</p> <p>Consider unintended results (positive or negative).</p> <p>Consider human rights, gender and vulnerable groups, including persons with disabilities– emerging as a regional/ national need or priority; being addressed effectively in the Programmes?</p> <p>What were the facilitating and hindering factors in achieving results? Reference Q4 – hinderances due to a lack of engagement, regionally or nationally, with changing/ emerging priorities.</p> <p>Have the programmes identified and managed conflict-related risks (the effects of the conflict context on the programme)?</p> | <p>All programs commented on limited funding having a negative impact on effectiveness</p> <p>GC report satisfaction of programming across soft outcomes- results enhancing regional mechanisms and enhancing capacities. Involved stakeholders were satisfied with the quality and effectiveness of UNODC expertise and constant availability for guidance, noting regular dialogue and cooperation. Programming was somewhat effective in providing opportunities for partnership, training and information sharing networks.</p> <p>Iran-The internal and international political situations impact on the Country Programme in a significant way – this fact underlies all other aspects of the programme. Unilateral sanctions create complexity across implementation, particularly in relation to procurement of equipment; internal political sensitivities preclude any regional training or meetings in country; addressing recognised needs and priorities is difficult with funding constraints. The RP has mitigated some of these issues.</p> <p>AFG- Increasing concerns that funding gaps will impact on results and long-term impact, across all sub-programmes. Support from global programmes is contributing significantly to Country Programme effectiveness. initiatives with border police are supported by Tajikistan, which is indicative of both the funding difficulties and the importance of joint cooperation mechanisms with neighbouring countries. Activities in the area of financial crimes are recognised as an area of high effectiveness, with the potential for greater impact. The preventive approach enabled the programme to develop more comprehensive and inclusive approaches to communities involved in the cultivation of plants used in the fabrication of illicit drugs, and to better align alternative development interventions to provincial and national development strategies.</p> <p>PAK- GC articulated limited success in regional cooperation and a lack of effectiveness in coordinated regional responses to pressing issues.</p> <p>The adaptation of implemented activities, especially trainings to target institution practices, culture and interests, ensured greater levels of satisfaction and receptivity. GC felt the program addressed the emerging threat of synthetic drugs; importance of infrastructure/equipment provisions. The Global Maritime Container Program (GMCP) is of value.</p> <p>Partial, yet significant achievements can be observed across SP3 This includes the development of necessary level of HIV literacy and capacity in basic concerned settings (such as prisons); enhanced and expanded capacity of health and LEA professionals, including female professionals, to deliver</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>evidence-based, standardized drug use prevention and treatment services, notably in prison settings. Shift of DDR interventions to institutional cultures and structures, as well as emerging concerns and needs of involved parties of note.</p> <p>PCA- GCs tend to view effectiveness positively, but a number commented on the need for better indicators to capture progress. They stress the need for MoUs and other mechanism that facilitate desired outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>Report also uneven MS support/subsription to change, e.g., high relating to modernisation, digitisation, but lower re HRG.</p> <p>Issues on geographical and population coverage are also important (methadone and OST services) The programme Increased participation of NGO at the national and regional levels. with potential for increased support.</p> <p>RP- Development of trust allows the RP to have some limited influence on the political sensitivities that can prohibit GC engagement with one another, but otherwise political sensitivities cannot be addressed at all. Specific needs were updated and prioritised annually via a Programme Steering Committee of national counterparts.</p> <p>The methods used in the SFP were particularly appreciated for having been theoretically and empirically tested, and for being easily replicated and adapted to country contexts.</p> |
| | <p>9. To what extent are the programmes effective in strengthening and promoting cross-border cooperation and collaboration with</p> | <p>Achievement of planned results (looking at both outputs and outcomes) that specifically reference cross-border and regional cooperation.</p> <p>What were the facilitating and hindering factors in achieving results?</p> | <p>Both the RP and the PCA report that cross border cooperation and cooperation is seen as a key strengths and successes, where the programming has become most effective. This was reflected in the commentary by GC, with a demand for more connectivity, especially with West Asia.</p> <p>This regional connectivity with Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iran is fundamental to the success of cross border operations/collaboration. Cross-border partnership across both West and Central Asia is impacted by a lack of trust, political sensitivities, regional instability and insurgency conflicts. Collectively, programming ensures regional communication is not blocked, within the contextual limits stated above.</p> <p>All programs reflect that there is a strong role for the RP to play in forwarding somewhat established lower-level cross border cooperation to higher, strategic cooperation/information exchange at the institutional level. Specific mention is made of cooperation being institutionalised within the ARIN-WCA structure</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
| | regional entities? | | <p>There are examples in Sub-programme 2 of moving forward with judicial and prosecutorial counterparts and in the area of mutual legal assistance (MLA), where matters are of a more technical nature. Stakeholders, GC in particular, note that with counternarcotic strategies in particular require regional approaches to be successful. Initiatives includes the Joint Planning Cell (JPC), the BLOs, the TI, CARICC, and the Paris Pact. However, the Triangular Initiative is specifically mentioned as not facilitating the anticipated level of cooperation and coordination, as political and funding issues present considerable challenges. There are also positives seen in the area of opioid substitution therapies, where Iran provides key lessons learned for the region. The regional approach enabled networks and exchanges of information and know-how on DDR and HIV prevention to be strengthened and sustained both regionally and nationally.</p> <p>Regional events and study tours across Central Asia, Afghanistan and Pakistan demonstrated enhanced effectiveness in the way successes, good practice and implementation lessons can be exchanged amongst participating member states. It is through such events that personal relationships are formed, supplementing cooperation pursued through concrete, operational agreements and initiatives.</p> <p>Very strong evidence re cross-border cooperation within Pakistan itself, via provincial government information sharing and communication. At the same time, many GCs reported enduring coordination issues, primarily at departmental levels within provinces.</p> <p>National counterparts valued focus on bilateral partnerships and formalising of relationships through MoUs and related instruments. Strengthened relationships at the national inter-agency level were also noted to be of significant value to GCs.</p> |
| Efficiency | 10. Were the resources and inputs converted to outputs and outcomes in a timely and cost-effective manner? | <p>What are donor perspectives on the relationship between input costs and outputs/ outcomes, and on related UNODC/ Programme systems?</p> <p>Did programmes spend their budgets? Did programmes try and use tools and systems that encourage cost-effective use of resources? Were there decreases in costs as a result of systems and processes?</p> | <p>All 5 programmes noted funding as one of their most significant challenges. The funding crisis extends across all areas of the programmes, impacting significantly on the ability to deliver planned results, with technical and strategic risks being specifically mentioned. Staffing levels are affected, and some programmatic areas are left completely un-funded. Examples include the unfunded cybercrime program in PAK, In AFG SP2, the crisis in funding and complete reliance upon the GPML in SP2, which threatens its existence as a stand-alone sub-programme, while critically low levels for the RP threaten its operational viability and impacts daily on the delivery of activities in all sub-programmes.</p> <p>The RP provided some funding cushion, contributing to delivery in some areas where CPs were not sufficiently funded, with further evidence of varying integration with global programmes to solve funding shortfalls.</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>What is the impact on activities, results and implementing CSO partners of the inability to obtain appropriate resources, i.e., of designing components and activities but not finding the necessary funding for these activities?</p> <p>What modalities of training delivery are used – do they focus on use of national trainers and provide specific examples of a focus on cost-effectiveness? Are national researchers being used in place of international resources?</p> <p>Were resources (financial, time, people, expertise) allocated strategically to achieve HR and/or gender related needs?</p> <p>Follow-up to document review related to office costs (project support costs and the full cost recovery policy) to ascertain updated perspectives (Mgt; PS) in relation to programme efficiency?</p> <p>The relationship between HQ and FOs, in the sense of efficiency. How the relationship works and doesn't.</p> <p>Do programmes undertake risk analysis, regularly update this analysis, and make specific plans for mitigating identified risks?</p> | <p>Complex and time-consuming internal UNODC processes and donor restrictions were pointed to by a range of stakeholders as impacting negatively on the timing, coordination, execution, and potential delays of deliverables as a result. Of note were lengthy and complex procurement requirements, and recruitment procedures. It was noted that GC do not fully understand the restrictions/limitations of the UN in terms of implementation/funding, compliance with donor requirements, leading to frustrations that negatively impact the connection with GC.</p> <p>Reporting mechanisms largely performance-oriented and based on short-term quantitative indicators were found not to fully grasp critical aspects of UNODC support such the quality of capacity-building interventions, and the impact of the constant availability of UNODC for policy dialogue and guidance. Reporting has an insufficient focus on capturing longer-term change and transformation.</p> <p>The programme structure of the RP, and of the other programmes in the region, maintain a loose correlation to these sub-programmes of UNODC's strategic framework. They do not, however, correlate directly, neither with the strategic framework nor with each other. Concerns were expressed about the indicators in the result framework and in particular a lack of framing in relation to longer-term change and change processes. Reporting mechanisms, largely performance-oriented and based on short-term quantitative indicators, were found not to fully grasp critical aspects of UNODC support such the quality of capacity-building interventions, and the impact of the constant availability of UNODC for policy dialogue and guidance.</p> <p>Gaps in the design process were also identified as resulting in a disconnect between sub-programming and important discrepancies of funding across them. The three SPs appeared to have been managed as separate projects, with SP3 being the least supported.</p> <p>PSC and FCR questioned re value for money, and for reducing competitiveness, duplication and overlap with the RP, but main difficulties perceived to be bureaucratic rather than completely financial.</p> <p>The +e-learning platform in PAK is well integrated with noted cost savings. The evolution towards e-learning across all programmes is of value as GCs recognise the scale of the problem of staff turnover and resulting skills loss.</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | | Do programmes have results frameworks, including well-defined indicators? Were results frameworks used in a defined and resourced monitoring system? | |
| Impact | 11. To what extent did the programmes contribute to Member State implementation of relevant international Conventions and other instruments ? | <p>Project reporting describes links between MS priorities/ obligations in international Conventions and instruments and how activities, outputs and outcomes have provided assistance in meeting obligations.</p> <p>MS provide evidence of how their engagement with the Programmes have assisted them in meeting their international obligations.</p> <p>Confirmatory responses of MS to quantitative surveys.</p> <p>Indications from PS, DIP, OUN and NGO that Programmes are contributing to MS meeting obligations.</p> <p>Enquiry will include:</p> <p>Normative: accession to relevant international Conventions and other instruments and implementation in national legislation and regulations;</p> <p>Agency: evidence of use and enduring impact on work of government agencies or services, including borders, investigations, prosecution, judicial, etc.;</p> | <p>The PCA assisted MS to reform and implement their legislation and policies, supporting UNCAC and UNTOC, HTMS, with considerable norms-based work in TIP, prisons, border management and counter-narcotics. SP3 was successful in disseminating and adapting international standards to country policy and normative contexts (in 4 countries of the region), in particular the recently updated UNODC/WHO International standards on drug use prevention.</p> <p>In Pakistan, HTMS law reform brought legislation in compliance with international standards, and there is strong evidence of the role of SP2 in supporting Pakistan in FATF processes from both UNODC staff and GCs. Elements point to the positive influence of the Country Programme on the prioritisation of DDR on the Government of Pakistan agenda in line with international standards and guidance.</p> <p>The Islamic Republic of Iran has signed and endorsed all conventions and protocols related to drugs and narcotics. There are good examples of work being done by the Country Programme with respect to international instruments and norms, reflected in progression on UNCAC and early progress on UNTOC and the Mandela Rules.</p> <p>COAFG works closely with GC on UNCAC implementation and on satisfaction of FATF requirements and provides assistance on a range of legislation including the penal code, anti-corruption and asset recovery laws. Alternative Development interventions have adopted a more comprehensive and inclusive approach than in past programming periods, notably in following the International Guiding Principles on Alternative Development. UNODC is now codified in Afghanistan’s counter-narcotics legislation.</p> <p>The RP placed limited focus on international treaties and conventions as MS are primarily in compliance, but the ARIN-WCA, a clear, regional result, illustrates impact potential.</p> <p>GCs positive and cite support for legislation, training in new or relevant norms and partnerships to support implementation work. There can be limited effective follow up or reporting mechanisms to observe concrete implementation and sustainability in local structures, impacted by funding shortfalls.</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|--|---|---|
| | | Beneficiary: evidence of enduring change in relation to target groups, including in relations to cross-cutting themes of human rights, gender, vulnerability and disability and the overarching principle of leaving no one behind. | |
| | 12. To what extent can long-term sustainable results be expected for all stakeholders from current programme implementation? | <p>Project reporting describes links between MS priorities/ obligations in international Conventions and instruments and how activities, outputs and outcomes have provided assistance in meeting obligations.</p> <p>What were/ have been the Programmes' unintended, negative or positive effects on conflict situations. How have these effects impacted on vulnerable populations.</p> <p>MS provide evidence of how their engagement with the Programmes have assisted them in meeting their international obligations.</p> <p>MS provide examples of legislation; policy; staffing; budget and MoUs / agreements as indicators of sustainable results.</p> <p>External respondents indicate legislation; policy; staffing; budget and MoUs / agreements as indicators of sustainable results.</p> | <p>Unilaterally across programs, ownership challenges were identified as putting at risk the sustainability of project gains. Sustainability challenges in Afghanistan, include the political fragility, the insurgency and the underlying challenges of the drug situation. In Iran, the current unilateral sanctions regime and a lack of interest from international agencies to work in and with Iran impacts strongly on results. These issues may mask the significant technical achievements made in what is an early stage of a long-term change process. (UNODC staff note the 4-5yr programme cycle is short within an overall change process, making it difficult to evaluate the medium to long term impact) GC recognize continued programming commitment to development of national ownership is noted as a contribution to sustainable impact.</p> <p>In Iran, the new counter narcotics law, designed to overcome previous challenges in in controlled deliveries that existed at the judicial level.</p> <p>There are indications of ownership in the Strengthening Families Programme, that GCs are involved and are participating with the Country Office in development of project modules into national education strategy and curricula, although impacted by limited funding.</p> <p>The Counternarcotic Police of Afghanistan (CNPA) are sustainable although within a context of ongoing support and mentoring.</p> <p>The CNPA forensics lab is considered a 'crown jewel' of the Country Programme.</p> <p>The Airport Interdiction Unit (AIU) is also indicative of sustainability of results and is now been considered for expansion beyond Kabul.</p> <p>Alternative Development projects were found to have a positive impact at the community and household levels, notably in terms of food security and income generation.</p> <p>Some initiatives, such as the work in AD, remain small in scope and impact appears insufficient for ensuring sustainable transition for communities away from the illicit economy.</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>In PAK, there is sustainable impact in legal reforms, national counternarcotic policy contributions.</p> <p>Comprehensive e-learning platform successfully implemented across country.</p> <p>Expanded and improve the capacity of GC to prioritise and deliver evidence-based drug use prevention and drug dependence services.</p> <p>PCA strengthened institutional capacities in the region by improving national data collection mechanisms, engaging in continuous dialogue and facilitating inter-sectorial coordination.</p> <p>Increased the level of knowledge, capacity and implication of narcology and HIV/AIDS centres staff regionally in developing and enhancing the quality of responses and practices to reduce the health harms caused by drugs. However, DDR policy and strategic frameworks in the region remain embryonic</p> <p>Whereas SP3 paved the way for a more sustainable balanced approach to health issues related to drugs, examples of paradoxes and counterproductive efforts were referenced.</p> <p>RP-Catalysing regional cooperation for mutual benefit, in support of which it provides assistance toward partnership building at regional and international levels. Expert working groups on precursors and related training, as well as expert exchanges across the 8 countries, are examples of this cooperation.</p> <p>Initiated bilateral or regional discussions of issues such as transfer of sentenced prisoners, though this is currently unfunded.</p> <p>Sub-programme 3 effective in positively influencing the development of an evidence-based early prevention strategy mainly through SFP and FAST programs</p> <p>SP3 mainly impacted the structural level of DDR in the region.</p> |
| | 13. To what extent did the programmes contribute to the Sustainable | <p>Reference in Prodoc and related discussion in project reporting on a Programme’s SDG focus re activities, outputs and outcomes.</p> <p>Commentary from Mgt, PS and other UN actors on Programme contributions to SDGs.</p> | <p>There is a referencing to the SDGs in programme design documentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries is aligned with SDG 3 and SDG 16. • The Programme for Central Asia is aligned with SDG3, SDG 5, SDG 8 and SDG 16. • The Country Programme for Pakistan is aligned with a wide number of targets in SDG 16, as well as its contributions to SDG 3, SDG 4, SDG 5, SDG 8 and SDG 10. |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|--|
| | Development Goals? | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Country Programme for Afghanistan documents states that all the activities under the Country Programme for Afghanistan (2016-2019) are fully aligned with the SDGs but does not provide further detail. • The Country Programme for Iran does not discuss the SDGs in the programme document but reporting notes SDG 1, 2, 3, 5, 8 and 16. <p>UNDAFs and SDGs are not as visible in sub-programme documentation as they are at the programme level although there are indications across all programmes of contributions to SDGs.</p> <p>Sensitivities around the SDGs requires a strategic discussion, to better assist the government in their reporting, to correlate better, and inform strategies accordingly. Need for more data and more conscious efforts to align systems towards SDG indicators.</p> <p>In Afghanistan, SP1 -SDG 16 The connection between drug money and the insurgency is substantial-providing support in building strong institutions. SDG 5- decreasing resistance towards gender equality, but it remains a challenge to establish women in meaningful roles in law enforcement. Sub-programme 2 contributes to SDG 6.5 (reducing corruption and bribery) and SDG 16.6 (effective, accountable and transparent institutions). Sub-programme 3 contributes to SDGs 2, 3, 5, 8, 12 and 16, as well as to the peace and security pillars of the Afghanistan agenda through Alternative Development components.</p> <p>In Pakistan there is clear evidence of work in support of SDG 5 on gender. GC note success in SDG 16, peace, justice, rule of law, and strong institutions, noting HTMS- instilling peace and justice within the communities. The Country Programme plays a key role to contribute towards SDG 3.5 “Strengthen the prevention and treatment of substance abuse, including narcotic drug abuse and harmful use of alcohol”, with DDR now designated by both GC and UNODC as key priority for future programming.</p> <p>There is strong evidence of linkages between the work of the RP and SDG 16 across the region. GC emphasised that the negative impacts of narcotics trafficking permeate across all aspects of society, on the stability of the government, on the health of the population, and undermine legitimate economies. SDGs are implemented at country level, but the RP contributes to international/regional dimensions and addresses specific goals</p> <p>PCA particularly cites SDG 16, 5 and 3</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|--|---|--|
| Sustainability | 14. Has national ownership of the programmes been generated? In what ways? What factors have hindered or facilitated this ownership? | <p>Project reporting specifically describes national ownership: legislation; policy; staffing; budget; MoUs.</p> <p>MS provide examples of national ownership: legislation; policy; staffing; budget; MoUs.</p> <p>External respondents indicate development of national commitment and ownership.</p> <p>Confirmatory responses of MS to quantitative surveys.</p> <p>Enquiry will include: Normative work; Gov Agencies and their capacities; Final beneficiaries – clinics, drug users, community members.</p> | <p>In Afghanistan there is evidence of GC ownership in the financial crimes area, through budget provision for the ACJC, and both financial (ring fenced) protection and protection against malign influence (reporting structures). The transfer of AD responsibilities from the Ministry of Counter narcotics to the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (MAIL) created new opportunities to mainstream into national rural development strategies and infrastructure policies, and to strengthen coherence and ownership.</p> <p>In Pakistan, the new Country Programme design is being led by the MOFA; increased dialogue between stakeholders around design. In the FATF area evidence of engagement is stronger than evidence of ownership. Strong evidence of ownership at mid to senior levels with the RoL initiatives, but political support remains less clear. Budget allocation to the RoL initiatives provides a positive indicator but lacking a clear allocation mechanism. Improved GC and provincial authority capacities in HIV and drug use prevention and treatment, creating a momentum among stakeholders on the need to consolidate their strategy and knowledge base in those areas</p> <p>I.R. Iran indicators of sustainability include the K9 unit demonstrates long-term sustainable success, notwithstanding consistent requests from the Government of Iran for additional funding. The JPC is demonstrating a level of support from Government of Iran funds. Engagement in the UNCAC and to a lesser extent the UNTOC indicate sustainability of outcome. Current engagement by GCs in the areas of criminal justice (alternatives to imprisonment) and MLA are encouraging.</p> <p>Programme for Central Asia indicators of sustainability include good evidence of GC recognition of importance and of ownership of what falls within that GC's domain of responsibility. CARICC efforts to be self-funded by requiring funding contributions from MS. Kazakhstan provides some funding/infrastructure. DCA over long terms has proven sustainability, almost a standalone agency. Strong challenges of diverging policy perceptions and cultural bias to be overcome for MS to reach international standards on HIV and engage in a sustainable and balanced DDR strategy.</p> <p>RP indicators of sustainability include in I.R. Iran, Kazakhstan and to some extent in Uzbekistan, the SFP has been scaled up into national and/ or school curricula, and into the provinces.</p> |
| | 15. How have the programmes developed national | Project reporting specifically describes developed national capacity. We are looking for outputs and outcomes, not training inputs: knowledge, skills, practice; institutional change | The evaluation found that the solid relationships built up over time with GC created opportunities for sustainable influence. UNODC advocacy efforts are well tailored and adapted to the national cultural and political contexts. This results in soft dialogue being critical to engage MS in the consideration of more balanced and sustainable policy frameworks on the long run. |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| | capacity to support sustainability of effort and benefit? | <p>(structure, policy; practice); normative change (legislation, international conventions).</p> <p>MS provide examples of change in national capacity, structures, frameworks.</p> <p>External respondents indicate development of national capacity, structures, frameworks.</p> <p>Confirmatory responses of MS to quantitative surveys.</p> <p>Enquiry will include: Normative work; Gov Agencies and their capacities; Final beneficiaries – clinics, drug users, community members.</p> <p>Is there an exit strategy – is there thinking going on to position sustainability in how Programmes are delivered – specifically in those Programme areas where there is no long-term, direct UNODC programming intent.</p> | <p>There is specific evidence of capacity development visible in all the region. In Afghanistan, capacities have improved notably through the ACJC, an asset recovery office and Afghanistan’s cash control regime. In Iran, the Anti-narcotics Police and agencies engaged in border and/or inland drug control with the expansion of activities related to sniffer dogs being an achievement of DCHQ. Regional institutional structures supported by the RP such as the ARIN-WCA were found actively used by national counterparts.</p> <p>Legislative development work, changes to codes and regulation and regimes of training point also led to increased ownership. Iran has adopted for use the UNODC MLA Request Writer Tool while in Pakistan RoL programming established a clear model of data-driven/responsive policy development and government planning led by provincial governments. Some GCs thus noted their growing confidence in their own capacities and their belief that Programmes implementation would continue to some extent without continued UNODC support.</p> <p>However, project gains remain continuously challenged. Chronic issues of GC staff turnover in the entire region impedes success for institutional memory needs to be renewed constantly. Development of national capacity is further constrained by funding and implementation limitations, somehow doubled by policy and cultural divergences in some areas. On drug use prevention and treatment specifically, high stigmatisation, cultural sensitivities and policy divergences reduce opportunities for ownership, harmonisation and mainstreaming of DDR. Donor challenges exist as well, funding being highly dependent on their own priorities, leaving some areas unfunded.</p> <p>Additional structural challenges have been identified. The state of war in Afghanistan directs most of available funding (mainly external) to insurgency and security issues, nourishing a climate of donor fatigue. Within initiatives on alternative development, while community empowerment efforts are noted, it is also apparent that interventions lack sufficient vision, resources and coverage for sustainable benefits to be anticipated.</p> <p>More broadly, UNODC exit strategies are not included in design.</p> |
| Leaving no one behind | 16. To what extent have human rights and gender priorities and | Extent to which critical HRG issues and vulnerable groups’ needs are identified as MS priorities, and/or as central in Programme thematic sub-programmes: what are they? | There is strong evidence that human rights and gender are both a focus of UNODC programming across West and Central Asia. Efforts were made to include a gender and human rights sensitive approach at the design and planning stages, despite not have a developed mainstreaming strategy comparable to other UN agencies operating in the country. |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Evaluation criteria | Evaluation Question | Indicators/ sub-questions to respond to each question | Summary findings (elaborated discussion can be found in the main report narrative and programme annexes). |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
| | principles, including the needs of vulnerable groups, guided programme design? | <p>Extent to which HRG and vulnerable group perspectives were integrated into the Programme logical framework.</p> <p>Identification of any potential risks attached to HRG and vulnerable group issues in the context of the Programme implementation.</p> | <p>The leave no one behind umbrella and donor influence provide the programmes with useful tools for advancing the agenda of human rights and vulnerable populations, however the effectiveness of this varies between countries. Tailoring approaches in relation to country-specific contexts is noted.</p> <p>There are often limits as to how far HR and gender can be flagged in programme initiatives, as clear cultural and religious barriers remain. While some GC recognise these priorities in UNODC programming, others may not welcome explicit programming and/or use of M&E indicators to measure progress towards human rights and gender equality goals.</p> |
| | 17. To what extent have specific measures been taken to address the needs and priorities of human rights, gender and vulnerable groups during implementation of the programmes? | <p>The extent to which the organisational and governance structure of the Programmes (staffing, engagement in decision making etc.) facilitated human rights and gender parity and capacity/ HRG mainstreaming, and included some level of representation of vulnerable groups?</p> <p>The extent to which HRG and vulnerable group perspectives were mainstreamed in the activities of the Programmes: How can the approach to HRG and vulnerable groups be improved in this regard?</p> <p>Identify the major achievements and major shortcomings in addressing HRG issues/ vulnerable group needs, including any facilitating or hindering factors in this regard</p> | <p>There are clear efforts and progress within the different Programmes to engage and focus more on gender related issues, notably from an inclusion and participatory perspective. This is particularly the case for SP3. Prioritisation of specific forms of gender needs, e.g. investigation and prosecution of gender-based violence and support for victims has also been documented notably in Pakistan, while some progress in gender-sensitive staffing is visible with GC agencies, particularly in Kabul. Overall, the programme implementation yet demonstrated a focus on the regions specialised systems and structures rather than on the targeted vulnerable populations. Only the AD interventions in Afghanistan demonstrated a clear engagement on tailoring interventions to women’s needs and supported women entrepreneurship.</p> <p>Programming also demonstrates some human rights perspective across all its aspects, notably in the training and event agendas content. There are signs that acceptance of this focus is also growing with GC and other stakeholders. In Afghanistan, funded work on anti-corruption and financial crimes addresses the human rights of GC to safety, security and freedom from threat to life and family. There is also considerable overlap between human rights-based approaches and alternative development implementation in poor and marginalised communities. In Pakistan, vulnerable groups are targeted through legal aid in prisons programmes to reduce rates and length of unsentenced imprisonment.</p> <p>However, there is limited evidence of a strategic approach to gender and HR mainstreaming, from programme design to implementation. This is partly related to funding constraints and partly to cultural sensitivities and national/regional policies and history, across all sub-programmes. This is particularly the case for SP1. There is an expressed view that UNODC does not exploit its respected position and the trust it has built up in addressing these areas with GC. Room exists for increased soft advocacy. Increased cooperation with UN sister agencies and support to CSO – key intermediaries and advocates for vulnerable populations and rights – have been identified as possible avenues.</p> |

ANNEX VI: PROGRAMME STRUCTURE OF THE FIVE PROGRAMMES

A following table details the structure of the five programmes.

| Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries | Country Programme for Afghanistan | Country Programme for Iran | Country Programme for Pakistan | Programme for Central Asia |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Sub-Programme 1: Regional Law Enforcement Cooperation (RERV07)</p> <p>Project Objective: Law Enforcement Agencies and other relevant competent authorities increasingly communicate, cooperate and coordinate to identify and investigate illicit trafficking of drugs as well as precursor chemicals</p> | <p>Sub-Programme 1: Law Enforcement (AFGZ87)</p> <p>Objective: The Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan takes concerted action against drugs trafficking, transnational organized crime, human trafficking, smuggling of migrants, corruption involving government employees, money laundering and terrorist financing</p> | <p>Sub-Programme 1: Border Management and Illicit Trafficking (IRNZ76)</p> <p>Project Objective: Promote and support national drugs and precursors control capacities and regional-international cooperation in line with the international recognised standards and UN Conventions and instruments.</p> | <p>Sub-Programme 1: Illicit Trafficking and Border Management (PAKW50)</p> <p>Project Objective: Secure environment for the people of Pakistan against illicit narcotics trafficking; support to counter organised criminal groups involved in HTMS and the related transnational organized crime (TOC); and reduced illicit drug supply to international markets in line with national laws</p> | <p>Sub-Programme 1: Countering transnational organised crime, illicit drug trafficking and preventing terrorism (XAC/Z60)</p> <p>Project Objective: Transnational organized crime, illicit flows, money laundering and the financing of terrorism effectively addressed in the Region in line with SDG Goal 16</p> |
| <p>Sub-programme 2: Phase II International/ Regional Cooperation in Legal Matters (RERV08)</p> <p>Project Objective: Regional cooperation and coordination in fighting drugs and crime is enhanced among Afghanistan and its neighbouring countries</p> | <p>Sub-Programme 2: Criminal Justice (AFGZ88)</p> <p>Project Objective: Afghan society made more secure through strengthening the rule of law, and significantly reducing corruption and economic crime and recidivism.</p> | <p>Sub-Programme 2: Crime, Corruption and Criminal Justice (IRNZ77)</p> <p>Project Objective: Promote and support effective responses to transnational organized crime, countering corruption; strengthening rule of law and fair and accountable criminal</p> | <p>Sub-Programme 2: Criminal Justice and Legal Reforms (PAKW51)</p> <p>Project Objective: Enhanced capacities of criminal justice actors</p> | <p>Sub-programme 2: Criminal Justice, Crime Prevention and Integrity (XAC/Z61)</p> <p>Project Objective: Member States: strengthen the rule of law through prevention of crime and promotion of effective, fair, humane and accountable criminal justice systems in line</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries | Country Programme for Afghanistan | Country Programme for Iran | Country Programme for Pakistan | Programme for Central Asia |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>through assisting them to bringing their domestic and institutional frameworks in closer compliance with the UN drugs and crime conventions (in the areas related to drugs and international cooperation in Criminal Matters) and international standards and norms.</p> | | <p>justice system; and improve capacities to counter terrorism in line with international instruments and UN Conventions.</p> | | <p>with UN standards and norms and are more capable of preventing and combating corruption, in line with the UN convention against corruption.</p> |
| <p>Sub-Programme 3: Drug use prevention, drug dependence treatment and care, HIV and AIDS prevention and care in the community and in prison settings (RERV09)</p> <p>Project Objective: Reduction in drug dependence, injecting drug use and HIV prevalence among drug dependent individuals.</p> | <p>Sub-Programme 3: Alternative Development (AFGZ89)</p> <p>Sub-programme Objective: Strengthen the institutional capacity of MAIL and MCN on AD policy formulation, programme design, implementation and impact assessment as per the national strategies of GIRoA (ANDS and NDCS).</p> <p>Sub-Programme 3: Health (AFGZ97)</p> <p>Project Objective: To strengthen the effective, comprehensive Drug and HIV prevention treatment and care policies and Program based on scientific evidence</p> | <p>Sub-Programme 3: Drug Use Prevention, Treatment, Rehabilitation and HIV Care (IRNZ78)</p> <p>Project Objective: Develop and implement effective, comprehensive and integrated drug and HIV Prevention, treatment and care policies and programmes based on scientific evidence</p> | <p>Sub-Programme 3: Drug Demand Reduction, prevention and treatment (PAKW52)</p> <p>Project Objective: Increased access to quality drug treatment for vulnerable populations with a special focus on women, children and prisoners</p> | <p>Sub-programme 3: Drug prevention, treatment and reintegration and HIV prevention (XAC/Z62)</p> <p>Project Objective: Member states more capable of reducing drug use and HIV/AIDS (in relation to PIWD, prisons and trafficking of persons); effective at prevention of drug use, treatment, care, rehabilitation and reintegration into society of people who suffer from drug use disorder; ; effective at developing and implementing drug demand reduction and HIV prevention policies and programmes based on scientific evidence; and able to participate internationally and regionally, based on the principle of shared responsibility</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries | Country Programme for Afghanistan | Country Programme for Iran | Country Programme for Pakistan | Programme for Central Asia |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| <p>Sub-Programme 4: Trends and Impact (RERV10)</p> <p>Project Objective: Informed evidence-based policies and strategies through trends analysis and impact monitoring at the regional level.</p> | | <p>Sub-programme 4: Alternative Livelihoods and Sustainable Development (IRNZ79)</p> <p>Project Objective: Design, promote, and implement alternative livelihood and sustainable development programmes, based on the international principle of shared responsibility</p> | | <p>Sub-programme 4: Research and trend analysis (XAC/Z63)</p> <p>Objective: Member States able to enhance their knowledge of thematic and cross-sectorial trends for effective policy formulation, operational response and impact assessment, based on sound understanding of drug, crime and terrorism issues.</p> |

ANNEX VII: PROGRAMME SUMMARY OF THE FIVE PROGRAMMES

| | |
|--|---|
| Project/ Programme number | <p>AFGF98, AFGZ87, AFGZ88, AFGZ89, AFGZ97</p> <p>IRNZ76, IRNZ77, IRNZ78, IRNZ79</p> <p>PAKJ85, PAKW20, PAKW50, PAKW51, PAKW52</p> <p>XACZ47, XACZ60, XACZ61, XACZ62, XACZ63 XACK22, TAJH03, TAJE24, RERH22, RERF23, KGZK50, KGZT90, XCEA0, UZBU57</p> <p>RERV07, RERV08, RERV09, RERV10</p> |
| Project/ Programme title and duration | <p>Country Programme for Afghanistan (2016-2020)</p> <p>Country Programme for Pakistan (2016-2020)</p> <p>Country Partnership Programme in (I.R. of) Iran (2015-2020)</p> <p>Programme for Central Asia (2015-2020)</p> <p>Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (2016-2020)</p> <p>The programmes were extended to 31 December 2020 by decision of the Programme Review Committee and related Inter-office Memo from the Director for Operations of 30 May 2019, and further extended to 31 December 2021 as endorsed by the Programme Review Committee on 10 August 2020 and approved by the UNODC Officer-in-Charge on 13 August 2020.</p> |
| Location | West and Central Asia |
| Linkages to Thematic Programmes | <p>Countering Transnational Organised Crime and Illicit Trafficking</p> <p>Anti-Corruption</p> <p>Terrorism Prevention</p> <p>Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Reform</p> <p>Health and livelihoods</p> <p>Research and trend analysis</p> |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Linkages to UNDAF ³⁴ | The Programmes to be evaluated are related to all UNDAFs developed in the West and Central Asian Region |
| Linkages to the SDGs | 3, 4, 5,11, 12, 15,16 and 17 |
| Executing Agency | UNODC |
| Total Approved Budget | <p>Afghanistan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AFGF98 - \$ 37,391,137 • AFGZ87 - \$ 14,092,656 • AFGZ88 – \$ 2,912,615 • AFGZ89 – \$ 22,233,402 • AFGZ97 - \$ 116,667 <p>Islamic Republic of Iran:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRNZ76 - \$ 2,463,753 • IRNZ77 - \$ 1,496,048 • IRNZ78 - \$ 818,627 • IRNZ79 - \$ 210,959 <p>Pakistan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAKJ85 – \$ 3,076,881 • PAKW20 – \$ 8,229,898 • PAKW50 - \$ 8,656,362 • PAKW51 - \$ 8,935,731 • PAKW52 – N/A <p>Central Asia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XACZ47 - \$ 1,529,960 • XACZ60 - \$ 18,572,470 • XACZ61 - \$ 8.216,738 • XACZ62 - \$ 1,805,575 • XACZ63 - \$ 1,063,239 <p>(The following UNODC projects has also contributed to the Programme for Central Asia during 2015-2019 and have been integrated into the Programme for Central Asia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XACK22 – \$ 3,067,646 • TAJH03 – \$ 1,266,254 • TAJE24 – \$ 1,497,252 |

³⁴ United Nations Development Assistance Framework

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RERH22 – \$ 5,338,103 • RERF23 – \$ 659,229 • KGZK50 – \$ 1,763,988 • KGZT90 - \$ 3,016,589 • XCEA01 – \$ 699,360 • UZBU57 – \$ 269,015 <p>Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RERV07 - \$ 13,311,910 • RERV08 - \$ 8,924,592 • RERV09 - \$ 9,485,591 • RERV10 - \$ 7,404,929 |
| <p>Total Overall Budget</p> | <p>Afghanistan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AFGF98 - \$39,510,180 • AFGZ87 - \$20,000,000 • AFGZ88 - \$ 8,000,000 • AFGZ89 - \$ 28,000,000 • AFGZ97 - \$ 500,000 <p>Islamic Republic of Iran:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRNZ76 - \$ 8,000,000 • IRNZ77 - \$ 4,000,000 • IRNZ78 - \$ 4,000,000 • IRNZ79 - \$ 4,000,000 <p>Pakistan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAKJ85 - \$3,774,323 • PAKW20 - \$ 7429,890 • PAKW50 - \$ 35,000,000 • PAKW51 - \$ 20,000,000 • PAKW52 - \$ 15,000,000 <p>Central Asia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XACZ47 - \$ 2,979,248 • XACZ60 - \$ 30,400,000 • XACZ61 - \$18,300,000 • XACZ62 - \$ 3,018,432 • XACZ63 - \$ 1,995,383 <p>Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RERV07 - \$ 17,820,976 • RERV08 - \$ 13,641,000 • RERV09 - \$ 15,860,600 |

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
ANNEXES

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RERV10 - \$13,766,000 |
| Donors | Austria, Australia, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, NATO, Netherlands, Norway, OFID (OPEC Fund for International Development), Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sweden, UNAIDS, United Kingdom, United States, UN Women |
| Project Manager/ Coordinator | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Colhoun, Country Representative, UNODC Country Office in Afghanistan • Ashita Mittal, Regional Representative, UNODC Regional Office for Central Asia • Alexander Fedulov, Country Representative, UNODC Country Office in Iran • Jeremy Milsom, Country Representative, UNODC Country Office in Pakistan • Jeremy Milsom, Senior Programme Coordinator (ad interim), UNODC Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries |

ANNEX VIII: DISBURSEMENT HISTORY OF THE FIVE PROGRAMMES

The following table details the disbursement history of the five programmes, incorporating their component projects, current through 12 November 2020.

| | Total Approved Budget | Expenditure | Exp. in % |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|-----------|
| RP Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries (RERV07, RERV08, RERV09, RERV10) | \$39,127,021.29 | \$37,336,336.12 | 95% |
| Programme for Central Asia (XACZ47, XACZ60, XACZ61, XACZ62, XACZ63, TAJH03, TAJE24, RERH22, RERF23, KGZK50, KGZT90, XCEA01, UZBU57) | \$106,325,093.67 | \$116,462,185.32 | 110% |
| CP Afghanistan (AFGF98, AFGZ87, AFGZ88, AFGZ89, AFGZ97) | \$81,014,209.15 | \$71,087,077.48 | 88% |
| CP for Iran (IRNZ76, IRNZ77, IRNZ78, IRNZ79) | \$4,989,387.16 | \$4,788,635.57 | 96% |
| CP for Pakistan (PAKJ85, PAKW20, PAKW50, PAKW51, PAKW52) | \$35,733,565.39 | \$28,895,967.32 | 81% |

ANNEX IX: THE EVALUATION TEAM

The following are brief biographies of the evaluation team.

LEAD EVALUATOR, JAMES NEWKIRK

Jim, an Australian, has worked in development for over 40 years, spending a lot of time on rural development projects in villages and remote locations in Brazil, Peru and Indonesia before spending over 10 years on Aboriginal communities in remote central and western Australia. Jim now resides in Serbia, where he has lived for 18 years. Jim has an MBA focused on organisational learning and organisational change, specifically chosen to add value to project/ programme implementation with project teams. Jim uses his project management experience in delivering project and programme evaluations, including work for Sida in Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo, Albania, Georgia and BiH, the Millennium Development Goals Fund in Serbia and Ethiopia, the Global Campaign for Education across Africa, the EU across the Balkans and Turkey and a number of UN Agencies, including assignments with UNODC, in a number of countries.

SPI – TEAM MEMBER/ LAW ENFORCEMENT EXPERT, CHANTELLE CULLIS

Chantelle, a Canadian citizen, is an accomplished law enforcement/border security professional with 20+ years of employment with the Canada Border Services Agency. Her significant roles include 2 long term diplomatic assignments, representing the CBSA in Japan and Vietnam, a short-term intelligence-based assignment in Malaysia, targeting human smuggling in the region, and has also worked temporarily in Beijing. She has extensive experience in integrated border security, all aspects of customs and immigration enforcement, human trafficking, contraband smuggling, criminal and fraud investigations, and intelligence analysis. Her experience also includes the development, collection and handling of sensitive and protected information, in compliance with country-specific privacy and disclosure legislation. Chantelle also has a strong background in capacity building with foreign governments and international counterparts, in various political and cultural environments. She participated as an evaluator/law enforcement expert in the 2018 UNODC cluster evaluation in Central Asia.

SP2 – TEAM MEMBER/ TEAM MEMBER/CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS AND LEGAL EXPERT, MARK BROWN

Mark is an Australian with more than 30yrs experience in research and evaluation in various criminal justice and law sectors. He is Director of the Centre for Criminological Research at the University of Sheffield, UK, where he is also Deputy Head of the School of Law. Mark has particular experience working with drug law enforcement and in all aspects of the penal process, with a focus on prison, prisoners, rehabilitation and criminal justice management. Prior to working in the UK he was a senior advisor to the Global Initiative Against Transnational Organised Crime, based in their Geneva secretariat and a consultant to International Security Sector Advisory Team, also in Geneva. Mark has more than 20yrs experience working in South Asia, particularly India, Kashmir, Nepal and Bhutan, where is currently working on a project with civil society groups. He currently also works with ICRC on sites of detention in addition to his work with UNODC. When not engaged with criminal justice matters Mark works as a mountain guide in the Himalayas, Caucasus and New Zealand.

SP3 – TEAM MEMBER/ HEALTH, SOCIAL AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT EXPERT, DEBORAH ALIMI

With more than 10 years of academic and professional experience in the drug policy field, and in development cooperation and governance support, Deborah is a French researcher specialized in the study of the links between the illicit drug economy and the essential development dimensions of

societies and communities (health, HIV/AIDS, socio-economic conditions, vulnerabilities of populations, education, rule of law...). She previously worked as a policy analyst and research fellow on governance and organized crime related issues for the OECD and the French Government (Prime Minister office). Deborah currently serves as an independent consultant notably for the UNODC and the Global Partnership on Drug Policies and Development (GPDPD). She provided her research and evaluation services to a wide range of institutions (EU, UNODC, GIZ, DfID, AFD, ODI) covering different program areas related to global drug policy, governance, fragility and conflict. A graduate from Georgetown University, Deborah has conducted a PhD at the University Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne, dedicated to the international governance of illicit drugs and its global policy adjustments since the 2000s.

TEAM MEMBER/ NATIONAL EVALUATION EXPERT, NASTARAN MOOSSAVI

Nastaran is a long-term practitioner, having worked in the fields of gender, rural development and alternative livelihoods in Iran, Afghanistan, Cambodia and Lao PDR. In addition to her experience linking gender, decent work, alternative livelihoods and environmental conservation, Nastaran is also knowledgeable about the relationships between the economy and gender-based violence, displacement, migration and informal work and has written and presented on the concept of women's economic autonomy. Since 2008, she has also been engaged as a team member in programme evaluation of several international organizations and the UN agencies in Iran and elsewhere, including her recent collaboration with the ITAD Limited to conduct the UBRAF Evaluation of UN system response to AIDS in Iran in 2019 and with the KONTERRA Group to conduct the mid-term evaluation of WFP's Operation in Afghanistan in 2015. Nastaran was also involved in the UNODC Mid-Term Evaluation of the Iran Country Programme for 2011–2014, as a national consultant.

TEAM MEMBER/ NATIONAL EVALUATION EXPERT, CHINARA ESENGUL

Chinara is Bishkek-based with extensive experience in policy and regional political analysis and with a master's degree in international relations. Chinara has a range of experience with international organisations, including UN Agencies, as a policy expert, researcher and trainer.

TEAM MEMBER/ NATIONAL EVALUATION EXPERT, AIDA ALYMBAEVA

Aida is a Bishkek-based consultant/ researcher/ evaluator, with a master's degree in public policy. Aida has extensive work in Central Asia with international organisations, including UN agencies, and has specific evaluation and security-focused thematic experience.

TEAM MEMBER/ NATIONAL EVALUATION EXPERT, SAEED ULLAH KHAN

With 15 years of professional experience in programme management, monitoring and evaluation, Saeed has completed master's degree in development economics from University of Sussex, United Kingdom and master's degree in business administration with focus on management of development programmes from National University of Science and Technology, Pakistan. He is a World Bank McNamara Fellow and British Commonwealth Scholar. Saeed has successfully completed advance training from Harvard, Oxford and other leading international universities. This includes: i) Strategic Frameworks for Non-profits Organisations from Harvard University, USA; ii) Human Development: From Theory to Practice from UNDP/Oxford University; iii) National Security Workshop from National Defence University Pakistan; iv) Non-Violent Conflict from the Fletcher School v) Advance course in Protecting Human Research Participants; and vi) COVID-19: Tackling the Novel Coronavirus from London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and UK Public Health Rapid Support Team. Saeed has been part of over 50 different evaluation engagements within the DAC framework for donors, UN agencies, INGOs and private sector. This included mid-term evaluation, final evaluation, end-of-project / end-line evaluation, process evaluation, performance evaluation, impact evaluation using experimental, quasi-experimental or mixed methods. His experience includes conducting key informant interviews and group interviews, as well as surveys – all completed while having a gender and marginalisation perspective as one of the main analysis frameworks.

TEAM MEMBER/ NATIONAL EVALUATION EXPERT, AFGHANISTAN

Holds an MBA and an undergraduate degree in economics, the evaluator has a range of experience in programme management and implementation, including evaluations, research and analysis. The evaluator focused on the evaluation's work in Afghanistan.