



UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Independent Evaluation Section



INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF UNODC PROGRAMMING IN WEST AND CENTRAL ASIA



PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF :
PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

This independent evaluation report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of Mr. James Newkirk (Lead evaluator), Ms. Deborah Alimi (SP3 – Team member/Health, Social and Human Development Expert), Ms. Chantelle Cullis (SP1 – Team member/Law Enforcement Expert), Mr. Mark Brown (SP2 – team member/Criminal Justice Systems and Legal Expert), Ms. Aida Alymbaeva (Team member/National Evaluation Expert), Ms. Chinara Esengul (Team member/National Evaluation Expert), Ms. Nastaran Moossavi (Team member/National Evaluation Expert), Mr. Saeed Ullah Khan (Team member/National Evaluation Expert) and an Afghan National Evaluator (Team member/National Evaluation Expert).

The Independent Evaluation Section (IES) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) provides normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process of projects. Please find the respective tools on the IES web site: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html>

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

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

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this independent evaluation report are those of the evaluation team. They do not represent those of UNODC or of any of the institutions or Member States referred to in the report. All errors and omissions remain the responsibility of the evaluation team.

© United Nations, JUNE 2021. All rights reserved worldwide.

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

This publication has not been formally edited.

INTRODUCTION.....	1
PROGRAMME FRAMEWORK	1
PROGRAMME SUMMARY	2
DISBURSEMENT HISTORY (THROUGH 13 NOVEMBER 2020)	2
FINDINGS.....	3
RELEVANCE	3
COHERENCE.....	4
EFFECTIVENESS	6
EFFICIENCY	7
IMPACT	8
SUSTAINABILITY.....	9
LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND	9
CONCLUSIONS.....	10
RELEVANCE	10
COHERENCE.....	11
EFFECTIVENESS	11
EFFICIENCY	12
IMPACT	12
SUSTAINABILITY.....	12
LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND	13
LIMITATIONS TO THE EVALUATION	13
EVALUATION MATRIX - PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA - FINDINGS.....	14

INTRODUCTION

UNODC's presence in Central Asia dates back to 1993 with the establishment of the Regional Office for Central Asia (ROCA) in Tashkent, Uzbekistan. Central Asian countries recognised the need for international cooperation to address drugs and crime related threats to the region through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed in 1996 and which laid the ground for launching coordinated 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 an integrated programme approach in Central Asia in 2015. The current Programme for Central Asia (PCA) aims to enhance law enforcement, criminal justice, health and research capacities across Central Asia, including through targeted interventions at the national level in a country-specific context, better cooperation and better allocation of resources and provision of technical assistance for cooperation by the international community to the countries of Central Asia. The Programme has established itself as a key cooperation framework, with a high degree of harmonisation and coherence with national priorities and with regional configurations.

PROGRAMME FRAMEWORK

SUB-PROGRAMMES

SP 1: COUNTERING TRANSNATIONAL ORGANISED CRIME, ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING AND PREVENTING TERRORISM (XAC/Z60)

OBJECTIVE: Member States: more capable and proficient at responding to transnational organised crime, illicit trafficking and illicit drug trafficking at the normative and operational levels in accordance with relevant UN conventions; and criminal justice regimes are strengthen and more capable at preventing and combating terrorism in accordance with the rule of law.

SP 2: CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CRIME PREVENTION AND INTEGRITY (XAC/Z61)

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 with UN standards and norms and are more capable of preventing and combating corruption, in line with the UN convention against corruption.

SP 3: DRUG PREVENTION, TREATMENT AND REINTEGRATION AND HIV PREVENTION (XAC/Z62)

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.

SP 4: RESEARCH AND TREND ANALYSIS (XAC/Z63)

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.

NATO-UNODC Partnership for Counter Narcotics Training (XAC/Z47) (NATO funding – not part of a sub-programme.)

XACK22, TAJH03, TAJE24, RERH22, RERF23, KGZK50, KGZT90, XCEA01, UZBU57
Have all been integrated into the Programme for Central Asia
I think the NATO-UNODC and these projects can be indicated in separate, unattached boxes but leave the final decision to your expertise.

PROGRAMME SUMMARY

Project/ Programme number	XACZ47, XACZ60, XACZ61, XACZ62, XACZ63 XACK22, TAJH03, TAJE24, RERH22, RERF23, KGZK50, KGZT90, XCEA0, UZBU57
Project/ Programme title and duration	Programme for Central Asia (2015-2021) ¹
Total Approved Budget	<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> <p>KGZT90 - \$ 3,016,589</p> <p>XCEA01 – \$ 699,360</p> <p>UZBU57 – \$ 269,015</p>
Total Overall Budget	<p>XACZ47 - \$ 2,979,248</p> <p>XACZ60 - \$ 30,400,000</p> <p>XACZ61 - \$18,300,000</p> <p>XACZ62 - \$ 3,018,148</p> <p>XACZ63 - \$ 1,995,383</p>

DISBURSEMENT HISTORY (THROUGH 13 NOVEMBER 2020)

	Total Approved Budget	Expenditure	Exp. in %
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%

¹ The Programme has been extended to the end of 2021.

FINDINGS

RELEVANCE

According to its programme document, PCA aims to serve as a strategic and programmatic framework for sub-regional cooperation, with a focus on the provision of technical assistance aimed at supporting Central Asian States in achieving a safe and secure environment for their citizens. This is intended to be achieved by focusing on the priorities identified by Member States (MS) in their national strategies. These priorities were organised under the four sub-programmes detailed above, which reflect the strategic goals of the Central Asian States and are in line with both the UNODC Medium-Term Strategy 2012-2015 and the biennial UNODC Strategic Framework 2014-2015.² The programme document does not describe a programme theory of change it does provide important context for the work of UNODC in Central Asia. The use of research in programme formulation is improving and visible, as is the drawing on of a number of previous evaluations and on lessons learned from the previous programme. The programme document describes the preconditions for this work and addresses a range of underlying assumptions. Prior to 2015, programming in the sub-region of Central Asia was notable for the many national, regional and global projects being implemented. It was determined at this time, in line with similar approaches in other geographies, to move to a programme approach to UNODC's work in Central Asia. This approach is detailed in the UNODC Programme for Central Asia document. The Programme document allows for synergistic response to the countries in the region to all three vehicles of UNODC, catalysing inputs from the Central Asian Programme from global initiatives and the RP.

There is strong evidence that feedback/ inputs from Government Counterparts (GCs) was a key component of the programme's consultation process, across all five relevant MS, and GCs report strong engagement with UNODC in defining priorities that underpin programming and its timely revision. Discussion with donors and the engagement of an international expert at the design phase also contributed to alignment of the programme with stakeholder needs and priorities and enabled agreement on the programme document to move quickly across all five countries of Central Asia. The Programme document for Central Asia notes that its funding strategy is 'multi-pronged' to secure sufficient funding and from a variety of sources, including encouraging Central Asian states to finance some activities or contribute in kind to the achievement of activities, and the Programme for Central Asia works to find balance between donor requirements and programmatic needs. The impact of donor priorities on the Programme did raise some concerns among stakeholders, and one stated alignment challenge was the difference between what was needed and what was possible, and the potential for fragmentation within a broadly coherent programme. This issue resonates across West and Central Asia, with stakeholders noting pressures on a 'programmatic approach' where the whole of the designed programme is not funded and implemented. Specialised NGOs in Central Asia have been engaged both in programme design and in implementation. This engagement is welcomed, as these important partners often suffer from limited resources and space in which to operate and deliver services.

There are a number of examples from all sub-programmes of stakeholder support for activities, results and collaboration, although the evaluation did find some GC sense of a loss of autonomy with the programmatic approach, linked to a decrease in direct support at the national level and an experience of operating within a 'programmatic menu' rather than a consultation process that leads to bespoke solutions. Examples of where relevance is evident include the long-standing prison reform work in Kyrgyzstan that has grown into a wider programme of criminal justice reform across the region. Although it is affected by uneven donor funding, it addresses reforms in several areas, resting on a foundation of legislation supporting criminalisation, law enforcement and criminal procedure and the administration of punishment. Further examples are the initiatives on naloxone distribution and

² Programme for Central Asia (2015-2021) – programme design document.

prevention of overdose, rehabilitation of former and current prisoners, methadone programmes and the development alternatives to incarceration for people who use drugs, all of which are areas in which the programme is a preferred partner.

A dovetailing of the Programme for Central Asia with global programmes in beneficial ways is also visible. Good examples of this can be found in the areas of Anti-Money Laundering (AML), crime prevention, criminal justice and education. At the same time, however, not all additive contribution is self-evidently useful, at least to the extent that it could be and is understood by programme managers that it should be. For example, while AML/CFT in PCA has a large standalone component to it, triple operational relationships are visible in the AML and Asset Recovery and the supporting area of MLA, with national capacity building by the Programme for Central Asia, regional networking with institutions, driven by the RP (ARIN-WCA), and support also coming from Vienna via Global Programme Against Money Laundering (GPML) and HQ supported institutions such as the Network of Prosecutors and Central Authorities from Source, Transit and Destination Countries in response to Transnational Organized Crime in Central Asia and Southern Caucasus, known as the CASC initiative. Here, then, is an opportunity to work synergistically on the laundering of funds, recovery of proceeds and the coordination of legal mechanisms and regional partnerships to achieve that. While there are likely significant benefits to be found in each of the contributing programmatic elements, the evaluation's findings (below) regarding programme coherence suggest in some cases there is also significant duplication, competition and lack of synergy within this thematic space.

Programming has a strong alignment with SDG 16 and alignment to some extent with both SDG 5 and SDG 3, and in recent years with SDGs 4, 8 and 11 through prisoner rehabilitations programmes, work with students to develop life skills and promote a culture of lawfulness and programmes in community policing. The evaluation found concerted efforts to align with UN Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs), with specific commentary on how this is visible in participation in UN Country Teams (UNCTs) across Central Asia. Programme design documents and reporting note alignment with the UNDAFs of countries in the region but with very little detail of what this alignment looks like or how it affects activities and results.

The design document lacks clarity on the longer-term context of UNODC programming in Central Asia. While PCA is a clear extension of previous programming, no clear presentation of *change* is visible: there is no detailed discussion and representation of the impact vision for the programme, i.e. the ongoing nature of UNODC engagement over time, how the proposed inputs and outputs contribute to change over time and how this longer-term change is monitored and reported on. This latter aspect is particularly important, as there is currently no reporting framework that addresses the accumulation of results/ change across programme cycles and the full period of UNODC presence in Central Asia. With the Programme for Central Asia entering a second 5-year framework, a need for this longer-term view becomes more important. As an example, placing a greater focus on sharing the significant and longer-term gains from Central Asian Regional Information and Coordination Centre (CARICC) in international cooperation and intelligence sharing, gains which provide strong indications of a strategic and collaborative approach with an impact potential.

COHERENCE

CENTRAL ASIA

Central Asia is a connected geography, linked also by history and culture. The Central Asia approach in UNODC programming makes sense in this context, and field research notes that the programme is well-aligned and well-coordinated across Central Asia. As well, the shift to a programme approach has been a significant plus in programming cohesion, with programming structured across thematic areas, allowing programming to encompass broader issues rather than smaller programmes in isolation from each other. CARICC is a particular example of the value of this approach, as it contributes to increased

coordination and cooperation with other law enforcement bodies, providing learning opportunities and the sharing of good practices, and is evidence of a good collaboration between the Programme for Central Asia and the RP. Evidence of work and benefits across Central Asia is wide and deep, from work on financial crimes to prisons and non-custodial alternatives, the latter being a recent area of engagement and one positively noted by GC. In this case, developments in one country were effectively displayed and communicated regionally, advancing the perceived desirability of alternatives to prison. There are also examples of improvements in partnership relationships between countries in Central Asia, in the context of the programme, with the programme providing assistance to MS through neutral platforms. GC confirm the impact of the programme in this area. The forum on drug use, organised in Almaty in 2017, was referenced several times in this context. At national levels, UNODC has played a role as dialogue facilitator, able to convey to some extent needs, visions and concerns of NGOs and GCs to each other; particularly underlined in Tajikistan and Kazakhstan where a larger number of implementing partners were interviewed. The role of the programme in stimulating political dialogue was also found welcome by GCs, including an underlining UNODC's proactive leadership in promoting key security and crime prevention issues on the regional agenda.

THE REGIONAL PROGRAMME

In planning documents, such as the programme document, there is a clear alignment and intention for coherence between the Programme for Central Asia and the Regional Programme. According to the programme document, the 'Programme is closely linked to the Regional Programme for Afghanistan and Neighbouring Countries 2011-15 (and its second phase is aligned to 2016-2019), which allows UNODC to assist governments to tackle drugs and crime related challenges in a broader regional context.'³ The programme document also mentions 'working in tandem with the RP and global initiatives' and notes the RP was established as 'a permanent platform for regional cooperation'.⁴ In the context of programme management, the programme document notes that the Programme for Central Asia 'will ensure that the delivery of technical assistance is well integrated and coordinated having synergy with RP and global initiatives across the region.'⁵

In implementation at the sub-programme level, this alignment and integration can be seen (e.g., the work being done on networks and exchanges of information and know-how on Drug Demand Reduction (DDR) and HIV prevention across the region and within most Central Asian MS), but it is not consistent across all sub-programmes nor the Programme as a whole. Data from the evaluation field research in particular provides strong indications that cooperation and collaboration between the Programme for Central Asia and the RP is not 'well integrated and coordinated' and that there is no practical, effective, operational agreement on the strategic and delivery models. The programme delivery approach that is visible between the RP and the Programme for Central Asia is quite the opposite of coherent, collaborative and coordinated – the evaluation found evidence in the detailed commentary of stakeholders, of both duplication and overlap in the work of the two programmes. At the very least, the relationship between the two programmes is no longer articulated effectively and requires updating. Unfortunately, GCs and donors are aware of this situation, although it actually impacts more internally to UNODC than it does with these stakeholders.

PCA is not a 'regional programme', per inputs to the evaluation, but it is referred to generally, by GC and many other stakeholders, as the Regional Programme for Central Asia. The office for the Programme is called, formally and extensively, ROCA. In Central Asia, in many conversations the expression 'regional programme' is used and it is not clear if the speaker refers to the RP or PCA. These examples of usage are all understandable: however, in the overall context of UNODC programming in West and Central

³ Programme for Central Asia (2015-2021) – programme design document.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

Asia, they indicate that UNODC, as a whole, is not clear in communicating the language it wants to use in referring to its programme structures and divisions.

UNCT

There is strong, positive evidence of the contribution of PCA to UNCT processes and activities in all countries. Resident Coordinators and representatives of Resident Coordinator Offices detailed commitments to One UN principles and processes that are visible in offices of UNODC in the five MS. Offices contribute to UNDAF planning and reporting and are beginning to engage with other UN Agencies in development of Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks (UNSDCFs). Particular mention is made of UNDAF priority areas that reflect UNODC's mandate, and in these there are examples of UNODC leadership. The evaluation found evidence from stakeholders of a relative lack of strategic perspectives visible in programme offices (i.e., outside of ROCA in Tashkent) and therefore the relatively limited contributions of those offices to strategic formulation in One UN planning. A specific example is the lack of UNODC presence among the UN family working on HIV prevention and contributing to drug use prevention and treatment. The Global Fund as well as WHO are the main and more vocal/ visible partners in these areas, while UNODC support is limited in terms of grants, coverage and timing.

EFFECTIVENESS

Evidence provided to the evaluation attributes 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. GCs perceive successes to be broad based, including experience and insight from travel, meetings and training, improved capacity to work across borders, support for important national-level change such as legislative and policy development, and institutional reform, such as in prisons. While these impacts are noted by GC, many remain of the view that the provision of equipment and hardware should remain a programme priority. Programme staff also report uneven MS support/ subscription to change, ranging from, e.g., high subscription to initiatives relating to national modernisation, including digitisation, but far lower support for direct engagement with human rights and gender issues.

GC provide significant evidence of the successes of PCA in the building of MS capacity across a range of areas, followed by a strengthening of cross border cooperation in Central Asia. The two most visible confirmations of this effectiveness are the establishment of Border Liaison Officers (BLOs) across the region and the increasing capacity of CARICC, which will be further enhanced with the enactment of the MoU on the Exchange/ Production of Secret Information. This agreement will provide Liaison Officers posted to CARICC (from their respective MS) with a legal mechanism through which sensitive information/intelligence related to law enforcement and counter-narcotics efforts across the regions can be developed and distributed between members. Without such an agreement, this cooperation is otherwise extremely complex or not possible, which hinders the effectiveness and desired outcomes of CARICC. While the negotiation of such an agreement has been lengthy, it is anticipated that the agreement will be finalized and come into effect in the near future. While a Programme for Central Asia initiative, CARICC is also an important avenue for RP engagement with GC. It was noted during the field phase that the work of the programme is effective even within the context of political tensions in Central Asia, with relationships being built across borders in what is seen as a significant positive shift.

Effectiveness of sub-programme 2 must take consideration of the fact that the programme was unlikely to be fully implemented, and the understanding that as designed it was 'a menu of options' based on GC demand. Within this framework there is visible progress, including long standing work on prisons, newer work on alternatives to prison and crime prevention at the local level, as well as novel initiatives on education of young people for lawful lives. The latter was achieved in concert with the Doha Global Programme and represents a model of effective integration between PCA and HQ-led global

programmes. Contributions to the success of sub-programme 2 include experience and insight from travel, meetings and training, improved capacity to work across borders, support for important national-level change such as legislative and policy development, and institutional reform, such as in prisons and in response to of-the-moment issues such as the return of violent extremists from abroad. In the context of a multi-country and wide-ranging programme design, UNODC staff reported variable success due to the patchwork of funded projects which clearly undermines programmatic effectiveness. Programme staff also report uneven MS support/ subscription to change, ranging from, for example, high subscription to initiatives relating to national modernisation, including digitisation, but lower support for direct engagement with human rights and gender issues or with continuing efforts to counter institutional corruption.

Work in sub-programme 3 was effective in providing adequate policy guidance (including measures that integrate family education and development into preventive framework), increase national capacities, from national professionals (law enforcement and health specialists) to non-governmental structures (technical assistance and training participation) and strengthened the participation of CSOs in development, implementation and evaluation of drugs and HIV strategies. UNODC technical support, staff availability and liaising, and strong expertise were highlighted as key facilitating factors.

Discussions on effectiveness must take consideration of the fact that with funding shortfalls the programme was unlikely to be fully implemented, with programme design being considered, to a certain extent, as a menu of options. Not all programme staff positions are filled - the Senior Law Enforcement Advisor role for sub-programme 1 has not been filled for several years, something commented on by both UNODC staff and GCs. Some of the lack of programme coherence PCA and the RP is attributed by stakeholders to this vacant staff position. Separate, but related, is the systemic issue across Central Asia of staff turnover in counterpart agencies which presents ongoing issues with embedding of training and developing institutional memory.

EFFICIENCY

The programme is well-structured in terms of logic, i.e., the programme document and its revision documentations include a clear structure of activity, output and objective, within sub-programme areas. Across the design documents of the programme, at the output to outcome level there is a reasonably consistent logic visible, i.e., it is possible to see that the designed outputs will make a strong contribution to achieving the intended outcomes and it is generally possible to see how a set of activities will deliver the intended output. The evaluation found limited capacity in current result indicators to capture longer term change and transformation, i.e., to capture what the programme is actually being able to build, including its work as a soft influencer through dialogue building, sharing of expertise and policy guidance.

Donor funding is increasingly becoming an issue, with funding shortfalls causing issues across the whole of the programme and impacting specifically on aspects of some sub-programmes, particularly sub-programme 3 and sub-programme 4. Having said this, the evaluation heard evidence of the ability of the programme to deliver activities and results even with funding challenges. The quality and availability of staff was a specific factor contributing to ongoing dialogue and trust-building that makes a significant contribution to outcomes.

Administrative and procurement processes are lengthy, particularly in terms of the recruitment of expertise, procurement of equipment and materials, all processes related to travel. The length and complexity of these arrangements detract from effective delivery and impact on stakeholder perspectives on UNODC systems.

The efficiency of a programme will always in some part be determined by what is measured. UNODC staff described onerous reporting requirements relative to levels of staffing, but also raised questions

about the capacity of current indicators to capture longer term change and transformation. There is a heavy emphasis on activity/ input reporting, rather than an analysis of how activities are actually delivering the planned results (outputs and outcomes), where emphasis needs to be on analysis, i.e., reflection on and description of the conversion of inputs (time and money) into results. This is of growing importance as the programme grows in length. With the programme entering a new 5-year phase there is a real need for consideration of and reporting on higher level outcomes and impact, which is as yet not visible in reporting.

Misunderstandings about and the slowness of UNODC procurement processes impacts on programme delivery and compromising both effectiveness and relevance. Specific examples include delays in recruitment of research consultants, delays in provision of access support to centres delivering Opioid substitution therapy (OSTs) and a range of procurement issues with the small grant programme for interventions in prison settings.

There are both strengths and weaknesses in programme reporting. Strengths include the framing of the reports, based on UNODC templates. This approach ensures that areas of priority in reporting are included and also ensures a standard approach that allows comparison across sub-programmes or programmes (sub-programme reporting is structured differently to country programme reporting). Programme documentation gives focus to risk definition and risk management strategies.

The report templates also create links between important components of programme design and reporting, such as the SDGs, UNDAFs and human rights/ gender, although these links are not direct. There is little on specific contributions to SDGs in reporting. There is not always a direct correlation between the SDGs defined at the design stage and what is reported on and reporting is not always detailed in how the sub-programme/ programme is actually contributing. Sub-programme reports do not, apparently, require this analysis and programmed reporting is limited. There is limited discussion on actual engagement in Delivering as One approaches or specific contributions to UNDAFs in country programme reports (Annual Programme Progress Reports – APPRs). Reporting on engagement in and contributions to UNDAFs is generally not visible in sub-programme reporting (APPRs) or is only discussed in very general terms. As noted above, the programmes make significant contributions to the One UN, but these are not well-covered in reporting.

More recently, the Covid-19 crisis severely disrupted programme implementation, despite the use of remote and online solutions which GC found somewhat adequate, considering language barriers, limited possibilities for interactions and lack of contextualised support. Donors and GCs have been very responsive to and understanding of impacts on programming. Donors noted the impact of COVID-19 on implementation processes while also noting the flexibility of the programmes during this period. The Programme made a rapid provision of necessary materials and assessment of the pandemic's impact on drug users and on service provision, including NGOs, which was positively welcomed and facilitated a more adapted response from service providers.

IMPACT

UNODC has had success in Central Asia supporting government reform and the implementation of legislation and policies, in regard to border management and drug trafficking, anti-corruption, penal systems, extremism, harm reduction measures, improvement in national data collection mechanisms and improvements in dialogue and inter-sectoral coordination. This is also visible in implementation and evaluation of UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) measures and, to a lesser but still visible degree in relation to the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC) and human trafficking and the smuggling of migrants. Innovative work has also been done around education for justice and crime free lives, where sub-programme 2 has engaged with civil society and reached more deeply toward community level final beneficiaries than is typical in criminal justice programming. Considerable work has also been undertaken on norms-based work in prisons, cooperating with global

programmes, work which has delivered clear impacts in improved prison conditions and regimes. CARICC remains an indication of sustainable impact and is growing in these areas with time. The Programme for Central Asia has contributed to implementation of international standards on HIV and drug prevention and treatment in the region. It was notably successful in disseminating and adapting international standards to country contexts (in 4 countries in Central Asia), in particular the recently updated UNODC /WHO International standards on drug use prevention although there is no effective follow up or reporting mechanisms to observe concrete implementation in local structures. Support for safe injection rooms and the methadone programme in Kazakhstan were cited as an example of development and enhancement of practices in reduction of harms to health caused by drugs.

SUSTAINABILITY

Evidence from the evaluation on sustainable results was not consistent, with evidence pointing to the importance of legislation and other normative frameworks while other data points to the fundamentally low national capacity and a reliance on external support and funding. There is a consistent trend in GC responses towards demand for more than just training, including such initiatives as the building of national or regional centres of expertise so that training benefits can accrue and be retained.

The Drug Control Agency (DCA) in Tajikistan is the best example of national ownership in Central Asia. The agency was built up over a number of years and then, in close consultation with authorities, an exit strategy was developed through which funding and UNODC initiatives were gradually decreased over time. Considerable efforts have been made to develop national ownership at the law enforcement training institutions throughout the region. While training of trainer initiatives have created competency, this is undermined by the constant turnover of staff. GCs recognise both the importance of sustainable approaches and the impacts of staff turnover, and it is worth noting that the DCA has been able to effectively address this issue and has national trainers conducting training sessions for officers from other government agencies on software for data collection and intelligence analysis.

While not yet fully self-sustaining, CARICC's development is assisted by financial support from Kazakhstan and developing measures for further contributions from other MS.

GCs themselves view established networks, regional cooperation, personal relationships, their broader understanding of the work that each other does as contributors to sustainability and view themselves as having the capacity to continue to a large extent on their own. Having said this, there remains the view that UNODC provides a very good platform for success, and that decreased external support would create significant challenges.

There are some signs of robust governmental ownership and political will to engage further on HIV and drug use prevention across Central Asia. While all interviewed stakeholders agreed on the key role played by the Programme in triggering and catalysing policy and vision changes, for these efforts to be sustained there is a need for continued, longer-term engagement with governments.

LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

Whereas past evaluations pointed out the need for more prominent inclusion of human rights and gender considerations into programming in the region, PCA demonstrated increased focus on these issues and a clear commitment to embed human rights and gender sensitivity across the different elements and activities of the Programme. As project and reporting documents, as well as interviews with key stakeholders suggest, UNODC has been pro-active in addressing the needs of vulnerable populations through its activities and raising the profile of these issues to GC in the region. The Programme has defined HRG promotion as one of its six guiding principles of programme development and has appointed gender focal points and uses these positions to give prominence to this area of priority.

Along with advocating in these areas with GC during training programmes and meetings, in line with international norms and standards, the Programme has included an increase emphasis on gender equality and the rights of vulnerable populations through several activities across sub-programmes. In sub-programme 3 addressing vulnerability is a specific priority of sub-programme initiatives. Under sub-programmes 1 and 2, mainstreaming of human rights and gender appeared less apparent, notably due to political and contextual factors and institutional cultures attached to the fields of intervention. Nonetheless, close attention was given to vulnerable population as reflected for example in work on trafficking in persons and local gender-based violence prevention mechanisms as enhanced in Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, in orphanages with young people at risk of both criminal victimisation and participation in organised crime, or in training implementation that includes a strong human rights focus such as on rights of detainees, and where possible women's participation. Instruments and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation, such as gender impact analysis methodologies have been introduced, yet outcomes and impacts beyond the activity level remain difficult to grasp. It should also be noted that although GC do note that these are priorities in UNODC programming the evaluation found the issues do not constitute a high priority. Several initiatives implemented with GC to address the rights of vulnerable populations are encouraging, such as support provided to experts at the National Human Rights Centre (NHRC) in Uzbekistan to review potentially stigmatising or discriminatory policies or practices against people who inject drugs (PWID) and people living with HIV (PLHIV), and monitoring cases of violence or human rights violations to prepare an analysis for national stakeholders.

The work the Programme does with NGO implementing partners strengthens the Programme's work on gender, human rights and the rights of vulnerable people. The programme is particularly supporting NGOs in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

Programme engagement in the UNCT includes engagement on human rights and gender priorities. This engagement is noted by sister UN agencies, but is qualified by the view that UNODC's engagement overall is less active than other UN organisations such as WHO or UNAIDS in work on and HIV prevention and treatment.

CONCLUSIONS

RELEVANCE

PCA demonstrates relevance to and alignment with Member State Priorities and UNODC strategies. There is also strong evidence of engagement from MS for the Programme's design process and of the relevance of the programme to MS. The Programme engages a range of stakeholders, there are a range of interactions with UNODC's global programmes, and programming has clear alignment with a number of SDGs. Programme planning and detailed design would benefit from intentionally addressing the longer-term context of the programme. As the engagement of UNODC in Central Asia is a long-standing one. As the concerted approach enters into a second 5-year strategic framework, and does so within what is described as a programmatic framework, it becomes more relevant to consider the longer-term implications, outputs and outcomes of this work, including specific attention on the higher-level outcomes and contributions to impact that result from the Country Programme. This is likely to include a discussion on and representation of the impact vision for the programme, i.e. the ongoing nature of UNODC engagement over time. With the Programme entering this new 5-year framework, a need for this longer-term view becomes more important. Such a design approach offers the possibility for addressing the finer details of strategic and structural relationships and interactions with the RP and the other programmes in the region.

COHERENCE

PCA is well-aligned and coordinated across Central Asia, with the shift to a programme approach providing clear positives to a cohesive approach across the 5 MS. This approach has also encouraged improvements in partnership relations between these MS through the Programme's provision of neutral platforms.

However, the coherent linkages and coordinated direction-setting described in the programme document for PCA are not in fact functioning. While the programme document describes 'closely linking' to the RP, which is intended to assist UNODC as a whole in addressing drug and crime challenges in West and Central Asia, these links with the RP have slipped to some extent. Given the importance of the role played by the RP for GC, in their regional engagement and with regional initiatives, these links should be re-established and given a new priority. It would be a mistake for programming for the next phase to be undertaken without these issues being resolved, as they are significant and impact on the day-to-day operations of the Programme for Central Asia and the RP and a re-establishment of frameworks is critical to the design and implementation in the coming 5-year period. There is a lack of clarity on definitions of and criteria for 'region', 'regional programme' and even 'country programme' and 'country office', as a significant lack of clarity exists within UNODC itself in these areas.

The Programme plays an important role in UNCTs in Central Asia. This is a role that is encouraged and, given comments from UN sister agencies, requires a greater focus at the strategic level of engagement – this would open up possibilities for engagement with these UN Agencies, potentially giving the Programme a greater role in the countries of Central Asia and also potentially opening up funding streams.

EFFECTIVENESS

Programme effectiveness can be largely attributed to the quality of the technical advice provided through the programme. There are four key areas of importance to programme effectiveness in Central Asia, areas requiring an ongoing focus and commitment:

- Capacity – the most important outcomes of programming in Central Asia are the BLOs, the IMTs, the ongoing development of the DCA and CARICC, criminal justice reform, crime prevention, promotion of alternatives to incarceration and overall drug and crime prevention, as well as legal measures and activities surrounding AML/CFT/AR and AML. These are all founded on the building of capacity in institutions, sustainable capacity for ongoing change.
- Sharing – GC in particular note the importance of cross-border sharing and collaboration, internally to the five Central Asian countries and also in association with RP initiatives across the region.
- Advice – GCs make specific reference to the quality of provided expertise and the quality and value of the technical advice they get from UNODC programming, although a greater emphasis on practice would be welcomed.
- Evidence – within initiatives on criminal justice, crime prevention, anti-corruption, drug use, HIV and related issues, the gathering of evidence and building of policy based on evidence is a critical outcome and strong foundation for ongoing initiatives in this area. This requires data collection for appropriate M&E at a minimum but extends also to the capacity to measure and track impacts over the medium to longer term.

It is important to note that each of these areas directly contributes to impact and sustainability.

EFFICIENCY

PCA is demonstrating capacity to deliver results even within the current funding challenges that are particularly visible in sub-programmes 3 and 4. The quality of staff within the programme is a strong contributing factor in this.

The programme document is well-structured, with a consistent logic although the ability to capture longer-term change is limited within the current set of result indicators. As the programme is entering the planning for a new 5-year phase, it is important to consider how the work of UNODC in Central Asia is properly measured and reported on. This is important to ensure that the story of change and impact, brought about by significant inputs over a significant period, is told. It is important for this story to be told based on evidence, evidence that is presented against clearly delineated outcome and impact indicators. Clearly this is linked to the conclusion above on the longer-term context of the programme is the importance of addressing how the proposed inputs and outputs contribute to change over time and how this longer-term change is monitored and reported on. This later aspect is particularly important as there is currently no reporting framework that addresses the accumulation of results/change across programme cycles. It is likely that without a focus on gathering and sharing evidence of change, an appreciation of what has occurred will be lost.

Secondly, a clear picture of what has been done and what has been achieved will, in all likelihood, provide a clearer and more detailed perspective on where programming should go in the future. Given that past, successful programming has built a foundation for success, visible in the trust and quality of relationships visible with GCs, donors and with NGO implementing partners, it makes sense to build up from the most solid of those foundations. Understanding what these are requires analysis based on evidence. While this includes forward thinking, it is as important in ensuring the foundations laid and successes achieved over the past programming are not lost, neither in reporting nor in planning for future initiatives and making use of these foundations.

A closer correlation between the sub-programmes of the Programme and the UNODC strategic framework as defined in the UN *Biennial programme plan and priorities for the period 2018-2019*⁶ and the *UNODC Strategy 2021-2025*⁷ would offer significantly greater potential for the Programme for Central Asia and UNODC as an organisation to aggregate reporting on activities and results and to better tell the story of the importance of UNODC's work and its related successes.

IMPACT

Normative frameworks offer the best indications currently of the road to impact. These include programme influences on legislation and policies in regard to border management and drug trafficking, anti-corruption, criminal justice and penal systems, extremism, harm reduction measures, national data collection and inter-sectoral coordination. They also include the visible implementation and evaluation of UNCAC measures, UNTOC and implementation of international standards on HIV and drug prevention and treatment in the region.

SUSTAINABILITY

As indicated above, the strongest indications of sustainability are the DCA and CARICC, while GCs themselves view established networks, regional cooperation, personal relationships, their broader understanding of the work that each other does as clear indicators. It is likely that UNCAC, Financial Action task Force (FATF) and related AML initiatives will have sustainable effort and impact.

⁶ This document defines UNODC's strategic framework and correlates with the five-year programme being evaluated.

⁷ This document correlates with the coming strategic period.

LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

PCA demonstrated increased consideration of human rights and gender (HRG) mainstreaming across the different elements and activities of the programme. Encouraging yet unevenly supported practices are visible. While these efforts seem strong enough to be consolidated in the future, the evaluation sees additional opportunities to strengthen the Programme contribution to HRG issues through the work the Programme initiated with NGO implementing partners that can further strengthen the programme's work on gender, human rights and the rights of vulnerable people. There is particular support being provided to NGOs in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, as well as to national human rights institutions, notably in Uzbekistan, with the view of consolidating the evidence basis and inform policy development to tackle human rights violations and stigmatisation issues related to PWID and people living with HIV. There is clear potential in providing a greater level of support in this area, support which would contribute to effectiveness within Sub-programme 3 but which would also increase the visibility of UNODC's initiatives on human rights, gender and vulnerable populations. This increased visibility is also likely to have potential for flow-on, both with GCs (increasing influence) and within the UNCT (increasing partnership and funding).

LIMITATIONS TO THE EVALUATION

The Covid-19 global health crisis impacted significantly on the processes of the evaluation, notably in forcing all evaluation enquiry to be undertaken online. No face-to-face interviewing was possible, no site visits were undertaken and no observation of activities, as a field tool, was possible as the scheduling of programme activities was limited and none took place during the period of field research.

The evaluation did not address questions/ enquiry to the general population nor to indirect beneficiaries – all enquiry is with key stakeholders, including project staff, implementing partners, donors and direct beneficiaries.

EVALUATION MATRIX - PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA - FINDINGS

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Sub-Programme 1: Countering transnational organised crime, illicit drug trafficking and preventing terrorism (XAC/Z60)	Sub-programme 2: Criminal Justice, Crime Prevention and Integrity (XAC/Z61)	Sub-programme 3: Drug prevention, treatment and reintegration and HIV prevention (XAC/Z62)	Sub-programme 4: Research and trend analysis (XAC/Z63)
Relevance	1. Were the programmes designed based on evidence (research, lessons learned from past programming, evaluations)?	<p>Current programme shifted from project-based focus to programmatic approach, based on the successes of similar programming changes across UNODC.</p> <p>Challenges in design process stemmed from large numbers of sub-programme projects across Central Asia, but the new structure has allowed broader issues to be incorporated into initiatives.</p> <p>Overall, GCs report strong engagement with UNODC in defining priorities. Formal and informal dialogue mechanisms with a wide range of actors including civil society, and working groups created to represent GC and donors and involving the participation of an international expert further informed design.</p> <p>Programming is increasingly data driven, especially in the AML area where HQ-based research resources, such as on choke points in financial flows, have allowed more effective targeting of planning and resources.</p> <p>Programme design is coherent while also sufficiently tailored manner to ensure it aligns to both regional and national priorities and needs.</p>			
	2. To what extent does the defined structure of programmes in the region align with current regional practice and future directions?	<p>GC confirm alignment with priorities 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. Although it is affected by uneven donor funding, it addresses reforms in several areas, resting on a foundation of legislation supporting decriminalisation, law enforcement and criminal procedure and punishment.</p> <p>The programme for Central Asia has been designed in a coherent, yet sufficiently tailored manner to ensure it aligns to both regional and national priorities and needs (national workshops, joint planning sessions and regional experts meeting).</p> <p>Initiatives on naloxone distribution and prevention of overdose, rehabilitation of former and current prisoners, methadone programmes and the development of alternatives to incarceration for people who use drugs are all active areas and areas in which the Programme is a preferred partner.</p> <p>Flexibility of programming was noted and appreciated – this was specifically noted in relation to changing drug use patterns.</p>			

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Sub-Programme 1: Countering transnational organised crime, illicit drug trafficking and preventing terrorism (XAC/Z60)	Sub-programme 2: Criminal Justice, Crime Prevention and Integrity (XAC/Z61)	Sub-programme 3: Drug prevention, treatment and reintegration and HIV prevention (XAC/Z62)	Sub-programme 4: Research and trend analysis (XAC/Z63)
	3. To what extent are the objectives of the Programmes aligned with regional priorities and UNDAFs/ UNSDCF/ SDGs?	<p>Programming has a strong alignment with SDG 16 and alignment to some extent and as the programme developed with both SDGs 3, 4, 5, 8 and 11.</p> <p>The 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>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.</p> <p>GCs report national priorities to include effective regional responses and opportunities for information sharing and learning.</p>			
	4. To what extent do the programmes respond to the changing and emerging regional and national (Member State) priorities and needs?	<p>GCs across Central Asia note their clear priority for international cooperation and support.</p> <p>UNODC openness to include a wide range of stakeholders and build trust across sector ensured the programme to respond to MS needs in a balanced and comprehensive manner.</p> <p>Most GCs respond very positively to alignment and flexibility. Some note lack of dynamism in face of rapidly changing risk situations (e.g., VEPs), while the responsiveness to the emerging threat of synthetic drugs was viewed very well.</p> <p>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 legitimation of DDR measures such as substitution therapy and overdose treatments.</p> <p>Room for increased coverage and specific intervention on DDR.</p> <p>GC still have strong focus on the acquisition of hardware, PCA making efforts to move priorities towards a more strategic approach.</p>			

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Sub-Programme 1: Countering transnational organised crime, illicit drug trafficking and preventing terrorism (XAC/Z60)	Sub-programme 2: Criminal Justice, Crime Prevention and Integrity (XAC/Z61)	Sub-programme 3: Drug prevention, treatment and reintegration and HIV prevention (XAC/Z62)	Sub-programme 4: Research and trend analysis (XAC/Z63)
Coherence	5. To what extent did the programmes develop or strengthen existing and new partnerships at bilateral, regional and international levels?	<p>Both GC and UNODC staff note concern over potential duplication of efforts and lack of clear coordination between PCA and the RP. GC feel Afghanistan/West Asia is at arm’s length, creating gaps in national counter narcotics strategies.</p> <p>At national levels, UNODC played as a dialogue facilitator and an intermediary able to convey needs, visions and concerns of NGO and GCs, NGO’s and other relevant stakeholders to each other.</p> <p>UNODC’s role as a neutral partner is critical.</p> <p>Very high levels of GC demand, responsiveness and satisfaction with regional aspects of programming, regional work and benefits with emphases on learning, knowledge transfer and models of building sustainable national capacity, despite noted lack of clarity between PCA and RP.</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.</p>			

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Sub-Programme 1: Countering transnational organised crime, illicit drug trafficking and preventing terrorism (XAC/Z60)	Sub-programme 2: Criminal Justice, Crime Prevention and Integrity (XAC/Z61)	Sub-programme 3: Drug prevention, treatment and reintegration and HIV prevention (XAC/Z62)	Sub-programme 4: Research and trend analysis (XAC/Z63)
	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>Contribution to UNCT 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 MS.</p> <p>Contributions to UNCT within the UNODC mandate.</p> <p>Value of One UN approach is seen and perceived to be beneficial to UNODC in the longer term, but as a small agency, both capacity levels and funding undermine participation. The Global Fund, WHO, UNDP and UNICEF remain the main and more vocal/visible partners.</p> <p>Strong documentary alignment with UNDAFs but practical contributions somewhat limited in many countries – mainly a sharing of expertise, rather than a strategic engagement.</p> <p>UNODC lacks sufficient presence among the UN family working on HIV prevention and contributing to drug use prevention and treatment.</p>			

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Sub-Programme 1: Countering transnational organised crime, illicit drug trafficking and preventing terrorism (XAC/Z60)	Sub-programme 2: Criminal Justice, Crime Prevention and Integrity (XAC/Z61)	Sub-programme 3: Drug prevention, treatment and reintegration and HIV prevention (XAC/Z62)	Sub-programme 4: Research and trend analysis (XAC/Z63)
Effectiveness	7. To what extent were the objectives and outcomes stated in programme documents achieved?	<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>The evaluation found the programme’s 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, such as prisons.</p> <p>Specific evidence points to this change being facilitated by 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.</p> <p>Diverging political visions and cultural stigmatisation of drug use and users slows down sub-programme 3 implementation and impact negatively on its successes.</p> <p>GC and PCA note inconsistent/ differentiating legal standards across the region create challenges impacts overall effectiveness.</p> <p>Recognised that the full programme 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>			

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Sub-Programme 1: Countering transnational organised crime, illicit drug trafficking and preventing terrorism (XAC/Z60)	Sub-programme 2: Criminal Justice, Crime Prevention and Integrity (XAC/Z61)	Sub-programme 3: Drug prevention, treatment and reintegration and HIV prevention (XAC/Z62)	Sub-programme 4: Research and trend analysis (XAC/Z63)
	8. How effectively did the programmes address national and regional needs and priorities?	<p>GC value MoUs and other mechanism that facilitate desired outputs and outcomes and stress the need for efforts in support of these to continue.</p> <p>UNODC staff report variable success due to patchwork of funding projects, undermining programmatic effectiveness.</p> <p>Report also uneven MS support/subscription to change, e.g., high relating to modernisation, digitisation, but lower re HRG.</p> <p>GCs tend to view effectiveness positively, but a number commented on the need for better indicators to capture progress.</p> <p>Issues on geographical and population coverage are also important (methadone and OSTs services)</p> <p>Increased participation of NGO at the national and regional levels. with potential for increased support.</p> <p>The Covid-19 crisis severely disrupted programme implementation, despite the use of remote and online solutions which GC found somewhat adequate, considering language barriers, limited possibilities for interactions and lack of contextualised support. The Office in Tashkent made a rapid provision of necessary materials and assessment of the pandemic’s impact on drug users and on service provision, which was positively welcomed and facilitated a more adapted response from service providers.</p>			
	9. To what extent are the programmes effective in strengthening and promoting cross-border cooperation and collaboration with regional entities?	<p>Cross border cooperation/collaboration seen as one of the key strengths and successes of the PCA, widely noted by GCs as effective and with demand for more.</p> <p>Lower-level cross border cooperation somewhat established but limited strategic cooperation/information exchange at the institutional level, that further integration with the RP would allow</p> <p>Lack of trust between MS impedes further cooperation, despite political will.</p> <p>The regional approach enabled networks and exchanges of information and know-how on DDR and HIV prevention to be strengthened and sustained both across the region and within most of each national context.</p>			

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Sub-Programme 1: Countering transnational organised crime, illicit drug trafficking and preventing terrorism (XAC/Z60)	Sub-programme 2: Criminal Justice, Crime Prevention and Integrity (XAC/Z61)	Sub-programme 3: Drug prevention, treatment and reintegration and HIV prevention (XAC/Z62)	Sub-programme 4: Research and trend analysis (XAC/Z63)
Efficiency	10. Were the resources and inputs converted to outputs and outcomes in a timely and cost-effective manner?	<p>While the programme structure is well-conceived, the funding constraints mean delivery is more an assemblage of projects from within the programme concept, undermining efficiency as synergies are less available.</p> <p>Stricter donor requirements create restrictions in programme flexibility. Donor demands require comprehensive programme planning to avoid delays in implementation.</p> <p>Potential for more thinking on organisation of field-HQ project-expertise relationships.</p> <p>Country coordination mechanism on HIV/AIDS prevention was successful in maximising available funds.</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>Reporting has an insufficient focus on capturing longer-term change and transformation.</p>			
Impact	11. To what extent did the programmes contribute to Member State implementation of relevant international Conventions and other instruments?	<p>GCs positive and cite support for legislation, training in new or relevant norms and partnerships to support implementation work.</p> <p>PCA assisted MS to reform and implement their legislation and policies, supporting in the case of SPs 1 & 2, for example, UNCAC and UNTOC, HTMS, with considerable norms-based work in TIP, prisons, border management and counter-narcotics.</p> <p>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>The evaluation found only limited effective follow up or reporting mechanisms to observe concrete implementation of those Standards in local structures.</p>			

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

	<p>12. To what extent can long-term sustainable results be expected for all stakeholders from current programme implementation?</p>	<p>PCA note evidence of short-term gains, but do not have a mechanism in place to measure long term impact.</p> <p>Across SP1, GC confident that in the absence of funding, core capacities would remain, but are not yet where the withdrawal of international support would not have a significant impact on performance.</p> <p>UNODC implemented an exit strategy for the Drug Control Agency of Tajikistan, gradually decreasing the amount of funding and activities the Programme provided, transitioning both to the responsibility of the Tajikistan government. This exit strategy took place in close consultation with authorities, over a series of many years, creating what is now a self-sustained agency.</p> <p>SP1 reports successes in implementing and reforming legislation and policies particularly in regard to border management, drug trafficking, and HTMS, assisting governments in the adoption of national legislation to be consistent with UN conventions and instruments.</p> <p>Legislative focus and policy guidance provide basis for sustainability, but strong potential for erosion and non-compliance.</p> <p>Consistent trend in GC desire for elements that would directly support sustainable outcomes, e.g., building national/regional centres of expertise.</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>Significant investments in the development of national capacities through training undermined by frequent GC staff turnover.</p> <p>In SP2 the strong legislative focus provides basis for sustainability, but there remains potential for erosion and non-compliance.</p> <p>GCs somewhat divided on sustainable results within SP2, some pointing to importance of eg, legislation, others noting low national capacity and reliance on UNODC and donor support.</p> <p>Consistent trend in GC responses toward demand for more than just training, ie, elements that would directly support sustainable outcomes, e.g, building national/regional centres of expertise in criminal justice and related areas.</p> <p>PCA had a positive impact on the level of knowledge, capacity and implication of narcology and HIV/AIDS centres staff in the region in developing and enhancing the quality of responses and practices to reduce the health harms caused by drugs.</p> <p>However, despite greater openness and engagement from MS, DDR policy and strategic frameworks in the region remain embryonic. Important policy divergences and cultural biases persist, making it difficult to anticipate sustainable results.</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>13. To what extent did the</p>	<p>Clear support for work on SDG16 and some work towards SDG 5.</p> <p>SDG 3 cited.</p>

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Sub-Programme 1: Countering transnational organised crime, illicit drug trafficking and preventing terrorism (XAC/Z60)	Sub-programme 2: Criminal Justice, Crime Prevention and Integrity (XAC/Z61)	Sub-programme 3: Drug prevention, treatment and reintegration and HIV prevention (XAC/Z62)	Sub-programme 4: Research and trend analysis (XAC/Z63)
	programmes contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals?	<p>Several events were conducted to align programme with SDGs and support the countries in better implementation and reporting of SDGs.</p> <p>Countries were supported in nationalization of SDG indicators.</p> <p>Countries are supported in preparation of VNRs, and implementation of follow up actions.</p>			
Sustainability	14. Has national ownership of the programmes been generated? In what ways? What factors have hindered or facilitated this ownership?	<p>Good evidence of GC recognition of importance and of ownership of what falls within that GC’s domain of responsibility.</p> <p>CARICC is making efforts to be self-funded by requiring funding contributions from MS. Kazakhstan and Russian Federation provide some funding/infrastructure.</p> <p>DCA over long terms has proven sustainability, almost a standalone agency.</p> <p>UNODC exit strategies to be included in design (Ex- DCA TAJ).</p> <p>Overall a mixed picture though, relying strongly on political support from highest levels.</p> <p>Rapid staff turnover in key roles was widely noted to undermine sustainability. Development of national capacity was uneven, with some GC responses indicating low/no national ownership of training, no institutional memory. In other places, such as prosecutorial and judicial training, MS were taking active steps toward autonomy and institutionalizing expertise.</p> <p>Good and long experience with GC creates opportunities for increased openness to more balanced and sustainable DDR policy frameworks.</p> <p>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>Increased advocacy and soft dialogue efforts have been identified as critical to engage MS in a sustainable fashion.</p>			

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Sub-Programme 1: Countering transnational organised crime, illicit drug trafficking and preventing terrorism (XAC/Z60)	Sub-programme 2: Criminal Justice, Crime Prevention and Integrity (XAC/Z61)	Sub-programme 3: Drug prevention, treatment and reintegration and HIV prevention (XAC/Z62)	Sub-programme 4: Research and trend analysis (XAC/Z63)
	15. How have the programmes developed national capacity to support sustainability of effort and benefit?	<p>GCs themselves view established networks, regional cooperation, personal relationships, their broader understanding of the work that each other does as contributors to sustainability</p> <p>Legislative development work, changes to codes and regulation and regimes of training point to ownership.</p> <p>Improving the skill base of key actors contributing to sustainable outcomes.</p> <p>MS in the region appear to lack human and financial resources, capacities and structures and to some extent sufficient political will to pursue the deployment of drug use prevention, treatment and rehabilitation services.</p>			
Leaving no one behind	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>HR/G present in all programming.</p> <p>GC recognition of human rights and gender is less visible, although GC note that they recognise these priorities in UNODC programming.</p> <p>Clear attention and support to gender related issues (material, participation, trust building etc.) – possible through tailored approach.</p> <p>Clear evidence of UNODC raising profile of HRG, and to some extent vulnerability, e.g., in work with orphans at risk of victimisation and recruitment into criminality.</p> <p>SDG used as an advocacy umbrella – helping make GC accountable.</p> <p>Gender focal points established but have no earmarked funding.</p> <p>PCA recognises limits as to how far HR and gender can be flagged in initiatives in SP1.</p>			

INDEPENDENT IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF
PROGRAMME FOR CENTRAL ASIA

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Question	Sub-Programme 1: Countering transnational organised crime, illicit drug trafficking and preventing terrorism (XAC/Z60)	Sub-programme 2: Criminal Justice, Crime Prevention and Integrity (XAC/Z61)	Sub-programme 3: Drug prevention, treatment and reintegration and HIV prevention (XAC/Z62)	Sub-programme 4: Research and trend analysis (XAC/Z63)
	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>Limited feedback throughout evaluation from GC on HR and gender issues from SP1 counterparts.</p> <p>Strong influence of culture and religion on the difficulty of inclusion of women in law enforcement.</p> <p>HR may in some areas be more prominent in implementation than in direct planning and targeting, e.g., work on trafficking allows focus on vulnerable groups and gender, and training includes HR focus.</p> <p>Strong evidence of vulnerability being broadly conceived so as to provide inclusive access to programming, such as in crime prevention work, in assisting prison authorities to identify and make provision for higher risk vulnerable inmate groups, in the recognition of women’s vulnerability to gender-based violence and forms of predatory violence associated with trafficking and other forms of organised crime. Vulnerability was also threaded thematically into legislative reform and supporting training and documentation.</p> <p>Other UN Agencies and the RCs recognise a strong commitment from UNODC to addressing HRG frameworks. UNODC put greater emphasis on gender and human rights in its programming than in the past. The reduction of stigma and discrimination towards people who use drugs, including PWID as well as improving access for women to drug treatment and comprehensive package of HIV services constitute central outputs of SP3.</p> <p>Specific interventions were designed and implemented to that end, notably in support of NGO empowerment, awareness raising and directing services to most vulnerable populations.</p> <p>The work the Programme does with NGO implementing partners strengthens the Programme’s work on gender, human rights and the rights of vulnerable people.</p> <p>Room however exists for increased support to CSO – key intermediaries and advocates for vulnerable populations and rights.</p>			