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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation or Acronym</th>
<th>Full name</th>
<th>Abbreviation or Acronym</th>
<th>Full name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANPN</td>
<td>Agence Nationale des Parcs Nationaux du Gabon (National Agency for National Parks of Gabon)</td>
<td>EDF</td>
<td>European Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRCOP</td>
<td>UNODC, INTERPOL, WCO project to support anti-trafficking efforts in participating airports</td>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>GABAC</td>
<td>Groupe d’Action contre le Blanchiment d’Argent en Afrique Centrale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>GPCAE</td>
<td>UNODC Global Programme on Crimes that Affect the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEB</td>
<td>(UNODC) Corruption and Economic Crime Branch</td>
<td>GPAC</td>
<td>UNODC Global Programme Against Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEEAC</td>
<td>Communauté Economique des Etats de l’Afrique Centrale (also ECCAS)</td>
<td>GRR</td>
<td>Guide de référence rapide (RRG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMIFAC</td>
<td>Central African Forestry Commission</td>
<td>ICCWC</td>
<td>International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPIL</td>
<td>Comité de Pilotage (Standing Committee)</td>
<td>LNOB</td>
<td>Leaving no one behind (principle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
<td>MIKE</td>
<td>CITES Programme on Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of Central African States (also CEEAC)</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOFAC</td>
<td>Fragile Ecosystems of Central Africa</td>
<td>PARCIC</td>
<td>Programme d’appui aux Réformes et au Renforcement des Capacités Institutionnelles de la CEEAC (ECCAS reform and institutional capacity-building support programme)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROSEN</td>
<td>UNODC Regional Office for West and Central Africa (in Senegal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRG</td>
<td>Rapid Reference Guide (also GRR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACE</td>
<td>Technologies and Resources for Applied Conservation and Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC</td>
<td>Wildlife trade monitoring network (Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCAC</td>
<td>United Nations Convention Against Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOCA</td>
<td>United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNTOC</td>
<td>United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W&amp;E</td>
<td>Wildlife and environmental (crime)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCO</td>
<td>World Customs Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NARRATIVE

The UNODC Global Programme on Crimes that affect the Environment (GPCAE) is pleased to provide this management response to the Evaluation Report of the project “Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources” (GLOZ31-CA). Launched in 2018 with funding from the European Union, this was the first regional project of the GPCAE in Central Africa aimed at enhancing governments’ capacities to investigate and prosecute wildlife and natural resources crime.

The GPCAE welcomes the results of the final independent in-depth evaluation indicating that the project clearly responded to the increasing concerns about wildlife and environmental crime, including trafficking in wildlife and forest products and other natural resources. The GPCAE is pleased to note the evaluation’s findings on the project’s contributions to enhancing national investigative and wildlife forensic capacities, changing perceptions of prioritization and needs related to wildlife and natural resources crime prosecution, strengthening links between first responders/park rangers and judicial authorities, and transferring skills for the development of a “crime scene to court” approach.

The GPCAE acknowledges the key lessons learned from the implementation of the project, which include the need for a thorough assessment of the implementation context and needs (staffing, partners mapping, political economy analysis, etc.) to prevent delays and mixed expectations, the need for multi-sectoral participation in training and the proper balancing of institutional and operational capacity strength to maximize impact and national engagement. The GPCAE is pleased to note the good practices of the project which include the tailored and participatory approach to achieving outputs, the support to national structures and the positive pairing of expertise and activities across UNODC, among others.

The GPCAE welcomes the recommendation to engage in dialogue with potential donors, regional partners and interested stakeholders to strengthen momentum on wildlife and environmental crime prioritization and support. Similarly, the GPCAE accepts the recommendation to review the scope and framework of UNODC intervention on wildlife and environmental crimes in the region, including diversifying fundraising strategies, developing knowledge tools and strategic visions, and strengthening national/subregional institutions, structures, and expertise.

The GPCAE welcomes the recommendation to enrich the technical assistance and capacity-building portfolio and focus interventions at the operational levels. The GPCAE acknowledges the finding that preventive measures and cross-cutting issues of gender, human rights and inclusion of vulnerable populations were insufficiently integrated and accepts the recommendation to develop a more balanced and comprehensive approach to wildlife and environmental crime programming, including learning across GPCAE regional segments and specific human rights/gender understanding in this context.

The GPCAE welcomes and accepts the recommendation to strengthen UNODC presence in the region through smart partnerships to increase programmatic coherence and effectiveness on wildlife and environmental crime portfolio dependent on the availability of further funding. The GPCAE acknowledges the need for more monitoring report/tools and communications and accepts the recommendation to review the results framework with greater consideration of higher-level outcomes, impact, and implementation challenges.

In conclusion, the GPCAE accepts all the recommendations while remaining cognizant of the funding availability as well as human and other resources required to progressively realize the recommendations.
## INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Management Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. **Take stock and engage in dialogue with interested stakeholders to strengthen momentum on wildlife and environmental crime prioritisation and support:** It is recommended that participatory dialogues and consultation be initiated, including donors and key partners at regional and national levels, to examine project outcomes and clarify priorities, best strategic approach, and expectations of cooperation on wildlife and environmental crime in the subregion.  
One possible outcome of this dialogue and consultation exercise would be the drafting of an in-depth situational analysis, emphasizing regional opportunities and challenges specific to wildlife and environmental crime, and attached possible cooperation paths that could serve as a basis for future programming.  
*Action: Management and project team of the UNODC Global Programme on Crimes that Affect the Environment (GPCAE), in cooperation with UNODC Regional Office for West and Central Africa (in Senegal) (ROSEN), and consultations with potential donors, regional partners and interested stakeholders (part of or interested in taking part in project development). Timeframe: 3-6 months.* | Accepted |
| 2. **Readjust the scope and framework of UNODC intervention on wildlife and environmental crimes in the sub-region:** It is recommended to redesign and adjust UNODC wildlife and environmental crime programming in the subregion to optimize results, based on lessons learned and identified opportunities.  
When formulating the strategy, this would imply, among other operational recommendations, i) to diversify fundraising strategies, ii) to develop knowledge tools and strategic visions by major W&E crime priorities, and iii) to focus on strengthening national/subregional institutional mechanisms, existing structures, and expertise to maximize impact and outreach.  
*Action: Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination and team of UNODC GPCAE. Timeframe: 12-18 months.* | Accepted |
| 3. **Enrich capacity-building portfolio and focus interventions at operational levels:** It is recommended for future actions, to enrich the capacity-building portfolio and focus interventions at operational levels, notably through better use of partners expertise, | Accepted |

1 Should include the specific target group of implementing recipient(s) at UNODC.

2 Accepted/partially accepted or rejected for each recommendation. For any recommendation that is partially accepted or rejected, a short justification is to be added.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Management Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>focused-targeting of participants, and a diversified training offer to better respond to the evolution of criminal phenomenon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> <strong>Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination and team of UNODC GPCAE, and ROSEN.</strong> <strong>Timeframe:</strong> 12-18 months.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. At organisational level, consider developing a more balanced and comprehensive approach to wildlife and environmental crime programming:</strong> It is recommended to give greater consideration to more holistic approaches and cross-cutting aspects such as gender and human rights when formulating and implementing follow up or future interventions on crimes that affect the environment in the subregion, and as part of the GPCAE. That would integrate increased opportunities for learning and exchanges across GPCAE regional segments and projects and define more specifically Human Rights and Gender Equality (HRGE) and Leaving no one behind (principle) (LNOB) understanding in the context of wildlife and environmental crime.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> <strong>Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination of UNODC GPCAE, UNODC Environment Team and possible UNODC Research and Trend Analysis Branch (RAB).</strong> <strong>Timeframe:</strong> 24-36 months</td>
<td><strong>Accepted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Continue strengthening UNODC presence in the subregion through smart partnerships:</strong> It is recommended to strengthen UNODC presence in the subregion, including through smart partnerships to increase UNODC programmatic coherence, added value and effectiveness on wildlife and environmental crime portfolio. This could be done through i) broadening and increasing levels of staffing assigned to regional cooperation; ii) strengthening and expanding where relevant UNODC programming synergies (AIRCOP, CEB-GPAC) and cooperation with UN agencies to optimize costs, coherence and effectiveness of intervention(In that line the UNOCA-UNODC-UNESCO-ECCAS consortium under discussion could be an interesting way forward); and iii) extending the partnership landscape to other relevant and concerned actors, including NGOs, and academia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> <strong>Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination of UNODC GPCAE, United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa (UNOCA) and UNODC Environment Team.</strong> <strong>Timeframe:</strong> 12-18 months</td>
<td><strong>Accepted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Monitoring and reporting for impact:</strong> It is recommended to review result frameworks with greater consideration of higher-level outcomes, impact, and challenges of implementation, and with the view of more regular monitoring report/tools and communications.</td>
<td><strong>Accepted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations¹</td>
<td>Management Response²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Action: Management of UNODC GPCA, in cooperation with project coordination of UNODC GPCA and UNODC Management. Timeframe: 18-24 months.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

With more than 200 million hectares of forests and a reserve of diverse protected species, wild fauna and flora, Central Africa has become highly vulnerable to crimes against wildlife and natural resources. Launched in 2014, the UNODC Global Programme on Crimes that Affect the Environment (GPCAE – GLOZ31) supports Member States to address the phenomenon and to improve cooperation across sectors, concerned authorities and borders. The project under evaluation, entitled “Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources” (GLOZ31-CA), funded by the European Union, constitutes one of its regional segments. It seeks to enhance governments capacities in Central Africa to disrupt the incentives chains conducive to wildlife crimes and illicit trafficking of natural resources that impact governance, security, and peace in the sub-region.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The evaluated project aims at supporting Central African States and regional capacities to prevent and reduce wildlife crime and illicit trafficking of natural resources in the sub-region. Funded by the European Union, the project implemented by UNODC is part of an inter-regional cooperation effort to support the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) institutional capacities in the peace and security sector (PARCIC - Programme d'appui aux Réformes et au Renforcement des Capacités Institutionnelles de la CEEAC). Adopting a systemic approach to capacity-building across the entire criminal chain (“crime scene to court” approach), the project was developed in the view of i) reinforcing national capacity to detect and investigate wildlife and forest crime, to prosecute offenders, and to adjudicate the crimes; ii) promoting regional cooperation between ECCAS Member States; and iii) reinforcing the capacity of Member States to address corruption and money-laundering as related to wildlife and natural resources crimes. With a total overall budget of EUR 6.107.000 (with 98.22 % of total budget funded by the EU and 1.78 % of it through UNODC contribution), the project was implemented in six pilot countries (Cameroon, Central African Republic (CAR), Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Gabon, and the Republic of the Congo) over a 5-year period (February 2018-January 2023), including a one-year extension period.

PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION

The Final In-Depth Evaluation of the Project GLOZ31-CA segment assesses the implementation and contributions of the project in achieving its three objectives over its entire timeframe (1 February 2018 – 31 January 2023) and across the six pilot countries. The evaluation utilizes a theory-based, mixed-method and triangulated approach to examine how far the project has made a difference in targeted countries with regard to their capacity to address and organize inter-agency and regional cooperation mechanisms to fight wildlife crime and trafficking of natural resources in Central Africa. The evaluation derives recommendations, best practices and lessons learned to inform future follow up and programming. More broadly, it looks at the extent to which the intervention contributed to induce a strategic change of approach to combat wildlife crime and natural resource trafficking at national levels while encouraging regional cooperation and institutional strengthening. The OECD-DAC evaluation criteria were applied in a tailored manner along with

---

4 https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm
human rights, gender, disability, and leaving-no-one-behind lenses, in line with UNEG and UNODC evaluation norms and standards\(^5\).

**MAIN FINDINGS**

**Relevance:** As a regional component of UNODC’s Global Programme on Crimes that Affect the Environment (GPCAE-GLOZ 31), the project very obviously responds to the increasing concerns, internationally, about wildlife and environmental crime, including illegal trade in wildlife and forest products and other natural resources. A direct outcome of the EU-supported multidimensional programme PARCIC to accompany ECCAS reforms and institutional capacity, the project aligns with donor and key partners priorities. While fit for purpose, some implementation challenges have tended to overshadow the strategic significance of the intervention within this framework. However, the capacity-building interventions with organisational missions and mandates have been highly relevant at national levels. Despite clear contributions to SDG15 (Protect ecosystems and forests) and SDG 16 (Peaceful and inclusive societies), the design of the project has not incorporated explicit measures of success.

**Efficiency** - The project has faced important efficiency and programmatic delivery challenges, resulting in a delayed and unbalanced implementation of objectives. Several factors and considerations explain these shortcomings, including an unusual level of personnel turnover within the project team, external ownership deficits affecting the overall project coordinating structure, and miscommunications on project ambitions and feasibility among key project stakeholders. In its second half period and once fully staffed, the project efficiently recontextualized its action, caught up on and expanded deliveries in a satisfactory manner given the context, highlighting UNODC capacity to adjust and respond to challenges. The project monitoring and results framework did not fully reflect implementation challenges, project vision and impact beyond activities implementation.

**Coherence** – Despite variation across countries, the project established appropriate mechanisms with relevant national authorities to achieve project outcomes and developed adequate synergies with other UNODC programs. This contributed to strengthening UNODC programmatic coherence in the fields of crimes that affect the environment, border security and, to some extent, anti-corruption; as well as UNODC presence in the region. The project also established participatory and collaborative partnerships with key partners across pilot countries that were instrumental in developing capacity-building activities, encouraging inter-agency collaborative mechanisms, and strengthening momentum around prioritization of wildlife and natural resource crimes at country level. GLOZ31-CA contributions were complementary to two relevant interregional cooperation frameworks – PARCIC and indirectly to ECOFAC-6 (EU-ECCAS Regional Cooperation Programme to protect Biodiversity and Fragile Ecosystems of Central Africa). Yet, the project’s intervention logic turned out to be quite ambitious. The project’s partnership structure encountered some challenges that had direct effects on project planning and operationalisation. More broadly, missed opportunities were identified with other UN agencies and specialized agencies on wildlife and environmental crime (W&E), as well as with other actors concerned with W&E crimes such as local NGOs and academia.

**Effectiveness** – There are good levels of utility of the project activities and of fruitful dialogue-building between recipient authorities across the region and the UNODC Project Office, including with ROSEN, AIRCOP

---

and GPCAE management. Significant and rapid progress was observed in its capacity-building objectives, mainly between 2021 and 2023, even though they were uneven and limited in scope. Among the project’s main achievements, the evaluation highlights the development of ready-to-use rapid reference guides, essential crime scene management and investigative and prosecutorial methods and knowledge transfer including through train-the-trainer programmes and research products, and the development of forensic capacities. In its entirety, the project presents however mixed and delayed results mainly due to efficiency challenges and a complex implementation context. Supplemented human resources and a recontextualized strategy effectively reversed and accelerated the project’s implementation trend. There is a sense of positive yet unfinished work, with limited indication of optimization of project gains beyond the project implementation phase.

**Impact** – The project achieved a number of short- to medium-term results notably in terms of enhanced national investigative, prosecutorial, and judicial capacities, prioritisation and perception changes at individual levels, skill developments, forensic enhancement and dissemination of ready-to-use tools. Mentoring activities also played an important role in assisting interested authorities and Member States in the pursuit of key wildlife and natural resources trafficking cases. In that sense, project achievements contributed to building essential foundations to initiate a change of strategic approach to combat wildlife crime and natural-resource trafficking. However, the project scope and implementation pace made it difficult to anticipate any long-term impact until now, particularly in view of the difficult operationalisation of the project gains, and the incremental change and challenging factors, such as staff turnover, the continued need for funding, structural constraints of institutions, and the need for cooperation at a national and regional level.

**Sustainability** – The project has provided a basis for building long-term improvements in combating wildlife and natural-resource crime and contributed to sustaining demand for increased regional and national mobilizations in that regard. Some structures at the national level are in place to do this, notably through project support to capacity-building, but the sustainability of the results remains to be seen and would require follow up actions. There would be challenges for any continuation, including funding, security issues in some areas, and various factors that undermine the effectiveness of the project action.

**Human rights, Gender and Leaving no one behind** - Cross-cutting issues such as gender equity and vulnerability, gender equality, human rights and inclusion of vulnerable populations were insufficiently integrated in the project and did not represent central elements in its implementation. Links could have been drawn in a clearer manner notably how the project relates to environmental justice, due process of law/rights to justice for persons investigated for offences related to wildlife and natural resources crimes, and preventive approaches in line with the needs of concerned communities. This may also be explained by institutional and cultural biases, in particular concerning gender representation.

**MAIN CONCLUSIONS**

On the basis of triangulated findings, the evaluation concludes that, overall, the project achievements, although unbalanced and rather limited in scope, contributed to strengthening capacities and establishing mechanism and tools aimed at creating a more enabling environment for a change of strategic approach to combat wildlife crime and natural-resource trafficking. While the 2021 re-focus on national levels and project management reactivity were welcome in terms of relevance, coherence and efficiency, regional objectives took however time to materialize, and put into question the project’s effectiveness and impact. There is a need to redirect the project focus towards operational units and agents acting on the ground, in addition to
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their institutional counterparts. The project demonstrated important efficiency gaps that impacted its performance and the level of satisfaction over results achieved and communications. The project’s top-down approach may have led to missed opportunities for more adequate programmatic planning and to diverging appreciations of existing operationalisation needs and challenges. The results framework and implied theory of change need to be revised, to better reflect progress made against targets over time, and advancement made through dialogue, sharing of expertise and cognitive influence (policy approaches – “crime scene to court”, prioritization of specific crimes such as poaching, wood trafficking etc.).

MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1 – TAKE STOCK AND ENGAGE IN DIALOGUE WITH INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS TO STRENGTHEN MOMENTUM ON WILDLIFE AND ENVIRONMENTAL CRIME PRIORITISATION AND SUPPORT

It is recommended that participatory dialogues and consultations be initiated, including donors and key partners at regional and national levels, to examine project outcomes and clarify priorities, best strategic approach, and expectations of cooperation on W&E crime in the subregion.

RECOMMENDATION 2 – READJUST THE SCOPE AND FRAMEWORK OF UNODC INTERVENTION ON WILDLIFE AND ENVIRONMENTAL CRIMES IN THE SUB-REGION

It is recommended to redesign and adjust UNODC W&E programming in the subregion to optimize results, based on lessons learned and identified opportunities. When formulating the strategy, this would imply, among other operational recommendations, i) to diversify fundraising strategies, ii) develop knowledge tools and strategic visions by major W&E crime priorities, and iii) focus on strengthening national/regional institutional mechanisms, existing structures, and expertise to maximize impact and outreach.

RECOMMENDATION 3 – ENRICH CAPACITY-BUILDING PORTFOLIO AND FOCUS INTERVENTIONS AT OPERATIONAL LEVELS

To build on the project’s gains and improve the relevance and coherence of the capacity-building strategies and processes, it is recommended for future actions, to enrich the capacity-building portfolio and focus interventions at operational levels, notably through better use of partners expertise, focused-targeting of participants, a diversified training offer to better respond to the evolution of the phenomenon.

MAIN LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICE

This evaluation led to draw some key lessons. First, to maximize project efficiency and effectiveness, project planning needs to adequately consider in-field staffing needs and conduct a thorough assessment of the context of implementation (structural, political economy, security, risks, actors mapping etc.) to avoid delays and mixed expectations, especially when projects seek ambitious political and social changes. Second, a comprehensive approach to capacity development also needs to consider a proper balancing of institutional and operational capacity strengthening to optimize the intervention gains in the long run. In that regard, the inclusive and participatory approach and use of in-country expertise, systems, and infrastructures (such as those in place to develop the Rapid Reference Guides, of the Forensic lab of the National Agency for National Parks of Gabon (ANPN) or the Garoua Wildlife School) constituted a good practice that created opportunities for enhanced ownership of the final products. Besides, pairing expertise and building synergies across UNODC
programs also improved efficiency, effectiveness and programmatic coherence, and generated impetus for future joint initiatives.
### SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Despite positive results notably in terms of enhanced national investigative capacities, changes of perception at individual levels, and forensic enhancement, the project demonstrated important efficiency gaps that impacted its performance and the level of satisfaction over results achieved and communications. The project top-down approach may have led to missed opportunities for more adequate programmatic planning and to diverging appreciation of existing operationalisation needs and challenges.</td>
<td>Key informant interviews, case studies, field visit, desk review, EQs and survey.</td>
<td>1. Take stock and engage in dialogue with interested stakeholders to strengthen momentum on wildlife and environmental crime prioritisation and support: It is recommended that participatory dialogues and consultation be initiated, including donors and key partners at regional and national levels, to examine project outcomes and clarify priorities, best strategic approach, and expectations of cooperation on W&amp;E crime in the subregion. One possible outcome of this dialogue and consultations exercise would be the drafting of an in-depth situational analysis, emphasizing regional opportunities and challenges specific to W&amp;E crime, and attached possible cooperation paths that could serve as a basis for future programming. Action: Management and project team of the UNODC Global Programme on Crimes that Affect the Environment (GPCAE), in cooperation with UNODC Regional Office for West and Central Africa (in Senegal) (ROSEN), and consultations with potential donors, regional partners and interested stakeholders (part of or interested in taking part in project development). Timeframe: 3-6 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. The project laid the groundwork for increased political buy-in, and continued efforts to sustain momentum on W&E crimes priorities and enhanced national and regional capacities in that sense. Rapid results were observed in terms of capacity-building mainly in the project’s second phase of implementation, despite being unbalanced and limited in scope. This highlighted UNODC capacity to adjust and recontextualize its actions to respond to evolving contexts and challenges. There is thus a need to optimize the project gain and plan follow up/future interventions within a more coherent, efficient, and realistic approach. | Key informant interviews, case studies, field visit, desk review, EQs and survey. | 2. **Readjust the scope and framework of UNODC intervention on wildlife and environmental crimes in the subregion**: It is recommended to redesign and adjust UNODC wildlife and environmental crime programming in the subregion to optimize results, based on lessons learned and identified opportunities. When formulating the strategy, this would imply, among other operational recommendations, i) to diversify fundraising strategies, ii) develop knowledge tools and strategic visions by major W&E crime priorities, and iii) focus on strengthening national/regional institutional mechanisms, existing structures, and expertise to maximize impact and outreach.  
*Action: Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination and team of UNODC GPCAE. Timeframe: 12-18 months.* |
| 3. There are good levels of utility of the project activities. The project contributed to build some essential foundations and tools to initiate a change of strategic approach to combat wildlife crime and natural-resource trafficking, but its pace and efficiency gaps made it difficult to anticipate any long-term impact until now, particularly in view of the difficult operationalisation of the project gains, and challenging factors, such as staff turnover. | Key informant interviews, case studies, field visit, desk review, EQs and survey. | 3. **Enrich capacity-building portfolio and focus interventions at operational levels**: It is recommended for future actions, to enrich the capacity-building portfolio and focus interventions at operational levels, notably through better use of partners expertise, focused-targeting of participants, and a diversified training offer to better respond to the evolution of the criminal phenomenon.  
*Action: Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination and team of UNODC GPCAE, and ROSEN. Timeframe: 12-18 months.* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Preventive measures and cross-cutting issues such as equity and</td>
<td>Key informant interviews, desk review,</td>
<td>4. At organisational level, consider developing a more balanced and comprehensive approach to wildlife and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vulnerability, gender equality, human rights and inclusion of vulnerable</td>
<td>survey.</td>
<td>environmental crime programming: It is recommended to give greater consideration to more holistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populations were insufficiently integrated in the project and did not</td>
<td></td>
<td>approaches and cross-cutting aspects such as gender and human rights when formulating and implementing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>represent central elements in its implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>follow up or future interventions on crimes that affect the environment in the subregion, and as part of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the GPCAE. That would integrate increased opportunities for learning and exchanges across GPCAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regional segments and projects and define more specifically Human Rights and Gender Equality (HRGE) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaving no one behind (principle) (LNOB) understanding in the context of wildlife and environmental crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action: Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination of UNODC GPCAE, UNODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Team and possible UNODC Research and Trend Analysis Branch (RAB). Timeframe: 24-36 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In its second half period and once fully staffed, the project</td>
<td>Key informant interviews,</td>
<td>5. **Continue strengthen UNODC presence in the subregion through smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiently recontextualized its action, and made positive use of</td>
<td>desk review, field visit.</td>
<td>partnerships:** It is recommended to strengthen UNODC presence in the region,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-house synergies to catch up and expand deliveries in a satisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td>including though smart partnerships to increase UNODC programmatic coherence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner. Despite variation across countries and initial shortfalls, the</td>
<td></td>
<td>added value and effectiveness on W&amp;E crime portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project then established mechanisms with relevant actors to enhance</td>
<td></td>
<td>This could be done through i) broadening and increasing levels of staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project operationalisation and results.</td>
<td></td>
<td>assigned to regional cooperation; ii) strengthening and expanding where relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNODC programming synergies (AIRCOP, CEB-GPAC) and UN agencies to optimize costs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coherence and effectiveness of intervention (In that line the UNOCA-UNODC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNESCO-ECCAS consortium under discussion could be an interesting way forward) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii) extending the partnership landscape to other relevant and concerned actors,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>including NGOs, and academia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of UNODC GPCAE, United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa (UNOCA) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNODC Environment Team. <strong>Timeframe:</strong> 12-18 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Result frameworks do not consider the full project history nor</td>
<td>Desk review; key informant</td>
<td>6. <strong>Monitoring and reporting for impact:</strong> It is recommended to review result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delineate clear outcome indicators. Qualitative assessments are</td>
<td>interviews; field visit.</td>
<td>frameworks with greater consideration of higher-level outcomes, impact, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also missing to reflect on implementation challenges, the project</td>
<td></td>
<td>challenges of implementation, and with the view of more regular monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vision progress, soft influence gains and contributions to achieving</td>
<td></td>
<td>report/tools and communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the SDGs.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of UNODC GPCAE and UNODC Management. <strong>Timeframe:</strong> 18-24 months.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Crimes that affect the environment are increasingly serious, impacting sustainable development (including global health through the risks of zoonotic diseases transmissions), and are more and more intertwined with other types of transnational organized crimes, including money laundering. With more than 200 million hectares of forests and a reserve of diverse protected species, wild fauna and flora, Central Africa has become highly vulnerable to crimes against wildlife and natural resources. Latest global figures show that 18% of estimated poached elephants in Africa between 2010-2018 were observed in Central Africa (figure 1); while the illegal logging in Central and West Africa (which is home to the second largest rainforest on Earth) has led to the loss of 30% of tree cover since 2001 (Africa Center for Strategic Studies). Yet, in a region with porous borders and insufficient legal frameworks, limited specialisation of law enforcement authorities and low prioritisation of the phenomenon have left wildlife and environmental criminality in a grey zone, often under-investigated and unpunished.

Figure 1: Estimated annual numbers of illegally killed elephants in Central, Eastern and Southern Africa

Based on the principles and obligations of UNTOC and UNCAC, crimes that affect wild fauna and flora have become of direct and growing relevance to the UNODC mandate. In 2014, UNODC launched its Global Programme on Crimes that Affect the Environment (GPCAE) to strengthen the capacity of governments: i) to investigate and criminally prosecute wildlife crime, illegal logging, and related trafficking of natural resources; ii) to better respond to the links between organized crime and illicit trafficking of natural resources; and iii) to improve cooperation across sectors, concerned authorities and institutions, and borders. In 2018, the European Union funded the implementation of the evaluated project entitled “Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources” (GLOZ31-CA), which became a regional segment of the UNODC Global Programme. Through this project framework,

---

UNODC also extended and strengthened its presence in the subregion where a dedicated project office was then created.

OVERALL CONCEPT AND DESIGN

The evaluated project “Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources” in Central Africa (GLOZ31-CA segment) aims at “enhancing national investigative, prosecutorial, and judicial capacities and regional cooperation among ECCAS Member states to prevent and reduce wildlife crime and illicit trafficking of natural resources in Central Africa”\(^8\).

Financed by the European Union under the 11th European Development Fund (EDF), it was designed to contribute directly to the implementation of the EU Regional Indicative Programme 2014-2020 for Central Africa adopted in June 2015 (priority areas 1 and 3). As part of an inter-regional cooperation effort, the intervention directly contributes to the EU-supported multidimensional programme to accompany ECCAS reforms, and institutional capacity-building to strengthen its ability to act in the peace and security sector (PARCIC - Programme d’appui aux Réformes et au Renforcement des Capacités Institutionnelles de la CEEAC). Divided into 4 thematic components and 7 results objectives, PARCIC functions on tripartite agreements, involving ECCAS as its main coordinating entity, the EU as main partner, and specialised implementing partners in each domain of intervention as depicted in figure 2. UNODC acts as the implementing agency of PARCIC output 6 under component 3 (strengthening ECCAS capacities in the fight against wildlife crime and illegal exploitation of natural resources), through a delegation agreement in indirect management of EUR 6.1M, signed in December 2017 for a 48-month period from February 2018.

The UNODC Sustainable Livelihoods Unit, and then the Environmental Team in Vienna coordinate the project as a regional component of GPCAE, while a UNODC project office has been installed in Libreville, Gabon in 2018 to ensure project implementation at country and regional levels. UNODC collaborates with the ECCAS Secretariat and its Member States, national institutions, as well as non-governmental organisations, including TRACE, TRAFFIC, African Parks and others in the implementation of activities. The only direct implementing partner in project countries is TRACE.

The project adopts a systemic approach to capacity-building across the entire criminal chain (“crime scene to court” approach). It is developed in six pilot countries – Cameroon, Central African Republic (CAR), Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Gabon, and the Republic of the Congo (map 1) and articulated around three main objectives, as follows:

1. Reinforcing national capacity to detect and investigate wildlife and forest crime, to prosecute offenders, and to adjudicate the crimes;
2. Promoting cooperation at the regional level between ECCAS Member States; and

---

\(^8\) Project global objective, as per project Logframe and project document – EU/UNODC – « Renforcement des capacités nationales et régionales des forces d’application de la loi, des procureurs et du système judiciaire et renforcement de la coopération entre les États membres de la CEEAC pour lutter contre la criminalité liée aux espèces sauvages et le trafic illicite des ressources naturelles » p.3. (Authors’translation)
3. Reinforcing the capacity of Member States to address corruption and money-laundering.

The direct beneficiaries of the project are ECCAS as the primary target of PARCIC and, 6 of its 11 Member States where activities have been implemented. As such, the project’s direct beneficiaries regroup national law enforcement agencies (police, gendarmerie, eco-guard, national parks agents, wildlife and forestry authorities, customs, etc.), prosecutors and judicial actors, including those specialised in anti-corruption and anti-money laundering, as well as legislators and CITES Management Authorities, in the six pilot countries.

More broadly, the project contributes to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 16 (Peaceful and inclusive societies) and 15 (Protect ecosystems and forests). Indirect beneficiaries are the communities affected by wildlife crime and illicit trafficking of natural resources in Central Africa, at the population level. As it unfolded, the relevance of the project’s contribution to preventing the transmission of zoonotic diseases, as related to illicit trafficking of wildlife and natural resources, was noted, as the COVID-19 pandemic eruption highlighted the risks and potential links attached to both phenomena.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The Final In-Depth Evaluation of the Project “Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources” in Central Africa (GLOZ31-CA segment) assessed the implementation and contributions of the project in achieving its three objectives. The evaluation covers GLOZ31 Central Africa-segment in its entire timeframe since February 2018, including its one-year extension (1 February 2018 – 31 January 2023) and its different components, reviewing results based on implementation of activities as follows:

- Result 1: focus on Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Cameroon, Chad, Gabon, Congo.
- Result 2: focus on Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Cameroon.
- Result 3: focus on Gabon and Democratic Republic of the Congo.

It derives recommendations, best practices and lessons learned, identifies areas of improvement, and records achievements reached in the course of the project implementation, to inform follow up and/or future programming in the region and beyond, on this theme. This is conducted following OECD-DAC criteria9 of evaluation (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact, and sustainability) and applying human rights, gender, disability and leaving-no-one-behind lenses, in line with UNEG and UNODC evaluation norms and standards10.

This evaluation serves UNODC (as the implementing agency) and the European Union (as main donor) by providing conclusions and recommendations in order to seek agreement on possible follow-up actions or future programming, subject to funding availability. The main users of the evaluation include senior management of the UNODC GPCAE (now the Environment Team of the UNODC Border Management Branch), the project team in Libreville Project office (Gabon), UNODC focal points in Central Africa, the EU Commission

---

9 https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm
and country delegations, and ECCAS (Commissioner for the Environment, Natural Resources, Agriculture and Rural Development) as main coordinating partner. Secondarily, the evaluation may also be used by pilot countries’ ministries, agencies and departments of interested Governments, as well as other key partners and stakeholders of the project as it unfolds, such as UN Regional Office for Central Africa (UNOCA), or the Commission of Central African Forests (COMIFAC - Commission des Forêts d’Afrique Centrale).

THE COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation was conducted by a gender-balanced team of two international experts of complementary expertise, and both fluent in French and English - the main languages of the countries of project implementation. Specialised in organized crime and related policies studies, and their linkages with sustainable development, Deborah Alimi (team leader, evaluation expert) is a professional expert in development cooperation, UNODC programming and evaluation. Jonathan Barzdo (substantive expert, wildlife crime) is an independent consultant on wildlife trade and use.

MAP OF PROJECT COUNTRIES

Figure 3: Map of Project Countries

Source : EU GLOZ31 Mid-term Evaluation (Evaluation mi-parcours "Renforcement des capacités judiciaires des États membres de la CEEAC pour la lutte contre la criminalité liée aux espèces sauvages et le trafic des ressources naturelles"), April 2021, p. 7.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This section presents the approach, methods and data collection tools the evaluation team used for this evaluation as prepared and validated during its Inception phase.
FINAL IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF STRENGTHENING THE JUDICIAL CAPACITIES OF ECCAS MEMBER STATES TO COMBAT WILDLIFE CRIME AND TRAFFICKING IN NATURAL RESOURCES
(GLOZ31 – CENTRAL AFRICA)

APPROACH

Following UN guidelines and frameworks for evaluation\textsuperscript{11}, the evaluation team developed a \textit{theory-based, mixed-method approach} to first understand how the specific intervention was intended to work and the assumptions behind its logical framework. This approach was preferred to appreciate the project’s main achievements and possible limits. A Theory of Change (ToC) was first reconstituted, as outlined in the following section as a basis to observe to what extent the intervention has achieved its intended results and outcomes, and to develop the evaluation matrix and tools as presented in Annex II.

Following a \textit{contribution analysis}, the evaluation team examined how far the project has made a difference in targeted countries with regard to their capacity to address and to organize inter-agency and regional cooperation mechanisms to fight wildlife crime and trafficking of natural resources in Central Africa. Particular attention was given to hindering and facilitating factors that influenced the project implementation and expected contributions.

To that end, the evaluation exercise was broken down into \textbf{three phases} as follows:

- Inception phase, to constitute a general understanding of the project and develop the evaluation methodology and tools;
- Data collection and analysis phase, to refine data collection tools, collect and analyse information;
- Reporting phase, during which a draft evaluation report was prepared, reviewed for factual checking by the project team and sent to CLPs for comments after being cleared by IES, and finalised along with a summary and a presentation of key findings.

Throughout the evaluation process, the team adopted a \textit{cross-cutting approach} to human rights, gender, and leaving no one behind dimensions (HRG-LNOB), in line with UNEG’s guidance on \textit{Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations}. In addition to specific inclusion of HRG-LNOB questions in the evaluation matrix, the evaluation team assessed the extent to which the project has taken specific consideration and/or measures to integrate that dimension, in terms of both process and results. Tailoring the criteria to the evaluated project, the evaluation team also considered the specificities of the inter-connection between human rights and the environment, as well as autochthonous populations and communities affected by or concerned with wildlife crimes (including human/wildlife conflict), and illicit trafficking of natural resources.

Efforts were directed toward the inclusion of the voices and perspectives of all concerned stakeholders but due to resource constraints, only direct project stakeholders and beneficiaries could be met (see Limitations section).

Finally, this evaluation was conducted with \textit{culturally-sensitive and conflict-sensitive lenses:} i) to ensure evaluation questions and data collection tools are tailored to the specificities of the contexts of implementation; ii) to grasp, as closely as possible, in-country understandings of the social phenomenon at stake (crimes that affect the environment); and iii) to consider the possible influence on the project of a context marked by episodes of instability and governance vulnerabilities.

\textsuperscript{11} The team committed to follow the methodological standards as specified in the UNODC’s \textit{Evaluation Handbook}, the \textit{United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards} as well as \textit{UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation}, and the dedicated ToR for this evaluation available in Annex I.
DATA COLLECTION TOOLS AND SAMPLING STRATEGY

The evaluation was conducted based on an inclusive and participatory approach to data collection, with adequate triangulation of data to arrive at credible, reliable, and unbiased findings. This implied the constitution of a corpus of primary sourced information, through the development of qualitative and quantitative data collection tools, including in-depth interviews with key stakeholders (KII); specific emailed questionnaires (EQs); online survey; and case studies (CS) of most relevant activities as identified through desk review and in consultation with the project team. Focus groups were also initially foreseen but could not take place due to a limited number of participants responding (8 in total for 3 thematic focus groups). Each tool is presented in detail in Annex II. The focus was on the views of parties identified as key stakeholders of the project, including Core Learning Partners (CLPs), as presented in the Stakeholder recap table in Annex IV.

A total of 43 project documents have been reviewed and served as a basis for the reconstitution of the project Theory of Change. A comprehensive list is provided in Annex III.

As part of the data collection phase, efforts were directed toward the conduct of key informant semi-structured interviews (KII) with Core Learning Partners (CLPs) and key stakeholders to collect information related to project implementation and context, results achieved, facilitating or challenging factors, sustainability and lessons learned. A purposeful sampling technique was preferred to ensure qualitative feedback that covers most aspects of project results chains, from its development to its achievements.

A total of 45 interviews took place (M=31, F=14) out of 58 requests. 28 were conducted in a remote manner (using MS Teams, Zoom, Google Meet or WhatsApp as per interviewees preferences), and 17 were interviewed in-person as part of a 5-day field mission in Libreville, Gabon and Yaoundé, Cameroon. Annex II and figure 4 present KII per type of stakeholder and details KII sampling strategy, questionnaire and process.

As part of the data collection phase, efforts were directed toward the conduct of key informant semi-structured interviews (KII) with Core Learning Partners (CLPs) and key stakeholders to collect information related to project implementation and context, results achieved, facilitating or challenging factors, sustainability and lessons learned. A purposeful sampling technique was preferred to ensure qualitative feedback that covers most aspects of project results chains, from its development to its achievements.

A total of 45 interviews took place (M=31, F=14) out of 58 requests. 28 were conducted in a remote manner (using MS Teams, Zoom, Google Meet or WhatsApp as per interviewees preferences), and 17 were interviewed in-person as part of a 5-day field mission in Libreville, Gabon and Yaoundé, Cameroon. Annex II and figure 4 present KII per type of stakeholder and details KII sampling strategy, questionnaire and process.

As part of the data collection phase, efforts were directed toward the conduct of key informant semi-structured interviews (KII) with Core Learning Partners (CLPs) and key stakeholders to collect information related to project implementation and context, results achieved, facilitating or challenging factors, sustainability and lessons learned. A purposeful sampling technique was preferred to ensure qualitative feedback that covers most aspects of project results chains, from its development to its achievements.

A total of 45 interviews took place (M=31, F=14) out of 58 requests. 28 were conducted in a remote manner (using MS Teams, Zoom, Google Meet or WhatsApp as per interviewees preferences), and 17 were interviewed in-person as part of a 5-day field mission in Libreville, Gabon and Yaoundé, Cameroon. Annex II and figure 4 present KII per type of stakeholder and details KII sampling strategy, questionnaire and process.

In addition, questionnaires were emailed (EQs) to project stakeholders who could not be interviewed because of time constraints or who played support roles in project implementation. These included UNODC staff in-country, staff in key beneficiary institutions at governmental level and staff in donor in-country delegations.

---

12 Project stakeholders are understood as all organisations and individuals that supported, participated in or contributed to the design and/or implementation of the project, and those who benefited from its intervention, whether directly as participant or indirectly as implementers.
As the primary focus of the project under evaluation was technical assistance and capacity-building, an end-user survey was administered based on a voluntary sampling approach (see Annex II) to gauge project usefulness, direct impact and satisfaction levels at beneficiaries’ individual and organisational levels. The evaluation survey had a quite low response rate. An online survey form was sent to 142 participants, 17 emails bounced back, and 26 responses were received (M= 80%, F=18%), leading to a response rate of 20.8%. This was mainly explained by staff turnover and irregular internet connectivity in the subregion.

The evaluation team leader conducted a field mission in Libreville, Gabon and Yaoundé, Cameroon from 25-31 March 2023. The field mission included 17 KIIs with and a site visit to ANPN Laboratory in Libreville, Gabon. The report is annexed to this evaluation (Annex VI).

In addition, three specific project deliverables were studied, to highlight the project’s contributions to capacity-building in Central Africa to address wildlife crime and illicit trafficking in natural resources as follows:

- Rapid Reference Guide (RRG) development for investigators and prosecutors in Congo, DRC, Cameroon, Chad, and the Central African Republic;
- Crime Scene Management Training series;
- Train the Trainer programme at the Garoua Wildlife School (GWS), Cameroon.

The results are presented in Annex V and serve to exemplify core evaluation findings.

**SOURCES AND TRIANGULATION OF DATA**

The primary data sources included, among others, key informant interviews (KIIs) with key stakeholders, emailed questionnaires, online surveys and a field mission. Secondary data sources included all project documentation and documents requested during the data collection phase as detailed in Annex III, as well as supplementary publications providing background and context, related to international standards and global trends in crimes that affect the environment.

To increase the validity and reliability of the evaluation results, the evaluation team used triangulation of:

- data collection methods, using a mixed evaluation approach, involving document review, interviews with a variety of stakeholders, online surveys and in-depth case studies;
- data sources: primary data were cross-referenced with secondary ones;
- cross-referencing of information collected through the evaluation with external resources, such as relevant external UN documentation on W&E crime in Central Africa, and perspectives from experts and academics in the field to inform future programming.

**THEORY OF CHANGE FOR THIS EVALUATION**

The evaluation team reconstituted and readjusted the project’s theory of change (ToC) to be used for this evaluation. This ToC is an inferred representation deriving from a refinement exercise of the initial project logframe and a review of results frameworks, to clarify the intended results chain of the project as expressed in project documentation.

The figure at the end of this section provides a comprehensive picture of the intended causal pathways and interactions between output, outcome, and impact level respectively. It is analysed below from the right to the left side (from intended impacts/overall objective to the project outputs).
The overall objective of the project stated above is realised by contributing to three related and mutually reinforcing specific objectives as follows:

- **Specific Objective 1 (SO1): Reinforce national capacity** to prevent, detect, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate wildlife, forest crime and illicit trafficking of natural resources in Central Africa.
- **Specific Objective 2 (SO2): Reinforce cooperation at the regional level** between ECCAS Member States to fight against wildlife crime and illicit trafficking of natural resources.
- **Specific Objective 3 (SO3): Reinforce the capacity of Member States to address corruption and money-laundering** facilitating wildlife crime and illicit trafficking in natural resources in Central Africa.

The project’s results model is based on three main intervention areas – capacity-building, cooperation strengthening and knowledge provision – conducive to the delivery of several subsequent outcomes and outputs as described in the Figure below and thematically distinguished by different corresponding colours (blue, green, purple).

The project adopts a long-term intended impact pathway contributing to strengthen regional coordination capacities of ECCAS in a non-duplicative effort by the EU and UNODC, under the PARCIC framework, to contribute in synergy to peace and security efforts, through reduced crimes linked to wildlife and illicit trafficking of natural resources. By supporting the investigative and criminal justice chain in specific border areas, the project aimed at advancing the eco-security strategy developed by ECCAS. In line with UNODC’s “crime scene to court” approach, it was finally intended to contribute to a change of intervention logic, culture and practices in the fight against wildlife and environmental crimes towards more proactive and preventive dimensions. In that line, the focus has been put on investigative and prosecutorial capacities (as opposed to focusing on the act of committing a crime (in flagrante delicto)), and on the structural and incentive aspects of W&E crimes (corruption and money-laundering).

This ToC incorporates several assumptions of necessary conditions for the project to be successful in achieving its intended outcomes. These include no major change in resources available. It also assumes that committed counterparts and partners evolve in a stable and enabling political climate at both national and regional levels as well as in environments with favourable levels of security and stability. It is therefore worth mentioning that the project has been designed to respond to difficulties related to political and judicial prioritization and criminalization of wildlife and environmental crime, harmonization of crime control legal frameworks, and capacity-building of front-line agents and organisations responsible for the preservation of protected areas. Considering the above, as well as the project’s integration of the transnational nature of targeted crimes within a regional cooperation workstream, the evaluation team adjusted the scope of the evaluation exercise to include a transversal dimension of appreciation in addition to the OECD-DAC criteria of evaluation (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact and sustainability) as follows: To what extent has the project been able to induce a change of strategic approach to combat wildlife crime and natural resource trafficking while contributing to strengthening institutional capacity at the national and regional levels?

This consideration aims at capturing how far the project could lay down some conducive conditions for enhanced systemic and conceptual changes, notably to advance a “crime scene to court” approach. It also

---

13 As developed by the 2017 NDjamena Conference - Conférence des Ministres de la CEEAC sur l’éco-sécurité, le conflit homme/faune et les autres conflits liés à l’utilisation des terres en Afrique centrale. NDjamena, 25-28 juillet 2017

14 UNODC Approach to Crimes that Affect the Environment, and UNODC Approach to Crimes in the Forest Sector.
relates to the institutional and operational challenges that affected project implementation at the regional and national levels, as already identified by both project reporting documentation and the EU Mid-term evaluation (April 2021). More broadly, this adjustment may also help to nourish UNODC strategic reflection of how best to pursue its efforts “to empower counterparts and create sustainability by fostering a strong sense of national ownership through its work” as foreseen in its Global Programme on Crimes that Affect the Environment approach statement.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^\text{15}\) As described on UNODC approach page(https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/environment-climate/wildlife.html)
INTRODUCTION

Figure 5: GLOZ31-CA Theory of change as reconstituted by the Evaluation team.

Source: Evaluation team
The table below summarises the limitations of this evaluation and presents the mitigation measures undertaken to ensure the validity of findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitations to the evaluation</th>
<th>Mitigations measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation inquiry</strong></td>
<td>The evaluation team attempted to include consultations with wildlife and environmental crime experts in the subregion not closely involved with the project, who brought further insights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation is not addressing an inquiry to the general population nor to indirect beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation methodology</strong></td>
<td>The evaluation team applied a “do no harm” approach to data collection and requested the support of IES and the project team in relation to suitability of tools in each geographical and institutional context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The initial ToR for this evaluation foresaw the inclusion of a national consultant within the evaluation team, to facilitate access to national stakeholders and ensure cultural sensitivity of the evaluation process. This could not be achieved for administrative reasons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection exercise</strong></td>
<td>The evaluation team, in consultation with the project team, identified key trainees among CLPs and non-CLPs to ensure a minimal perspective on that project main component. Specific trainings were identified for evaluation case studies. Data were triangulated to compensate the low survey response rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and management turnover within key partners and recipients’ organisations impacted on rates of response to key data collection tools, notably the online survey and some KIIs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation team could not have access to groups considered most vulnerable here. In addition, extractive industries and private companies were not included in this evaluation, in view of the sensitivity of illicit natural-resource trade issues and because they were not directly involved in the evaluated project.</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation representatives who work closely in protected areas and with these populations (and not necessarily project stakeholders) were included in the data collection process. Questions related to the role of the private sector in the issues tackled by the project were added in KIIs where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal political dynamics and existing tensions in some countries have limited the participation of some key ministries in the data collection process.</td>
<td>Information was collected from other sources and triangulated accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country visits were constrained by the evaluation timeframe and to some extent the security conditions in some countries. No observation could be conducted in national parks/protected areas or at border areas.</td>
<td>The evaluation team mixed remote- and in-person data collection processes and conducted specific case studies to ensure in-depth information on specific interventions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limited internet reliability in the subregion impacted on the survey response rate and challenged the conduct of some KIIs in a remote manner.

Alternative channels of communication (e.g., WhatsApp) were used when possible. A supplementary field mission was organized to collect additional data.
II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

RELEVANCE

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

- To what extent have the objectives and outcomes of the project been consistent and relevant with regard to identifying recipients’ requirements, country needs, global priorities as well as partners’ and EU policies?
- Is the project fit for purpose in the context of the growing interest in wildlife and forest crimes internationally and UNODC’s role therein, including with regard to the 2030 Development Agenda and any relevant environmental protection agreements?

As a regional component of UNODC’s Global Programme on Crimes that Affect the Environment (GLOZ 31) the project very obviously responds to the increasing concerns, internationally, about wildlife and environmental crime, including illegal trade in wildlife and forest products and other natural resources. The implementation of the project, and its direct link to ECCAS, have also provided an opportunity for UNODC to reinforce its presence in Central Africa and its added value in the field of countering crimes that affect the environment. Stakeholders noted, in particular: its expertise and quality of training material; its reputation and dialogue building efforts; its international reach; its ability as a UN agency to engage and build political momentum with high levels of government, up to ministerial level; and its reach across many countries.

ALIGNMENT WITH DONOR’S PRIORITIES AND PARTNER’S NEEDS

The project constitutes a direct outcome result of the EU-supported multidimensional programme to accompany ECCAS reforms and institutional capacity-building to strengthen its ability to act in the peace and security sector (PARCIC - Programme d’appui aux Réformes et au Renforcement des Capacités Institutionnelles de la CEEAC). Through its technical assistance, the intervention complements the actions under the EU-funded ECOFAC 6 programme (Programme d’appui à la préservation de la biodiversité et des écosystèmes fragiles en Afrique Centrale). It also supports the implementation of the EU’s 2014-2020 Regional Indicative Programme for Central Africa, which was adopted in 2015, to improve natural resource management in ECCAS Member States. Stakeholders in Central Africa acknowledged these alignments. Project annual reports and monitoring indicators seemed however to only partially reflect programmatic contributions of the project in that regard. However, for some among donor country delegations and management level, in view of the rather partial achievements notably on strengthening regional capacities, the added value of UNODC’s involvement in the project appears to have been overshadowed.

GLOBAL PRIORITIES AND INTERNATIONAL LEVEL

There are obvious connections between the aim of the project and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), notably: SDG 15 (Protect ecosystems and forests) and SDG 16 (Peaceful and inclusive societies). Those are referenced in project documentation. However, the design of the project has not incorporated clear measures of success that would facilitate the use of the SDG indicators nor specific ones to show the project’s contribution to achieving those Goals.
The six pilot ECCAS Member States are all Parties to a number of relevant international treaties. CITES is probably of special relevance to the project. Moreover, four out of the six focus countries are currently (April 2023) subject to CITES recommendations to suspend trade in several species, because of inadequate enforcement and failure to comply with the provisions of the Convention. The evaluation found no indication that the activities under the project provided any assistance to the countries concerned to address the issues that resulted in these suspensions.

**CONTEXT RELEVANCE AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES**

The relevance of the aims of the project at the national level is not in doubt. Triangulated data show that the adequacy of training of officials or other agents from all parts of the criminal justice chain with organisational missions and mandates has clearly been appreciated. For many interviewed national stakeholders, the training was the first substantial exposure to the subject of wildlife and forest crime; while 59% of survey respondents indicated that the activities met the needs and priorities of their organisation to a large extent, and 36% to some extent.

There are other government departments or public organisations at the national level for which the project is especially relevant. A good example is the National Agency for National Parks (ANPN) Forensic Laboratory in Gabon. This laboratory provides a ground-breaking service to the criminal justice chain, not only in Gabon but for other countries of the region. It is ground-breaking because wildlife forensics is new to the courts of the region. ANPN has benefited from a development plan for the laboratory under the project, with important recommendations to be implemented. Outside of government, the aims of the project are also relevant to the activities of a number of non-governmental and public organisations. Notable examples are the TRACE Wildlife Forensics Network, which was a direct implementing partner, and African Parks, from which a number of parks and rangers were trained under the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY - RELEVANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● The project constitutes a direct outcome of the EU-supported PARCIC programme to accompany ECCAS reforms, but implementation challenges have tended to overshadow the strategic significance of the intervention within this framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The project addresses a globally recognized issue of illegal wildlife trade threatening biodiversity and sustainable development and aligns with political engagements of the countries and organisations involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The involvement of UNODC is widely recognized as adding value, but this was undermined by some implementation challenges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Notably: The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); the Convention on Biological Diversity; the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals; and the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance. All of these conventions include obligations relating to management and sustainable use of species or ecosystems.

17 In view of the concerns about illegal cross-border trade in wildlife specimens (including timber and other plant products), and because products of some highly threatened species have been identified as being traded illegally in large quantities from Central Africa to Asia (https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/prog/enforcement/E-CoP18-034-Threat-Assessment.pdf)

18 https://cites.org/eng/resources/ref/suspend.php
EFFICIENCY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

- To what extent was the process for implementing the activities and delivering the project outputs efficient, timely and cost-effective (timelines, communication of results, cooperation mechanisms), including in the context of the COVID-19 outbreak?

The project has faced important efficiency and programmatic delivery challenges. With a delayed and unbalanced implementation of objectives, the project under-delivered financially, spending 58% of its total budget. Two periods can be identified – a slow inception period, additionally affected by the COVID-19 pandemic (2018-2020), and an accelerated operationalization period, marked by faster and extensive delivery and further adjustments made as a result of the pandemic restrictions (2021-2023). Figure 6 presents the volume of activities delivered per year and objectives. Programmatic delivery accelerated pre-pandemic and found a speedy rhythm in its last two years, mainly towards its objective 1 as stated in project document ‘Reinforcing national capacities to detect, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate wildlife and forest crime’. In this connection, financial reports show an imbalance between HR/operating costs up to 2020. Operational costs increased as direct implementation of activities expanded to 5 countries. The project team was equipped with an additional Project Officer (P3) in support of the Project Coordinator. This was possible thanks to EU agreement to a 12-month extension (after the initial 48 months) with a budget realignment.

Figure 6: Distribution of project activities per year and objectives (2020-2022)

Several factors and considerations explain these shortcomings.

- The project, while ambitious in its geographical and thematic scope, had been initially understaffed and was marked by an unusual level of personnel turnover. As figure 7 shows, only one coordinator was first assigned to the task, helped by a UN Volunteer; the project coordinator position was filled 3 times in a 5-year period. UNODC’s initially limited presence in the region, and scarcity of national/regional experts on W&E crimes complicated the staffing situation. KIs and additional documentation suggest that diverging visions and miscommunications around staffing needs and cost attribution, between UNODC and donor, may have further influenced this situation. The evaluation
team also relates it to an organisational variable: the conditions placed on the project made the staffing subject to funding approval, which limits pre-selection or mapping of relevant experts prior to project operationalization.

Figure 7: Evolution of GLOZ31-CA Project staff (2018-2023)

Sources: Based on Annual reports, 2018-2022

- The project coordinating structure became fragile due to external factors, requiring the project managers to recontextualize the action several times. The ECCAS reform process (2015-2020) had a direct impact, leaving the project without a multi-stakeholder steering committee (COPILs) for more than two years. Limited internal capacities and expertise also prevented clear identification of national focal points and had direct consequences on the regional coordination of the project. With limited institutional ownership of the project, including within regional instances, the workplan proposed by UNODC had to be readjusted and its operationalization strategy changed towards a focus at national levels.

- To some extent, risk assessments and mapping of key stakeholders in-country did not sufficiently take into consideration existing political economies and internal dynamics in each country, which resulted in some cases of difficult engagements with some national authorities and partners.

- Miscommunications and diverging views on project ambitions and identity between UNODC project coordination and EU Regional delegation seems to have given stakeholders differing perceptions of project progress and needs, as confirmed in KIIs, notably in the context of the last, no-cost, extension request. As the project developed, the need for more regular and detailed updates on planned activities and project developments (including implementation conditions, key visible results, and possible long-term effects), both pre- and post- implementation, arose. In cases of limited reporting, implementation challenges had the tendency to overshadow, at times, the project’s accomplishments. Finally, despite efforts to advertise and publicly display EU support and sponsorship of project materials and communication tools, some gaps in the implementation of the project visibility strategy were reported, affecting satisfaction levels around project performance and results.

On the positive side, the evaluation team found that all activities implemented were delivered in an efficient and satisfactory manner. The overall efficiency of the project was highly enhanced by the setting up of an operational staff that changed the whole dynamic of project implementation and progress. Survey results and KIIs with partner organisations, beneficiaries’ ministries and authorities, as well as donor delegations, generally express positive perspectives on the activities and inputs of projects, both in terms of relevance,
Project stakeholders, including donor delegations and partners, positively welcomed the quality of the actions delivered and valued UNODC efforts to readjust its action, catch up on and expand the project deliveries. Across all KIIs, once fully staffed, the project team has been recognized for its professionalism, dynamism and dedication. Adaptation measures conducive to picking up project delivery include:

- Recontextualized vision and collaboration mechanisms at national levels;
- Increased reaching out to ECCAS Commissioner unit and technical commissions (COMIFAC);
- Extended consultation with CSOs and international partners;
- Recruitment and selection of project team members with increased expertise and knowledge of the region and the subject;19;
- Efforts directed to build greater UNODC coherence and synergies (notably with AIRCOP).

These readjustments have also been possible and facilitated thanks to the donor’s flexibility and agreement to adjust its contribution to address the challenges related to the COVID restrictions and repeated staff changes, which affected the entire implementation of the action. In that sense, the budget allocated to UNODC staff, which amounts to 1,595,631 EUR (delegation agreement, signed on 19/12/2017) has been increased to 2,062,676 EUR, i.e., more than 33.5% of the overall budget for this project (rider 1, signed on 01/03/2021).

In addition to their political and diplomatic functions and support, ROSEN and Global Programme management positively contributed to enhance dialogue with national authorities, engage more closely with donor representatives, notable at the regional level, and clarify, when needed, administrative issues, notably with recruitment.

Nevertheless, delays in administrative and procurement processes (notably recruitment and travel and allowance reimbursements) were found too lengthy, complex, and difficult to master. To some extent, this affected the image some key interviewed beneficiaries have of UNODC. This was particularly challenging, notably in cases where operations were outsourced to UNDP. Collected information suggests that alternative procedures were found, yet mainly in an ad hoc manner but rectifying most of administrative challenges up to the end of the project period.

The evaluation also notes some weaknesses in the M&E system to help track results on a more strategic level. While documentation is generally logical in this way, the current result indicators capture only short-term inputs and activities, and do not focus on longer-term impact (outputs and outcomes). This has been confirmed in various KIIs. More broadly, there is little indication of specific contributions to achieving the SDGs, or how UN-coherence is being built or challenged. The results frameworks need to be reviewed, with greater consideration of higher-level outcomes, impact, and challenges of implementation.

---

19 New project officer worked 4 years in ROSEN, and had experience with AIRCOP in other regions, while the current project coordinator had been working as substantive consultant on the project.
SUMMARY – EFFICIENCY

• Despite an accelerated delivery from 2021 onwards thanks to a supplemented, experienced project team and a recontextualized action, the project encountered important delays and performance imbalances and challenges.

• Several factors and considerations explain these shortcomings, including an unusual level of personnel turnover, delays in communication, and external ownership deficits affecting the overall project coordinating structure.

• In its second half period, the project however caught up on and expanded deliveries in an efficient and satisfactory manner, highlighting the professionalism and quality of UNODC management and staff, notably their capacity to jointly adjust and respond to hindering challenges.
COHERENCE

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

● To what extent has the project contributed to advance relevant strategic frameworks and programmatic actions in the field of wildlife crime and natural resource trafficking as pertinent for Key Partners (partnering countries, donors...) and UNODC engagements and mandates?
● To what extent have roles and responsibilities in terms of partnerships and cooperation been clearly defined, realistically set up and fulfilled in this project?
● To what extent did the project cooperate with partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) in the achievement of results?

INTERNAL COHERENCE

Synergies with other UNODC programmes and supporting units in the subregion were observed, contributing to UNODC’s programmatic coherence in the fields of crimes that affect the environment, border security (AIRCOP) and, to some extent, anti-corruption (CEB–GPAC). Close cooperation with AIRCOP focal points in the subregion materialized in direct, visible achievements at the intervention level (10 joint activities in 2022\(^{20}\)). At UNODC strategic level, it favoured AIRCOP developing its presence in the subregion\(^{21}\). Some KII’s suggest that there were nourished ambitions to transpose the GPCAE/AIRCOP coordinating scheme to West Africa. Positive exchanges of expertise and connection of networks across anti-corruption (Corruption and Economic Crime Branch–CEB) and environmental teams (GPCAE) has been central in advancing a politically sensitive workstream, even though timidly in a few countries of the region. Several stakeholders called for increased mutual learning across GPCAE regional components, in the perspective of building greater cooperation across regions playing central roles in wildlife crime and illegal trafficking of natural resources.

The project as implemented in its last two years has been also instrumental in advancing UNODC presence in the subregion. The creation of a Programme office in Libreville, Gabon, was well received, although a presence in Cameroon, host of most W&E international partners, would need to be strengthened.

The evaluation team however notes that there were limited opportunities for harmonization with other border security management and criminal justice support programmes, as initially intended in the project document\(^{22}\). This can be explained by rather limited available knowledge and data on linkages between W&E crimes and other types of illegal markets, and the subsequent difficulties to develop an adequate programmatic framework in that sense, and work on cross-fertilization of networks across the continent.

---

\(^{20}\) Training workshop on the fight against gold trafficking in airports in all 6 pilot countries, 2 regional workshops on information exchange and on general aviation control related to gold and precious metals trafficking.

\(^{21}\) Prior to the project, AIRCOP was present mainly in Cameroon.

\(^{22}\) Namely as per project document: UNODC - WCO Control Container Programme, West Africa Coast Initiative (WACI), UNODC ROSEN Regional Strategy to combat Human trafficking and migrant smuggling, and West African Network of Central Authorities and Prosecutors.
PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORKS AS PERTINENT FOR KEY PARTNERS

GLOZ31-CA contributions were complementary to two relevant interregional cooperation frameworks – PARCIC and ECOFAC-6. Yet, the evaluation team found those respective contributions to be sometimes at odds with each other. GLOZ31-CA partially responded to the political and strategic objectives of its binding PARCIC framework to strengthen ECCAS coordinating capacities in the fight against wildlife and natural-resource crimes (see Effectiveness section). At the technical and interventions levels, the project complemented the EU-ECCAS ECOFAC-6 programme. Personnel from EU, ECCAS and governmental partners who were interviewed often highlighted echoing objectives. Some KIIs suggest that strategic tensions around the project’s framework best fit seemed to have been left unresolved at the design stage. This is understood to have led to shifting responsibility across different units among key partners, affecting the project development. Considering existing structural challenges in the subregion that fall outside the project boundaries, the project’s intervention logic turned out to be a quite ambitious undertaking.

PARTNERSHIPS AND COOPERATION MECHANISMS

The project has established collaborative partnerships and overall satisfactory communication channels with relevant governments, and beneficiary organisations (law enforcement, criminal justice and to some extent forest management authorities) across pilot countries. This collaboration was particularly instrumental in developing capacity-building activities, enhancing inter-agency collaborative mechanisms, and strengthening momentum around W&E prioritization at country level. Good practices of inclusive and participatory instruments were also identified, notably as part of the work undertaken to develop the Rapid Reference Guides across the region. Most interviewed stakeholders, both at political level and in technical positions, shared an appetite for continuing direct partnerships in the future. Positive feedback from key partners and donor representatives was also collected across evaluation tools, notably regarding the quality of project activities and products, and concerning UNODC capacity to promote engagements on W&E crimes issues at higher-institutional levels. Triangulation of data shows that UNODC and its Programme office are acknowledged for their availability, professionalism, vision on W&E capacity building, and expertise in delivering quality technical assistance, training, mentorship and knowledge products. Levels of communication and cooperation have however fluctuated in some contexts marked by instability, internal challenges and political sensitivities going beyond the project’s sphere of control.

Synergies were also encouraged with non-governmental and international partners such as TRACE, African Parks, ICCWC, INTERPOL, and TRAFFIC (mainly its Africa Twix Program). This enhanced project delivery efficiency and adequacy. There has been limited engagement with local NGOs and academia, despite consultative efforts and learning exchanges, notably with Conservation Justice.

The project’s tripartite partnership structure however encountered some challenges. Triangulation of data collected through KIIs, EQs and desk review indicates some inconsistencies in communication among key partners, and diverging appreciations around project outcomes, and to some extent around defined roles (as per project document), organisational purposes (as per each partner’s specific mandates) and responsibilities (within project operationalization), as the project unfolded. Staff turnover across partnering units, and delays, further impacted the fluidity of project follow up, mainly in its first phase. As highlighted in most KIIs with key partners, internal dynamics notably linked to the CEEAC reform process, falling outside the project spheres of control or influence - further challenged the project’s coordinating structure and operationalization. As a result, limited engagements were possible with dedicated regional focal points or technical units, while the cancellation of two COPILS (2019, 2020) had a direct effect on project planning, operationalisation and
recontextualization. It also reduced the possibilities to initiate and build complementarities across PARCIC components, notably with those implemented by GIZ and Co-Water on cross-border management. This further led to diverging understandings around roles and purposes, nourishing some diverging expectations, and in some cases appreciations of achieved results and functioning of existing partnerships.

EXTERNAL COHERENCE

At the UN-system level, no evidence was found of established mechanisms with relevant UN agencies, including UNEP, UNDP or UNOCA. This can be partly explained by a limited UN presence on the topic in the region, respective mandates and technical specializations. The field mission and additional documentation however show some impetus for enhanced cooperation at regional level. Based on the project achievements and identified opportunities for increased synergies, a UNOCA, UNODC, and UNESCO Consortium on climate, biodiversity, security and sustainable development is currently being developed. Consistency with other actors’ interventions in the same thematic and geographical context\(^\text{23}\) is described in project documentation. Yet, no specific exchanges beyond informal ones, could be observed across agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY – COHERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Project synergies with AIRCOP and CEB-GPAC contributed to UNODC programmatic coherence in the fields of crimes that affect the environment, border security and, to some extent, anti-corruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Challenges over the project partnership structure led to diverging understandings around roles and purposes, and in some cases, diverging appreciations of achieved results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Despite variation across countries, the project established appropriate mechanisms with relevant national authorities in the perspective of achieving project outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Missed opportunities were identified with other UN agencies and W&amp;E specialized agencies, that also served as lessons to start new joint initiatives in the sub-region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{23}\) EU-supported programmes and EU Member States’ programmes (GIZ on ECOFAC-7) is referenced. The evaluation team also found no duplication with US Forest Service programme addressing illegal logging and wildlife trafficking in Central Africa and FAO-COMIFAC action on forestry and food security.
EFFECTIVENESS

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

- To what extent have the project outputs/activities been useful to beneficiaries and end users?
- To what extent has the project achieved its outcomes and results?
- What were the facilitating and hindering factors for achievement or non-achievement of the results? To what extent did the adjustments made in response to external hindering factors, including COVID-19 (if any) affect the achievement of the project’s expected results?

Overall, the project was found useful to its direct beneficiaries and end users at national levels across the six pilot countries. There is robust evidence of high levels of utility of the project activities and of fruitful dialogue-building between recipient authorities and the UNODC Project Office, including with ROSEN, AIRCOP and GPCAE management. 90% of surveyed respondents positively assessed the ability of GLOZ31-CA to meet their needs and priorities nationally, and to support better responses to wildlife and natural-resource crimes in the subregion.

On the relationship between outputs and outcomes, the project in its entirety presents mixed and delayed results. Before 2020, input level was so low that the EU Mid-term evaluation concluded that it would be desirable to “delegate activities to other actors (EU Member States and NGOs) or carried out jointly” parts of the project. The granted extension, recontextualized intervention and supplemented team modified the trend to respond better to a challenging partnership and implementing context. There is also a sense that a more precise mapping of existing specialised technical counterparts would have supported a smoother and quicker operationalization.

The evaluation gathered sufficient evidence to conclude that the project was however making significant and rapid progress, despite being unbalanced, in achieving intended results between 2021 and 2023. This was especially the case under its substantive objective 1 (75% of 98 activities identified). Several positive achievements resulted from intensive training, mentorship and dialogue-building activities, as well as research and knowledge production services.

The recruitment of experienced project coordinators and officers familiar with the context, partners and UNODC programming in the region, constitute a key facilitating factor, that modified the rhythm and trend of project implementation. Other facilitating factors include the development of closer cooperative mechanisms and momentum with national and specialised authorities and proactive outreach to other UNODC programmes (AIRCOP) and specialised organisations such as TRACE or African Parks. A more diverse training offer was possible in Cameroon and DRC, mainly owing to better relationships with government counterparts and more settled UNODC presence. In that line, cooperation with African Parks, notably in Chad and the Garamba National Parks in DRC, was found relevant to deliver more tailored modules and sessions.

24 Occurrences of a training, regional and international meeting with sub-region representation, as well as research products taken place as part of the project implementation. Activities part of a process, such as development of Rapid Reference Guide (preparation, follow up, finalization), have been counted separately.
Nevertheless, achievements had a limited scope and outreach, and were unequal across countries and work streams in the short- to medium-term. There is also limited indication of optimization of gains from the project by all concerned beneficiaries. Specific examples of the project outputs and outcomes are presented as outlined in the ToC used to assess effectiveness (see Methodology section).

SO 1 – REINFORCE NATIONAL CAPACITY TO PREVENT, DETECT, INVESTIGATE, PROSECUTE AND ADJUDICATE WILDLIFE, FOREST CRIME AND ILLICIT TRAFFICKING OF NATURAL RESOURCES IN CENTRAL AFRICA.

Transfer of investigative methodologies and skills: Training activities (notably on Wildlife Crime-scene management, gold trafficking in airports (with AIRCOP), and strengthening the criminal justice chain) were instrumental in equipping trainees across the region with new methods and skills to develop and start using a “crime scene to court” approach to wildlife, forest and natural-resource crimes. 70% of survey respondents consider those to have helped them develop new skills and consolidate existing ones at the individual level; while most consulted stakeholders rated favourably all aspects of training (modules, trainers, multi-agency and inter-institutional participation (from police to customs, to ministry of water and forests), networking opportunities and tailored advice and follow up).

Consolidation of national pools of expert: The Instructors’ Development Programme (IDP) at the Garoua Wildlife School (GWS) in northern Cameroon (see Annex VI), favoured the creation of an institutionalized mechanism of a “train the trainer” model within GWS. Positive return highlights the need to optimize and build on national expertise, with intensified ToT-style programmes. KII’s and desk review further show the positive impact of UNODC support on the school’s reputation and visibility as progress was showcased using different media channels.

Participatory elaboration of national legislative guidance and operational tools: Tailored through the setup of in-country inter-agency working groups meeting regularly, the Rapid Reference Guides (RRGs) constitute a key achievement of the project (see Annex VI). It is however difficult to gauge to what extent the recently published guides are being used within each administration. KII's and the desk review also suggest that legislative comparative assessments, mock trials, and related ready-to-use material stimulated reflections on normative alignments and standardization of prosecutorial methods. Building on good collaborative practice of RRGs working groups, there is room to engage further support in normative alignments (legislation, action

“Thanks to the training [crime scene management] the way we apprehended wildlife crime changed along with the methods we used to detect them. We now conduct thorough analysis of crime scenes and evidence that we encounter daily in the field. As a result, we identify and arrest more poachers on evidence ground. In the past, we were limited to flagrante delicto.” (Surveyed trainee, Crime scene management training, April 2023).

25 Notably through the following video Instructor Development Programme launched at Garoua Wildlife School in Cameroon - YouTube (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VKG8PsS0DZw)
plans, etc.). The use of ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Analysis Toolkit appeared confined to a few activities.\(^{26}\)

**Development of forensic capacities:** An important achievement was the support provided to the development of the ‘scientific body’ of Gabon’s ANPN - its wildlife genetic analyses laboratory, inaugurated in 2021. Visited during the field mission, the laboratory has the capacity to perform wildlife genetic research, and to generate essential forensic intelligence (see Annex VI). The development of a portable laboratory opens further possibilities for increased regional outreach and use of wildlife forensics. Nevertheless, acquiring human and financial resources remains challenging if the laboratory ambitions are to be met.

![ANPN Forensic lab, "PCR Room"](image)

**Knowledge production:** Studies were prepared on the trafficking of mineral resources as a source of financing for criminal groups and terrorist networks in selected border areas of Central Africa (TRIDOM and Chad-CAR border); and most recently on the eco-security concept as part of ECCAS PARCIC reflection. Studies on trafficking of mineral resources served as a key knowledge basis for GPCAE-AIRCOP trainings. Now, while producing key reference bases and sensitization materials for the subregion, there is limited information on how these studies are being used at national and regional levels.

**SO 2 – REINFORCE COOPERATION AT THE REGIONAL LEVEL BETWEEN ECCAS MEMBER STATES TO FIGHT AGAINST WILDLIFE CRIME AND ILLICIT TRAFFICKING OF NATURAL RESOURCES**

A third of the activities (15) were organized to foster inter-agency and regional cooperation and visibility at international level. Most cooperative and exchange mechanisms reported, yet describe individual initiatives, informal expert networks in-the-making, and social networks based on training participation. Overall inter-institutional cooperation mechanisms remain at an embryonic stage, largely dependent on individual perceptions (see figure 7). Triangulation of data however shows that the project enabled stakeholders to have a clearer mapping of counterparts in charge of W&E crime reduction across sectors, national and regional levels. Actions at ministerial levels and within international policy-making processes, involving specialized agencies such as COMIFAC, supported the development of a common subregional position for the various 2022 COPs demonstrating UNODC’s capacity and role in strengthening political momentum on W&E crimes.

\(^{26}\)Launch of the toolkit in DRC is referred to in the revised workplan for 2022/23 on p.55 (in English version) of the Annual Report for 2021. There are also references in the Annual Report to some actions to use the ICCWC Indicator Framework.
SO 3 - REINFORCING THE CAPACITY OF MEMBER STATES TO ADDRESS CORRUPTION AND MONEY-LAUNDERING FACILITATING WILDLIFE CRIME AND ILLICIT TRAFFICKING IN NATURAL RESOURCES

The anti-corruption workstream has been the most challenging to develop. Support was directed mainly to encourage dialogue and sensitize law enforcement and judicial actors on corruption risks in protected-area management and money-laundering related to W&E crimes. In addition to political sensitivities, scarce information (besides media-reported scandals) and limited official census of corruption cases challenged the development of concrete measures at national and regional levels to fight corruption and money-laundering as related to W&E crimes.

Several factors, both internal and external to the project’s sphere of control impacted on the project’s effectiveness and ambition to act simultaneously in six countries, at both institutional and operational levels. Internal factors relate to the efficiency gaps identified earlier. In addition, the top-down approach of project conceptualization narrowed the project’s collaborating landscape, mainly to politically driven entities and high-ministerial levels. Although critical, the project could have also benefited from greater involvement of specialised organisations such as COMIFAC, local NGOs and academia, and in some specific cases of private sector. External challenges include: i) the underestimated impact of institutional reform of ECCAS; ii) difficulty in encouraging national ownership and trust of national law enforcement and justice structures on emerging priorities for the region; and iii) disparities in social, cultural and institutional cultures and tolerance levels of practices involving wildlife, forest and use of natural resources (human-wildlife conflict for example).

The other critical issue for project effectiveness is the steady staff turnover in law enforcement agencies, political instability and frequent turnover at ministerial levels, which impacts the potential for embedding training and developing institutional memory. The evaluation team found that these dimensions could have been more considered if a conflict-lens or a fragility assessment had been applied earlier on in the inception phase. Besides, in a region with disparities of connectivity, the Covid-19 crisis disrupted further the implementation of the project, although the project attempted some virtual meetings and used online solutions to advance the conceptualization of future activities.

SUMMARY – EFFECTIVENESS

• Despite imbalances across workstreams, and limitations in scope, there have been noteworthy achievements in terms of reinforced capacities, and improved tools for investigation and prosecution of W&E crimes across the subregion, notably with the development of Rapid Reference Guides, the ANPN Forensic Lab and trainings.
• Several internal factors (related to its efficiency gaps) and external ones (including internal institutional challenges, ownership and deficits of political will) however challenged and delayed the project’s achievement of outcomes. Supplemented human resources and a recontextualized strategy effectively reversed and accelerated the project’s implementation trend.
• There is a sense of positive yet unfinished work, with limited indication of optimization of project gains beyond the project implementation phase.
Certainly, there are some positive short-term results from the activities implemented under the project, notably in terms of knowledge, tools and skill development, and awareness-raising. But, considering limitations in the project implementation and given the incremental dimensions of any practice and policy changes as intended, the evaluation could not observe clear impacts so far. The evaluation was also conducted in a timeframe close to the project completion, which precludes the possibility of taking the distance necessary to observe long-term impacts. Consideration of the scope and duration of the project also invites the need to be realistic about the potential long-term impact of the action. While impacts appear limited in scope, regional outreach and institutionalised strategic outcomes, some achievements however laid foundations for institutional and, to a lesser extent, social transformations, conducive to developing a “crime scene to court” approach in the subregion.

ENHANCED NATIONAL INVESTIGATIVE, PROSECUTORIAL, AND JUDICIAL CAPACITIES.

Notable activities in the six countries had direct results in changing perceptions on W&E crime responses and the need for more standardized investigative practices. Based on training activities, opportunities were also opened for making personal connections between personnel at different stages in the chain from crime-scene to court. Examples of more regular information exchanges were shared across Police, Customs and the Judiciary. Several WhatsApp groups also seemed to remain active between law-enforcement agents and judicial authorities with the participation of the project team and consultants, to alert and coordinate law-enforcement and judicial actions in the region. The evaluation found, however, that the project fell short on ensuring and monitoring how transferred skills were translated into fully institutionalized practices.

IMPROVED PRIORITIZATION, CRIMINALIZATION AND PROSECUTIONS

Triangulation of data shows improved sensitization to the need to prioritize and prosecute W&E crimes among project beneficiaries. With regard to magistrates, KIs and survey results highlight some increased interest by trained judges in prosecution of wildlife crime. Similarly, in some countries, the training is perceived to have stimulated better judicial follow-up of cases, and application of penalties for offenders in accordance with the law.

The review of national legislation, and the production of the Rapid Reference Guide have reportedly contributed to clarifying existing frameworks, procedures and tools to combat W&E crimes in 5 pilot countries of delivery. However, the evaluation team could not observe how, or whether, the Guide was being used in daily institutional routines and procedures.
Finally, the ANPN Forensic Laboratory in Gabon is foreseen to develop a regional capacity, notably through the use of its portable units. The laboratory provides an unprecedented forensic service for the countries of the region and has the potential to make a significant long-term contribution to improvements in addressing crime in wildlife and other natural resources. However, while the newly set structure provides the basis for further action, it does not by itself have a long-term impact on the strengthening of the processes to address wildlife crime and trafficking of natural resources.

In terms of reduced W&E crime and disruption of incentives to commit such crimes, the evaluation found only anecdotal elements to acknowledge a clear attributional relationship between improved prosecution and the project actions. Certainly, mentoring activities did play an important role in assisting interested authorities and Member States in the pursuit of key cases and seizures\textsuperscript{27}. In that regard, at the time of the evaluation, the project was still following-up on more than 20 cases opened in 2022 providing guidance, technical assistance and advice to support investigative and judiciary counterparts taking part in the case and former project trainees.

These elements could not, however, be put into perspective and compared with data on seizures made by the same agencies before the project started. Besides, an increase in seizures can also be interpreted to mean an increase in crime levels rather than an increase in enforcement effort. Considering the above, the evaluation team found that the data on seizures alone are not an adequate indicator of improvement in law enforcement and prosecution as a direct impact of project implementation. With regard to anti-corruption, besides examples of raised awareness at ministerial level, there was no further indication of concrete impact of the project at institutional, operational or social acceptance levels.

It is thus too early to see any significant long-term impact from the project activities. Indications of a long-term impact of the project are mostly personal perceptions and are varied. There is in fact little solid evidence of change, and there is a need for monitoring the effects of training and other interventions in future. Attention has been drawn to the fact that people who participate in training may not remain in their jobs for very long, so that positive effects of training may really be incremental.

### SUMMARY – IMPACT

- There have been a number of short-term results that should constitute foundations to initiate a change of strategic approach to combat wildlife crime and natural-resource trafficking (notably in terms of knowledge transfer, perception changes at individual levels, skill developments, forensic enhancement and ready-to-use tools).
- The project scope and implementation pace make it however difficult to anticipate any long-term impact as for now.
- It remains to be seen whether these actions will have any real impact, particularly in view of incremental change and challenging factors, such as staff turnover, the continued need for funding, structural constraints of institutions, and the need for cooperation nationally and regionally.

---

\textsuperscript{27}. For example, a 120\% increase in money-laundering investigation between the judicial authorities of DRC and Congo was noted (internal documents; ROSEN 2022 Annual report), while several cases implied the recognition of poaching as a crime.
SUSTAINABILITY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

- To what extent are the project results likely to persist beyond the project period?
- To what extent have ownership of project activities and outputs been generated?

Thanks to the work done under the project, some structures are in place to provide the basis for continued work to tackle wildlife- and natural-resource crime in Central Africa. Overall, however, the sustainability of the results remains to be seen.

At the operational level, training activities enhanced the transfer of skills and knowledge on investigative and prosecutorial methods to cases of wildlife- and natural-resource crime. Training on wildlife crime scene management across the region and workshops for magistrates have had some positive effects on raising awareness and encouraging the setting of standardized practices along the criminal justice chain to address wildlife crime and natural-resource crime that are likely to have results after the end of the project period. The fact that the Garoua Wildlife School (Cameroon) is revising its curricula to encompass some of the training from the project, if sustained, will be an important contribution to long-term improvements and strengthen national pools of experts.

Nevertheless, the focus of the training remained relatively narrow, and the frequency of training sessions too limited for the project gain to be sustained and put into practice without close follow up. Triangulation of data collected through KIs, survey and case studies show that high levels of staff turnover mainly among law enforcement personnel at the junior levels questioned the extent to which participants may use their learning over a longer term. There is a need for more regular trainings so that follow up sessions can be developed, and incoming staff be trained. This will require the governments to make a commitment, but also to provide or obtain the necessary funding.

At the institutional level, the development plan for the ANPN forensic laboratory provides the basis for the laboratory to make a significant contribution to support the criminal justice chain in bringing cases to court and providing reliable evidence throughout the region. Yet to maximise the utility and value of the structure, a number of improvements are needed, including the need for human and financial resources.

At the partnership level, some of the organisations that have been involved in the project in various ways have confirmed that their work to support the actions to tackle wildlife crime will continue. These include TRAFFIC, the TRACE Network, African Parks, and Wildlife Justice. But this commitment is not a consequence of the project.

Overall, the countries covered by the project have shown little sign of taking ownership of the project or of providing the much-needed funds for the continuation of the work and follow up actions remain quite dependent on contextualized initiatives and external funding. Stakeholders at the national level have drawn attention to the tensions that can exist between different institutions at national level, as a result of differing views (or competition) regarding responsibilities on W&E crimes and related corruption. Some are also concerned that insufficient use was made of in-country experts.
There was no evidence of an exit strategy for the project, so that it did not prioritize the establishment of commitments by the countries, or the regional partners concerned to continue the work or to ensure that the results would be embedded as part of a long-term strategy.

Considerations of any continuation would need to take into account that some activities could not be undertaken for security reasons, especially in the east of the region. There remains an open question about how these issues might affect the continuation of the project, or any future project.

Looking to the future, there is an appetite in the region for more work to address wildlife crime and natural-resource crime, and the project, as implemented since 2021, has further nourished this interest. There is a shared belief among interviewed stakeholders that long-term results in the region will need more than a single project to institutionalize good practices to address these crimes. Observers were convinced that there is a risk of lower impact in the long term if there is no follow-up. Even considering concerns about durability, institutional instability and staff changes, the indications are that more, and more regular, training is needed, taking into account the specific needs of rangers, investigators, and job-families in the criminal justice system. Any planning and design of future training needs to consider the gaps in training that has already been provided, as underlined in the Effectiveness section. In parallel, as also echoed by CSOs, regional specialised entities (such as COMIFAC) and some law-enforcement and conservation organisations, the evaluation team stresses that sustainability calls also for a more holistic approach to the phenomenon. There is thus also a need for a more comprehensive approach to global programming, incorporating prevention measures and more complementary regional strategies across trafficking regions such as Central Africa and distribution markets in Asia.

**SUMMARY – SUSTAINABILITY**

- The project has provided a basis for building long-term improvements in combating wildlife and natural-resource crime and contributed to sustaining demand for increased regional and national mobilizations in that regard.
- Some structures at the national level are in place to do this, notably through project support to capacity-building, but the project had no exit strategy and there is no obvious commitment of follow up of the action required to achieve sustainable results.
- There would be challenges for any continuation, including the finances required, security issues in some areas, and various factors that undermine the effectiveness of the project action.
HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUALITY AND LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

- To what extent has the project mainstreamed human rights, gender and disability inclusion aspects in its development and implementation, including with respect to the inter-connections between environmental protection and human rights?

There were clear references in project documents and observed efforts to ensure gender-balanced activities and consideration of human rights in project design and deliverables. However, cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality, human rights and inclusion of vulnerable populations were insufficiently integrated in the project and did not represent central elements in its implementation.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Triangulation of data shows very limited, if not minimal integration of human rights dimensions in both project design and implementation. Despite reference in project documentation, there is no presentation or recollection of understanding of human rights dimensions in the specific context of actions directed to the environment, anti-corruption measures and/or criminal justice. These aspects may also not have constituted intuitive dimensions in the context and thematic areas of the project. Nevertheless, links could have been drawn. For example, the project areas of intervention relate to environmental justice, and due process of law/rights to justice for persons investigated for offences related to wildlife and natural resources crimes.

At the implementation level, no information demonstrated clear integration of HR standards and principles in project deliverables, such as training modules or publications, including under the result area 3 on anti-corruption. Triangulated evidence collected through KIIIs, including through the field mission, suggests that soft-influence mechanisms were preferred to address human rights aspects, which are still sensitive in some institutional contexts. Access to equal representation, due process of law or the right to justice, or otherwise environmental justice, were reported to have been addressed during a number of training informal discussions: more than 90% of survey participants asserted that the project activities helped them to a great or good extent to identify how their professional responsibilities could contribute to the fulfilment of international norms and standards on environmental protection and related rights. Some interviewed government stakeholders referred to respect of human rights as central to credible and efficient investigation and prosecution of wildlife and natural resources crimes. A few examples of cases with no procedural violation of human rights were shared in that regard. The UNODC project team also developed consultation with a number of civil society organisations advancing human rights and environmental justice at the local level, notably with Alerte Congolaise pour l’Environnement et les Droits de l’Homme in DRC.

GENDER EQUALITY

Gender balance has been challenging to keep in most trainings targeting law enforcement authorities, despite efforts that include provisions in ToRs for training to ensure female participation; disaggregated reporting in the late years of the project period; and gender balance within the framework of the project, and its staffing. Nevertheless, the project deeply suffered from institutional and cultural biases heavily limiting equal gender representation within criminal justice and law enforcement authorities.
Like the human rights dimension, the evaluation team identified a need for tailored assessment of gender aspects within the thematic, geographic and institutional contexts of the project at its earliest stage to ensure greater integration, or, otherwise, to ensure mitigation of the risk of low integration at the implementation level.

LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

While wildlife crime and illicit trafficking of natural resources may affect or concern marginalized populations and rural communities (i.e., including indigenous or local communities living in close proximity to wild areas, who are often dependent on wildlife for their livelihoods), the evaluation team found limited information about how the “leaving no one behind” dimension was understood in the project context. Reviewed documentation contained no definition of populations falling under this category within the project-specific context of intervention (thematic and geographic). Besides, the specific needs of concerned populations (notably rural communities or populations living on forest resources) which constitute a central aspect of the principle of leaving no one behind (including human-wildlife conflict) fall outside of the project’s focus and objectives. Centred on supply-oriented and security-based interventions, the project also gave limited consideration to alternative approaches or measures, or to the needs of concerned communities, to prevent commercial poaching, wildlife crime or illicit trafficking of natural resources. Aspects related to the root causes of poaching in some areas for example, or prevention of corruptive practices as related to W&E crimes were not fully considered. The evaluation team notes however some interest within UNODC teams and government partners agencies to conduct further work on the prevention aspects of issues tackled by the project.

SUMMARY – HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUAULTY AND LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

- While the UNODC project team strongly encouraged gender-balanced and gender-sensitive activities, the project deeply suffered from institutional and cultural biases, heavily limiting equal gender representation within participating criminal justice and law enforcement authorities.
- Whereas the human rights dimension can be specified as related to the environment, anti-corruption measures and/or criminal justice, the project did not explore them directly. Soft-influence mechanisms were preferred to introduce HR considerations that might be still sensitive in some contexts.
- Centred on supply-oriented and security-based interventions, the project gave limited consideration to preventive approaches and to the needs of communities concerned with
On the basis of triangulated findings discussed in previous chapters, the evaluation concludes that:

- The project demonstrated important efficiency gaps that impacted its performance and the level of satisfaction of the donor over results achieved and communications. Internal challenges related to staffing and in-region presence were underestimated, while structural realities of partnering organisations seemed to have been overlooked. The project however demonstrated positive reactivity and managed to invert its initially downward progress trend.

- The project achievements, although limited in scope, contributed to create a more enabling environment for more comprehensive and effective responses to “enhance national investigative, prosecutorial, and judicial capacities and regional cooperation among ECCAS Member States to prevent and reduce W&E crime” (overall objective). While the 2021 re-focus on national levels was welcome in terms of relevance, coherence and efficiency, regional objectives took however time to materialize, and put into question the project’s effectiveness and impact.

- The project top-down approach may have led to missed opportunities for more adequate programmatic planning and adequate technical partnerships. In that sense, there is a need to redirect the project focus towards operational units and agents acting on the ground, in addition to their institutional counterparts.

- As for many other UNODC projects, the results framework or the implied theory of change needs to be revised, as it remains more-or-less an assemblage of activities and loose baselines. Reporting provides limited information on progress made on targets over time, and on what UNODC is being able to build in the different countries, including its work as a soft influencer through dialogue and trust-building, sharing of expertise and cognitive influence (policy approaches – “crime scene to court” in the case, prioritization of specific crimes (poaching, wood trafficking etc.).

- Considering the above, the project has nevertheless laid some foundations for institutional, policy and, to a lesser extent, social transformations, conducive to developing a “crime scene to court” approach and to inducing more comprehensive and coordinated efforts across and between all the actors in the criminal justice chain in the subregion.

The evaluation concludes that, overall, the contribution of the project to building and sustaining awareness and political momentum on W&E priorities across interested partners has been essential in providing first foundations and robust tools to initiate a change of strategic approach to combat wildlife crime and natural-resource trafficking. On the basis of the work done under the project, some structures are in place to provide the basis for continued work to tackle wildlife- and natural-resource crime in Central Africa.
**Figure 11: SWOT Analysis for GLOZ31-CA project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Crime scene to court approach.</td>
<td>× Ambitious Theory of Change compared to in-region presence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Capacity development work and focus on ready-</td>
<td>× Important efficiency gaps, leading to delays and shortcomings in performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-use tool development.</td>
<td>× Inadequate/partial needs assessment in training participant selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Presently, pro-active project team with good</td>
<td>× Partial and activities-focused reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge of the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats/ Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Nourished interest among national and technical stakeholders for continued effort on W&amp;E crime reduction and prevention.</td>
<td>✓ Security issues, political instabilities and/or competition that limit the project’s reach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Structures in place to provide the basis for continued work to tackle wildlife- and natural-resource crime in Central Africa (forensic, tailored resources and tools, growing pool of national experts...).</td>
<td>✓ Lack of political will and turnover in leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Cross-pollination of ideas across UN entities developing their presence and workstream in the sub-region.</td>
<td>✓ Uncertain future funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Incremental progress timeframe vs. result-for money tensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Results and nascent cooperative relationships may not be sustained without continuous attention and support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Evaluation team
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1 – TAKE STOCK AND ENGAGE IN DIALOGUE WITH INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS TO STRENGTHEN MOMENTUM ON W&E CRIME PRIORITISATION AND SUPPORT.

In the spirit of effective international/interregional cooperation, there is a need to jointly share and learn from the project’s key achievements and implementation challenges, to discuss future priorities and needs, and clear avenues for potential cooperation and preferred mechanisms to that end.

It is recommended that participatory dialogues and consultations be initiated, including donors and key partners at regional and national levels, to examine project outcomes and clarify priorities, best strategic approach and expectations of cooperation on W&E crime in the subregion.

To be useful, the discussions would imply:

- Involvement of GPCAE managers, Project team (possibly UNODC regional office), EU Delegations across all six countries, ECCAS Environment Commissioner unit and key personnel from PARCIC agreement, and all other relevant partners at regional level and national levels, including COMIFAC and relevant and interested ministries.
- Consultations would involve feedback on respective capacities, expertise and interests, and assessment of good practices and shortfalls in the framework of W&E crime action. This evaluation could serve as a basis for reflection to determine priorities and strategic planning.

Having this discussion would be an opportunity to determine best possible ways forward and future avenues for possible programmatic support at the subregional level, and cooperation on regional integration and relevant related priorities on wildlife, forestry and natural resources in the subregion.

One possible outcome of this dialogue and consultations exercise would be the drafting of an in-depth situational analysis, emphasizing regional opportunities and challenges specific to W&E crime, and attached possible cooperation paths that could serve as a basis for future programming.

Action: Management and project team of the UNODC Global Programme on Crimes that Affect the Environment (GPCAE), in cooperation with UNODC Regional Office for West and Central Africa (in Senegal) (ROSEN), and consultations with potential donors, regional partners and interested stakeholders (part of or interested in taking part in project development). Timeframe: 3-6 months.

RECOMMENDATION 2 – READJUST THE SCOPE AND FRAMEWORK OF UNODC INTERVENTION ON W&E CRIMES IN THE SUB-REGION

As it is, the project demonstrated limitations, but also laid the groundwork for increased political buy-in, and continued efforts to sustain momentum on W&E crimes priorities and enhanced national and regional capacities in that sense. There is thus a need to capitalize on the project’s gains, but also on lessons learned, and plan follow up/future interventions within a more coherent, efficient, and realistic approach.

It is thus recommended to redesign and adjust UNODC W&E programming in the subregion to optimize results, based on lessons learned and identified opportunities. When formulating the strategy, this would imply to:
Diversify fundraising strategies and funding opportunities based on a donor mapping exercise detailing all potential and most relevant donor frameworks and requirements with the intention of maximizing opportunities but also thematic relevance and harmonization of interventions.

Develop knowledge building tools by major theme or priorities (poaching, illicit trafficking in natural resources, illegal logging, etc.) including political economy analyses, conflict-sensitive risks assessments and sociological analysis of the W&E crime phenomenon in the subregion and across the pilot countries. This could be done by mixed teams of UNODC, potential donor and Central African academic researchers or experts. It would base interventions on evidence and better understanding of the political, institutional and/or social/cultural obstacles to a more comprehensive approach and enhanced regional cooperation in W&E crime reduction in Central Africa.

Develop a medium to long-term strategic vision (5-10 years) per priorities, that would strengthen the rationale of the subregional programming and enhance long-term relevance of foreseen interventions.

In that line, target local expertise, technical and specialized entities where possible (such as COMIFAC) and in-country systems/structures to improve ownership of the intervention. The ToT model used in Garoua School should be extended to sustain and enrich national pools of experts able to pass on institutional memory and knowledge.

Focus on strengthening existing structures and maximize their outreach. A strategic plan to follow up on the development of the ANPN laboratory would be key to sustain forensic capacity building of the region and install more standardized use of forensic science in investigation and prosecution.

Focus on institutionalized mechanisms, including national legislative reform plans and action plans.

**Action:** Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination and team of UNODC GPCAE. **Timeframe:** 12-18 months.

**RECOMMENDATION 3 – ENRICH CAPACITY-BUILDING PORTFOLIO AND FOCUS INTERVENTIONS AT OPERATIONAL LEVELS**

The project has demonstrated key achievements in capacity-building, and nourished appetite for increased participation and extended action at both institutional and operational levels to support the development of a more holistic “crime scene to court” approach to W&E crimes in the subregion.

To build on the project’s gains and improve the relevance and coherence of the capacity-building strategies and processes, it is recommended for future actions, to enrich the capacity-building portfolio and focus interventions at operational levels. This would imply:

- Balancing and focusing the training offer also at the law enforcement and criminal justice operational levels, including for extending training to MIKE sites in all countries and to rangers in all protected areas, or providing more practical training for rangers in the field.
- Targeting more operational units and agents: more specific ToRs for training participant selection could be drafted and directed to relevant MS authorities to that end; support to the creation of joint task forces, or other specialized units could also be another way forward.
- Diversify the training offer to better respond to the evolution of the phenomenon. Based on the evaluated project, extend training into other aspects of crime, such as financial crime connected with wildlife and natural resource crime, and online wildlife trade.
- Defining and applying systems to monitor and evaluate outcomes, including specific indicators for training initiatives and other capacity-building actions.
RECOMMENDATION 4 – AT ORGANISATIONAL LEVEL, CONSIDER DEVELOPING A MORE BALANCED AND COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO W&E CRIME PROGRAMMING

It is recommended to give greater consideration to more holistic approaches and cross-cutting aspects such as gender and HR when formulating and implementing follow up or future interventions on crimes that affect the environment in the subregion, and as part of the GPCAE.

Inclusion of several dimensions of W&E crime prevention and reduction were not considered, notably: the use of cryptocurrency and the role of online trading; the specific role of airport personnel; corrupt practices risks; prevention and global market chains. Increased research could be a possible step forward using in-house resources such as expertise of UNODC Research Branch and external specialized academic researchers.

In planning to tackle the continued serious problem of wildlife crime and natural resource crime, future programming is recommended to integrate increased opportunities for learning and exchanges across GPCAE projects, including from Asia regional components.

It is also recommended to define more specifically HRG and LNOB understanding in the context of W&E crime, including designing specific indicators to track progress (for example, this could include but not be limited to internal conceptual discussions, and/or contextualized study of trajectories and roles within the targeted criminal chains, within affected communities, but also in terms of responses taking into consideration the gender and inclusion dimensions; a conceptual note detailing the understanding and precision of the types of human rights intersecting with the responses to targeted crimes, etc.). In that line, the 2022 CoP to CITES resolution28 might serve as basis to explore ways to enhance the participation, especially of women and girls, in action supporting the fight against illegal wildlife trade, including complementary actions to supply-oriented interventions.

Action: Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination of UNODC GPCAE, UNODC Environment Team and possible UNODC Research and Trend Analysis Branch (RAB). Timeframe: 24-36 months

RECOMMENDATION 5 – CONTINUE STRENGTHENING UNODC PRESENCE IN THE SUBREGION THROUGH SMART PARTNERSHIPS

In the vein of the previous recommendation, it is recommended to strengthen UNODC presence in the subregion, including through smart partnerships to increase UNODC programmatic coherence, added value and effectiveness on W&E crime portfolio.

---

28 The resolution urges urging Parties “to enhance efforts to understand gender and how it interacts with other identifying factors in matters related to legal and illegal international trade in wild species of fauna and flora, with a view to taking these into account when designing responses and interventions”, https://cites.org/sites/default/files/documents/COP/19/resolution/E-Res-19-03.pdf
This could be done through:

- Broadening and increasing levels of staffing assigned to regional cooperation and reinforcing UNODC staff presence (Programme office, ROSEN in CA and across UN offices already in place in the subregion) as possible first step. This would allow to hold more frequent consultations and coordination meetings: i) between interested ministries and countries; ii) between donors’ representations and programme office; and iii) between regional and specialized partners.
- Building on AIRCOP and other relevant UNODC programming synergies to optimize costs, coherence and effectiveness of intervention. More broadly, searching for increased UN coherence could also open new funding opportunities. In that line the UNOCA-UNODC-UNESCO-ECCAS consortium under discussion could be an interesting way forward.
- Extending the partnership landscape to other relevant and concerned actors, including NGOs, academia and, where relevant, with private sectors to ensure comprehensive approach to the intervention.

Action: Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination of UNODC GPCAE, United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa (UNOCA) and UNODC Environment Team. Timeframe: 12-18 months

RECOMMENDATION 6 - MONITORING AND REPORTING FOR IMPACT

Frameworks need to take into account the full project history and delineate clear outcome indicators. Qualitative assessments are needed: i) to demonstrate the project’s non-measurable gains (dialogue building, perceptions changes...); and mostly ii) to tell the story of the change or challenges that the work of the programme has brought about, including contributions to achieving the SDGs.

It is recommended to review result frameworks with greater consideration of higher-level outcomes, impact, and challenges of implementation, and to prepare more regular monitoring report/tools.

This could include:

- drawing up clearer and more robust theories of change during programme formulation.
- Integrating impact studies of key interventions.
- Integrated links with SGDs monitoring framework and indicators.
- hold discussions or fast-assessment exercises to gather donors, implementing partners and beneficiaries and prevent risks of under-performances.

Action: Management of UNODC GPCAE, in cooperation with project coordination of UNODC GPCAE and UNODC Management. Timeframe: 18-24 months.
V. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

LESSONS LEARNED

- Project planning needs to adequately consider in-field staffing needs, precisely map most relevant institutional and technical partners, and thoroughly analyse the context of implementation (structural, political economy, security, risks, etc.) to avoid delays and mixed expectations, especially when projects seek ambitious political and social changes. This should be kept in mind in developing future projects of a similar nature.
- Ensuring adequate project staffing, and a well-developed regional and in-country presence, remains indispensable to ensure smooth project implementation and to strengthen cooperation mechanisms with national stakeholders, which may ensure later, increased ownership of project gains.
- Despite bureaucratic and structural challenges, the process of favouring South-South partnership, and regional integration, contribute in the long run to building political momentum and sustained endorsement.
- A comprehensive approach to capacity development also needs to consider a proper balancing of institutional and operational capacity strengthening. Multi-sectoral participation in most delivered training was critical to favour the formation of networks of experts. Training cannot however achieve a long-term impact overnight and there is a need for joint engagement of national structures and systems to ensure regularity and sustainability of capacity-building.

BEST PRACTICES

- An inclusive and participatory approach to project deliverables, such as those put in place to develop the Rapid Reference Guides, demonstrated sustained engagement in the project activities and created opportunities for enhanced ownership of the final products. Support to the institutionalisation of national structures, such as the ANPN Forensic Laboratory also increased opportunities for continued efforts and an appetite for use of the gains of the project. Such practices constitute a good basis as a model to ensure tailored, adapted product development and to create conducive conditions for increased ownership of project gains.
- The quality of UNODC's expertise, technical assistance and training programme models, including mentorship, have proved essential to enhanced capacity building and stakeholder buy-in. Nonetheless, when conjugated with local/national expertise, it created increased opportunities for more appropriate emphasis and focus on W&E crime and local specifics. In that sense, the “Training of Trainers” model as implemented with the Garoua Wildlife School, should be preferred, and enhanced to increase national pools of experts.
- Pairing expertise and building synergies across UNODC (as with AIRCOP and CEB-GPCE) not only contributed to UNODC's programmatic coherence and cognitive influence in the fields of crimes that affect the environment, border security and anti-corruption, but also improved efficiency, offsetting the challenges attached to a rather small and unstable project team.
## I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Programme number:</th>
<th>GLOZ31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project/Programme title:</td>
<td>“Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources” implemented under the Global Programme on Crimes that affect the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (dd/mm/yyyy-dd/mm/yyyy):</td>
<td>01/02/2018 - 07/04/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Economic Community of Central African States/Central Africa region (Cameroon, Republic of Congo, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo and Gabon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkages to Country, Regional and Thematic Programmes:</td>
<td>Sub programme 1: Countering transnational organized crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkages to UNDAF’s strategic outcomes to which the project/programme contributes:</td>
<td>Gabon (2018-2022); RCA (2018-2022); Congo (2018-2022); Cameroon (2018-2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkages to the SDG targets to which the project contributes:</td>
<td>15; 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency:</td>
<td>UNODC/Border Management Branch (BMB)/Regional Office for West and Central Africa (ROSEN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Organizations:</td>
<td>TRACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Approved Budget (USD):</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Overall Budget (USD):</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure by date of initiation of evaluation (USD):</td>
<td>4,786,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donors:</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/Programme Manager:</td>
<td>Mr. Jorge Eduardo Rios, Chief, Global Programme for Crimes that affect the Environment, UNODC/Border Management Branch (BMB) with support from Mr. Assane Drame, Regional Programme Coordinator, ROSEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type and time frame of evaluation: (Independent Project Evaluation/In-depth Evaluation/mid-term/final)</td>
<td>Final in-depth evaluation 7 November 2022 – 7 April 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame of the project covered by the evaluation (until the end of the evaluation field mission):</td>
<td>1 February 2018 – 13 January 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

29 United Nations Development Assistance Framework
Geographical coverage of the evaluation: Central Africa more generally with a focus on Chad, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo and Gabon

Budget for this evaluation in USD\textsuperscript{30}: 90,000

Number of independent evaluators planned for this evaluation\textsuperscript{31}: 3: One evaluation expert, one substantive expert and one national expert

Type and year of past evaluations (if any): Mid-term evaluation carried out by EU – April 2021

Project overview

UNODC, through its Global Programme on Crimes that affect the Environment (hereinafter “Global Programme”) has an important role to play in strengthening the capacity of governments to investigate and criminally prosecute natural resources crimes. The Programme was launched in May 2014 and is based on the premise of adherence to the principles and obligations of UNTOC and UNCAC. Through the Global Programme, UNODC responds to the many links between organized crime and illicit trafficking of natural resources, coordinating a range of activities aimed at strengthening legislative frameworks and judicial cooperation, improving the implementation of national law and investigative and prosecutorial capacities, as well as to improve interinstitutional and cross-border cooperation.

The Global Programme is implementing a regional project to reinforce the criminal justice system of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), namely Cameroon, Central African Republic (CAR), Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Gabon, and the Republic of Congo, to more effectively prevent, identify, investigate, prosecute, and adjudicate the illicit exploitation of natural resources. Aligned to UNODC’s Africa Strategic Vision, the project “Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources,” represents component 6 of the PARCIC Programme (ECCAS Reform and Institutional Capacity Building Support Program), which is funded by the EU, within the framework of the 11th European development funds (EDF).

To achieve the goals set by the PARCIC programme and in line with the Global Programme’s “crime scene to court” approach, the project provides technical assistance to reinforce the criminal justice system of ECCAS countries to combat the illicit exploitation of natural resources in Central Africa, through the following three objectives:

Reinforce the national capacity to detect, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate wildlife and forest crime.

Promoting cooperation at the regional level between ECCAS Member States.

Reinforce the capacity of Member States to address corruption and money-laundering.

The project implementation started on 1 February 2018 running through 7 April 2023.

UNODC collaborates with the ECCAS Secretariat and its Member States, national institutions, as well as non-governmental organizations, including TRACE, TRAFFIC, African Parks, etc. in the implementation of activities. The only direct implementing partner is TRACE.

\textsuperscript{30} Including fees for evaluation team, travel, printing, editing, translation, interpretation, etc.

\textsuperscript{31} Please note that the minimum for any UNODC evaluation is two independent evaluators, i.e., one lead evaluator and one team member.
Key stakeholders include wildlife and forestry authorities, law enforcement, customs, prosecutors, investigating judges and judges, legislators and CITES management authorities.

The populations of the Central African States are the target beneficiaries. In the broad sense, the project emphasizes the strengthening of the capacities of law enforcement agencies, prosecutors and the judicial system, the improvement of regional cooperation and support for tougher anti-corruption and money laundering measures.

UNODC’s efforts in combating wildlife and forest crime, corruption and strengthening the rule of law affect the three pillars of the UN (human rights; peace and security; and development). The human rights situation in Central African States is analysed and taken into account in project design and implementation.

The project contributes to the achievement of the policies of partners and stakeholders regarding gender equality policies. The gender dimension is integrated, in particular by ensuring, as far as possible, equal representation between men and women among participants and resource persons/experts during project implementation. The project collaborates directly with the populations and makes efforts to ensure that these exchanges take place, as far as possible, on the basis of gender equality. Activities such as trainings and mentorships will focus on gender equality where possible.

UNODC applies a gender-sensitive approach and strives to:

- Ensure equitable access to project resources and opportunities for both men and women, individually and in groups;
- Take measures to ensure equal access and full participation of women and men in power and decision-making structures within the framework of the project;
- Contribute to the UN goal of gender equality in staffing;
- Include gender assessment as part of situation analysis for training, assessments;
- Produce and disseminate gender-disaggregated data through monitoring-evaluation in the process of implementing the logical framework and objectives;
- Define the conditions for implementing and monitoring the gender dimension in the agreements concluded with all potential partner organisations.

In addition, in the implementation of this project, UNODC strives to adhere to the following:

- UNODC policy and operations at country level: country profile, assessment and analysis documents and other background documents containing information on the gender situation.
- Implementation and monitoring-evaluation activities of the Action: gender mainstreaming will be ensured in each stage of the project cycle, e.g., the guidance note “Mainstreaming gender in the work of UNODC” or the guidance document “Integrating human rights and gender equality into evaluations” of the United Nations Evaluation Group.
- Gender sensitization will be enhanced by integrating this component into training and mentoring programs for government counterparts, project staff and visiting consultants. Gender focal points could be identified in selected field offices.
II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The Final In-Depth Project Evaluation of the Project “Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources” (GLOZ31) will be conducted in line with UNODC and UNEG evaluation norms, standards, templates, and guidelines.

The evaluation will be conducted for the entire project and its different components. The time period covered is 1 February 2018 until 31 January 2023.

Although this project covers 11 countries in Central Africa/ECCAS, during the 2018 Steering committee, 6 pilot countries were identified as beneficiaries: Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Gabon, and the Republic of Congo. The large bulk of the activities under this project have taken place in these countries, while the rest of the countries were involved in some regional activities.

In consideration of the presence of project staff, UNODC field offices, project partners like TRACE as well as relevant core learning partners, it is recommended to conduct a more focused evaluation as following:

Results 1: focus on Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Cameroon, Chad, Gabon, Congo

Result 2: focus on Republic of Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo and Cameroon

Result 3: focus on Gabon and Democratic Republic of Congo

Assessment of Result 1 will focus on enforcement and criminal justice system capacity building to combat wildlife and forest crime, Result 2 will focus on the promotion of regional cooperation and Result 3 will focus on capacity building to address corruption and money-laundering.

The evaluation will be summative in nature and seek to derive recommendations, best practices and lessons learned, identify areas of improvement, get feedback and record achievements reached in the course of the project implementation.

The final evaluation is provisioned in the project design and its findings will help to:

- Promote reflection and learning by key stakeholders as to what has worked well and what can be improved in future similar projects, including for policy revision;
- Help identify issues which must be addressed in future similar projects in order to more effectively support output and outcome achievement, including promotion of key cross-cutting themes;
- Enhance accountability and provide feedback to the project.

UNODC and European Union will analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions for a new programme, subject to the funding availability.

The following OECD-DAC criteria32 will be assessed during the evaluation: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact and sustainability. In addition, aspects of human rights, gender mainstreaming, and leaving no one behind will be assessed. The evaluation will specifically assess how gender and human rights aspects have been mainstreamed into the programme, using pre-determined criteria and rubrics as defined in the inception phase and data collection tools.

The main evaluation users will include UNODC senior management, programme management, beneficiaries and key partners and the European Union as the donor.

32 https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm
III. EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

Relevance\(^{34}\): Is the intervention doing the right thing?

Relevance is the extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.

1. To what extent have the objective and outcomes of the project been consistent and relevant with regard to identifying recipients’ requirements, country needs, global priorities as well as partners’ and EU policies?

2. Does the project fit for purpose in the context of the growing interest in wildlife and forest crimes internationally and UNODC’s role therein?

Coherence\(^{35}\): How well does the intervention fit?

The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the country, sector or institution

1. To what extent have roles and responsibilities in terms of partnerships and cooperation been clearly defined, realistically set up and fulfilled in this project?

2. To what extent did the project cooperate with partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) in the achievement of results?

Efficiency: How well are resources being used?

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

1. To what extent have the resources/inputs (funds, expertise, staff time, etc) been converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner? What were the facilitating or hindering factors?

2. To what extent was the process for implementing the activities efficient (timelines, communication of results)?

Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?

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

1. To what extent have the results of the project been achieved?

2. What are the facilitating and hindering factors for achievement or non-achievement of the results/outcomes and outputs?

Impact: What difference does the intervention make?

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

1. To what extent has the project contributed to the beneficiaries’ capacity to address wildlife crime and natural resources trafficking?

---

\(^{33}\) [https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm](https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm)

\(^{34}\) Includes the previous criterion of design.

\(^{35}\) Includes the previous criteria of partnerships and cooperation.
### Sustainability: Will the benefits last?

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

1. To what extent have the States taken over the project activities and contributed own resources to their implementation?

2. To what extent have the skills and knowledge generated by the project been used in country operations regarding investigations and prosecutions of wildlife crime?

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

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

1. To what extent were human rights, gender and disability inclusion aspects mainstreamed in the development and implementation of the project?

2. How could human rights, gender and disability inclusion aspects be further mainstreamed in the design and implementation of future similar projects?

### Lessons learned and best practices

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

1. What lessons can be learned from the project implementation in order to improve performance, results and effectiveness in future similar projects?

2. What good practices can be identified to be continued and or scaled up in future similar projects?

### IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

#### The methods used to collect and analyse data

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

The evaluation team will be asked to present a summarized methodology (including an evaluation matrix) in the Inception Report outlining the evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection. The evaluation methodology must conform to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards as well as the UNODC Evaluation Policy, Norms and Standards.
While the evaluation team shall fine-tune the methodology for the evaluation in an Inception Report, a mixed-methods approach of qualitative and quantitative methods is mandatory due to its appropriateness to ensure a gender-sensitive, inclusive, respectful and participatory approach and methodology to capture disability and gender equality issues, as well as voices and opinions of both men, women and other marginalised groups, ensuring gender related and disaggregated data (e.g. age, sex, countries etc.). Special attention shall be paid to an unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories. The limitations to the evaluation need to be identified and discussed by the evaluation team in the Inception Report, e.g. data constraints (such as missing baseline and monitoring data). Potential limitations as well as the chosen mitigating measures should be discussed.

The main elements of the evaluation process are the following:

- Preparation and submission of an Inception Report (containing a desk review summary, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments, sampling strategy, limitations to the evaluation, and timetable) to IES through Unite Evaluations (https://evaluations.unodc.org) for review and clearance at least one week before any field mission/data collection phase may take place (may entail several rounds of comments);
- Initial meetings and interviews with the Project Manager, UNODC and TRACE staff (face-to-face or by telephone/skype/MS Teams etc.) as well as stakeholders during the field mission/data collection phase;
- Evaluation field missions combined with interviews and/or remote interviews (face-to-face or by telephone/skype/Teams), 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;
- Analysis of all available information;
- Preparation of the draft evaluation report (based on Guidelines for Evaluation Report and Template Report on IES website https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/guidelines-and-templates.html). The lead evaluator submits the draft report to IES only through Unite Evaluations for review and clearance (may entail several rounds of comments). A briefing on the draft report with project/programme management may also be organized. This will be based on discussion with IES and project/programme management.
- Preparation of the final evaluation report and an Evaluation Brief (2-pager) (based on the Template Brief), including full proofreading and editing, submission to IES through Unite Evaluations for review and clearance (may entail several rounds of comments). It further includes a PowerPoint presentation on final evaluation findings and recommendations;
- Presentation of final evaluation report with its findings and recommendations to the target audience, stakeholders etc. (in person or if necessary, through Skype/Teams etc).
- In conducting the evaluation, the UNODC and the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards are to be taken into account. All tools, norms and templates to be mandatorily used in the evaluation process can be found on the IES website: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/guidelines-and-templates.html.

V. INITIAL TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES
In-depth Evaluation of Strengthening the Judicial Capacities of ECCAS Member States to Combat Wildlife Crime and Trafficking in Natural Resources (GLOZ31 – Central Africa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation stage</th>
<th>Start date (dd/mm/yy)</th>
<th>End date (dd/mm/yy)</th>
<th>Subsumed tasks, roles</th>
<th>Guidance / Process description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report (3-5 weeks)</td>
<td>19/12/2022</td>
<td>13/01/2022</td>
<td>Draft IR; Review by IES, PM; Final IR</td>
<td>Includes 2 weeks for review by IES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection (incl. field missions) (2-6 weeks)</td>
<td>16/01/2022</td>
<td>17/02/2023</td>
<td>Field missions; observation; interviews; etc.</td>
<td>Coordination of data collection dates and logistics with PM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report (6-9 weeks)</td>
<td>20/02/2023</td>
<td>10/03/2023</td>
<td>Drafting of report; by evaluators</td>
<td>Includes 2 weeks for review by IES, 1 week by PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13/03/2023</td>
<td>30/03/2023</td>
<td>Review by IES; review by PM; revision of draft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report for CLP comments (1 week)</td>
<td>31/03/2023</td>
<td>07/04/2023</td>
<td>Compilation of comments by IES</td>
<td>Comments will be shared by IES with evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report, Brief and PowerPoint slides (3-4 weeks)</td>
<td>10/04/2023</td>
<td>28/04/2023</td>
<td>revision by eval; review/approval by IES; incorporation of EFP/MR by PM</td>
<td>Evaluation report, Brief and slides are finalised. Includes 1 week for review by IES and 1 week for PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (1 day)</td>
<td>28/04/2023</td>
<td>28/04/2023</td>
<td>Presentation organized</td>
<td>Date of presentation of final results to be agreed with PM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

VI. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of consultants/ evaluators (national/international)</th>
<th>Specific expertise required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Expert</td>
<td>1 international consultant</td>
<td>Evaluation methodologies and approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Expert</td>
<td>1 international consultant</td>
<td>Illegal wildlife trade, biodiversity conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Expert</td>
<td>1 national consultant</td>
<td>Evaluation methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36 Please note that an evaluation team needs to consist of at least 2 independent evaluators – at least one team leader and one team member.

37 Please add the specific technical expertise needed (e.g. expertise in anti-corruption; counter terrorism; etc.) – please note that at least one evaluation team member needs to have expertise in human rights and gender equality.
The evaluation team will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial. The qualifications and responsibilities for each evaluation team member are specified in the respective job descriptions attached to these Terms of Reference (Annex 1). The evaluation team will report exclusively to the Chief or Deputy Chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section, who are the exclusive clearing entity for all evaluation deliverables and products.

**Absence of Conflict of Interest**

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

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

**VII. MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

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

The Project team is responsible for:

- drafting and finalizing the ToR,
- identifying stakeholders and selecting Core Learning Partners (representing a balance of men, women and other marginalised groups) and informing them of their role,
- recruiting the evaluation team following clearance by IES, ensuring issued contracts ahead of the start of the evaluation process in line with the cleared ToR. In case of any delay, IES and the evaluation team are to be immediately notified,
- providing desk review materials (including data and information on men, women and other marginalised groups) to the evaluation,
- reviewing the draft report and the draft Evaluation Brief for factual errors,
- developing a management response (MR) and evaluation follow-up plan (EFP) 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;

The Project team will be in charge of **providing logistical support** to the evaluation team including arranging the field missions of the evaluation team, including but not limited to:

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

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

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

VIII. PAYMENT MODALITIES

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

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

---

## EVALUATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Indicators/sub questions to respond to each question</th>
<th>Collection method(s) and sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>To what extent have the objective and outcomes of the project been consistent and relevant with regard to identifying recipients’ requirements, country needs, global priorities as well as partners’ and EU policies?</td>
<td>Was the project designed based on evidence (research, lessons learned from past programming, evaluations) and in-depth and contextualized assessments of problems, needs and priorities?</td>
<td>Desk review of project documentation and external documentation, Partner institutions strategies; Interviews with key stakeholders (KIs); Responses of senior officials to the online survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did the project adopt a conflict-sensitivity approach considering the governance specificities related to the region of intervention?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Were national counterparts and beneficiaries consulted in the design and/or implementation stages of the project? Was the project aligned with strategic priorities and expectations of beneficiaries at regional and national levels?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are the objectives of the programmes aligned with ECCAS regional priorities and EU’s priorities and relevant framework of cooperation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>Is the project fit for purpose in the context of the growing interest in wildlife and forest crimes internationally and UNODC’s role therein, including with regards to the 2030 Development</td>
<td>Relevance of the project with regards to the wildlife crime situations (trends and evolutions)</td>
<td>Desk review of project documentation and external documentation, Partner institutions strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of project contributions to international priorities on wildlife and forest crimes such as those</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda and any relevant environmental protection agreements?

Agreed under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) or the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and under the SDGs, including specifically addressing SDG 3 (Health and well-being), SDG 13 (Climate action), SDG 15 (Life and Land) and SDG 16 (Peace, Justice and strong institutions).

Linkages in to UNODC global and regional strategic documents on crimes that affect the environment.

How does the project contribute to install UNODC’s added value and role in the global action framework on wildlife and forest crime?

To what extent has the project contributed to advance relevant strategic frameworks and programmatic actions in the field of wildlife crime and natural resource trafficking as pertinent for Key Partners (partnering countries, donors…) and UNODC engagements and mandates?

To what extent has the project built any synergies to advance:
- UNODC mandates and interventions such as related with support to the implementation of UNTOC and UNCAC.
- the direct or indirect implementation of specific Global programmes such as the Global Programme for Crimes that affect the Environment, the Global Programme against Money Laundering, Proceeds of Crime and the financing of Terrorism (GPML), UNODC’s Action against Corruption and Economic Crime...
- regional strategies such the UNODC Strategic Vision for Africa 2030 and ROSEN intervention frameworks.
- Other relevant UNODC supported initiatives such as E4Justice initiatives.

KIIs and email questionnaires (EQs) with UNODC, Government partners, and CSOs representatives, as well as development partners and donors.

Desk review; KII; EQs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does the project contribute and complement other interventions in the field of wildlife crime and natural resource trafficking in the region (notably EU-ECCAS PARCIC, ECOFAC 6, RALFF, GIZ Border management support (ECOFAC 7) Law enforcement and combating wildlife and forest crime...)?</td>
<td>Has the project been implemented considering UN-system coherence dimension and establish complementariness with actions of relevant UN entities and other international organisations in the in the field of wildlife crime and natural resources trafficking?</td>
<td>KIIs; EQs; desk review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have roles and responsibilities in terms of partnerships and cooperation been clearly defined, realistically set up and fulfilled in this project?</td>
<td>To what extent did the project establish and maintain appropriate partnerships and cooperation mechanisms with relevant governments, beneficiaries’ ministries and authorities, regional and donor’s partner’s, as well as with other relevant international/regional and non-governmental organisations?</td>
<td>KIIs; EQs; desk review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did the coordination work at the UNODC organisational level (HQ/field offices cooperation, Global Program/CA section implementation, other relevant UNODC units...)?</td>
<td>Has the project considered and cooperated with all pertinent partners (TRACE, African Parks, ICCWC, INTERPOL, NGOs.)?</td>
<td>KIIs; EQs; desk review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the project cooperate with partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) in the achievement of results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Matrix</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>To what extent was the process for implementing the activities efficient, timely and cost-effective (timelines, communication of results, cooperation mechanisms), including in the context of the COVID-19 outbreak?</td>
<td>To what extent were the activities implemented, resources employed, and outputs delivered as planned (funds, expertise, staff time, etc.) - what modalities of mentorship and training delivery were used (modules, methods, use of national trainers...)? What were factors facilitating or hindering the delivery of project outputs? As stressed in documentation, human resources and regional partners commitments were challenging. To what extent specific measures were deployed to overcome those identified implementing challenges? What are donor perspectives on the implementation of the project? How the relationship between HQ and FOs, and UNODC ECCAS, EU and relevant implementing partners such as TRACE, African Parks and UN entities work in the sense of efficiency. To what extent did COVID-19 affect the efficiency of the project and how the project adapted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>To what extent have the project outputs and activities been useful to beneficiaries and end users?</td>
<td>How far have project beneficiaries benefited from the project activities? How was this useful/translated in Survey; Interview with national counterparts; EQs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their practice and institutional practices? What was the most challenging?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project achieved its outcomes and results as outlined in its logical framework?</td>
<td>What have been the project's main achievements? What was the added value of UNODC in supporting beneficiaries and partners addressing wildlife and natural resources trafficking? Were there any unintended results (positive or negative), including considering human rights, gender and inclusion aspects and their inter-connection to the environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review; KII; EQs; survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the facilitating and hindering factors for achievement or non-achievement of the results/outcomes and outputs? To what extent did the adjustments made in response to external hindering factors, including COVID-19 (if any) affect the achievement of the project’s expected results?</td>
<td>Any specific factors related to the (institutional) partnership set ups at national/regional levels? Have the programmes identified and managed instability/conflict-related risks (the effects of the context on the programme and how was it managed)? Any specific adaptation needed/consequences of the pandemic on the project achievements?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII; EQs; case studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>To what extent has the project contributed to strengthen investigative, prosecutorial, and judicial capacities and cooperation at national and regional levels to address and prevent wildlife crime and natural resources trafficking in Central Africa?</td>
<td>How have activities, outputs and outcomes provided assistance to government partners and end beneficiaries in meeting the needs to strengthen their responses to W&amp;E crimes? How they have been used, to what aims? Any concrete example of operationalisation of transferred skills and knowledge? How the project influenced beneficiary institutions and individuals in their practices and services provided? Any unintended consequences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII; EQs; survey; external documentation/consultation (Wildlife crime trends, institutional dispositions, decisions, operations...).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annex II: Evaluation Matrix and Tools: Questionnaires and Interview Guides</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To what extent have the skills and knowledge generated by the project been used in country and regional operations and actions (policy, legal framework...) regarding investigations and prosecutions of wildlife crime?</strong></td>
<td>Any example of project’s influence on reduction/disruption/prosecution of wildlife crime and natural resources trafficking, and related ML activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concrete example of how project’s transferred skills (training, mentorship, cooperation support...) and developed tools were integrated into organisational routines/practices.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This related to short- to mid-term impact, while sustainability questions will focus on institutionalisation processes as related to ownership of project’s results.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td><strong>To what extent are the project results likely to persist beyond the project period?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To what extent has ownership of project activities and outputs been generated?</strong></td>
<td>Commentary from partners examples of national/institutional (regional level) ownership, or factor hampering it. Any exit/follow up strategy in place to ensure sustained use of project outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human rights, gender equality, and leaving no one behind</strong></td>
<td><strong>To what extent has the project advanced and mainstreamed human rights, gender and disability inclusion aspects in its development and implementation, including with respect to the specificities of CA context, the inter-connections between environmental protection and human rights, and to emerging international</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>To what extend was the aspect of human rights as related to the environment priorities addressed through project activities?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lessons learned and best practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards on the protection of the environment through criminal law?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What lessons can be learned from the project implementation in order to improve performance, results and effectiveness in future similar projects, including with regards to the mainstreaming human rights, gender and disability inclusion aspects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned on capacity-building and cooperation strengthening results, on responsiveness and adaptation to emerging challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review; KII; survey; case studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What good practices can be identified to be continued and or scaled up in future similar projects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best practices and/or lessons learned in order to improve results and effectiveness in the future? To encourage a change of approach on wildlife crime and natural resources trafficking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII; case studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION TOOL A – KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS (KIIS)

Key informant interviews (KIIs) were based on semi-directive questionnaires presented below. Those were administered in French or English according to respondents’ preferences and applied in a differentiated manner according to the type of interviewed stakeholders as presented in the stakeholders list. The interviews were instrumental in collecting information on socio-demographics of project stakeholders and responses on various issues related to project implementation and context, results achieved, facilitating/challenging factors, sustainability and lessons learned – the grid being derived from key evaluation questions for each DAC criterion.

A purposeful sampling technique was preferred to ensure qualitative feedback that covers most aspects of project results chains, from its development to its achievements. Based on initial stakeholder mapping provided by the project team, the evaluation team identified and pre-selected 88 priority informants39, among which 69 were pre-selected for interviews according to representativeness criteria as follows:

- Geographic representation from each of the 6 countries of implementation;
- Level of GLOZ31-CA activities implementation and achievements as per project reports;
- Types of key stakeholders, i.e., UNODC implementing agents, donors, key partners and development partners such as ECCAS, TRACE, African Parks, CITES Secretariat, UN-sister entities, key recipients and beneficiaries at governmental level, and implementing partners at civil society level;
- Specific knowledge, engagement, and likelihood of responsiveness at the individual level, as per project team guidance.

In total, 58 interviews were requested. 45 interviews took place (M=31, F=14), the remaining requests received no responses, or could not happen either for no show or technical issues. 28 were conducted in a remote manner (using MS Teams, Zoom, Google Meet or WhatsApp as per interviewees preferences), and 17 were met in-person as part of a 5-day field mission in Libreville, Gabon and Yaoundé, Cameroon.

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

This questionnaire provides a basis for interviewing and has been tailored to each stakeholder individually as the discussion flows. Considering the countries of implementation, all questions were translated into French.

3911 were identified to receive a questionnaire and 8 to be part of thematic focus groups. The latter could not take place due to a too short number of participants per group. 23 people were finally contacted for email questionnaires (EQs) - UNODC staff and management (6 people); Donors and partners organisation - Non CLPs (11 people; Nongovernmental Partners - Non-CLPs (6 people)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Questions</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background and context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you please describe your relationship to and role in EU/UNODC project Gloz31-CA? (Any specific activities that were important for you to follow/ to carry out)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you involved in / did you know about other projects related to W&amp;E crimes as part of national/regional (ECCAS) or international support (EU/UNODC) in that regard?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is GLOZ31-CA relevant to your country? Is it tailored enough for your institution’s priorities/ needs? What is your individual roles in this institution? Could you please elaborate on the learning needs in that regard, if any?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the project designed? Were any specific consultative mechanisms developed to that end?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you see the project aligning with international frameworks and engagements on W&amp;E crime such as CITES?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the project develop or strengthen existing/ new cooperation mechanisms at national, bilateral, regional (and international) levels? Was the partnership UNODC-ECCAS relevant and functioning? Were any other consultative mechanisms considered or in place (including with NGOs, private sector where relevant, academia etc.)?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the project conducive to the development of inter-agency partnerships to strengthen the response against W&amp;E crime in a more comprehensive and coordinated way? At the national level? At the regional level?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What challenges have you identified in building partnership and cohesion? How can cooperation/ partnership be improved?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective are the project’s governing structures? How was the cooperation with HQ/other UNODC programmes (regional/country/global)? With other Development and UN partners?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

40 Gvt Institutions (beneficiaries/recipient)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Questions</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To your knowledge, and based on your organisation’s needs, to what extent has the project contributed to advance relevant strategic frameworks and programmatic actions to support your action in the field of W&amp;E crimes in a comprehensive way?</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the project well-staffed, resourced and equipped to deliver as planned?</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the project articulated to the Global program in terms of resources and implementation strategy?</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you encountered any challenges? What have been done to overcome them?</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were resources (financial, time, people, expertise) allocated strategically to achieve HR and/or gender related needs?</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From your perspective, what have been the main achievements of the project? Do you consider the project successful, including in terms of HRG mainstreaming? What could have been done differently or need to be strengthened?</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider implementation to have been efficient in all pilot countries? Can you elaborate on your response?</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From your perspective, what was UNODC added value in this endeavour?</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the project contribute to strengthen your organisation/country capacities and cooperation structures to address W&amp;E crime?</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any examples of key resources, skills or frameworks (normative, operational, judicial...) gained as part of project participation?</td>
<td>x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you seen any unexpected consequences and/or results (positive or negative) from GLOZ31 implementation?</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent can long-term sustainable results be expected for all stakeholders from current project implementation?</td>
<td>x x x x x x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Final In-Depth Evaluation of Strengthening the Judicial Capacities of ECCAS Member States to Combat Wildlife Crime and Trafficking in Natural Resources (GLOZ31 – Central Africa)

### Annex II: Evaluation Matrix and Tools: Questionnaires and Interview Guides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Questions</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>UNODC</th>
<th>Gvt</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>CSOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any specific changes / adjustments (budget, legislation, policy, practices, MoUs ...) that can be seen as indicators of ownership?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRG-LNOB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you define HRG-LNOB dimension in the realm of action of GLOZ31-CA? Do you consider HRG-LNOB relevant for GLOZ31-CA? Could you please elaborate?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How HRG-LNOB were mainstreamed into project activities? Do you have any examples?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider the project took the context (security, conflict, governance vulnerabilities) and cultural influence into consideration throughout the project development? Do you have any examples?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lessons learned and best practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any lessons or best practice you would like to share in the design and implementation of the project to inform future projects of this sort? Any additional comments?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building on KIIs protocol, questionnaires were emailed to project stakeholders who could not be interviewed because of time constraints or who played mainly support roles in project implementation. These included UNODC staff in-country, staff in key beneficiary institutions at governmental level and staff in donor in-country delegations. Out of 88 pre-selected informants, 11 were identified to receive a questionnaire and 8 to be part of thematic focus groups. The latter could not take place due to a too short number of participants per group. 23 people were finally contacted for email questionnaires (EQs), including people unavailable for KIIs - UNODC staff and management (6 people); Donors and partners organisation - non-CLPs (11 people); Non-governmental Partners - Non-CLPs (6 people).

Evaluation questionnaire - UNODC project and management staff

Introductory remarks

Dear Sir/ Madam,

We are contacting you as part of an independent evaluation of the project "Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources," (hereafter “the project”) regional component implemented under UNODC’s Global Programme on Crimes that affect the Environment (GPCAE). As the independent evaluation team, we are conducting this evaluation under the supervision of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section (unodc-ies@un.org; unodc.org/evaluation).

As you are a staff member of a UNODC engaged in the project, your views and perspectives are vital for informing our evaluation. We have prepared a short evaluation questionnaire, which you can complete below and return to us. Alternatively, you can access the questionnaire here – thank you!

To guide this exercise, please also find below some broad background to the evaluation and data utilisation, should you agree to participate.

Please do not hesitate to contact us for any further information.

What is being evaluated?

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, projects require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion. This evaluation is conducted in a utilisation-oriented manner, to inform UNODC future project developments in the region and elsewhere, with a focus on accountability, on learning and on usefulness of UNODC interventions in that particular project framework.

The Final In-Depth Evaluation of the Project “Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources” in Central Africa (GLOZ31-CA segment) aims at assessing the implementation and contributions of the project in achieving its three objectives:

1. Reinforce the national capacity to detect, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate wildlife and environmental/forest crime;
2. Promote cooperation at the regional level between ECCAS Member States; and
3. Reinforce the capacity of Member States to address corruption and money-laundering.

This questionnaire is designed to collect information on the efficiency, effectiveness, impact and coherence of the project’s interventions, in order to identify some key lessons and good practices that can inform UNODC's future work.

What will happen to the answers I provide?

Completion of this questionnaire 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 project dimension/activities you were most involved 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 this questionnaire, you are completely free to choose not to complete it and we will have no record of who has made that choice.

**Questionnaire**

**Background information**

**Q1 - Please specify your gender:**
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Do not want to say

*First, we would like to know in what capacity you have been involved with the project; what has been your role in relation to the project.*

**Q2 - Under which result areas did you work most?**
- ☐ Result area 1: Capacity strengthening to detect, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate wildlife and environmental/forest crime;
- ☐ Result area 2: Regional cooperation support at the level of ECCAS Member States;
- ☐ Result area 3: Capacity of Member States to address corruption and money-laundering.

**Q3 – In which partner country have you been most engaged?**
- ☐ Gabon
- ☐ Cameroon
- ☐ Republic of the Congo
- ☐ Democratic Republic of the Congo
- ☐ Central African Republic
- ☐ Chad

**Q4 - How long have you been involved with UNODC GLOZ31 (2018-2023)?**
- ☐ Since its design stage
- ☐ Since its early implementation period (2018-2020)
- ☐ Intermittently for specific interventions
- ☐ Throughout the project period (2018-2023)
- ☐ Just recently (2022-2023)

**Q5 - Can you specify the types of contribution you have made? (Multiple choices possible)**
- ☐ Project design
- ☐ Project monitoring
- ☐ Grant management
- ☐ Liaising with partner countries national authorities
- ☐ Liaising with ECCAS partner agency
- ☐ Liaising with donor organisations
- ☐ Support to in-country implementation
- ☐ Partnering with GPCAE
- ☐ Research / guide development
- ☐ Training module development
- ☐ Communication around the project activities
- ☐ Other (please specify):

ANNEX II : EVALUATION MATRIX AND TOOLS : QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES
As you complete the following questions, we would like you to give your responses in relation to the result area you specified above. To begin, we would like to ask you some questions about coordination.

Q6 – To what extent did the project develop or strengthen existing and new partnerships at intra-agency level? Please enter your response in Bold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>Good extent</td>
<td>Some extent</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Do not know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7 - Can you describe some examples of particularly effective partnership between the project and each of the levels below? If you have no engagement with one of these, please leave the box empty.

- UN and International Programmes on wildlife and environmental/forest crime
  
  Please enter response here

- UNODC Global programmes other than Global Programme on Crimes that affect the Environment (GPCAE).
  
  Please enter response here

- UNODC Regional programmes
  
  Please enter response here

- UNODC Field projects in the region
  
  Please enter response here

- EU funded projects
  
  Please enter response here

- ECCAS partnerships
  
  Please enter response here

- In-country partnerships, eg., inter-agency, civil society organisations
  
  Please enter response here

- Other partnerships you would like to mention:
  
  Please enter response here

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 project’s result area you work most with.

Q8. From your perspective to what extent were the objectives and outcomes stated in project documents achieved? Please enter your response in Bold
Thinking about your response to Question 8, what were the key factors that facilitated or hindered the programme in achieving results?

Facilitating factors

Hindering factors

Q9 - Which types of resources were useful for delivering efficiently in-country activities? (Multiple choices possible)
☐ National trainers
☐ International trainers
☐ National researchers
☐ International consultants
☐ Local service providers
☐ Local civil society organisations
☐ International civil society organisations
☐ Sustainable financing
☐ Support from a governmental authority
☐ Digital solutions
☐ Other (please specify):

Q10a - Based on your experience in the selected result area, to what extent were resources (financial, time, people, expertise) sufficiently allocated to achieve your objectives relating to human rights as relevant for this project? Please enter your response in Bold

Q10b - Based on your experience in the selected result area, to what extent were resources (financial, time, people, expertise) sufficiently allocated to achieve your objectives relating to gender equality as relevant for this project? Please enter your response in Bold

Q10c- Based on your experience in the selected result area, to what extent were resources (financial, time, people, expertise) sufficiently allocated to achieve your objectives relating to the special needs of vulnerable populations as relevant for this project? Please enter your response in Bold
Q11 - To what extent did the project contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals as relevant to the project? Please mark a X where appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDGs</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Good extent</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Gender equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – Climate Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Life on Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you please elaborate on this SDG-contribution, providing concrete examples of how the contribution was made or of challenges that potentially limited these achievements?

Q12 - To what extent has the project supported a more comprehensive approach to Wildlife & Environmental crimes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Good extent</th>
<th>Some extent</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Can you please elaborate on this contribution, providing examples of exactly how the contribution was made or of challenges that potentially limited achievements?

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

Thank you very much for your contribution!
Questionnaire: Donors and development partners (incl. UN entities)

Introductory remarks

Dear Sir/ Madam,

We are contacting you as part of an independent evaluation of the project "Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources," (hereafter “THE PROJECT”) a regional component implemented under UNODC’s Global Programme on Crimes that affect the Environment (GPCAE). As the independent evaluation team, we are conducting this evaluation under the supervision of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section (unodc-ies@un.org; unodc.org/evaluation).

As you represent a donor or a UN organisation identified as a learning partner or contributor to the project implementation, your views and perspectives are vital for informing our evaluation. We have prepared a short evaluation questionnaire, which is attached, and we would be very grateful if you could complete it and return it to us. Alternatively, you can access the questionnaire through this link – thank you!

To guide this exercise, please also find below some broad background to the evaluation and data utilisation, should you agree to participate.

Please do not hesitate to contact us for any further information.

Thank you for your contribution.

Best regards,

What is being evaluated?

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, projects require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion. This evaluation is conducted in a utilisation-oriented manner, to inform UNODC future project developments in the region and elsewhere, with a focus on accountability, on learning and on usefulness of UNODC interventions in that particular project framework.

The Final In-Depth Evaluation of the Project “Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources” in Central Africa (GLOZ31 – CA segment) aims at assessing the implementation and contributions of the project in achieving its three objectives:

1. Reinforce the national capacity to detect, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate wildlife and environmental/forest crime;
2. Promote cooperation at the regional level between ECCAS Member States; and
3. Reinforce the capacity of Member States to address corruption and money-laundering.

This questionnaire is designed to collect information on the efficiency, effectiveness, impact and coherence of the project’s interventions, in order to identify some key lessons and good practices that can inform UNODC’s future work.

What will happen to the answers I provide?

Completion of this questionnaire 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 project dimension/activities you were most involved 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 this questionnaire, you are completely free to choose not to complete it and we will have no record of who has made that choice.
Questionnaire

Background information

Q1 - Please specify your gender:
☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Do not want to say

First, we would like to know in what capacity you have been involved with the project; what has been your role in relation to the project.

Q2 – In which country is your organisation operating?
☐ Gabon
☐ Cameroon
☐ Republic of the Congo
☐ Democratic Republic of the Congo
☐ Central African Republic
☐ Chad

Q3 - Under which result areas have you been engaged most?
☐ Result area 1: Capacity strengthening to detect, investigate, prosecute, and adjudicate wildlife and environmental/forest crime.
☐ Result area 2: Regional cooperation support at the level of ECCAS Member States.
☐ Result area 3: Strengthening the capacity of Member States to address corruption and money-laundering.

Q4 - How long have you been involved with UNODC GLOZ31 project (2018-2023)?
☐ Since its design stage
☐ Since its early implementation period (2018-2020)
☐ Intermittently, for specific intervention
☐ Throughout the project period (2018-2023)
☐ Just recently (2022-2023)

Q5 - Can you specify the types of activities you have been involved with? (Multiple choices possible)
☐ Project design
☐ Project monitoring
☐ Grant management
☐ Technical support to implementation
☐ Regional cooperation support
☐ Research / guide development
☐ Training activities
☐ Other (please specify):

As you complete the following questions, we would like you to give your responses in relation to the result area you specified above. To begin, we would like to ask you some questions about coordination.

Q6 –To what extent has the UNODC project to strengthen national capacities to detect, investigate and prosecute wildlife and forest crime in Central Africa been aligned with your organisation's priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great extent</td>
<td>Good extent</td>
<td>Some extent</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Could you please elaborate?

Q7 – a/ To what extent have the coordination mechanisms in place with UNODC facilitated implementation of the project activities? Please mark your response in Bold in the table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 Great extent</th>
<th>4 Good extent</th>
<th>3 Some extent</th>
<th>2 Not much</th>
<th>1 Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q7 – b/ To what extent have the coordination mechanisms in place with ECCAS facilitated implementation of the project activities? Please mark your response in Bold in the table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 Great extent</th>
<th>4 Good extent</th>
<th>3 Some extent</th>
<th>2 Not much</th>
<th>1 Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q7 – c/ Can you describe some examples of positive and/or challenging cooperation mechanisms with UNODC, ECCAS and your organisation?

Q8- From your perspective to what extent did the project develop or strengthen partnerships at inter-agency level at the country level (law enforcement and judiciary authorities mainly)? Please enter your response in Bold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 Great extent</th>
<th>4 Good extent</th>
<th>3 Some extent</th>
<th>2 Not much</th>
<th>1 Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Could you provide any examples?

Q9- From your perspective to what extent did the project develop or strengthen partnerships across countries at the regional level in the conduct of wildlife and forest crime investigation? Please enter your response in Bold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 Great extent</th>
<th>4 Good extent</th>
<th>3 Some extent</th>
<th>2 Not much</th>
<th>1 Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Could you provide any examples?

Q10 - While partnerships are an important feature of many projects, they are sometimes difficult to sustain or to operate most effectively. In the box below, can you provide examples of where the partnership with UNODC might have been challenging, highlighting lessons that might be learned?

We will move on now to some questions of efficiency and impact, remembering that we are asking you these questions in respect of the project’s result area you most engaged with.

Q11. From your perspective to what extent was the project objective to strengthen national capacities to detect, investigate and prosecute wildlife and forest crime achieved? Please mark your response in Bold in the table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Thinking about your response to Question 11, what were the key factors that facilitated or hindered the programme in achieving results?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitating factors</th>
<th>Hindering factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Q12– What have been the added values of having UNODC as main implementing partner on this project?**
(Multiple choices possible)
- ☐ UNODC expertise in organized crime prevention
- ☐ UNODC expertise in crimes that affect the environment and wildlife
- ☐ Research support
- ☐ Dialogue building
- ☐ Relationship with national governments and partners
- ☐ Expertise of national contexts
- ☐ Policy guidance and support
- ☐ Digital solutions
- ☐ No added value
- ☐ Other (please specify):
- ☐ Do not know

**Q13 - Based on your experience in the selected result area, what have been the main project’s achievements?**

**Q14 - To what extent did the project contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goals as relevant to the project? Please mark your response in Bold in the table below**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDGs</th>
<th>5 Great extent</th>
<th>4 Good extent</th>
<th>3 Some extent</th>
<th>2 Not much</th>
<th>1 Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – Gender equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13– Climate Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Life on Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q15 – From your perspective to what extent has the project supported a more comprehensive approach to Wildlife & Environmental crimes?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Great extent</th>
<th>4 Good extent</th>
<th>3 Some extent</th>
<th>2 Not much</th>
<th>1 Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Can you please elaborate on this contribution, providing examples of exactly how the contribution was made or challenges that potentially limited achievements?
Finally, we invite you to add any thoughts or comments you might have on your experience with this project and any information that you think might be useful to our evaluation.

Thank you very much for your contribution!

Evaluation questionnaire: Non-Governmental Partners

Dear Sir/ Madam,

We are contacting you as part of an independent evaluation of the project "Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources,” (hereafter “the project”) a regional component implemented under UNODC’s Global Programme on Crimes that affect the Environment (GPCAE). As the independent evaluation team, we are conducting this evaluation under the supervision of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section (unodc-ies@un.org; unodc.org/evaluation).

As you represent a non-governmental organisation identified as a learning partner or a contributor to the project implementation, your views and perspectives are vital for informing our evaluation. We have prepared a short evaluation questionnaire, which is attached, and we would be very grateful if you could complete it and return it to us.

Alternatively, if you prefer, you can access the questionnaire through this link.

To guide this exercise, please also find below some broad background to the evaluation and data utilisation, should you agree to participate.

Thank you very much for your contribution!

Please do not hesitate to contact us for any further information.

Best regards,

What is being evaluated?

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, projects require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion. This evaluation is conducted in a utilisation-oriented manner, to inform UNODC future project developments in the region and elsewhere, with a focus on accountability, on learning and on usefulness of UNODC interventions in that particular project framework.

The Final In-Depth Evaluation of the Project “Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources” in Central Africa (GLOZ31-CA segment) aims at assessing the implementation and contributions of the project in achieving its three objectives:

1. Reinforce the national capacity to detect, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate wildlife and environmental/forest crime;
2. Promote cooperation at the regional level between ECCAS Member States; and
3. Reinforce the capacity of Member States to address corruption and money-laundering.

This questionnaire is designed to collect information on the efficiency, effectiveness, impact and coherence of the project’s interventions, in order to identify some key lessons and good practices that can inform UNODC's future work.

What will happen to the answers I provide?

Completion of this questionnaire 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 project dimension/activities you
were most involved 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 this questionnaire, you are of course completely free to choose not to complete it and we will have no record of who has made that choice.

**Questionnaire**

**Background information**

**Q1 - Please specify your gender:**
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Do not want to say

*First, we would like to know in what capacity you have been involved with the project; what has been your role in relation to the project.*

**Q2 – In which country is your organisation operating?**
- ☐ Gabon
- ☐ Cameroon
- ☐ Republic of the Congo
- ☐ Democratic Republic of the Congo
- ☐ Central African Republic
- ☐ Chad

**Q3 - Under which of the following result areas have you been engaged most?**
- ☐ Result area 1: Strengthening capacity to detect, investigate, prosecute, and adjudicate wildlife and forest crime.
- ☐ Result area 2: Support of regional cooperation between ECCAS Member States.
- ☐ Result area 3: Strengthening capacity of Member States to address corruption and money-laundering.

**Q4 - How long have you been involved with UNODC GLOZ31 Project (2018-2023)?**
- ☐ Since its design stage
- ☐ Since its early implementation period (2018-2020)
- ☐ Intermittently, for specific intervention
- ☐ Throughout the project period (2018-2023)
- ☐ Just recently (2022-2023)

**Q5 - Can you specify the types of activities you have been involved with? (Multiple choices possible)**
- ☐ Project design
- ☐ Project monitoring
- ☐ Country needs assessment
- ☐ Technical support to implementation of activities
- ☐ Regional cooperation support
- ☐ Research / guide development
- ☐ Training activities
- ☐ Other (please specify):
As you complete the following questions, we would like you to give your responses in relation to the result area you specified above. To begin, we would like to ask you some questions about coordination.

Q6 – To what extent has UNODC support to strengthen national capacities to detect, investigate and prosecute wildlife and forest crime been consistent and relevant with regard to your organisation’s needs and priorities?

| 5 | Great extent | 4 | Good extent | 3 | Some extent | 2 | Not much | 1 | Not at all | Not applicable |

Could you please elaborate?

Q7 - To what extent were you consulted during the project development?

| 5 | Great extent | 4 | Good extent | 3 | Some extent | 2 | Not much | 1 | Not at all | Not applicable |

Q8 - Can you describe some examples of particularly effective partnership between the project and your organisation?

Q9 - While partnerships are an important feature of many projects, 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, highlighting lessons that might be learned (including within your organisation, and considering other types of partnership, such as with governmental partners or other development partners)?

We will move on now to some questions of efficiency and impact, remembering that we are asking you these questions in respect of the project’s result area you work most with.

Q10 - From your perspective to what extent were the project objective to strengthen national capacities to detect, investigate and prosecute wildlife and forest crime achieved? Please mark your response in Bold in the table below.

| 5 | Great extent | 4 | Good extent | 3 | Some extent | 2 | Not much | 1 | Not at all | Do not know |

Thinking about your response to Question 10, what were the key factors that facilitated or hindered the programme in achieving results?

**Facilitating factors**

**Hindering factors**

Q11 – What has been the added value of having UNODC as the main implementing partner on this project? (Multiple choices possible)

- [ ] UNODC expertise in organized crime prevention
- [ ] UNODC expertise in crimes that affect the environment and wildlife
- [ ] Research support
- [ ] Dialogue building
Q12 - Based on your experience, what have been the main and visible achievements of the project?

Q13 - How has the project contributed to support your organisation’s capacity to contribute to efforts against wildlife and environmental crimes?

Q14 - How has the project developed your country’s capacity to sustain the effort against wildlife and environmental/forest crime?

Q15 – From your perspective to what extent has the project supported a more comprehensive approach to wildlife & environmental crimes?

Can you please elaborate on this contribution, providing examples of exactly how the contribution was made or challenges that potentially limited achievements?

Q16 - 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 project activities?

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

Thank you very much for your contribution!
An end-user survey was administered to gauge the relevance, usefulness, effectiveness and direct impact of capacity-building activities implemented as part of the project. The survey provided quantitative and qualitative data in relation to the above-noted areas of enquiry. Results were triangulated with other sources of information and analysed in the general framework of this evaluation as well as in the perspective of the case studies (respectively, on the Rapid Reference Guide development, and trainings on Crime scene management).

A voluntary sampling approach was preferred, targeting participants to a selection of project trainings identified as most relevant by the evaluation team, in consultation with the project team. Were targeted the most relevant professional roles for the project (i.e., prosecutors, law enforcement agents, investigators, National Parks rangers, etc), varied forms of training participations (trainee, trained trainer, single and multiple attendance), and a selected number of most relevant national and regional workshops as follows:

- National Train the Trainer program at the Garoua Wildlife School (GWS) (Cameroun)
- National Workshop for OPJ on the use of forensic genetics (Gabon, May 2022)
- National Interagency Workshop on Understanding Corruption as a Driver of Forest, Wildlife and Biodiversity Loss (DRC, April 2022)
- National Workshop for Strengthening Coordination of Law Enforcement and the Judiciary in Wildlife and Other Natural Resource Crime Cases (Gabon, November 2022)
- Regional Training on the Fight Against Illicit Gold Trafficking with AIRAIRCOP (Gabon, November 2022)
- Central African Ministers preparation for the various cops in 2022 focusing on the fight against environmental crimes (Congo, September 2022)
- Wildlife Inter-Regional Enforcement Meeting 2022 (Thailand, November 2022).

The evaluation questionnaire was prepared in French and English and is available in English below. It has been sent out as an attached form and an online link to 142 participants (17 emails bounced back, and 26 responses were received (M= 80%, F=18%)) for a two-week response period. The low response rate can be explained by the high level of staff turnover and inequal and limited Internet access and use of email by survey recipients.

Introduction

Dear Sir/ Madam,

We are contacting you as part of an independent evaluation of the UNODC project "Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources,” (hereafter “the project”), a regional component implemented under UNODC’s Global Programme on Crimes that affect the Environment (GPCAE). As the independent evaluation team, we are conducting this evaluation under the supervision of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Section (unodc-ies@un.org; unodc.org/evaluation).

As you were a participant in one or more training or mentorship activities implemented by UNODC as part of this project, your views and perspectives are vital for informing our evaluation. We have prepared a short survey, which is attached, and we would be very grateful if you could complete it and return it to us within 15 days. Alternatively, you can access the questionnaire through this link – thank you!

To guide this exercise, please also find below some broad background to the evaluation and data utilisation, should you agree to participate.
What is being evaluated?

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, projects require a final in-depth evaluation when nearing their conclusion. This evaluation is conducted in a utilisation-oriented manner, to inform UNODC future project developments in the region and elsewhere, with a focus on accountability, on learning and on usefulness of UNODC interventions in that particular project framework.

The Final In-Depth Evaluation of the Project “Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources” (Central Africa segment under GPCAE/GLOZ31) aims at assessing the implementation and contributions of the project in achieving its three objectives:

- Reinforce the national capacity to detect, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate wildlife and forest crime;
- Promote cooperation at the regional level between ECCAS Member States; and
- Reinforce the capacity of Member States to address corruption and money-laundering in relation to wildlife and forest crimes.

This survey is designed to collect information on the efficiency, effectiveness, coherence and impact of the project's interventions, in order to identify some key lessons and good practices that can inform UNODC's future work.

What will happen to the answers you will provide?

Completion of this questionnaire 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 project dimension/activities you were most involved 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 this questionnaire, you are completely free to choose not to complete it and we will have no record or who has made that choice.

Background information

First, we would like to know in what capacity you have been involved with the project; what has been your role in relation to the project.

Q1 - Please specify your gender:
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Do not want to say

Q2 – In which country are you conducting your activities?
- ☐ Gabon
- ☐ Cameroon
- ☐ Republic of the Congo
- ☐ Democratic Republic of the Congo
- ☐ Central African Republic
- ☐ Chad

Q2 - Could you please specify your area of institutional specialisation?
- ☐ Law enforcement organisation (Police, Gendarmerie…)
- ☐ Customs
- ☐ Judiciary authority
- ☐ Anti-corruption authority
- ☐ Financial investigation authority
Q3 – Could you please specify the type of UNODC activities you attended? (Multiple choice possible)
- Rapid Reference Guide development for investigators and prosecutors
- Wildlife Crime Scene and Evidence Management Awareness - Train the Trainer training programme
- Training to strengthen national capacities in the fight against gold and minerals trafficking in airports
- Regional cooperation and dialogue workshops
- Training to strengthen national capacities on anti-corruption and/or anti-money laundering/illicit financial flows
- Training to strengthen national judiciary capacities in the fight against wildlife and environmental crimes
- Other (please specify):  

Q4 – Could you please specify the role or roles you had in the activity? (Multiple choices possible)
- Participant/trainee
- Trainer (external)
- Trainer for trainers
- Observer
- Other (please specify):

Q5a – In the capacity stated in Q4, how many thematic or regional trainings have you attended? By "one", it is understood the entire module sessions of a thematic training, not one module (Frequency of participation -multiple choices possible)
- One national thematic training
- Two national thematic trainings
- More than two national thematic training
- One regional training/exchange/meeting
- Two regional training/exchange/meetings
- More than 2 regional training/exchange/meetings
- One Train the Trainer training programme

We are now moving to the direct impact of UNODC training for your organisation.

Q6 – To what extent did the activities respond to your organisational needs and priorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Good extent</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Some extent</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q7- To what extent did the attended activity (or activities) respond to your capacity-building needs as a professional (usefulness) ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Good extent</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Some extent</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q8 - To what extent did your participation in the activity (or activities) allow you to develop or strengthen existing skills?
Q9 - To what extent did your participation in the activity (or activities) allow you to develop or strengthen inter-agency partnerships?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Good extent</th>
<th>Some extent</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q10 – Have any partnerships been developed with counterparts from neighbouring countries?
☐ Yes
☐ No

If you answered yes, to what extent did your participation in project activities allow you to develop or strengthen partnerships with other counterparts at the regional level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great extent</th>
<th>Good extent</th>
<th>Some extent</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q11 - Can you describe any examples of particularly effective partnership strengthening as a result of the skills you gain through UNODC training?

We will move on now to some questions of efficiency, usefulness and the use of resources.

Q12 - Which type of resources did you find useful as delivered by the project activity (or activities)?

- National trainers
- International trainers
- Module contents
- Study material
- Case studies and mock activities
- Produced guidance, report or publication
- Digital solutions
- Other (please specify)

Q13 - To what extent do you agree with the following statements:

| My knowledge of wildlife and environmental crime in my country has been improved by the series of capacity-building activities |
| My knowledge of wildlife and environmental crime in my country has been improved by the series of capacity-building activities |
| The training I attended has helped me to do my work better |
| The training I attended provided me with essential tools to advance more efficient |

Very much | To some extend | Not really | Not at all | Do not know | Very much | To some extend | Not really | Not at all | Do not know | Very much | To some extend | Not really | Not at all | Do not know | Very much | To some extend | Not really | Not at all | Do not know | Very much | To some extend | Not really | Not at all | Do not know|

ANNEX II: EVALUATION MATRIX AND TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES
actions against wildlife and environmental crimes

Wildlife and environmental crimes constitute a national priority

Wildlife and environmental crimes require a set of diverse skills to be adequately responded to

Mentoring activities (UNODC advice and support on investigative tool development for example) provided enough support to develop a sustained and coordinated response to criminal activities negatively affecting the environment

Q14 - Could you share a brief story about the most significant change in your professional practice that has occurred as a result of your participation in training under the UNODC project?

Q15 – Do you consider the activities under the UNODC project as useful for your country in its fight against wildlife and environmental crime?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 Great extent</th>
<th>4 Some extent</th>
<th>3 Some extent</th>
<th>2 Not much</th>
<th>1 Not at all</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q16 - Has the project helped you identify clear linkages between your work and broader environmental protection principles and norms?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 Great extent</th>
<th>4 Good extent</th>
<th>3 Some extent</th>
<th>2 Not much</th>
<th>1 Not at all</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q19 - What could have been done differently, if anything?

Q20 - Where would you situate future needs and priorities to support and strengthen more comprehensive and effective response to wildlife and environmental crime in your country?

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.

Thank you very much for your contribution!
## UNODC DOCUMENTS

### UNODC-EU Project documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document – name</th>
<th>Comments, if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• GLOZ31 Project document – Action description, summary and amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOZ31 Project Logical framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOZ31 Staffing Table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Steering Committee Meeting Reports 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOZ31 Annual Report to EU for Yeay 2020, 2021 and synthesis April 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOZ31 Workplans 2021, 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GLOZ31 Mid-term Evaluation report by EU independent expert (April 2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Document PARCIC (Convention de financement PARCIC I and annexe I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dispositions techniques et administratives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Revision GLOZ31 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Annual Reports 2018, 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Samples of projects outputs (training modules, publications, studies.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Etude Eco-sécurité</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Etude sur le trafic de minerais en Afrique centrale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Wildlife Crime Scene and Evidence Management Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Train the Trainer training programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Mock Trial scenario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Training modules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Country assessments and review of legal and judicial frameworks to address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife crime – Congo, Cameroun, Gabon, DRC, Tchad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNODC Evaluation documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document – name</th>
<th>Comments, if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• UNODC Independent Evaluation Section: Evaluation-based analysis of good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• practices in UNODC’s approach to capacity building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNOV/UNODC’s Strategy for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• (2018-2021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gender-Responsive Evaluations in the Work of UNODC (2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNODC Gender Guidance for Project Managers and Evaluators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNODC evaluation guidelines, templates, handbook, policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation Inception Report Template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation Report Template IDE, IPE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation Brief Template IDE, IPE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation Quality Assessment Template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNEG: Integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020)

Total number of UNODC documents reviewed: 43

EXTERNAL DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document – name</th>
<th>Comments, if applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNODC Approach to Crimes that Affect the Environment - UNODC_Approach_to_Crimes_that_Affect_the_Environment.pdf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC Guide, Scaling Back Corruption Scaling Back Corruption (unodc.org)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit Toolkit_e.pdf (unodc.org)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC Global programme for combating Wildlife and Forest Crimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC Strategic Vision for Africa 2030 - UNODC_Strategic_Vision_for_Africa_2030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme d’Appui aux Réformes et au Renforcement des Capacités Institutionnelles de la CEEAC Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for Justice (E4J) initiative Module on Wildlife crime - Wildlife Crime (unodc.org)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (“Bern Convention”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention on the Protection of the Environment through Criminal Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Europe’s Manual on Human Rights and the Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of external documents reviewed: 12
## ANNEX IV: STAKEHOLDERS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of interviewees</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Type of stakeholder (see note below)</th>
<th>Sex disaggregated data</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6                      | UNODC Global Programme | Project implementer | Male: 2  
Female: 4 | Austria |
| 8                      | UNODC Field Project implementer | Male: 5  
Female: 3 | Gabon, Cameroun, DRC, Senegal |
| 5                      | European Union (incl. EU country Delegations) Donors | Male: 2  
Female: 3 | Belgium, Gabon, CAR, Congo |
| 3                      | ECOWAS and technical commission Project key partner (regional) | Male: 3  
Female: 0 | Cameroun, Gabon |
| 7                      | TRACE, CITES, UN agencies Project partner (international) | Male: 5  
Female: 2 | Gabon, Cameroun, Belgium |
| 9                      | Relevant ministries (Justice, Good governance, Forestry) and Protected area, and forest authorities Government recipient | Male: 8  
Female: 1 | Cameroun, DRC, Gabon |
| 7                      | Environmental protection NGOs Civil society organisation | Male: 6  
Female: 1 | Sub-regional |
| **Total: 45**           |              | **Male: 31**  
**Female: 14** |           |

**Note:** A stakeholder could be a Civil Society Organisation; Project/Programme implementer; Government recipient; Donor; Academia/Research institute; etc.
In addition to materials collected through the inception and field phases of this evaluation, focused and additional information were constituted in parallel to identify good practices and lessons learned from key project’ activities, here, the development of the Rapid Reference Guides (RRGs), the Wildlife Crime Scene management trainings and the Instructors’ Development Programme (IDP) (or Train the trainer program ToT) at the Garoua Wildlife School (GWS) in northern Cameroon. Applying the DAC criteria in a more transversal way, the cases studied were helpful to appreciate:

- The extent to which the project was effective in strengthening knowledge, skills and operational capacities of relevant front-line actors for investigation and prosecution of W&E crimes (Effectiveness: is the intervention achieving its goals? Is it a good practice?)
- The types of effects the intervention produced and to what extent long-term results can be expected from this type of intervention (Impact and sustainability: what difference does it make, for how long and for whom?)

These cases were of particular interest to gauge how far the project contributed to develop strategies and operational frameworks that would enable better development results on the long run (ownership).

Case studies were based on triangulated data from:

- Adapted KIIs (with additional specific questions about ToT activities) with relevant national partners, implementation partners, UNODC staff involved in above mentioned activities;
- Review of project documentation and visibility material (modules, UNODC project stories, GWS open-access information...);
- Responses from ToT participants and trainers to the Survey of final beneficiaries conducted for this evaluation.

These case studies however face important limitations (time constraints, limited field observations, representativeness of survey participants...) and can only provide indications of UNODC performance and elements of responses to the above-mentioned questions.

**CASE STUDY A - RAPID REFERENCE GUIDES DEVELOPMENT**

Based on good practices and lessons learned, UNODC developed a model of ready-to-use tools that was successfully implemented in countries in South America, Eastern Africa and Asia. As part of the project under evaluation, the development of Rapid Reference Guides (RRGs) aimed at providing all actors of the penal chain addressing wildlife and natural resources crime with a practical and comprehensive tool that would facilitate investigation, prosecution and cooperation to address W&E crime. As part of the project, tailor-made RRGs for investigators and prosecutors of wildlife and forest crime were developed and are under dissemination in 5 pilot countries, i.e., Republic of Congo, Chad, Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the Central African Republic.

**EFFECTIVENESS - THE IMPORTANCE OF INCLUSIVE AND COLLABORATIVE MECHANISMS**

Triangulation of data collected through focused KIIs, desk review, field mission and final beneficiary survey shows that the RRG constitutes a key project achievement and a good practice of project effectiveness but also an example of UNODC positive soft and cognitive influence.
A key feature of this action is the methods used for the elaboration of the tool. UNODC assisted the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS) Member States with the development of the RRGs in a collaborative way through a series of inter-sectoral workshops with the active involvement of key law enforcement and prosecution actors. In each country, this led to the constitution of “drafting and validation Committees”, coordinated by UNODC experts, and meeting regularly over a year. Each committee gathered key front line and institutional actors of the Police, the Gendarmerie, Customs, the Judiciary, including judges and magistrates, but also representatives of ministries of Interior, Justice, Finance, Governance, the environment, water and forests, and other relevant actors such as Interpol liaising officers.

This participatory approach was recognized by most consulted stakeholders to have facilitated the identification of key actors and paths for increased exchange of information as well as best practices between investigators and prosecutors to ensure that those conducting the investigations gather the information required by the prosecution to build a strong case. Interviewed stakeholders and survey respondents highly valued the “synergy in the work of developing the Guide” and welcome that all sectoral forces involved conducted a “joint effort to achieve a concrete and useful result”.

Late 2022, UNODC organized RRG handover ceremonies in each country to officially launch the RRGs to which high-level representatives of each of these countries participated, demonstrating positive political support.

ACHIEVEMENTS – A READY-TO-USE TOOL TO SERVE AS A BASIS FOR HARMONIZED NORMATIVE FRAMEWORKS AND COOPERATIVE PRACTICES TO ADDRESS WILDLIFE AND NATURAL RESOURCES CRIMES.

First, the development of the RRGs provided countries across the region with a practical and tailor-made tool laying down the actors, norms and means to obtain information on legislation, key points to prove in court and specific investigation methods, to trace criminal networks and bring members of a criminal organisation to justice. The Guides provide an overview of the legal tools and best practices available from the commission of a crime, through the collection and processing of evidence, to its presentation before the judges.

Collected data also shows that the collaborative and participatory development mechanisms increased the product ownership and stakeholders’ support and buy-in. Involved in the design, drafting and structuration of the Guide, consulted stakeholders valued the fact that the tool was “their own” and not externally driven. Translation of the Guide is underway in Cameroon, while it has been disseminated and distributed across national authorities in other countries and its development requested in Gabon.

Finally, from its elaboration to its contents, the RRG process and product were reported to have encouraged greater collaborative work. Several points were made through KII and survey responses highlighting how far the RRG development raised awareness and to some extend individual practices towards the search for evidence, improved identification of existing legal frameworks, key partners and responsible authorities, encouraging inter-agency communication.

EMERGING PRIORITIES – TRANSLATING KNOWLEDGE INTO ACTION AND STANDARDIZED PRACTICE.

The production of the Rapid Reference Guides has reportedly contributed to clarify existing frameworks, procedures and tools to combat W&E crimes in 5 pilot countries of delivery. However, the evaluation team could not observe how, or whether, the Guide was being used in daily institutional routines and procedures.
More broadly there was no information or indication of increased prosecution rates following the dissemination of the RRGs at national levels.

Surely the RRGs represent important achievements that might nevertheless be under-used considering the high level of institutional turnover and the relative low levels of product dissemination among front-line actors.

Information collected through KII, field observations and survey, highlights the need to pursue planned activities and train investigators and prosecutors in countries in the use of the RRGs to improve case analysis and preparation of information and evidence gathering, investigation, charging, pleading, and sentencing, among other aspects.

Building on existing RRG working groups and achieved work, there is also a need to sustain the momentum and encourage further work towards normative harmonization and standardization of investigative practices to address wildlife and natural resources crimes in the region.

**CASE STUDY B – WILDLIFE CRIME-SCENE MANAGEMENT TRAININGS**

**PURPOSE AND RELEVANCE – IMPROVED STRATEGIC APPROACH TO W&E CRIMES**

From the first description of the Project on 'Strengthening the judicial capacities of ECCAS Member States to combat wildlife crime and trafficking in natural resources', the need for specialised training of enforcement officers was identified.

One of the areas where such specialised training is required is in relation to 'crime-scene management'. The need for such training is highlighted in the *Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit* (latest version 2022) of the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime, which states that "Proper crime scene work further requires personnel who are adequately trained in crime scene management and record keeping."

This objective aligns with the declared activities of UNODC, which states, in the *UNODC Approach to Crimes that Affect the Environment* (2021?) that, "UNODC engages in several cross-cutting activities related to crimes that affect the environment, including .... Capacity building for Member States in the areas of crime scene management, forensic evidence generation ..." etc. In the same document, attention is drawn to the partnership with TRACE Wildlife Forensics Network and the African Wildlife Forensics Network, in developing best practices and training for crime-scene first responders, among others.

The Annual Report for 2021 of UNODC's Global Programme for combating Wildlife and Forest Crime draws attention to its work in the field of training also in this area: "The Global Programme also organized workshops in many beneficiary countries to train investigators and prosecutors on crime scene management, interviewing suspects and witnesses ..." etc. Noting that "The forensic process is highly dependent on the recognition of potential evidence and the actions taken at a crime scene. First responders need to know how to approach and process a crime scene in a way that ensures evidence is admissible in a court of law. Mistakes made at the beginning of a forensic investigation may jeopardize the validity of subsequent analysis and prevent prosecutions from being successful." Attention is also drawn to the fact that crime-scene management training was delivered in several of the countries that are the subject of the Project being
evaluated, and to the collaboration with African Parks in order to strengthen the capacity of park rangers and judicial authorities to detect and investigate wildlife and natural resources-related crimes.

ACHIEVEMENTS – REINFORCED KNOWLEDGE AND NEW UNDERSTANDING OF WILDLIFE AND NATURAL RESOURCE CRIME INVESTIGATION NEEDS

A key point made in the report was repeated by interviewees during the evaluation, namely that the trainings helped increase the awareness of the participants of the need for coordination between park rangers and judicial authorities, to bridge the gap between crime-scene and court.

The training on crime-scene management clearly addresses the first objective of the Project, to "Reinforce the national capacity to detect, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate wildlife and forest crime."

Within the context of the Project under evaluation, training on wildlife crime-scene management was provided in Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo and Gabon. The interviews with participants and trainers show that these training sessions were very much appreciated. They were appreciated for three reasons. The first is that the participants learned more about what is required in the management of a wildlife crime scene or were able to reinforce the knowledge that they already had. The second is that they acquired a new understanding of the needs and the difficulties facing other personnel in the chain from crime-scene to court; in particular, rangers learned about the specific needs of prosecutors and the court, and the prosecutors learned about the challenges of fieldwork for rangers at the scenes of crime. The third reason why these sessions were appreciated is that participants were able establish direct contacts with personnel at different levels in the chain. Some stakeholders report that this has led to finding quicker solutions to issues arising in the provision of evidence for courts.

So, there are some positive outcomes from this training in the project already. But there was little solid evidence of these positive effects. It is probable that the positive effects will emerge in the longer term.

LIMITATIONS AND NOTES OF CAUTION

Some stakeholders noted that a single training session is not enough. And others agree that more training is needed, in particular for those who have not been trained. The point was also made that if there is further training, the additional sessions should also respond to the specific needs at different levels in the law enforcement chain. So, rangers, for example, would need more practical training for their work in the field.

There is a continued concern that some (or many) trainees will not continue in their jobs for a long time, so that some of the training gains were not fully optimized. No easy solution has been proposed to tackle this.

There is also a risk that the training could be lost when the personnel, on their return to work, do not have the equipment required to implement what they have learned. They may also not have access to the forensic expertise, and associated scientific equipment, that is needed in order to follow up cases. So there needs to be a coordination of training with supply of equipment and expertise.

In spite of these concerns and notes of caution, the overwhelming view of the training, and of the way it was delivered, has been very positive.
**CASE STUDY C - TRAIN THE TRAINER PROGRAM AT THE GAROUA WILDLIFE SCHOOL (GWS)**

**EFFECTIVENESS - THE IMPORTANCE OF HARMONIZED SKILLSETS AND PARTICIPATORY INTERVENTIONS**

The Instructors’ Development Programme (IDP) used a “train the trainer” model (ToT) to help building a curriculum of basic and essential tools to manage wildlife and natural resources crime management. It supports the GWS instructors develop their proficiencies as tutors and knowledge producers able to tailor and design training course relevant to national front-line agents addressing W&E crimes. The overall objective was to support the school to deliver and provide a wide array of professionals (including the Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife (MINFOF) park rangers, police officers, prosecutors and the judiciary) accessible and essential training that will harmonize their knowledge and skills in tackling wildlife and forest crimes, and in turn, strengthen and standardize law enforcement and judiciary practices to tackle W&E crime.

The Garoua School benefited from the expertise and technical assistance of UNODC, in cooperation with TRACE for the development of a training modules in crime scene management, covering methods that were relatively under-used in both teaching and operations on W&E crimes. Despite some delays in the intervention delivery, the program unfolded in three phases:

1. Crime scene management and evidence management awareness basics modules;
2. Specific thematic and methodology of investigation;
3. Simulation cases and trainers’ tests.

In the course of the program, eight instructors were identified and equipped to work as course managers and develop training content. At the end of this evaluation, 13 trainees completed the programme and became national instructors on wildlife crime scene management and have already delivered such training to their peers. The instructors had then been responsible to elaborate a tailored training module on wildlife crime investigation to be incorporated into the GWS curriculum. Survey respondents highlighted the usefulness of internationally recognized practices and knowledge, and the relevance of simulation cases to test their abilities.

In addition, based on the ToT success, visibility materials were prepared to disseminate good practices and highlight the school new curriculum in the perspective of attracting new professionals.

**ACHIEVEMENTS – A PROMISING INSTITUTIONAL MECHANISM OF KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER**

The intervention had positive effect at three levels.

- At the individual level (Trained trainers): Triangulation of data shows that IDP developed trainees’ skills and enabled them to acquire new methods and expertise to address W&E crime. Nevertheless, collected data shows that the first rounds of the program delivered mainly on the necessary theoretical tools of crime scene management, but were slow to move to the investigation phase and in-field situations. The program developed appetite for more in-depth and specific knowledge that additional and more operational coaching work could fulfill.
FINAL IN-DEPTH EVALUATION OF STRENGTHENING THE JUDICIAL CAPACITIES OF ECCAS MEMBER STATES TO COMBAT WILDLIFE CRIME AND TRAFFICKING IN NATURAL RESOURCES (GLOZ31 – CENTRAL AFRICA)

- At the institutional level (GWS): Through the elaboration of an in-house curriculum, the IDP constitutes a good practice to encourage the establishment of key institutional mechanisms to ensure increased ownership of the intervention and more sustainable knowledge transfer on wildlife crime management. Thanks to the communication strategy developed around the project, the school also gained in visibility and credibility to attract additional students and resources to pursue its missions. However, the number of trained trainers remains quite low compared to the needs of national law enforcement and front-line agents dealing with wildlife criminality. There has been also limited evidence of adequate resources to enable the school to deliver the new curriculum and train new trainers.
- At the national level (interested government partners), while data remains scarce and the GWS curriculum development process is at its earliest stage, collected data suggests that the acquisition of new expertise contributed to raise awareness at higher levels within law enforcement and judiciary authorities on the importance of wildlife crime priorities and needed actions to counter it. It is however still quite challenging to gauge the use and impact of the training in daily routines and operations.

Overall, while promising, these achievements remain quite limited in scope and outreach. The high level of participants turnover questions the sustainability of the intervention, while the limited number of fully trained trainers remain insufficient to cover national and regional needs in capacity-building to address W&E crime.

EMERGING PRIORITIES

As this evaluation closed, the GWS was undergoing a revision of its programs to integrate and contextualize the IDP modules into its ordinary curriculum and the specificities of law enforcement systems and wildlife crime manifestations in Cameroon and more broadly in Central Africa.

At national level, the main challenges are now: for the GWS i) to develop strategies and sufficient resources to continue to identify future trainers, ii) provide this training to students and staff of protected areas and departments of ministries, and iii) to scale up the program dissemination in interested law enforcement schools; for UNODC action at the regional level, to support the dissemination of ToT programs throughout the sub-region.

To that end, and providing additional resources, some priorities have been highlighted for future follow up opportunities:

- Sustaining the ToT offer to reach out an increased number of potential trainers;
- Deepening the ToT offer and modules to complement theoretical knowledge with in-field practical cases (training in protected areas with eco-guards, opportunities to practice during actual patrols, etc.), field investigations and real-time follow-up of legal cases;
- Continuing to support interested partners and schools to encourage national momentum to ensure follow up actions, including fundraising efforts to enable the extension of the program at national, and potentially regional levels.
ANNEX VI: REPORT OF SITE VISIT TO GABON ANPN FORENSIC LAB

BACKGROUND

The National Agency for National Parks of Gabon (Agence nationale des parc nationaux, ANPN) has been created in 2002, under the Forest and Water Ministry, to manage and protect the 13 national parks of Gabon, representing nearly 11.5% of its territory. Since its creation, the Agency has grown from 25 personnel to more than 700 agents operating around the country, receiving financing support from both national budget and external funding. The ANPN institutional and operational development (2002-2015) benefited from the historic support of the World Bank, the French Development Agency (AFD), and more recently of the European Union and UNODC.

As part of this evaluation, a site visit was organized at the headquarters of the ANPN in Libreville, Gabon where the lead evaluator met with the ANPN Wildlife Forensics Laboratory scientific management and team. The visit took place for a half day on March 27th, 2023, and included joint interviews of ANPN representatives, and a tour of the Forensic Lab infrastructure.

PROJECT SUPPORT AND ACHIEVEMENTS

The evaluated project support to ANPN contributed to the creation and operationalization of the first wildlife genetics forensic lab of the Central African region. Inaugurated in March 2021, the ANPN Lab responds to the need for evidence-based investigation of wildlife crime scenes in Gabon and in the region. Not initially part of the GLOZ31-CA project plan, the Lab now constitutes a positive example of flexible cooperation and tailored support to key partners. The cooperation between UNODC and TRACE with the EU support was highly welcome and acknowledged to have significantly amplified the agency scientific capacities by all interviewed stakeholders.

The support to the Forensic lab enabled an extension of that unit in terms of human resources (project support to 2 consultants in addition to one biologist), equipment (portative units), and missions. The Lab extended the ANPN scientific unit responsibilities and has now capacity to:

- Perform wildlife genetic research to improve the conservation management of Gabon’s wildlife and deepen the understanding of the animals, their habitat and their behavior that should be useful in the fight against elephant poaching and ivory trafficking. In that sense, the ANPN conducted the first elephant census of Gabon.
• **Support the production and collection of data and evidence for judiciary and investigative purposes.** The participation of ANPN agents to the project Crime scene management trainings and UNODC technical expertise were found highly useful in that sense.

**Picture 3: ANPN Wildlife Forensic Lab, Research Unit**

Source: See bottom of page 89

• **Develop its capacity to perform DNA-based wildlife forensic analyses**, which includes the production of evidence for a wildlife crime prosecution and the generation of intelligence to support wildlife crime investigations (verification, identification, tracing of low-template samples, including faeces and ivory). The project equipped the Lab of two portative units, to facilitate evidence collection across the country and, more broadly in the region. The portative labs have started to be operationalized and enabled the collection of evidence in several cases, including cases in Gabon, Cameroon and Nigeria mainly thanks to the action of ANPN Eco-guards and Police cooperation.

“Thanks to the Lab, from samples of tips seized by customs officers in Cameroon for example, it is possible to know where elephants were killed and, therefore, to identify areas where poachers operate, and to trace criminal networks involved in ivory trafficking.” Interview, ANPN Lab representative, site visit, March 2023

The Wildlife forensic lab now provides expertise and methods of criminal analysis that are unprecedented and unique in Central Africa. Thanks to the project support, the laboratory has also started to develop its international network for both wildlife forensics and research, participating to international events, and exchanging information at the regional and international levels, notably with Interpol.
SUSTAINABILITY AND WAY FORWARD

The Lab represents the only wildlife forensic laboratory in Gabon and Central Africa. The project contributed to strengthen the Lab scientific capacities and credibility. The services provided have thus the potential to constitute essential tools to support national and regional efforts in developing evidence-based investigation and due administration of proof in the judicial chain to address wildlife crime, but also to bring forensic capacities to the field, notably through the portative units.

A series of challenges would however need to be overcome for the Lab to achieve its full potential. First, the Lab does not have any legal recognition and as such, encounters difficulties to standardize its practice within the national criminal chain beyond crime scene management support. In addition, the admissibility of wildlife forensic evidence in Gabon courts remain dependent on institutions external to ANPN that are just starting to acknowledge the value of forensics with regards to wildlife crime. Second, the lack of long-term sustainable funding prevents the structure to expand its research team, as well as the necessary equipment to adequately respond to the increasing scale of wildlife criminality in the region. The laboratory workload could become too large for its current technical and staffing capacity. Third, there is still some room to improve the Lab compliance with international standards and concurrently, work with the judicial chain authorities to better understand the use and value of wildlife forensics in investigations and prosecution.

As a result of the site visit, and providing additional resources, a number of areas have been identified for possible follow up:

- To support at national level the recognition of the ANPN Lab as a key scientific actor in the judiciary chain to address wildlife crime.
- To support the development of the Lab technical capacities in the region, notably through expansion and increased use of portative units, based on international best practices and standards.
- To work at increasing or sustaining the political momentum for national and international support to wildlife forensics and research.

At the close of this evaluation, UNODC elaborated a Development Plan to direct and support the development of ANPN’s wildlife genetic analyses laboratory to ensure its long-term sustainability. There have been however no indications of the resources needed and in place ensure its implementation.

Source of all pictures: Evaluation field visit, March 27th, 2023; Evaluation KIIs; Additional project documentation, UNODC/DO/BMB/Environment team, Elaboration of a development plan for ANPN's wildlife genetic analyses laboratory in Gabon, October 2022; Official presentation, “Développement institutionnel de l’Agence nationale des parcs nationaux du Gabon”, ANPN International relations unit.