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NARRATIVE

UNODC’s CBRN Terrorism Prevention Programme team of the Terrorism Prevention Branch (CBRN TPP) is pleased to provide this management response to the Evaluation Report of the project ‘Union Support for the Universalisation and Effective Implementation of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism – ICSANT (Segment of GLOTP1)’.

CBRN TPP welcomes the independent in-depth final evaluation of the ICSANT project, especially in the context of the current implementation of a second, follow-on project, for which this evaluation provides valuable recommendations.

Launched in 2019 with funding from the European Union, this project aims to ensure that there is no safe haven for those who commit or seek to commit terrorist or other criminal acts involving nuclear or other radioactive material by supporting the universalization and effective implementation of ICSANT.

CBRN TPP welcomes the evaluation results highlighting the project’s essential contribution to building and sustaining momentum on the importance of ICSANT universalization across interested stakeholders and partners, thus supporting the establishment of an effective global nuclear security regime and fully aligning with UNODC’s core mandate to promote the international legal framework against terrorism, as well as UNODC’s programming and strategic framework. It also welcomes that external partnerships have been crucial to advance project outcomes in a coherent and synergetic manner and placed UNODC as a key strategic and expert partner in the field, and it fully endorses the recommendation to explore opportunities of more formalized cooperation and joint planning mechanisms.

CBRN TPP further acknowledges with appreciation the finding that the project made use of its resources in a highly efficient manner and was adequately adapted to the challenges presented by the Covid-19 pandemic, it was tailored to the specific needs and requirements of individual countries/regions and was very well tracked in terms of financial and donor reporting.

CBRN TPP is pleased to note the key lessons learned and good practices from the project implementation, which include the provision of tailor-made assistance and the development of diversified and comprehensive knowledge tools, the close cooperation with key international organizations and NGOs and optimized use of international specialized platforms, events and networks, as well as the multi-stakeholder outreach strategy and the innovative and continuous learning approach adopted by the project team.

CBRN TPP accepts the recommendation to ensure in future programming the mainstreaming and monitoring of human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and “leaving no one behind”.

It partially accepts other recommendations, in light of the fact that most of the recommended actions are already being implemented and/or have already been duly taken into account in the design and (ongoing) implementation of the follow-on project, particularly those pertaining to results-based management and reporting, visibility enhancement and long-term monitoring of project results. Additionally, while the evaluation suggests prioritization of countries with the highest nuclear terrorism risk and threat, CBRN TPP notes that in many cases it responds to requests from Member States, and proactive prioritization is not necessarily always possible. Furthermore, all countries are considered a priority for the universalization and effective implementation of the Convention at the heart of the project given that security is only as strong as its weakest link, any country could potentially become a safe haven; also, citizens of any country could be victims or perpetrators, in light of globalization and of the transnational nature of the threat of nuclear or radiological terrorism.

In conclusion, CBRN TPP accepts most of the recommendations, noting that many are already being implemented and while remaining cognizant of the limitations inherent to some of them.
**INDIVIDUAL RESPONSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Management Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enhance in-country follow-ups and adjust the scope and framework of intervention to regional and national legislative needs and priorities on ICSANT.</td>
<td>Partially accepted²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended that the Project Management and Team in close dialogue with senior management of the Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), as well as UNODC Field Offices (FOs) and Regional Offices (ROs), along with the donor, interested Member States and specialized partners where relevant, focus the second phase of the ICSANT project toward enhanced technical assistance and in-country support. This could be done at the earliest convenience during the second-phase planning of activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mainstream HRG-LNOB dimension in accordance with thematic specificities of ICSANT and nuclear security.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended that the ICSANT Project Team rely on available UNODC resources and expertise to conduct a thorough analysis of relevant aspects of HRG-LNOB to mainstream human rights and gender equality into future project activities, at all stages, including monitoring and reporting, and updating project deliverables to be more inclusive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Streamline and strengthen the project cooperation architecture.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended that the ICSANT Project Management and TPB senior management, in consultation with donors, continue with building synergies and optimizing complementarities of mandates across partners as a central component of the project, and formalize cooperation mechanisms and practices in a more systematized manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Streamline, Specify and refocus the project Theory of Change for its next phases of development.</td>
<td>Partially accepted³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended that the ICSANT Project Management and the Team, in close dialogue with TPB senior management, along with the donor, undertakes at the earliest in the second project phase and in the design stage of the possible next phases, a thorough reflection exercise to streamline, specify and refocus the project’s Theory of Change on ICSANT adherence and implementation at regional and national levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

² The recommendation is partially accepted as the ICSANT Project Management and the Team is already implementing most of the suggested actions, which have been duly incorporated into the design of the follow-on project. Also, some of the suggested actions (e.g. translation of tools and resources in other languages beyond the six UN official languages) is subject to the donor’s agreement and availability of funds. In some cases (e.g. the recommendation to encourage the creation of regional working groups), the Project team’s experience shows that the recommended action is not feasible and/or not desirable, due for example to lack of capacity in certain States or the existence of multiple, similar initiatives/mechanisms, and therefore it risks being counterproductive.

³ The recommendation is partially accepted, as the ICSANT Project Management and the Team is already using a results-based management methodology in the planning and implementation of the project, and a logical framework has been agreed with, and approved by, the donor. Also, most of the suggested actions have already been taken into account in the design of the follow-on project. Additionally, while the evaluation suggests prioritization of countries with the highest nuclear terrorism risk and threat, the ICSANT Project Management and the Team notes that in many cases it responds to requests from Member States, and proactive prioritization is not necessarily always possible.
5. **Develop and implement a comprehensive and change narrative-based monitoring system.** It is recommended that the ICSANT Project Management and Team, and in dialogue with UNODC senior management, review, develop and follow a more comprehensive monitoring system.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accepted⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. **Encourage and monitor the use of project’s knowledge tools.** It is recommended that the ICSANT Project Team, as part of the development of the project second phase, encourage the continued use of project’s tools, including for example, a module including the administration of the self-questionnaire and a presentation of each tool, during potential field visits, follow-up activities and capacity-building/technical assistance packages.  

|   | Accepted⁵   |

---

⁴ The recommendation is accepted, with the clarification that most of the suggested actions were already incorporated in the design and implementation of the follow-on project before the evaluation recommendations were received.

⁵ The recommendation is accepted, with the clarification that most of the suggested actions were already incorporated in the design and implementation of the follow-on project before the evaluation recommendations were received.
INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

A thematic segment of the UNODC Global Programme on Preventing and Countering Terrorism (2022-2027) (GLOTP1), the project under evaluation - “Union support for the universalisation and effective implementation of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism – ICSANT”, represents a key UNODC action to support Member States in the implementation of the obligations established under the Convention.

Adopted in 2005 and in force since 2007, ICSANT is one of the 19 international legal instruments against terrorism that UNODC is mandated to promote, and the sole legally binding international legal instrument relating to the security of radioactive material. It complements the Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (CPPNM), in force since 1987, and its 2005 Amendment - the International Atomic Energy Agency being their depository.

The project refers to one of the core functions and strategic objectives of UNODC to support Member States (MS) in implementing key international legal instruments to counter terrorism, and enhancing their legislative, policy and criminal justice capacities and systems to effectively prevent and respond to all forms of terrorism. This required multi-levelled support (political, technical, legislative) whose results are difficult to monitor as they are not necessarily and immediately tangible.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

Funded by the European Union (EU), the ICSANT project ran for 51 months (April 2019-June 2023) with an overall budget of EUR 3,5M and including two no-cost extensions. The project developed outreach, knowledge, legislative and capacity-building activities towards the universalisation and the effective implementation of ICSANT globally, with a specific focus on Asia, South-east Europe and Africa.

The project delimits five complementary outcomes focusing on increasing the number of States considering/initiating processes/becoming Parties to ICSANT, improving national legislation, upon request, to ensure incorporation of all ICSANT requirements, and supporting the capacity of criminal justice, law enforcement and legislative officials to investigate, prosecute and adjudicate cases in which ICSANT would be of relevance through the development of advocacy activities, and reference knowledge products and tools (website, a training manual and eLearning materials).

PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION

Summative in nature, this final in-depth evaluation covers the entire operational period of the project (April 2019-June 2023) and seeks to assess the results of the project as well as the impact and sustainability of the project’s gains, to prevent and respond to terrorism as well as to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

This evaluation followed a theory-based, inclusive and mixed-method approach developed in line with UN ethical requirements and United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, to build a better...
understanding of the narrative and operational rationale underpinning the project’s development, focusing on the utility and usability of key outreach and knowledge outputs beyond the project’s implementation period.

Based on the main OECD/DAC criteria of evaluation (relevance, effectiveness, coherence, efficiency, impact, sustainability), it includes a cross-cutting approach to gender, human rights, and leaving-no-one-behind dimensions (HRG-LNOB). It derives lessons learned, good practices and recommendations to inform future decision-making, organizational learning, as well as activities and knowledge products of the project in its commencing second-phase - endorsed by the Council of Europe for the period of 1 July 2023 – 30 June 2026 (36 months)⁸.

Inclusive, participatory and gender-sensitive tools were designed and tailored to the specificities of the project under evaluation. A corpus of primary and secondary sources of information and data were collected and triangulated including the following.

A total of 52 project and external documents have been reviewed and served as a basis for the reconstruction of the project Theory of Change. A total of 45 interviews took place (M= 20, F= 25) out of 67 requests, with key informants (KII) including project management, key project stakeholders⁹ as well as extended interested parties (including UNODC HQ staff working on similar mandates, external experts from NGOs or sister agencies), while an end-user online survey was administered to 140 participants based on a voluntary sampling approach to gauge the usefulness of the project’s products and activities, direct impact and sustainability mainly at the regional level. The survey received however only 14 responses, i.e. a response rate of 10%.

A field mission in Vienna, Austria at the UNODC HQ, took place on the occasion of the IAEA General Conference, from 25-29 September 2023 to follow-up in-person interviews with key project staff and stakeholders (16 in total), learn from presentations of key knowledge products to assess their quality, strengths, and rooms for improvements (website, social media, eLearning-modules and self-questionnaires), and facilitate 2 focus group discussions with the ICSANT Project team (6 participants in total).

**MAIN FINDINGS PER EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**Relevance.** The project is relevant to the current geopolitical context and UNODC mandate in promoting ICSANT as one of the 19 international legal instruments against terrorism, as a crucial Convention covering the threat posed by nuclear terrorism and the impact of a terrorist/criminal act involving radioactive material. The main objective of the project complements the overall efforts of UNODC and other relevant UN bodies such as the IAEA as well as the EU in strengthening security across the globe by supporting Member States in the adherence to important international legal instruments. While relevant to SDGs 16 and 17, there was, however, no evidence of consideration or monitoring of the project’s contribution to the SDGs. While the project did not develop any additional consultation mechanisms with Member States, it built positively on consultations and negotiations undertaken under previous, similar projects under Canadian funding. As a result, its implementation adequately responded to a pre-existing confluence of interests among Member States, notably donors and primary target groups, to advance greater support to

---


⁹ Project stakeholders are understood as all organizations 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.
ICSANT universalisation and UNODC action in that area. Participation in project activities was particularly useful and relevant to deepen Member States’ understanding of ICSANT’s provisions and their practical application, leading to better awareness, improved preparedness, and prioritization of building adequate responses to nuclear terrorism threats.

Efficiency. The Project made use of its resources in a highly efficient manner to produce most of the expected outputs and adequately adapted to the challenges presented by Covid-19. The project team built optimal synergies with other specialized international and UN partners (notably IAEA and UNODA) through which it benefited from events co-organised with other organizations as a platform for raising awareness and reaching out to potential beneficiaries (i.e., non-States Parties to ICSANT). It also cooperated with IGOs and NGOs to further disseminate its knowledge products. Progress in the implementation of the Project was very well-tracked in terms of financial reporting, as well as reporting to the donor, and financial rules of UNODC were strictly complied with.

Coherence. At the organizational level, the project delivered results in line with UNODC priorities, programming, and strategic framework in the area of nuclear terrorism, and demonstrated positive internal coherence, aligned with UNODC mandate in the area of combating chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) terrorism and well embedded within UNODC Strategy 2021-2025 and the Global Programme on Preventing and Countering Terrorism (2022-2027). At the project implementation level, the project cooperation architecture and practices with external partners have proved efficient to advance project outcomes in a coherent and synergetic manner but have been articulated using a delivery-oriented logic, rather than formalized or joint frameworks. The project and its implementation areas were initially split between two offices (UNOCT and UNODC) for separate implementation. Some hindrances in the cooperation and coordination were observed. While nuclear terrorism has constituted an emerging niche within UNODC, the ICSANT project has highly contributed to serve the Office’s core function of technical and legal advisory in this thematic area.

Effectiveness. The project’s overall effectiveness was satisfactory in achieving the intended outputs and outcomes, including in the development of ready-to-use knowledge products. The project increased the number of States considering/initiating processes/becoming Parties to ICSANT and heightened awareness of ICSANT among beneficiaries; developed and maintained a reference-website containing all ICSANT-relevant information, including tools and legislation; developed training materials; and built the capacity of criminal justice officials and other relevant national stakeholders to investigate, prosecute and adjudicate cases related to ICSANT. While legislative assistance was promoted and available throughout the project to potential beneficiary countries upon Member States’ request, limited demand was observed during the implementation period. It is anticipated that efforts will be directed towards encouraging more beneficiaries to utilize available legislative assistance. Its major achievement was the increased awareness of ICSANT amongst different beneficiaries and the creation of working relationships with many organizations working in the field of nuclear security, which increased its effectiveness. It however missed to develop a clear and explicit Theory of Change (ToC) including a clear mapping and evidence-based outreach strategy of target groups per ICSANT status and levels of engagement towards ICSANT adherence. Furthermore, despite regular follow-up with counterparts, the project monitoring system design and indicators focus on activities and outputs, but as designed, do not allow for monitoring and measuring of medium-term to long-term impact of project activities in a systemized manner. It has been noted that TPB is in the process of introducing a long-term assessment questionnaire in the monitoring of all future activities.
Impact and Sustainability. The project acted as a key knowledge and awareness broker on ICSANT, including at national levels, contributing to advancing ICSANT universalisation at global level. At the time of this report drafting, five additional countries had ratified ICSANT during the implementation period of the project and the project activities in concerned and requesting countries have positively contributed to accompany that process. One may nevertheless note that treaties’ adherence remains a national process resulting from many different factors and considerations – whether political, economic, legal or others. It remains thus challenging to attribute this process to one determining factor. Considering the above and the inherent constraints to any project evaluation exercise, it has been difficult to observe and determine the direct impact of the project in this process for each of the new State parties. However, in addition to critical knowledge transfer and awareness rising, collected information from interviews and additional documentation attest that the project team’s tailored support and guidance contributed to push the adherence process forward once it was identified as a priority by concerned Member States. In addition to bilateral communication channels between MS and UNODC Project team, some partners officially stated and acknowledged in global forums the critical support the project provided in that sense. The tools and information developed within the framework of the project to support ratification were particularly influential and are expected to remain relevant and available to stakeholders beyond the project’s timeline due to being embedded within the existing UNODC structure. The diversity of information channelled through the project’s produced tools (ICSANT website, eLearning module, manuals, webinars etc.) allows for various types of use by different audiences, ensuring further the long-term utility of the project’s products. Whereas funding has already been secured for the second phase of the project, the project’s dependence on extrabudgetary contributions creates a degree of uncertainty on the continuity and sustainability of the activities.

Human Rights, Gender Equality, Disability Inclusion and Leaving no-one behind. Relevant dimensions of human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind in the field of action of the project (nuclear security/counterterrorism) were insufficiently identified during the project’s design stage, impacting the level of considerations at the implementation and monitoring stages. While some attention was given to encouraging the participation of female delegates in events, a more thorough assessment could have been conducted to identify other relevant aspects of gender equality in the nuclear security field. Relevant human rights considerations were included in informative presentations and capacity-building tools, but the full extent of UNODC resources on human rights could have been more widely utilised. Aspects related to leaving no-one behind also might have been given more consideration, beyond the activities conducted in the least developed countries. As far as observed, there was no evidence that aspects related to disability inclusion were considered nor any specific UNODC guidance on this aspect in the time of the project evaluation.

MAIN CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the contribution of the project to building and sustaining momentum on the importance of ICSANT universalisation across interested stakeholders and partners has been essential in raising informed and strong awareness at the regional and global levels and in keeping the international momentum to support the construction of an effective global (nuclear) security regime.

It contributed to initiating and/or supporting a dynamic of prioritization of ICSANT at national levels, laying a solid ground for continued work focused on capacity-building, technical and legislative assistance to further ICSANT implementation. It further managed to place UNODC as a key strategic and expert partner in the field, in complementarity with other specialized agencies and in line with its core function to support
Member States in implementing key international legal instruments to counter terrorism. Optimization of existing workstream and specialized networks across agencies further laid robust foundations to explore opportunities of more formalized synergies.

At the thematic level, the project demonstrated the added value of having a thematic-focused project on ICSANT to increase project coherence and effectiveness regarding the prioritisation of ICSANT universalisation at regional and global levels. It allows a specific content-centred outreach and a creative and diverse knowledge production, tailored to the specific needs and requirements for ICSANT adherence.

At the management level, the inclusion of the project as a thematically focused segment on ICSANT within the global TPB programming contributed to the project’s internal coherence and efficiency. At the same time, this implied that theproject functioned in an autonomous manner within the UNODC global programme which may have affected the visibility of the project achievements (including in terms of inclusion of cross-cutting dimensions of programming such as the ones on gender and human rights), since they were reported on as one aspect of a wider global programme, encompassing a wide range of activities delivered by TPB.

MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1 – ENHANCE IN-COUNTRY FOLLOW-UPS AND ADJUST THE SCOPE AND FRAMEWORK OF INTERVENTION TO REGIONAL AND NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE NEEDS AND PRIORITIES ON ICSANT

To be operationalized, this could include, but not limited to i) a more diversified portfolio of activities including an increased number of regional and capacity-building activities as an avenue for the constitution of specialized regional and national working groups, (ii) more systematized follow-up mechanisms with interested stakeholders and national “champions” to jointly develop national follow-up action plan/roadmap, iii) strengthened cooperation with UNODC regional and field offices, and iv) Adapt and translate existing training modules beyond UN official languages.

RECOMMENDATION 2 – MAINSTREAM HRG-LNOB DIMENSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEMATIC SPECIFICITIES OF ICSANT AND NUCLEAR SECURITY

Consultation with UNODC gender and human rights focal points on planning as well as reporting (e.g. relevant indicators developed for GLOTP1 to monitor progress) could be a first step in that direction. Partnering with NGOs and UN agencies with relevant expertise and diversifying the pool of national interlocutors during country visits could be further considered.

RECOMMENDATION 3 – STREAMLINE AND STRENGTHEN THE PROJECT COOPERATION ARCHITECTURE

Building synergies and optimizing complementarities of mandates can be a central component of the second phase of the project. This could imply the formalization of cooperation and joint planning mechanisms with key partners such as IAEA, the readjustment of existing cooperation scope along the project priorities and respective mandates of key partners, and exploration of possible extended partnerships with i) experts, academia and NGOs to update and diversify the knowledge base as relevant; and ii) with regional organizations such as the African Union (AU) and ASEAN which are equipped with dedicated bodies working.

Please note that the Executive Summary only includes the most important recommendations as identified by the evaluation team. All recommendations can be found in the main body of the report.
on nuclear security for increased relevance and effectiveness of the intervention in terms of outreach and in-country follow-up strategies.

**MAIN LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES**

The project has introduced some lessons learned that mainly relate to the importance of developing diversified and comprehensive knowledge tools that include accuracy and timeliness of the information, the user-friendliness of the interface, the availability of resources and tools that address specific needs and are translated in 5 UN languages.

The Project team utilised several good practices to increase awareness on ICSANT and reach out to as many Member States as possible. Building synergies across specialized organizations and an optimized used of international specialized platforms, events, and networks, not only enabled to advance in promoting universal goals and taking into account the different mandates of different organizations, but also contributed to consolidate UNODC’s specific role and added value in the field.
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. Overall, the project achieved its intended outputs and outcomes in a satisfactory manner, including in the development of ready-to-use knowledge products such as the ICSANT website and in a challenging period of implementation due to external factors (Covid 19). (Effectiveness). The project acted as a key knowledge and awareness broker on ICSANT, including at national levels, and the tools and information developed within the framework of the project are expected to remain relevant and available to stakeholders beyond the project’s timeline (Product utility and sustainability). There was no materialization of an explicit Theory of Change (ToC) and limited information on a clear mapping and evidence-based outreach strategy of target groups per ICSANT status and developing in turn more specific activities in line with national levels of engagement towards ICSANT adherence.</td>
<td>KII, Survey, desk review, focus groups.</td>
<td>1. Enhance in-country follow-ups and adjust the scope and framework of intervention to regional and national legislative needs and priorities on ICSANT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be operationalized, this could include, but is not limited to i) a more diversified portfolio of activities including an increased number of regional and capacity-building activities as an avenue for the constitution of specialized regional and national specialized working groups, (ii) more systematized follow-up mechanisms with interested stakeholders and national “champions” to jointly develop national follow-up action plan/roadmap, iii) strengthened cooperation with UNODC regional and field offices, and iv) Adapt and translate existing training modules beyond UN official languages.

(The Project Management and Team in close dialogue with senior management of the Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), as well as well as UNODC Field Offices (FOs) and Regional Offices (ROs), along with the donor, interested Member States and specialized partners where relevant.)

---

11 General sources that substantiate the findings.
12 Should include the specific target group of implementing recipient(s) at UNODC.
### Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The project design, implementation and monitoring considered human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind in an insufficient manner. Despite strong partnership with relevant and experienced NGOs and UN agencies in terms of HRG integration, the major challenges to effectively mainstream gender and HR were general lack of awareness of relevant aspects in the field of nuclear security as well as of relevant UNODC policies and existing resources, as well as some resistance from several Member States (Gender, Human rights and Leaving no one behind, and Efficiency).</td>
<td>KIs, Survey, desk review, focus groups.</td>
<td>2. <strong>Mainstream HRG-LNOB dimension in accordance with</strong> <strong>thematic specificities of ICSANT and nuclear security</strong>&lt;br&gt;Consultation with UNODC gender and human rights focal points on planning as well as reporting (e.g., relevant indicators developed for GLOT1 to monitor progress) could be a first step in that direction. Partnering with NGOs and UN agencies with relevant expertise and diversifying the pool of national interlocutors during country-visits could be further considered.&lt;br&gt;(ICSANT Project Team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The project cooperation architecture and practices with external partners at regional, UN and international level have proved efficient to advance project outcomes in a coherent and synergetic manner, but have been articulated using a delivery-oriented logic, ad hoc practices and pragmatic decisions rather than formalized or joint frameworks (Coherence)</td>
<td>KIs, Survey, desk review, focus groups.</td>
<td>3. <strong>Streamline and strengthen the project cooperation architecture</strong>&lt;br&gt;Building synergies and optimizing complementarities of mandates can be a central component of the second phase of the project. This could imply the formalization of cooperation and joint planning mechanisms with key partners such as IAEA, in line with the final In-Depth Evaluation of GLO/R35, the readjustment of existing cooperation scope along the project priorities and respective mandates of key partners, and exploration of possible extended partnerships with i) experts, academia and NGOs to update and diversify the knowledge base as relevant; and ii) with regional organizations such as the African Union (AU) and ASEAN which are equipped with dedicated bodies working on nuclear security for increased relevance and effectiveness of the intervention in terms of outreach and in-country follow-up strategies.&lt;br&gt;(The ICSANT Project Management and TPB senior management, in consultation with donors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Despite a limited consultation and in-depth monitoring mechanisms, the project implementation adequately responded to a confluence of interests among Member States and donors to advance greater support to ICSANT universalisation (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact). The project’s overall effectiveness was satisfactory but missed developing an explicit Theory of Change (ToC) and to clearly materialize a detailed mapping of target groups per levels of engagement towards ICSANT adherence, as well as a better consideration of human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind.</td>
<td>KIlIs, Survey, desk review, focus groups.</td>
<td>4. Streamline, specify and refocus the project Theory of Change for its next phases of development To be useful, this exercise would imply i) the preparation of a realistic, HRG-sensitive and outcome-oriented logical framework that can be used for results-based management and reporting; ii) a nuancing of the project’s target groups mapping, and iii) a prioritisation of project activities at country levels, including towards countries with the highest nuclear terrorism risks and threats. This would support the development of a more strategic outreach approach and tailored implementation plans per target groups. (The ICSANT Project Management and the Team, in close dialogue with TPB senior management, along with the donor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. While pro-active and effective, the project’s reporting system focuses on financial and factual reporting, with limited narrative on emerging challenges and key non-tangible project achievements towards ICSANT universalisation (Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact)</td>
<td>KIlIs, Survey, desk review, focus groups.</td>
<td>5. Develop and implement a comprehensive and change narrative-based monitoring system It is recommended that the project management and team review, develop and follow a more comprehensive monitoring system with greater consideration of higher-level outcomes, impact, and challenges of implementation, including towards the SDGs; which demonstrates the project's non-measurable gains (dialogue building, strengthened international cooperation, perceptions changes, trustworthiness...); and is which is more intentional about measuring human rights, gender equality and leaving no one behind results. (The ICSANT Project Management and Team review, and in dialogue with UNODC senior management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. The tools and information developed within the framework of the project are expected to remain relevant and available to stakeholders beyond the project’s timeline due to being embedded within the UNODC structure (Product utility and sustainability), yet it remains difficult to ensure and track the translation of project’s products into actions at national and individual levels (Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability). | KII, Survey, desk review, focus groups. | **6. Encourage and monitor use of knowledge tools**
As part of the development of the project second phase, project activities should focus on continued use of project’s tool, including for example, a module including the administration of the self-questionnaire and a presentation of each tool, during potential field visits, follow-up activities and capacity-building/technical assistance packages at national levels. A communication strategy could be also developed in that sense to enhance the visibility of existing tools.
(The ICSANT Project Team) |
I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

OVERALL CONCEPT AND DESIGN

The project under evaluation constitutes a thematic component of the UNODC Global Programme on Preventing and Countering Terrorism (2022-2027) (GLOTP1). Implemented by the UNODC Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB) and funded by the European Union (EU), the project ran for 51 months (April 2019-June 2023) with an overall budget of EUR 3.5M and including two no-cost extensions related to Covid-19 pandemic. It was implemented in a complementary manner with a Canada-funded project supporting the universalisation of the international legal framework related to nuclear security, including ICSANT, and with specific activities in Latin America and the Caribbean.

The project’s overall objective is “to make progress towards the universalisation and the effective implementation of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism (ICSANT)”15. With activities directed towards (i) outreach and advocacy, (ii) technical legislative assistance, and (iii) capacity building, the project delimits five complementary outcomes. Outcome 1 focuses on increasing the number of States considering/initiating processes/becoming Parties to ICSANT, exploiting synergies with other relevant international legal instruments16. Outcome 2 aims to improve national legislation, upon request, of beneficiary countries by incorporating all ICSANT requirements into national legislation. Outcome 3 supports developing the capacity of criminal justice officials and other relevant national stakeholders to investigate, prosecute and adjudicate cases in which ICSANT would be of relevance. It also aims to strengthen national capacities to detect and respond to the threat of non-State actors, including terrorists, acquiring nuclear or other radioactive materials. Outcome 4 and 5 involves the development and maintenance of a reference-website, training manual and eLearning materials on ICSANT and their incorporation into technical legal assistance delivery. A reconstructed theory of change for this project is proposed as part of this evaluation, clarifying the project overall structures, intents, and assumptions, as detailed in the Methodological section and in the Annex VI.

As a demand-driven project with global outreach, it primarily targets beneficiaries from those countries that are not yet party to ICSANT (73 States before the project start date), but also beneficiaries from countries party to ICSANT that lack adequate legislation or provisions to implement all its requirements.

The core project team is based in Vienna in the TPB Implementation Support Section 1, and is responsible for carrying out project’s activities, management as well as monitoring, with the support of UNODC Regional offices (ROs), a liaison office in Brussels, UNODC relevant desk and field representatives as appropriate. UNODC and the project donors (EU and EU Delegations) ensured the project’s coordination and worked, where appropriate, with relevant international stakeholders in nuclear terrorism prevention, mainly the

13 Formerly UNODC Global Programme to Strengthen the Regime Against Terrorism (GLOR35). GLOR35 has undergone final evaluation in 2021.
14 Canada’s contribution to UNODC to Support the Universalisation of International Legal Frameworks to Nuclear Security, Phase II (NRS-2018-0017)
16 Such as the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, the Amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, UNSC resolution 1540.
IAEA, the UN Office of Counter-Terrorism (UNOCT), the 1540 Group of Experts, and UN Office on Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), as well as with specialised non-governmental organizations and experts.

**CONTEXT**

Adopted in 2005 and in force since 2007, ICSANT is one of the 19 international legal instruments against terrorism that UNODC is mandated to promote and the sole legally binding international legal instrument relating to the security of radioactive material. It complements the Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (CPPNM), in force since 1987, and its 2005 Amendment, the only legally binding agreements on physical protection of nuclear material (in domestic use, storage and transport) and nuclear facilities used for peaceful purposes, the International Atomic Energy Agency being their depository.

Through its universalisation, ICSANT aims to ensure that there are no safe havens for parties committing or trying to commit acts of terrorism involving radioactive material. The Convention obliges State Parties, inter alia, to criminalize above mentioned acts and introduce preventive measures against them, extend their jurisdiction to either extradite or prosecute offenders, cooperate with other Member States in preventing terrorist attacks by sharing relevant information and assisting each other in connection with criminal investigations and extradition proceedings, thus simultaneously establishing a deterrent factor to (potential) criminal actors. The project under evaluation “represents a key action to support Member States in the implementation of the obligations established under the Convention.”

**PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

Summative in nature, this final in-depth evaluation covers the entire operational period of the project (April 2019-June 2023) and seeks to assess the results of the project as well as the impact and sustainability of the project’s gains, to prevent and respond to terrorism as well as to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It further focuses on the utility and useability of key outreach and knowledge outputs beyond the project’s implementation period and looks at the synergies within which the project is embedded, as a thematic component of UNODC Global Programme on Preventing and Countering Terrorism.

The project refers to one of the core functions and strategic objectives of UNODC to support Member States (MS) in implementing key international legal instruments to counter terrorism, and enhancing their legislative, policy and criminal justice capacities and systems to effectively prevent and respond to all forms of terrorism. This required multi-levelled support (political, technical, legislative) whose results are not necessarily and immediately tangible.

This evaluation thus asks: To what extent has the project contributed to support the strengthening of the global (nuclear) security regime through ICSANT, while reinforcing UNODC’s role as a key actor in the construction of an effective global counter-terrorism response? This transversal evaluation question aims at capturing how far the project could enhance the international regime to prevent and respond to nuclear terrorism and how far UNODC efforts were most relevant, sustainable and creative enough to build and sustain international momentum and support to the construction of an effective global (nuclear) security regime.

Based on the main OECD/DAC criteria17 of evaluation (relevance, effectiveness, coherence, efficiency, impact, sustainability), and including a mainstreaming approach to gender, human rights and leaving-no-one-behind dimensions (HRG-LNOB) an evaluation matrix has been created to guide this exercise, as available in the Annex II. The evaluation derives lessons learned, good practices and recommendations to

---

17https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm
inform future decision-making, organizational learning, as well as activities and knowledge products of the project in its commencing second-phase - endorsed by the Council of Europe for the period of 1 July 2023 – 30 June 2026 (36 months)\textsuperscript{18}.

This evaluation will benefit the UNODC TPB senior management and project team, project stakeholders at UNODC regional and field levels, as well as project donor, governmental and international partner entities, ministries and other relevant stakeholders.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation was conducted by three female international experts of complementary expertise. The team was led by Ms. Deborah Alimi, specialised in organized crime policies and their linkages with sustainable development, and UNODC programming and evaluation. Two substantive experts guided this evaluation, ensuring thematic relevance and adequacy. Ms. Marta Walker (nuclear security expert) and Ms. Miri Sharon (criminal justice expert).

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

APPROACH

This evaluation followed a theory-based and mixed-method approach developed in line with UN ethical requirements and United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards\textsuperscript{19}, to build a better understanding of the narrative and operational rationale underpinning the project’s development. A Theory of Change (ToC) was first reconstituted, as outlined in the Annex VI, to analyse in a simplified, yet more nuanced way the project’s results chain and supports the development of the evaluation matrix and tools.

Organized in three phases (inception, data collection and analysis, and reporting), the evaluation adopted a cross-cutting approach to human rights, gender, and leaving-no-one-behind dimensions (HRG-LNOB) (process-wise and result-wise) in line with UNEG’s guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations as well as UNODC new Guidance Notes for Evaluators on Gender-Responsive Evaluation, Human Rights Mainstreaming and Inclusive Evaluations (2023)\textsuperscript{20}.

It was further conducted with culturally and politically sensitive lenses to ensure it does no harm to the project’s operationalisation and follow-ups, considering the topic sensitivity, and the various levels of awareness, understanding and prioritisation of ICSANT globally.


\textsuperscript{20} UNODC (2023) Guidance Note for Evaluators on Gender-Responsive Evaluation (new); Guidance Note for Evaluators on Human Rights Mainstreaming (new) as well as Guidance Note for Evaluators on Inclusive Evaluations (new)
DATA COLLECTION TOOLS AND SAMPLING STRATEGY

Inclusive, participatory and gender-sensitive tools\textsuperscript{21} were designed and tailored to the specificities of the project under evaluation to ensure the voices of all concerned stakeholders were included at best, and all ICSANT status and adherence/implementation scenarios were considered. A corpus of primary and secondary sources of information and data were collected and triangulated through qualitative and quantitative complementary data collection tools and against counterfactuals to arrive at credible, reliable, and unbiased findings. This entailed the following tools and results, each presented in detail in the Annex III.

A total of 52 project and external documents have been reviewed and served as a basis for the reconstruction of the project Theory of Change. A comprehensive list is provided in Annex IV.

A total of 45 interviews took place (M= 20, F= 25) out of 67 requests, with key informants (KIIs) including project management, key project stakeholders\textsuperscript{22} as well as extended interested parties (including UNODC HQ staff working on similar mandates, external experts from NGOs or sister agencies). 29 interviews were conducted in a remote manner (using MS Teams platform), and 16 in person as part of a 5-day field mission in Vienna, Austria. Those followed a mapping of key and relevant stakeholders as purposeful sampling.

An end-user online survey was administered based on a voluntary sampling approach to gauge the usefulness of the project’s products and activities, direct impact and sustainability. Sent to 140 participants of regional and global activities implemented within the framework of the project\textsuperscript{23}, the survey received 14 responses, i.e., a response rate of 10%. This was mainly explained by staff turnover, but also partial mapping of participants to all workshop activities, at national and regional levels.

Two evaluation experts conducted a field mission in Vienna, Austria at the UNODC HQ, on the occasion of the IAEA General Conference, from 25-29 September 2023. This mission included follow-up in-person interviews with key project staff and stakeholders (16 in total), presentations of key knowledge products to assess their quality, strengths, and rooms for improvements (website, social media, eLearning-modules and self-questionnaires), and 2 focus group discussions with the ICSANT Project team (6 participants in total). The field mission also offered the opportunity to attend the General Conference side events, notably the one on Strengthening Nuclear Security Worldwide Through A/CPPNM and ICSANT, co-organized by the IAEA and the UNODC project team.

In-depth case studies of project interventions within three beneficiary countries were intended to grasp the project’s strategic approach per context of intervention. Albania, Ghana and Iceland were selected based on the project’s performances, and the project team appraisal of “successful actions”. However, data obtained was too limited to ensure a fully-fledged analysis, mainly due to limited evaluation timeframe, limited numbers of in-country activities and while available, the provided documentation could not be used for in-depth comparative case studies.

\textsuperscript{21} In line with UNEG’s guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations. UNODC Guidance Notes on Human Rights and Gender Equality in UNODC Evaluations, the Guidance notes for Evaluators on Inclusive Evaluations, on Human Rights Mainstreaming and Gender-responsive evaluations.

\textsuperscript{22} Project stakeholders are understood as all organizations 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.

\textsuperscript{23} I.e. participants to IAEA-UNODC joint seminar 2021, MED Trident 2022, regional workshops series in South-East Asia 2022-2023.
SOURCES AND TRIANGULATION OF DATA

The evaluation team used triangulation of:

- data collection methods, using a mixed evaluation approach as previously detailed;
- data sources: primary data collected though KIIs, an end-beneficiary survey, focus groups and project tools analysis were cross-referenced with secondary data including project documents, and external documentation;
- cross-referencing of information collected through the evaluation with external resources, such as relevant external UN documentation, and perspectives from experts and academics in the field.

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

An initial mapping of key parties, implementing and learning partners, as well as key project beneficiaries has been conducted in consultation with the project team and in a gender-sensitive manner. Stakeholders are understood at various levels:

1. **Implementing stakeholders** i.e., entities/personnel who have negotiated, designed, contributed to or implemented directly the project or at least one activity through resources (financial, knowledge etc.) i.e., UNODC TPB, DTA, regional offices and field representatives, donors.

2. **Partnering stakeholders** i.e., specialized and/or interested entities/personnel contributing to and/or with a keen interest in exchanging knowledge to advance project implementation, including international partners (IAEA, UNOCT, the 1540 Group of Experts, and UNODA), government counterparts, CSOs, expert consultants, academia.

3. **Beneficiary stakeholders**:
   a. Beneficiary countries i.e., Member States that are not yet party to ICSANT but are likely to do so; Party to ICSANT lacking adequate legislation; counterparts in countries not participating/refusing/with delayed participation in the project.
   b. Target groups of capacity-building and technical assistance activities within beneficiary countries, i.e. representatives of the judicial and legislative powers, law enforcement and legal practitioners, as well as national policy- and decision-makers, including members of parliaments.

It has been challenging to conduct a more comprehensive and refined mapping of key project beneficiaries according to their ICSANT status, considering the limited access to national legislative information and limited production of such assessment by the project. No enquiry of general beneficiaries was conducted: product quality assessment and review of secondary materials (project reports and post-activities surveys) were preferred to gauge utility and useability of specific outputs and achievements of corresponding outcomes. To understand the rationale and the added value of such a stand-alone focus, the evaluation team considered a comparative angle, integrating where possible to the analysis the perspectives of additional relevant informants, including external experts in the field. Efforts were finally devoted to including women, as well as the vulnerable, disadvantaged and excluded groups, such as persons with disabilities and young persons in the sample of stakeholders to be interviewed. However, this was not always possible considering the sectoral biases in play.
### LIMITATIONS TO THE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitations to the evaluation</th>
<th>Mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representativeness of beneficiaries that were consulted as part of this evaluation depended on their participation in the project. Only limited information could be gathered on stakeholders lacking awareness or presenting different levels of prioritisation of ICSANT, thus making it difficult to grasp project impact and effectiveness on a global scale.</td>
<td>KIIIs and survey questionnaires included questions related to outreach challenges and opportunities. A large sample of stakeholders was constructed as part of the mapping exercise to ensure most relevant stakeholders are contacted and/or aware of this evaluation, according to their ICSANT status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering the evaluation timing (European summer), and the sensitivity of the issue, the evaluation faced a low response rate of stakeholders, including targeted beneficiaries and within UNODC, to both interviews for case studies, and survey. This resulted in the collection of partial data and missing information on some key stakeholders.</td>
<td>The conduct of a field mission has been decided as the evaluation unfolded, to maximize participation though in-person reaching out. The evaluation team also conducted an additional and complementary mapping of, and outreach to relevant informants outside the project’s direct boundaries to include external thematic experts and indirect UNODC staff (gender and human rights focal points, other thematic areas) to collect additional information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While a survey of final beneficiaries of national and regional capacity building activities was planned, its execution encountered several challenges of representativeness and robustness. First, a thorough and large survey sample could not be constituted across all project activities due to the sensitivity of the contact information of key personal on nuclear security. Second, the very low response rate prevents any use of survey data, but in an anecdotal manner.</td>
<td>The scope of the survey sample was reduced to regional events gathering more generalist personnel. The collected information, mainly the responses to open-ended questions, provided concrete examples and individual perspectives. Additional sources of information, as detailed above, were sought.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

RELEVANCE

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

- To what extent have the project design and implementation been relevant to and included stakeholders’ and target groups (e.g., governments, Member States, donors etc.) needs and priorities?
- To what extent are the project’s objective and outcomes aligned with relevant international legal instruments on nuclear terrorism, including with relevant UNODC mandates, UN resolutions and the SDGs?
- To what extent are the outcomes, outputs, and activities of the project relevant to achieving its objective?

Finding 1: The project’s objective is relevant to the current geopolitical context and the UNODC mandate in promoting ICSANT as one of the 19 international legal instruments against terrorism.

Given the current geopolitical context and transnational nature of the threat posed by nuclear terrorism and the impact of a terrorist/criminal act involving radioactive material, the project objective is in line with and of relevance to the international discourse regarding the significance of a cooperative and transboundary approach to the strengthening of both the national and global nuclear security regime(s). The main objective of the project (i.e. the achievement of the universalisation of ICSANT and removal of safe havens for parties committing or trying to commit acts of terrorism involving radioactive material) complements the overall efforts of the UNODC in complementarity with other relevant UN bodies, the IAEA as well as the EU in strengthening security across the globe by supporting Member States in the adherence to important international legal instruments as well as improvement of national frameworks to implement provisions. Since the project was relevant to SDGs 16 and 17, the project could have also monitored its contribution to those SDGs using specific indicators.

The project’s overall objective is “to make progress towards the universalisation and the effective implementation of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism (ICSANT)”, one of the 19 international legal instruments against terrorism UNODC is mandated to promote by the United Nations General Assembly. The findings of the evaluation support the claim that the project is well situated as a sub-component of the UNODC Global Programme on Preventing and Countering Terrorism (2022-2027), previously GLOR35, and that it has been aligned with relevant resolutions, in particular with regards to the mandates of the adherence to and ratification of the 19 international legal instruments against terrorism, and within that especially the mandate to promote the adherence to ICSANT.

A first attempt to develop and integrate programming on nuclear security within TPB, the project further proved to fit into the UNODC/TPB’s work objectives, namely to promote adherence to the above mentioned 19 international legal instruments against terrorism, assist Member States in bringing their counter-terrorism legislation in line with these instruments, build the capacity of criminal justice officials to prevent and combat terrorism (including nuclear terrorism) and strengthen international cooperation in criminal matters.
Finding 2: Despite limited consultation mechanism at its design stage, the project implementation adequately responded to a confluence of interests among Member States, notably donors and primary target groups, to advance greater support to ICSANT universalisation and UNODC action in that area.

Whereas the relevance of the project design and implementation can be confirmed based on the above factors, project documentation along with interviews show limited formal consultation mechanisms on the needs and priorities of stakeholders and relevant target groups as part of the design of the project and/or any specific activities or knowledge products (notably related to tailoring of capacity-building interventions). The project has rather come about as a result of high-level political discussions based on emerging priorities and converging interests in the area of CBRN. This resulted in the development of a rather ad hoc strategy for outreach and prioritisation of target groups. Whereas a tailored approach to the assistance provided was developed based on the current status of the beneficiary country, triangulation of information from the desk review and interviews did not yield an exact template for how assistance was adapted and/or prioritised depending on the beneficiary ICSANT status.

However, at the implementation level, the project demonstrated increased mobilisation of bilateral consultative channels. It ensured that a representative number of key target and supporting Member States would participate in relevant national, regional, and interregional project activities under all outcomes, thus reflecting Member State interest for assistance and cooperation in this area. Interviews and the final beneficiary survey further show that the project activities, notably participation in workshops, seminars, and training sessions, were particularly useful and relevant to deepen Member States’ understanding of the ICSANT’s provisions and their practical application, leading to better awareness, improved preparedness and prioritization of building adequate responses to nuclear terrorism threats.

EFFICIENCY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

- To what extent has the project delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner?
- To what extent did the project adapt to meet the challenges presented by Covid-19 and other unforeseen relevant events or threats?
- How was progress tracked, including in terms of levelling up intention, momentum and/or engagements towards ICSANT adherence and/or implementation?

Finding 3: The Project made use of its resources in a highly efficient manner to produce most of the expected outputs and was adequately adapted to the challenges presented by Covid-19.

The project had an overall budget of 3,469,979 Euro and was funded by the EU. The EU considers it a relatively small one, and therefore does not conduct independent assessment of its efficiency. Financial reports provided during the field mission24, and stakeholders’ interviews indicate that sufficient funds were available to implement all the planned activities, and that the implementation rate was quite good. In particular, during the implementation period, the dedicated website was launched, and all information materials and tools were developed. All of them were translated into all UN languages (and some also to

24 The reports included certified reports up to 31 March 2023, and internal reports up to 30 June 2023. Final reports are expected to be certified in December 2023.
Portuguese). Simultaneous interpretation was also available in some of the meetings, depending on the needs of Member States.

Staffing information was regularly included in the project’s progress reports. The project had a dedicated core-staff team of several UNODC staff and hired consultants as appropriate to perform functions under the project. Other UNODC staff provided support on an as needed basis. Staff members gathered a wide array of different expertise and know-how that ensured effective complementarity to efficiently perform their functions and provide technical assistance to interested recipients. Triangulated data highlights the professionalism and dedication of a highly motivated, accessible, and pro-active project team: several examples were reported of the team working longer hours to achieve its goals, notably to catch up with project’s objective post-Covid. The evaluation team considers, however, that this intense phase of project implementation post-Covid is not sustainable in the long-run for team management and good performance, and needs to be considered as an efficient, but exceptional adjustment to already exceptional circumstances and requires the engagement of additional subject-matter expert staff. The project team kept good track of spending and provided clear financial information to the Financial Resources Management Service (FRMS) and to the EU, consulting with FRMS to ensure compliance with applicable rules and informing them of any changes in the plan that affected spending.

As an element of efficiency, it is worth noting that the project team capitalized on events organised by other organizations and engaged them as a platform for raising awareness and reaching out to potential beneficiaries (i.e., non-State parties to ICSANT). It cooperated with IGOs and NGOs to further disseminate its knowledge products. Many events were organised during the implementation period, and the project team prepared information materials as well as presentations for use during such events. In addition, it was agreed that all webinars would be hosted on the UNODC Counterterrorism Learning Platform, thus utilising existing resources and ensuring efficiency of project delivery. When it comes to efficiency of implementation in beneficiary countries, one aspect that was considered both efficient and effective was the inclusion in such events of practitioners from different ministries and agencies, thus bringing together all the relevant stakeholders for the internal process of ratification.

The evaluation revealed that the project adapted to meet the challenges presented by Covid-19, by replacing face-to-face meetings with webinars, and using the time to work on the development of different knowledge tools by hiring experienced consultants. Once travel restrictions had been lifted, the implementation rate accelerated, with for example, three regional meetings within less than six months. The desk review highlights that the project had already included a number of planned webinars (12), therefore it could easily adapt to on-line delivery of certain activities. Some national workshops were delivered on-line, as well as other types of technical assistance. The final evaluation of GLOR35 advocated as part of its findings on efficiency the continued use of online tools. The current project followed this recommendation.

**Finding 4: Progress in the implementation of the Project was very well-tracked in terms of financial reporting, and reporting to the donor, but not sufficiently tracked in terms of the UNODC-wide internal reporting line, project challenges and narrative of change (long-term impact).**

Hindrances to efficiency, have been cumbersome approval procedures and complex field offices contracting practices, as well as a weak internal monitoring system and institutional records on workflows. For example, in relation to in-country implementation, administrative aspects of organising events were reported to have
caused some delays. This has however also been noted as a limitation throughout the Office, and not specific to the project.

The project is considered a thematic element of the TPB global programme (initially GLOR35 and since 2022, GLOTP1). Being a unique project in terms of its subject matter (CBRN) and focus (universal adherence of one treaty), the project functioned on its own internal tracking system and work plan developed by the project team. It provided regular progress reports to the EU and to Branch-level report on the global TPB programme. There have been multiple internal monitoring and reporting mechanisms, e.g., DTA inputs, TPB activity lists, regular interaction, and consultation with FRMS/BRULO, briefing notes for the ED and other senior officials, regional road maps/strategies that could have benefited from a more comprehensive reporting system. As such, performance indicators and measurements of achievement could only partially consider the project specific contributions to and compliance with UNODC-wide frameworks such as those related to the SDGs, human rights, and gender aspects.

Interviews with UNODC and the donor have confirmed that there is a close cooperation and regular communication with the donor, in particular the European Commission, with regard to status updates and guidance on the project implementation, which goes way beyond the regular submission of 6-month reports. It was indicated that the Project Team Lead consulted with the donor on a regular basis to ensure that activities implemented were in line with donor requirements. This was also confirmed by the UNODC FRMS (Financial Resources Management Service) whereby all expenditures were always consulted on to ensure compliance.

COHERENCE

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

• To what extent has the project delivered results in line with organizational, regional and international priorities in the area of nuclear terrorism, including as part of UNODC Global programming and strategic frameworks, and in synergies with other relevant international instruments?

• To what extent was the project cooperation architecture with internal (UNODC regional offices, field representatives...) and external stakeholders effective and coherent (including UN entities, external specialised stakeholders, CSOs, academia, etc.) to achieve results? To what extent were synergies and complementarities with other relevant (UNODC) interventions explored?

• To what extent has the project demonstrated UNODC added value in its core function of technical advisory to interested Member States in the ratification and implementation of international legal instruments related to the prevention and suppression of terrorism?

Finding 5: At the organizational level, the project delivered results in line with UNODC priorities in the area of nuclear terrorism and the UNODC programming and strategic framework and demonstrates positive internal coherence.

The project’s goal is aligned with the UNODC mandate in the area of combating chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) terrorism (See: GA A/RES/74/174 on Technical assistance provided by UNODC related to counter-terrorism) as well as other international efforts in the field. The project has been embedded within the UNODC Strategy 2021-2025: Thematic Area 4: Preventing and Countering Terrorism -
Global Programme Strengthening the Legal Regime Against Terrorism (2003-2022) and Global Programme on Preventing and Countering Terrorism (2022-2027).

Moreover, the EU-funded project complements and draws synergies from a project of similar objective implemented with the financial support of Canada’s Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development, “Canada’s Contribution to UNODC to Support the Universalisation of International Legal Frameworks related to Nuclear Security, Phase II” (project number NRS-2018-0017). The Canada supported project is broader in scope as it targets support to the universalisation of the international legal framework on nuclear security beyond ICSANT and deployed specific ICSANT activities mainly in Latin America and the Caribbean, whereas the EU-funded project focuses mainly, but not exclusively, on Europe, Africa and Asia. Collected information shows continuous efforts to ensure avoidance of overlaps or duplication of assistance to Member States between the two projects, given the limited resources available. Nevertheless, there were cases of assistance beyond the main target audience of the project (based on Member State request), and it was indicated that Canada has also allowed the use of some funds (around 10,000 Euros) within the framework of the EU-funded project in response to the EU’s preference for multi-donor projects. As an example, Paraguay and Saint Kitts and Nevis participated in activities under the EU project.

At the implementation level, interviews and desk review highlight that positive cooperation between the project team and regional offices have been useful in the organization of key activities and regional workshops, as well as in outreach to key stakeholders and potential partners and champions for ICSANT ratification at national levels. However, at the operational and field level, triangulation of data highlights some unexplored opportunities to further build on and expand in-house expertise and capacities of field and regional levels i) to identify gaps and needs in terms of knowledge requests and legislative support towards ICSANT; ii) to support and broaden the project outreach strategy of ICSANT sensitisation among a broader spectrum of national actors, ii) to further activities of legislative capacity-building. Further, at the HQ level, the evaluation also found that the project position within the TPB global programme may have at time reduced the visibility and the achievements of the ICSANT project to a “niche” project – limiting greater support from senior management above TPB.

**Finding 6:** The project cooperation architecture and practices with external partners at regional, UN and international level have proved efficient to advance project outcomes in a coherent and synergetic manner but have been articulated using a delivery-oriented logic, ad hoc practices and pragmatic decisions rather than formalized or joint frameworks.

The evaluation has shown that the project in its original form had been intended for co-implementation by UNODC and the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Centre (UNCT) of the UN Office of Counter-terrorism (UNOCT) given some similarities in the work objectives of both institutions. However, overlapping mandates and responsibilities rapidly called for a strict division of labour and parallel paths of implementation between the two agencies, according to their own expertise and know-how. Regular communication channels were open and maintained, yet to a level that seemed too loose to positively respond to the recommendation of tighter partnership made as part of GLOR35 final evaluation.²⁵

The provided project progress reports, interviews and group discussions with the project team and project partners, however, demonstrate that continuous efforts have been undertaken to seek out cooperation with relevant UN and non-UN partners, including with CSOs. In order to effectively use limited resources and build on existing and relevant expertise on ICSANT, efforts were undertaken to participate in, contribute to and

solicit relevant experts to activities organized by partners, in particular the IAEA and the UNSCR 1540 Committee. Given the similar target audience for the above institutions’ activities, a good practice was to benefit from the opportunity to interact with key stakeholders who were already gathered, without having to use their valuable time again.

In the case of the IAEA, given the similar objectives and target audience for the A/CPPNM, such cooperation proved highly useful. Triangulated evidence shows that efforts were undertaken to exchange information on target countries and combine efforts during activities through inviting each other to relevant events, co-organizing (some of) them, sharing relevant information on a regular basis etc. This cooperation, however, is largely based on ad hoc practices, personal connections and working interactions between the project team and relevant contacts in other institutions rather than on formalized agreements or information exchange mechanisms.

**Finding 7: While nuclear terrorism has constituted an emerging niche within UNODC, the ICSANT project has highly contributed to serve the Office’s core function of technical and legal advisory in this thematic area, and to demonstrate its added value for the universalisation of international legal instruments related to the prevention and suppression of nuclear terrorism.**

Contrary to other counterterrorism and nuclear security specialized agencies with a broad mandate, the project highlighted the added value of having the UNODC dedicated to a focused and concrete mandate on nuclear security, i.e., awareness building, legislative capacity-building, and technical support. Data collected through Interviews, quality assessment of project tools, along with the survey responses point out key features in that sense. In addition to benefiting from the UN universal coverage and outreach possibility, the UNODC project team demonstrated strong technical expertise and solid capacities of cooperation and broad partnership, including CSOs, as well as great availability and timely responsiveness to partners, solicitation for assistance and close mentoring at the country level notably through country visits. The quality of support, including of all knowledge tools produced and openly available, further contribute to positioning UNODC as a source of technical knowledge on ICSANT. The evaluation finds that the project focus on the production and dissemination of knowledge products, availability and pro-activity of the project team, and its accelerated outreach activities at the individual and institutional levels, greatly contributed to lowering the perceived difficult entry level for Member States in this thematic area and ICSANT. Nevertheless, an exchange of good practices and/or cooperative practices across UNODC sections responsible for the Office core mandate of technical advisory to interested Member States in the ratification and implementation of international legal instruments could still be enhanced and useful.
EFFECTIVENESS

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

- To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objective, including considering the various levels of interests, knowledge and capacities towards ICSANT across the different types of beneficiary countries?
- What have been the facilitating or hindering factors in achievement of results?
- To what extent has the EU ICSANT website reached the intended audience?

Finding 8: The project’s overall effectiveness was satisfactory in achieving the intended outputs and outcomes, including in the development of ready-to-use knowledge products such as the ICSANT website. It however missed to develop a realistic Theory of Change (ToC) including a clear mapping and evidence-based outreach strategy of target groups per ICSANT status and levels of engagement towards ICSANT adherence.

As per its action description and progress reports, the evaluation team found that the project presented limited delimitation of a specific theory of change, often positioning, if not mixing, at the same level, its specific outcomes, outputs and the project’s main deliverables and activities. As detailed earlier, a simplified ToC has been proposed and is now used to gauge the project effectiveness. Corresponding original project outcomes have been reorganised within that adjusted framework. Ambitious in scope, the project’s set goal of universal adherence to the Convention required a long-term vision and outreach strategy along with many concerted and incremental efforts, identifying opportunities, and increased political will, which are not all under the control of the project team. While highly effective in raising awareness on ICSANT among non-State parties and in the production of high-quality tools for outreach and for capacity building, legislative and technical assistance to Member States was more limited. This is particularly explained by the increasing focus on increasing adherence through awareness and knowledge building and the limitations on travel imposed by Covid 19, which prevented holding face-to-face capacity building events. It also relates to the lack of a tailored outreach strategy early in the design stage, developed mainly on political momentum than on evidence-based assessments of national/regional legislative gaps, strengths and needs. While it can be seen as a limitation, it also contributes to demonstrate the project’s effectiveness in nourishing appetite and raising awareness on the importance of ICSANT adherence and implementation at national levels. It also allowed for more flexibility in the engagement with MS based on the perceived interest and/or openness of the MS to engage on ICSANT. The successor project seems to have already taken a different approach to the theory of change as its main goal is now “to ensure that there is no safe haven for those who commit or seek to commit terrorist or other criminal acts involving nuclear or other radioactive material, by supporting the universalisation and effective implementation of ICSANT.” The focus on more hands-on assistance has also been mentioned by the Project Team as one of the key objectives in the follow-up project.

The data collected was reported under the five original outcomes. The analysis below highlights the main achievements per these five outcomes, under the three general intervention areas as delimited in the proposed ToC.
OUTREACH AND ADVOCACY

Project Outcome 1: Increased number of States considering/initiating processes/becoming Parties to ICSANT and heightened awareness of ICSANT among beneficiaries (national policy and decision makers, including Parliamentarians) and in international fora. Synergies with other relevant international legal instruments (CPPNM, ACPPNM, UNSC resolution 1540) are exploited.

There were 116 States parties to ICSANT before the project started (in 2019), meaning there were 77 Member States or territories that were not yet party to ICSANT. During the project’s implementation period (1 April 2019 – 30 June 2023), five States adhered to ICSANT; and shortly after its conclusion two more countries adhered to the Convention, after extensive support from the project. This is a good rate, considering the relative length of national proceedings required for the adherence to conventions, the political considerations that go into them, and the inherent difficulty to encourage adherence of a convention once the initial momentum of its adoption has subsided. In addition, several countries that received relevant UNODC assistance or country visits are going through national procedures to become parties.

Stakeholders agreed that the project’s approach to increasing awareness has been very effective. It entailed organising events on the Convention, including high-level events, attending events organised by IAEA and UNODA to increase outreach, attending workshops organised by NGOs such as PGA and NTI, and developing promotional materials with information on the Convention and the benefits of adherence. The material produced offered different levels of depth of information to target different audiences. Stakeholders agreed that these activities generated increased visibility and created momentum and awareness amongst Member States around ICSANT and attributed this success to the project team’s dedicated work. Optimizing the use of international events and networks of experts and decision-makers, as well as partnering with other specialized UN and non-UN international organizations have proved efficient in that sense.

The evaluation attempted to assess the added value of a stand-alone project on ICSANT adherence. Stakeholders noted that the project’s strategy to link ICSANT adherence with the adherence to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (CPPNM) and its 2015 Amendment was effective, since the instruments cover different but complimentary aspects of achieving nuclear security (for example, the latest country to adhere to ICSANT, Zimbabwe, also ratified CPPNM and its Amendment). It allowed for effective cooperation with IAEA, as well as UNODA, which multiplied the impact of awareness raising. It also allowed for the creation of specialized expertise of the project team in all the aspects related to the Convention’s implementation. Many stakeholders noted the team’s expertise and knowledge as a factor in the success of workshops. Stakeholders involved in organizing regional workshops indicated the high level of satisfaction of participants, and the follow up by the project team. Several participants interviewed and respondents to the survey confirmed this.

In terms of a strategy for the selection of countries for outreach activities, the project team focused on non-State Parties, starting with those without knowledge on the benefits of the Convention, those without capacities or resources for implementation, and finally on those who are known to have objections to adherence.

Country visits have proven to be useful in supporting national momentum, building necessary knowledge to ICSANT adherence and strengthening a national network of the most relevant national agencies and professionals to discuss and most likely to advance the adherence to the Convention. Several stakeholders...
expressed interest in follow-up country visits to sensitize additional national stakeholders and continue the momentum for adherence, or to assist in the adherence process. Other stakeholders from organizations promoting non-proliferation commented that the project should reach out to more senior decision makers in order to make an impact and generate a move and clear actions towards adherence.

UNODC staff and other stakeholders noted that the challenges in encouraging adherence of relevant treaties ranged from lack of legal drafting skills in the country; lack of coordination amongst national stakeholders; specific legal problems in certain countries; complex bureaucracy and the need to domesticate first before adherence (in some cases, a need to adopt the necessary legislation first) and finally lack of political interest. The project attempted to address some of these challenges for example, by bringing different actors together to allow for coordination, and presenting tools to assist with legislative drafting. As mentioned below, this aspect of the project was effective but less requested, and the project could focus more on legislative assistance in the second phase, in particular in countries that require legislation to be in place prior to adherence. In that line, the evaluation found that the lack of evidence-based situational assessments and of a narrative of project contributions to change integrated within project reporting – mainly based on output-oriented indicators – also prevented early identification of such challenges.

**Project Outcome 4: Developed and maintained a reference-website containing all ICSANT-relevant information, including good practices.**

The ICSANT website is an important component of awareness raising. While it also includes tools for capacity building, it seems that those were mostly utilised in the context of face-to-face workshops and training, while their online version was used for increasing awareness. According to UNODC reports, it was accessed by 15,000 users from 188 countries (data for end June 2023), but no comparative information was provided on similar UNODC sites (e.g., SHERLOC).

The website was developed and launched on 30 September 2021 in an online event with over 90 participants from 22 Member States and nine international and non-governmental organizations. The event was opened by the UNODC’s Executive Director and by the Head of the Delegation of the European Union to the International Organizations in Vienna.

The website is available in all UN official languages and has become the main point of reference on ICSANT. It is updated weekly, and all new information is translated into all UN official languages. Its address is [https://www.unodc.org/icsant/](https://www.unodc.org/icsant/) and the project purchased all similar domain names to ensure that users will reach the correct address. The website is housed in the UNODC platform, which ensures its sustainability. It includes adherence status, resources, web articles on events and information provided by the IAEA on their complimentary role in nuclear security and implementing the Convention. A dedicated e-mail address (unodc-icsant@un.org) was created to receive requests for information. Requests are received and addressed on a regular basis.

Stakeholders commented that the website was very practical and self-explanatory. It was a good source of information, that was not available before, and its information sheets were useful. In terms of accessibility, most of the information was very accessible, yet training modules and webinars had links to different platforms requiring registration, which may deter certain users. There is, however, limited information on how the website is being used by its targeted audience and recommendations are formulated in that sense.
LEGISLATIVE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

**Project Outcome 2: Improved national legislation of beneficiary countries by incorporating all ICSANT requirements into national legislation.**

Limited achievements have been noted in that area, mainly due to limited in-country activities (also related to the Covid 19 pandemic) and the lack of clear follow-up roadmaps or action plans in that sense, with most interested stakeholders. According to project reports, desk review of national legislation was provided to two countries. An additional request was made but eventually withdrawn. The project team indicated that this aspect would receive more prominence in the second phase of the project. The dedicated website provides model legislative provisions which were developed in 2009, together with IAEA. It also includes examples of legislation from about a third of the Member States party to ICSANT. Updating these resources might be one way to support efforts to provide legislative assistance to Member States. This is particularly crucial for Member States with limited resources for drafting legislation, and thus could also be integral to promoting leaving no one behind.

Interviews did not identify the use of the self-assessment questionnaires as a tool used in assessing gaps in legislation to implement the Convention. Some stakeholders noted that the nuclear security part of the questionnaire seems to be similar to the Integrated Nuclear Security Sustainability Plan developed by MS within the framework of IAEA engagement. This could be an area for discussion and cooperation with the IAEA in the next phase, to maximize legislative assistance provision and impact and compile information on national examples.

CAPACITY BUILDING

**Project Outcome 3: Developed capacity of criminal justice officials and other relevant national stakeholders to investigate, prosecute and adjudicate cases in which ICSANT would be of relevance. Strengthened capacity of Member States to detect and respond to the threat of terrorists acquiring nuclear or other radioactive materials.**

According to progress reports, the project conducted table-top exercises in Rome, Italy (9-11 November 2022) and Dushanbe, Tajikistan (30 May 1 June 2023), as well as regional workshops for countries in the Pacific region (8-10 May 2023), for South-East Asian countries (21-22 June 2023) and for South-Eastern European States (21-22 March 2023).

Post-activities survey results from participants provided to the evaluation team indicate high levels of satisfaction. 136 participants indicated increased capacities in investigation, prosecution and adjudication of cases involving nuclear or other radioactive material covered by ICSANT. Stakeholder interviews also indicated high levels of satisfaction from the organization of the workshops, the high level of informative content provided, and noted the professionalism of all team members, who exhibited legal expertise, knowledge of many languages and accessibility.

The main hindering factor was Covid-19 which imposed travel restrictions and prevented some of the planned activities. In some cases, the complex administrative proceedings for holding events in the field were found deterrent, leading to organizing more events in Vienna. While this makes sense in terms of capacity building and general awareness raising, in the context of promoting adherence by Member States, interviews with national partners and stakeholders highlight that country visits are more likely to be effective.
in covering interaction with a wider range of stakeholders, including high-level decision makers, who could be stronger like-minded partners to push for political momentum necessary for ICSANT adherence, and allowing technical discussion of specific issues.

**Project Outcome 5: Developed training manual and eLearning materials on ICSANT, incorporated into technical legal assistance delivery.**

While project outcome 5 ties the development of training materials to legislative assistance, they were also used in awareness raising (handed out in events) and mostly in learning and capacity building events. According to the project reports at the end of June 2023, the Manual on fictional cases related to offences under ICSANT was published in 2022 in UN official languages plus Portuguese both in paperback and on the ICSANT website.

According to the same reports, 260 users have successfully completed the eLearning module which was launched on the UNODC eLearning Platform in 2022. It is available in all UN official languages plus Portuguese. The project team encouraged participants to complete the module as preparation ahead of its outreach or capacity building activities. The evaluation nevertheless found not all stakeholders interviewed have taken the training, but the ones that did noted that the courses were useful and provided a good basis for more advanced discussions. They also highlighted the importance of having specific resources on this topic that is sometimes perceived as a “niche” issue. The project team indicated that other publications with other partner organizations were in the pipeline, e.g., on investigation and prosecution with UNICRI, as well as more specialized eLearning (funded under the Canada-funded project).

**IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY**

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

- To what extent has the project generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended, or unintended, higher-level effects?
- What contribution to impact did the project have on the nuclear security landscape in beneficiary Member States?
- To what extent has the project generated sufficient ownership and capacities in beneficiary and partner Member States to support sustainability of benefits?
- To what extent has the project developed national capacity to support sustainability of benefits?
- To what extent will the project’s key outreach and knowledge products (website mainly) be sustained, used and useful beyond the project period?

**Finding 9: The project acted as a key knowledge and awareness broker on ICSANT, including at national levels, contributing to advance ICSANT universalisation at global level.**

**PROGRESS TOWARDS UNIVERSALISATION OF ICSANT**

Taking into consideration that the decision to become party to and subsequently adhere to and implement an international treaty is a prolonged process depending on a multitude of factors, a positive development was that five additional countries have adhered to ICSANT during the implementation period of the project and two shortly after completion – countries that received direct support from the project.26 Interviews and

---

documentation provided by key stakeholders of adhering countries suggest that the project positively contributed to accompany that process, mainly through knowledge products and tailored technical guidance. However, assistance varies from one country to another in this first phase, largely depending on Member States’ requests for assistance and levels of ICSANT prioritisation. One may also note that treaties’ adherence remains a national process resulting from many different factors and considerations – whether political, economic, legal or others. It remains thus challenging to attribute this process to one determining factor. Considering the above and the inherent constraints to any project evaluation exercises, it has been difficult to observe and determine the direct and sole impact of the project in this process for each of the new States parties. However, in addition to critical knowledge transfer and awareness raising, collected information from interviews and additional documentation attest that the project team’s tailored support and guidance contributed to push the adherence process forward once it was identified as a priority by concerned Member States. In addition to bilateral communication channels between MS and UNODC Project team, some partners officially stated and acknowledged in global forums the critical support the project provided in that sense.

The project monitoring system design and indicators could have better allowed for a closer follow-up of medium to long term impact. The evaluation did not identify a (formal) mechanism to monitor actual impact in participating/beneficiary countries outside of workshop reports and discussions with/feedback from counterparts. Taking into consideration the difficulty in measuring direct impact within a MS, the project team indicated that written feedback from MS representatives as well as official statements made during (high-level) meetings, such as the ICSANT 15th Anniversary event and IAEA events including the Plenary Session of the IAEA General Conferences, are used as examples of acknowledgement of the impact. The desk review of project progress reports showed a rather restrictive available grid to appreciate project impact, remaining activity-focused and providing limited narrative on project implementation, as well as not fully reflecting the multiplicity of factors to be considered in MS adherence to international treaties, and the need to better reflect the nuanced understanding of impact in such context of intervention.

OWNERSHIP OF PROJECT’S GAINS

The project demonstrated clear contribution to awareness and information building on the relevance and importance of ICSANT and its provisions towards the promotion of universalisation. The desk review and feedback received from interviewed and surveyed stakeholders indicate that the project has contributed to increased awareness and capacity building of those participating in project activities. Equally, the selected event evaluation forms filled in by event participants reflect overall satisfaction with the contents of the events and supporting activities. It remains difficult to assess how far the project’s interventions reached out to national stakeholders among targeted countries beyond activities direct participants. It can be nevertheless expected that project participants would continue to use the acquired knowledge and/or contribute to awareness building within the national framework, although this is difficult to monitor. The project strategy to partner with potential and effective national “champions” on nuclear security to advance increased awareness at national levels has been found to be particularly instrumental in that sense. Respondents have, however, also expressed that there are certain factors, such as different political national interests and priorities, which may affect the speed of achievement of results at country-level.

Several partners across KIIs also expressed appreciation for the complementarity of the work under the project, contributing to a broader awareness and understanding of the large legal framework of relevant treaties and the position and relevance of ICSANT within this context. Cooperation laid foundation for joint engagements on ICSANT support and encouraged provision of assistance from other partners in the field,
thus also contributing to the sustainability of efforts. Increased international cooperation in this area, reduction of potential safe havens, as well as setting an example to the region, including showing own national goodwill and trustworthiness were often mentioned as positive impact from becoming party to ICSANT.

In terms of ensuring ownership and sustainability at the national level, the project intended to identify and foster national champions and key figures, who can continue activities and knowledge transfer within their countries, but also keep the momentum going at national and regional level. The evaluation has shown that Member States with one or several “champions” pushing adherence to ICSANT at the national level, have had a more successful rate of success in advancing with ICSANT promotion, knowledge and prioritisation. The evaluation also notes that regular follow-up activities were undertaken with beneficiary Member States to ensure greater continuity to ICSANT promotion (e.g. follow-up calls, debriefs, offer of further assistance and awareness building), but rather in a non-systematized way in this first phase. Success thus remains highly dependent on fostering greater national capacities and ownership of ICSANT, but also on current political priorities, internal support to champions, that goes beyond the sphere of project control. Capacity building, including the limited response to the request to communicate national liaison points (as per Art. 7.4 of ICSANT), implies challenges, which may need to be addressed in the project’s second phase. A possible next step could be to include an outreach activity demonstrating the relevance of such national liaison points for the implementation of ICSANT, in particular with regards to facilitation of international information exchange and cooperation as well as regular exchange meetings for liaison points.

Finding 10: The tools and information developed within the framework of the project are expected to remain relevant and available to stakeholders beyond the project’s timeline due to being embedded within the UNODC structure (Product utility and sustainability)

The position and incorporation of the project’s tools and materials on ICSANT into the overall UNODC framework of virtual assistance, i.e., UNODC website, eLearning platforms, etc., ensured product visibility, easy access and ready-to-use information sharing in the long run. The diversity of formats and the wide spectrum of information channelled through the project’s produced tools (ICSANT website, eLearning module, manuals, webinars etc.) allows various types of use, ensuring further the long-term utility of the project’s products. Most interviewees as well as survey respondents welcome the readability and availability of the website in the medium to long-term, allowing consultations for in-depth learning but also regular and quick reference or information checks (3-6 months). Overall, the evaluation found that available products are valued and respond to relevant issues and needs related to ICSANT. However, the evaluation found that no specific written feedback on the available resources and their usefulness or responsiveness to specific beneficiaries’ needs had been logged by the project team but was provided anecdotally to them. The actual frequency of usage and knowledge transfer at national level could not be verified outside of the number provided related to the eLearning platform and numbers relating to the distribution of printed materials.

Through the incorporation into the UNODC server, the information resources will remain available and accessible to stakeholders beyond the project’s timeline, whereas a standalone website or server might have risked being discontinued once funds are no longer provided within the framework of a formal project. Given the rather static characteristic of ICSANT and its provisions (assuming no amendments will be introduced), the key material available is also likely to remain highly relevant and of use to stakeholders beyond the project’s lifetime, thus being a sustainable part of the project. While the long-term utility of the knowledge products is clear, the evaluation also identified a clear need for provision of more in-depth knowledge and
practical training, using existing materials and developing new ones, tailored to national legislative contexts and advancement of ICSANT provisions which is being addressed under the new ongoing ICSANT project. In that line, for example, evidence from interviews and survey responses show that a limited number of beneficiaries and project stakeholders have been using the self-assessment questionnaire as it is a tool designed to gather national feedback related to ICSANT and not a knowledge product for individual use: integration of the tool into national follow-up mechanisms/practices, along with the development of capacity building activities, including introduction of a ‘Train-the-Trainees’ concept in activities, could be considered in the future to ensure greater ownership and fostering informed engagements into ICSANT adherence and implementation processes. In the same line of action, as stressed by the project team, as well as partners, recipients and beneficiaries during interviews, regular follow-up communication efforts by the project team after concluded activities, by form of providing more information on ICSANT, relevant links and materials as well as a general offer of follow-up assistance in form of official and unofficial exchanges, country visits, bilateral meetings etc., highly contributed to keeping momentum. There is thus appetite, if not some leeway, to consider formalizing follow-up action with most interested parties: this could take the form of follow-up roadmaps, action plans or multi-stakeholder /regional working groups (see recommendation section).

**Finding 11:** Future implementation of assistance related to the universalisation of ICSANT is largely dependent on securing extrabudgetary funding and/or embedding the activities within the UNODC’s regular Programme and Budget (assistance sustainability)

As previously noted, the project is based on an agreement between the EU and UNODC and fully funded by extrabudgetary contributions by the EU. Given that a decision has already been made by the cooperating parties to extend the project to a second phase, it is assumed that funding has been secured for further implementation. Considering that the project is almost exclusively funded from extrabudgetary funds, which affects both human resources as well as the budget for project implementation, the continuation of project activities and efforts to promote and assist in the universalisation of ICSANT beyond the ongoing next project and are very much dependent on the success of project implementation as well as continued commitment of the donor to provide funding support. This creates a degree of uncertainty on the continuity and sustainability of the activities.

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

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS:**

- To what extent has the project design, implementation and monitoring fully considered human rights, gender equality as well as marginalised groups, including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities as relevant in the area of the project’s thematic scope and diversified terrains of implementation?
- Which were the major challenges to effectively mainstream gender and human rights in the project/programme? (financial, institutional, understanding, political, expertise, tools)

**Finding 12:** The project design, implementation and monitoring did not sufficiently consider human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind.

As per documentation, the Action intended to follow a **rights-based and gender-sensitive approach** and contribute to gender mainstreaming pursuant to United Nations Security Council resolution 1325 and in line
with relevant guidance notes on “Gender mainstreaming in the work of UNODC”. Human rights and gender considerations were included in the description of the Action (design) and in the semi-annual progress reports (monitoring), as well as in the implementation of workshops (participation of females and males, panel parity). Gender balance considerations were also noted in staffing (consultants and staff). Project staff indicated that they also addressed relevant human rights considerations in trainings and workshops, such as the proportionality of punishment and non-discrimination in extradition procedures under the Convention (implementation).

The evaluation found that these provisions could have been more fully translated into action as part of the project implementation. On the basis of interviews with stakeholders and gender experts, as well as review of additional relevant documents, it found that the project could have better highlighted relevant dimensions of human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind in the field of action of the project (nuclear security/counter-terrorism).

PROMOTING GENDER EQUALITY

In the design stage, the project aimed to “provide equitable access to project resources and opportunities to men and women; take measures to ensure women and men’s equitable access to and full participation in power structures and decision-making in the project; Include gender assessments as part of the situation analysis for training and assessments, where appropriate; Generate and disseminate gender-disaggregated data through monitoring and evaluation in the process of the implementation of its logical framework; Define the implementation and monitoring requirements concerning gender in agreements with any potential partner organizations”.

UNODC guidance documents including concrete suggestions regarding the integration of human rights and gender aspects in counter-terrorism activities were available during the design and initial implementation of the project.

However, there could have been more thoroughly consulted to conduct specific analysis of the activities planned and of intended recipients. The description of the Action indicated that “for each step of the project cycle, a list of key questions will be addressed to ensure gender mainstreaming”. The desk review and the evaluation did not document such written analysis during the implementation of the project, as progress reports only included sex-disaggregated information on participation in events and reiterated the principle of non-discrimination.

Some efforts towards integration of parity consideration are nevertheless visible. The activities taken in the context of the project focused on encouraging the participation of women in regional events and country visits, including a specific invitation to Member States to nominate women. This is an important goal, since many stakeholders noted that nuclear security tends to be a male-dominated field. During the project’s last regional workshop, held in June 2023, one of the presentations by an NGO (the Stimson Institute) included several slides on the impact of bias in nuclear security. While these are all relevant actions, they might have benefitted from being supplemented through more concrete gender assessments as initially planned and adding more specific activities, and conceptualisation of the gender dimension within the area of project intervention.

29 Ibid.
HUMAN RIGHTS MAINSTREAMING

The project demonstrated mainstreaming of human rights dimension into key project activities. Nevertheless, several components could have benefited from a stronger sensibilisation to the dimension. As several stakeholders noted, human rights protection is inherent to counterterrorism and nuclear security as it is intended to protect human lives and health from harmful incidents. In addition, UNODC promotes the position that “when countering terrorism, States are required to respect international human rights”, and developed several tools to support the promotion and protection of international human rights among Member States. The ICSANT eLearning module developed by the project mentions the relevant human rights obligations towards an individual investigated or prosecuted (article 10 & 12 – fair trial guarantees) and in the context of extradition (article 16 – non-discrimination). The same provisions were mentioned in workshops organised by the team, as well as other principles of human rights in criminal justice such as proportionality of sentencing and safeguards on the use of the death penalty.

DISABILITY INCLUSION

The evaluation did not reveal specific analysis of the relevance of the project to marginalised groups, including persons with disability and considerations of intersectionality. In some activities with partners such as UNODA, disability considerations may have been applied in the selection of venues that are accessible for disabled persons in organising events, and indicating that in their invitations, yet not in a systematic manner. This could be considered for the second phase of the project.

LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

The project, being one of global coverage, targeted States that are not parties to ICSANT. Since its engagement with States was on a request basis, it could not adopt a dedicated strategy for least developed and developing countries (LDC), but collaborated with them wherever possible, in the context of regional meetings and country visits. As for its first phase, there was no evidence that the project included activities that directly responded to the needs of under-represented countries and vulnerable groups to adequately consider ‘leaving no one behind’ outside of country visits to the following LDCs as identified by the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs: Cambodia, Laos People’s Democratic Republic, Sierra Leone, Togo, United Republic of Tanzania.

Finding 13: The major challenges to effectively mainstream gender and HR in the project/programme were general lack of awareness of relevant aspects in the field of nuclear security as well lack of proper outreach to highlight UNODC policies and existing resources, as well as some resistance from some Member States.

In addition to institutional biases resulting in low presence of female professionals in the area of nuclear security, the project did not consider conceptual linkages that may also apply with regard to the relevance of gender for the topic of nuclear security. While the pertinence of the dimension varies from one national context to another, anecdotal evidence suggest that the dimension remains challenging to address.

At the operational level, interviews and desk review of project documentation revealed quite a low level of knowledge and familiarity of the project team with relevant UNODC policies and tools on gender and human rights due to lack of outreach on the subject. These include checklists to be reviewed during project approval
(available in the system since 2019), specific tools on human rights and gender equality in countering terrorism, and relevant indicators for reporting on achievements.

Institutionally, UNODC has developed extensive policies and guidance in recent years and appointed specific focal points on gender (2018) and human rights (2023). However, as the project is not an independent project, but part of a global programme, it was not reviewed to ensure compliance with these policies. This was also the case with the second project which started during the evaluation period (July 2023).

**Finding 14: the project has established strong partnerships with NGOs and UN agencies which could provide the basis for integrating gender equality aspects in the successor project.**

The second phase of the project was approved by the donor on 19 June 2023. The Annex to the European Council Resolution of June 2023 states that the “project will be implemented in a gender sensitive manner, with gender perspectives mainstreamed throughout the project.” This provides an opportunity for the project team to analyse and identify relevant aspects of HRG-LNOB of future activities and plan specific activities on human rights and gender aspects of nuclear security. Some stakeholders suggested that there should be a specific outcome on this to ensure adequate consideration during project implementation. In that line, the project team indicated that an event on human rights is already planned, with the support of the UN Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism.

The evaluation team presented the question on relevant aspects of HRG-LNOB to many of the stakeholders and identified additional gender experts in the field of nuclear security. The evaluation revealed that most of the NGOs that the project partnered with (GPA, NTI, Stimson), as well as UNODA had relevant policies and presentations on gender issues in nuclear security. These included for example sharing information on the different health impacts of nuclear and radioactive incidents on women and girls and on the importance of diversity of views on nuclear security and the impact of ignoring female experiences. Others have specific strategies to involve women decision makers in the push towards ICSANT ratification, to appoint gender champions in nuclear security, and to involve youth in nuclear security issues.

Stakeholders interviewed expressed willingness to collaborate with UNODC on these issues and made concrete suggestions such as the development of a dedicated e-learning module or including dedicated sessions in webinars and workshops. The evaluation teamformulates a recommendation towards stronger partnerships in that area as Recommendation 2.

32 See for example the Parliamentary Handbook on the Role of Women Parliamentarians in Preventing the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (PGA, 2020); WINS Special Report Series: Gender and Nuclear Security: Challenges and Opportunities (July 2019). Also UNIDIR is working on the issue of gender and global security (Gender and Global Security → UNIDIR).
III. CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of triangulated findings discussed in previous chapters, and on the basis of its transversal evaluation question (To what extent has the project contributed to support the strengthening of the global (nuclear) security regime through ICSANT, while reinforcing UNODC’s role as a key actor in the construction of an effective global counter-terrorism response?), the evaluation concludes that:

1. At the thematic level, the project demonstrated the added value of having a thematic-focused project on ICSANT to increase project coherence and effectiveness with regard to the prioritisation of ICSANT universalisation at regional and global levels. It allows i) a specific content-centred outreach; ii) a creative and diverse knowledge production, tailored to the specific needs and requirements for ICSANT adherence; and iii) the development of technical assistance packages in line with the specific needs and legislative gaps of interested national partners. It further favoured the recruitment of a thematically versed and experienced expert team, enhancing the relevance of project activities and products, and with it the Office added value in its role of legislative technical partner and knowledge broker including on nuclear terrorism prevention and security.

2. The project further contributed to strengthen global nuclear security awareness, developing strong complementarities with other UN and non-UN specialised agencies, mainly IAEA and UNODA, to ensure coherence of ICSANT prioritisation within the broader nuclear security regime. Optimization of existing workstream and specialized networks across agencies further lay robust foundations to explore opportunities of more formalized synergies.

3. At the management level, the inclusion of a stand-alone project within the global TPB programming contributed to the project’s internal coherence and efficiency. However, the project functioned on a rather autonomous basis, given the subject matter difference from standard TPB projects, sustaining a strong and efficient cooperation architecture between its partners and donor, but with limited use of policies, monitoring, guidance (notably on gender and human rights) existing within the UNODC global programme. While this architecture enhanced the project’s external coherence and efficiency, it may have isolated the project within its niche of intervention internally. The project could benefit from promotion of visibility at a higher level and linkages to UNODC global programming.

The evaluation concludes that, overall, the contribution of the project to building and sustaining momentum on the importance of ICSANT universalisation across interested stakeholders and partners has been essential in raising informed and strong awareness at the national, regional and global levels and keeping the international momentum and strengthening an effective global (nuclear) security regime.

It contributed to initiating and/or supporting a dynamic of prioritization of ICSANT at national levels, laying a solid ground for continued work focused on capacity-building, technical and legislative assistance to further ICSANT implementation. It also managed to place UNODC as a key strategic and expert partner in the field, in complementarity with other specialized agencies and in line with its core function to support Member States in adherence to and implementing key international legal instruments to counter terrorism, and enhancing their legislative, policy and criminal justice capacities and systems to effectively prevent and respond to all forms of terrorism.
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1 – ENHANCE IN-COUNTRY FOLLOW-UPS AND ADJUST THE SCOPE AND FRAMEWORK OF INTERVENTION TO REGIONAL AND NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE NEEDS AND PRIORITIES ON ICSANT

Based on findings 8 (Effectiveness) and 9-10 (Impact and Sustainability) it is recommended that the Project Management and Team, in close dialogue with senior management of the Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB), as well as UNODC Field Offices (FOs) and Regional Offices (ROs), along with the donor, interested Member States and specialized partners where relevant, focus the second phase of the ICSANT project toward enhanced technical assistance and in-country support. This could be done at the earliest convenience during the second-phase planning of activities.

To be operationalized, this could include, but not limited to:

- Balance global and Vienna-based activities with increased number of regional events as an avenue for consolidating specialized regional expertise, with the support of UNODC, in charge of drawing on specific lessons and determine regional priority areas for ICSANT universalisation and implementation at regional level. This could serve as a basis for the UNODC project management and team to design and tailor regional follow-ups and activities.

- Systematize follow-up mechanisms with interested stakeholders and national “champions” to jointly develop national follow-up action plan/roadmap/lists of key areas of possible interventions and next steps. This would include consideration of readjusting the project workstream and budget to the country level (in-country visits).

- Explore and strengthen cooperation with UNODC regional and field offices, considering joint additional recruitment of consultants, to conduct legislative and training need assessments, identify experts/lecturers from the region, strengthen national network of specialized actors and decision-makers to help increase buy-in and capacities for ICSANT adherence.

- Diversify the project activity portfolio with activities directed to capacity-building of specialized agents (in-country training tailored to national legal frameworks and needs, mentoring on a case-by-case basis, Train-the-Trainer modules…), using lessons learned and good practices in place within UNODC broader capacity-building workstream.

- Adapt and translate existing training modules considering going beyond UN official languages, encourage the use of self-assessment questionnaires (considering mentoring on case-by-case basis).

RECOMMENDATION 2 – MAINSTREAM HRG-LNOB DIMENSION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEMATIC SPECIFICITIES OF ICSANT AND NUCLEAR SECURITY

Based on findings 12-14 (Gender, Human rights and Leaving no one behind) and 4 (Efficiency) it is recommended that the ICSANT Project Team relies on available UNODC resources and expertise to conduct a thorough analysis of relevant aspects of HRG-LNOB to mainstream human rights and gender equality into future project activities, at all stages, including monitoring and reporting, and updating project deliverables to be more inclusive.
Consultation with UNODC gender and human rights focal points on planning as well as reporting (e.g., relevant indicators developed for GLOTP1 to monitor progress) could be a first step in that direction. Partnering with NGOs and UN agencies with relevant experience and expertise in the design and implementation of HRG-LNOB activities in the field of nuclear security for the second phase of the project would need to be considered. In a future phase, the project could prioritise country visits to allow participation of many different national stakeholders and include consultations with adequate partners at national levels to ensure the inclusion of the needs of under-represented countries and vulnerable groups.

Further, it is recommended to include HRG-sensitive indicators into the project monitoring system and align future phase design with UNODC-wide policies on HRG and inclusion, including ensuring that new project staff are trained on and introduced to all relevant HRG-LNOB policies.

**RECOMMENDATION 3 – STREAMLINE AND STRENGTHEN THE PROJECT COOPERATION ARCHITECTURE**

Based on findings 6 (Coherence) and 9-11 (Sustainability), it is recommended that the ICSANT Project Management and TPB senior management, in consultation with donors, continue with building synergies and optimizing complementarities of mandates as a central component of the project, and formalize cooperation mechanisms and practices in a more systematized manner. This could imply:

- In line with the final In-Depth Evaluation of GLO/R35, explore joint planning and project activities with key UN and non-UN specialized agencies to optimize resources and advance external coherence. It could also be useful to reconsider the scope of existing cooperation notably with UNOCT, to clarify respective responsibilities in the nuclear security domain. Senior management across the two institutions could act to facilitate such discussions.

- Enhanced external synergies, moving from an ad hoc, practice-oriented and relationship-based cooperation to more formalized mechanisms such as regular planning meetings, strategic multi-actor working groups or, where relevant and needed, specific MoUs to formalize and clarify the relationship with IAEA and other relevant partners to increase transparency, complementarities and efficient planning.

- Clarify the cooperation and information sharing framework with UNOCT for clearer distribution of work and responsibilities.

- Consider expanding partnerships to regional organizations such as the African Union (AU) and ASEAN which are equipped with dedicated bodies working on nuclear security for increased relevance and effectiveness of the intervention in terms of outreach and follow-up strategies. This could be aligned to regional organization priorities of harmonization amongst MS in different thematic areas.

- Consider increased consultation with experts, academia and NGOs to update and diversify the knowledge base as relevant for regional outreach, advocacy and in-country capacity building workstream.

**RECOMMENDATION 4 – STREAMLINE, SPECIFY AND REFOCUS THE PROJECT THEORY OF CHANGE FOR ITS NEXT PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT**

Based on findings 2 (Relevance), 8 (Effectiveness), 4 (Efficiency), 9 (Impact and Sustainability) and 12 (HRG-LNOB), it is recommended that the ICSANT Project Management and the Team, in close dialogue with TPB senior management, along with the donor, undertakes at the earliest before the operationalisation of the second phase and in the design stage of the next phases, a thorough reflection exercise to streamline, specify...
and refocus the project’s Theory of Change on ICSANT adherence and implementation at regional and national levels.

To be useful, this exercise would imply:

- The preparation of a clear, realistic and outcome-oriented Theory of Change and logical framework that can be used for results-based management and reporting.
- A clarification and nuancing of the project’s target group mapping, founded in evidence-based and detailed assessments of i) thematic and strategic areas of intervention (legislative, knowledge etc.), ii) target groups status, advancement and needs in terms of ICSANT adherence /implementation, and iii) a prioritisation of countries with the highest nuclear terrorism risks and threats. This would support the development of a more strategic outreach approach and tailored implementation plans per target groups.
- An assessment of how the project aligns with current UNODC strategies and TPB programming, including on programme design, gender equality and human rights.
- A reprioritisation of project activities at country-level, where relevant, with the aim of receiving more requests for technical legislative assistance and capacity-building advancing ICSANT.

RECOMMENDATION 5 – DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A COMPREHENSIVE AND CHANGE NARRATIVE-BASED MONITORING SYSTEM

Based on findings 9 (Impact), 12 (HRG-LNOB), 11- (Efficiency), 8 (Effectiveness), there is an inherent difficulty in monitoring progress in achieving the intended outcome of ICSANT project universalisation, since adherence is the conclusion of a long process with many steps that take different forms in different countries, and some of them outside the control of the project.

It is recommended that the ICSANT Project Management and Team, and in dialogue with UNODC senior management, review, develop and follow a more comprehensive monitoring system:

- with greater consideration of higher-level outcomes, impact, and challenges of implementation.
- which demonstrates the project’s non-measurable gains (dialogue building, strengthened international cooperation, perceptions changes, trustworthiness...);
- which tells the story of the change or challenges that the work of the programme has brought about, including contributions to achieving the SDGs; and,
- which is more intentional about measuring human rights, gender equality and leaving no one behind results, and oriented towards a change narrative instead of outputs only. In the second phase, the project team could consult with in-house experts to define additional indicators to highlight progress beyond listing activities conducted and participants attending them.

It is further recommended to streamline the procedure for follow-up with national counterparts and encouraging Member States to commit to the next step in the process. This intention/commitment could be highlighted in reporting on progress made. It can also be strengthened by a follow-up question such as “what in your view is the next step/the most urgent need of your country towards ratification?”.

RECOMMENDATION 6 – ENCOURAGE AND MONITOR USE OF KNOWLEDGE TOOLS

Based on findings 8 (Effectiveness) and 10 (Impact and Sustainability), it is recommended that the ICSANT Project Team, as part of the development of the project second phase, encourage the continued use of
project’s tool, including for example, a module including the administration of the self-questionnaire and a presentation of each tool, during potential field visits, follow-up activities and capacity-building/technical assistance packages. A communication strategy could be also developed in that sense to enhance the visibility of existing tools (such as a newsletter to ICSANT network of stakeholders and interested parties, redirected links from partners organization dedicated pages on nuclear security...).

It is also recommended to integrate a short user survey within the website (to keep track of website users, gather demographic information and a first overview of the website audience). This would facilitate future website updates and adjustments according to its targeted and effective audience.

Such features have been/are considered or used across other UNODC-related pages, such as SHERLOC home and the World Drug report webpage.
LESSONS LEARNED

The project has introduced some lessons learned that can be used for its second phase as well as for replication across UNODC for similar projects:

1. The importance of providing technical assistance that is tailored to the needs of each country, i.e. understanding the culture, the politics, and the specific resistances to adherence.

2. The development of diversified and comprehensive knowledge tools that include considerations of factors such as the accuracy and timeliness of the information, the user-friendliness of the interface, the availability of resources and tools that address specific needs and are made available in all 6 UN languages, and feedback from users who have used the website for their intended purposes.

GOOD PRACTICES

The Project team utilised several good practices to increase awareness on ICSANT and reach out to as many Member States as possible. In particular to be noted:

1. **Building synergies** across specialized organizations and optimized use of international specialized platforms, events and networks, not only enabled to advance in promoting universal goals and taking into account the different mandates of different organizations, but also contributed to consolidate UNODC's specific role and added value in the field. Taking any opportunity to promote ICSANT in events organized by other UN and non-UN agencies and promoting ICSANT together with other relevant instruments. The close cooperation with all the key international organizations and NGOs working on nuclear security, allowed the ICSANT project team to reach (out to) higher numbers of stakeholders.

2. **Multi-stakeholder reach-out approach**: Organizing events with participants from different agencies in the criminal justice system such as prosecutors, judges and law enforcement, different ministries such as justice and foreign affairs, and regulatory bodies for nuclear security. This helped establish broader understanding of the importance of ICSANT and the different roles and responsibilities of institutions/stakeholders with regard to national implementation of the obligations.

3. **Knowledge brokering**: Further developing specific expertise on ICSANT within the team and preparing a wide range of high-quality materials for dissemination in all UN official languages, including detailed presentations on ICSANT. The team showed creativity and continuous learning from previous events, applying it to adapt and improve their approaches in the future. The team benefits from good and regular exchange on the status quo regarding engagement with stakeholders, lessons learned etc.
## I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

| Project/programme duration (dd/mm/yy-dd/mm/yy): | 01/04/19- 30/06/23 |
| Location (Country/ies and sub-national focus areas, if relevant): | Global |
UNODC’s Global Programme Strengthening the Legal Regime Against Terrorism (2003-2022)  
The Global Programme on Preventing and Countering Terrorism (2022-2027) |
| Linkages to the SDG targets to which the project/programme(s) contribute(s): | SDG 16 “Peace, justice and strong institutions” |
| Executing Agency (UNODC office/section/unit): | UNODC Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB)/ISSI/CBRN Terrorism Prevention Programme |
| Implementing partner: | n/a |
| Donor(s): | European Union  
*At the request of the donor, nominal USD 10,000 from Canada |
| End Beneficiaries/Recipients: | UN Member States |
| Total Approved Budget (USD): | USD 3,978,360.45  
EUR 3,506,978.84 |
| Total Overall Budget (USD): | USD 3,978,360.45  
EUR 3,506,978.84 |
| Total Expenditure by date of initiation of evaluation (USD): | TBD |
| Name and title of Project/Programme Manager(s) and implementing UNODC office(s)/section(s)/unit(s): | Maria Lorenzo Sobrado,  
UNODC/DTA/TPB/ISSI |
| Time frame of evaluation: (planned start and end date of the evaluation process) | 01/06/2023- 15/11/2023 |
| Budget for this evaluation in USD\(^{33}\): | Up to USD 100,000 |

\(^{33}\) Including fees for evaluation team, travel (incl. IES staff as required), printing, editing, translation, interpretation, etc.
Implemented by UNODC/Terrorism Prevention Branch (TPB) and funded by the European Union, the project “Union support for the universalisation and effective implementation of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism” aims at making progress towards the universalisation and the effective implementation of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism (ICSANT). To do so, UNODC delivers four complementary outcomes. Outcome 1 focuses on increasing the number of States considering/initiating processes/becoming Parties to ICSANT and heightening the awareness of ICSANT among beneficiaries (national policy and decision makers, including Parliamentarians) and in international fora. It also looks to exploit synergies with other relevant international legal instruments (Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, the Amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, UNSC resolution 1540). Outcome 2 aims to improve national legislation, upon request, of beneficiary countries by incorporating all ICSANT requirements into national legislation. Outcome 3 supports developing the capacity of criminal justice officials and other relevant national stakeholders to investigate, prosecute and adjudicate cases in which ICSANT would be of relevance. It also aims to strengthen the capacity of Member States to detect and respond to the threat of non-State actors, including terrorists, acquiring nuclear or other radioactive materials. Outcome 4 involves the development and maintenance of a reference-website containing all ICSANT-relevant information, including good practices.

The project specifically targets beneficiaries from those countries that are not yet party to ICSANT. The project also specifically targets beneficiaries from the countries party to ICSANT and particularly those that lack adequate legislation implementing all requirements of the Convention as well as those that have not included as offences in their national legislation the conduct that ICSANT requires them to establish as crimes. The project also targets a wide audience globally to raise awareness of ICSANT, developing information mechanisms and technical assistance materials, amongst others a specific website. Target groups include: (i) Judicial, prosecutorial and law enforcement officials and representatives of the legislative power and legal practitioners in the target countries who will benefit from increased capacity and expertise regarding the effective implementation of the provisions of ICSANT; (ii) National policy- and decision-makers of target countries, including members of parliament; (iii) Other external partners, who would benefit from UNODC’s work in promoting ICSANT; (iv) Other beneficiaries informed by the information mechanisms and communication materials developed.

The project is delivered through the core project team based in Vienna to carry out the project’s activities, project management as well monitoring and evaluation. They receive support as appropriate from UNODC.

---

34 Please note that the recommendation for any UNODC In-Depth Evaluation is at least two independent evaluators, i.e. one Evaluation Expert and one Substantive Expert in the subject area of the project/programme to be evaluated.
35 This project started as a part of the UNODC Global Programme to Strengthen the Regime Against Terrorism (GLOR35) and is now under the new UNODC Global Programme GLOTP1.
36 Currently, 73 States are not yet party to ICSANT.
in the field. The delivery modality of activities varies depending on the most applicable method for each intervention, such as: regional workshops and country visits; development of promotional materials; legislative assistance to requesting States via desk reviews or legislative drafting workshops; regional workshops for prosecutors, investigators or judges; a website on all resources on ICSANT; the translation of legislative materials; webinars; training manuals; and an eLearning module.

However, with the spread of Covid-19, the adaptation of some interventions to online/virtual delivery was required. The pandemic also caused unavoidable delays to activity implementation across some outcomes, eventually resulting in a no-cost extension of the project being requested and approved in November 2022, increasing the timeline from 36 to 43 months (now concluding on 30 June 2023).

The project is coordinated closely with other relevant international stakeholders in the area of nuclear terrorism prevention, as relevant and appropriate. The project follows a rule-of-law and human-rights-based approach and contributes to gender equality and mainstreaming. Human rights are at the core of all work of the UN system.

**Project title:** Union support for the universalisation and effective implementation of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism

**Objective:** To make progress towards the universalisation and the effective implementation of ICSANT.

| Outcome 1: Increased number of States considering/initiating processes/becoming Parties to ICSANT and heightened awareness of ICSANT among beneficiaries (national policy and decision makers, including Parliamentarians) and in international fora. Synergies with other relevant international legal instruments (CPPNM, ACPPNM, UNSC resolution 1540) are exploited. |
| Outcome 2: Improved national legislation of beneficiary countries by incorporating all ICSANT requirements into national legislation. |
| Outcome 3: Developed capacity of criminal justice officials and other relevant national stakeholders to investigate, prosecute and adjudicate cases in which ICSANT would be of relevance. Strengthened capacity of Member States to detect and respond to the threat of terrorists acquiring nuclear or other radioactive materials. |
| Outcome 4: Developed and maintained a reference-website containing all ICSANT-relevant information, including good practices. |

**II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

**Planned utilisation of the evaluation results**:

- e.g. inform the future development of the project/programme or similar projects/programmes, for organizational learning, assess the success and areas of improvement of the project/programme etc.

**Main users of the evaluation results**:

- UNODC CBRN Terrorism Prevention Programme

**Unit of analysis (full projects/segment/etc.)**:

- Full project (which forms a segment of the Global Programme GLOR35 and subsequently GLOTP1)

---

37 e.g. inform the future development of the project/programme or similar projects/programmes, for organizational learning, assess the success and areas of improvement of the project/programme etc.

38 e.g. senior management, programme management, stakeholders, beneficiaries, donors etc.
All findings and recommendations as well as the management response pertain solely to the UNODC project(s)/programme(s) being evaluated and is not in any way targeted to Member States, implementing partners or other entities that took part in this project/programme.

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be conducted based on the below selected relevant DAC criteria\(^\text{39}\). All evaluations must include gender, human rights, disability inclusion and no one left behind. Ideally these are mainstreamed within the evaluation questions. Moreover, the evaluation needs to identify lessons learned\(^\text{40}\) and good practices. The evaluation questions will be further refined by the Evaluation Team in the drafting of the Inception Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevance\(^\text{41}\): Is the intervention doing the right thing? | To what extent has the project been relevant to stakeholder’s (e.g. governments, Member States, etc.) needs and priorities?  
To what extent are the outcomes, outputs, and activities of the project relevant to achieving its objective? |
| Coherence\(^\text{42}\): How well does the intervention fit? | To what extent has the project delivered results in line with organizational, regional and international priorities?  
To what extent did the project cooperate with partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) in the achievement of results? |
| Efficiency\(^\text{43}\): How well are resources being used? | To what extent has the project delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner?  
To what extent did the project adapt to meet the challenges presented by Covid-19? |
| Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?\(^\text{44}\) | To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objective?  
What have been the facilitating or hindering factors in achievement of results?  
To what extent has the EU ICSANT website reached the intended audience? |

---

\(^\text{39}\) [https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm](https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm)  
\(^\text{40}\) Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/programme.  
\(^\text{41}\) Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.  
\(^\text{42}\) The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the country, sector or institution  
\(^\text{43}\) The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.  
\(^\text{44}\) The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.
Criteria | Evaluation question
--- | ---
Impact\(^45\): What difference does the intervention make? | To what extent has the project generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects?  
What contribution to impact did the project have on the nuclear security landscape in beneficiary Member States?

Sustainability\(^46\): Will the benefits last? | To what extent has the project generated ownership by Member States?  
To what extent has the project developed national capacity to support sustainability of benefits?

Human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind\(^47\): Has the intervention been inclusive and human rights based? | To what extent has the project design and implementation fully considered human rights, gender equality as well as marginalised groups, including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities?

Lessons learned and good practices | What are the key lessons learned and good practices of the project?  
What lessons learned and good practices should inform future thematically related projects/initiatives at UNODC?  
How can these be used to further the UNODC Strategy 2021-2025, particularly Thematic Area 4: Preventing and Countering Terrorism and The Global Programme on Preventing and Countering Terrorism (2022-2027)?

IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

All evaluations of the United Nations system are guided by the principles of human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind. Gender-sensitive and disability inclusive evaluation methods and gender-sensitive and disability inclusive data collection techniques are therefore essential to identify key gender issues, address marginalized, disabled, hard-to-reach and vulnerable population.

THE METHODS USED TO COLLECT AND ANALYSE DATA

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 that evaluation conclusions, findings, recommendations, and lessons learned are substantiated by evidence and based on sound data analysis and triangulation; as well as a gender-sensitive, inclusive, respectful and participatory approach and methodology to capture disability and gender equality issues. Special attention will be paid to: (i) ensuring that voices and opinions of both men, women and other marginalised groups, such as people with disabilities are heard (including gender related and disaggregated

---

\(^45\) The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.

\(^46\) The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

\(^47\) 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.
data, (e.g., by age, sex, countries etc.); (ii) ensuring 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 included. The evaluation team will be asked to present a dedicated methodology 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, guidance, tools and templates. The evaluation team is also expected to use interviews, surveys and/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.

The final evaluation report as well as optionally the draft report will be externally independently assessed (facilitated by IES). Based on this assessment, the report may not be published if it does not meet minimum quality standards.

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. Timeframe and Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation stage</th>
<th>Start date&lt;sup&gt;48&lt;/sup&gt; (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>Finalisation ToR (3-5 weeks)</td>
<td>12/05/2023</td>
<td>31/05/2023</td>
<td>Submit the ToRs to IES per email; upload revised ToR in Unite Evaluations and finalise draft ToR based on IES feedback; IES shares final draft with CLPs; PM to finalise ToR based on CLPs feedback.</td>
<td>IES initiates the evaluation in Unite Evaluations; includes 1 week review by IES and 1 week review by CLPs; multiple revisions by PM based on IES and CLPs feedback; final clearance by PM; in parallel, consultation on evaluation team and outreach by PM and IES to qualified evaluators; identification of additional management arrangement (e.g. Evaluation Reference Group) may be proposed by IES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment (3-4 weeks)</td>
<td>7/06/2023</td>
<td>12/06/2023</td>
<td>Consult with IES on potential evaluators; PM manages full recruitment process&lt;sup&gt;49&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Review and clearance of evaluators by IES before recruitment can be initiated by PM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report, incl. desk review (4-5 weeks)</td>
<td>14/06/2023</td>
<td>17/07/2023</td>
<td>Kick-off meeting with PM and evaluators; desk review by evaluators, followed by draft Inception Report; Review by IES; clearance of revised Final Inception Report by IES; logistical preparations by PM in consultation with evaluators for interviews and other data collection efforts.</td>
<td>Includes 1 week review and clearance by IES; IES participates in the kick-off meeting; engagement between IES, PM and evaluators as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection (incl. field)</td>
<td>01/07/2023</td>
<td>31/08/2023</td>
<td>Field missions; observation; interviews; survey; Coordination of data collection dates and logistics by PM; IES may participate in any data collection activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>48</sup> Required preparations before the start: completed ToR; 1 week review of ToR by the Core Learning Partners; finalised ToR based upon comments received; clearance by IES; assessment of qualified evaluation team candidates; clearance by IES; recruitment (Vienna HR for international consultants requiring a minimum of 2 weeks; UNDP for national consultants which may take up to several weeks); desk review materials compiled.

<sup>49</sup> Please follow the official recruitment process for international, regional or national consultants at UNODC.
### VI. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

<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>Missions TBD/TBC (4-6 weeks)</td>
<td>01/09/2023</td>
<td>14/09/2023</td>
<td>etc. by evaluators and IES (if applicable).</td>
<td>Collection efforts, including interviews or field missions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and draft report (4-6 weeks)</td>
<td>01/09/2023</td>
<td>14/09/2023</td>
<td>Data analysis and drafting of report by evaluators</td>
<td>Includes 1 week review by IES, followed by 1 week review by PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14/09/2023</td>
<td>31/9/2023</td>
<td>Review by IES; review by PM; revision of draft report by evaluators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report for CLP comments (1 week)</td>
<td>01/10/2023</td>
<td>07/10/2023</td>
<td>CLPs review and provide comments to IES</td>
<td>CLP comments are compiled and shared by IES with evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report, evaluation brief, PowerPoint slides, and External Quality Assessment (1-2 weeks)</td>
<td>01/11/2023</td>
<td>14/11/2023</td>
<td>Revision by evaluators; Evaluation report, 2-page Evaluation Brief and PowerPoint slides are finalised by evaluators based upon feedback by IES and PM; external quality assessment of report; completion of MR and EFP by PM; editing/publishing of final report</td>
<td>Includes 1 week review and clearance by IES of Final Report and Brief and 1 week review by PM of Brief and PowerPoint slides; 1 week for external quality assessment facilitated by IES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (1 day)</td>
<td>15/11/2023</td>
<td>30/11/2023</td>
<td>Presentation organised by PM and IES jointly at key event within 4 weeks of finalisation of the evaluation.</td>
<td>Date of presentation of final results to be agreed between PM, IES and evaluators; IES to open the presentation together with Senior Manager of the project/programme under evaluation.</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.

---

50 Data collection is currently likely to take longer than usual due to competing priorities of stakeholders and beneficiaries due to Covid-19. Data collection phase may imply on-line interviews, surveys etc instead of travel/face-to-face interviews.
VII. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Please ensure that the full evaluation process is managed through Unite Evaluations (evaluations.unodc.org). All communication of preliminary, draft or final evaluation results needs to be reviewed and cleared by IES before dissemination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of consultants (national/international)</th>
<th>Specific expertise required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Expert</td>
<td>1 international</td>
<td>Evaluation methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Expert</td>
<td>1 international</td>
<td>Expertise in criminal justice, human rights and gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Expert</td>
<td>1 international</td>
<td>Expertise in nuclear security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation team will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial and 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. 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.

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. 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.

51 Please note that an evaluation team needs to consist of at least 1 independent evaluator – the Evaluation Expert – and at least one Substantive Expert.

52 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.

53 The Unite Evaluations user manual for Project Managers is available here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation stage</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>IES</th>
<th>Evaluation team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ToR</strong></td>
<td>Draft, submission per email to IES and subsequent uploading to Unite evaluations and finalising</td>
<td>Conversation with PM on evaluation scope, questions, etc. as needed; multiple rounds of comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify stakeholders and CLPs</td>
<td>Share ToR with CLPs for comments (1 week)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compile the desk review material</td>
<td>Collaborate with the PM in the identification of suitable evaluation team; reach out to evaluators as necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify, jointly with IES, potential evaluators and experts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment</strong></td>
<td>Propose evaluators and experts after consultation with IES</td>
<td>Review &amp; clear proposed evaluation team before recruitment process starts</td>
<td>Submit all required documentation for the selection and recruitment process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative process and recruitment (in line with organizational rules and regulations for consultants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finalise the compilation of the desk review material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inception Report</strong></td>
<td>Engage with the evaluation team and provide all required information, documents, stakeholder lists, schedule kick-off meeting in consultation with IES.</td>
<td>Open the kick-off meeting, and provide relevant templates and guidance, review draft Inception Report in line with UNODC and UNEG norms and standards</td>
<td>Participate in kick-off meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Release payment once requested by IES</td>
<td>Clear Final Inception Report before any data collection can start</td>
<td>Draft Inception Report in line with UNODC templates and guidelines54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All logistical arrangements for the evaluators and IES, if applicable, including travel arrangements, set-up of interviews as requested, note verbales, etc.</td>
<td>Provide guidance on the evaluation process to the evaluation team and/or the project team, as needed; engage with the evaluation team on a regular basis, participate in evaluation team meetings, briefings, etc. as necessary and oversee data collection process.</td>
<td>Conduct an independent, participatory and high-quality data collection, ensuring that IES has full access to all primary and secondary data collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timely travel arrangements, payments of DSAs, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement the methods and tools developed in the Inception Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in de-briefings, as necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Engage with Project Management to request further information and assistance as required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation stage</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>IES</th>
<th>Evaluation team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>Provide further data, documents, stakeholders, etc. as requested by the evaluation team.</td>
<td>Provide further information to evaluators as requested</td>
<td>Conduct de-briefings to PM and IES, as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct a thorough analysis to ensure triangulation of evidence.</td>
<td>Provide a high-quality draft report, in line with UNODC and UNEG N&amp;S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of the draft report</td>
<td>Initial clearance or rejection of draft report</td>
<td>Incorporate comments of IES and consider those of PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review the 2-page Evaluation Brief and PowerPoint slides and organize a presentation of the results to internal and external stakeholders in consultation with IES.</td>
<td>Final review by IES and either 1) clearance for publication or 2) non-clearance for publication if it does not meet UNODC &amp; UNEG norms and standards. IES to consult with PM on the date and time of event and provide introductory remarks at final presentation</td>
<td>Present the results as agreed with Project Management and as cleared by IES within 4 weeks of approval of the final evaluation report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Release all outstanding payments, as requested by IES</td>
<td>Clear all deliverables for payment, once they meet UNEG Norms and Standards and UNODC evaluation policy, templates and guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>Yearly update on the implementation of recommendations.</td>
<td>Report on the implementation of recommendations to Member States and the Executive Director on an annual basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation matrix below presents a comprehensive picture of the evaluation methodology. It details for each evaluation question, its main dimensions, collection methods and data sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Indicators/sub-questions(^{55})</th>
<th>Data collection method(s) and triangulation(^{56})</th>
<th>Sources of information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE</strong></td>
<td>To what extent have the project design and implementation been relevant to and included stakeholders’ and target groups (e.g., governments, Member States, donors etc.) needs and priorities?</td>
<td>Were specific assessments/analysis/research conducted to guide project design, geographic prioritization and/or planning? 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 and donors?</td>
<td>Desk review KIIs; FGDs; online survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are the project’s objective and outcomes aligned with relevant international legal instruments on nuclear terrorism, including with relevant UNODC mandates, UN resolutions and the SDGs?</td>
<td>Relevance of the project with regards to the construction of a comprehensive international normative framework on nuclear terrorism prevention. To which specific UN and UN specialized commissions’ resolution is the project relevant? Relevance of the project towards the achievement of the SDGs</td>
<td>Desk review KIIs; FGDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent are the outcomes, outputs, and activities of the project relevant to achieving its objective?</td>
<td>What were the rationales, hypotheses and assumptions on which the project has been designed? What is the relationship between input, delivered outputs/outcomes?</td>
<td>Desk review KIIs; FGDs; online survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{55}\) Please state the sub-questions and indicators that will guide your data collection to respond to the evaluation question.

\(^{56}\) Please state the data collection and triangulation methods that will be used to answer the respective evaluation question and the respective data sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COHESION</th>
<th>Coherence</th>
<th>Coherence</th>
<th>Desk review</th>
<th>Progress reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To what extent has the project delivered results in line with organizational, regional and international priorities in the area of nuclear terrorism, including as part of UNODC Global programming and strategic frameworks, and in synergies with other relevant international instruments? | To what extent has the project built any synergies to advance:  
- UNODC mandates and interventions in support to the ratification and implementation of ICSANT (incl. GA/RES/74/174 on Technical assistance provided by UNODC related to counter-terrorism) and other relevant international instruments (e.g. adherence to A/CPPNM, Terrorist Bombings Convention, UNSCR 1373, UNSCR 1540);  
- UNODC Strategy 2021-2025: Thematic Area 4: Preventing and Countering Terrorism - Global Programme Strengthening the Legal Regime Against Terrorism (2003-2022) and Global programme on Preventing and Countering Terrorism (2022-2027) and its twin project covering other geographical areas;  
- Donor and partners strategic framework towards nuclear terrorism prevention and responses such as IAEA efforts and assistance towards strengthening of the global nuclear security regime;  
- Other relevant UN supported initiatives such as the SDGs or work on related issues such as organized crime and criminal justice. | Desk review  
KIIs; FGDs; online survey | Stakeholder mapping; Progress reports; project description; activity reports; logical framework; external documentation; UNODC staff; implementing partners; beneficiaries; donor. |

**Coherence**

To what extent was the project cooperation architecture with internal (UNODC regional offices, field representatives...) and external stakeholders effective and coherent (including UN entities, external specialized stakeholders, CSOs, academia, etc.) to achieve results?  
To what extent were synergies and complementarities with other relevant (UNODC) interventions explored?  
Has the project considered and cooperated with all pertinent partners (IAEA (in particular OLA and NSNS), UNCT/UNOCT, UNODA, UN OLA, IPU, EU CBRN Risk Mitigation Centres for Excellence Initiative, UNICRI, GICNT, 1540 Group of Experts / Committee, Interpol, Regional offices, Ministries, regional groups ...)?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFICIENCY</th>
<th>To what extent has the project demonstrated UNODC added value in its core function of technical advisory to interested Member States in the ratification and implementation of international legal instruments related to the prevention and suppression of terrorism?</th>
<th>To what extent has the project implementation demonstrated the added value of UNODC in the field of preventing and countering (nuclear) terrorism? How pertinent is the project for internal UNODC coherence towards fulfilling its core mandate to support the strengthening of international normative frameworks against organized crime and terrorism? To what extent has the project delivered its interventions in coherence with the mandates of other relevant UN entities/UN-system/reforms?</th>
<th>Desk review KIIs; FGDs</th>
<th>Progress reports; project description; activity reports; logical framework; external documentation; UNODC staff; implementing partners.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent has the project delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner?</td>
<td>Did the project use cost-effective tools and processes? (e.g. use of online and communication tools, use of consultants and/or national trainers, cooperation between HQ and Field offices, etc.) Was the project well-staffed, resourced and equipped to deliver as planned? Any specific challenges in that regard? How was the project organized and delivered from a financial perspective?</td>
<td>Desk review KIIs; FGDs; online survey</td>
<td>Progress reports, financial reports; logical framework; UNODC staff; implementing partners; beneficiaries; donor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent did the project adapt to meet the challenges presented by Covid-19 and other unforeseen relevant events or threats?</td>
<td>What resources were used to cope with Covid-19 related challenges? With other unforeseen challenges or threats? Were they considered in the initial risk assessment? Were tools and adjustments relevant/efficient to achieve results? Are there any lessons learned to be drawn?</td>
<td>Desk review KIIs; FGDs; online survey Quality assessment</td>
<td>Progress reports, logical framework; UNODC staff; implementing partners; beneficiaries; donor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Evaluation Methods</th>
<th>Overall Evaluation Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How was progress tracked, including in terms of levelling up intention, momentum and/or engagements towards ICSANT adherence and/or implementation?</td>
<td>Indicators and narrative grids used to measure progress. Specificities and challenges in measuring progress against ratification and intentions of ratification. Was implementation efficient in all beneficiary/recipient countries? What was the logic of prioritization beyond MS request and demand-driven logics?</td>
<td>Desk review KIs; FGDs; online survey Case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objective, including considering the various levels of interests, knowledge and capacities towards ICSANT across the different types of beneficiary countries?</td>
<td>What were the project’s main achievements? How were they translated into progress reports and any specific follow ups? Were there any gaps or discrepancies across beneficiary countries/target groups? Were the online tools and materials most relevant and effective in achieving intended results? How were they used? How useful were they for final beneficiaries and targeted groups? How far have project beneficiaries benefited from the project activities/deliverables? How was this helpful/conducive/translated into decision-making/practice towards implementation of ICSANT? What was/is the most challenging?</td>
<td>Desk review KIs; online survey; FGDs Quality assessment; case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What have been the facilitating or hindering factors in achievement of results?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Desk review KIs; online survey; FGDs Case study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent has the EU ICSANT website reached the intended audience?

- How was the website designed, with which intentions? Who was consulted in that process?
- How was the format and serviceability tested/improved as the project unfolded?
- How is the website used? By whom? Does the project keep track of utilisation/useability of the website?
- How were human rights and gender considerations mainstreamed in the design of the website?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>To what extent has the project generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended, or unintended, higher-level effects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How have activities, outputs and outcomes raised awareness and increased knowledge about ICSANT? Was the prioritisation and targeting of activities adequate to advance and optimize adherence efforts to ICSANT? Were the types of assistance provided (legislative, capacity building…) relevant and useful to target groups, government partners and end beneficiaries to consolidate understanding and due implementation of ICSANT? How they have been used, to what aims? Any concrete examples of operationalisation of transferred skills and knowledge? Of spill over effects/ synergies across ICSANT and other international instruments in the area? Any unintended consequences?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>What contribution to impact did the project have on the nuclear security landscape in beneficiary Member States?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | Desk review
KIIs; online survey; FGDs
Case study
Quality assessments |
        | Progress and key activity reports, logical framework; UNODC staff; implementing partners; beneficiaries; donor. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>Website and eLearning material data and information reports; target beneficiaries; UNODC staff, project partners and key beneficiaries.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td><strong>To what extent has the project generated sufficient ownership and capacities in beneficiary and partner Member States to support sustainability of benefits?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td><strong>To what extent will the project’s key outreach and knowledge products (website mainly) be sustained, used and useful beyond the project period?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Rights - Gender - Livelihood</strong></td>
<td><strong>To what extent has the project design, implementation and monitoring fully considered human rights, gender equality as well as marginalised groups, including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities as relevant in the area of the project’s thematic scope and diversified terrains of implementation?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSONS AND GOOD PRACTICES</td>
<td>Which were the major challenges to effectively mainstream gender and HR in the project/programme? (financial, institutional, understanding, political, expertise, tools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the key lessons learned and good practices of the project, with the view of informing future thematically related projects/initiatives at UNODC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How can these be used to further the UNODC Strategy 2021-2025, particularly Thematic Area 4: Preventing and Countering Terrorism and The Global Programme on Preventing and Countering Terrorism (2022-2027)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDES BY STAKEHOLDER GROUP

KII s last between 30-45 min. depending on counterparts’ availability and relationship to the project. They were based on semi-directive questionnaires as follows. The interviews enable to collect basic social demographic data of interviewees such as gender, location, designation, age, number of years spent working on the project, type of stakeholder and organization. The Questionnaire also elicit responses on various issues related to project implementation, results achieved, success factors, sustainability and lessons learnt – the grid being derived from key evaluation questions per each DAC criteria. Cross cutting issues such as gender equality, human rights, and protection of the environment were explored in each session as appropriate.

The interviews were conducted in English using online meetings tools such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams or any other technology most accessible and preferred by interviewees (Google meet, WhatsApp…) and in person during the field mission in Vienna.
### Criteria/Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background and context</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Could you please describe your relationship to and role in the EU/UNODC project?</strong></td>
<td>Project Team/Key UNODC staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any specific activities that were important for you to follow/carry out?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your level of knowledge of the current project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you involved in/do you know about other projects or work related to ratification of counter-terrorism treaties or nuclear security treaties?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent have the project design and implementation been relevant to and included stakeholders’ and target groups’ (e.g., governments, Member States, donors etc.) needs and priorities?</th>
<th>Project Team/Key UNODC staff</th>
<th>UNODC HQ/FO</th>
<th>Key partner</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>UN / Regional partners</th>
<th>NGOs &amp; Academia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How was the project designed? Was it informed by gender-sensitive analysis? Were any specific consultative mechanisms developed to that end? Were the consultations gender-inclusive?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the project’s objective and outcomes aligned with relevant international legal instruments on nuclear terrorism, including with relevant UNODC mandates, UN resolutions and the SDGs?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the outcomes, outputs, and activities of the project relevant to achieving its objective?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Coherence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Questions</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project delivered results in line with organizational, regional and international priorities in the area of nuclear terrorism, including as part of UNODC Global programming and strategic frameworks, and in synergies with other relevant international instruments?</td>
<td>UNODC Team/Key UNODC staff, UNODC HQ/FO, Key partner, Donors, Recipients, Beneficiaries, UN / Regional partners, NGOs &amp; Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was the project cooperation architecture with internal stakeholders (UNODC regional offices, field representatives, other TPB sections...) effective and coherent to achieve results? To what extent were synergies and complementarities with other relevant (UNODC) interventions explored?</td>
<td>UNODC Team/Key UNODC staff, UNODC HQ/FO, Key partner, Donors, Recipients, Beneficiaries, UN / Regional partners, NGOs &amp; Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was the project cooperation architecture with external stakeholders effective and coherent (including UN entities, external specialized stakeholders, regional organizations, NGOs, academia, etc.) to achieve results?</td>
<td>UNODC Team/Key UNODC staff, UNODC HQ/FO, Key partner, Donors, Recipients, Beneficiaries, UN / Regional partners, NGOs &amp; Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project demonstrated UNODC added value in its core function of technical advisory to interested Member States in the ratification and implementation of international legal instruments related to the prevention and suppression of terrorism?</td>
<td>UNODC Team/Key UNODC staff, UNODC HQ/FO, Key partner, Donors, Recipients, Beneficiaries, UN / Regional partners, NGOs &amp; Academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What challenges have you identified in building partnerships and cohesion? How can cooperation/partnerships be improved?</td>
<td>UNODC Team/Key UNODC staff, UNODC HQ/FO, Key partner, Donors, Recipients, Beneficiaries, UN / Regional partners, NGOs &amp; Academia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Efficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was the project well-staffed, resourced and equipped to deliver as planned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project delivered outputs in a timely and efficient manner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria/Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were resources (financial, time, people, and expertise) allocated strategically to achieve HR and/or gender related needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was progress tracked, including in terms of levelling up intention, momentum and/or engagements towards ICSANT adherence and/or implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the project adapt to meet the challenges presented by Covid-19 and other unforeseen challenges or threats? In what ways did it adapt? Are there any lessons learned to be drawn?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider implementation to have been efficient in all beneficiary/recipient countries? Can you elaborate on your response?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a scale from 1 (not efficient at all) to 5 (extremely efficient), how would you overall rate the efficiency of the project in terms of converting inputs into outputs, considering staff, financial resources and time allocation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From your perspective, what have been the main achievements of the Project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider the project successful, including in terms of HRG-LNOB mainstreaming?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What could have been done differently or need to be strengthened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the project achieve its intended outcomes and objective, including considering the various levels of interests, knowledge and capacities towards ICSANT across the different types of beneficiary countries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria/Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the facilitating or hindering factors in the achievement of results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the EU ICSANT website reached the intended audience? What is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your level of knowledge of the website? How often have you used it? What type of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information did you obtain?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From your perspective, what was UNODC’s added value in this endeavour?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project generated or is expected to generate significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a scale from 1 (not effective at all) to 5 (extremely effective), how would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you rate the effectiveness of the project related to its four outcome areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What contribution to impact did the project have on the nuclear security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscape in beneficiary Member States? To what extent did it contribute to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>universal ratification of ICSANT?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the project contribute to strengthen your organization/country’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacities and cooperation structures to prevent and address nuclear terrorism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any examples of key resources, skills or frameworks (normative,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operational, judicial…) gained as part of project participation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you seen any unexpected consequences and/or results (positive or negative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the implementation of the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria/Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project generated sufficient ownership and capacities in beneficiary and partner Member States to support sustainability of benefits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent will the project’s key outreach and knowledge products (website mainly) be sustained, used and useful beyond the project period?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is UNODC’s fundraising strategy for this area? How has donor funding evolved since the design of the project? Were sufficient funds allocated to successor projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project/programme built the capacity of women and men and of gender related stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights, gender equality, disability inclusion and leaving no one behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you define the HRG-LNOB dimension in the field of action of the project (nuclear security/counter-terrorism)? Do you consider HRG-LNOB relevant for the project? Could you elaborate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the project design, implementation and monitoring fully considered human rights, gender equality as well as marginalized groups, including LGBTQI+ and people with disabilities as relevant in the area of the project’s thematic scope and diversified terrains of implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the major challenges to effectively mainstream gender and HR in the project/programme? (financial, institutional, understanding, political, expertise, tools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which opportunities do you see for the successor project to integrate HR and gender aspects in its design? What would be key aspects to address in this regard?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria/Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria/Questions</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In which areas have you collaborated with least developed and developing countries? Do you think that under-represented countries are adequately involved in project implementation? (Why? Why not?)</td>
<td>Project Team / Key UNODC staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons learned and best practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the key lessons learned and good practices of the project, with the view of informing future thematically related projects/initiatives at UNODC?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can these be used to further the UNODC Strategy 2021-2025, particularly Thematic Area 4: Preventing and Countering Terrorism and The Global Programme on Preventing and Countering Terrorism (2022-2027)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are, in your view, some lessons learned on designing ratification campaigns? What are some lessons learned on mainstreaming gender and human rights in the work of TPB/UNODC?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any additional comments?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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With the project having a large share of activities directed towards learning, advocacy and capacity building, a survey appeared instrumental to gauge project’s products and activities usefulness, direct impact and sustainability in the advancement of ICSANT universalisation and related strengthening of global nuclear security and counter-terrorism regimes; as well as the satisfactory levels of direct project beneficiaries towards the project and UNODC work in that area.

Collected data complement and were triangulated with project’s activities reports and evaluation KIIIs. The surveys collect data from final beneficiaries (i.e., “target groups” on this report). A voluntary sampling approach to surveys was preferred. The survey was sent for 15 days, with a reminder, from September 25th to October 10th, 2023.

Elements for proposed introduction (to be updated based on final list of target groups and chosen activities)

Dear Madam/Sir,

We are contacting you as part of an independent evaluation of the UNODC EU-funded project “Union support for the universalisation and effective implementation of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism” (hereafter “the project”). 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 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 available at the following link [to be inserted], and we would be very grateful if you could complete it and return it to us by [insert date].

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?

The Final In-Depth Evaluation of the Project aims at assessing the implementation and contributions of the project in achieving its overall objective “to make progress towards the universalisation and the effective implementation of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism (ICSANT)”, one of the 19 international legal instruments against terrorism UNODC is mandated to promote by the United Nations General Assembly.

In line with UNODC evaluation policy, projects may 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, with a focus on relevance, effectiveness, learning and usefulness of UNODC interventions in that particular project framework i.e. (to be determined).

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.
QUESTIONNAIRE

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Would you agree to please specify your gender. If so, how do you define your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Other:
- Do not want to say

Which describes best your professional affiliation?

- Law enforcement
- Prosecution
- Judiciary
- Defense
- Diplomacy
- Policy- and Decision-making
- NGO
- Academia
- Other

If you are part of a national organization, which best describes the status of your country:

- Party to ICSANT
- In the process of becoming party
- Considering becoming party to ICSANT
- Not party to ICSANT
- I do not know / N/A

In which region is your country situated?

- Africa
- Asia
- Australia and South Pacific
- Europe
- Latin America and Caribbean
- North and Central America
- MENA
- Other:

RELATIONSHIP TO UNODC PROJECT

Have you / your organization/ or country previously participated in UNODC capacity building events related to ICSANT?

- Yes
- No
- N/A

Have you / your organization/ or country previously participated in capacity building events related to ICSANT organized by another UN or international organization?

- Yes
- No
- N/A
What type of UNODC assistance or activity related to the universalisation of ICSANT have you and/or your country benefitted from?

- Participation in national workshop / national visit for awareness-building on ICSANT
- Participation in regional workshop
- Participation in one or more webinars of the ICSANT webinar series
- Completion of eLearning module on ICSANT
- ICSANT Website user
- Legislative assistance, review of national legislation etc.
- Participation in international event
- N/A

What type of resource was useful in the particular activity(s) you participated to?

- Trainers and presenters
- Module contents
- Study material
- Case studies
- Produced manuals, reports or other publications.
- Digital solutions
- Other (please specify)

Could you please provide an example of how you may have used the training/technical assistance tools/ICSANT website in your own practice/organization?

What type of activities listed above do you find most useful to support increased awareness and/or adherence to ICSANT (in your country)? Please provide a concrete example.

What other types of assistance would you consider useful towards improving awareness and/or adherence to ICSANT?

RELEVANCE AND USEFULNESS OF UNODC PROJECT

To which extent has the participation in the project’s events or activities contributed to increased capacity and awareness of ICSANT (in your country)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
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Could you please explain.

From your perspective, where have UNODC tools and information around ICSANT (website, webinars, information packages...) been most useful to increase awareness and understanding of ICSANT:

- □ At the individual level
- □ At the organization level
- □ At the country level

Based on your response to the previous question, to which extent have UNODC tools and information around ICSANT (website, webinars, information packages...) been useful to increase awareness and understanding of ICSANT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Do not know</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>

Could you please provide an example.

To what extent has your country’s participation in relevant project activities contributed to the adherence to ICSANT and/or strengthening of the legal framework related to the national implementation of ICSANT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Do not know</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>

Could you please explain.

Are you aware of a knowledge transfer mechanism to share the knowledge and capacity gained through UNODC assistance within the relevant national authorities and institutions?

- □ Yes
- □ No

Are you aware of any particular challenges your country encountered in the implementation/adherence to ICSANT? If so, which?

WEBSITE AND TOOLS

Are you familiar with the UNODC ICSANT website?
Which type of online resources developed by UNODC project have you used the most to get information on ICSANT?

- [ ] ICSANT website (in general)
- [ ] eLearning on ICSANT
- [ ] Legal training curriculum module
- [ ] Manual of fictional cases
- [ ] Other UNODC online resources
- [ ] Twitter
- [ ] N/A / None

Do you use other types of resources to get information about ICSANT?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If so, which ones?

How useful do you find the information/resources available through the ICSANT website?

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

Could you please provide an example or explain why?

How accessible / user friendly / easy to navigate do you find the ICSANT website?

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

Could you please provide an example of features that could be ameliorated/works well?

- [ ] every day
- [ ] every week
- [ ] once a month
- [ ] every 3-6 months
- [ ] once a year
- [ ] never
What other type of information/resources would you consider useful or beneficial?

How useful do you find the information and tools found on the website?

Please share any good practices of websites in this area of work that you like in particular (optional)

If you could change one thing on the ICSANT website, what would that be?

Are you familiar with the ICSANT self-assessment questionnaire?

If answered yes, are you aware whether your country has used the questionnaire?

If participated in a webinar from the ICSANT webinar series to what extent have you found the webinars useful?

Are there any other topics you would like to be discussed in the webinars?

Any other comments?
FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS (FGDS)

Focus group discussions allow the evaluation team to better understand specific choices related to separate ICSANT actions to other activities/projects directed towards universalisation of key international legal tools to prevent nuclear terrorism. The discussions were directed towards understanding the "whys" associated with the decision-making and operational processes during project development and implementation. It was also aimed at identifying lessons and good practices across UNODC towards global regime support, as one of its key functions. During the field mission, 6 project team members participated to 2 discussions of 1h30 and moderated by one member of the evaluation team and observed by a second one. Confidentiality agreements were shared before the sessions begins and each participant will be asked to give their consent. Sessions were not recorded. Below are the questions and themes discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICSANT FOCUS GROUP GUIDING QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the activity relevant to the role of UNODC compared with other specialized agencies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering legal assistance is one of UNODC core function, what does a stand-alone project dedicated to one legal instrument, here ICSANT bring in terms of effectiveness and coherence of UNODC work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What difference does it make compared with other legal assistance projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there any other specific needs or priority to which the project could have responded to in a different manner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see the project implementing mechanism as a best fit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specificities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional cooperation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you engage with regional offices and institutions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where any regional organizations involved with working in Africa (AU for example) or in Southeast Asia (ASEAN)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you plan to work with other UNODC relevant programs such as with the Container control program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-agency cooperation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could you please describe your relationship with the IAEA? With UNOCT?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was division of labor decided? Any follow up mechanisms in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other mechanisms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were any other UN coherence mechanisms used? At country level? (Deliver as one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design and strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How was developed the project rationale (consultation mechanisms? ToC? ...) ? Have you proceeded differently with the second phase of the project?

What was the theory of change used for the second phase and how did the first phase lessons or practices were used?

What is the approach to promoting ratification? Have they discussed the experience of OCB colleagues taking similar action?

How were the countries selected?

Implementation

What modalities of project delivery were used? Can you describe a typical activity and your role in planning/implementing/supporting it?


Have you targeted any specific partner and/or beneficiary groups, such as parliamentarians, Police, Judges?

Were specific country action plans developed?

From your perspective, do you consider the resources and skills transfer useful at national level? How so?

What made the activities successful/ short on its delivery/expectations?

How did you organize follow up on activities?

What could have been done differently, if anything?

Impact

Where do you situate ICSANT project main achievements/successes/ rooms for improvement?

Where did you see project beneficiaries make use of project’s gain? Any concrete example?

Did it influence the way you will conduct future activities/project implementation?

Gender and inclusiveness

Council Resolution June 2023 reads:

> The project will be implemented in a gender sensitive manner, with gender perspectives mainstreamed throughout the project. The project will promote gender perspectives and integrate gender dimension in its methodology and, to the extent possible, ensure equal opportunities for female and male officials to participate in all project events, underlining the benefits of inclusion of female public servants in the national institutions. All feedback collected from pre- and postworkshop surveys and tests will be disaggregated by gender, to ensure the project is able to capture and report on the perspective of female officials. Project indicators will collect, and report data disaggregated by gender.

How was this planned? How do you plan to implement it in the future project phases?

The EU does separate programs on gender and human rights - how did you manage this specificity?
QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF SELECTED KNOWLEDGE/OUTREACH/ADVOCACY PRODUCTS

The project has an important advocacy and knowledge production component. Several project outputs, including ICSANT website and e-learning materials, have been developed to be useful sources and references of information on ICSANT to all interested parties, beyond the project period. The evaluation team thus propose to assess the quality of the e-learning/knowledge and/or advocacy outputs, i.e. their consistency, their usefulness and their sustainability – on the basis of international standards and methods related to scientific and knowledge products.

Such exercise implied to take into consideration the multi-dimensionality of the concept of quality, hence including an assessment of several domains such as quality of service provided, methodological rigour and shortfalls in the development and dissemination of each product, as well as content depth and breadth. Considering the diversity of the products likely to be under review, a qualitative assessment ensured to gather information about the strengths and weaknesses of selected outputs.

Three products were analysed in that sense, : (i) the ICSANT website, (ii) the self-assessment questionnaire and (iii) the e-Learning Module on the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism (ICSANT). These selections are based on initial discussion with the project team. They also cover three types of products under each SO as follows:

i) The website constitutes both an advocacy and knowledge product that can serve all project’s objectives and be used across beneficiaries, independently of their ICSANT status, as well as by a wider audience.

ii) The self-assessment questionnaires constitute a knowledge and capacity-building instruments that support achievement of SO1 and 2 related to developed knowledge of ICSANT, increased adherence and effective implementation.

iii) The learning modules as legislative tools, directly feed into SO3 related to Improve national legislation of beneficiary countries by incorporating all ICSANT requirements into national legislation.
## UNODC DOCUMENTS

- UNODC Independent Evaluation Section, Terms of Reference – Final In-Depth Evaluation of “Union support for the universalisation and effective implementation of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism – ICSANT” (SEGMENT OF GLOT1), United Nations, VIENNA 2023

- UNODC-IES Updated Guidance Note for Evaluators: Gender-responsive evaluations in the work of the UNODC (Draft April 2023)

- Eight 6-month Interim Narrative Reports - Promoting universalisation and effective implementation of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism for the reporting periods April 2019 – March 2023

- Table based on a logical framework matrix (as per Article 3.7 b) covering the project reporting period April 2019 – March 2023 and its update for the last reporting period April-June 2023


- Four UNODC Powerpoint presentations on (1) ICSANT (F. Andrian, 8 May 2023), (2) Benefits of joining ICSANT (A. Lazarev, 8 May 2023), (3) Synergies among the main international legal instrument sin nuclear security: ICSANT, CPPNM and its Amendment (A. Lazarev, 30 May 2023), and (4) UNODC’s technical and legislative assistance to States in adherence to, and implementation of ICSANT (A. Lazarev, 27 June 2023)

- Agendas, evaluation reports, raw evaluation data and webstories on the National Workshop on Facilitating Adherence to and Implementation of ICSANT, Accra, Ghana, 6-7 December 2022, the Regional Workshop on ICSANT, Vienna, Austria, 21-22 March 2023, the Workshop on Promoting the Universalisation and Effective Implementation of ICSANT for the Pacific Region, Nadi, Fiji, 8-10 May 2023.

- Programmes and (draft) webstories of the meetings between representatives of UNODC and Iceland (Reykjavik, Iceland, 23 November 2022) and Brunei Darussalam (Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam, 27 June 2023) on facilitating adherence to and implementation of ICSANT

- Web story on a meeting between representatives of the Republic of Maldives and UNODC with a view to encouraging the country’s policy and decision-makers to consider adhering to ICSANT in the Republic of Maldives, 14 February 2023

- List of Member States not party to ICSANT as of July 2023
- Google Analytics Information on use of UNODC ICSANT website from its launch on 30 September 2021 - 9 April 2023 as well as from 10 April 2023 until 17 July 2023

- Information on use of the eLearning module
- Website visits data /use information as well as statistics on use/Access to eLearning
- MED Trident After Action Report (AAR) - project activity report
## EXTERNAL DOCUMENTS


- Agenda and webstory of the IAEA’s National Workshop to Raise Awareness on the Amendment to CPPNM in the United Republic of Tanzania (with UNODC contribution), Dodoma, 24 - 26 October 2022.

- Canada Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development, Contribution Arrangement, Project Number: NRS-2018-0017, Project Title: Canada’s Contribution to UNODC to Support the Universalisation of International Legal Frameworks related to Nuclear Security, Phase II

  Final interim narrative progress report for the period April-June 2023

  Financial reports for the project (FRMS)
ANNEX V: STAKEHOLDERS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of stakeholders</th>
<th>Type of stakeholder (see note below)</th>
<th>Sex disaggregated data</th>
<th>Country(ies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Project implementers</td>
<td>Male: 7 Female: 8</td>
<td>Global – UNODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Donor organization</td>
<td>Male: 1 Female: 3</td>
<td>European Union and delegations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Government and regional partners</td>
<td>Male: 4 Female: 5</td>
<td>Cambodia, Tanzania, Montenegro, St. Kitts and Nevis, Iceland, Fiji, Ghana, Albania, Malaisia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>International partners</td>
<td>Male: 5 Female: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Civil society and academia</td>
<td>Male: 3 Female: 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Male: 20 Female: 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

STAKEHOLDERS PARTICIPATING IN SURVEYS OR OTHER FORMS OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of stakeholder</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Sex disaggregated data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final beneficiaries of project key activities at regional and global levels</td>
<td>14 out of 140 send outs</td>
<td>Male: 9 Female: 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: there may be stakeholders interviewed and the same individuals may also have replied to surveys, which cannot be tracked to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. Therefore, these numbers cannot be combined.
ANNEX VI: THEORY OF CHANGE

To guide and ground this evaluation on a clear understanding of the changes intended by the project and its rationale of operationalisation, the evaluation team reconstituted and readjusted a project’s theory of change based on available logical frameworks, EU and UNODC monitoring reports. This ToC serves as a means of establishing a shared understanding of what the project has sought to accomplish and how it has sought to do so. It is an inferred representation, as accurate as possible, 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. Such exercise further ensures a more relevant tailoring of evaluation questions and provides a structure for data collection instrument prioritisation and analysis. This ToC was discussed and validated in consultations with the project team.

The following figure provides a comprehensive picture of the intended causal pathways and interactions between output, outcome and impact level respectively of the project under evaluation. It is analysed below from the right to the left side (from intended impacts/overall objective to the project outputs).

The project’s overall objective is “to contribute to the universal adherence to ICSANT and its effective implementation by Member States”. While the intervention has been designed around five (5) interconnected outcomes, the evaluation team sees a simplified log-frame. The overall objective appears to be realized by contributing to four related and mutually reinforcing specific objectives as follows:

➢ **Specific Objective 1 (SO1):** Develop awareness, knowledge, and better understanding of ICSANT and related provisions and synergies with other relevant international instruments.

➢ **Specific Objective 2 (SO2):** Encourage and support States to adhere to and effectively implement ICSANT.

➢ **Specific Objective 3 (SO3):** Improve national legislation of beneficiary countries by incorporating all ICSANT requirements into national legislation.

➢ **Specific Objective 4 (SO4):** Reinforce the capacity of Member States and relevant criminal justice stakeholders to detect, investigate and address cases in which ICSANT would be of relevance and related threats of terrorists or other criminals acquiring and misusing nuclear or other radioactive material.

Subsequently, the project’s results model is based on three main intervention areas:

i) outreach and advocacy (*regional workshops, country visits, and international meetings and events as well as development of promotional materials, tools and self-guiding materials (i.e. case studies, flyers, self-assessment questionnaires), launch of a comprehensive and updated website*)

ii) Legislative advice and technical assistance (*training manual, country visits, and eLearning materials, website*)

iii) Capacity-building and experience sharing (*trainings, mock trials, regional workshops, accessible webinars, website and success stories*)

These activities are – conducive to the delivery of several subsequent outcomes and outputs, thematically distinguished by different corresponding colours in the Figure (Purple, blue, orange and green). Some of the
outputs delivered by the project are inter-related and work across various outcomes, while other outcomes are influenced by more than one output or even other outcomes as represented by directional brackets, bi- and multi-directional arrows in the Figure.

The project seeks to make the impact outlined in SO1 by achieving three main outcomes consisting in increasing sensitization, knowledge, and awareness of ICSANT’s benefits, provisions and requirements among beneficiaries, especially for States not party to ICSANT. The development and use of a reference website constitutes a key outcome to enhance understanding, share good practices and increase synergies around ICSANT as well as project implementation progress and produced materials. Most activities directed towards that outcome also serve and condition in parallel the achievement of the others. Progress under SO1 is closely linked to achieving SO2 that focuses on the legislative aspects of ICSANT adherence, aiming at an increased number of States considering/initiating processes/becoming Parties to ICSANT.

Finally, SO3 and SO4 are intended to better equip interested parties in the adequate integration and effective implementation of ICSANT, through the conduct of legislative reviews, highlighting synergies with other relevant international legal instruments (such as the CPPNM and its Amendment, and UNSCR 1540), and cooperation mechanisms as relevant for ICSANT, while strengthening capacities of criminal justice officials and other relevant national stakeholders with regard to the investigation, prosecution and adjudication of relevant cases.

For this chain to materialise, various intermediate steps need to be taken and activities implemented under each area of intervention for a series of key outputs to be achieved as specified on the left side of the Figure.

The evaluation team would however need further clarifications on the selection criteria of the different beneficiary countries and target groups for each activity and has initiated consultations with the project team on the matter.

At the impact level, the project adopts a medium to long-term intended impact pathway to first ensure, through the universal adherence to and implementation of ICSANT, that there is no safe haven for those that commit or seek to commit criminal acts involving nuclear or other radioactive material. In the longer-term, the project would contribute to equip States and relevant actors to adequately counter and respond to certain offences related to nuclear or other radioactive material, but also to ensure that the threat of terrorists or other criminals acquiring nuclear or other radioactive material can be prevented. At a broader development and cooperation scale, this action would contribute to building more peaceful and safe societies. Those intended impacts are only under the project’s sphere of influence. The project can only work towards guaranteeing to some extent the achievement of the outcomes, and specific objectives within its sphere of control.

Requiring a mix of technical assistance, consultations and dialogue, the project deals with an intrinsically complex and sensitive subject, which demands both a nuanced reading of progress, and a delicate equilibrium between legislative, (geo)political and technical needs and considerations, often outside the project outreach. It can only operate at the request of interested parties, based on the assumptions that nuclear terrorism is acknowledged as a credible threat and that (geo)political environments are conducive to supportive and committed partnerships. It aims to create such awareness through its advocacy efforts.

Overall, the project has been developed in a non-duplicative effort, in a complementary manner with a parallel project supported by Canada focusing on similar objectives. That project, however, expands its scope to cover the promotion of the adherence to other relevant international legal instruments in the area of nuclear security, beyond ICSANT. Referring to one of the core mandates of UNODC, the project further asks the Office to deploy a tremendous mix of diplomatic, political and technical efforts to raise awareness, build
knowledge and capacities, as well as encourage decision-makers to adhere to and/or make progress towards the implementation of a sensitive legal instrument, which is sometimes met with a lack of sufficient awareness about the significance of the instrument, lack of political will and/or prioritisation of other interests, or lack of adequate human resources to facilitate adherence and implementation. In addition to internal organizational risks, its implementation would need to consider:

- Diverse and differentiated levels of understanding, attributing-value and prioritising of ICSANT relevance and requirements often linked to and depending on the Member State’s overall level of understanding of nuclear issues and use of nuclear applications in the country (for peaceful purposes, including energy generation, medical and industrial applications etc.), and subsequently various levels and types of technical and legislative capacities in the matter. The same might be true for perceptions of counter-terrorism approaches and terminology.
- An evolving geopolitical context, including ongoing and emerging conflicts and the threat of (chemical, biological, radiological and) nuclear terrorism.
- Potential shifts in the political support for ICSANT, institutional buy-in and adequate coordination among relevant stakeholders (e.g. following national election, reprioritisation of issues etc.)
Figure 1: Proposed Theory of Change of the project under evaluation

Activities related to OUTREACH-ADVOCACY-AWARENESS RAISING
- Sensitization, exchange of knowledge and technical advice to policy and decision-makers on ICSANT through regional workshops, country visits and workshops, and international meetings and events.
- Produce, disseminate and facilitate use of relevant technical assistance materials, tools and self-guiding materials (e.g., manual on fictional cases, eLearning module, flyers, self-assessment questionnaires) to promote and facilitate adherence to ICSANT for countries considering so.
- Develop knowledge materials accessible and available to all interested parties on different aspects of ICSANT (webinars in several UN official languages available to non-State/interested parties).
- Develop, launch, and maintain a regularly updated website on all resources, relevant knowledge and training materials, good practices, and relevant focal points on ICSANT adherence and implementation.

Activities related to TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE/LEGISLATIVE ADVICE
- Develop training manual on fictional cases and eLearning module on ICSANT and incorporate the tools into technical legal assistance delivery.
- Relevant legislative assistance delivered to requesting States via desk reviews or legislative drafting workshops.
- Ad hoc support and other follow-up.

Activities related to CAPACITY-BUILDING
- Delivery of regional workshops for prosecutors, investigators or judges to enhance investigative and prosecution capacities in connection with cases involving nuclear or other radioactive material covered by ICSANT (in States Parties to ICSANT).
- Improved national capacities of criminal justice officials and other relevant national stakeholders with regard to the investigation, prosecution and adjudication of relevant cases.
- Enhanced conditions for reinforced cooperation mechanisms and exchange of information as relevant for ICSANT implementation.

Source: Evaluation team