

## **Terms of Reference – Independent Evaluation of the “Enhancing the Maritime Safety and Security and Fight against Terrorism in the Gulf of Guinea Region” project**

(C2023.TARPT138.DEUMFA)

### **Background**

1. The **United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)** is a principal training arm of the United Nations (UN), with the aim to increase the effectiveness of the UN in achieving its major objectives through training and research. UNITAR’s programming covers several thematic areas and activities aimed at supporting the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development; multilateral diplomacy; public finance and trade; environment, including climate change, environmental law and governance, and chemicals and waste management; peacekeeping, peacebuilding and conflict prevention; decentralized cooperation; and resilience and disaster risk reduction.
2. UNITAR’s mission is to develop the individual, institutional and organizational capacity of countries and other UN stakeholders through high-quality learning solutions and related knowledge products and services to enhance decision-making and to support country-level action for overcoming global challenges. Approximately three-quarters of beneficiaries from learning-related programming are from developing countries.
3. The 2022-2025 Strategic Framework includes five strategic objectives for effective and efficient achievement of results. UNITAR’s first strategic objective seeks to promote peace and just and inclusive societies with a sub-objective of supporting institutions and individuals to contribute meaningfully to sustainable peace. The Institute’s focus under this sub-objective is to support institutions and individuals, including those marginalized such as women, to contribute to sustainable peace by increasing the capacities of stakeholders at different levels to prevent and resolve conflicts, restore the rule of law and build lasting peace.
4. In alignment with the above, the project **“Enhancing the Maritime Safety and Security and Fight against Terrorism in the Gulf of Guinea Region”**, with a project implementation period running from 15 April 2023 to 31 December 2024, aims to strengthen the capabilities of African regional / national institutions, as well as partners, engaged in the context of counter-terrorism and maritime security in response to (trans-)national threats in the region.<sup>1</sup> The project also aligns with the objectives set by the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO), which include strengthening African ownership by empowering African partners to effectively conduct crisis prevention and effective crisis response.
5. As the project covers two areas, counter-terrorism and maritime security, the project aims to achieve more effective national, regional and global responses to prevent and counter-terrorism in West Africa and in the Gulf of Guinea region. Additionally, the project seeks to enhance access to high impact training in maritime security for military and police personnel from the Gulf of Guinea countries and beyond.
6. For the delivery of project activities, two training institutions based in Côte d'Ivoire – [\*Académie Internationale de Lutte Contre Le Terrorisme\*](#) (AILCT) in the field of counter-terrorism and the [\*Institut de Sécurité Maritime Interrégional\*](#) (ISMI) in the field of maritime security – serve as the project’s

---

<sup>1</sup> Angola, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, The Gambia.

primary beneficiary institutions. ISMI acts as the implementing partner for delivering the training programmes in the maritime domain, whereas the AILCT covers the activities in the area of counter-terrorism. The evaluation's scope covers only the activities implemented by ISMI.

7. In relation to maritime security and the cooperation with ISMI, the project entails the revision and expansion of the course portfolio (particularly in line with UN standards, policies, and frameworks) in its role of Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Centre of Excellence in Maritime Safety and Security, and the delivery of approximately 12 types of training<sup>2</sup> for civil and port actors, *i.e.*, military personnel, police officers, civilian, port personnel gendarmes, magistrates, prison officers and custom officers engaged in maritime operations. This project component aims at strengthening the capacities of personnel on port safety and security at the ports of the Gulf of Guinea countries to reduce the vulnerability of ports in the region. The project activities under this component are implemented by ISMI.<sup>3</sup>
8. The project also contemplates a transversal component of gender in the counter-terrorism and maritime safety and security components. In the area of maritime security and safety, the project aims to support the inclusion of female personnel at all levels in the different training events delivered. It aims to achieve this by contributing to the existing evidence and knowledge on the obstacles to women's meaningful participation in maritime operations. This will serve as a basis for policy development and further remedial actions. Additionally, it seeks to foster a conducive environment for women's participation and leadership in maritime operations. This approach aligns with recommendations from The Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) Baseline Study, commissioned by Global Affairs Canada (GAC) under the Elsie Initiative for Women in Peacekeeping Operations.
9. While the project's budget does not divide the budget strictly between the two project components, the estimated grant-outs to ISMI amounts to 2,436,481.03 EUR.

### **On the project evaluation**

10. The evaluation shall build upon the results from UNITAR's assurance activities, including an output delivery verification and a spot check which were undertaken of the 2024 grant-out agreement to ISMI.

### **Purpose of the evaluation**

11. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, likelihood of impact and likelihood of sustainability of the maritime security component of the project; to identify any good practices or challenges that the project has encountered; to issue recommendations, and to identify lessons to be learned on design, implementation and management. The evaluation's purpose is thus to provide findings and conclusions to meet accountability requirements, and recommendations and lessons learned to contribute to the project's improvement, strategic direction and broader organizational learning. The evaluation should not only assess how well the project has performed, but also seek to answer the 'why' question by identifying factors contributing to (or inhibiting) successful delivery of the results. The evaluation is also forward-looking to inform decisions on the design and planning of possible future related projects and focus areas.

---

<sup>2</sup> The list of planned training activities is included in Annex A.

<sup>3</sup> With the pedagogical and logistical support of the [Regionally Oriented National School of Cybersecurity \(École nationale de cybersécurité à vocation régionale, ENCVR\)](#) based in Dakar, Senegal.

12. While the evaluation will include an assessment of all six OECD/DAC criteria, gender, disability and human rights, and environmental considerations will be taken into account. The evaluation's purpose is to serve learning and accountability purposes, and to be as forward-looking as possible to inform decisions on the design and planning of possible future phases and focus areas of this or similar projects.

### Scope of the evaluation

13. The evaluation will cover the period from 15 April 2023 to 31 December 2024 and will only evaluate the maritime security and safety component, as mentioned above. The evaluation should maintain sufficient focus to deliver findings and conclusions with forward-looking and actionable recommendations to inform future projects.

### Evaluation criteria

14. The evaluation will assess project performance on maritime security and safety component using the following criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of impact, and likelihood of sustainability. The evaluation questions related to gender equality and the empowerment of women dimensions are marked with "GEEW". Questions related to environmental sustainability are marked with "ENVSUSE". Disability and human rights considerations should also be considered throughout the evaluation.
- **Relevance:** *Is the maritime security and safety component of the project reaching its intended individual and institutional users and are its related project objectives and activities relevant to the beneficiaries' needs and priorities, and designed with quality?*
  - **Coherence:** *To what extent is the maritime security and safety component of the project complementing, harmonizing and co-ordinating with other similar programmes and projects implemented by UNITAR and other actors in the intervention context?*
  - **Effectiveness:** *How effective has the maritime security and safety component of the project been in delivering results and in reinforcing capabilities and in improving access to high-impact training in maritime security for military and police personnel and other beneficiaries?*
  - **Efficiency:** *To what extent has the maritime security and safety component of the project delivered its results in a cost-effective manner and optimized partnerships through implementing partner arrangements?*
  - **Likelihood of Impact:** *What are the potential cumulative and/or long-term effects expected from the project, including contribution towards the intended impact and intermediate outcome, positive or negative impacts, or intended or unintended changes?*
  - **Likelihood of Sustainability:** *To what extent are results of the maritime security and safety component of the project likely to be sustained in the long term? How is environmental sustainability addressed in the project?*

### Principal evaluation questions

15. The following questions are *suggested* to guide the design of the evaluation, although the criteria applied to the outcomes and the final questions selected/identified will be confirmed by the evaluator following the initial document review and engagement with project management with a view to ensuring that the evaluation is as useful as possible with regard to the project's future orientation or other similar undertakings.

### Relevance

- a. *To what extent is the project aligned with the Institute's efforts to helping Member States implement the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the UNITAR strategic framework 2022-2025, particularly the strategic objective 1, the Sustainable Development Goals 14 and 16 and the German Federal Foreign Office policy guidelines for Africa?*
- b. *How relevant are the objectives and the design of the maritime security and safety component of the project to the identified needs and priorities of beneficiaries (training participants and beneficiary institution)?*
- c. *Did this project component reach its intended beneficiaries, namely the ISMI and the military personnel, police officers, civilian and port personnel, gendarmes, magistrates, prison officers and custom officers (men and women) that participated in the training? If not, what are the hindering factors and what could have been done differently?*
- d. *How relevant is the maritime and safety component of the project to supporting gender equality and women's empowerment, to the extent possible? (GEEW)*
- e. *How relevant is the maritime and safety component of the project to the changing regional and international context?*

### **Coherence**

- f. *How well is the project aligned with other UNITAR programming focusing on enhancing capabilities of regional institutions and military, police personnel and/or workers involved in maritime affairs in other regions)?*
- g. *How well is the maritime security and safety project component aligned with and complements programmes implemented by other institutions focusing on enhancing capabilities of regional institutions and military, police personnel and/or workers involved in maritime affairs?*
- h. *How well is the project aligned with relevant international frameworks and UN resolutions and priorities in the peacekeeping field and maritime safety and security protocols, including the WPS Agenda, UN Convention on the Law of Sea, MARPOL Protocol, SOLAS Convention, Guidelines on Maritime Cyber Security Management of IMO, Resolution [MSC-FAL.1-Circ.3-Rev.2: Guidelines on Maritime Cyber Security Management of IMO](#), Resolution [MSC.428\(98\) on the Maritime Cyber Risk Management in Safety Management Systems](#), the [IACS Recommendation on Cyber Resilience \(No. 166\)](#), amongst others?*
- i. *How well does the project component fit the political and operational context in the Gulf of Guinea countries and maritime and port authorities?*

### **Effectiveness**

- j. *To what extent have the planned outcomes and outputs of the maritime security and safety project component been achieved? What are the factors affecting the project component and the beneficiary institutions and trained personnel?*
- k. *How effective is the maritime and security project component's design and training methodology? Have partnerships been effective in delivering and attaining results, including the performance of the implementing partner?*
- l. *To what extent and how is the project contributing to improved knowledge and skills, capabilities, and opportunities of maritime and port personnel to address risks and hazards in terms of security, safety and port security and port safety according to the pertinent cargo in the Gulf of Guinea countries?*
- m. *How effective is the project component in reinforcing the role of the ISMI as an ECOWAS Centre of Excellence in maritime safety and security?*
- n. *To what extent are a human rights-based approach, disability considerations, and a gender mainstreaming and inclusiveness strategy incorporated in the design and implementation of the project? (GEEW)*

### **Efficiency**

- o. *To what extent has the project produced outputs in a timely and cost-efficient manner, including through grant arrangements with the implementing partner (ISMI) and other partners (GS-F and BORDERPOL, if applicable, in comparison with alternative approaches? Were the project's resources (human and financial) used as planned and fully utilised?*
- p. *To what extent was the project including both activities and planned expenditures delivered as planned? What caused deviations from the original plan? Did the project apply adaptive management to adjust to implementation challenges?*
- q. *To what extent has the project component created benefits (intended or unintended) of integrating gender equality (or not) and what were the success or hindering factors? **(GEEW)***
- r. *To what extent did the project component engage with environment-related content and practices in the delivered training for maritime and port personnel? **(ENVSUSE)***

#### **Likelihood and early indication of impact**

- s. *To what extent have beneficiaries from training events reported changed behaviour or practices following the completion of the training? To what extent does the project component contribute to a broader maritime and port regional safety and security in the countries of the Gulf of Guinea?*
- t. *What other observable end-results or organizational changes (positive or negative, intended or unintended) have occurred as a result of the implementation of the maritime safety and security project component?*

#### **Likelihood of sustainability and early indication of sustainability**

- u. *To what extent are the project component's results likely to endure beyond the implementation of the activities in the mid- to long-term? What conditions will be necessary for sustainability of the activities?*
- v. *What are the major factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project component? How can risks be mitigated and opportunities seized by project stakeholders?*
- w. *What can we learn to inform the future design of similar programming in other contexts? To what extent can the project be replicated elsewhere?*

### **Evaluation Approach and Methods**

16. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the [UNITAR Evaluation Policy](#), [the operational guidelines for independent evaluations](#) and the [United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation](#), and the [UN Evaluation Group \(UNEG\) Ethical Guidelines](#). The evaluation will be carried out by a supplier or an international consultant (the "evaluator") under the supervision of the UNITAR Planning, Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PPME). PPME shall support the evaluation team in gathering background documentation and other data collection processes.
17. Since the project focuses on capacity development, it is recommended to look at the different dimensions of capacity development, including:
  - **Individual dimension:** This relates to the people involved in terms of knowledge, skill levels, competencies, attitudes, behaviours and values that can be addressed through facilitation, training and competency development.
  - **Organizational dimension:** This relates to organizations and networks of organizations. The change in learning that occurs at individual level affects, from a results chain perspective, the changes at organizational level. The maritime safety and security component of the project is specifically relevant because the partner organization is at the same time beneficiary and implementing partner.
  - **Enabling environment dimension:** This refers to the broader context in which individuals and organizations work, including the political commitment and vision; policy, legal and

economic frameworks and institutional set-up in the country; national public sector budget allocations and processes; governance and power structures; incentives and social norms; power structures and dynamics.

**Table 1 - Capacity areas within the three dimensions**

<b>Individual</b>	Skills levels (technical and managerial skills) Competencies Awareness and motivation	Essential knowledge, Cognitive skills, Interpersonal skills, Self-control, Attitude towards behaviour, Self-confidence, Professional identity, Norms, Values, Intentions, Emotions, Environmental barriers and enablers with specific focus on gender and disability inclusion (among others)
<b>Organizations</b>	Mandates Horizontal and vertical coordination mechanisms Motivation and incentive systems Strategic leadership Inter/intra institutional linkages Programme management Multi-stakeholder processes	Organizational priorities Gender and disability inclusion Processes, systems and procedures Human and financial resources Knowledge and information sharing Infrastructure Environmental sustainability Institutional support
<b>Enabling environment</b>	Policy and legal framework Political commitment and accountability framework Governance	Economic framework and national public budget allocations and power Legal, policy and political environment

18. To maximize utilization of the evaluation, the evaluation shall follow a participatory approach and engage a range of project stakeholders in the process, including the project implementation team, partners, the beneficiaries, the donor, and other relevant stakeholders. It should follow a mixed-methods approach and data collection should be triangulated to the extent possible to ensure validity and reliability of findings. Data collection should draw on the following methods: comprehensive desk review, including a stakeholder analysis; surveys; review of the log frame, the theory of change (reconstruct if needed); key informant interviews; focus groups; and, if possible, field visits.

19. The evaluator should follow mixed-methods approach in responding to the principal evaluation questions and present the findings qualitatively or quantitatively as most appropriate. Suggested methods and data collection tools include:

*Comprehensive desk review*

The evaluator will compile, review and analyse background documents and secondary data/information related to the project, including a results framework indicator tracking review. A list of background documentation for the desk review is included in Annex D. A template for document review suggested by PPME, can be found [here](#).

*Stakeholder analysis*

The evaluator will identify and relate the different stakeholders involved in the project. Key stakeholders at the global and national level include, but are not limited, to:

- UNITAR project team;
- Beneficiaries/participants at all levels: UNITAR trainers and participants (military personnel, police officers, civilian and port personnel, gendarmes, magistrates, prison officers and custom officers);
- Implementing partner institutions (ISMI and the Regionally Oriented National School of Cybersecurity (École nationale de cybersécurité à vocation régionale, ENCVR) based in Dakar, Senegal);
- The donor (GFFO);
- Etc.

#### *Survey(s)*

With a view to maximizing feedback from the widest possible range of project stakeholders, the consultant will develop and deploy a survey(s) following the comprehensive desk study to provide an initial set of findings and allow the evaluator to easily probe during the key informant interviews.

#### *Key informant interviews*

Based on stakeholder identification, the evaluator will identify and interview key informants. In preparation for the interviews with key informants, the consultant will define interview protocols to determine the questions and modalities with flexibility to adapt to the particularities of the different informants, either at the global, at the national or local level.

#### *Focus groups*

Focus groups should be organized with selected project stakeholders at the local levels to complement/triangulate findings from other collection tools.

#### *Field visit*

Field visit shall be conducted to Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire where the Interregional Maritime Security Institute (ISMI) is located. Other field visits shall be also considered (depending on the format of the delivery of the training) to a selection of the project countries including Angola, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, The Gambia and will be defined as part of the evaluation design.

### **Gender, disability and human rights, and environmental sustainability**

20. The evaluator should incorporate [human rights, gender, disability, and environmental sustainability](#) perspectives in the evaluation process and findings, particularly by involving women and other groups subject to discrimination. All key data collected shall be disaggregated by sex, country classification, and age grouping and be included in the draft and evaluation report. Though this is a general requirement for all evaluations, this evaluation should particularly put emphasis on **gender equality and environment (marine resources and port pollution)**.
21. The guiding principles for the evaluation should respect transparency, engage stakeholders and beneficiaries; ensure confidentiality of data and anonymity of responses; and follow [ethical and professional standards](#).

### **Timeframe, work plan, deliverables and review**

22. The proposed timeframe for the evaluation spans from September 2024 (recruitment of the evaluator) to January 2025 (publication of final evaluation report). An indicative work plan is provided in the table below.

23. The consultant shall submit an evaluation design/question matrix following the comprehensive desk study, stakeholder analysis and initial interviews with the project team. The evaluation design/question matrix should include a discussion on the evaluation objectives, methods and, if required, revisions to the suggested evaluation questions or data collection methods. The evaluation design/question matrix should indicate any foreseen difficulties or challenges/limitations in collecting data and confirm the final timeframe for the completion of the evaluation exercise, as well as a list of documents reviewed highlighting insights from every reviewed document.
24. Following data collection and analysis, the consultant shall submit a zero draft of the evaluation report to the evaluation manager and revise the draft based on comments made by the evaluation manager.
25. The draft evaluation report should follow the structure presented under Annex E. The report should state the purpose of the evaluation, and the methods used and include a discussion on the limitations to the evaluation. The report should present evidence-based and balanced findings, including strengths and weaknesses, consequent conclusions and recommendations, and lessons to be learned. The length of the report should be approximately 30 pages, excluding annexes.
26. Following the submission of the zero draft, a presentation of emerging findings with discussion of evaluation recommendations and a draft report will then be submitted to Project Management to review and comment on the draft report and provide any additional information using the form provided under Annex F by 23 December 2024. Within two weeks of receiving feedback, the evaluator shall submit the final evaluation report. The target date for this submission is 6 January 2025. Subsequently, PPME will finalize and issue the report. The report will be shared with all concerned stakeholders.

Indicative timeframe:

Activity	September 2024	October 2024	November 2024	December 2024	January 2025
Evaluator selected and recruited					
Initial data collection, including desk review, stakeholder analysis					
Evaluation design/question matrix					
Data collection and analysis, including survey(s), interviews and focus groups and field visit					
Zero draft report submitted to UNITAR					
Draft evaluation report consulted with UNITAR evaluation manager and submitted to Project Management					
Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned					
Project Management reviews draft evaluation report and shares comments and recommendations					
Evaluation report finalized and management response by Project Management					



Dissemination and publication					
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

### Summary of evaluation deliverables and indicative schedule

Deliverable	From	To	Deadline*
Evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	23 September 2024
Comments on evaluation design/question matrix	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	27 September
Mission plan for field data collection	Evaluator	Evaluation Manager	TBD
Zero draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	2 December 2024
Comments on zero draft	Evaluation manager	Evaluator	6 December 2024
Draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	9 December 2024
Presentation of emerging findings, recommendations and lessons learned	Evaluator/evaluation manager	Programme Management	TBD
Comments on draft report	Programme Management	Evaluation manager	16 December 2024
Final draft report	Evaluator	Evaluation manager	30 December 2024

\*To be adjusted depending on the contract signature and to be agreed upon with the Evaluation Manager.

### Communication/dissemination of results

27. The evaluation report shall be written in English and the Executive Summary shall be translated into French. The final report will be shared with all partners and be posted on an online repository of evaluation reports open to the public in UNITAR website as well as the UNEG website.

### Evaluation management arrangements

28. The evaluator will be contracted by UNITAR and will report directly to the Director of the Strategic Planning and Performance Division and Manager of Planning, Performance Monitoring, and Evaluation Unit (PPME) ('evaluation manager').

29. The evaluation manager reports directly to the Executive Director of UNITAR and is independent from all programming related management functions at UNITAR. According to UNITAR's Evaluation Policy, in due consultation with the Executive Director/programme management, PPME issues and discloses final evaluation reports without prior clearance from other UNITAR Management or functions. This builds the foundations of UNITAR's evaluation function's independence and ability to better support learning and accountability.

30. The evaluator should consult with the evaluation manager on any procedural or methodological matter requiring attention. The evaluator is responsible for planning any meetings, organizing online surveys and undertaking administrative arrangements for any travel that may be required (e.g., accommodation, visas, etc.). The travel arrangements, if any, will be in accordance with the UN rules and regulations for consultants.

### Evaluator Ethics

31. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project's design or implementation or have a conflict of interest with project activities. The selected consultant shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct under Annex F prior to initiating the assignment and comply with [UNEG Ethical Guidelines and the Guiding Ethical Principles for using AI in Evaluation, if it is the case](#).

### Professional requirements

32. The lead evaluator should have the following qualifications and experience:

- MA degree or equivalent in international relations, peace studies, maritime law or security or a related discipline. Knowledge of and experience in needs assessments, training design and delivery, and in areas related to peace and maritime security and safety.
- At least 7 years of professional experience conducting evaluation in the field of peace, maritime security and/or capacity building. Knowledge of UN Norms and Standards for Evaluation.
- At least 3 years of professional experience in the field of maritime and port affairs. Knowledge of Maritime Safety and Security protocols of IMO and ISO.
- Technical knowledge of the focal area including the evaluation of peace studies and maritime affairs, as well as contemporary developments in multilateral efforts.
- Field work experience in Africa.
- Excellent research and analytical skills, including experience in a variety of evaluation methods and approaches. Experience in evaluation using Kirkpatrick method is an advantage.
- Excellent writing skills (report to be drafted in English with executive summary in French).
- Strong communication and presentation skills.
- Cross-cultural awareness and flexibility.
- Availability to travel.
- Fluency in oral and written English and French.

#### **Annexes:**

- A. List of contact points**
- B. Event data available on the UNITAR Event Management System**
- C. List of documents and data to be reviewed**
- D. Structure of evaluation report**
- E. Audit trail**
- F. Evaluator code of conduct**

#### **Annex A: List of planned training events on maritime security**

2023:

1. Training on the ISPS Code 18.1
2. Training on the ISPS Code 18.2
3. Training on Targeting and Controlling of Maritime Vectors at Risk (Ship and Container Searches)
4. Training on Management of a Terrorism Crime Scene on Board of Ships
5. Training on Management of Dangerous Goods
6. Fight against Cybercrime in the Maritime Environment – Level 1
7. Training on Fight against Maritime Pollution at Ports
8. Nautical Driving – Level 1

2024:

1. Dangerous Goods 1 – Basic Level (private firms)
2. Dangerous Goods – Basic Level (Administrations)
3. Dangerous Goods 1 – Advanced Level (Ports)

4. Cybercrime – Advanced Level (Dakar)
5. Dangerous Goods 1 – Advanced Level (private firms)
6. Dangerous Goods – Advanced Level (Administrations) (Cotonou)
7. Dangerous Goods 2 – Basic Level (private firms)
8. Dangerous Goods 2 – Advanced Level (Ports)
9. Marine Pollution
10. Civil Liability in Ports
11. Cybercrime – Basic Level

Training delivered by the IP in 2023:

1. Training of port security officers (ISPS Code 18.1)
2. Training on prevention and management of a port crisis.
3. Training on management of dangerous goods.
4. Training of port security officers (ISPS code 18.2)
5. Training on fight against marine pollution inside ports.
6. Training on targeting and control of maritime transport vectors at risk.
7. Training on management of a terrorism crime scene on board of ships.
8. The fundamentals of cybercrime.
9. Piloting and maintenance of “RHIBS”
10. Fight against marine pollution inside ports.
11. Training delivered by the IP in 2024:
12. Dangerous goods administration level 1 private firms
13. Management of dangerous goods, level 2
14. Fight cybercrime in the maritime environment, level 2
15. Handling of dangerous goods, level 1 administration
16. Dangerous goods, level 2, Cotonou
17. Dangerous goods, level 2, Dakar

#### **Annex B: List of contact points**

ISMI representative: CL. ABE Aké Lazare, Directeur de l'Institut de Sécurité Maritime Interrégional (ISMI), Académie Régionale des Sciences et Techniques de la Mer (ARSTM) – Abidjan, [abeakelaz@gmail.com](mailto:abeakelaz@gmail.com), +225-0707966889 (WhatsApp), +225-0140396325

Frank Borchers, Head UNITAR Bonn Office, Chief of Division for Peace Office in Bonn, United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), Tel: +49-162 9558233, [frank.borchers@unitar.org](mailto:frank.borchers@unitar.org)

Kerstin BARTSCH (Ms.), Senior Specialist – Rule of Law, Division for Peace, United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), M: +49 (0) 15 20 40 11 066, [kerstin.bartsch@unitar.org](mailto:kerstin.bartsch@unitar.org)

### To be complemented by Project Management

### Annex C: Event data available on the Event Management System

Start date (Y-m-d)	End date (Y-m-d)	Event title	Event ID	Country	Learning outcome
2024-05-05	2024-05-09	Fighting Cybercrime in the Maritime Environment - Dakar, Senegal [06 - 10 May 2024]	1221 1	Senegal	No
2024-05-05	2024-05-09	Handling of Dangerous Goods, Level 1 - Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire [06 - 10 May 2024]	1221 2	Côte d'Ivoire	No
2024-05-12	2024-05-16	Administration of Dangerous Goods, Level 1 - Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire [13 - 17 May 2024]	1221 3	Côte d'Ivoire	No
2024-06-02	2024-06-06	Management of Dangerous Goods, Level 2 - Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire [03 - 07 June 2024]	1221 4	Côte d'Ivoire	No
2024-06-09	2024-06-20	Basic Vessel Board, Search & Seizure (VBSS) Training - Gisenyi, Rwanda [10 - 21 June 2024]	1221 5	Rwanda	No

### Annex D: List of documents/data to be reviewed

- Narrative and finance reports (in the absence of interim reporting requirements, internal reporting and monitoring data shall be provided, including self-evaluations, logframe updates etc.)
- Legal Agreement
- Logical Framework and outcome areas
- Monitoring and self-evaluation data
- Implementing partner documentation
- Stakeholder contacts
- Project Description
- UNITAR website content
- Event Management System Data
- Relevant international frameworks
- Reports from assurance activities including output delivery verification and spot check
- Any other document deemed to be useful to the evaluation

### Annex E: Structure of evaluation report

- i. Title page
- ii. Executive summary
- iii. Acronyms and abbreviations
1. Introduction

2. Project description, objectives and development context
3. Theory of change/project design logic
4. Methodology and limitations
5. Evaluation findings based on criteria/principal evaluation questions
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations
8. Lessons Learned
9. Annexes
  - a. Terms of reference
  - b. Survey/questionnaires deployed
  - c. List of persons interviewed
  - d. List of documents reviewed
  - e. Evaluation question matrix
  - f. Evaluation consultant agreement form

**Annex F: Evaluation Audit Trail Template**

*(To be completed by Project Management to show how the received comments on the draft report have (or have not) been incorporated into the evaluation report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the evaluation report.)*

**To the comments received on (date) from the evaluation of the “Enhancing Maritime Security and Fighting against Terrorism in the Gulf of Guinea Region” project**

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft evaluation report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and track change comment number (“#” column):*

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft evaluation report	Evaluator response and actions taken

**Annex G: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form\***

**The evaluator:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. He/she should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. He/she must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. He/she are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncovers evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. He/she should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, he/she must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. He/she should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom he/she comes in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, he/she should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Is responsible for his/her performance and his/her product(s). He/she is responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>4</sup>**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation. and I declare that any past experience, of myself, my immediate family or close friends or associates, does not give rise to an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

\*This form is required to be signed by each evaluator involved in the evaluation.

<sup>4</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)