

Committee of the Chief Statisticians of the United Nations System
(CCS-UN)

Muscat, 26 September 2017

10:00 – 1:00

=====

A proposal for a peer review system of statistical programmes

Prepared by UNODC

Introduction

This document aims at exploring the interest of UN entities/CCSA members to establish a common system for peer review of international/regional statistical programmes. The first two pages of the document briefly address questions related to the benefits and costs of such a system, while the Annex includes the Terms of Reference developed by UNODC for the peer review of its research programme. UNODC peer review covered more than statistics, but it may still serve as an illustrative example of the approach which could be taken to peer review statistical programmes.

Why should an International/regional organization ask for a peer reviewing of its statistical programme?

- To ensure that the statistical programme remain relevant, fit for purpose and in line with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics and Principles governing International Statistical Activities
- To enhance trust in the statistical programmes by internal and external stakeholders
- To increase visibility of the statistical programme and raise awareness of the UN ethics on statistics inside the agency and among external partners (particularly non-statistical partners)
- To share good practices across international/regional statistical programmes

Benefits of a standardized and coordinated peer review process under the auspices of UN entities/CCSA members

- It follows a practice which has proven to be effective within the UN group on evaluation (a group which similarly to the CCSA includes UN and non UN agencies)
- It provides multiple benefits: transparency and accountability, consistency, credibility and exemplarity
- It is cost-effective

- Statistical programmes in UN entities experience benefits and challenges that are peculiar to the UN inter-governmental process. External reviewers such as experts from academia or from national statistical offices may not fully appreciate the intrinsic challenges and the membership constrains that agencies face. A corporate approach among international statisticians ensures the understanding and appreciation of these challenges and facilitates the development of feasible and effective recommendations. The adherence to the Principles governing International Statistical Activities by the members also guarantees a common framework to underpin the review.

How can the UN entities/CCSA develop a peer review system?

Taking the model developed by the evaluation network as a starting point, the UN entities/CCSA could develop its own framework by defining an exemplary Terms of Reference and a model process (both to be considered as a reference to be further adapted to the needs of each agency). The terms of reference could for example be structured around the Statistical Principles with due attention to the lessons learnt during the review of the application of the Principles recently undertaken by the CCSA. The composition of the review team needs also to be standardized. UNODC for example followed the example of the evaluation network and it engaged three reviewers and one consultant. Among the reviewers, two were chief of statistical and research programmes in UN entities and one from a national government institution engaged in research on UNODC-relevant themes.

The development of a standard per review system could be done by a task force, with a first concept note to be developed for the 2018 NY meeting and a full proposal to be finalized for discussion at the September meeting.

What are the resources that an agency should employ to peer review its statistical programme?

Financial and human resources necessary to undertake a peer review depend on the scale and complexity of the statistical programme. Overall the review requires funds to cover the travel of the reviewers and travel and fee of the consultant (who supports the reviewers and draft all the documents on behalf of the reviewers). The review can be demanding on the time of the staff of the agency who needs to finalize terms of reference, identify persons inside and outside the organization to be interviewed and manage the overall operation. Time needs to be invested also after the report of the peer review is finalized to ensure a proper follow up.

How much work is required for a chief statistician to be engaged as peer reviewer?

Based on UNODC experience, a reviewer may need to allocate 2-3 weeks of her/his time, including a 3-4 days travel to the requesting agency

Annex

Professional Peer Review of the UNODC Research and Trend Analysis Thematic Programme

Terms of Reference, March 2017

Introduction

1. UNODC's Thematic Programme on Research, Trend Analysis and Forensics, 2015-2016 provides the overall framework for research and trend analysis at UNODC. The thematic programme covers UNODC outputs which are produced for research purposes. The Research and Trend Analysis Branch (RAB) has one of the principal responsibilities for the thematic programme, but other UNODC offices are directly involved in the areas covered by the programme, particularly the implementation of national and regional research and forensic programmes, which are carried out by UNODC field offices. When not directly involved in undertaking research or implementing forensic capacity building initiatives, RAB has overall responsibility for defining research standards and ensuring quality and consistency across all UNODC research and forensic science products.

2. Since the implementation period of the current Thematic Programme is ending, it is proposed to conduct a peer review of the research function of RAB with the aim of ensuring that the research function is fully fit for purpose and matched to UNODC's evolving approach. Peer reviews have proven to be an important tool for international co-operation and progress, in a variety of policy fields. It is seen here as potentially providing multiple benefits (transparency and accountability, consistency and coherence, credibility and exemplarity), promoting effectiveness (sharing best practices) and resource efficiency ('simply good business'). Peer reviewing focuses on best practices, achievements and potential progress and relies on mutual trust among peers and confidence in the peer review process. Review reports include factual evidence, independent assessment and non-binding recommendations.

3. The Peer Review will focus on the methods and approach used in the development of UNODC research products and their dissemination practices, looking at issues related to research methodology, quality assurance and cooperation with Member States. It will assess relevance, accuracy, impartiality, and accessibility of UNODC research and will assess how UNODC implements international ethical research standards such as the Principles Governing International Statistics. Undertaking research in a United Nations environment carries peculiar challenges because in addition to meet universal research standards as any research institute, UN research needs to bring a value added to the inter-governmental work and therefore it needs to be embraced and accepted by member states as a unique source of impartial factual information. It is this unique characteristic that makes a peer review more appropriate for evaluating UNODC research.

4. The Peer Review will be conducted in parallel to an in-depth project cluster evaluation of five of the main research projects implemented by the UNODC research branch to deliver the most visible global, regional and national research outputs such as the World Drug Report, the Global Report on Trafficking in Persons, the Global Report on Wildlife Crime, and the reports related to the Afghan Opiate Trade Programme. The in-depth project cluster evaluation will also cover the project supporting the UNODC-INEGI Center of Excellence on Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics given the crucial role that the Center is playing in the implementation of capacity building activities on crime

statistics. The Peer Review will cover the social science research part of the Thematic Programme because the forensics part has recently been evaluated through the in depth cluster evaluation of the two projects related to the scientific forensic field , i.e. the Global Scientific and Forensic Services Programme (GLO54) and the Global Synthetics Monitoring: Analyses, Reporting and Trends Programme (GLOJ88). In consolidating the findings of the Peer Review and the cluster evaluation, the results of the recent cluster evaluation of the two forensics projects will be also considered.

5. The Peer Review Panel will include: the Director of the UN Statistics Division, the Director of the UNICEF Innocenti Research Center and the Head of Project, Global Partnership on Drug Policies and Development (GPDPD), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). This composition will ensure that different perspectives of the research process (from data to analysis) are taken into account, as well as the different perspectives of national and international organizations.

6. The primary audiences for the Peer Review are Senior Management and Member States (Open-ended Working group on Governance and Finance/FinGov, Commission on Narcotic Drugs/CND and Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice/CCCPJ), as well as the research branch itself. The Peer Review report will be presented to the Executive Director, the Executive Committee¹ and FINGOV, and proactively discussed within UNODC.

7. The Peer Review Panel will focus on how the research function is currently implemented by UNODC, given its corporate objectives, organizational arrangements and financial situation. It is anticipated that the added value of the Peer Review will specifically be in the area of research ethics. While the adequacy of existing financial and human resources to reach the highest standards of research may be commented upon, it will not be in the scope of the peer review to look into administrative issues and/or present options to change the current level of human and financial resources. The Peer Review report will provide UNODC management with an independent assessment of **how** UNODC undertakes research and possible suggestions for its improvement. Recommendations made by the peer-review will be used to stimulate an internal discussion on the subject and will not be binding for the Organization. Recommendations of the peer review will be presented to Governing Bodies together with a Senior Management Response.

8. This document sets out the Terms of Reference for the Professional Peer Review of the research function of UNODC, as outlined in the Thematic Programme. It describes the background and rationale for the Peer Review, its purpose, scope, general approach, methods, time schedule and funding arrangements. The document has been shared with senior UNODC Management for inputs.

Background

9. Dating back to the establishment of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND) in 1946, UNODC has had considerable experience on data collection and analysis that reflects its pre-eminence in the fields of research, trend analysis and forensic science. The research conducted at UNODC is characterized both by its global reach and by its substantive universality in addressing global problems, particularly those of a transnational nature. This in turn provides the foundation for the broad comparability of collected data across different countries.

¹ The Executive Committee comprises UNODC Executive Director and D2-level Directors (4).

10. UNODC performs its research in a cooperative fashion, building and expanding upon regional and international partnerships, interactions and cooperation in the collection, analysis and dissemination of information. UNODC research seeks to be factually and evidence-based, credible, trustworthy, relevant and useful. Avoiding any bias, it is conducted in a transparent manner in accordance with fundamental principles of integrity and neutrality.

11. UNODC is gradually introducing a system of peer review for its global reports to ensure that they meet the highest scientific standards and can benefit from best practices in the field. An Advisory Committee for example has been established for the production of the World Drug Report, its annual flagship publication. This Committee is composed by research experts who have decades of experience in analysing the drug problem.

12. The evidence underpinning UNODC analytical research is based on: i) four regular global data collection systems: Annual Report Questionnaire (ARQ), Individual Database Seizures (IDS), Early Warning Advisory (EWA), United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (UN-CTS), and the Trafficking in Persons questionnaire; ii) information provided by national, regional and international authorities or institutions in the context of special programmes or data-sharing agreements; iii) reliable open-sourced information; and iv) scientific literature. The quality of UNODC data and qualitative evidence helps to ensure the relevance, accuracy, timeliness, coherence, comparability, accessibility and clarity of its research.

13. The external landscape has evolved significantly in the last five years. Peace and Security have become more prominent in the priority agenda of the UN. Issues which are the core of UNODC mandate such as violence, rule of law, access to justice, organized crime, illicit financial flows and corruption have been recognized as an integral part of the new development paradigm, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). These UN policy evolutions have implications for UNODC research which is expected to expand its reach to analyse its mandated areas in relation to social, economic and environmental development. UNODC has also been identified as the global custodian agency for a number of SDG indicators related to its areas of expertise which brings additional responsibilities on global data collection, standard settings and capacity building.

14. In the areas of UNODC's mandate, where the international architecture is changing, the UN Transformative Agenda calls for improved accountability and learning. Increased attention is being given to evaluation of crosscutting themes such as equity, human rights, gender equality, comprising the borderless dimensions of UNODC's mandate: drugs, crime and terrorism. Meanwhile, in the context of reduced resources, there is demand for greater attention to assessment of value for money and efficiency.

Purpose of the Peer Review

15. The Peer Review is taking place at a time of strategic change with significant implications for the research function. An independent Professional Peer Review will help UNODC to ensure that its research function is well positioned and equipped to make the best contribution to the work of the organization, and those it serves.

16. In line with this goal, the Peer Review will undertake an assessment of the independence, credibility and relevance of UNODC's research function, focusing on:
- a. **relevance** of the research programme to address the emerging trends on drugs and crime and to feed political and programmatic efforts within UNODC, its governing bodies and other regional and international processes;
 - b. **quality** of research in relation to transparency of study design, methods, and procedures; balanced and objective approach; accuracy and comprehensiveness;
 - c. **impartiality** of the research programme. In particular, to determine how the research programmes balance its objective to achieve quality and impartiality while ensuring national ownership;
 - d. **effectiveness** of the implementation of the research programme and integration of the different programmes/projects;
 - e. adherence to the **Fundamental principles of Official Statistics and the Principles of International Statistics**;
 - f. **relevance and quality of UNODC assistance to countries** in relation to data collection and analysis on drugs and crime (to assess if the right institutions are targeted and if the assistance has a short and long term impact on people and institutions, to assess the quality of the assistance).

17. In this, the Peer Review will be coordinated closely with the in-depth cluster evaluation of research projects. The Peer review will address overarching issues related to methodology, credibility and policy relevance of UNODC research, while the cluster evaluation will analyse in details the effectiveness and efficiency of the research projects from a project management point of view. The design and implementation of the two assessment exercises will focus on achieving complementarity, as well as synergies.

18. Finally, the Peer Review will provide non-binding recommendations to the research function directly and to the Executive Director, Senior Management and Member States with the aim of improving the quality of UNODC's research function generally, and specifically to inform discussions and decisions about the role, positioning and mandate of the Research and Trend Analysis Branch.

Subject, Scope, and Limitations

19. The Peer Review of research functions is inspired by the peer review system established by the DAC-UNEG which established an agreed framework with a blend of standardized and flexible elements to reflect the diversity of UN organizations and their respective evaluation arrangements.

20. The overarching assessment question is: "Are the agency's research functions, methodology, its products and services: impartial; credible; accurate and useful for policy making, as assessed by a Panel of professional research peers against the principles set up in the UNODC Thematic Programme on Research, Trend Analysis and Forensics?"

21. The Peer Review will be carried applying three main criteria: ²

² These criteria resemble the criteria established by UNEG for the evaluation function and products to be considered of high quality. See Footnote 1 and <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/945>

- A. Independence of the review. The peer review process should be impartial. This requires that the persons and entities undertaking the review are independent of those concerned with the UNODC research programme, to avoid possible bias or conflicts of interest.
- B. Credibility of the evaluators. The credibility of the peer review depends on the expertise and independence of the evaluators and the degree of transparency of the process. Credibility requires that the review process is undertaken in a way to report successes, as well as failures. Recipient partners should, as a rule, fully participate in the review process in order to promote credibility and commitment on their side.
- C. Utility of the review process. To have an impact on decision-making, the findings of the review process must be perceived as credible, relevant and useful and be presented in a clear and concise way. They should fully reflect the different interests and needs of the many parties involved in research. Although, measures to ensure the utility of the review findings are only partly under the control of evaluators. It is also critically a function of the interest of managers and member countries through their participation on governing bodies, in commissioning, receiving, and using the findings.

22. Furthermore, the criteria of impartiality and transparency will also be considered, as they are strongly related to the criteria of independence, credibility and utility. Impartiality is enabled by independence and is a fundamental element of the credibility of the review process. Transparency is another fundamental element of credibility and is an important basis for the utility of the review process.

23. Within this framework, the Peer review will analyse the main areas of focus and issues listed below. The research function in UNODC includes three broad areas: statistics (data collection, dissemination, survey implementation, statistical capacity building), analysis (production of regional and global analytical reports including flagship publications such as the World Drug Report, the Global Study on Homicide and the biannual Global report on Trafficking in Persons), and forensics. The scope of this peer review is limited to the first two areas of statistics and analysis, so "research" mentioned in the list below is to be interpreted as referring to both of these two areas.

- I. UNODC RESEARCH METHODOLOGY including:
 - a. responsibility for and safeguards in place for ensuring:
 - unbiased interpretation of the research findings
 - impartiality of the research process
 - transparency in the choices made when choosing different methodological approaches
 - transparency on the uncertainty around data and research findings
 - accessible documentation of the research process
 - adequate technical skills available for research within UNODC
 - methodology is tailored to address well formulated research questions
 - b. mechanisms to protect research funding from influence which might undermine the impartiality of UNODC research;
 - c. the extent to which UNODC research conforms with scientific research standards;
 - d. Identity of the research function within UNODC, including:

- to what extent it is distinct from policy setting, advocacy and operational functions inside and outside UNODC;
 - to what extent UNODC policies affect the impartiality of UNODC research.
- e. consistency of the research approach across the different thematic areas and between HQ and the field offices;
- f. capacity to adopt innovative methodologies;
- g. disclosure and dissemination policy for UNODC research products;
- h. the role of Governing Bodies in governance and use, appreciation and understanding of the research function.
- II. QUALITY of UNODC research products (databases, survey reports, regional and global analytical reports, international standards), including the following:
- i. The level of trust that internal and external stakeholders have in UNODC research products;
- j. working procedures and internal organization of the research branch to ensure the highest level of quality;
- k. mechanisms and systems in place to:
- ensure that research is accurate and timely
 - have easy access to all UNODC research products for internal and external stakeholders
- l. mechanisms and systems in place to ensure that UNODC consistently apply the Principles Governing International Statistical Activities ³. In particular, to what extent UNODC:
- has regular consultations with key users both inside and outside the relevant organisation to ascertain that their needs
 - compile and disseminate international statistics based on impartiality
 - provide equal access to statistics for all users
 - use strictly professional considerations for decisions on methodology, terminology and data presentation
 - make a clear distinction, in research publications, between statistical and analytical comments on the one hand and policy-prescriptive and advocacy comments on the other;
 - aims at continuously introducing methodological improvements and systems to manage and improve the quality and transparency of statistics;
 - enhance the professional level of staff by encouraging them to attend training courses, to do analytical work, to publish scientific papers and to participate in seminars and conferences;
 - facilitate the provision of data by countries;
 - undertake periodic review of statistical programmes to minimise the burden on data providers;
 - share collected data with other organisations and collecting data jointly where appropriate;
 - develop a framework describing methods and procedures to provide sets of anonymous micro-data for further analysis by bona fide researchers, maintaining the requirements of confidentiality;
 - respond to perceived erroneous interpretation and misuse of statistics;
 - systematically involve national statistical offices and other national organisations for official statistics in the development of international statistical programmes,

³ http://unstats.un.org/unsd/acsub-public/principles_stat_activities.htm

including the development and promulgation of methods, standards and good practices;

- advise countries on implementation issues concerning international standards;
- cooperate and share knowledge among international organisations and with countries and regions to further develop national and regional statistical systems.

III. RELEVANCE of UNODC research, including consideration of the following:

- m. systems in place to choose research topics that:
- reflect priorities of UNODC thematic, regional and national programmes and priorities of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice;
 - are based on research needs as mandated by UN inter-governmental bodies
- n. to what extent UNODC research products (databases, survey reports, regional and global reports, international standards) are used by internal and external stakeholders;
- o. to what extent single member states, the international communities, UNODC programmes, and UNODC senior managers make policy and programmatic decisions based on UNODC research;
- p. the extent to which functional and organizational arrangements within UNODC contribute or obstruct the effective use of research products for programming and policy making;
- q. adequacy of UNODC research in providing knowledge on the most pressing and contemporary issues related to drugs and crime;
- r. to what extent UNODC research has a unique role as compared to other international organizations and research institutions;
- s. integration of research activities between HQ and field;
- t. effective coordination of research activities within UNODC and between UNODC and other international organizations;
- u. UNODC capacity building programme targeting right national institutions and addressing national needs

24. The Peer Review Panel will focus on how the research function is currently implemented by UNODC, given its corporate objectives, organizational arrangements and financial situation. It is anticipated that the added value of the Peer Review will specifically be in the area of research ethics. While the adequacy of existing financial and human resources to reach the highest standards of research may be commented upon, it will not be in the scope of the peer review to look into administrative issues and/or present options to change the current level of human and financial resources.

25. By necessity, a professional Peer Review is not a full-fledged evaluation that can comprehensively evaluate practices, processes, and outcomes in depth. Parallel to the peer review process there will be an in-depth cluster evaluation of the five projects which have underpinned most of the RAB work. This in-depth evaluation will be able to cover some of the issues which will not be addressed by the Peer Review. The Peer Review Panel will report on the limitations of its work. However, it is expected that the Panel will be resourceful, drawing on a solid methodology as well as on their own experience as statisticians, researchers and managers within and outside the UN system.

Approach, methods and tools

26. UNODC's Research and Trend Analysis Branch will assemble all necessary information to

ensure a smooth work of the Panel. This will be supplemented by further information to be assembled by a consultant (who will also be part of the in-depth evaluation team), based on a review of relevant documentation from within and outside of UNODC. In consultation with the Peer Review Panel, the evaluation consultant will carry out a quality review of a sample of data and research reports, selected from research products related to the period 2013-2016. The sample will include data related to SDG indicators, reports which have a high and low number of downloads ensuring with an adequate representation of national, regional and global products. The Data Quality Assurance Framework (DQAF)⁴ will be used to assess the quality of the data while universal research standards based on scientific methods will provide the framework to assess analytical outputs.

27. The evaluation consultant will undertake preliminary consultations with RAB and will gather relevant documentation and information. S/he will also will design an anonymous web survey to gather information from a variety of stakeholders relevant to the topics listed above. These activities will provide the basis for a preliminary assessment, for the Peer Review Panel to discuss and use as a basis for its direct and broader assessment.

28. The visit of the Peer Review Panel to UNODC Headquarters on 10-12 April 2017 will include a round of meetings, interviews and focus group discussions with UNODC staff at both HQ and field levels, senior management and Member States, at HQ or in capitals. During this visit, the Peer Review and RAB staff will also organize a Peer Exchange session, during which a few key issues of high relevance to UNODC research function will be discussed. Based on these activities, the Panel will prepare a draft report with the support of the evaluation consultant.

Reporting

29. The final report of the Peer Review Panel will present an overview and assessment of the UNODC research function and conclusions and recommendations for action. The report will be a maximum of 50 pages in length, supplemented by a short executive summary and annexes.

30. The Panel will first share its draft report with RAB to provide comments, suggestions and feedback on factual mistakes. Factual mistakes will be corrected, while other comments will be incorporated as considered appropriate. The Peer Review report will provide UNODC management with an independent assessment of **how** UNODC undertakes research and possible suggestions for its improvement. Recommendations made by the peer-review will be used to stimulate an internal discussion on the subject and will not be binding for the Organization. The final report will be submitted to the Executive Director, FinGov, and other inter-governmental fora as needed. Recommendations of the peer review will be presented to Governing Bodies together with a Senior Management Response. Taking into account their complementarity and synergies, it is foreseen that the results of the Peer Review will be presented jointly with the results of the in-depth cluster evaluation.

Responsibility of RAB

31. UNODC RAB will serve as the main contact point within UNODC for the Peer Review Panel and the evaluation consultant. The Independent Evaluation Unit will guide and oversee the process

⁴ The Data Quality Assurance Framework is rooted in the UN Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics and grew out of the Special Data Dissemination Standard (SDDS) and General Data Dissemination System (GDSS), the IMF's initiatives on data dissemination.

to ensure continuity and that synergies are used between the Peer Review and the evaluation.

32. The Office will provide requested information and data, including the following:
- Names and details of contact persons whom the Panel or its advisors wish to contact;
 - Complete list of UNODC research outputs (2013-present);
 - Description of UNODC activities related to capacity building in research (2013-present);
 - List of persons to meet in the UNODC Senior Management and in Fin GOV;
 - Access to all UNODC databases;

Documents to be consulted

- UNODC Thematic Programme on Research, Trend Analysis and Research
- RAB policy on data sharing
- Internal document on the treatment of confidential information
- Questionnaires used to collect data from Member States (ARQ, CTS, IDS, etc.)
- MoU and communication with other agencies on data collection
- MoUs signed with member states on the implementation of national surveys
- Research publications
- Results of feedback surveys related to global reports

Persons to meet or to contact (by advisor and/or Peer Panel Members)

- Chief of RAB and RAB Staff;
- The Executive Director or his representative and senior staff in UNODC, including Directors;
- UNODC Staff responsible for the different thematic programmes, results-based management, IT, and advocacy;
- Former research staff;
- Staff members in regional, sub-regional, and country offices to be interviewed through teleconferencing or Skype;
- Representatives of Permanent Missions in Vienna;
- Counterparts placed in capitals or within key national institutions to be interviewed through teleconferencing or Skype;
- Members of the Advisory Committee for the World Drug Report
- Prominent academics and staff of research institution in the field of drugs and crime
- Staff of regional and international organizations active in the research field of drugs and crime;

Peer review time-schedule and process

33. The Peer Review will begin in March 2017, and the Peer Review Panel will undertake formal visits to UNODC HQ in April 2017, providing a final report in June 2017. The presentation of the findings to the Executive Director and Member States will be done jointly with the results of the in-depth evaluation. Key findings and conclusions will be presented first to the Executive Director, UNODC Senior Management and subsequently to Member States.

34. The Peer Review process has five main phases (indicative timing is shown in brackets):
- i. Preparation (January – March 2017): Mobilization of the Panel and recruitment of the evaluation consultant;

- ii. Fact-finding (March –May 2017);
- iii. Visit by the Panel to UNODC HQ (April 2017); interviews with selected UNODC Members and staff of relevant UNODC units and Senior Management; analysis and triangulation of findings; preparation of draft report; this will include a Peer Exchange session between the Peer Review Panel and RAB staff.
- iv. Report preparation (May-June 2017): the Panel will prepare its draft report and share an advanced version with RAB for comments and suggestions before finalizing it.
- v. Submission of Final Report: June 2017.

Resources

35. The cost of the Peer Review will be covered by UNODC RAB projects, including:
 - The participation of the Panel members (travel, DSA);
 - The costs of hiring the evaluation consultant;
 - Costs in UNODC (including in-kind contributions of staff time)

Panel Composition

36. Following consultations within UNODC a Peer Review Panel of professionals in the field of research has been assembled. A number of important considerations were taken into account when composing it:
 - i. relevant professional experience;
 - ii. independence: to avoid any potential or perceived conflict of interest or partiality, the Panel members do not have any close working relationship to UNODC that might influence the Panel's position and deliberations; and
 - iii. institutional affiliations: members to be drawn from a variety of multilateral and bilateral development agencies.
37. The combination of these criteria together with the voluntary nature of serving on the Panel resulted in the following composition (to be confirmed):
 - Mr. Stefan Schweinfest, Director of the Statistics Division, DESA New York
 - Ms Sarah Cook, Director Research Innocenti Center;
 - Mr. Daniel Brombacher, Head of Project, Global Partnership on Drug Policies and Development (GPDPD), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
38. The Panel will be assisted by the evaluation consultant responsible for (a) data collection and information gathering; (b) preliminary assessment of the collected information, and c) preparation of substantive inputs to the preliminary draft peer review report.