

**FINAL EVALUATION:**  
**ANTI CORRUPTION FOR**  
**PEACEFUL & INCLUSIVE SOCIETIES**  
**(ACPIS)**  
**GLOBAL PROGRAMME**



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

March 2021

*Kevin Deveaux & Tim Baker  
Deveaux International Governance Consultants Inc.*

*Contents*

<b>ACRONYMS USED .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>II. Background.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>III. Final Evaluation Methodology .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>IV. Limitations of the Review .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>V. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>VI. Relevance .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>VII. Efficiency.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>VIII. Effectiveness .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>IX. Sustainability .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>X. Impact .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>XI. Gender Equality &amp; Inclusiveness .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>XII. COVID-19 and anti-corruption activity during a pandemic .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>XIII. Partnerships.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>XIV. Innovation.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>XV. ACPIS AS A LEADER IN ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>XVI. LESSONS LEARNED .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>XVII. RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: Persons interviewed for final evaluation .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: List of Documents Consulted.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>ANNEX 4: Analytical Framework Answers.....</b>	<b>58</b>

## ACRONYMS USED

AC - Anti-Corruption

ACA - Anti-Corruption Agency

ACC – Anti-Corruption Commission

ACPIS – Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies

ACRC – Republic of Korea Anti-Corruption Agency

CO – Country Office (UNDP)

CoP - Community of Practice

CSO - Civil Society Organisation

DFAT - Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Australia)

FE - Final Evaluation

GAIN - Global Anti-Corruption Initiative

GoPNG – Government of Papua New Guinea

IACC - International Anti-Corruption Conference

INGO – International Non-Governmental Organisation

M&E - Monitoring and Evaluation

MTE – Mid-term Evaluation

NGO – Non-Governmental Organisation

NORAD – Norwegian Agency for Development

OECD - Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

PACDE – Global Programme on Anti-Corruption for Development Effectiveness

QAI – Quality at Implementation Report (DFAT)

RBx - Regional Bureaux

SIDA – Swedish International Development Agency

SDG – Sustainable Development Goal

TI - Transparency International

ToR - Terms of Reference

UN - United Nations

UNCAC - United Nations Convention Against Corruption

UNDP - United Nations Development Programme

UNGA – United Nations General Assembly

UNGASS – United Nations General Assembly Against Corruption (2021)

UNODC - United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

WHO – World Health Organisation

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been a leader in the promotion of anti-corruption values and principles and its place in development work globally, especially as it relates to the added value such principles bring to the establishment of effective governance systems. Over the past 13 years UNDP's anti-corruption work has evolved as the organisation has implemented a series of anti-corruption global programmes. The latest iteration of the programme, known as **Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies (ACPIS)** was established in 2016 and ends in 2021. This report reflects the results of the final evaluation of the project supported by DFAT.

Anti-corruption has ascended the development priority ladder over the past twenty years, moving from a niche area of work to one that is now front and centre in the development agenda. This has occurred for a variety of reasons, but includes the placing of anti-corruption as a measurable target for the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It has also benefited from the thought leadership of a small group of global and regional implementers, including UNDP, which have consistently and actively promoted anti-corruption as a cross-cutting issue that now is seen as critical to governance development work.

In reviewing the work of ACPIS it is important to consider two key questions – has the project done what it was intended to do and how does such work place UNDP and the broader anti-corruption community of practice in the coming years?

With regard to the programme's implementation, it is concluded that the programme has achieved almost all the objectives and outputs it set out to achieve.

### **Objective 1: Integrate anti-corruption solutions in service delivery sectors, in partnership with youth, women and private sector.**

ACPIS has led the drive to integrate anti-corruption measures into the development work related to specific governance sectors, such as education, health and justice. In particular, with the COVID-19 pandemic ACPIS was able to quickly scale-up its work within the health sector to promote the application of anti-corruption tools as governments globally rolled out significant health programmes. ACPIS also incubated innovative approaches to social accountability in select countries in the Asia-Pacific region that have had knock-on results and impact at the national level. Significant efforts were made to ensure the work of ACPIS was inclusive and this can be seen not only in the beneficiaries of the work of the global programme, but also in the programme outputs, where projects and activities in support of an effective role for women and youth in anti-corruption dialogues have been promoted.

### **Objective 2: Strengthen state/institutional capacity to implement UNCAC, in particular with regard to the prevention of corruption.**

Through an enhanced and robust relationship with the UNODC, ACPIS has continued UNDP's work in supporting national governments to adopt and strengthen anti-corruption standards and frameworks. With the adoption of the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs ACPIS now has the ability to leverage this framework for even more results. In a number of countries, including Myanmar, Indonesia and Papua New Guinea, ACPIS has been instrumental in working with UNDP Country Offices to support their work with national partners to establish and improve national legal frameworks for anti-corruption.

### **Objective 3: Promote knowledge and advocacy to support anti-corruption efforts, including a better understanding of the link between violent extremism and corruption.**

Of particular interest at the time of formulating the programme, the link between anti-corruption and violent extremism was effectively unpacked by the ACPIS programme team. This resulted in further, practical support to the Indonesian Government in its efforts to build a robust system of governance to counteract violent extremism.

More broadly, ACPIS has continued to play a leadership role in the anti-corruption community by promoting new ideas, approaches and tools and testing and trying such systems on a scale that allows for evaluation and promotion where they are seen to be effective. This can be seen within the UN system through the support provided by ACPIS to UNDPs leadership in supporting a coordinated effort engage on the topic of anti-corruption and in the UN General Assembly Special Session held in 2021 on the topic. Outside of the UN system, ACPIS continues to build and maintain strong partnerships with multilateral organisations, governments, civil society and the private sector to advocate for anti-corruption integration into all aspects of development work.

The success of ACPIS in achieving results is directly linked to the structure under which it is implemented. Guided by a small, highly professional team based in Singapore, the global programme was nimble in its ability to respond to shifting demands as the programme was implemented. In addition to the pandemic pivot noted already and the need to support the UN-wide coordination on the topic, ACPIS was able to leverage trusted relationships within and outside UNDP to offer an amount of technical expertise and knowledge that is far greater than would be expected from a small team of full-time staff supporting the programme. Again, the nurturing of partnerships has been critical to this approach.

Yet as this phase of UNDPs global work draws to a close, there is a need to consider what is next and how UNDP can continue to lead. A key challenge to the work of UNDP and ACPIS is the scale at which it is able to develop, analyse, implement and evaluate new approaches to anti-corruption work. The successes that emanated from the pilot projects funded by ACPIS were impressive, but the scale of the interventions and the ability to create global impact from such an approach is limited by the amount of resources available for such work. In short, the work of ACPIS was impactful, but given the size of the challenge of integrating anti-corruption into the development agenda, there is a need for a massive increase in resources to allow such work to flourish in numerous locales and under a variety of political and governance contexts.

There is also a need to enhance the anti-corruption community of practice – both within UNDP and the broader field. Previous efforts to maintain a community of practice in support of technical experts working in this field proved costly. But technology, expedited by the leap forward caused by the pandemic, has now made such ongoing work to allow the sharing of information and experiences more cost-effective. If anti-corruption is to be placed at the centre of the development agenda, not only within the UN system but more broadly, then there is a need for a robust, well-informed group of experts who can support such integration at national, sub-national and regional levels.

### **Key Recommendations**

Based on the review conducted the following are the key recommendations from the Final Evaluation of ACPIS:

#### **Establish a Global Integrity Fund, managed by UNDP, that will be a facility for supporting innovative ideas on integration of anti-corruption into development objectives and SDG implementation.**

Similar to other funds (GEF; REDD+; GCF), anti-corruption work would benefit from a fund that allows the incubating of innovative approaches to integration of anti-corruption solutions into the development agenda.

#### **Continue to identify cutting edge ideas and approaches to anti-corruption work that can be implemented for real world application, but with the intent of identifying those that can be scaled up/replicated**

The piloting of new approaches to anti-corruption work was a success for ACPIS and this work should not only continue, but allow for the support required to ensure these new ideas are scaled up and, where possible, institutionalised.

#### **Continue to integrate anti-corruption principles and approaches into the broader UN development agenda**

UNDP is a leader within the UN system with regard to anti-corruption and ACPIS is key to this role. Going forward, there will be a need for strong coordination within the UN system and UNDP must ensure its technical capacity is properly utilised to ensure such coordination is based on best practices and standards.



## I. INTRODUCTION

Since the adoption of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC)<sup>1</sup> in 2003 the global development community has made significant efforts to address corruption as a key barrier to the impactful and cost-effective delivery of results. In the past 18 years there have been key milestones or events that have supported the need to consider the impact of corruption in all development work. Probably the most important of these is the recognition of the importance of addressing corruption as part of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015, where the development community moved towards the recognition that corruption is a deterrent to human development, social, economic and environmental sustainability, and can also be a significant contributing factor in political instability.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been working to establish anti-corruption systems at the national level for decades. This work was aided in 2008 with the first global anti-corruption programme (Programme on Anti-Corruption for Development Effectiveness (PACDE)) and continued with the second such programme (Global Anti-Corruption Initiative (GAIN)) which ran from 2012-16. The third iteration of the global programme is the Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies (ACPIS), which runs from 2016 to 2020. As part of the conclusion of the ACPIS global programme, a final, independent evaluation has been commissioned. This report is the result of that evaluation process.

As UNDP has supported measures to entrench anti-corruption (AC) in governance objectives at the country, regional and global levels, its work has evolved, as it has for the broader development community's work in the same field. In past years the focus of the work was on "Anti-Corruption 1.0" where efforts were made to build AC national architecture, including establishing legal frameworks and anti-corruption agencies (ACAs) and anti-corruption commissions (ACCs).

However, in the past four years there has been a shift in how the development community has perceived AC. With the SDGs having specific targets under SDG-16 related to transparency, accountability and anti-corruption, opportunities were opened for AC work to be more integrated within the centre of the development dialogue. This was coupled with a broader agenda as part of SDG implementation, in which barriers to implementation, including governance barriers, are being seen in a new light as there is a desire among many development partners to see the integration of AC and other governance barriers into the broad work of development. Anti-corruption, in particular, has been recast as critical to development given the drain on resources and the fact that corruption can be a bottleneck to service delivery. In the context of the COVID-19 Pandemic such issues have arisen specifically in the health sector. This has led to a greater focus amongst AC practitioners on how best to integrate AC work into other development challenges. This has resulted in the specific work of ACPIS and a more nuanced approach to such work (Anti-Corruption 2.0).

## II. Background

When ACPIS was launched in 2016, the Programme was almost exclusively funded by the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs & Trade (DFAT), with a small amount of supplemental funding from the Government of Liechtenstein and funding from UNDP. In 2018, ACPIS also received \$8 million USD from the Government of

---

<sup>1</sup> UNCAC: <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/> and SDG 16 on bribery and anti-corruption: <http://www.anti-corruption.org/themes/anti-corruption-in-sdgs-2/>



Uzbekistan to implement a country level project in Uzbekistan. Although most of the activities under this cost-sharing agreement (\$7 million USD) are implemented at the county level, \$1 million USD is allocated for the policy and programme support, south-south exchange, global knowledge sharing and advocacy led by ACPIS global team.

In 2019 the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) allocated resources to UNDP to implement a 3-year project on ‘Strengthening National Capacities to Integrate Anti-Corruption in the SDGs’. The main objective of this component of ACPIS is **to strengthen national anti-corruption capacities to accelerate the achievement of the SDGs**. This funding and its expected results will be referenced in this report, from time to time, as a reference to the direction of the work being conducted globally by UNDP.

Under previous phase of the global AC programme (2012-2016), DFAT funding was more than double the level in support of ACPIS, and also had a global focus. Under ACPIS (2016-2020), DFAT has pivoted its work to focus on the Indo-Pacific Region over the prior (and broader) global engagement programmes. This has resulted in ACPIS being primarily focused on support in Asia and the Pacific Region. As the programme draws to close, DFAT has determined that its priorities lie elsewhere with regard to development and it has decided not to fund further UNDPs global anti-corruption work.<sup>2</sup>

ACPIS has the following objectives and outputs:

Objective	Output
<b>Objective 1: Integrate anti-corruption solutions in service delivery sectors, in partnership with youth, women and private sector.</b>	Output 1.1: Anti-corruption solutions integrated in service delivery systems (such as in health, education, water and infrastructure, justice and security) to mitigate corruption risks.
	Output 1.2: Social accountability mechanisms to monitor services and provide oversight promoted and strengthened (such as civic engagement, youth and women empowerment, and the private sector participation).
<b>Objective 2: Strengthen state/institutional capacity to implement UNCAC, in particular with regard to the prevention of corruption.</b>	Output 2.1: UNCAC and anti-corruption integrated in national development processes, including the mainstreaming of SDGs at national and sub-national levels, to prevent and tackle corruption.
	Output 2.2: Measures to prevent corruption are put in place by anti-corruption institutions.
<b>Objective 3: Promote knowledge and advocacy to support anti-corruption efforts, including a better understanding of the link between violent extremism and corruption.</b>	Output 3.1: Advocacy is promoted at national and sub-national levels to reinforce anti-corruption efforts.
	Output 3.2: Knowledge on anti-corruption is produced and shared globally, including through south-south and triangular cooperation.

Though it is a global programme, given the source of the vast majority of its funds, **ACPIS’ primary focus was on the Asia-Pacific region** with targeted support to regional and country-level initiatives. Despite these circumstances, ACPIS maintained a global focus with regard to its work, especially as it related to global advocacy for anti-corruption as a governance priority and support to UNDPs global development architecture, including quality assurance and technical advice to regional and country-level interventions and elaboration of anti-corruption global knowledge and policy direction. The programme has also invested in establishing and maintaining a diverse network of partners, including with such organisations as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Transparency International (TI); the U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre (U4); SIDA, the Global Fund, the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the World Bank

In the last quarter of 2020, as part of the monitoring and evaluation of the programme, an independent evaluation was commissioned to be conducted by a two-person team through Deveaux International Governance Consultants (DIG), Inc.<sup>3</sup> The Final Evaluation (FE), which looks into the DFAT-funded components of ACPIS global project,

<sup>2</sup> In response to this evaluation, it was made clear by interlocutors in DFAT that the decision to end funding was in no manner a negative judgement on ACPIS and the work of its programme team, but as a result of a change in priorities for the Australian Government.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.deveauxconsultants.com/>

considered what has (and has not) been working effectively with regard to the delivery of the outputs and objectives noted above. This FE identifies lessons learned and best practices and points to any challenges that may need to be addressed in the next phase of UNDPs global work on anti-corruption.

More specifically and in accordance with the Terms of Reference<sup>4</sup> for this FE, the following objectives were met:

- To assess progress of the ACPIS project against the three project objectives and evaluate whether the project achieved expected results, as envisioned by the project document;
- To evaluate the implementation of the project and its existing capacity according to: a) DFAT's quality criteria and expectations; and b) mid-term review recommendations; and
- To assess the project's alignment with and contribution to UNDP's Strategic Plan 2018-2021, and provide forward-looking recommendations, lessons learned and good practices

The final evaluation also builds on the findings of **the ACPIS mid-term review** which was conducted in early 2019. That review noted that ACPIS was working effectively with regard to all three outcomes of the project. In particular, the country-level projects had already achieved results at the halfway mark of the project. The review recommended a greater emphasis on the role ACPIS could play in building capacity at the global level for UNDPs work in the anti-corruption field and the need for a greater integration of anti-corruption work into UNDPs development agenda. However, the review also recommended a clear plan for institutionalizing the work tested through the pilot projects and a need for sufficient resources to maintain a global architecture related to anti-corruption within UNDP.

### III. Final Evaluation Methodology

This Final Evaluation (FE) builds on the work completed as part of the Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) of ACPIS that took place in late 2018 and early 2019. The objective of the FE is to reflect on what was noted in the MTE and based on evidence gathered for this report, determine what has changed since the MTE was completed. It is also an objective to consider how the future work of UNDP globally in the field of AC should be organised and what areas of focus should be emphasized.

To that end the FE was conducted in three stages:

#### **Stage 1: Inception Phase**

At the start of the FE the ET was provided with numerous documents from the programme team that were reviewed for this report.<sup>5</sup> In addition, the ET produced an Inception Report that provided a detailed description of how the review would be conducted, including methodology and timeline. Based on that early analysis, the ET requested further documentation and data from ACPIS with a positive reply from the programme team on each occasion.

#### **Stage 2: Evidence Gathering Phase**

Once the Inception Report was approved by the programme team, the ET proceeded to collect evidence upon which to conduct an analysis and make determinations. Given the remote nature of the FE, it was decided that the review will focus on semi-structured interviews via video platform (i.e. – Zoom). Letters requesting an interview were sent

---

<sup>4</sup> See Annex 1 for the Terms of Reference for this review

<sup>5</sup> A list of documents consulted for this evaluation can be found in Annex 3

to a sample of stakeholders, beneficiaries and partners of ACPIS with an interview guide with illustrative questions. Based on responses the ET conducted approximately 20 interviews over a three-week period in January 2021. A summary of the content of each interview was produced.<sup>6</sup>

### **Stage 3: Analysis & Reporting**

Once the interviews were completed the ET conducted an analysis of the data and evidence collected and through triangulation make certain findings that are reflected in this report. A draft of this report was submitted to the ACPIS team for feedback and was then finalised and submitted to UNDP.

## **IV. Limitations of the Review**

The FE was conducted during the global COVID-19 Pandemic, which placed significant constraints on how the evaluation as performed. All interviews were conducted remotely through different time zones. Not all stakeholders were invited to participate in the review, as a sample of interviewees was agreed upon at the start of the process between the ET and the ACPIS team. Of those engaged the vast majority were available for an interview, though some did decline the request.

---

<sup>6</sup> A list of those interviewed for this evaluation can be found in Annex 2

## V. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

### KEY FINDINGS:

- *The need for more sectoral integration continues*
- *Partnerships matter and ACPIS is effective at building them*
- *Pilot projects at national level have shown results – but how to upscale and institutionalise such changes?*
- *Leveraging relationships with governments to move towards the cultural shift required for a true anti-corruption paradigm shift*
- *ACPIS provided effective support through technical inputs to UNDPs lead in the UN system coordination of anti-corruption work*
- *Support to the Anti-Corruption Community of Practice – both internally for UNDP and the broader community – has shown promise, but will require longer-term planning and resources*
- *The future of anti-corruption policy and practice requires increased resources - both financial and human resources – and a new modality to help ensure that progress and incubation of innovative approaches as part of ACPIS implementation can be replicated in the long-term*

In conducting the Final Evaluation (FE), the evaluation team relied on specific criteria upon which to measure if the programme was achieving results in line with ACPIS programme objectives at the terminal point of implementation at calendar year end 2020. The criteria used for the FE are defined in the TOR appended to this report (Annex 1). These criteria included the five of the six standard development evaluation criteria: relevance; efficiency; effectiveness; impact; and sustainability.<sup>7</sup> In addition, the evaluation team added other criteria that they

---

<sup>7</sup> OECD DAC criteria: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>,

considered relevant to this review – gender & inclusivity, ACPIS partnerships, and COVID-19 (and the pandemic’s impact on anti-corruption, particularly in the health care sector). The definition or parameters for each criterion are defined under each sub-section below.

With the end of DFAT global programme funding for ACPIS, the donor has deemed ACPIS overall as a positive investment for the Australian taxpayer, and reporting and recording of programme activity through calendar year end 2020 suggests that ACPIS pilot activities and the broader anti-corruption community of practice nurtured consistently during the project lifetime will endure from 2021, and serve as a template for follow-on anti-corruption activity. The DFAT decision to cease funding for ACPIS and pivot towards support for other (e.g., Covid-related) projects in the Indo-Pacific region does not indicate a lack of success for UNDP anti-corruption activity. It is, rather, an indication of the profound impact the global pandemic during the final year of ACPIS implementation has had on global development assistance priorities. Likewise, and in response to the ongoing pandemic, post-ACPIS activities at least in the short-term from 2021 are likely to include a greater focus on anti-corruption in the health care sector.

It is also noteworthy that DFAT provided funding for ACPIS on a multi-year and substantial financial support basis as noted in detail later in this report. The results framework and project implementation and impact analysis described indicate that ACPIS met (or exceeded) donor expectations for a project of this size and scope. The piloting of anti-corruption activities in various countries in response to the mid-term evaluation recommendations is a particular success with best practice sharing moving forward—particularly in line with donor support from Norway (Norad) and Sweden (SIDA) from 2021 for pilot project activity in countries in Asia-Pacific and Africa.

Norad is moving toward greater support for AC activity in line with the SDGs (especially SDG-16). Norad support to AC activity over the past ten years includes a focus on AC across development assistance sectors including health care. It is also important to consider that donors may likely have funds available that were unspent in 2020 due to the restrictions on programme activity imposed by COVID-19 travel and in-person contact restrictions worldwide. Norad is therefore putting in \$2.5 million USD into AC activity as a starting point from 2021. Finally, Norad identified ACPIS as a sound and well-documented AC implementation partner in part as a result of the findings and analysis provided in the 2019 ACPIS Mid-Term Review.<sup>8</sup>

SIDA’s anti-corruption approach is similar to UNDP’s approach to integrate anti-corruption in development efforts. Like UNDP, implementing effective **anti-corruption initiatives at the country-level** is a priority for SIDA, which is adopting a holistic approach to tackling corruption as an obstacle to sustainable development and poverty reduction, by systematically integrating anti-corruption in all development areas, including localization and sectoral integration. Amid the COVID-19 pandemic, health and anti-corruption have become of great importance.

Regarding UNDP’s work focused on business integrity through the Fair Business project<sup>9</sup> centred at the UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub and implemented in various countries in the southeast Asia region, ACPIS again demonstrated the capacity to bring a relevant network of AC practitioners together—particularly during the restrictive engagement environment due to COVID-19 in 2020. In that regard, COVID-19 has encouraged ACPIS knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer through on-line webinars and Internet-based conferences. While a

---

<sup>8</sup> As conducted at calendar year end 2018 by Deveaux International Governance Consultants, Inc.

<sup>9</sup> Fair Business project implementation countries are Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam: <https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/rbap/en/home/programmes-and-initiatives/Fair-Biz.html>

terrible year for global health and socio-economic stability, 2020 was however a good year for anti-corruption best practice transfer and knowledge sharing.

In 2020, amid the COVID-19 pandemic, the ACPIS global project was flexibility and agile in adapting to the emerging challenges of the crisis by realigning its workplan, innovating in its service offering to countries, and supporting countries to integrate transparency, accountability and anti-corruption solutions in COVID-19 response and recovery.

In terms of the current consensus on effective AC practice, there needs to be more sectoral integration, more technical expertise in identifying and devising AC activities, and an awareness that national government commitment to implementing effective and impactful AC legislation and regulations is not the same as identifying instances of graft and corruption. As noted throughout this report, the SDGs (and in particular SDG-16) are a good starting point for AC policy and practice moving forward.<sup>10</sup>

The Philippines DevLIVE innovative social accountability pilot project with local authorities encouraging transparency is a good example of this and a template for replication in other countries as the pandemic wanes and UNDP AC project implementation shifts toward technology-based AC activity. AC activity with support of UNDP also worthwhile with relevant reporting and as part of a shift toward integrating anti-corruption across the UN system. In addition, the success of anti-corruption project implementation in Uzbekistan, Myanmar, Thailand, PNG, Indonesia are noted, with case studies interspersed throughout this report.

These AC activities are a substantial and positive starting point for maintaining forward momentum and can be replicated independently as desired if government and relevant market participants support looking forward as part a wider transparency and accountability agenda. The gap between practice and pilot implementation exists, and it remains to be seen if anti-corruption policies established during this period will be replicated and maintained with changes in government, personnel, institutional memory and external forces of change like the current pandemic.

Obviously, and as recognised by UNDP and other interlocutors engaged for this report, this is a starting point for accomplishing the long-term goal of minimizing graft and corruption whilst encouraging a greater degree of accountability and transparency in all public governance and private enterprise activity. ACPIS succeeded in laying the foundation for an integrated transparency, accountability and anti-corruption approach across borders and within respective national governments. The future of anti-corruption policy and practice requires increased resources - both financial and human resources - to help ensure that progress made to date as part of ACPIS implementation is maintained and from this evident baseline, additional donor resources are allocated to move all participants in the socio-economic process toward full accountability and transparency in the years ahead.

Moving forward from 2021, there will be a special session of UNGA to address corruption. Specifically, this session will follow the adoption of the December 2018 [resolution 73/191](#) entitled “Special session of the General Assembly against corruption,” to convene in the first half of 2021 to address the challenges, preventive measures and

---

<sup>10</sup> See SDG-16: “Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels” [Goal 16 | Department of Economic and Social Affairs \(un.org\)](#). Academic thinking drove this new approach. See for example Khan, M., Andreoni, A., and P. Roy (2016). Anti-corruption in adverse contexts: A strategic approach. Working Paper. London: School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS). [https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/23495/1/Anti-Corruption%20in%20Adverse%20Contexts%20\(1\).pdf](https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/23495/1/Anti-Corruption%20in%20Adverse%20Contexts%20(1).pdf)

mechanisms to strengthen international cooperation against corruption. ACPIS also contributed to the UN Common Position on Corruption which was developed in the lead up to the UNGASS 2021.<sup>11</sup>

At its [eighth session, held from 16 to 20 December 2019, in Abu Dhabi](#), the Conference considered under item 7 of its provisional agenda, as well as during a meeting held in parallel to the plenary session, the preparations for the special session, including the modalities for the preparations for and organisation of the special session of the General Assembly against corruption, proposals by member states on the structure and substantive content of the political declaration on anti-corruption to be adopted by the special session and other matters relevant to AC in public and private practice.<sup>12</sup>

Progress made by ACPIS since global programme inception is an opportunity for ongoing and meaningful anti-corruption practice integrated into all aspects of development assistance and as adopted to date by some beneficiary governments, put into practice by a number of businesses in participating countries, and pushed onto the public agenda by positive pressure from civil society actors intent on realizing a more just, equitable, and open socio-economic system from 2021.

## VI. Relevance

OECD defines the relevance evaluation criteria as:

“The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.”<sup>13</sup>

In answering this key question related to the criteria, it is important to reflect on the conclusions of the mid-term evaluation conducted in February 2019 and to review the key aspects of the design of the programme.

### Strategic Alignment

The MTE noted that the programme was originally designed during the previous UNDP Strategic Plan (SP) timeframe (2014-17) and is being concluded during the current Plan (2018-21). In both cases the programme is well-aligned with the SP. Since there have been no amendments to the programme since the MTE that conclusion remains valid.

DFAT priorities have changed and this had led to the ending of the partnership between DFAT and UNDP on AC. As noted elsewhere in this report, DFAT has determined that AC work is no longer a priority and has decided not to fund any further phases of the work of ACPIS. Those interviewed at DFAT were clear in stating that the decision is

---

<sup>11</sup>[https://ungass2021.unodc.org/uploads/ungass2021/documents/session1/contributions/UN\\_Common\\_Position\\_to\\_Address\\_Global\\_Corruption\\_Towards\\_UNGASS2021.pdf](https://ungass2021.unodc.org/uploads/ungass2021/documents/session1/contributions/UN_Common_Position_to_Address_Global_Corruption_Towards_UNGASS2021.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> Special session of the General Assembly against corruption 2021 (UNGASS 2021) (unodc.org)

<sup>13</sup> Supra Note 1 – OECD-DAC Criteria Definitions:

<https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

not an indication of their positive impression of the work of the programme, but a matter of new priorities for the organisation.

The MTE also concluded that the programme was well-aligned to the SDGs and, particularly, SDG-16 and the targets and indicators related to AC (i.e. – Targets 16.5 & 16.6).

With regard to national priorities, ACPIS is also well-aligned. First and foremost, by identifying country-level interventions based on demand and partnerships between UNDP and national governments, the programme was designed to support national priorities, as compared to imposing specific modalities on those beneficiaries. The MTE noted the example of the Philippines and their desire to decentralise infrastructure development and the need for accountability over such work. Additionally, support of global anti-corruption team in Uzbekistan, Bhutan, Armenia, Mongolia etc., where the programme responded to demand from national governments, would also be positive examples of how ACPIS works.

Particularly, the financing modality of Uzbekistan project is noteworthy in terms of designing a new phase of ACPIS, which acted not only as the vertical fund for the country level projects, but also brought global and regional expertise to implement the country level project and achieve the results.

## Context

The MTE noted that the three key areas of focus of the programme – sectoral integrity, social accountability and technical advice/capacity development to national anti-corruption agencies – were all relevant and directly linked to integrating AC into the broader governance development work. Since the MTE the areas of focus and the priorities for AC interventions within UNDP, the broader UN family and the global AC community have not changed significantly.

Considering the MTE recommendations there has been a clear indication that UNDP, and the ACPIS Programme Team in particular, have worked towards addressing many of key points from the report. For example, the new sources of funding obtained from SIDA and Norad allow for a global footprint by ACPIS, beyond the resource limitations imposed through the DFAT funding. Also, ACPIS has been placed at the centre of UNDPs development agenda as integration of AC work continues. This can also be seen in ACPISs role in technical support to UNDPs lead in UN system-wide coordination of anti-corruption work.

Likely the greatest change in the context has been the global COVID-19 Pandemic which started in March 2020. Here the pre-pandemic work of ACPIS to build partnerships in the health sector allowed for a quick pivot to strong thought pieces and training and knowledge materials that were able to be distributed in a timely manner as public health spending was significantly increased due to the pandemic.

Specifically, two knowledge products were produced that specifically addressed the impact of the pandemic on anti-corruption work.<sup>14</sup> This was part of a broader pivot by the programme that had begun prior to the pandemic to online resources, including course and webinars related to AC. ACPIS also expanded its partnership to increase

---

<sup>14</sup> Transparency, Accountability and Anti-Corruption Service Offer for COVID-19 Response and Recovery <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/anti-corruption/transparency--accountability-and-anti-corruption-service-offer-f.html> & Integrating Transparency, Accountability and Anti-Corruption in Socio-Economic Impact Analysis, Needs Assessment and Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/anti-corruption/integrating-transparency--accountability-and-anti-corruption-in-.html>



collaboration in the health sector. With the Global Fund, the World Bank and U4, UNDP has received funding from Norad to support the global coordination related to integrating AC into health sector development initiatives.

It is of note that the programme not only managed the shift in modalities and entry points, but also was able to wind down the country pilot projects that had been implemented since the start of ACPIS. The programme also was able to nurture new partnerships, including with the B20, under challenging circumstances.

## Design

The MTE noted both positives and negatives related to the design of ACPIS. The positives, including its thought leadership, its attention to inclusivity and the use of competitive selections for national pilot projects, remain integral to the work of ACPIS and are still good examples of how the programme was well designed.

As for the negative aspects of the design, some have been since been addressed while others will need to be considered as a new phase of the programme is formulated:

**Geographic Reach:** DFATs geographic focus of the Indo-Pacific Region resulted in ACPIS also having a similar focus, especially with regard to the pilot projects. Since the MTE there are some indications of a broader scope of work for the programme. ACPIS has also made significant effort in maintaining technical support to UNDP COs globally.

**Community of Practice:** A key aspect to the AC work is to share knowledge and allow for peer-to-peer exchanges amongst AC development practitioners. The MTE noted that UNDP made a global corporate decision to reduce the emphasis on internal communities of practice in 2015. Yet the need for opportunities for exchanges and sharing remains as relevant as before, as was noted by many practitioners interviewed for this report. However, with the 2020 Pandemic ACPIS was quick to shift support to UNDP AC staff online, including timely webinars and blog posts that provided pertinent information and ideas for practitioners.

**Scaling Up of Pilot Projects:** The MTE noted that there was a lack of plan for how pilot projects would be made sustainable and/or scaled up. This was not specifically resolved within the work of ACPIS, but the programme team has ensured that other related programming is working on larger scale pilot projects that will allow for further steps in institutionalising AC measures at the national level.

Therefore, it can be concluded that ACPIS' design remains a strong point for the programme. There are indications that where the design issues were "fixable" the programme team made an effort to do so as the programme was implemented. Other issues are being addressed through the formulation of other related projects and, likely, in the formulation of the next global AC programme.

The one new aspect that has arisen during this FE is the need for greater resources to allow the programme to be more comprehensive, allow for more pilot projects and able to support more AC practitioners. At the same time, there is little desire on the part of stakeholders to have a global bureaucracy or event to have the direct funding of regional and national UNDP technical advisers, as was done in previous iterations of the global programme. Instead, there is a need to design the next global programme with both the flexibility to adapt and adjust quickly to global conditions (as was seen during the 2020 Pandemic) and having access to the human and financial resources to allow for a robust and impactful response to UNDP internal and global beneficiary needs.

**Lessons Learned: Relevance**

**1.1:** Nimble, adaptive programming is critical for achieving results, but it must be coupled with sufficient resources (human; financial) to ensure global reach and impact.

**1.2:** UNDPs added value in anti-corruption work is not just as a thought leader, but as an organisation that is able to test and try new ideas and approaches and to share results with partners.

**1.3:** One of UNDPs strengths is in its technical capacity with a global reach. Yet there is a need to ensure that such capacity is supported, informed and motivated through a robust Community of Practice.

## VII. Efficiency

In considering efficiency as a development evaluation criterion, the evaluation team considered some specific measures. This starts with the cost-effectiveness of the programme in which two variables are considered – the quality of the inputs and the cost of delivering those inputs. It also includes whether or not the programme outputs were achieved. In considering these factors, it is important to also consider if the resources allocated overall for the programme were sufficient and if they changed from previous phases of the global programme.

Overall, what inputs did ACPIS use to deliver the programme and were the inputs cost-effective?

### Piloting

UNDP provides added value in the pilot modality with the intent of scaling up and replicating viable AC activities, the depth and scope of UNDP country-level presence, and the demonstrated and recognized expertise and experience of the UNDP AC staff and collaborative partners.

In the health sector, a pilot model for output-based financing should be considered which would involve testing basic models with the goal of leveraging baseline practice into longer-term reforms to determine how funding is allocated by the Global Fund longer-term.<sup>15</sup>

UNDP should engage other countries and donors proactively moving forward to ensure that pilot projects are replicated and also that funding is selective to focus limited resources on ensuring that success is preserved and reports and guides. For Norway (via Norad), there is an expressed desire to look at successful pilot projects that can be shared and replicated elsewhere. Norad's focus is at the sectoral (health, business) level with a focus on digital governance for transparency, accountability and anti-corruption that can be refined and replicated with value for money to allow scaling up and a longer-term and more broadly-based impact over time, including Nepal, Myanmar, Indonesia and certain African countries. Similarly, SIDA-supported components of ACPIS can also contribute to scaling up of initiatives by focusing on integration of anti-corruption in the SDGs.

In sum, ACPIS has already established a firm foundation to act as a springboard for follow-on activity based upon pilot projects conducted during global programme implementation, including GIZ and UK-funded AC activities in SE Asia. Anti-corruption in the business environment is a new and emerging area for UNDP engagement beyond the

---

<sup>15</sup> This approach has been championed by Bill Savedoff & Bruno Meesen. See: <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/corruption-and-development-william-savedoff>

established public sector (government) work.<sup>16</sup> This includes multiple outcomes and impacts for SDGs 5, 8, 10, 16 AC through business/corporate AC engagement, OECD activity, and these pilot activities that then evolve into ongoing, independent practice.

### **Technical advice and efficiency of practice**

In terms of efficiency of practice, the focus of UNDP AC interventions moving forward should be on practical sectoral tools rather than AC theory, and these interventions must ensure that sectoral AC efforts are objectively SMART<sup>17</sup> and in line the broader issues that exist in individual countries and globally—particularly during this pandemic period of social, economic and political upheaval. Should this sectoral focus be fully adopted, established guidelines for AC practice will need to be in line with other AC participants (e.g., UNODC, the UN system overall, external public and private sector participants). For example, health sector reform requires participation and involvement from WHO, UNDP, local Ministry of Health, et al.

The ACPIS Singapore full-time four-person office (including a secondee from ACRC), with support from collaborative UNDP governance and anti-corruption advisors and focal points in Addis Ababa, Bangkok, Istanbul, Oslo, Panama City, and Seoul, has proven their ability to identify best practices, maintain an extensive AC architecture and catalogue of institutional memory, and connect a global community of practice despite the restrictions imposed in 2020 by the pandemic. Likewise, the value for money in establishing and maintaining donor and practitioner relationships is a key factor in maintaining momentum even during periods of external challenge and a (temporary) period of follow-on funding uncertainty.

### **Partnership development**

As funding for UNDPs AC work continues to flow toward the Singapore-based global programme, it will be increasingly important to ensure that integration in AC activity is evident across the UN system and in line with the system-wide principles defined as part of the 2021 UNGA on corruption and as a practical implementation protocol within UNGASS. As noted previously, Norway and Sweden are looking to invest donor funds into successful pilot projects that can be shared, replicated and scaled up elsewhere, with SIDA focused on SDG support through ACPIS until the end of 2023, and Norway's focus on sectoral approach (health, business, public procurement) and digital governance that can be refined and replicated from 2021. Therefore, donor value for money can be described as scaling up and longer-term and more broadly-based impact over time.

The pandemic created a gap between anticipated donor funding for other activities worldwide and the actual outlay during 2020. The established relationship between a potential donor (Norway) and the Covid-inspired implementation deficit resulted in UNDP being well-positioned to move forward with anti-corruption activity in a responsive and flexible way from 2021. This includes the digitization of public service delivery and identifying and moving toward minimizing corruption in the facilitation and delivery of health services during this crisis period.

Finally, the partnership towards systemic anti-corruption work within the UN system via ACPIS and UNODC includes scrutinising the cash on hand for project expenditure between the two AC implementers, and the issue of

---

<sup>16</sup> As noted earlier in this report via the Fair Business (FairBiz) pilot project: <https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/rbap/en/home/programmes-and-initiatives/Fair-Biz.html>

<sup>17</sup> Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound programme objectives.

the 30% of technical requests flowing from UNCAC reporting by member states that have been addressed by UNODC to date.

### **Knowledge-sharing and UNDP as an anti-corruption resource hub**

The value for money evident in the UNDP ACPIS experience shows that resources matter when under the umbrella of UNDP Governance global activity. Expressed donor satisfaction with ACPIS work, specific expertise, and value for money despite limited strategic resources (especially personnel and funding) is another evident indication of the value for money inherent in UNDP's anti-corruption work moving forward.

Since the MTE in 2019, mobilized resources from Norad and SIDA are indicative of donor confidence in UNDP's anti-corruption work, and as per the MTE, it is not about providing funds without focus on technology and innovation while making sure that donor country office can join in with focused and resource-specific results-orientation in the interest of innovation.

In terms of **UNGASS**, UNDP's global governance team relies heavily on the ACPIS team for specific expertise and AC knowledge, with this input allowing for technical review and refining of the agenda for UNDP as part of this group. In addition, the UNDP AC team contributes to thought leadership in AC practice, and this is an important aspect of AC work, including UNODC and the UN Taskforce on AC.<sup>18</sup>

### **Cost-Effectiveness**

Integration of AC into various support and development efforts moving forward will result in a cost-effective allocation of resources without the need to duplicate efforts (e.g., a particular AC practice such as government transparency and public accountability) which includes government resistance to "anti-corruption" and towards more broadly-based public-sector reforms for example.

Therefore, there is to some extent extreme diplomatic caution around the core issue of AC as part of internal government and external private sector, public sector and public services corruption. Anti-corruption can then fall prey to a fine theoretical construct on paper, but not necessarily manifest as a practical and regular process for attacking the core of the issue at all levels within government and without as part of private sector activity.

---

<sup>18</sup> [UNGASS side event - finalized.pdf \(unodc.org\)](#) and [https://ungass2021.unodc.org/uploads/ungass2021/documents/session1/contributions/UN\\_Common\\_Position\\_to\\_Address\\_Global\\_Corruption\\_Towards\\_UNGASS2021.pdf](https://ungass2021.unodc.org/uploads/ungass2021/documents/session1/contributions/UN_Common_Position_to_Address_Global_Corruption_Towards_UNGASS2021.pdf) with [Special session of the General Assembly against corruption 2021 \(UNGASS 2021\) \(unodc.org\)](#)

### **Uzbekistan: A Model for Anti-Corruption Work?**

Over the past four years Uzbekistan has made significant efforts to help its people feel confident that leaders in the national public and private sectors operate in a transparent and ethical way. With the establishment of a new anti-corruption body in the country, and having advanced 5 positions in the [Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index](#) in 2019, Uzbekistan is slowly but steadily progressing in this field. The COVID-19 pandemic has taught valuable lessons about ensuring the transparency and accountability of state agencies and public expenditures, in the midst of efforts made to alleviate COVID-19's impact on vulnerable population groups.

Since the adoption of the law on anti-corruption in 2017, Uzbekistan has doubled its efforts to prevent corruption in the public sector, and has widened international cooperation to achieve this end. Namely, in 2018 the '[Preventing corruption through effective accountable and transparent governance institutions in Uzbekistan](#)' (PCEAT) project was established. This has been an enormous undertaking implemented by UNDP, with direct support from ACPIS, in which the Ministry of Justice and the General Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Uzbekistan, seeking to eliminate both the perception and existence of corruption within Uzbekistan, under the lead coordination of the Republican Inter-Agency Anti-Corruption Commission.

PCEAT, including ACPIS support for the project, was established through a dedicated fund allocated by the Government of Uzbekistan to provide technical assistance and other resources in support of the structural changes anticipated. The fund provided flexibility in how UNDP could provide support to the Government. This included webinars and the development of a policy paper on establishing anti-corruption agencies, including international best practices. It allowed for other components of UNDPs global governance to be engaged, including work by the Seoul Policy Centre. It also allowed for ACPIS to provide technical input into key legislation related to the establishment of the anti-corruption architecture in the country, including:

- The law on Anti-corruption Expertise on normative legal acts and their drafts;
- The law on declaration of income, property and conflict of interest of public servants;
- The law on the Anti-corruption Agency in Uzbekistan; and
- Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan: On additional measures to improve the anti-corruption system in the Republic of Uzbekistan

Source: <https://www.dentons.com/en/insights/articles/2020/july/2/uzbekistan-establishes-new-anti-corruption-agency> and [https://www.uz.undp.org/content/uzbekistan/en/home/stories/uzbekistan\\_s-path-in-overcoming-corruption.htm](https://www.uz.undp.org/content/uzbekistan/en/home/stories/uzbekistan_s-path-in-overcoming-corruption.htm)

### **After ACPIS from 2020**

The successor programme should focus moving forward on getting to the core of AC in practice, with a focus on how to devise viable anti-corruption strategies that can be implemented and readily-replicated moving forward so that success during ACPIS implementation will lead to a more integrated and regular AC practice at all levels without ongoing large-scale intervention and in consideration of the current restrictions imposed by COVID-19. The efficacy of past ACPIS intervention sustainability is countered by the constantly evolving temptation in the public and private sectors to fall back on graft and corruption in times of social, economic and political upheaval.

This is evident at present as the ripple effects of the pandemic negatively impact socio-economic activity and encourage bad actors to profit from the pain of others in many countries around the world.

In 2021, UNDP’s anti-corruption effort can move forward with an ACPIS-inspired better understanding of how to implement effective and impactful (and also sustainable) efforts with a focus on specific committees such as PAC in parliament, civic actors holding their elected representatives and business leaders to account on-line and via traditional media, and legislation intended to identify and prosecute those engaged in illicit and illegal activity. A carefully constructed theory of change is not necessarily a tool for getting to the core of the issue of corruption, and the conundrum remains as to how to influence power brokers and motivate other market participants toward meaningful and substantive change in daily practice despite an organizational mandate and with a political economy analysis in hand.

Why partner with UNDP on AC activity moving forward post-ACPIS from 2021?

For Norway, piloting and donor funding to certain countries and as part of bilateral engagement with other countries. These countries are important for meaningful and impactful AC activity which is noted in Nepal, Myanmar, Indonesia, and certain African countries. Also, in terms of project implementation the substantial challenge was introducing AC measures when contrary to culture of corruption (to some extent) and resistance from those participating in petty corruption to change behavior or have customary behavior changed.

**Programme Cost per Year (USD)<sup>19</sup>**

Year	Programming	Operations	Total
2016	\$400,475.96	\$ 105,818.11	\$ 506,294.07
2017	\$1,343,714.73	\$ 127,500.57	\$1,471,215.30
2018	\$1,182,546	\$213,243.78	\$1,395,790
2019 <sup>20</sup>	\$900,000	\$52,074	\$952,074
2020 <sup>21</sup>	\$450,000	\$47,110	\$497,110

Contribution received in 2016 - \$2,525,034  
 Contribution received in 2018 - \$1,285,478  
 Contribution to be received in 2019 - \$1,107,029  
**TOTAL CONTRIBUTION FROM DFAT (2016-2020): \$4,917,541**

**Outputs**

Output	Status
Output 1.1: Anti-corruption solutions integrated in service delivery systems (such as in health, education, water and infrastructure, justice and security) to mitigate corruption risks.	<b>Achieved</b>
Output 1.2: Social accountability mechanisms to monitor services and provide oversight promoted and strengthened (such as civic engagement, youth and	<b>Achieved</b>

<sup>19</sup> As extracted from the UNDP Atlas system-generated calemid-term financial reports, and as of March 5, 2019.

<sup>20</sup> Anticipated funding for 2019

<sup>21</sup> Anticipated funding for 2020

women empowerment, and the private sector participation).	
Output 2.1: UNCAC and anti-corruption integrated in national development processes, including the mainstreaming of SDGs at national and sub-national levels, to prevent and tackle corruption.	<b>On Track</b> with need for full sectoral integration moving forward from 2021
Output 2.2: Measures to prevent corruption are put in place by anti-corruption institutions.	<b>Achieved</b>
Output 3.1: Advocacy is promoted at national and sub-national levels to reinforce anti-corruption efforts.	<b>Achieved</b>
Output 3.2: Knowledge on anti-corruption is produced and shared globally, including through south-south and triangular cooperation.	<b>Achieved</b>

<b>Lessons Learned: Efficiency</b>
<b>2.1:</b> UNDP provides added value in the pilot modality with the intent of scaling up and replicating viable AC activities at the country and regional levels.
<b>2.2:</b> An added value of ACPIS is the practical tools that have been developed and applied with results at the country level.
<b>2.3:</b> Early efforts to coordinate and expand the work of the UN system with regard to anti-corruption show promise and will require even more complex partnerships with other UN agencies and the Secretariat.
<b>2.4:</b> Partnerships, when used effectively, result in the leveraging of resources and knowledge from other like-minded groups and results in better results at less cost.

## VIII. Effectiveness

In evaluating effectiveness, the final evaluation team considered the extent to which the programme has achieved its objectives. In particular, this includes determining if the objectives have been achieved or are on track to be achieved. It also means considering the major factors that will determine if the objectives will be achieved (or not). Given that this is the final review, the expectation is that these objectives have been fully achieved overall.

The following table provides a simple summary of the status of the objectives of the programme:

<i>Objective</i>	<i>Status</i>
<b>Objective 1: Integrate anti-corruption solutions in service delivery sectors, in partnership with youth, women and private sector.</b>	Achieved
<b>Objective 2: Strengthen state/institutional capacity to implement UNCAC, in particular with regard to the prevention of corruption.</b>	Achieved
<b>Objective 3: Promote knowledge and advocacy to support anti-corruption efforts, including a better understanding of the link between violent extremism and corruption.</b>	<b>Partially achieved</b> due in part to external circumstances (e.g. shift in AC focus due to COVID-19 in 2020)

Considering each objective in some detail, we can see the evidence upon which these conclusions are reached:

**Objective 1:** Integrate anti-corruption solutions in service delivery sectors, in partnership with youth, women and private sector.

This was accomplished, in part, through the gender-specific activities accomplished and reported on in periodic ACPIS reports during 2019 and 2020. Similarly, country-level work in multiple countries with the private sector through the Fair Business project provided both private sector and gender-inclusion in the AC practice process.

Women were an integral focus of ACPIS activities specifically and more generally as participants in various on-line coursework, in person conferences and trainings and community of practice in-person and remote webinars. This is noted in the number and kind of participants in the anti-corruption on-line courses conducted since the MTE and despite the pandemic in 2020:

**ACPIS project participation for women in on-line course work**

1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> edition	184 participants	41% female – 76 women
3 <sup>rd</sup> edition	145 participants	39% female – 57 women



4 <sup>th</sup> edition	151 participants	53% female – 80 women
		<b>Total 213 women</b> of 480 participants trained in 4 editions (44.4% women)

For example, at calendar year-end 2020, ACPIS focused on launching the B20 Pilot project in Thailand and Indonesia to build on work already accomplished. This included the Federation of Business and Professional Women of Thailand, with a focus on diversity and inclusion with Thai women business leaders. From January 2021, UNDP will begin mentoring and training in this regard.<sup>22</sup>

### Youth and AC at the CO level

In PNG, the CO via ACPIS participated in several anti-corruption awareness events hosted by Transparency International in Port Moresby and Eastern Highlands Province and TI fund raising walks to support the International Anti-Corruption Day. The program also partnered with Wantok Newspaper who displayed the program logo/information every week in their weekly and also held a competition for youth and women to raise anti-corruption awareness.

In Indonesia, the CO as part of ACPIS activity responded to a Presidential Decree on Anti-Corruption (mid-2018) which provided a platform for government-wide policies on AC with youth, students, CSOs, media. This strengthened the work of the joint national secretariat on corruption prevention. This included a monitoring framework for several youth-oriented CSOs and included technical expertise, dissemination of results, and data gathering by participating CSOs.

This information was then dissemination to sub-national leaders and youth groups were most impactful and effective due in large part to the enthusiasm of young people and that of the sub-national leaders (mayors, district officials et al). The CO also conducted outreach to young people for advocacy on anti-corruption through media.

---

<sup>22</sup> See GIZ/Indonesia and Gender: <https://gender-works.giz.de/competitions2018/indonesia-view-of-gender-focal-points-in-indonesia/> and UNDP/Thailand: <https://www.th.undp.org/>

### **Papua New Guinea: Phones Against Corruption Project**

Papua New Guinea has slowly developed since the establishment of its independence in 1975. It is an extremely heterogeneous society with hundreds of separate ethnic groups and languages. In 2009 the Parliament of Papua New Guinea approved the Vision 2050 development document that noted, among other things, the impact of corruption. The document went on to propose key interventions, including “Effective Leadership & Good Governance” and “Performance and Accountability” as part of the long-term plan. A good example of measures implemented to promote transparency and accountability is the adoption of amendments to the Public Finance Management Act in 2016. The amendments required all government departments/agencies and provincial administrations (departments) to establish and maintain an Internal Audit Division (IAD) to monitoring spending and budget implementation. In addition, the Department of Finance (DoF) has a role in monitoring each department’s internal auditing systems. DoF benefited from the assignment of a Secretary to the Department in 2014 who was reform-minded. This resulted in a flurry of new, innovative approaches to address corruption within the DoF, including a proposal from **UNDPs Provincial Capacity Building Programme (PCAB)**. The second phase of the UNDP Global Anti-Corruption Programme (GAIN) provided seed funding of \$50,000 USD over two years (2015-16) to develop an SMS-based system for staff of DoF to file anonymous complaints against possible cases of corruption known as **Phones Against Corruption (P@C)**. During the initial pilot phase there were impressive results:

- A total of over 30,000 SMS texts were received (each question considered a text)
- A total of 557 valid complaints in the form of SMSs were received.
- Of these 234 complaints were found to be devoid of any financial corruption.
- Of the 323 valid complaints, 131 were related to other departments.
- Of the 192 cases that related to DoF, 77 cases were identified for investigation.
- Of the 77, cases it has completed investigation of 17 cases.
- Of the 17 cases, 5 cases are in Courts and 2 convictions recorded

As the Global Anti-Corruption Programme entered its third phase (ACPIS), a **key output of the project remained the funding of pilot projects** through a call for proposals which was issued in 2016 for Asia-Pacific Country Offices. The UNDP CO in Papua New Guinea submitted a proposal for the extension of P@C to cover a broader group of Government of Papua New Guinea (GoPNG) departments. After a series of interviews and presentations ACPIS agreed to fund the new P@C Project for \$200,000 USD over two years (2018-19). The project was launched in April 2018 and is expected to continue until December 2019.

The P@C Project has a number of elements beyond what was part of the initial pilot, including:

- Beyond the \$200,000 from ACPIS, P@C has leveraged significant funding from PCAB and the GoPNG has committed One Million Kina per year over the next 5 years by way of ‘Public Investment Program (PIP) funding to support the Public Sector Audit Committee (PSAP) program and transparency through audit committee meetings.
- The P@C program was nominated by “Wantok Niuspepa”, a media stakeholder in 2018, for the International Anti-Corruption Excellence Awards under ‘innovation category’ instituted by Rule of Law and Anti-Corruption Centre (ROLACC), Doha-Qatar. The award also comes with a cash grant of USD 125,000.
- The project has built partnerships with a number of key organizations, including the Ombudsman Commission, **Transparency International Papua New Guinea**, GoPNG Internal Revenue Commission, University of Papua New Guinea, GoPNG Public Service Commission, GoPNG Customs, GoPNG Electoral Commission, and others.

### **Private Sector AC activity during ACPIS implementation**

On a regional level, ACPIS provided advisory support to the Bangkok Regional Hub's FairBiz project, which established an AC Network on business integrity to bring Asia-Pacific stakeholders together and to promote business integrity and anti-corruption becoming mainstreamed in daily business activity. This is also noted in this report through the FairBiz project, and as part of ongoing topical discussions and outreach to business interests in various participating UNDP CO projects.

In PNG, the CO focused on building and nurturing effective partnerships on a continuous basis with civil society, media, institutions in educational, cultural, sports and religious fields, private sector businesses, and NGOs/INGOs with development partnerships with PNG business interests. This was part of work with donors and development partners to positively influence PNG government institutions to enhance awareness and anti-corruption efforts at all levels of government and society.<sup>23</sup>

### **Objective 2: Strengthen state/institutional capacity to implement UNCAC, in particular with regard to the prevention of corruption.**

UNODC is the custodian of UNCAC and implements anti-corruption activities at the regional and country level to support the implementation of the Convention. More specifically, in term of technical assistance, UNODC supports states parties to the Convention in addressing gaps identified through the UNCAC review mechanism. UNDP's work in the area of anti-corruption is complementary to that of UNODC. Cooperation was formalized in 2008 with an official MoU.

UNODC and UNDP collaborated on various occasions for the implementation of UNCAC related anti-corruption activities, at the global, regional and national levels. Some of the joint or coordinated initiatives were partially or entirely funded by ACPIS.

Cooperation with UNDP at the regional and national levels is coordinated by UNODC field advisors. For example, with regard to South East Asia, the UNODC regional adviser for the region, based in Bangkok, held regular programming meetings with the UNDP anti-corruption team at the Bangkok Regional Hub, as well as meetings with UNDP teams at the country level on an ad hoc basis to ensure cooperation where possible and avoid implementation overlap.

In this regard, an initial agreement in terms of areas of anti-corruption responsibility included a division of responsibility that would provide for UNODC to focus on normative standards and UNCAC whilst UNDP via ACPIS would focus on governance and development of anti-corruption practice.

In 2019, UNDP through the Bangkok Regional Hub, continued to support countries in increasing transparency and integrity in public procurement. On 9-10 September 2019, UNDP, UNODC, Anti-Corruption Organisation of Thailand (ACT) and Khonthai Foundation jointly organised a High-level seminar on increasing transparency and integrity in public procurement in the context of the SDGs in Bangkok, Thailand. Representing **eight ASEAN countries**, senior practitioners from public procurement oversight bodies, anti-corruption agencies, national audit offices, as well as civil society and private sector, exchanged best practices on strategies and approaches to enhance integrity and accountability in public procurement in line with Article 9 of the UNCAC. The lessons learned and good practices discussed at the High-Level Seminar fed into the strategy paper 'Pathways to SDGs in ASEAN: Strategies for Creating Impact through Open and Transparent Public Procurement', which will inform policy dialogues on public procurement with stakeholders at the country level.

---

<sup>23</sup> [https://www.pg.undp.org/content/papua\\_new\\_guinea/en/home.html](https://www.pg.undp.org/content/papua_new_guinea/en/home.html)

From 11-12 June 2019, UNDP's ACPIS team and Bangkok Regional Hub's regional 'Promoting a Fair Business Environment in ASEAN' project organized the **Asia-Pacific Regional Community of Practice on Transparency, Accountability and Anti-Corruption**, the first Community of Practice meeting convened for transparency, accountability and anti-corruption in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. UNODC participated in the meeting to provide inputs into the UNDP global policy discussion.

In 2019, UNDP through Bangkok Regional Hub in cooperation with UNODC supported **Malaysia's** National Centre for Governance, Integrity and Anti-Corruption (GIACC) to review their national anti-corruption strategy in line with international best practices and standards. In January 2019, the **National Anti-Corruption Plan (NACP) (2019-23)** was launched.

To commemorate International Anti-Corruption Day on 9 December 2019 in **Myanmar**, UNDP together with UNODC supported the ACC to organise large-scale events. Parallel to the main event in Nay Pyi Taw, regional events were organized in **all 14 State and Regions**.

For ACPIS donor DFAT, Australia separately funded bilateral activity in the Pacific and much has had to be put on hold due to Covid 19. Specifically, UNDP and UNODC conducted a review of the PNG National Anti-Corruption Strategy in Port Moresby in February 2019, and this UNCAC review process for the Government of Papua New Guinea (PNG) National Anti-Corruption Strategy in 2019 led to positive pressure on the Government of PNG (GoPNG) for the establishment of ICAC<sup>24</sup> and Whistleblower<sup>25</sup> Protection bill in 2020.

In PNG, the relevant aspects of UNCAC that this programme was enabled to work in as a result of ACPIS funding can be described to mainly fall under Chapter II – Preventive Measures. Specifically, some of the contributions are:

1. Article 5 relating to preventive anti-corruption policies and practices and Article 10 relating to public reporting and Article 13 relating to participation of society – The program provided an anonymous reporting platform to not only internally within GoPNG Department of Finance but externally to other GoPNG agencies with support from ACPIS funding and which by awareness created in the media extended to private sector and civil society.
2. Article 6 relating to establishing an anti-corruption body – The program's efforts in conjunction with efforts of civil society and donor partners resulted in GoPNG passing the ICAC and Whistleblower protection bills in 2020.
3. Article 7 relating to public sector – The program partnered with GoPNG Public Service Commission (PSC) to create anti-corruption awareness and disseminate information relating to the program scaling up and rollout to other GoPNG agencies.
4. Article 8 relating to conduct of public officials and Article 9 relating to public procurement – The program initially was piloted in the GoPNG Department of Finance and was part of consultative processes in drafting the amendment to the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA) in 2016 which significantly raised the penalties for corrupt acts by GoPNG public officials and the program through ACPIS funded workshops in association with GoPNG PSC created the awareness of the PFMA amendments and the new changes as a result of new legislation in National Procurement Act and establishment of the National Procurement Commission in addition to anti-corruption practices awareness.

**Objective 3:** Promote knowledge and advocacy to support anti-corruption efforts, including a better understanding of the link between violent extremism and corruption.

As noted in various UNDP reports produced during ACPIS implementation, corruption is both a cause and consequence of deficiencies in government practices and these conditions (such as war, ongoing low-level

---

<sup>24</sup> <https://www.abc.net.au/radio-australia/programs/pacificbeat/anti-corruption-body-welcomes-passing-of-png-icac-bill/12879908>

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.thenational.com.pg/whistleblower-act-passed/>

conflict and socio-economic disruption) may create or sustain conditions that could fuel violent extremism. For example, evidence from ACPIS implementing partner Transparency International indicates that the countries with the lowest score on the Corruption Perception Index are often those at war or in internal conflict.<sup>26</sup>

A report produced during ACPIS implementation on this topic describes the process by which countries that fail to control corruption tend to witness a greater number of incidents linked to violent extremism.<sup>27</sup> Building on this work, ACPIS supported the implementation of the UNDP Indonesia country programme. That country programme targets anti-corruption (SDG 16.5) and accountability (SDG 16.6), it is hoped that it can contribute to efficiencies that can lead to enhancing the quality and effectiveness of delivery of public services that can contribute to achieving targets/indicators that fall under many other SDGs.

At the conclusion of ACPIS programme implementation and given the persistence of corruption and violent conflict exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, there is evident need for this programme objective to persist in UNDP’s anti-corruption work moving forward from 2021.

<b>Lessons Learned: Effectiveness</b>
<b>3.1:</b> When effort is made to ensure women are an integral focus of ACPIS activities there are indications that there is a higher rate of participation and engagement.
<b>3.2:</b> Strategic interventions in support of national anti-corruption systems, when coupled with other interventions, such as social accountability, can deliver significant results.
<b>3.3:</b> Effective and impactful interventions that help reduce conditions of conflict reduce instances of violent extremism and help reduce the conditions rife for corruption. A reduction in conflict results in a reduction in corruption over time.

## IX. Sustainability

When considering the sustainability criterion, the evaluation team must look at whether or not the results or benefits of the programme will last beyond the interventions and resources of the programme. This will include two levels of sustainability – within UNDP and at the national level.

### UNDP Level

<sup>26</sup> TI CPI (2017): <https://www.transparency.org/en/news/corruption-perceptions-index-2017#research>  
<sup>2727</sup> Anga Timilsina and Jidi Okeke: <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/blog/2018/Reducing-Corruption-could-help-Prevent-Violent-Extremism.html>

Sustainability is an important question, and in terms of ACPIS implementation, where has ACPIS contributed to sustainable AC capacity and knowledge? As such, organisational change and change management issues of import and fundamental considerations in international development work moving forward.

To start, people matter in development and trust and personal relationships are very important in terms of sustainability of practice. Those who have worked at the national, regional and global level within the UNDP global architecture and who have directly engaged in AC projects and activities with external public and private sector participants are key to the sustainability of the ongoing and incremental process of embedding anti-corruption in everyday practice. UNDP has institutional memory and its people with specific expertise are vital in the process.

In Indonesia, sustainability for UNDP and AC is basically in line with key ministry priorities (MOP, MOHA, AC Commission et al). Similarly, ACPIS' support is also in line with mainstreaming human resources, business integrity and human development priorities. Although the projects are different, they are in line with UNDP and UK (business integrity) and EU (business and human rights) priorities. Therefore, in Indonesia, the foundation for sustainability in AC practices is coming into place. This projects are also in line with **SDGs (16)**, and of course this is of importance when countering violent extremism and terrorism and institutional strengthening with AC as an integral component of government transparency and integrity.

By providing timely, high-quality technical support and seed funding to COs, ACPIS has nurtured country-level AC capacity. In some cases, such as Myanmar, this support has been leveraged into AC projects and full-time capacity within the CO and project teams for ongoing AC technical interventions.

### **National Level**

At the national level, how has ACPIS contributed to national AC capacity that is sustainable?

To start, it is important to note sustainability that was identified during the MTE. The pilot projects that were conducted in a number of Asia-Pacific countries have resulted in longer-term projects or programmes that, in some cases, have been fully absorbed by national government apparatus. In PNG the Phones Against Corruption pilot project became a Ministry of Finance programme when the pilot ended. In the Philippines the DevLive app that was developed through the ACPIS pilot project was quickly adapted by the Government of the Philippines to be used to verify the delivery of school equipment to remote communities.

In both Indonesia and Thailand there are examples of national level AC activity that is likely to prove sustainable. A pilot project for diversity and inclusion with Thai women business leaders includes GIZ focus on business interests globally and sustainability of AC practice at the national and regional levels.

In Indonesia with ACPIS-funding, UNDP partnered with the Alliance for Integrity (GIZ) to include sustainable AC practices from January 2021, and UNDP will begin mentoring and training in this regard toward the goal of independent and sustainable AC practice. To that end, AC engagement at the national level is implemented with an eye toward sustainability, through 3 major components for the SPEC (strengthening prevention elimination of corruption) Project supported by ACPIS. These are:

- 1) Dissemination of a new policy on sustainable corruption prevention (4Q 2016) which preceded ACPIS;
- 2) Strengthening institutional arrangement of AC policies during ACPIS implementation, and;
- 3) Monitoring framework for new policies toward sustainable AC practice from 2021

<b>Lessons Learned: Sustainability</b>
<b>4.1:</b> At the UNDP level, timely, high-quality interventions with seed funding and technical advice have resulted in expended country office capacity.
<b>4.2:</b> At the national level, building trusted relationship that create results is benefited from country-level direct engagement through UNDP COs on a regular basis.
<b>4.3:</b> South-South and Peer-to-Peer technical support to national beneficiaries, brokered by ACPIS, have shown significant results.

## **X. Impact**

In considering impact as an evaluation criterion, the evaluation team must determine if there have been concrete, institutionalized achievements beyond the scope of the work of ACPIS, as a result of ACPIS interventions (e.g. – new legislation; new institutions; new relationships)?

In the 2019 MTE it was noted that ACPIS interventions resulted in a change in policy by the Government of Thailand related to AC training as part of post-secondary school curricula. The adoption of a tertiary school anti-corruption curriculum was a direct result of the work of ACPIS through its pilot projects and technical support to the Government.

Since the MTE the work in support of the Government of PNG through the ACPIS-funded pilot project has had an impact on the legal framework of PNG. In 2020, in part due to the work of the UNDP Country Office (with support from ACPIS) and civil society, the Parliament adopted unanimously the legislation establishing the Independent Commission on Anti-Corruption. The Parliament adopted the country’s first Whistleblower Act.

In Myanmar, again as part of support to the UNDP Country Office, ACPIS supported the development of the Anti-Corruption Risk Assessment template that is being applied by the Government in a number of key ministries. The recent political turmoil in that country does not diminish the fact that the elected Government prior to 2021 had been in the process of implementing a government-wide approach to integrating anti-corruption into key aspects of its work. This could also be seen in the support from SIDA to designate Myanmar a pilot country for further integration support.

In Uzbekistan, ACPIS support to the PCEAT project was integral in establishing the legal framework for the anti-corruption system in the country. This included timely, high-quality interventions and inputs into key legislation that established such a system.

<b>Lessons Learned: Impact</b>
<b>5.1:</b> Where ACPIS builds trusted relationships and leverages partnerships it has proven to be able to have a direct impact on national beneficiary decisions.

*implemented in 2017 and 2018, included provisions to improve awareness and integrity among young people regarding corruption through new tertiary anti-corruption education curriculum and strengthening of the Thai Youth Anti-Corruption network while highlighting and enhancing AC awareness through an existing anti-corruption mobile app and funded its retooling as a simple game that could be targeted at youth to learn about corruption through “gamification” of anti-corruption awareness in November 2018.*

## **XI. Gender Equality & Inclusiveness**

Gender equality and inclusivity is not one of the five OECD-DAC standard evaluation criteria, yet given that one of the main objectives of the global programme is inclusivity, it makes sense to include it as a criterion. In addition, in many development evaluations it has become an additional and important criterion for evaluation. As noted throughout this report, gender (like anti-corruption work itself) is becoming increasingly mainstreamed as part of all aspects of development assistance and not a unique or distinct intervention. In considering these criteria, the evaluation team will measure the efforts made to (i) target interventions for women and other marginalised groups; and (ii) mainstream women and marginalised groups into all activities and outputs.

### **Gender**

**Anti-corruption, gender equality and women’s empowerment.** The ACPIS project has built on the work of previous global programmes in this field which initiated key interventions, including knowledge products and pilot projects. ACPIS was the first to develop and implement dedicated online courses related to the intersection of gender equality and anti-corruption efforts. This can be seen in a dedicated course<sup>28</sup> and in a module that is part of a broader course on SDGs and anti-corruption.<sup>29</sup>

ACPIS also supported country-level advocacy campaigns connected to the International Anti-Corruption Day (09 December). It also has provided technical advice to UNDP projects with dedicated outcomes related to gender equality and anti-corruption that are being implemented in eleven countries globally.

**Women and private sector.** The Fair Business (FairBiz.org) project was engaged during the latter half of the ACPIS implementation period via the UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub (BRH) as a long-term partner in combatting global corruption. Private sector companies were invited to form the Fairbiz Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG). The FairBiz project adopts a multi-stakeholder approach (including women and youth) in promoting business integrity and encourage responsible business practices—across five platforms (ESG, supply chain, procurement, youth, D&I/gender).

The gender aspect of AC work is also very important and should be included in any future AC activity at a local or regional level from 2021. Corruption is an issue with an evident and important gender component to consider.

<sup>28</sup> [https://anti-corruption.org/UNDP\\_Anticorruption\\_Gender2015\\_WBT\\_100516/story.html](https://anti-corruption.org/UNDP_Anticorruption_Gender2015_WBT_100516/story.html)

<sup>29</sup> <https://www.unssc.org/courses/anti-corruption-context-2030-agenda-november-december-2020/>





UNDP participated in training with the B20 to pilot anti-corruption project activities in Thailand and Indonesia in 2020. Whilst the B20 does not have funds to dedicate to such training, there is an intent to do so as a joint effort in 2021, and B20 corporate members can contribute funds to conduct training in this fashion. ACPIS proposal for doing this includes private firms such as Siemens which already conducts training for suppliers, women entrepreneurs, and SMEs.<sup>30</sup>

At present, UNDP is working diligently to launch the B20 Pilot project in Thailand and Indonesia building on work already accomplished there. The Federation of Business and Professional Women of Thailand is one example.<sup>31</sup>

### Youth

As noted in the MTE, in Papua New Guinea, the CO under ACPIS also partnered with Wantok Newspaper who displayed the program logo/information every week in their weekly and also held a competition for youth and women to raise anti-corruption awareness.

The Indonesia CO under ACPIS responded to a Presidential Decree on Anti-Corruption (mid-2018) which provided a platform for government-wide policies on AC with youth, students, CSOs, and media participation. The dissemination to the sub-national leaders and youth groups were most impactful and effective due in large part to the enthusiasm and for sub-national leaders (mayors, districts et al) difficult to have presidential decree from the top which then trickles down for meaningful action at all lower levels. This project received \$200k for 2017-2019 in funding, with donor support for anti-corruption efforts targeting youth in the country.

COVID-19 has brought the issue to the fore including health care, service delivery and the necessary momentum for social accountability, public procurement, data collection and use, and the need to effectively **mobilize young people moving forward.**

<sup>30</sup> On June 19, 2008, the World Bank Institute presented the guideline "Fighting Corruption Through Collective Action" in London. The guide has been created to help companies fight back against the insidious impacts of corruption. See: Siemens, Inc and anti-corruption efforts at <https://new.siemens.com/global/en/company/sustainability/compliance/collective-action/fighting-corruption.html>

<sup>31</sup> See for example: U4 and AC topics Women and Gender: <https://www.u4.no/topics/gender/basics> and Corruption and gender: Women and men affected differently by corruption, but no evidence women or men are less corruptible <https://www.unodc.org/lpo-brazil/en/frontpage/2019/12/corruption-and-gender-women-and-men-affected-differently-by-corruption-but-no-evidence-women-or-men-are-less-corruptible.html>

### Civic Activity

The Indonesia CO engaged CSOs in conducting AC monitoring and the Secretariat has been established with a framework in place for carrying on post-ACPIS. This is intended to strengthen the work of the joint national secretariat on corruption prevention. Initially, the Secretariat was in search of resources but by 2018, significant funds were allocated and the Secretariat also requested money from donors (including the UNDP CO) to allow CSOs to independently monitor AC efforts. The monitoring framework includes three CSOs and support for technical expertise, dissemination of results, and data gathering by CSOs. This effort has proven effective at the national level and is therefore an important template for follow-on work at sub-national levels.

Lessons Learned: Gender Equality & Inclusiveness
<p><b>6.1:</b> Targeted interventions and activities aimed at women, youth and other marginalised groups have shown that such efforts can have an impact on results.</p>
<p><b>6.2:</b> CSOs are a vital demand-side element of effective and responsive government and in particular, CSOs can hold elected officials and government functionaries to account at all levels and as part of a comprehensive anti-corruption implementation strategy.</p>

### XII.

### XIII. COVID-19 and anti-corruption activity during a pandemic

“The leadership of the G20 in the global fight against corruption is needed now more than ever as we join forces to recover better from the COVID-19 crisis, and to get the world back on track to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. The G20’s high-level commitment is being reinforced by concrete action with the Riyadh Initiative for Enhancing International Anti-Corruption Law Enforcement, and with Saudi Arabia’s funding pledge of 10 million dollars over the next five years. This much-needed initiative will launch a Vienna-based, global network for anti-corruption law enforcement authorities to enhance informal cooperation through regular meetings; an online hub and secure communication platform; and knowledge- and capacity-building programmes and tools...”<sup>32</sup>

Recognizing the importance of anti-corruption amid the COVID-19 pandemic, the UN Global Task Force on Corruption designated UNDP as the lead, together with UNODC, to develop a methodology and training modules on integrating anti-corruption in COVID-19 response and recovery. UNDP also contributed to the **UN Common Position on Corruption** which was developed in the lead up to the UNGASS 2021.

Specifically related to the need to respond to the pandemic and its implications for governance and, more specifically, the exposure to corrupt practices as the world invested in massive government procurement, ACPIS provided a rapid response for the need for knowledge and information with a series of interventions. These included webinars, guidance notes, trainings, and modules on how to intergrade anti-corruption practices into pandemic activities. In 2020, ACPIS also conducted trainings for nearly 300 practitioners working in the development field, public service and the private sector on SDG implementation through the lens of anti-corruption.

<sup>32</sup> [G20anticorruption-221020 \(unodc.org\)](https://www.unodc.org/g20anticorruption-221020)

ACPIS expanded its partnership and collaboration with the Global Fund, WHO and the World Bank in global coordination of integration of anti-corruption principles into the health sector. This included a series of blogposts that were a timely response to the demand for information.<sup>33</sup> ACPIS also collaborated with the UNDP health team to conduct an e-discussion **COVID-19: Promoting accountability and transparency during the pandemic**.

In addition, technology for engagement (webinars, teleworking), access to information, citizen engagement in observing and reporting on instances of corruption at the grassroots level (health care, business, government corruption) and the increasing import of digitizing data and utilizing data for information processing and tracking purposes rose to the fore in response to the pandemic.

UNDP also strengthened its AC Community of Practice in the emerging context to align its global, regional and country-level priorities. COVID-19 has accelerated the incorporation of new technology in daily engagement while encouraging knowledge sharing and transfer through on-line webinars, remote learning, and on-line platform interaction. ACPIS also produced two knowledge products in 2020 to reflect the shift in priorities as a result of the Pandemic.<sup>34 35</sup>

Finally, data from ACPIS has shown that the pivot to a greater use of online courses related to AC capacity development has resulted in a notable increase in the number of women participating in such courses. For example, the percentage of women taking the AC-SDGs online course developed by UNDP ACPIS and UNSSC was less than 50% in 2019, but jumped to over 61% of participants in 2020. The flexibility afforded by online courses, including the ability to take the courses without having to travel, has resulted in more women having access and participating in the work.

Without a global economic recovery until the end of the pandemic, finding donor support might also become challenging at the UNDP country office level and indeed more broadly depending upon how rapidly and effectively the world's population can be efficiently and safely vaccinated.

<b>Lessons Learned: COVID-19 and AC activity during a pandemic</b>
<b>7.1:</b> The COVID-19 pandemic has presented a unique set of political and socio-economic challenges for all participants in the global development process, and effective response includes identifying and utilizing new tools for engagement, outreach, and ongoing anti-corruption practice at all levels.
<b>7.2:</b> A rapid shift in programme modalities can have unexpected consequences, including some that are positive, but it requires close monitoring to manage such a transition effectively.

<sup>33</sup> For example, see: <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/blog/2020/promoting-accountability-and-transparency-during-covid-19.html>

<sup>34</sup> Integrating Transparency, Accountability and Anti-Corruption into Social-Economic Impact Analyses - <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/anti-corruption/integrating-transparency--accountability-and-anti-corruption-in-.html>

<sup>35</sup> Transparency, Accountability and Anti-Corruption Service Offer for COVID-19 Response and Recovery - <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/anti-corruption/transparency--accountability-and-anti-corruption-service-offer-f.html>

#### **XIV. Partnerships**

A key criterion is to measure how well the global programme used networks and built partnerships to deliver results. This is noted in particular during the final evaluation process through:

- Improved relationship between UNODC and UNDP due in large part to ACPIS team effort
- Established network which includes World Bank and B20
- ACPIS team recognized for expertise within UN system and externally (e.g., acting as an advisor to Uzbek PM on anti-corruption)

As noted in the ACPIS mid-term evaluation, ACPIS had developed solid partnerships with key AC actors, including Transparency International. The ACPIS partnership with TI is long-standing and mutually-beneficial and that partnership has continued during the latter half of ACPIS programme implementation since.

At the country and regional levels, anti-corruption activity with new partners in AC practice implementation include CO projects in Viet Nam and Thailand (GIZ), along with innovative partnerships engaging the business community (FairBiz) and global economic and corporate interests (G20; World Bank). The mid-term partnership in PNG has been maintained and strengthened, with aspects evident in the regional engagement through the Bangkok Regional Hub.

In the health care sector and reflecting on the COVID-19 response, ACPIS has begun engagement with the WHO and the Global Fund and, in that regard, post-ACPIS implementation will likely include a focus on how to prevent corruption in the manufacture, distribution and front-line health care worker interaction with patients for scheduling, delivery and distribution of vaccines from 2021.

Likewise, the partnership with UNDP's Seoul Policy Center and the Republic of Korea's ACRC has shown the ability for ACPIS to "open the door" in engaging national ACAs and for the ACRC to provide further support afterwards and for the UNDPs Seoul Policy Centre for Global Development Partnership<sup>36</sup> to act as an "anti-corruption clearing house" to collect and disseminate anti-corruption best practices.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> [http://www.undp.org/content/seoul\\_policy\\_center/en/home.html](http://www.undp.org/content/seoul_policy_center/en/home.html)

<sup>37</sup> For example, please see "Delegation from Iraq Commission of Integrity meets Korean experts to share Korea's anti-corruption policy tools": [http://www.undp.org/content/seoul\\_policy\\_center/en/home/presscenter/articles/2018/Korean-anti-corruption-policy-tools-shared-with-Iraq.html](http://www.undp.org/content/seoul_policy_center/en/home/presscenter/articles/2018/Korean-anti-corruption-policy-tools-shared-with-Iraq.html)

***Mongolia and Innovative Health Care Anti-Corruption Practice***

In June 2013, the UN Secretary General established the United Nations Interagency Task Force on the Prevention and Control of Non-communicable Diseases (NCDs) at the request of ECOSOC. The Task Force is led by the World Health Organization (WHO), and the work of the Task Force is meant to support implementation of SDG 3: *Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages, with particular focus on NCD-related targets*. To that end, an institutional and contextual analysis was conducted in Mongolia as an integral part of the Second Joint Mission of the United Nations Interagency Task Force on the Prevention of Control of NCDs, focusing on SDG Target 3.4 (By 2030 reduce by one-third pre-mature mortality from non-communicable diseases) through prevention and treatment, and promote mental health and wellbeing.

In terms of anti-corruption in the Mongolian health care sector, corruption is a major issue undermining efficiency in health care delivery. Two health ministers have been dismissed in the past because of corruption related issues and two health secretaries were prosecuted in corruption cases. The integrity assessment by the anti-corruption agency of Mongolia shows that health was one of top three sectors in terms of corruption and gaps in integrity. The Transparency International Global Corruption Barometer 2013 also points out that about 71% of Mongolian people view health sector as “corrupt or most corrupt”. During the interviews with TI and other stakeholders, procurement was cited as one of the major problems in the health sector in addition to the constant turn-over of management and staff, including four Ministers of Health in four years.

The Anti-corruption Agency of Mongolia lacks resources and suffers from political interference. This has undermined its capacity to address corruption issues in the health sector. Strengthening integrity, transparency and accountability within the Health sector and also promoting monitoring of services by the Anti-corruption Agency, civil society, media and communities (with the use of ICTs) should be a key priority for the new Government. This should be done, inter alia, through a strict application of the newly approved “Glass Budget Law”, providing adequate resources and independence for audits to be carried out, and ensuring the political independence of the Anti-corruption Agency.

*Sources: Institutional and Context Analysis: NCD Prevention and Control in Mongolia by Claudia Melim-McLeod (PDF/November 28, 2016) and Transparency International/Mongolia: <https://www.transparency.org/en/countries/mongolia#>*

Overall, **ACPIS has maintained and strengthened partnerships** established at programme inception, noted specifically in the Mid-term Evaluation, and confirmed as part of this final evaluation review process. This is due in no small part to the dedication and diligence of the ACPIS team working toward maintaining existing partnerships and seeking new partners to identify and combat corruption in step with the changing global situation.

**Lessons Learned: Partnerships**

**8.1:** ACPIS has developed diverse, effective, synergistic and sustainable AC implementation partnerships with organisations such as TI, WHO, the World Bank and the Global Fund which have allowed for greater penetration and leveraging of other skill sets to achieve better results for the programme.

**8.2:** UNDPs ability to act as a convener and thought leader in AC is important when identifying and establishing new partnerships in innovative areas such as health care (WHO), business (G20), and UN systemic response to corruption (UNGASS, UNODC/UNCAC).

## **XV. Innovation**

In addition to the other criteria analysed above, it is important to also consider how ACPIS promoted **innovation** with regard to its approach to addressing anti-corruption. To a great extent the work of ACPIS, as with the previous phases of the global programme, has been focused on promoting innovation. Indeed, it could be argued that innovation is one the core objectives of a UNDP global programme.

In particular, ACPIS was able to promote innovation both in terms of the use of technology and in new thinking in the field of anti-corruption development. These two aspects of their work can be seen through two concrete examples:

- **Technology & Innovation:** ACPIS funded pilot projects that were focused on the use of technology to promote social accountability. In the Philippines this was the DevLIVE mobile app. In PNG it was Phones Against Corruption. In both cases the projects were successful in establishing new forms of accountability through new technology.
- **Innovative Thinking:** This can be seen in ACPIS's work in promoting integrity as a core means of establishing anti-corruption systems in a country. As noted elsewhere in this report, ACPIS has led the global thinking on this approach and has piloted it in certain countries, such as Bhutan, where support was provided to sectoral integrity development (i.e. – youth; private sector).
- **Innovation in monitoring, reporting on and reducing corruption:** engagement with national governments on identifying and reducing health care fraud and corruption particularly as a result of Covid 19 in 2020.

In PNG for example, the anonymous reporting platform that the program provided has received good support from all the Audit Committee agencies. The awareness created by the program and the publicity received in the media enabled even the general public to use the platform to report cases. While in pilot state from 2014 to 2017 the program received a total of 567 cases, post ACPIS scale-up and rollout to ACM agencies since 2018 from the several SMSs the program received, it was able to record 378 cases in 2018, 252 cases in 2019 and despite covid19 impact hindering program activities, 63 cases up to September in 2020. The partnership with the Audit Committee Agencies has enabled the Department of Finance to forward 121 cases to them for undertaking necessary investigations at their end.

The program was also globally recognized for its efforts with GovInsider innovation award for best citizen engagement in Singapore in 2016 and the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sheikh Tamim Bin Hamad Al Thani International Anti-Corruption Excellence (ACE) by the Rule of Law and Anti-Corruption Centre (ROLACC) in Doha, Qatar in 2018. The ROLACC award also came with a cash award of USD 125,000 which helped the program to identify 40 GoPNG internal auditors from various GoPNG ACM agencies to pursue Certified Fraud Examiner training and certification program from ACE USA.

Because of the UNDP mandate and AC work, donors are recognising the need for machinery at the global level and the identification and promotion of **innovative tools** should be a main focus, including citizen voice, civic engagement and accountability through IT technology with improved service delivery whilst legally requiring accountability from government (and front-line government service providers) to citizens and in response to citizen monitoring and reporting on instances of petty corruption. This will allow AC work to leap frog into the future rather than continue on as an incremental process whilst allowing UNDP's innovative AC work to keep pace with unfortunate innovation in institutional and individual graft and corruption.

Since the MTE, ACPIS mobilized resources from Norway and SIDA for AC work. As per the MTE, it is not about providing funds without focus on technology and innovation while making sure that donor country office can join in on pilot project efforts and with focused and resource-specific results-orientation in the interest of best practice innovation.

For example, the Myanmar CO had, until recent political turmoil, an ongoing public awareness raising campaign launched collaboratively with the Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC), which started with a video produced under ACPIS in 2017.<sup>38</sup>

<b>Lessons Learned: Innovation</b>
<b>9.1:</b> ACPIS funded pilot projects that were focused on the use of technology to promote social accountability and in utilizing technology in innovative ways (e.g. webinars, on-line courses, distance learning) in response to the pandemic.
<b>9.2:</b> Innovation and innovative tools should be a main pillar and focus for future work globally by UNDP, including citizen voice, civic engagement and accountability through IT technology with improved service delivery whilst legally requiring accountability from government

---

<sup>38</sup> See AC-day video: [https://web.facebook.com/watch/?ref=saved&v=710647756233713&\\_rdc=1&\\_rdr](https://web.facebook.com/watch/?ref=saved&v=710647756233713&_rdc=1&_rdr) and AC media campaign Tetnyiletnyi (Hand in Hand in English) Facebook Page, 8 messages per month are posted and produced videos as well: <https://www.facebook.com/tetnyiletnyi> There is also ongoing dissemination on radio and TV stations, and 8 webisodes are currently being developed.

## XVI. ACPIS AS A LEADER IN ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE

As noted in the MTE:

“Given the work of UNDP and, in particular, its global programme on anti-corruption, over the past 12 years, we can now see the value and position of UNDP in its work in support of anti-corruption development. There are other global organisations that work in this field – TI and UNODC are the most well-known of these – and so it is important to consider what is the added value of UNDP in this field. From the work conducted during the MTE and this FE, it is clear that UNDP does provide an added value.”<sup>39</sup>

Two years hence from the MTE and UNDP has maintained its added value status by continuing to deliver unique quality and services in the field of anti-corruption. However, as ACPIS draws to a close there are at least two other key components of the work in this field that have been identified.

Looking first at those components that were identified in the MTE and are still valid, we see the following:

- Thought Leadership: New and innovative ways to identify and analyse new approaches to anti-corruption work are a hallmark of the programme;
- Anti-Corruption Mainstreaming: ACPIS has worked effectively at integrating AC work into the broader development agenda, both within UNDP and the broader community;
- Innovation: The testing and piloting of new ICT tools to support social accountability and more transparent government services have shown promise with regard to results;
- Upstream Support: ACPIS is working at the strategic level to provide partners and national government beneficiaries with high-level technical advice and using its skills of knowledge brokering, facilitation and technical expertise to provide high-quality, timely advice;
- Partnership Management: ACPIS is uniquely positioned to establish and maintain a network of AC stakeholders that is second-to-none in the global discussion on the fight against corruption. This has now been expanded with newer partners, such as CSOs (e.g. – B20) and multilateral organisations (e.g. – G20).

In addition to these skills or capacity that were already identified in the MTE, there are new capacities that can be identified that also provided added value to the work of UNDP through ACPIS.

- Incubator: ACPIS has used its limited funds to support innovative small-scale projects that have shown significant results. This funding is highly impactful and is the “glue” that holds together the other capacities and allows ACPIS to incubate and promote new methods of fighting corruption and promoting integrity.
- Knowledge Broker: ACPIS is at the centre of multiple networks and discussions related to AC and development. These are based on the capacity of the programme to leverage partnerships for new knowledge and critical collaboration.



**Lessons Learned: UNDP Thematic Leadership**

**10.1:** Being open to new partnerships while having sufficient funding to test and try new approaches to their work allows ACPIS to overreach with regard to results while maintaining a small footprint.

## XVII. LESSONS LEARNED

<b>Lessons Learned: Relevance</b>
<b>1.1:</b> Nimble, adaptive programming is critical for achieving results, but it must be coupled with sufficient resources (human; financial) to ensure global reach and impact.
<b>1.2:</b> UNDPs added value in anti-corruption work is not just as a thought leader, but as an organisation that is able to test and try new ideas and approaches and to share results with partners.
<b>1.3:</b> One of UNDPs strengths is in its technical capacity with a global reach. Yet there is a need to ensure that such capacity is supported, informed and motivated through a robust Community of Practice.
<b>Lessons Learned: Efficiency</b>
<b>2.1:</b> UNDP provides added value in the pilot modality with the intent of scaling up and replicating viable AC activities at the country and regional levels.
<b>2.2:</b> An added value of ACPIS is the practical tools that have been developed and applied with results at the country level.
<b>2.3:</b> Early efforts to coordinate and expand the work of the UN system with regard to anti0-corruption show promise and will require even more complex partnerships with other UN agencies and the Secretariat.
<b>2.4:</b> Partnerships, when used effectively, result in the leveraging of resources and knowledge from other like-minded groups and results in better results at less cost.
<b>Lessons Learned: Effectiveness</b>
<b>3.1:</b> When effort is made to ensure women are an integral focus of ACPIS activities there are indications that there is a higher rate of participation and engagement.
<b>3.2:</b> Strategic interventions in support of national anti-corruption systems, when coupled with other interventions, such as social accountability, can deliver significant results.
<b>3.3:</b> Effective and impactful interventions that help reduce conditions of conflict reduce instances of violent extremism and help reduce the conditions rife for corruption. A reduction in conflict results in a reduction in corruption over time.
<b>Lessons Learned: Sustainability</b>
<b>4.1:</b> At the UNDP level, timely, high-quality interventions with seed funding and technical advice have resulted in expended country office capacity.
<b>4.2:</b> At the national level, building trusted relationship that create results is benefited from country-level direct engagement through UNDP COs on a regular basis.
<b>4.3:</b> South-South and Peer-to-Peer technical support to national beneficiaries, brokered by ACPIS, have shown significant results.

<b>Lessons Learned: Impact</b>
<b>5.1:</b> Where ACPIS builds trusted relationships and leverages partnerships it has proven to be able to have a direct impact on national beneficiary decisions.
<b>Lessons Learned: Gender Equality &amp; Inclusiveness</b>
<b>6.1:</b> Targeted interventions and activities aimed at women, youth and other marginalised groups have shown that such efforts can have an impact on results.
<b>6.2:</b> CSOs are a vital demand-side element of effective and responsive government and in particular, CSOs can hold elected officials and government functionaries to account at all levels and as part of a comprehensive anti-corruption implementation strategy.
<b>Lessons Learned: COVID-19 and AC activity during a pandemic</b>
<b>7.1:</b> The COVID-19 pandemic has presented a unique set of political and socio-economic challenges for all participants in the global development process, and effective response includes identifying and utilizing new tools for engagement, outreach, and ongoing anti-corruption practice at all levels.
<b>7.2:</b> A rapid shift in programme modalities can have unexpected consequences, including some that are positive, but it requires close monitoring to manage such a transition effectively.
<b>Lessons Learned: Partnerships</b>
<b>8.1:</b> ACPIS has developed diverse, effective, synergistic and sustainable AC implementation partnerships with organisations such as TI, WHO, the World Bank and the Global Fund which have allowed for greater penetration and leveraging of other skill sets to achieve better results for the programme.
<b>8.2:</b> UNDPs ability to act as a convener and thought leader in AC is important when identifying and establishing new partnerships in innovative areas such as health care (WHO), business (G20), and UN systemic response to corruption (UNGASS, UNODC/UNCAC).
<b>Lessons Learned: Innovation</b>
<b>9.1:</b> ACPIS funded pilot projects that were focused on the use of technology to promote social accountability and in utilizing technology in innovative ways (e.g. webinars, on-line courses, distance learning) in response to the pandemic.
<b>9.2:</b> Innovation and innovative tools should be a main pillar and focus for future work globally by UNDP, including citizen voice, civic engagement and accountability through IT technology with improved service delivery whilst legally requiring accountability from government
<b>Lessons Learned: UNDP Thematic Leadership</b>
<b>10.1:</b> Being open to new partnerships while having sufficient funding to test and try new approaches to their work allows ACPIS to overreach with regard to results while maintaining a small footprint.



## XVIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and analysis conducted for this final evaluation, the following are the recommendations of the Evaluation Team with regard to possible future work by UNDP at the global level as it relates to anti-corruption:

### **High Priority**

- **Recommendation: Establish a Global Integrity Fund, managed by UNDP, that will be a facility for supporting innovative ideas on integration of anti-corruption into development objectives and SDG implementation.**

Similar in concept to the Global Environment Fund, REDD+ or the Global Climate Fund, anti-corruption, as a field, requires a well-funded facility that will support national and regional initiatives that promote the integration of integrity and anti-corruption into all aspects of development work and the current efforts to implement and achieve the SDGs. Such a fund would allow for the best elements of ACPIS – high quality technical capacity, thought leadership, knowledge brokering, pilot projects, nimble/adaptive programming – with the limited architecture and financial resources that can transform how anti-corruption is considered in an integrated manner for development. **MEDIUM-TERM**

- **Recommendation: Continue to identify cutting edge ideas and approaches to anti-corruption work that can be piloted for real world application, but with the intent of identifying those that can be scaled up/replicated**

ACPIS did significant work in testing the use of technology and sectoral support to anti-corruption and integrity. This work should continue, but should be based on identifying and promoting new methods or ideas related to the next stages of anti-corruption work. This should also include a clear plan and sufficient resources to ensure the piloted projects are evaluated and promoted for replication or scaling up. This may require pilot projects that require more resources than were made available for pilots under ACPIS.

**IMMEDIATE**

- **Recommendation: Invest in a robust UNDP internal Community of Practice to support, inform and link anti-corruption expertise within the organisation**

Communities of practice have previously been perceived as costly and less than optimal with regard to results, but post-pandemic there is the opportunity to redefine the concept based on multi-faceted approach and the use of different tools, including digital ones, to ensure UNDPs technical experts in the field of anti-corruption at the global, regional and country levels are well-connected and able to access the new knowledge being generated globally by UNDP. As staff have adapted to more remote learning and experience sharing due to the Pandemic, there is an opportunity to transfer some work that was done only in-person through workshops to online discussions and courses that can be completed both in a synchronous and asynchronous manner.

**IMMEDIATE**

- **Recommendation: Continue to integrate anti-corruption principles and approaches into the broader UN development agenda**

ACPIS has made significant progress in integrating anti-corruption values into the broader development of agenda for UNDP and the UN-system in general. This work must continue and is buoyed by the anticipated

direction of the next UNDP Strategic Plan that is likely to focus on SDG-16 and the need for addressing governance barriers to the implementation of the SDGs. This work should include a three-pronged approach –

- Supporting UNDP leadership in the UN system coordination related to anti-corruption efforts;
- Taking a leadership role within the broader AC community in promoting further integration; and
- Identifying pilot countries which are receptive to such integration and providing the resources and technical support required to test and try sector-level and country-level integration.

**IMMEDIATE**

**Medium Priority**

➤ **Recommendation: Expand UNDP support of integrity in public services to include new areas of work**

ACPIS has done impactful work in the field of supporting integrity in procurement processes and construction project management. That work should be expanded to other aspects of public services delivery with a focus on those areas where there is the potential for an intersection of social accountability and sectoral engagement, such as health services and education. **MEDIUM TERM**

➤ **Recommendation: UNDP should expand outreach to corporations that have a proven commitment to business integrity and have already put in place corporate training and engagement departments in line with global anti-corruption priorities.**

UNDP should leverage the relationship it has developed with the B20 to access a network of private sector firms that will allow for even greater reach for UNDPs anti-corruption efforts. By expanding its partnerships with the private sector UNDP can benefit from their added value of core knowledge of how business can be a positive force for the fight against corruption. **MEDIUM TERM**

➤ **Recommendation: Position UNDP as the focal point for integrating anti-corruption in the UN development agenda.**

The UN has made significant efforts in the past few years to create a coherent approach to anti-corruption and its role in the broader development agenda. UNDP, with its AC architecture (led by the ACPIS team), should continue to engage in the Task Force and UNGASS in order to provide the timely, high quality technical advice that is critical to a coherent policy on UN AC engagement. But beyond such support, as the coherent policy is implemented, UNDP should be positioning itself to be the UN system’s “go to” agency with regard to managing and supporting implementation by all agencies and the Secretariat. **IMMEDIATE**

➤ **Recommendation: Explore how digitalisation has positively impacted the role of women in the fight against corruption.**

Anecdotal evidence is pointing to the fact that the Pandemic has enabled women to use digital technology to have the flexibility to access the knowledge and skills to be more active participants in the fight against corruption, including the ability to take a lead role in social accountability. This will require further research to define the specific parameters and impact of digitalization, but such work may have significant consequences for civil society, especially women. **MEDIUM TERM**

➤ **Recommendation: Promote the adoption of national rules and systems to ensure Beneficial Ownership and transparency in corporate filings.**

Beneficial ownership is focused on the provision of laws and rules that ensure a transparent process for establishing corporation and those individuals who have ownership of these entities as a means of limiting corruption. UNDP should take on this topic as one of the cutting-edge topics that will expand the integration of AC in development work while promoting partnerships with the private sector and governments interested in transparency. This can include the development of think pieces, an advocacy campaign and pilot projects to promote the required legal reforms in receptive jurisdictions. **MEDIUM TERM**

## ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference

### “Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies” (ACPIS)

<b>Location:</b>	Home-Based
<b>Application Deadline:</b>	25 November 2020
<b>Additional Category:</b>	Governance and Peacebuilding
<b>Type of Contract:</b>	Individual Contract
<b>Post Level:</b>	International Consultant
<b>Languages Required:</b>	English

### Background and Project Description

Despite the significant progress that has been made in fighting the global scourge of corruption in recent years, corruption continues to harm national development processes and undermine democracy and the rule of law, contributing to the culture of impunity and violence thus impeding progress towards achievement of 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Recognizing the detrimental impact of corruption on sustainable development, nearly all countries have ratified or acceded to the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC). With 187 states parties as of 6 February 2020, UNCAC has been influential in enabling states parties to adopt national legal instruments to combat corruption, including anti-corruption laws and strategies, and the establishment of anti-corruption institutions.

Moreover, corruption and its consequences significantly impact COVID-19 response and recovery. The impact of corruption is currently being felt not only across healthcare service delivery, policymaking, procurement practices, and the management of health funds, but also on governance systems overall, undermining the effectiveness of response and recovery measures to the crisis. To build back better, strengthen resilience of institutions, systems and people and reduce vulnerability to future crisis, anti-corruption initiatives will maintain their critical role in the development agenda at the global, regional and country levels.

The multi-year support of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), Australia to UNDP’s anti-corruption work has been very important to promote transparency, accountability and integrity agenda at the global, regional and country levels. In 2012-2016 DFAT Australia supported UNDP’s Global Anti-corruption Initiative (GAIN) to implement anti-corruption initiatives in close collaboration with UNODC, and a joint UNDP-UNODC initiative, UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project.

The successful implementation of Phase 1 resulted in a renewed DFAT-UNDP-UNODC partnership in 2016-2020, with UNDP’s new Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies (ACPIS) global project implemented with a total budget of **AUD 6,550,665**. The project aimed to integrate anti-corruption solutions in service delivery sectors such as health, education, water, construction, etc., strengthen institutional capacity of integrity institutions to prevent corruption, and promote knowledge and advocacy to support anti-corruption efforts.

More specifically, the ACPIS project aimed to strengthen national capacities, integrate anti-corruption measures into national development processes and enhance integrity in service delivery. The project aimed to contribute to the implementation of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in particular Goal 16 on promoting peaceful and inclusive societies, provide access to justice and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions, by integrating anti-corruption, transparency and accountability across all the SDGs.

From the end of 2018 to the beginning of 2019, an independent international consultant carried out a mid-term review of the ACPIS project. Overall, the review concluded that the project showed continued progress during 2016-2018 and achieved its expected results during the mid-point of project implementation, demonstrating evidence of success at the country level, with 6 countries implementing anti-corruption initiatives (Bhutan, Indonesia, Myanmar, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, and Thailand) supported by the global ACPIS project. Through global advocacy and



awareness activities, the ACPIS project widely shared its lessons learned and good practices from global, regional and country levels, for example, during the commemoration of International Anti-Corruption Day, participation at the Conference of the States Parties to UNCAC, International Anti-Corruption Conference, etc. Coupled with these achievements, the project also promoted innovation through its activities, both in terms of the use of technology, and in leading new thinking and ways in addressing corruption.

### Scope of work

The overall expected outcome of the ACPIS project is:

**“Anti-corruption institutions, systems and mechanisms are better integrated to support partner countries to prevent and tackle corruption.”**

< Objectives and Outputs >

**Objective 1:** Integrate anti-corruption solutions in service delivery sectors, in partnership with youth, women and private sector.

Output 1.1: Anti-Corruption solutions integrated in service delivery systems (such as in health, education, water and infrastructure, justice and security) to mitigate corruption risks.

Output 1.2: Social accountability mechanisms to monitor services and provide oversight promoted and strengthened (such as civic engagement, engagement and participation of youth and grassroots women, private sector participation).

**Objective 2:** Strengthen state/institutional capacity to implement UNCAC, in particular with regard to the prevention of corruption.

Output 2.1: UNCAC and anti-corruption integrated in national development processes, including the mainstreaming of SDGs at national and sub-national levels, to prevent and tackle corruption.

Output 2.2: Measures to prevent corruption are put in place by anti-corruption institutions.

**Objective 3:** Promote knowledge and advocacy to support anti-corruptions efforts, including a better understanding of the link between violent extremism and corruption.

Output 3.1: Advocacy is promoted at national and sub-national levels to reinforce anti-corruption efforts.

Output 3.2: Knowledge on anti-corruption is produced and shared globally, including south-south and triangular cooperation.

### Purpose of Final Evaluation

Against this background, an independent final evaluation will be undertaken in October-November 2020, as per the project document.

The objectives of this final evaluation are threefold:

1. To assess progress of the ACPIS project against the three project objectives and evaluate whether the project achieved expected results, as envisioned by the project document;

2. To evaluate the implementation of the project and its existing capacity according to: a) DFAT's quality criteria and expectations; and b) mid-term review recommendations; and
3. To assess the project's alignment with and contribution to UNDP's Strategic Plan 2018-2021, and provide forward-looking recommendations, lessons learned and good practices.

#### **Issues to be addressed:**

##### **Key Evaluation Questions:**

The final evaluation will take into account DFAT's Partnership Performance Assessment (PPA) criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, monitoring and evaluation, sustainability, gender equality, and risk management, to assess the results and progress of the project. The consultant will evaluate the achievements during 2019-2020 (up to the month of August) (the last 20 months of the project's operation) and consolidate them with the mid-term results achieved by the project, against its objectives and result indicators. The final evaluation should answer the following key questions:

##### **Project Design, Outcomes and Impact:**

- What are the project's key achievements and what impact and progress have been made based on the theory of change and results framework (impact, outcomes, outputs) of the project?
- What tangible results or impact have been achieved through the activities implemented, and is there evidence of sustainability? (Gender dimensions should be taken into account.)
- How were the findings and recommendations from the mid-term review addressed by the ACPIS project?
- Did the project's structure, coordination and implementation of work at the global, regional and country levels, and the project's existing capacity contribute to the successful implementation of the ACPIS project?
- How did ACPIS contribute to development of knowledge and expertise that was utilised by other anti-corruption initiatives focused in the Asia-Pacific region?
- Is there an evidence that policy and programme support provided to target countries, knowledge products, etc. produced through ACPIS made a difference to other anti-corruption endeavours in the region?
- What are the main lessons learned from the ACPIS project and what are the recommendations going forward? What has worked well, what has not, and what is recommended for future initiatives on anti-corruption that UNDP will implement?

##### **Modality, Partnerships and Cooperation:**

- How effective were the organizational structures and operations, as well as policy mandates, between the implementing partners? E.g. UNDP global anti-corruption team in Singapore, regional hubs, and country offices; other UN agencies (e.g. UNODC); etc.?
- To what extent have partnerships been established/supported with governments and non-state actors (e.g. civil society organisations, private sector, etc.)?
- To what extent has there been coordination amongst relevant UNDP teams, country offices and regional hubs, and between UNDP, UNODC and other international and partner organisations?
- What are UNDP's strengths and comparative advantages in anti-corruption work vis-à-vis UNODC and other partners?

##### **Key Evaluation Criteria:**

The final evaluation will take into account criteria such as **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, monitoring and evaluation, sustainability, gender equality, and impact** to assess the final results and progress of the project.

1. **Relevance:** The final evaluation will assess the degree to which the project considers the global and local contexts and development problems. It will also review the extent to which the project design is logical and coherent, and it will assess the link between activities and expected results, and between results and objectives to be achieved.
2. **Effectiveness:** The final evaluation will assess the extent to which the project's objectives have been achieved compared to the overall project goal. In evaluating effectiveness, it is useful to consider: 1) if the planning activities were consistent with the overall objectives and project purpose; 2) the analysis of principal factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives.
3. **Efficiency:** Using a range of cost analysis approaches, from the elaborate cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis, to cost-efficiency analysis, to a quick cost comparison, the evaluation will assess how well did the project produce the products and services it committed itself to deliver; how do costs affect the sustainability of the results;
4. **Impact:** The final evaluation will assess any credible evidence and the main impact achieved during the life of the project. Views of government officials, civil society, private sector and other direct participants involved in project implementation will be also assessed.
5. **Sustainability:** The final evaluation will assess the project capacity to produce and to reproduce benefits over time. In evaluating the project sustainability, it is useful to consider to what extent intervention benefits will continue even after the project is concluded and the principal factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project sustainability.
6. **Monitoring & Evaluation:** The final evaluation will assess the robustness of the M&E system and whether has generated credible information that is being used for management decision making, learning and accountability.
7. **Gender equality:** The final evaluation will assess to what extent the project has made a difference to gender equality and empowering women and girls, as well as promoting women's participation throughout project activities.

### **Methodology:**

Based on UNDP's policies and guidelines on M&E and the standard global practices on reviewing projects/programmes, the independent consultant will discuss and finalize the methodology to conduct the final evaluation, with support from the ACPIS team. The evaluation process will entail a combination of desk review of all relevant project documents, evaluations and knowledge products; interviews (via Webex, Skype or Zoom) with key UNDP staff, senior management, regional focal points on anti-corruption, selected Country Offices, partner organizations, civil society organizations or beneficiaries of country level projects; and an online survey to review UNDP's policy and programme support globally through this project.

### **Expected outputs and Deliverables**

The consultant will be responsible for the following deliverables:

1. Final evaluation inception report—an inception report should be prepared by the consultant before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. It should detail the evaluator's understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. (By 2 December 2020)

2. First draft evaluation report which should be reviewed and approved by ACPIS team members and interviewed staff. (By 25 December 2020)
3. Presentation of findings and recommendations of final evaluation to ACPIS team and DFAT via Skype or Zoom. (By 8 January, 2021)
4. Final evaluation report, incorporating all the comments and inputs made to the previous drafts. (no later than 1 February 2021)

### **Institutional Arrangements /Reporting Relationship**

#### **Reporting**

The consultant will work closely with the ACPIS team, under the direct supervision of the Global Programme Advisor on Anti-Corruption and in close coordination with the ACPIS Programme Manager. The ACPIS team will provide all the necessary documents and facilitate the work of the consultant.

#### **Duration of work/Time frame:**

The consultancy will start on **25 November 2020** and the final product should be submitted no later than **1 February 2021**.

#### **Duty Station**

This consultancy will be home-based. The Consultant will be required to use her/his own computer.

#### **Travel:**

Travel is not required under this assignment.

**ANNEX 2: Persons interviewed for final evaluation****UNDP Global**

Ms. Sarah Lister	Head of Governance, UNDP
Mr. Stephan Klingebiel	Director, UNDP Seoul Policy Centre
Ms. Brigitte Strobel-Shaw	Chief, Corruption and Economic Crime Branch, UNODC – global AC Task Force
Ms. Aparna Basnyat	Senior Research and Policy Advisor on SDG 16, UNDP Oslo Governance Centre

**UNDP Regional Staff**

Ms. Sonja Stefanovska-Trajanoska	Anti-Corruption Advisers, UNDP/UNODC – UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project
Ms. Diana Torres	Ex programme manager of Fairbiz project/Bangkok Regional Hub, currently Assistant Resident Representative, UNDP Vietnam
Mr. Phil Matsheza	ex-Governance and Peacebuilding Team Leader in Bangkok Regional Hub, recently was Governance Team Leader in UNDP's Addis Ababa Regional Service Centre for Africa

**UNDP Country Offices & Implementation Partners**

Ms. Julie Bukikun, Assistant Resident Representative, UNDP Papua New Guinea	Papua New Guinea CO
Mr. Kaspar Burger, Legal Advisor (Anti-Corruption, Rule of Law and Human Rights), UNDP Myanmar	Myanmar CO
Mr. Siprianus Bate Soro, Head of Governance, UNDP Indonesia	Indonesia CO

**ACPIS Office (Singapore)**

Mr. Anga Timilsina, Global Programme Advisor on Anti-Corruption, UNDP	ACPIS Singapore
Ms. Aida Arutyunova, Programme Manager, ACPIS global project, UNDP	ACPIS Singapore
Mr. Jungoh Son, Policy Advisor, Anti-Corruption, UNDP – ACRC secondee	ACPIS Singapore

**Donors**

Mr. Klas Rasmusson	Senior Anti-Corruption Policy Specialist, SIDA
Mr. Stephen McElhinney	Deputy Director (2019), Law and Justice, Development Policy Division, DFAT
Mr. Harald Mathisen	Senior Advisor, The Knowledge Bank, Section for Knowledge Programs, Norad

**Implementation Partners**

Mr. Roberto Perez-Rocha	Director of IACC Series & Global Initiatives, Transparency International
-------------------------	--

Ms. Aneta Wierzynska	Senior Specialist for Anti-Corruption and Impact, The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria
Ms. Angela Joo-Hyun Kang	Founder and Executive President Global Competitiveness Empowerment Forum (GCEF) <a href="http://www.g-cef.org">www.g-cef.org</a>
Mr. David Clarke	Team Leader, Universal Health Coverage and Health Systems Law, WHO

### **ANNEX 3: List of Documents Consulted**

#### **e-Documents for Desk Review**

ACPIS Board Meeting minutes (April 2020)

Anti-Corruption and COVID-19 knowledge products (Word documents)

Anti-Corruption and COVID-19 webinars organised by ACPIS (Word)

B20 and UNDP Joint Statement: Accountability and Anti-Corruption in the Age of a Global Pandemic (Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, September 29, 2020).

Beneficial ownership and disclosure: Technical assistance with implementation Services and tools for governments implementing beneficial ownership reform (Open Ownership.org/PDF)

Fourth Regional Community of Practice for Transparency, Accountability, and Anti-Corruption in Asia and the Pacific: Meeting Report and Recommendations (11-12 JUNE 2019, Bangkok, Thailand/PDF)

Good Practices in Public Sector Excellence to Prevent Corruption: A Lessons Learned Study in Support of the Implementation of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC)

Institutional and Context Analysis: NCD Prevention and Control in Mongolia by Claudia Melim-McLeod (PDF/November 28, 2016)

Integrating anti-corruption in socio-economic recovery to build forward better hosted by UNDP and SIDA (panel discussion notes, 05 December 2020).

Integrating Transparency, Accountability and Anti-Corruption in Socio-Economic Impact Analysis: Needs Assessment and Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic (Guidance Note, 2020)

Key Highlights of ACPIS Achievements in Global Advocacy and Knowledge (2019-2020)

Manual on Corruption Surveys: Methodological guidelines on the measurement of bribery and other forms of corruption through sample surveys (PDF)

Moving from Commitment to Action hosted by UNDP ACPIS Global Project (discussion notes, 01 December 2020)

Next Generation of Anti-Corruption Priorities: Towards 2030 hosted by UNDP and NORAD (panel discussion notes, 30 November 2020)

Reassessing donor performance in anticorruption: Pathways to more effective practice By Phil Mason OBE (U4 Publications/PDF)

Strengthening Transparency and Accountability in the Health Sector in Africa for COVID-19 Response and Recovery: Concept Note, 04 June 2020 (Word document)

Transparency, Accountability and Anti-Corruption Service Offer for COVID-19 Response and Recovery (Guidance Note)

UNDP Gender & Anti-Corruption Project overview (PowerPoint presentation)

UNDP Regional Community of Practice on Anti-Corruption and Public Administration Reform in Europe and Central Asia and Forum on Innovations in Anti-Corruption (Summary Report)

UNDP Special Events at the Eighth Session of the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption Abu Dhabi, 16-20 December 2019

United Nations Common Position to Address Global Corruption Challenges (Towards UNGASS 2021).

United Nations Development Programme Strategic Plan 2022–2025 PHASE 1: Landscape Paper

### **On-line Anti-corruption Resources**

ACPIS Anti-Corruption blog:

[Uniting against corruption | UNDP](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/blog/2018/uniting-against-corruption.html) <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/blog/2018/uniting-against-corruption.html>

Asia-Pacific AC: [https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/rbap/en/home/presscenter/events/2019/anti-corruption\\_COP2019.html](https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/rbap/en/home/presscenter/events/2019/anti-corruption_COP2019.html) and **[Asia-Pacific Regional Community of Practice \(CoP\) on Transparency, Accountability and Anti-Corruption](#)**

Fair Business (FairBiz) Anti-Corruption project: [Promoting a Fair Business Environment in ASEAN | UNDP in the Asia and the Pacific](#) and [FAIRBIZ - Promoting a Fair Business Environment in Viet Nam | UNDP in Viet Nam](#)

G20 and Anti-corruption: [G20anticorruption-221020 \(unodc.org\)](#) and [Anti-corruption - Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development \(oecd.org\)](#)

**Gender and Anti-Corruption:** U4 and AC topics Women and Gender: <https://www.u4.no/topics/gender/basics> and Corruption and gender: Women and men affected differently by corruption, but no evidence women or men are less corruptible <https://www.unodc.org/lpo-brazil/en/frontpage/2019/12/corruption-and-gender-women-and-men-affected-differently-by-corruption-but-no-evidence-women-or-men-are-less-corruptible.html>

Khan, M., Andreoni, A., and P. Roy (2016). Anti-corruption in adverse contexts: A strategic approach. Working Paper. London: School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS).

[https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/23495/1/Anti-Corruption%20in%20Adverse%20Contexts%20\(1\).pdf](https://eprints.soas.ac.uk/23495/1/Anti-Corruption%20in%20Adverse%20Contexts%20(1).pdf)

Myanmar UNDP AC: AC

video: [https://web.facebook.com/watch/?ref=saved&v=710647756233713&\\_rdc=1&\\_rdr](https://web.facebook.com/watch/?ref=saved&v=710647756233713&_rdc=1&_rdr) Media campaign Tetnyiletnyi (Hand in Hand in English) Facebook Page, 8 messages per month are posted and produced videos as well: <https://www.facebook.com/tetnyiletnyi>

Norad (Norway) Anti-corruption overview: <https://www.norad.no/en/front/evaluation/planned-and-ongoing-evaluations/norways-anti-corruption-efforts/>

SIDA (Sweden) and Gender AC: <https://publikationer.sida.se/English/publications/159390/gender-and-corruption/>

Transparency International Corruption Index: <https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2019/index/nz/>



U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre (Norway): <https://www.u4.no/>

UNGASS:

[https://ungass2021.unodc.org/uploads/ungass2021/documents/session1/contributions/UN\\_Common\\_Position\\_to\\_Address\\_Global\\_Corruption\\_Towards\\_UNGASS2021.pdf](https://ungass2021.unodc.org/uploads/ungass2021/documents/session1/contributions/UN_Common_Position_to_Address_Global_Corruption_Towards_UNGASS2021.pdf)

[Special session of the General Assembly against corruption 2021 \(UNGASS 2021\) \(unodc.org\)](#)

[UNDP Anti-Corruption Portal \(anti-corruption.org\),](#)

[UNGASS side event - finalized.pdf \(unodc.org\)](#)

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Key Publications on Anti-Corruption to download: [www.anti-corruption.org](http://www.anti-corruption.org)

UNODC: [Special session of the General Assembly against corruption 2021 \(UNGASS 2021\) \(unodc.org\)](#)

**ANNEX 4: Analytical Framework Answers**

Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Answers to Key Questions	Evidence
1. Relevance			
	1.1 Has the programme been designed based on an accurate analysis of the political and institutional contexts in which it will be operating?	Yes. Strong understanding of position of AC in broader DG work both within UNDP and more broadly.	Focus areas of work is based on strong analysis and cutting-edge knowledge of where AC work is headed (business integrity; sectoral support)
	1.2 Is the project designed to align with UNDP and DFAT strategic documents (Strategic Plans/Frameworks; Country Documents; SDGs)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Well-aligned with UNDP SP</li> <li>• DFAT - yes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DFAT Interview</li> <li>• Sarah Lister interview</li> </ul>
	1.3 What tools have been identified for the delivery of outputs and are they the correct tools to achieve results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical Advice</li> <li>• Peer-to-Peer Exchanges</li> <li>• Knowledge Products</li> <li>• Piloting Projects</li> <li>• Corruption Risk Assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Myanmar – CRAs</li> <li>• PNG/Philippines – digital tool piloting</li> <li>• ISO adoption</li> <li>• Korea-Myanmar relationship</li> </ul>
	1.4 How was gender equality and social inclusion principles integrated into the design of the programme?	Keen effort by ACPIS to ensure balanced representation amongst presenters, TAs and participants. Focus on youth and AC through education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thailand youth education and game</li> <li>• Balance of presenters at IACC</li> </ul>
	1.5 To what extent are the objectives of the programme valid for ensuring that partner countries have systems, institutions and civil engagement mechanisms to better manage and deliver public resources and services?	A three-pronged approach that focuses on sectoral interventions and support for national AC institutions.	Clear results at national level in multiple countries through piloting social accountability tools. Also direct support to Myanmar, Indonesia and others on implementing government-wide policies on AC

	1.6 Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of the programme's stated objectives?	Yes. If the outputs are achieved it will likely lead to achieving of outcome/objective	Intervention in one output area can lead to support in other areas. PNG support for pilot Social Accountability led to direct TA to government
	1.7 Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?	Yes. But AC work takes a long view to success. Impact is incremental, at best.	Direct intervention in Thailand on curriculum for post-secondary schools on AC led to GoT policy on same topic.
2. Efficiency			
	2.1 Were project activities delivered in a cost-efficient manner?	Yes. Small office that provides timely, high quality advice and project support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small team delivering global AC work for UNDP and broader UN family</li> <li>• Use of partnerships to leverage more work with fewer resources</li> <li>• Enhanced COP may have even greater leveraging ability for project</li> </ul>
	2.2 What was the quality of the inputs of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High quality advice</li> <li>• Innovative pilot projects</li> <li>• Strong partnerships</li> <li>• Effective knowledge brokering</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online courses</li> <li>• ASEAN Conference with G20</li> <li>• Uzbek ISO adoption</li> <li>• Korean Centre interventions</li> </ul>
	2.3 What were the costs associated with the inputs of the project?	See annual budget and spending	Annual budget figures
	2.4 Were outputs achieved on time and within budget?	Yes	Table of achievements per Output with associated costs
	2.5 Was the programme implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?	Hard to think of an alternative that would be as effective at delivery	Leads to debate about whether or not the ACPIS Team should be larger. Not sure of added value of more staff at global level as partnerships are

			effectively expanding capacity without more staff.
	2.6 Were project budgets sufficient to meet stated objectives and outputs?	Yes	See financial reports
3. Effectiveness			
	3.1 Is the programme on track to achieve its objectives?	Yes. Examples from each Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health sector interventions</li> <li>• Education sector interventions</li> <li>• AC integration in Indonesia and Myanmar and Uzbekistan</li> <li>• Online courses and timely Knowledge Products (KPs)</li> </ul>
	3.2 What results can be articulated that provide evidence that the programme is on the right track for achieving its objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot projects produced results</li> <li>• Good knowledge products</li> <li>• Health sector work</li> <li>• Education sector work</li> <li>• ACC work?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot project summaries</li> <li>• Online courses</li> <li>• Thailand education sector work</li> <li>• Malaysia AC Strategy implementation</li> </ul>
	3.3 What factors have affected the capacity of the programme to achieve its objectives (either positive or negative)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong partnerships</li> <li>• Technical capacity</li> <li>• Well-connected network within UNDP and AC community</li> <li>• Seed funding for pilot projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thailand</li> <li>• PNG</li> <li>• Malaysia</li> <li>• COP for UNDP</li> <li>• IACC Global network</li> </ul>
	3.4 Were the results achieved as impactful for women beneficiaries as for men?	Yes. Work in support service delivery will impact women and men equally. Specific interventions in support women business leaders in Thailand.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thailand post-secondary AC course impacts men and women equally</li> <li>• Women and AC in business via Bangkok regional hub. Also specific to the Fair Biz project.</li> </ul>

	3.5 Were major factors such as national ownership, capacity development, effective aid management and south-south cooperation present to maximize the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?	National Ownership – pilot projects  Capacity Development - ?  South-South – Korean exchanges; AC Conference	National Ownership – PNG; Philippines; Thailand  Cap.Dev.-Online courses; ASEAN/G20 Conference  South-South – ASEAN work; Korea/Myanmar
4. Impact			
	4.1 What concrete change has occurred as a result of the programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased social accountability in public service delivery</li> <li>• More structured use of CRAs by national governments</li> <li>• Increased use &amp; access to digital tools for accountability</li> <li>• New national AC strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Philippines</li> <li>• PNG</li> <li>• Malaysia</li> <li>• Myanmar</li> <li>• Indonesia</li> </ul>
	4.2 What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot projects show promise for better service delivery</li> <li>• Thought Leadership has LT benefit</li> <li>• Increased capacity to integrate AC into public service delivery</li> <li>• Access to TA at country level through UNDP AC network</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Myanmar</li> <li>• Philippines</li> <li>• Uzbekistan</li> </ul>
	4.3 Have the knowledge sharing tools developed through the programme been widely utilized?	Yes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online courses in PNG for 40+ participants in Orientation Workshop for Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE) trainees</li> <li>• Also in PNG, CFE training and</li> </ul>

			<p>certification program base of knowledge for the audit and investigation managers. It can be continued by offering additional support to the course participants to successfully complete the program like partnering with Pacific Institute of Leadership and Governance (PILAG) in Port Moresby</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IACC attendance</li> <li>• COP revitalization</li> </ul>
	4.4 Has interregional knowledge sharing at the country office level significantly contributed to the corporate results framework?	Yes. But COP could be more impactful. Need to think of how to ensure routine interactions amongst AC Tas in UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some work to revitalize COPs, but more work needed</li> <li>• COVID response included more webinars to support COs</li> </ul>
5. Sustainability			
	5.1 Are there indications that the work of the programme will result in permanent or lasting changes to the work of beneficiaries beyond the life of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilots are being Institutionalised and replicated</li> <li>• Relationships between Korean Centre and countries is lasting beyond ACPIS intervention</li> <li>• Other?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some pilot work has been upscaled to apply to other work (Philippines – education equipment delivery accountability)</li> <li>• ISO adoption in Uzbekistan</li> <li>• Thailand curriculum</li> </ul>
	5.2 What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong partnerships</li> <li>• Trusted relationships between government and CO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PNG example of a local TA building relationship that is leveraged in long-term for other AC work</li> </ul>
	5.3 To what extent are programme modalities designed to facilitate the continuation of the project	How to scale up the pilot projects. Process to date should be replicable but will require ongoing support	More of an organic process, but where pilots showed ownership by government they are

	after donor funding ceases? Is this design work being done?	from COs and perhaps ACPIS	being replicated (PNG; Philippines)
6	Innovation		
	6.1 How has the programme included innovative approaches to achieve results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot projects selected through competition</li> <li>• Testing of new digital tools for social accountability</li> <li>• New concepts and approaches are tested</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Philippines &amp; Thailand competitive process for pilot</li> <li>• Use of ICT for social accountability</li> <li>• Business integrity support is innovative concept and worked with G20 and CSOs to promote</li> <li>• ISO adoption</li> </ul>
	6.2 How has the project used new technologies to achieve results?	Use of ICT in PNG and Philippines has resulted in better service delivery, but on a small scale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on ICT for social accountability (Philippines; PNG)</li> <li>• New technology for AC education (Thailand video game)</li> <li>• Could be improved with more focus on digitalization for procurement transparency</li> </ul>
	6.2 What innovative approaches were applied to integrate gender equality and social inclusion principles into the programme's work?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGOs focused on women were employed to roll out social accountability</li> <li>• Online courses benefit women with more flexibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Philippines – rate of women trained to use DevLive was based on selection of NGOs</li> <li>• Online course participation by women in Fair Biz programme (BRH) data – 61% of course takers were women</li> <li>• Percentage of women taking online courses went above 50% during pandemic</li> </ul>
	6.3 How has the programme engaged with the new actors such as the private sector and youth to achieve its results?	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thailand engaged young entrepreneurs to develop app-based AC game</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Korean NGO working on private sector integrity</li> </ul>
	6.4 How has the programme adjusted with the challenges posed by emerging crisis (namely COVID-19 crisis)?	Adaptation in 2020 resulted in more online courses, new think pieces and knowledge products, and training materials to consider anti-corruption aspects of pivot to public health spending.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New think pieces on health funding accountability</li> <li>• Two new knowledge products on health spending and accountability</li> <li>• New online training courses related to health sector</li> <li>• New partnerships with Global Fund, WHO &amp; World Bank</li> </ul>
7	Gender Equality		
	7.1 What percentage of beneficiaries of the programme were women?	Between 40% & 50%	<p>Sample of data for participants in activities includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 44% of online course participants</li> <li>• 61% of FairBiz course takers</li> </ul>
	7.2 What did the programme do to ensure women’s perspectives were incorporated into its work with beneficiaries?	Emphasis on participation of women as equal partners – from TA to participants to capacity building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training for Philippines DevLive app</li> <li>• Partnership with B20 NGO accessing their technical knowledge on gender and corruption</li> </ul>
	7.3 How did the project ensure its activities were designed to promote the participation of women?	At planning stage ensuring equal participation of women in all aspects of each activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IACC presenters (45% women)</li> <li>• FairBiz Participants (61% women)</li> <li>• Shift to online courses creates flexibility and increases percentage of women participating (44% of participants for</li> </ul>



			select online courses were women)
8 Partnerships & Cooperation			
	8.1 Did the programme develop and maintain partnerships to achieve results?	Yes. One of the strengths of the Programme	Numerous partnerships
	8.2 What was the added value of the programme to the work of partners?	Using convener status ACPIS has brought disparate groups together to collaborate. It has strong partnerships at global level with other key actors, including UNODC and TI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ASEAN/G20 Conference &amp; training</li> <li>• IACC support/planning</li> <li>• Korea/Myanmar Partnership – role of ACPIS in brokering</li> <li>• Key to UNDP role in UN broader AC strategy</li> </ul>
	8.3 What was the added value of partners to the work of the programme?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost efficient use of resources</li> <li>• Access to different skill sets (e.g. – Korean Centre)</li> <li>• Sectoral knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Korea/Myanmar bilateral relationship – Korean skills</li> <li>• Korean NGO-G20 relationship</li> <li>• G20 convener status</li> <li>• TI - data</li> </ul>
	8.4 What recommendation(s) do partners have for forward planning and follow-on programme activity from 2021?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More youth engaged in AC work (TI)</li> <li>• Increase us of convener status</li> <li>• Funding of IACC to support more diverse groups to attend (TI)</li> </ul>	