

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
Vienna
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
New York

Independent Mid-term project evaluation
of the
**UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption
(UN-PRAC) Project**
Evaluation Report

UNODC project number: XSP/X70
Pacific Region

September 2015



UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2015

This evaluation report was prepared by Lawrence Robertson. The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) provides normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process of projects. Please find the respective tools on the IEU web site: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html>

The Independent Evaluation Unit of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime can be contacted at:

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Vienna International Centre
P.O. Box 500
1400 Vienna, Austria
Telephone: (+43-1) 26060-0
Email: ieu@unodc.org
Website: www.unodc.org

Disclaimer

Independent Project Evaluations are scheduled and managed by the project managers and conducted by external independent evaluators. The role of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) in relation to independent project evaluations is one of quality assurance and support throughout the evaluation process, but IEU does not directly participate in or undertake independent project evaluations. It is, however, the responsibility of IEU to respond to the commitment of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in professionalizing the evaluation function and promoting a culture of evaluation within UNODC for the purposes of accountability and continuous learning and improvement.

© United Nations, August 2015. All rights reserved worldwide.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This publication has not been formally edited.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Executive summary.....	v
Summary matrix of findings, evidence and recommendations.....	ix
I. Introduction	01
Background and context.....	01
Evaluation methodology	02
II. Evaluation findings.....	04
Design	04
Relevance	05
Efficiency	06
Partnerships and cooperation.....	08
Effectiveness	09
Impact	14
Sustainability	15
Human Rights and Gender	16
Innovation	17
III. Conclusions	18
IV. Recommendations.....	20
V. Lessons learned	21
<i>Annexes</i>	
I. Terms of reference of the evaluation	23
II. Evaluation tools: questionnaires and interview guides	54
III. Desk review list	62
IV. List of persons contacted during the evaluation	64

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AC	Anti-corruption
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CLP	Core Learning Partners
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Australia)
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
GAIN	Global Anti-corruption Initiative
GOPAC	Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption
ICAC	Independent Commission Against Corruption
IEU	Independent Evaluation Unit
MCO	Multi-Country Office
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
PAC	Public Accounts Committee
PICs	Pacific Island countries
PNG	Papua New Guinea
RMI	Republic of the Marshall Islands
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UN-PRAC Project	UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project
UNCAC	United Nations Convention against Corruption
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project is a joint initiative of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC) to strengthen the capacity of Pacific Island Countries (PICs) to tackle corruption and thereby to improve service delivery. Fifteen states and territories are the counterparts for these actions: the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Niue, and Tokelau.

UN-PRAC activities support the achievement of three outputs:

- Strengthen political will to endorse strong policy legal frameworks aimed at implementing the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC).
- Strengthen the capacity of key national anti-corruption institutions and non-state actors to more effectively tackle corruption with resultant improvements in service delivery.
- Promote more informed anti-corruption policy and advocacy by conducting tailored research and sharing knowledge.

While the four-year project formally began in June 2012 with the signing of the Project Document, activities began after the initial arrival of UNDP staff in February 2013. The USD 4.2 million project, funded by the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), will be implemented through June 2016.

The mid-term evaluation of the UN-PRAC project was conducted in June and July 2015. Guided by a clear Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation, which followed the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group, the evaluator consulted with project staff and UNDP and UNODC management in Suva, Fiji and drafted an inception report with evaluation instruments to use to answer all the questions in the TOR. The inception report was approved by UNDP and the Independent Evaluation Unit of UNODC. The evaluator then used these instruments to collect data remotely from Core Learning Partners (CLPs), the stakeholders of the project from whom interviews were sought for the evaluation, across the Pacific and world. The evaluation is based on a detailed review of project documentation, other UNDP and UNODC documents, and materials about UN-PRAC activities; interviews conducted with 37 people, and a questionnaire completed by seven civil society beneficiaries of the project.

Main Findings

UN-PRAC has an ambitious design that combines a tight focus on UNCAC ratification through UNODC with broad potential to inject a wide variety of capacity development and institutional strengthening support through UNDP to support anti-corruption in the vast Pacific region with a small budget and staff.

The project is seen by UN agency staff, partners, and stakeholders as relevant, as combatting corruption is a priority for some PIC governments while relevant to others and clearly related to striving for UN agency goals in the region.

After a slow start up, UN-PRAC practices are recognized to be designed and implemented in efficient ways through collaborative relationships and combining resources.

UNDP staff across the region work in partnership with the project; national CLPs see and value project assistance to them but do not often see the relationship as a partnership. National counterparts recognize and appreciate project support for their countries and work against corruption. Links and partnerships with other UNDP and UNODC projects were only noted by UN agency staff.

The planned objectives and outcomes from the Project Document, while ambitious, are being or likely to be attained. UN-PRAC activities that directly support raising awareness of UNCAC, convention ratification, and implementation of key processes in the convention such as reviews are seen as highly effective. UN-PRAC support for national anti-corruption reforms, frameworks, and institutions was less recognized and less common, although there was appreciation for project assistance when it had been provided to support key institutions in some PICs. Targeted Project support to institution building through project staff, national consultants, trainings, exchanges, and meetings was valued by CLPs. Networking and relationships built or strengthened through the project and UNCAC were seen to be effective. Some of the methods used by the project, such as comprehensive workshops and using experts from other developing countries (particularly within the region) were seen as effective by national CLPs. UN-PRAC support for research and knowledge products has been relatively limited to date. This area is an explicit output of the project and thus relevant. However, few CLPs interviewed expressed a desire for research products from the project; on the other hand, many CLPs appreciated the regional and international links to counterparts and experts – including project staff - which they asserted was extremely important for their progress with UNCAC.

UN agency staff and national CLPs interviewed emphasized the tremendous impact of the project on engagement, ratification, and implementation of UNCAC across the region. Impact to date in terms of the Project's contribution to anti-corruption reforms through legislative and institutional amendments in Pacific Island countries was less noted in project documentation or by interviewees, many of whom found it difficult to identify specific project support and concrete results in their countries other than UNCAC processes. Others that had benefited directed from Project-funded national consultants for up to a year or substantial staff consultations recognized the capacity built in their institutions.

Sustainability poses difficult issues in the small, donor-dependent PICs; the project's strategy and approach of working with PIC institutions and raising awareness among the public and key stakeholders are recognized as useful approaches to emphasize sustainability by CLPs and project reporting. Using UNCAC and national accountability institutions as well as linking key anti-corruption counterparts across the Pacific are explicit parts of the sustainability strategy of the project in the ProDoc. South-South support and working through regional institutions, such as the GOPAC Oceania and PASAI are also seen as ways to support sustainability.

Human rights and gender are addressed in UN-PRAC through being a UN governance project, working with key institutions for human rights like Ombudsman offices, targeted direct work on human rights, and processes that report gender disaggregated statistics. Some project approaches that endeavoured to more strongly consider gender were noted, but not seen as impactful to date.

Conclusions

The UN-PRAC project has had substantial success through its work on UNCAC and in building awareness of corruption as a set of issues and the potential for anti-corruption approaches. The project has had less success to date in supporting the development of practical AC efforts in

Pacific island countries that are recognized by the population of these archipelagos. The project has built a strong foundation for further AC programming in many PICs that should be built upon, including for sustainability.

UN-PRAC's ambitious design in working across the Pacific region on sensitive topics of corruption with a complicated partnership between UNODC and UNDP in implementing the project has placed high burdens on project management and staff; the UN-PRAC team has been able to gain DFAT, UNDP, and UNODC concurrence and been able to adjust the design to improve staffing and manage the implementation of the project through their hard work.

The project is highly relevant to UNDP and UNODC and to its partners in countering corruption in countries across the region. UN-PRAC is well aligned with global UNDP and UNODC frameworks in countering corruption and works in a collaborative way with UNDP staff across the region.

The UN-PRAC project has developed a set of well-appreciated, efficient, effective workshops to set the stage for anti-corruption efforts within PICs using methods that resonate with key PIC stakeholders like south-south cooperation and targeted TA from project staff. This work under UN-PRAC provides a strong base to support AC legislation and institutions in particular PICs to start helping countries across the Pacific implement AC reforms.

UN-PRAC processes and actions are efficient because of the staff's focus on achieving results while managing costs, using co-financing, and employing available resources within the UN system in project implementation.

UN-PRAC has been effective in its support for PIC knowledge of, ratification, and implementation of UNCAC. This was seen as the main objective of the design and focus of implementation by CLPs that were knowledgeable about the overall project. UN-PRAC has been less effective in supporting the development of national AC institutions across the region and producing research and knowledge products to date, although activities in these areas have increased. The project has built a strong foundation for further AC programming to build capacity and strengthen key institutions in PICs.

Recommendations

With a year remaining in the UN-PRAC, the Project should focus on UNCAC as well as building a constituency and support for concrete follow-up actions in anti-corruption in PICs.

UN-PRAC should focus, based on demand from partners and the limited time remaining, on a subset of outcomes and outputs from the Project Document that they determine best support and institutionalise a base for broader anti-corruption reform in the region.

A Phase II of the project should be developed to consider priority ways to support practical AC actions in PIC partners. A successor project should emphasize supporting for practical, visible ways that institutionalize and implementing AC reforms with clear impact on the population in PICs and that are visible to them.

UNDP and UNODC should explore ways to build institutional ways of better collaborating to reduce the burdens that are placed on project staff in implementing a program in partnership and simplify project implementation. This might include, for example, unifying reporting systems and processes for joint projects. The project should continue to collaborate with UNDP offices,

national partners, and international organisations across the region as ways to efficiently boost the reach of any UN-PRAC II project.

Lessons Learned

UNCAC provides an important reference point for AC programming in the region where there seems to be limited knowledge of corruption issues and limited development of AC institutions many in countries. In these circumstances, supporting links between institutions in countries, networking between PICs, and engagement with international partners on AC through UNCAC can be valuable ways to engage counterparts in countering corruption.

PIC partners value support for networking, integration, and UNCAC implementation. Practices that were most appreciated by CLPs included joint workshops and meetings within and between countries and South-South expertise on what has been done in other countries, particularly across the Pacific.

Developing effective national AC institutions that are widely recognized to be implementing policies and procedures that reduce corruption in practical ways in PICs appears to take substantial time and requires additional support beyond a single, limited-time project. The UN-PRAC has built a constituency and institutional base that can be built upon to strengthen anti-corruption across the Pacific going forward.

SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings¹	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations²
Key recommendations		
United Nations (UN) Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project support for Pacific Island Country (PIC) participation in United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) processes is seen as critical to the progress made by PICs with UNCAC.	Interviews and desk review of documents.	The Project should focus on UNCAC as well as building a constituency and support for concrete follow-up actions in the short year of implementation remaining.
The UN-PRAC Project has made substantial progress towards the achievements of most of the outputs and outcomes of its results framework and in demonstrating overall impact.	Interviews and desk review of documents.	The UN-PRAC team should focus, based on demand from partners and the limited time remaining, on a subset of outcomes and outputs that they determine best support and institutionalise a base for broader anti-corruption (AC) reform in PICs.
UN-PRAC engagement with UN partners and national stakeholders across PICs has developed additional demand for AC support.	Interviews and desk review of documents.	Any Phase II of UN-PRAC should focus on support for practical, visible ways for implementing AC reforms that are noted by the population in PICs.
The project does not yet have many concrete activities that lead to AC reforms that are noted by people in the region as the project has focused on UNCAC processes.	Interviews and desk review of documents.	A Phase II of the project should be developed to consider priority ways to support practical AC actions in PIC partners. A Phase II of the project should build on the achievements made supporting UNCAC engagement across the region to building anti-

¹ A finding uses evidence from data collection to allow for a factual statement.

² Recommendations are proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a project/programme; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources. For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions.

		corruption efforts that are tangible for the people in each PIC (which are likely to vary in each PIC).
Institutional and operational challenges, such as different reporting formats and different financial software of United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) as well as the limited transportation network across PICs, creates additional work for UN-PRAC staff in implementing the ambitious joint project across 15 states and territories.	Interviews and desk review of documents.	UNDP and UNODC should review and align some of their processes and procedures to facilitate the implementation of joint programming and reduce the burden on project staff.
UN staff noted ways that UNDP and UNODC, based on their institutional practices, made the partnership and cooperation between the two institutions challenging and increased the workload in implementing UN-PRAC.	Interviews and desk review of documents.	Reliance on the good will and hard work of project staff is not a strong basis for institutional partnership; UNDP and UNODC should explore what modifications can be made to project design and corporate cultures to strengthen cooperation in an institutional rather than staff-based way.
The skills and hard work of project staff are recognized by Core Learning Partners (CLPs) as critical to the achievements made by the project by CLPs.	Interviews.	Project staff should be commended by UNODC and UNDP for their successes in managing and smoothing over the institutional challenges of implementing a joint project without affecting partners and beneficiaries across the Pacific.
Important recommendations		
UN staff and CLPs found the design of the project to be very ambitious.	Interviews and desk review of documents.	UNDP and UNODC should consider ways to structure project design, such as breaking down the budget for each output to a range of USD within an overall ceiling for the project rather than a specific budget figure for each discrete output to simplify project implementation.
The project is highly relevant to the varied AC needs of different CLPs from different institutions and PICs.	Interviews and desk review of documents.	Based on the robust demand for diverse AC support from different PICs and institutions within them, any successor project should retain a component for flexible, as

		needed assistance to national partners to their different needs (based on institutional and country priorities).
It is challenging to discuss even the quantitative outputs of the project, such as how many laws have been changed in the wake of UNCAC review, and especially difficult to understand and measure the impact of a legal change, such as whether changing these measures has been enforced and led to behavioural change	Interviews and desk review of documents.	Project reporting should continue to describe and discuss briefly the AC actions taken by national counterparts and connect these actions at the PIC level to UN-PRAC engagement which may have contributed to these actions.
The project is well aligned with UNDP's Global Anti-corruption Initiative (GAIN).	Interviews and desk review of documents.	Regional projects should continue as important tools to build collaboration across similar countries and institutions, such as PIC anti-corruption agencies.
The project is well aligned with UNDP's Strategic Plan, "Changing with the World."	Interviews and desk review of documents.	UN-PRAC should maintain its alignment with the UNDP strategic plan.
The project is well aligned with UNODC's Thematic Programme on Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity related Crime.	Interviews and desk review of documents.	UN-PRAC should maintain its alignment with the UNODC thematic programme.
UN staff and CLPs recognized many ways that UN-PRAC activities have been implemented by project to boost efficiency and value-for-money through combining their own activities, collaborating with UNDP offices, and using experts from regional organisations or from the Pacific.	Interviews and desk review of documents.	The project should continue to collaborate with UNDP offices, national partners, and international organisations across the region as ways to efficiently boost the reach of the modestly-funded UN-PRAC project.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and context

The United Nations (UN) Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project, a joint United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC) project, aims to support Pacific Island Countries (PICs) to strengthen their capacity to address corruption. The project uses the processes of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), particularly its ratification by states and the obligations they undertake as States parties to the convention, as a basis to support anti-corruption work across the region and in particular countries. UNCAC, as the primary international legislative framework for fighting corruption and monitoring country-level reform efforts, is widely recognized as a positive demonstration of political commitment in the fight against corruption. UN-PRAC is designed to not only support UNCAC ratification and review but also build from these processes to support the implementation of sustainable and effective anti-corruption reform in States parties to the convention.

The project was developed in 2012; the Project Document was written and agreed upon by UNDP and UNODC. UN-PRAC funding and plans were negotiated with and approved by the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) in June 2012. With the incorporation of AusAID into the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), DFAT has assumed responsibility for funding and overseeing UN-PRAC. At the time the project was developed, AusAID was simultaneously negotiating about developing and funding the UNDP Global Anti-Corruption Project (GAIN) with UNDP. GAIN is also now funded by DFAT.

The partnership divides the budget approximately 40/60, with USD 1.8 million allocated to UNODC and USD 2.4 allocated to UNDP. The project is implemented jointly through a UNODC advisor and a UNDP advisor plus support staff based in Suva, Fiji.

The Project Document defines the goal of UN-PRAC as “to strengthen the capacity of Pacific Island Countries to tackle corruption and thereby to improve service delivery.” The PICs targeted by UN-PRAC are 15 states and territories: the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Samoa, the Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Niue, and Tokelau. The Project aims to assist PICs in the fight against corruption by supporting:

- UNCAC ratification;
- UNCAC implementation through the strengthening of policies, laws, measures and institutional frameworks; and
- PIC engagement in UNCAC processes, including the UNCAC Review Mechanism.

Three “outputs” are articulated in the Joint Project Document:³

- Output 1: To strengthen political will to endorse strong policy legal frameworks aimed at implementing UNCAC
- Output 2: To strengthen the capacity of key national anti-corruption institutions and non-state actors to more effectively tackle corruption with resultant improvements in service delivery
- Output 3: To promote more informed anti-corruption policy and advocacy by conducting tailored research and sharing knowledge.

Implementation has treated these three as the higher-level outcomes targeted by the project. UN-PRAC did not effectively start to implement activities until 2013, after hiring a UNDP advisor that began in February 2013. The mid-term evaluation thus covers approximately 2.5 years of implementation, through June 2015.

The particular context of the Pacific was part of the rationale for the development of the project. With PNG the exception, the PICs are small island societies; the CLPs that explicitly noted the challenging context in interviews all expressed in one way or another that in PICs, the meaning and context of corruption is challenging to define as their cultures encourage gift giving, networking, and supporting tribe and extended family. Corruption or perceived corruption is also difficult to address openly, as people often know each other (and are often related). This makes it particularly difficult to publically address corruption. The PICs are also highly donor dependent, with limited resources overall and limited resources to use to counter corruption. Capacity constraints are clear in anti-corruption; PICs have few trained professionals and small institutions, with only a handful of people at most serving in the key institutions for countering corruption, such as Ombudsman’s offices, Attorney General’s Offices, and others.

The project had not yet developed sufficient activities and partners, including CLPs, in two of the smaller countries and territories: Niue and Tokelau. Interviews were thus not sought or held about project performance with potential partners and beneficiaries in these locations. The evaluation also did not interview anyone from Tuvalu as the project’s key counterparts had been replaced and were not available. The evaluation is thus based on UN-PRAC’s work on 12 countries and territories, although plans to work in these territories in the future are noted.⁴

Evaluation Methodology

The fieldwork for the evaluation was carried out in June and July 2015 in line with the norms and standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group and was informed by the expectations, tools, and templates for evaluations provided by the Independent Evaluation Unit of UNODC and UNDP’s Independent Evaluation Office. The design of the evaluation followed the Terms of Reference, which had been approved by UNDP and UNODC. The evaluator consulted with project and UN agency stakeholders in the drafting of an inception report, which included draft instruments developed to gather relevant, valid, and reliable data from project staff, partners, and beneficiaries to answer all of the questions included in the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the

³ These “outputs” are better conceptualized as outcomes, and are referred to as outcomes by the most recent reporting of the project.

⁴ The Cook Islands, Niue, and Tokelau are New Zealand territories.

evaluation (Annex I). The design of the inception report, methodologies employed in the evaluation, and draft report focus use criteria from the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. These criteria are relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, as well as partnerships and cooperation, gender and human rights and lesson learned. The Inception report was approved by UNODC and UNDP prior to the evaluation fieldwork.

The evaluation's fieldwork used the plans and tools approved in the inception report (Annex II) and reviewed a host of documents on project formation, implementation, and achievements (Annex III) and then conduct the evaluation. The UN-PRAC team provided invaluable support to the consultant in conducting the evaluation by providing all project materials, introductions to all CLPs, and contact information and support reaching out to all CSO beneficiaries of the project.

The evaluator interviewed the UNODC advisor and the two other staff of the project. In addition, while in Suva, the consultant interviewed eight people from the UNDP management and staff in the multi-country office and Pacific Centre, plus an UN-PRAC consultant in Suva at the time, one CSO stakeholder and one UNODC manager (based in Thailand). Three other UNDP staff across the region were interviewed remotely as was the UNODC manager in Vienna and the DFAT management and staff in Canberra.

Eleven interviews were held with national CLPs remotely, some of which encompassed more than one individual person. Plus three CLPs preferred to fill out written responses to the questions from the interview protocol. The Evaluation thus reached 18 national CLPs. Of the countries that UN-PRAC has focused on to date, the evaluation was only not able to contact and interview a CLP member in Tuvalu, as the project's key counterpart had recently been moved as part of a government reshuffle.

In addition to the one CSO interviewed, six CSO partners provided written answers to the questionnaire developed for civil society beneficiaries. The other CSO beneficiaries were not responsive to repeated requests to fill out the brief questionnaire, including a reminder from project staff.

The evaluation report is thus based on direct engagement with 45 people (Annex IV) as well as review of documents and reports produced by and on the Project. Many interviewees had limited experience with the UN-PRAC project, UNDP, and UNODC and were thus not able to answer many of the questions in the questionnaire as these points were not relevant to their experience with the project.

These limitations are not believed to have significantly hampered gathering and analysing sufficient valid and reliable data to compile solid findings, draw strong conclusions, and make recommendations that target the three purposes of the mid-term evaluation.

II. EVALUATION FINDINGS

Design

The UN-PRAC Project Design was ambitious and widely seen to be ambitious. International organisation staff and national partners of the project, referred to as national CLPs for this evaluation report, recognized that the project had two divergent attributes: a tight focus from UNODC on the ratification and implementation of UNCAC in PICs and the broad potential to inject a wide variety of support through UNDP towards the implementation of sustainable and effective anti-corruption reforms in countries of the Pacific. The implicit theory of change that connects international obligations to national action is realistic and plausible. The project document included a complete results matrix for the outcomes and outputs.

The focused design of portion of the project that emphasises UNCAC ratification, which was seen as the focus of UNODC's engagement, was praised as clear and tight. National CLPs and UN organisation staff were less satisfied with the design of the project in terms of its potential support for national reforms, which was designed to be UNDP's priority roles in UN-PRAC. UNDP management and staff recognized that UNDP's experience and expertise in capacity development and institutional strengthening had many potential applications under UN-PRAC. While some countries and stakeholders pointed to specific accomplishments of the project that supported concrete AC reforms, other interviewees focused on the inherent potential in a non-specific design to have done more and different activities to support national AC programmes. The more critical CLPs interviewed felt that the project could and should do more to support national AC reforms in PICs. Each of these national CLPs focused on the needs of their particular PIC.

Another way that the design was seen as ambitious was in targeting 15 diverse states and territories spread across the Pacific. The logistics of collaborating with this many partners across this much distance and so many time zones with only a few staff given the limited transportation and communications infrastructure of many PICs was explicitly raised as daunting by CLPs and UN organisation staff, some of whom also noted the lean budget of the project. The timeframe was also seen as ambitious as it required substantial effort from UN-PRAC staff to introduce UNCAC and the project to key counterparts, both within the UN system and national institutions, and initiate work in each PIC.

UN-PRAC staff, UNDP management and staff, and DFAT recognized that the original staffing to implement the design was overly ambitious. The staffing proposed was problematic and too lean. Based on the early implementation of the project, the absence of support staff was seen to overburden UNDP and UNODC advisors which was viewed as an impediment to implementing the ambitious technical design. UN-PRAC managers requested, and DFAT agreed, to adjust the staffing for the project to add two support staff, who were then hired by UNDP and have been used exclusively by the project. This resolution is seen as successful.

The design of the project was also recognized to have substantial overlap in its outcomes and objectives. Project reports have managed this overlap by reporting how activities or sequences of events contribute to more than one outcome and output. The initial budgeting for the project was also overly complicated, with the budget allocated precisely to particular activities. Project and agency staff have been able to proactively work with DFAT to adjust the budgeting to build in

adequate flexibility to fit the actual methods of working based on opportunities to support AC, which cannot be forecast in detail ahead of time.

The design has also made it difficult to clearly identify and explain impact. With the potential to work to support AC interventions in so many areas in so many countries, project staff, CLP partners, UN staff, and DFAT are challenged to articulate the effects of project support, particularly effects beyond UNCAC. It is challenging to discuss even the quantitative outputs of the project, such as how many laws have been changed in the wake of UNCAC review, and especially difficult to understand and measure the impact of a legal change, such as whether changing these measures has been enforced and led to behavioural change. Targets set in the design were also seen as overoptimistic by the few interviewees that were familiar with these numerical goals (e.g. for Outcome 1: 13 PICs ratify UNCAC). The push of the small staff of the project towards UNCAC has led to substantial results, but limited their ability to focus on other aspects of the project, to the detriment of reaching the ambitious targets in these other areas. The design has provided staff the ability to focus and target particular PICs as priorities, such as Tonga, which has yet to accede to UNCAC. The design has allowed staff to emphasize supporting larger PICs and ones where there is more emphasis on anti-corruption within its mandate to work with all 15 PICs. CLPs interviewed and many UNDP staff recognized the value of targeting Members of Parliament (MPs) as is done in the design for anti-corruption work, as Parliaments provide a venue for discussion and exposure of corruption and the political competition between parties and leaders encourages checks and balances on governments through opposition MPs.

Relevance

Relevance assesses the importance of the project to partners and fit with their needs and priorities in two ways: relevance to country partners (both governmental and non-governmental) and to UNDP, UNODC, and other international organisations and donors. Direct questions asked informants about relevance; Project reporting also explicitly notes the relevance of project activities to target group's needs and priorities.

UNDP staff interviewed in the Multi-Country Office in Fiji, in the Pacific Centre, and in other multi-country, country, and sub offices across the Pacific region noted the relevance of the UN-PRAC project to countries of the region for UNCAC. The project was recognized as relevant because of its important support to countries to enable and strengthen their participation with UNCAC and to attaining UNCAC endorsement. The project was seen as highly relevant for CLPs that focused on UNCAC. UN-PRAC was praised by all CLPs with this focus for its help with the review process. CLPs in countries that were new to UNCAC such as Nauru particularly appreciated the involvement of the project in preparing their first reports.

Anti-corruption was seen by CLP interviewees from some PICs as not of great importance in some particular sub-regions and countries. UNDP staff in some countries also explicitly noted that the need for AC was not so great in these countries as AC was not one of the government's priorities - or not one of their top priorities as guided by the UN's agreements with each country. This does not mean that AC is not relevant to UN agency staff or these countries, but that other priorities occupy them and their national counterparts. The receptivity of some country partners to AC work was recognized to be weak by UNDP staff in these countries. UNCAC, as a global convention, is potentially applicable to all countries – and all countries face practical challenges with corruption. UN-PRAC has tried to increase receptivity through holding more than one seminar in some of these countries and trying different approaches to increase interest. UNDP staff in some of these countries noted that climate change and the environment were the priorities

for their partner governments. One CLP noted the need to have AC institutions to receive environmental protection funding through the Global Environment Facility.

On the other hand, UNDP managers and staff as well as national partners noted that anti-corruption was a top priority for some national governments as well as their offices. Counterparts interviewed from these countries found UN-PRAC to be highly relevant to supporting their priorities. UN-PRAC staff have emphasized supporting larger PICs and ones where there is more emphasis on anti-corruption while continuing to work with all 15 PICs.

The project remains highly relevant to DFAT, as it focuses on the key investment area of governance and key country partners in the new DFAT aid policy. For UNDP and UNODC, the relevance of the project is clear in its alignment with regional and global frameworks and projects. For UNODC, UN-PRAC is aligned with the Regional Programme for Southeast Asia (2014-2017), where it fits under Sub-Programme 2: Anti-corruption, Outcome 2.1: Member States more effectively prevent, raise awareness of, detect, investigate and prosecute corruption, as well as the Thematic Programme on Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity related Crime (2012-2015). Few national partners and stakeholders had the knowledge to address evaluation questions about UN-PRAC’s alignment with UNDP and UNODC goals and programmes. UNDP and UNODC management interviewed readily outlined the alignment between the project and global agency frameworks and programmes. Interviewees that addressed alignment at the project level noted accordance with UNODC’s Joint Action towards a Global Regime against Corruption (GLOX69) and UNDP’s Global Anti-corruption Initiative (GAIN) project.

UNDP staff in a variety of positions interviewed from the Pacific Centre and in country and multi-country offices noted the usefulness of collaborating with the UN-PRAC team to incorporate additional anti-corruption input and messaging into their work, for example in supporting CSOs development. UNDP staff noted liaising without challenges with UN-PRAC staff to further their own in-country or regional work. This was seen as another way that UN-PRAC staff worked to make the project relevant to partners and stakeholders across the Pacific.

Few CLPs noted other donor support for anti-corruption across the region. No interviewee suggested that the project was duplicative, but instead noted ways that the project complements and is aligned with other UN, especially UNDP, initiatives.

Efficiency

Efficiency considers whether the actions taken in the project to achieve the outputs were proportional, and to what extent the human and financial resources and inputs provided under UN-PRAC were converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner. Implementing a project efficiently is a challenge in the Pacific region due to the huge distances between countries and the complexity of these archipelagos, the limited infrastructure for travel and communications, and high transport costs. Project management and staff interviewed noted numerous ways that the project effectively considered efficiency criteria in developing, planning, and implementing activities – as well as in their engagement with CLPs and UN agency counterparts.

The project has reached key decision makers in many countries, including Prime Ministers and Acting Prime Ministers, as needed to make UNCAC and the implementation of AC reforms a priority. High-level political support was seen as strong yielding results and thus was efficient.

Another way that the project is systematically efficient is in its work to have project processes reported on in the press across the Pacific to raise awareness of corruption issues and anti-corruption activities. UN-PRAC has worked hard as part of activities to have an effective media outreach that has managed to get positive coverage of activities in PICs in the press in each country.

The project is also efficient in soliciting feedback through standardized best practices; UN-PRAC workshops and trainings end with evaluations that are filled out on the spot by workshop participants. UN-PRAC staff review this feedback and have made changes to the implementation of activities based on their analysis of participant evaluations.

Although the design was completed in April 2012 and the project Document provides a start date of 1 June 2012, the UN-PRAC project did not have its initial staff on board until early 2013. The UNDP advisor began in February 2013 and the UNODC advisor arrived in June 2013. Thus the project had an eight month delay in start-up, which was not seen as efficient. The staffing approved in the ProDoc included only these two advisors. As the advisors began their work, inefficiencies of this arrangement became clear. The advisors used substantial time and effort to manage the logistics of working across 15 countries and territories and in managing the logistics of events, travel, and financial accounting - duties that could be more economically managed by support staff. UN-PRAC requested and DFAT approved modifications to hire two staff through UNDP to manage UN-PRAC finance and logistics as well as engagement with civil society. This adjustment was seen as increasing efficiency by UNDP and UNODC management and staff.

Some UNDP and UNODC staff as well as DFAT noted that efficiency had suffered when the UNDP advisor was not working 100% on UN-PRAC but was also acting as head of governance at the Pacific Center, as well as when the project has been without a UNDP advisor (particularly a permanent one).

UN-PRAC has developed and used practices of sequencing workshops to be efficient. Concentrating project and stakeholder engagement minimizes travel costs and maximizes the networking between participants. In engagement with PICS, UN-PRAC regularly combine the project's engagement with different stakeholders in particular PICs in ways that maximize the results of travel and workshops. UNDP staff interviewed noted that the project was efficient in the ways it used UNDP staff in country, multi-country, and sub offices in the development and implementation of UN-PRAC activities. UN-PRAC staff consciously engage with UNDP Offices across the Pacific when developing and implementing programming; one of the reasons for this engagement is to be efficient by delivering good value for money through using existing UNDP personnel, assets, and experience.

Other efficient practices were cost sharing, using free individual expertise, and developing institutional linkages with other AC experts. Cost sharing, such as with the Government of Vanuatu on an FOI advisor, was seen as efficient. Using individual experts at no or low cost, like having the Australian Ambassador to FSM, who had previously presented at the G20 AC working group, present at Project workshops was recognized to be efficient. And UN-PRAC has developed and used institutional expertise from regional partners, such as the Malaysian Anti-

Corruption Commission and the Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC) Oceania, which was seen as efficient for bringing high quality AC expertise at low cost.

UNDP staff also noted additional efficiencies in that UN-PRAC staff personally supported country and multi-country office learning and development in anti-corruption as well as through UN-PRAC project support for conference attendance and training. This has helped country and multi-country offices incorporate anti-corruption aspects into their other work in countries, sub-regions, or the region as a whole (for example in designing broader good governance activities in Tokelau). UNDP staff also noted the value (or potential value) of modest UN-PRAC grant support for anti-corruption activities for CSOs in their countries or sub-regions.

Project, UNDP, and UNODC staff recognized that there were inefficiencies in project administration as the different systems and processes of UNDP and UNODC require different computer programs and formats. Bookkeeping and reporting twice as required to use and account for the resources provided to each institution by the donor and separate reporting and styles required by UNODC and UNDP are a burden on project staff. However, staff have professionally kept these burdens from national counterparts; no CLP interviewed commented on inefficiencies in the relationship and links between UNDP and UNODC in the UN-PRAC project.

Partnerships and cooperation

UNDP and UNODC management and staff were the only informants that were able to address questions of partnerships. Some UNDP staff interviewed noted tensions in the past in the within-UNDP partnership, which they attributed to “personality” factors, and other interviewees praised the ways UN-PRAC staff had been able to manage the sometimes challenging institutional relationships between UNDP and UNODC and within UNDP itself. UNDP staff in country and multi-country offices lauded the operating style of the project which “always” worked through them to engage with national authorities and partners. UN-PRAC staff appreciated the support and assistance with entry points through this collaboration. This was seen as particularly important for UNODC, which does not have staff in countries of the region outside of the one UNODC advisor funded through the project. Some CLPs however asserted that the absence of dedicated project staff in their countries left UN-PRAC isolated from the actual conditions and constraints on corruption and anti-corruption in particular PICs. This knowledge base they felt was not effectively overcome through the use of UNDP staff in the country by UN-PRAC. These CLPs felt that the Project was less able to cooperate and partner with them due to gaps in the knowledge base and not having their own staff in country.

CLPs were not well versed in the partnership between UNDP and UNODC, or knowledgeable about internal partnerships within UNODC between projects (such as GLOX69: Joint Action towards a Global Regime against Corruption) or within UNDP between projects (such as with the Global Anti-corruption Initiative or GAIN). UN-PRAC appears to have focused on assisting counterparts with UNCAC and follow-up actions not explaining the complicated institutional relationships and varied projects of UN agencies relevant to anti-corruption. No national CLP interviewed found this lacunae to be an issue.

Partnerships were not recognized by CLPs interviewed. CLPs often did not distinguish between UNODC and UNDP, or in some cases, only knew UNODC and did not think of the project as a joint one with UNDP. CLPs did not view their relationship with UN-PRAC or that between their

institutions and UN-PRAC as a partnership. While they appreciated project support with UNCAC and for particular activities, the project was seen as providing assistance to them not as a partnership. Civil society organizations that worked with the project, such as Pacific Youth Council for the Forum Against Corruption for example, also did not view their relationship with UN-PRAC as a partnership. CSOs interviewed or that returned questionnaires felt that their organizations had had a grant or attended a workshop, rather than build an enduring relationship with the project.

Project reports and evaluation field work noted partnership approaches with organisations as part of implementing UN-PRAC, such as the systematic collaboration with GOPAC Oceania in working with parliamentarians. GOPAC also valued this regular engagement with UN-PRAC in workshops.

Effectiveness

This section considers whether or how much the planned objectives and outcomes from the Project Document and the workplans have been achieved to date. Some sections rely on answers to the TOR question, “What measures have been taken by Core Learning Partners in-country based on UN-PRAC activities/inputs?” Other sections are drawn from project reporting or from interviews on project outputs and national follow-up.

In ***Outcome 1, “Pacific Island governments endorse strong policy and legal frameworks aimed at implementing UNCAC,”*** the project has provided important support across the Pacific to senior government officials, parliamentarians, and civil society leaders to raise awareness by helping them know about and understand UNCAC, to encourage the ratification of UNCAC, and to support meeting their obligations under UNCAC – particularly the review.

This outcome has been a strong focus of the project per the design, which planned to leverage off of UNCAC to support anti-corruption across the Pacific. During the period of implementation, Kiribati acceded to the convention in 2013 with project support, and Tonga and Tuvalu have made important progress towards membership in 2015 (with Tuvalu reportedly only having to deposit the instruments properly to become a member). Thus while the target of 13 PICs as States parties is ambitious, UN-PRAC is thought likely to reach this target, as Tuvalu will be the 11th PIC member. UN-PRAC has organized and planned its first engagement with the Niue that is in free association with New Zealand and Tokelau that is a territory of New Zealand.

Outputs under the outcome include *1.1, “MPs better able to implement UNCAC/accountability standards,”* which has been pursued through workshops and engagement with GOPAC. UN-PRAC held workshops in 2014 for Parliamentarians on UNCAC and AC in Tuvalu and Samoa, and in the RMI on the role of the Public Accounts Committee (PAC). UN-PRAC supported GOPAC implementation of a workshop for parliamentarians in the Cook Islands. UN-PRAC has also funded a national consultant to advise the PAC in Vanuatu. UN-PRAC and GOPAC interviewees noted benefits to awareness raising and AC action from these workshops with MPs.

Output 1.2, “Countries encouraged and supported to ratify UNCAC (state and non-state actors)”, has also been pursued through workshops. One of the reasons for supporting workshops for Parliamentarians is to encourage UNCAC ratification; meetings with senior officials and civil society also have these goals. The project’s practice of sequential meetings has helped link

participants has put MPs and Senior Government officials. UN-PRAC has organized, led, and supported senior officials meetings and CSO workshops in Tuvalu and Tonga.

The project conducts *Output 1.3, “Countries actively take part in the UNCAC review mechanism,”* through support for individual CLPs as well as follow-up national UNCAC workshops for officials and for CSOs. As a start for this process and the project, UN-PRAC trained individual focal points for five States parties in February 2013. Individual trainings were held in 2014 for three other focal points, and a broader follow-up workshop was held for stakeholders in PNG (including the focal point) in March 2014. Focal points interviewed greatly valued this assistance from UN-PRAC in meeting their responsibilities – which most did not know and understand prior to the training.

Nine PICs (the Cook Islands; Kiribati; Federated States of Micronesia; Republic of the Marshall Islands; Nauru; Palau; Solomon Islands; and Vanuatu) benefitted from UN-PRAC assistance for the review; advice and TA through the project led to all the Focal Points for reviews being nominated in line with the Guidelines of the UNCAC Review Mechanism. And all nine PICs completed their UNCAC self-assessments, 8 with project support (all but Palau).

UN-PRAC support for senior officials and parliamentarians has come through four National Workshops, including three with additional workshops for CSOs, in the first half 2015; in 2014, UN-PRAC supported the first two national workshops, including in one the first civil society workshop. In addition, in 2013 and 2014, UNODC assisted seven Pacific States under review in year four of the current cycle in completing their responses to the UNCAC self-assessment checklist.

All 10 Pacific States parties to UNCAC attended the November 2013 fifth session of the Conference of the States Parties, and eight attended the June 2014 Implementation Review Group meeting; participants particularly appreciated UN-PRAC support which not only allowed them to attend through funding and logistical support but also helped them be active participants through the advice and support of the UNODC advisor.

Output 1.4, “National Anti-Corruption frameworks, including legislation developed/strengthened,” follows from the intent of the project design to leverage off of UNCAC to support institutional and legal changes that further anti-corruption in countries of the region. Recommendations from UNCAC are an integral part of the UNCAC review mechanism; UN-PRAC provides support for the review and for making these changes through national processes afterwards.

The project has supported review, information gathering, as well as national and international networking on AC; provided technical advice from staff; and provided consultants to bring specific TA to PIC counterparts. The primary UN-PRAC support mechanism was to facilitate the UNCAC review of States parties across the Pacific, as well as their review of other countries, through assistance with the technical aspects of review plus funding and logistical support to enable their full participation. This support extended to major international meetings on UNCAC, where UN-PRAC also organized side events for PICs that were appreciated by interviewees.

Networking through the project was greatly appreciated by CLPs; many interviewees noted that the network of contacts they had gained through the project was instrumental for learning from the experience of other countries across the Pacific for UNCAC ratification, review, and

implementation. Networking also brought in other resources and connections to support anti-corruption activities.

UN-PRAC staff reviewed the legislation on to the proposed establishment and functioning of Papua New Guinea's ICAC several times in 2013 and 2014 at the request of the Government. For Kiribati and Vanuatu, the UN-PRAC team developed discussion papers with detailed guidance on how to develop a national anti-corruption policy and establish an anti-corruption coordination committee as needed for UNCAC implementation.

UN-PRAC has also supported targeted TA to individual PICs, and plans to do more in the future. An FOI consultant has supported Palau and was planned for Vanuatu, although this support was postponed due to the cyclone that hit Vanuatu in early 2015. Assistance to CSOs was also useful as part of the inputs to the development of frameworks (such as the citizen's report card initiative in Samoa).

UN-PRAC has furthered ***Outcome 2, "Key national anti-corruption institutions and non-state actors more effectively tackle corruption,"*** by supporting UNCAC implementation and institution-building by providing technical advice, through support for workshops, via study tours, and by funding consultants.

In-depth institution-building was provided by the Project through the recruitment of two national specialists who were based and worked for a full year in the Department of Justice in the Federated States of Micronesia and with the Public Accounts Committee in Vanuatu. The specialist in the Department of Justice, placed at the request of the Attorney General successfully addressed a number of the recommendations of the UNCAC review and sought to enhance national coordination on anti-money laundering and promote the passing of the Whistleblower Protection Bill. She was also instrumental in raising awareness on corruption among the youth and with government officials. The specialist with the Public Accounts Committee worked closely with the Clerk and provided direct technical assistance to the Committee on their role in considering the Auditor-General's reports. In addition to the work of these advisors, the Project staff worked closely with Papua New Guinea's Office of the Prime Minister and National Executive Council on the establishment of the Independent Commission against Corruption. The Project provided an in-depth assessment on its implementation of UNCAC article 11 (Measures relating to the judiciary and prosecution services) for the in the Federated States of Micronesia and reviewed the assessment conducted by the Chief Justice in the Republic of the Marshall Islands. UN-PRAC further focused on access to information by supporting the drafting of policy, legislation and the establishment of a unit in Vanuatu, and providing advice to Kiribati to a lesser extent. UN-PRAC is co-funding a Right to Information Officer with these Governments for the second half of 2015.

Output 2.1, "Capacity gaps identified and appropriate training given" in anti-corruption emphasizes capacity assessments, capacity development plans, and training; UNCAC reviews as well UN-PRAC workshops provide some of this analysis and are then used to support some capacity building. This includes trainings were provided by UN-PRAC on how to investigate and prosecute corruption cases, through a mock case, given in the Solomon Islands, Republic of the Marshall Islands and in the Federated States of Micronesia (with Palau also in attendance). In addition, UN-PRAC ran a regional workshop on judicial integrity.

Project annual and semi-annual reports note training 430 participants in the first half of 2015 (167 Female) and over 450 (130 female) in 2014. Project reports from 2013 when the project was getting started are not clear on a specific number of people trained.

Output 2.2, “Non-State actors receive training and small grants for their anti-corruption prevention / monitoring activities,” has used civil society workshops as part of UNCAC reviews and follow up workshops to raise awareness of corruption issues and anti-corruption programming and to build capacity to combat corruption. UN-PRAC has implemented this output through dedicated CS events, such as the 2015 Pacific Youth Forum against Corruption, which focused on youth, and Tuvalu, Tonga and Fiji civil society workshops. Participants interviewed greatly appreciated this engagement. While there has always been outreach to media to increase coverage, UN-PRAC also supported training for media in Tonga in 2015.

Output 2.3, “South-South exchanges of expertise and knowledge,” is another mechanism used by the project – as well as a goal in and of itself in the Project Document. UN-PRAC support for UNCAC review uses southern expertise to review the PICs and some CLPs to review other countries. Workshops also share experience and knowledge, nationally and between PICS. Organisations used include the Pacific Youth Forum Against Corruption, the Pacific Association of Supreme Audit Institutions, and using strong national counterparts from developing countries, like as the Fijian FIU, as well as experts from the region, such as the former Auditor-General from the Solomon Islands. UN-PRAC support has enabled Financial Intelligence Units (FIUs) from at least 6 Pacific Island countries to participate in the attachment and training programme offered at the Fiji FIU for three consecutive years. An exchange programme between the staff of the Audit Offices in Fiji and Kiribati is set to commence in the second half of 2015 with Project support. Some CLPs noted that experience from within the region was particularly useful for their AC efforts.

Outcome 3, “Knowledge and research produced and/or shared to ground more informed anti-corruption policy and advocacy,” had an explicit target of at least 3 products produced and baseline survey’s produced in at least two PICs. As of July 2015, the UN-PRAC team has published two factsheets and the AC directory. For surveys, the Project’s UNODC advisor has assisted across the region in preparing UNCAC review, including the legislative (and in same case, also the institutional and practical) implementation of UNCAC in the Federated States of Micronesia, Cook Islands, Kiribati, Nauru, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. As noted above, an in-depth assessment of the Federated States of Micronesia's implementation of UNCAC article 11 (Measures relating to the judiciary and prosecution services) was also conducted in-country and a review of the Republic of the Marshall Island's assessment. Other knowledge products prepared by the Project include the legislative analysis for the FSM’s implementation of UNCAC and the Cook Islands’ assessment.

Output 3.1, “Capacity of Government counterparts enhanced through participation in global/regional meetings,” is measured by the number of officials supported in attending global and regional fora (disaggregated by country, gender, meeting); UN-PRAC largely reports the same government participants from meetings and workshop noted earlier (leaving out the civil society participants).

Output 3.2, “Knowledge products & research available to support national integrity initiatives,” reports the publications from Outcome 3; these to date are the two Factsheets

and the Directory. UN-PRAC has in process a thematic report based on the UNCAC review reports from PICs. Some CLPs interviewed sought to learn more about successful anti-corruption reforms from the experiences of other PICs, and advocated not only meetings and exchanges (under outcomes 1 and 2) but also additional research and publications through UN-PRAC as a means to develop and spread this knowledge.

The TOR for the evaluation included a question on unintended results. Interviews thus asked about whether CLPs knew of any unintended results– outcomes beyond those included in the logical framework – that had been achieved by UN-PRAC. No interview noted unintended results, positive or negative. Project reporting to UNODC also include the category of unanticipated results. No such results have been noted in project reports through June 2015.

The project was seen as more effective when the full complement of staff were fully engaged. This was seen as a weakness at several times in the project – after approval, when the recruitment and start-up of staff was perceived to be slow; when the UNDP advisor was also contributing to the Pacific Centre as acting governance team lead; after the resignation of the UNDP advisor when the project had either support from consultants or secondment of UNDP staff from other offices around the world; or when the UNODC advisor was the sole advisor in the project.

Follow-through on anti-corruption has sometimes been lacking by national authorities; for example Tonga passed legislation establishing an Anti-Corruption Commission in 2007, but has yet to make it operational by appointing Commissioners. Follow-through may be a problem with or without UN-PRAC support and is not within the project’s control in many instances.

UN-PRAC was commended in some interviews for its successes in raising awareness of anti-corruption, particularly in parliaments, in countries such as Samoa where the government was less interested in AC and correspondingly less engaged with the project. UN-PRAC staff were also appreciated for helping UNDP staff work with CSOs in some of these countries or sub-regions to refine and develop ideas that may become fundable activities under UN-PRAC in the future, such as youth activities against corruption in Samoa. UNDP staff also noted ways that UN-PRAC staff helped them include and integrate aspects of anti-corruption into the development of broader good governance programming in countries of the region. CLPs interviewed about UN-PRAC knew other UNDP programming – but were not aware of behind the scenes advice from UN-PRAC and its influence.

Impact

Impact is defined in the UNODC Evaluation Handbook as “the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term economic, environmental, social change(s) produced or likely to be produced by a project or programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, after the project or programme was implemented.”⁵ Two and a half years of active

⁵ See the Glossary, <http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Guidelines/Glossary.pdf>.

implementation is a short time period for secondary impacts. Targets set by the project can also be used to consider impact, by considering whether they have been achieved or are likely to be reached with a year to go in the project.

The TOR focused impact questions on three areas that are close to the three Outcomes of the project – whether and how the Project has:

- “raised greater awareness around corruption/anti-corruption efforts in Pacific Island countries?
- supported Pacific Islands States participation in the UNCAC review process?
- contributed to anti-corruption reform (i.e. legislative, institutional amendments) in Pacific Island countries?

Project staff, UNODC management, and national partners interviewed emphasized the impact of the project on PIC knowledge of and engagement with UNCAC processes as the main way the project raised greater awareness. This is Outcome 1 and its associated outputs, which go beyond raising awareness to UNCAC ratification and implementation. Civil society organizations that responded to the questionnaire for the review noted the benefits for awareness raising of the UN-PRAC project’s CSO workshops. They saw greater awareness of corruption as an issue and anti-corruption as an approach as the main results of the CSO workshops supported by the project. Some CSO participants sought information about any follow up to the workshops that they had participated, which suggested that awareness of how some PICs were or were not making AC reforms still needed more support. CSO survey respondents noted that greater engagement – and targeted efforts on advocacy – had the potential to contribute to government action against corruption in their countries and the region.

Impact in supporting UNCAC review participation was also clear. CLPs interviewed from all nine of the ten Pacific Island countries (PICs) that are UNCAC States parties asserted that UN-PRAC support had been helpful, very helpful, or critical in holding and finalizing their UNCAC reviews.⁶ Project performance was asserted to be the reason why the Pacific region, not often a leader in international forums, was the only world region to have finalized all their reviews of UNCAC. National CLPs noted this regional achievement in interviews and praised the role of the project in raising the profile of the region in international fora.

Impact to date in terms of the Project’s contribution to anti-corruption reforms through legislative and institutional amendments in Pacific Island countries was less noted in project documentation or by interviewees, many of whom found it difficult to identify specific project support and concrete results. The targets set for Outcome 2 “Key national anti-corruption institutions and non-state actors more effectively tackle corruption,” in the Project Document were AC institutions reviewed/strengthened in at least 3 PICs; enhanced roles of CSOs in at least 6 PICs; and Parliamentary committees in at least 6 PICs more active were seen as not very specific, modest, and for the most part met (although few interviewees had the whole picture of the UN-PRAC project and its work).

⁶ The ten are the Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

Outcome 3, the development and promotion of AC research, has had less attention in the project and correspondingly fewer results. However the kinds of research that has been supported and produced by UN-PRAC has focused explicitly on building understanding of the project that is useful for partners and stakeholders. These Fact-sheets and newsletters as well as the “2015 Pacific Islands Anti-Corruption Directory” support networking and South-South cooperation on AC in the Pacific. These are the types of knowledge that national CLPs suggested they needed and support the South-South methods of learning and advising preferred by many UN staff and national CLPs.

CSO workshop participants reported less knowledge and understanding of what the project’s objectives, goals, and outcomes had been to date – or their plans for the future. They however did appreciate the connections with the donors and other civil society participants and the networking on AC that had been supported by UN-PRAC.

Sustainability

Questions on sustainability asked how the ownership of key stakeholders had been sought and institutionalized by the project, and the major factors that influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of UN-PRAC achievements.

Sustainability also provides a framework to include questions of partnerships, as required in the TOR. Partnership questions included: To what extent has the partnership between UNODC and UNDP been successful under this Project? To what extent have partnerships been sought and established with governments, regional/international organizations and others? Was the partnership and collaboration with UNDP effective and to what extent did it add to the achievement of objectives and outcomes?

PIC countries have small staffs in key counterpart institutions for anti-corruption; project staff and some partners interviewed noted that the small size of the professional staffs in these offices and what was seen as frequent political turnover of key staff hampers sustainability. Working with AC institutions was seen as the strategy for sustainability, in conjunction with awareness raising among governments and parliaments. Institutional strengthening and raising awareness were viewed as part of the package of building political support for AC work and part of the effort in PICs to build a practical consensus that AC was a core attribute of key institutions, which while they might be supported for now through UN-PRAC for activities would eventually be funded adequately and sustainably through the national budget. This was part of the process of getting full PIC ownership over AC.

The personal styles of UN-PRAC staff and ways that they have built relationships and mutual respect with key counterparts in PICs was seen as a key to building partnerships. Building trust was seen as particularly important across the Pacific by both national CLPs and internationals in order to implement, particularly in politically sensitive areas such as AC.

Successful indicators of national ownership in the wake of the program were identified; these include some countries funding their own UNCAC coordinators and developing and funding or co-funding their own AC institutions, such as PACs.

Human Rights and Gender

Three questions from the TOR addressed these topics: Where international human rights standards promoted? To what extent was gender promoted? To what extent were gender and human rights mainstreamed in project development and implementation?

UNDP staff interviewed noted that a human-rights based approach was inherent in the overall framework of the organisation and that support for human rights was a guiding principle in their work. The project thus has a subtle approach to supporting human rights. Some staff went further to explain the relevance of anti-corruption to meeting the rights and responsibilities of citizens. Others noted the crucial roles of UN-PRAC partners such as Ombudsmen's offices in raising human rights issues and developing and strengthening the protection of rights. UN-PRAC picked up particular activities that directly furthered human rights. The Project followed-up on the work of the former Human Rights Adviser in the UNDP Pacific Centre after her departure; this led to drafting of a right to information policy and legislation that passed to establish a Right to Information Unit under the Office of the Prime Minister in Vanuatu, a position that is co-funded with the Government. The design of the Project sponsored Pacific Youth Forum Against Corruption included the Secretariat of the South Community's Regional Rights Resource Team in the Forum in order to highlight the link between corruption and human rights, which started further collaboration going forward. Some CLPs were key counterparts for their countries in the ratification and obligations, including reporting, for key human rights treaties for PICs, however not view UN-PRAC as a human rights project.

UN-PRAC's approaches to gender were recognized by some CLPs, UNDP staff, and UNODC staff. However, other UNDP staff did not consider UN-PRAC specifically relevant to their work on gender with CSO or government partners. UN-PRAC has attended UN-Women-facilitated learning sessions on gender equality and hired a consultant to provide guidance on how the UN-PRAC Project can better mainstream gender within the Project, as well as adopt gender sensitive approaches going forward.

UN-PRAC partners with national counterparts that are selected by Pacific countries themselves; while the project encourages the participation of women in activities, selection was not seen in its purview. UN-PRAC tracks and reports sex-disaggregated statistics for workshop participation.

Some CSO partners from workshops asserted that they did not have adequate information to comment on human rights or gender in the project. Other CSO participants felt that defining corruption in the workshop had framed the issue at least in part as one of ensuring rights of citizens.

Innovation

Although asked about innovation, UN-PRAC innovations were not noted or explained by any CLPs interviewed for the evaluation. UN-PRAC reporting has also not explicitly noted innovations that have been developed by the project. As noted above, project support and activities focus on proven methods, such as civil society conferences, and pre-existing international network/treaties (e.g. UNCAC reviews). These may however be new to

partner countries and project CLPs; These CLPs particularly appreciated UN-PRAC support with processes that are new to them.

III. CONCLUSIONS

The UN-PRAC project has an ambitious design – in working across the Pacific region on sensitive topics of corruption with a complicated partnership between UNODC and UNDP. These aspects of the design have placed high burdens on the management and staff, which have been able to adjust the design to improve staffing and use their good auspices to manage the implementation of the project in this complicated institutional landscape.

The project is clearly relevant to UNDP and UNODC, and its partners in PICs recognize the relevance of UN-PRAC assistance. The project is seen by UNDP and UNODC staff as well aligned with global frameworks and programmes; national stakeholders do not have a clear picture of these global frameworks and are not concerned about whether a project that benefits them is aligned with UN agency frameworks or not. Few CLPs were able to comment on the alignment of the project with UNODC global frameworks or UNDP strategies and global programmes. Rather than a weakness, this may be considered a strength, as it suggests that project materials, activities, and support do not focus on UNODC or UNDP but instead emphasize stakeholder needs, such as meeting obligations under UNCAC or building awareness about the potential for anti-corruption activities. Interviews focused on evaluating the project did not identify many other donors or international programs that target countering corruption in the Pacific.

The UN-PRAC project has developed a set of well-appreciated, efficient, effective workshops to set the stage for anti-corruption efforts within PICs using methods that resonate with key PIC stakeholders like south-south cooperation and targeted TA from project staff. This work under UN-PRAC provides a strong base to support AC legislation and institutions in particular PICs to start helping countries across the Pacific implement AC reforms that are widely seen to make a difference to the population in service delivery. UN-PRAC practices of TA from staff and providing consultants to countries to support particular reforms are appreciated and valued. These practices appear to need more time to have a stronger impact. CLPs note many positives in project performance, particularly towards meeting UNCAC requirements, before then noting additional needs for support and a desire for more follow-up support from the project in a variety of aspects of anti-corruption. Interviews focused on evaluating the project did not identify many national-level institutions or programs that are effectively making a difference against corruption - although these may exist.

UN-PRAC processes and actions are considered to be efficient based on the evident focus on managing costs, co-financing, and using available resources within the UN system wisely in project implementation. UN-PRAC staff were commended for managing the many needed relationships to be effective across the countries of the region and managing the logistics of working across the vast region, including working with UN colleagues. Processes identified as supporting efficiency were targeting high level decision makers, utilizing other UN staff, using a series of workshops to engage beneficiaries in countries, using the press, and soliciting feedback. Efficiency was seen as problematic at the inception of the project when

the process of placing staff was prolonged and when the project has not had a permanent full-time UNDP advisor. GOPAC by contrast had a more regular engagement with UN-PRAC across several countries which came closer to a partnership in project implementation.

UNDP staff across the region felt that they worked in partnership with the project on AC. National CLPs appreciated support from the project but did not view the relationship as one of partnership; they were beneficiaries of project assistance. CSOs that had engaged with the project saw the relationship as new and hoped for more sustained, focused work together. Institutional challenges in the joint programme were managed and handled by the hard work of project staff.

UN-PRAC was seen as effective in its support for PIC knowledge of, ratification, and implementation of UNCAC. This was seen as the main objective of the design and focus of implementation by CLPs that were knowledgeable about the purview of the project. UN-PRAC was seen as less effective in supporting the development of national AC institutions across the region – although the extent and pace of work under this Outcome was seen as picking up and improving. While UN-PRAC has published research products, CLPs sought additional information that they hoped would be useful in helping accelerate AC reforms.

Effective implementation has led to impact; Project staff, UNODC management, and national partners interviewed emphasized the impact of the project in building PIC knowledge of and engagement with UNCAC processes, which lead to ratification and implementation. Support for PIC participation in UNCAC review processes was greatly appreciated. Interviewees noted less impact in national-level reforms to combat corruption, where they sought additional support to make changes in their societies and systems. Few CLPs knew and had used the research products of UN-PRAC produced to date.

UN-PRAC was seldom seen to have a human rights focus or to be engaged in AC through a gender lens. However, the project has endeavoured to reach women, including by trying to analyse and consider gender and corruption as issues to be addressed in the Pacific, and reports gender disaggregated statistics. The project has had a focus on youth in some activities that was appreciated by UN staff and some CLPs.

The UN-PRAC project has had substantial success through its work on UNCAC and in building awareness of corruption as a set of issues and the potential for anti-corruption approaches. The project has had less success to date in supporting the development of practical AC efforts in Pacific island countries that are recognized by the population of these archipelagos. The project has built a strong foundation for further AC programming in many PICs that should be built upon, including for sustainability.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions above lead to suggestions relevant to implementation in the last year of the project, as well as to ideas for further development with donors, partners, and stakeholders for any successor anti-corruption project in the Pacific region.

Since the project has effectively made progress towards its outcomes and outputs, in particular by supported substantial impact in meeting UNCAC obligations, the UN-PRAC should maintain this effort in its final year. With a year left in implementation, the current programme should also emphasize building relations and the base for AC institutions, legislation, and practical implementation that could be developed further in the future, including through a potential UN-PRAC II project.

The UN-PRAC team should focus, based on demand from partners and the limited time remaining, on a subset of outcomes and outputs that they determine best support and institutionalise a base for broader anti-corruption (AC) reform in Pacific Island States (PICs). Since in many PICs, interest in AC and institutional development (with UN-PRAC support) has focused on parliamentary oversight and financial investigations, the project should consider focusing more in this area to help pilot concrete changes that are more visible to people in the region. Other areas to consider increasing the focus on based on substantial interest are in FOI legislation and practices as well as protection of rights through Ombudsman's offices.

Other avenues for AC in PICs should be further explored as part of the prospective development of a follow-on AC project through stakeholder engagement with CLPs, outreach to CSOs, and research. These areas may include other priorities of donors, governments, and people across the region: youth, private sector development, natural resource management, the environment, and climate change. A future project should retain substantial flexibility to provide various types of AC assistance to national partners based on their demand for AC, which cannot be specified *ex-ante*.

As part of developing future AC initiatives, UNDP and UNODC should explore ways to build a stronger institutional partnership and reduce the burden that joint projects place on project staff in relationship-building, implementation, and reporting. A future project should retain substantial collaboration between project staff and UNDP staff across the region. UNDP and UNODC should explore ways to reduce the time-lag between project approval and staffing, and look for methods to involve implementing staff in project design to increase the realism of project planning documents and speed of start-up, particularly staff hiring.

V. LESSONS LEARNED

The TOR included three questions that directly targeted lessons learned. The three were:

- Which lessons, both positive and negative, can be learned from this Project?
- Could best practice(s) be identified through the Project that could be replicated in other regions or thematic areas?
- Was there any practice experimented with through the Project, which did not work and should therefore be avoided in the future?

The findings and conclusions drawn from the interviews and project documents suggest lessons learned with potential replication in other areas. No evidence was found for experimentation, either positive or negative. The design of the project, the experience of two and a half years of UN-PRAC implementation, and the perspectives expressed by project management and staff, the management and staff of UN organisations, project partners, and project beneficiaries suggest several lessons learned relevant for management of current and future anti-corruption programming in Pacific Island Countries.

UNCAC provides an important reference point AC programming appears to be at an early stage across the Pacific region, as does knowledge of corruption issues and the development of AC institutions many in PICs. Links between institutions in countries, networking between PICs, and engagement with international partners on AC also appears to be chronologically young. In such conditions, CLPs valued support that helped integrate institutions in individual countries, brought them together with counterparts from other PICs, and provided ideas about what has been attempted in countering corruption in similar societies in the region. Learning from counterparts and South-South methods may be a best practice for anti-corruption.

Collaborative relationships and flexibility are needed from donors, UN agencies, and project staff to adjust AC program management as well as the content of AC activities in the early stages of their development in the region. This flexibility was needed by project management and staff, and had to be matched and supported by the donor, UNODC, and UNDP to enable the project to develop effective ways of working. Flexibility was needed for aspects like staff structure, where adequate support staff was needed, and to develop effective ways of implementing, such as linking senior officials, parliamentarians, and CSOs in particular PICs around shared interests in AC in workshops and developing or deepening links across these groups.

Substantial time appears to be needed to develop a constituency able to develop effective national AC institutions that are widely recognized to be implementing policies and procedures that reduce corruption in practical ways in PICs. Two and a half years of implementation of UN-PRAC may not be enough time to make substantial progress in this area under the conditions across the Pacific islands. Longer programming cycles or a clear

sequence of programmes may be needed to support cultural and institutional change, such as AC, in small, traditional societies like the PICs.

Programmatic flexibility provides important benefits in being able to develop a wide range of activities in diverse areas based on shifting, unforecastable demand - but leads to challenges in aggregating programmatic results across activities and explaining impact. By its nature and design, the wide range of Project activities that have been developed with so many different institutions in the 15 PICs is a challenge for management to report on – and for an evaluator to evaluate. This diversity and range build a base for future anti-corruption activities.

ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE EVALUATION



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

Terms of Reference of the Mid-Term Evaluation UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project

2015



UNITED NATIONS
New York, Year 2015

Contents

I. Background and context.....	01
II. Disbursement history.....	04
III. Purpose of the evaluation	04
IV. Scope of the evaluation	05
V. Evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions.....	06
VI. Evaluation methodology.....	08
VII. Timeframe and deliverables.....	08
VIII.Evaluation team composition	09
IX. Management of evaluation process	12
X. Payment modalities	13
Annexes	
I. Terms of reference for evaluators.....	15
II. List of background documents for desk review	23
III. List of CLP members.....	24

I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Project number:	UNDP No. 00093645 UNODC No. XSPX70
Project title:	UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project
Duration:	2012 - 2016
Location:	Pacific Region
Linkages to Country Programme:	N/A
Linkages to Regional Programme:	UNDP's Regional Programme Document for Asia and the Pacific, Outcome 2: Citizen's expectations for voice, effective development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance UNODC's Regional Programme for Southeast Asia (2014-2017), Sub-Programme 2: Anti-corruption, Outcome 2.1: Member States more effectively prevent, raise awareness of, detect, investigate and prosecute corruption
Linkages to Thematic Programme:	UNODC Thematic Programme on Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity related Crime (2012-2015)
Executing Agency:	UNDP (Pacific Centre) and UNODC
Partner Organizations:	N/A
Total Approved Budget:	US\$4,302,968 (2012/13 - 2015/16) UNDP: \$2,446,000 (2012/13 - 2015/16)

	<p>\$611,500 per year UNODC: \$1,856,968 (2012/13 – 2015/16) \$464,242 per year</p>
Donors:	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)
Project Manager(s)/ Coordinator(s):	<p>UNDP's Pacific Center focal points- Luisa Senibulu, Governance Associate with the UN-PRAC Project; Peter Batchelor, Manager of the UNDP Pacific Centre</p> <p>UNODC's Project Coordinator – Annika Wythes, Anti-Corruption Adviser – Pacific; HQ Focal Person – Candice Welsch, Chief, Implementation Support Section, Corruption and Economic Crime Branch</p>
Type of evaluation (mid-term or final):	Mid-term
Time period covered by the evaluation:	June 2013 to March 2015
Geographical coverage of the evaluation:	Pacific Region
Planned budget for this evaluation:	USD30,000
Core Learning Partners ⁷ (entities):	<p>Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific; UNDP Pacific Centre; UNDP Multi-Country Offices in Fiji, Papua New Guinea and Samoa; Crown Law Office (Cook Islands); Attorney-General's Office and Financial Intelligence Unit (Fiji); Ministry of Justice and FSM National Police (Federated States of Micronesia); Office of the President (Kiribati); Ministry for Justice and Border Control (Nauru); Ombudsman's Office and Attorney-General's Office (Palau); Office of</p>

⁷The Core Learning Partnership (CLP are the key stakeholders of the subject evaluated (project, programme, policy etc.) who have an interest in the evaluation. The CLP works closely with the Evaluation Manager to guide the evaluation process.

	<p>the Prime Minister and National Executive Council and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General (Papua New Guinea); Attorney-General's Office and Chair of the Public Accounts Committee (RMI); Prime Minister's Office and Financial Intelligence Unit (Solomon Islands); Office of the Attorney-General (Tuvalu); Ministry of the Prime Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Justice (Vanuatu); Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat; Melanesian Spearhead Group; Pacific Association of Supreme Audit Institutions.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Project overview and historical context in which the project is implemented

This joint UNDP-UNODC Project aims to support Pacific Island Countries (PICs) to strengthen their capacity to address corruption. While ratification of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) is recognized as a positive demonstration of political commitment in the fight against corruption, the main focus of the Project is to support the implementation of sustainable and effective anti-corruption reform, leveraging off UNCAC as the primary international legislative framework for fighting corruption and monitoring country-level reform efforts.

The Project, funded by the Australian Government, aims to assist PICs fight corruption by supporting: i) UNCAC ratification; ii) UNCAC implementation through the strengthening of policies, laws, measures and institutional frameworks; and iii) engagement in the UNCAC processes, including the mechanism for the review of implementation of UNCAC (UNCAC Review Mechanism).

Justification of the project and main experiences / challenges during implementation

The overall goal of the UN-PRAC Project is *"to strengthen the capacity of Pacific Island Countries to tackle corruption and thereby to improve service delivery"*, pursuant to the Project Document. This goal is based upon recognition that UNDP and UNODC emphasize sustainable human development, and that corruption remains a major barrier in the Pacific to achieving this goal.

Consistent with the goal of UN-PRAC, the UN-PRAC Project has adopted three outputs. As articulated in the Joint Project Document, these are:

- *Output 1: To strengthen political will to endorse strong policy legal frameworks aimed at implementing UNCAC*

- *Output 2: To strengthen the capacity of key national anti-corruption institutions and non-state actors to more effectively tackle corruption with resultant improvements in service delivery*
- *Output 3: To promote more informed anti-corruption policy and advocacy by conducting tailored research and sharing knowledge*

Output 1 of the UN-PRAC Project is "*to strengthen political will to endorse strong policy legal frameworks aimed at implementing UNCAC*". Output 1 is based on broad international and regional experiences which recognize political will as vital to tackling corruption effectively, yet political will in support of anti-corruption efforts in the Pacific has been inconsistent. Output 1 recognizes the importance of enabling PICs to become States parties to the Convention, as well as participate in the UNCAC Review Mechanism. Output 1 also underlines the importance of supporting PICs to develop effective policy and legal frameworks in the fight against corruption. To this end, under Output 1, the UN-PRAC Project adopted four activity areas. These are:

- Activity 1.1: MPs better able to implement UNCAC / accountability standards;
- Activity 1.2: Countries encouraged and supported to ratify UNCAC;
- Activity 1.3: Countries supported to participate in UNCAC Review Mechanism;
- Activity 1.4: National Anti-Corruption frameworks, including legislation, developed /strengthened.

Output 2 of the UN-PRAC Project is "*to strengthen the capacity of key national anti-corruption institutions and non-state actors to more effectively tackle corruption with resultant improvements in service delivery*". Output 2 recognizes the importance of institutional strengthening of, and building capacity within, key integrity institutions in the Pacific. This commitment is based upon experience that capacity limitations remain a major challenge in the region, and that weak institutions undermine effective governance. Output 2 also recognizes the importance of non-state actors in the fight against corruption, particularly in so far as their key role in advocating for effective reform as well as their role in holding governments to account. Output 2 also recognizes the importance of 'South-South' collaboration and experience sharing as a means to enhance learning and knowledge transfer based upon similar contexts. To this end, under Output 2, the UN-PRAC Project adopted three activity areas. These are:

- Activity 2.1: Capacity development of key integrity institutions;
- Activity 2.2: Non-state actors undertake effective anti-corruption advocacy and monitoring;
- Activity 2.3: South-South exchanges of expertise and knowledge.

Output 3 of the UN-PRAC Project is "*to promote more informed anti-corruption policy and advocacy by conducting tailored research and sharing knowledge*". Output 3 is intended to enable national counterparts and UNDP/ UNODC staff to

participate in key international fora, and to access and learn from international experience and emerging issues internationally and regionally. In addition, Output 3 is to enable the UN-PRAC Project to contribute to international, regional and national level learning through the development of relevant and well-targeted knowledge products. To this end, under Output 3, the UN-PRAC Project adopted two activity areas. These are:

- Activity 3.1: Capacity of UNDP (and UNODC) staff and Government counterparts enhanced through participation in global/regional meetings;
- Activity 3.2: Knowledge products and research available to support national integrity initiatives.

Project documents and revisions of the original project document

The full Project Document can be found at:

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/rbap/docs/Research%20&%20Publications/mdg/PC_UNDP_UNODC_Joint_Pacific_ProDoc.pdf.

There have been no revisions to the original project document.

This Project falls under the Outcome 2 of UNDP's Regional Programme on Asia and the Pacific, dealing with citizen's expectations for voice, effective development, the rule of law and accountability. In that regard, UNDP has committed to support implementation of country programmes through policy advisory services, contributing to strengthened transparency, accountability and integrity at national and sub-national levels in compliance with UNCAC.

This Project falls under Subprogramme 2 (Countering Corruption) of the UNODC Strategy 2012-2015. The objective of this subprogramme is to prevent and combat corruption, in line with UNCAC. The Project comes directly under 2.7, "Enhanced capacity of national institutions to prevent and fight corruption in the private sector and to enhance the role of the private sector as a stakeholder in the prevention of and fight against corruption, through advocating the effective implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption".

This Project further falls under UNODC Thematic Programme "Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity-related Crime" (2012-2015), as well as Sub-Programme 2 (Anti-corruption) of the Regional Programme for Southeast Asia (2014-2017). The Project comes directly under 2.1 of the Regional Programme, "Member States more effectively prevent, raise awareness of, detect, investigate and prosecute corruption".

II. DISBURSEMENT HISTORY

<i>Total Approved Budget (time period)</i>	<i>Expenditure (time period)</i>	<i>Expenditure in % (time period)</i>
US\$4,302,968 (2012/13 – 2015/16)	4 years	Expenditure rate of UNDP as of 31 December 2014 was 70.1%
UNDP: \$2,446,000 (2012/13 – 2015/16) \$611,500 per year		Expenditure rate of UNODC as of 31 December 2014 was 79.6%
UNODC: \$1,856,968 (2012/13 – 2015/16) \$464,242 per year		

III. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

Reasons behind the evaluation taking place

The mid-term evaluation is mandatory as outlined in the Project Document.

Assumed accomplishment of the evaluation

The evaluation will be used to improve the Project performance and also to design future activities along the subject matter.

The goals include to: assess the progress of the Project against the result framework (outcomes and outputs) and provide recommendations for strengthening its performance and impact; assess the Project’s alignment with and contribution to the UNDP’s Global Anti-corruption Initiative (GAIN) (2014-2017), UNDP’s Strategic Plan, “Changing with the World” (2014-2017) and UNODC’s Thematic Programme on Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity related Crime (2012-2015); and provide forward looking recommendations based on lessons learned and good practices for a possible Phase II of the UN-PRAC Project.

The main evaluation users

The UN-PRAC Team and DFAT.

IV. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The unit of analysis to be covered by the evaluation

The unit of analysis of the evaluation will be comprised by the UN-PRAC Project and therefore should cover all activities undertaken under the Project.

The time period to be covered by the evaluation

The time period to be covered is since June 2013 to March 2015.

The geographical coverage of the evaluation

The geographical coverage is the Pacific region.

V. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, as well as partnerships and cooperation, gender and human rights and lesson learned, and, will respond to the following below; however, provided as indicative only, and required to be further refined by the Evaluation Team.

<i>Relevance</i>
1. How relevant is the Project to target groups' needs and priorities, including the target groups of governments, the private sector and others?
2. To what extent is the Project aligned with and/or complementary to the policies and strategies of other relevant regional and international organizations (with or within the UN) and where applicable, bilateral donors?
3. To what extent has the Project been aligned with the mandate, overarching strategies and policies of the UNDP Pacific Centre and UNODC?

<i>Efficiency</i>
1. Were the actions taken to achieve the outputs efficient?
2. To what extent were the human and financial resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?
3. To what extent was the coordination between UNDP Pacific Centre, UNODC and the UN Country Offices involved in the Project efficient and appropriate?
4. To which extent were the activities of this Project implemented in the Pacific region integrated with UNDP/GAIN and the UNDP Pacific Centre’s and UNODC/CEB’s mandate and portfolio of interventions? And to other relevant global, regional/country programmes?
<i>Effectiveness</i>
1. Were the planned objectives and outcomes in the workplans and Project Document achieved?
2. Were there any unintended results achieved beyond those included in the logical framework? If so, what were those results?
3. What measures have been taken by Core Learning Partners in-country based on UN-PRAC activities/inputs?
<i>Impact</i>
1. Has the Project raised greater awareness around corruption/anti-corruption efforts in Pacific Island countries?
2. Has the Project contributed to anti-corruption reform (i.e. legislative, institutional amendments) in Pacific Island countries?
3. Has the Project supported Pacific Islands States participation in the UNCAC review process?
<i>Sustainability</i>
1. To what extent and how has the ownership of key stakeholders been sought and institutionalized?
2. What are the major factors that influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?
<i>Partnerships and cooperation</i>
1. To what extent has the partnership between UNODC and UNDP been successful under this Project?
2. To what extent have partnerships been sought and established with governments, regional/international organizations and others?
3. Was the partnership and collaboration with UNDP effective and to what extent did it add to the achievement of objectives and outcomes?
<i>Human rights and gender</i>
1. Where international human rights standards promoted?
2. To what extent was gender promoted?
3. To what extent were gender and human rights mainstreamed in project development and implementation?
<i>Lessons learned</i>

1. Which lessons, both positive and negative, can be learned from this Project?
2. Could best practice(s) be identified through the Project that could be replicated in other regions or thematic areas?
3. Was there any practice experimented with through the Project, which did not work and should therefore be avoided in the future?

VI. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The methods used to collect and analyse data

This evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the Terms of Reference and the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders. In all cases, the consultant is expected to analyze all relevant information sources, such as reports, Project Document, internal review report, Project files, strategic country development documents and any other documents that may provide further evidence for triangulation on which their conclusions will be based. The consultant is also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for this mid-review evaluation. The consultant will present a summarized methodology (evaluation matrix) in an Inception Report, which will specify the evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection.

The evaluation should involve multiple perspectives with clear views and assessments both within and outside of UNDP and UNODC. Special attention should be paid to triangulation of different sources and types of data and other information, types of methods and analysis to enhance reliability of the evaluation findings. It is essential that the evaluation assesses and determines the effects of outcomes and impacts (intended or unintended) in different types of duty bearers and right holders in disaggregated fashion with special consideration of the ones in most vulnerable positions.

All evaluations of the United Nations system are guided by the principles of human rights and gender equality. Evaluation methods that are gender-sensitive and methods that explicitly address issues of marginalized, hard-to-reach and vulnerable populations are essential for conducting this evaluation.

The evaluation methodology should define a sampling strategy that will guarantee the highest degree of representation of the reality of the Project recognizing the limitations; the sample is to be representative of the universe of units under study.

The evaluation will have to utilize a mixture of primary and secondary sources of data. The primary sources for the desk review will include, among others, interviews with key stakeholders (face-to-face or by telephone/Skype). Secondary

data sources will include the Project Document, progress and monitoring reports and relevant policy documents, among others.

The consultant will perform a desk review of existing documentation as per the preliminary list of documents (see Annex II) to independently assess and validate evidence gathered from different sources of information, cross-checked and triangulated by primary research methods.

The consultant will summarize the desk review in an Inception Report, which will specify the evaluation methodology proposed in the Terms of Reference, determining the exact design, focus and scope of the evaluation, including the evaluation questions, the sampling strategy, and related data collection indicators, methods, sources of information, and instruments as well as include a detailed work plan for the evaluation.

The consultant is expected to deliver the Inception Report as one of the key deliverables, and to share it with the UN-PRAC Project team for review, and also with UNDP's Pacific Centre Management and UNODC's IEU for clearance. The Inception Report should ensure that the stakeholders have a common understanding of how the evaluation will be conducted.

The UN-PRAC team will provide support to the consultant before, during and after the mission to Suva, Fiji. The required support will include, for example, provision of assistance in setting up meetings with key informants and stakeholders in consultation with the UN-PRAC Advisers, supporting in all logistical matters (including local translation, in-country travel, security and accommodation), making available all relevant Project materials to the consultant, and arranging discussions with Field Office staff and others. After the evaluation, the UN-PRAC team will lead discussions about the recommendations with the stakeholders, and follow-up on their implementation.

The de-briefing session for the presentation of the preliminary findings will be organized with the UN-PRAC team. The de-briefing session is expected to strengthen the ownership among the Core Learning Partners and promote understanding of the evaluation results. During the de-briefing session, the consultant will present an oral report of initial findings and preliminary conclusions. The de-briefing session could also be used as an opportunity for identifying needs for follow-up interviews and conducting them as may be needed.

The Draft Evaluation Report prepared by the consultant will be shared with the relevant UNDP and UNODC Offices for their comments, inputs and corrections of factual information, as guided by the UN-PRAC Project team. Relevant comments, inputs and corrections will be incorporated by the consultant to produce the final Evaluation Report.

In conducting the evaluation, the consultant has to conform to the UN's Evaluation Policy, including the guiding principles.

The evaluation will be conducted by an international evaluator.

The sources of data

The following sources of data to include are: Project Document for the UN-PRAC Project; annual and semi-annual reports of the Project; donor reports (QAIs) and work plans of the Project; DFAT-UNODC and DFAT-UNDP Pacific Centre grant agreements and all related reports; Sample Missions/ Back-to-Office reports of UN-PRAC Project; Executive Summaries of the UNCAC reviews of the Pacific; interventions made by non-UNODC Core Learning Partners during the resumed fifth session of the Implementation Review Group in Vienna in October 2014; newspaper articles/radio coverage/other materials pertaining to UN-PRAC Project advocacy; UNDP's Strategic Plan, "Changing with the World" (2014-2017), UNDP Regional Programme for Asia and the Pacific; UNODC Strategy 2012-2015; Thematic Programme – Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity-related Crime (2012 – 2015); UNDP's Global Anti-corruption Initiative (GAIN) (2014-2017); UNDP's Regional Programme for Southeast Asia (2014-2017); and other documentation, as necessary.

VII. TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

Time frame for the evaluation

The timeframe for the evaluation is from 1 May 2015 to 1 July 2015, so 25 working days over a period of 8 weeks.

Time frame for the field mission

One mission to Suva, Fiji is to be held in the first half of May 2015 for approximately 5 days.

Expected deliverables and time frame

The consultant will be responsible for the following outputs, which are to be consistent with the UNDP and UNODC evaluation policy:

- Inception Report, containing a refined work plan, methodology and evaluation tools;
- Draft Evaluation Report; and
- Final Evaluation Report, including the feedback from UNDP and UNODC on the draft report and final presentation on the evaluation results. The final Evaluation Report should contain assessment of the Project performance, identification of the

main lessons learned and good practice, and recommendations for a possible phase II of the Project.

Duties	Duration (working days)	Timeframe (due date)	Location	Deliverables
Initial briefing and consultation with UN-PRAC Project team and start up of desk review and drafting of the Inception Report.	5 days	First half of May 2015	Suva	Draft Inception Report, containing a refined work plan, methodology and evaluation tools
Drafting of the Inception Report (Inception Report to be reviewed and cleared by the UN-PRAC Project team)	4 days	Mid May 2015	Home-based	
Data collection: interviews (with Core Learning Partners)	7 days	End May 2015	Home-based (teleconferences)	Notes
Presentation of preliminary findings	1 day	End May 2015	Home-based (teleconferences)	Notes
Drafting of the Evaluation Report; submission to the UN-PRAC Project team for review and clearance	7 days	Mid June 2015	Home-based	Draft Evaluation Report
Finalization of the Evaluation Report (reviewed and cleared by the UN-PRAC Project team, and also cleared by UNDP Pacific Centre Management and UNODC's IEU)		End of June 2015		Final Evaluation Report, including annexes
Preparation of a presentation of evaluation findings and	1 day	30 June 2015	Home-based (teleconference)	Notes Power Point presentation

recommendations to UN-PRAC Project team (the team will then pass on the findings and recommendations to DFAT and the joint UNDP-UNODC-DFAT Steering Committee)				Draft of a final "brief" on the evaluation results
Total	25 days			

VIII. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

Number of evaluators needed

One international evaluator is needed to conduct this mid-term evaluation.

The role of the evaluator

Carry out the desk review; develop the Inception Report, including sample size and sampling technique; draft and finalize the Inception Report and evaluation methodology, incorporating relevant comments; lead and coordinate the evaluation process and the oversee the tasks of the evaluators; implement quantitative tools and analyze data; triangulate data and test rival explanations; ensure that all aspects of the terms of reference are fulfilled; draft an evaluation report in line with UNDP evaluation policy, guidelines and template and also with UNODC guidance; finalize the Evaluation Report on the basis of comments received; include a management response in the final report; present the final evaluation findings and recommendations to stakeholders.

More details will be provided in the respective job descriptions in Annex I.

Absence of Conflict of Interest

The consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/ project or theme under evaluation.

They will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial.

Reference to the evaluators ToR detailing qualifications and responsibilities

Please refer to Annex I for the details of the consultant’s Terms of Reference.

IX. MANAGEMENT OF EVALUATION PROCESS

Roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager

The Project Manager is responsible for managing the evaluation, drafting and finalizing the Terms of Reference, selecting Core Learning Partners and informing them of their role, recruiting evaluators, providing desk review materials to the evaluation team, reviewing the inception report as well as the evaluation methodology, liaising with the Core Learning Partners/stakeholders, reviewing the draft report, assessing the quality of the final report by using the Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, as well as developing an implementation plan for the evaluation recommendations as well as follow-up action (to be updated once per year).

Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation stakeholders

Members of the Core Learning Partnership are selected by the project managers. Members of the Core Learning Partnership are selected from the key stakeholder groups, including UNDP/UNODC management, mentors, beneficiaries, partner organizations and donor Member States. The Core Learning Partners are asked to comment on key steps of the evaluation and act as facilitators with respect to the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action.

Roles and responsibilities of UNDP Pacific Centre Management and the UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit

The UNDP Evaluation Office provides norms, standards, guidelines and tools to support the quality enhancement of evaluations, which are implemented by the UNDP Pacific Centre Management. Evaluation related tools can be found on the following webpage: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/>

IEU of UNODC provides normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process. Please find the respective tools on the IEU website <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html>.

Logistical support responsibilities

The UN-PRAC Project team will be in charge of providing logistical support to the consultant including arranging the field mission. For the field mission, the consultant is to liaise with the UN-PRAC team.

X. PAYMENT MODALITIES

Consultants will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNDP rules and regulations. The contract is a legally binding document in which the consultant agrees to complete the deliverables by the set deadlines. It is the responsibility of the requesting office to carefully consider and determine the estimated time period that the consultant would need, to be able to produce quality work and fully complete all the expected deliverables on time. It is particularly essential that sufficient time is planned for the drafting and finalizing of the report, including the process of consultation and incorporation of comments and changes. Payment is correlated to deliverables and three instalments are typically foreseen (25%, 25% and 50% of total fees):

- The first payment (25 per cent of the consultancy fee) upon clearance of the Inception Report;
- The second payment (25 per cent of the consultancy fee) upon clearance of the Draft Evaluation Report;
- The third and final payment (50 percent of the consultancy fee, i.e. the remainder of the fee) only after completion of the respective tasks, receipt of the final report, as well as a presentation of final evaluation findings and recommendations.

TOR ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EVALUATORS

TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)

Title:	International Evaluation Consultant
Organizational Section/Unit:	UN Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project
Duty Station:	Home based (with one mission to Fiji first half of May 2015 for approximately 5 days)
Proposed period:	1 May 2015 to 1 July 2015
Actual work time:	25 working days over a period of 8 weeks

1. Purpose of the Assignment

The joint United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is seeking a consultant to conduct a Mid-Term Evaluation of the Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project. The mid-term evaluation is part of the UNDP-PRAC project strategy and it will be used to improve the project performance and also to design future activities along the subject matter.

2. Background

This joint UNDP-UNODC Project aims to support Pacific Island Countries (PICs) to strengthen their capacity to address corruption. While ratification of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) is recognized as a positive demonstration of political commitment in the fight against corruption, the main focus of the Project is to support the implementation of sustainable and effective anti-corruption reform, leveraging off UNCAC as the primary international legislative framework for fighting corruption and monitoring country-level reform efforts.

The Project, funded by the Australian Government, aims to assist PICs fight corruption by supporting: i) UNCAC ratification; ii) UNCAC implementation through the strengthening of policies, laws, measures and institutional frameworks; and iii) engagement in the UNCAC processes, including the mechanism for the review of implementation of UNCAC (UNCAC Review Mechanism). The full Project Document can be found at http://www.undp.org/content/dam/rbap/docs/Research%20&%20Publications/mdg/PC_UNDP_UNODC_Joint_Pacific_ProDoc.pdf.

3. Purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to:

- 1) To assess progress of the Project against the result framework (outcomes and outputs) and provide recommendations for strengthening its performance and impact;
- 2) To assess the Project's alignment with and contribution to the UNDP's Global Anti-corruption Initiative (GAIN) (2014-2017), UNDP's Strategic Plan, "Changing with the World" (2014-2017) and UNODC's Thematic Programme on Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity related Crime (2012-2015), and
- 3) To provide forward looking recommendations based on lessons learned and good practices for a possible Phase II of the UN-PRAC Project.

Within this framework, specific issues and questions to be addressed will include, but not be limited to the issues of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability. The specific evaluation questions will be developed by the Consultant in collaboration with the UN-PRAC project team. List of indicative questions is attached as Annex 1 of these ToR.

The Final Report of the mid-term evaluation will be stand-alone document that substantiates recommendations and conclusions.

4. Specific tasks to be performed by the individual contractor

The International Evaluation Consultant will carry out the following duties:

- Carry out the desk review of relevant Project documentation (;
- Develop the Inception Report, including containing a refined work plan, methodology* and evaluation tools (including the questions), in line with UNDP and UNODC evaluation policies and incorporating relevant comments from the UN-PRAC Project team; A list of key stakeholders (core learning partners) should accompany the Inception Report.
- Interacting (mostly through electronic interviews) with the Core Learning Partners (national, regional and global levels,
- Draft an Evaluation Report in line with UNODC and UNDP evaluation policies;
- Finalize the Evaluation Report on the basis of comments received, include the management response in the Final Report;
- Present the findings and recommendations of the evaluation, as/when agreed with the UN-PRAC Project team.

*The methodology of the evaluation shall entail triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data, multiple sources of information and shall be gender and human rights responsive.

5. Expected tangible and measurable outputs

The International Evaluation Consultant will be responsible for the following outputs, which are to be consistent with the UNDP evaluation policy, handbook, guidelines and templates and also with UNODC guidance:

- Inception Report, containing a refined work plan, methodology and evaluation tools;

- Draft Evaluation Report; and
- Final Evaluation Report, including the feedback from the UN-PRAC Project team on the draft report and final presentation on the evaluation results. The final Evaluation Report should contain assessment of the Project performance, identification of the main lessons learned and good practice, and recommendations for a possible phase II of the Project.

6. Deliverables specified by required time

Duties	Duration (working days)	Timeframe (due date)	Location	Deliverables
Initial briefing and consultation with UN-PRAC Project team and start up of desk review and drafting of the Inception Report.	5 days	First half of May 2015	Suva	Draft Inception Report, containing a refined work plan, methodology and evaluation tools
Drafting of the Inception Report (Inception Report to be reviewed and cleared by the UN-PRAC Project team)	4 days	Mid May 2015	Home-based	
Data collection: interviews (with Core Learning Partners)	7 days	End May 2015	Home-based (teleconferences)	Notes
Presentation of preliminary findings	1 day	End May 2015	Home-based (teleconferences)	Notes
Drafting of the Evaluation Report; submission to the UN-PRAC Project team for review and clearance	7 days	Mid June 2015	Home-based	Draft Evaluation Report
Finalization of the Evaluation Report (reviewed and cleared by the UN-PRAC Project team, and also cleared by UNDP Pacific Centre Management and UNODC's IEU)		End of June 2015		Final Evaluation Report, including annexes
Preparation of a	1 day	30 June 2015	Home-based	Notes

presentation of evaluation findings and recommendations to UN-PRAC Project team (the team will then pass on the findings and recommendations to DFAT and the joint UNDP-UNODC-DFAT Steering Committee)			(teleconference)	Power Point presentation Draft of a final "brief" on the evaluation results
Total	25 days			

The Consultant shall report and work under the guidance of the UN-PRAC Project team. Responsibilities for logistical support remain with UNDP Pacific Centre, Suva. The UN-PRAC Project team will provide the Consultant with the needed documentation and contacts of the identified Core Learning Partners.

7. Payments

Consultants will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNDP rules and regulations.

Payments will be issued as follows:

Deliverable	Payment
Inception Report, containing a refined work plan, methodology and evaluation tools	25%
Draft Evaluation Report	25%
Final Evaluation Report, including the feedback from the UN-PRAC Project team and final presentation on the evaluation results	50%

8. Indicators to evaluate the consultant's performance

All outputs should meet the satisfaction of UNODC and UNDP according to the following indicators:

- Substantive quality and quantity of contributions provided; technical competence and timely completion of assigned tasks.
- Assessment of performance as at least fully satisfactory by UNODC and UNDP.

9. Qualifications/expertise sought

The Consultant should demonstrate:

- University degree/advanced university degree in law, social sciences or related field.

- At least 10 years of professional experience in development work; strong record in designing and leading programme and project evaluations (designing, conducting and leading evaluations; applying qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods).
- At least 3 years of experience with governance and anti-corruption or closely related issues (such as transparency and accountability, crime prevention);
- Excellent communication and drafting skills in English.
- Prior work experience with the UNDP and/or UNODC is an asset.
- Knowledge of the Pacific Region is an asset

10. Absence of Conflict of Interest:

The consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project or theme under evaluation.

They will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial.

10. Ethics

The evaluators shall respect the UNEG norms and standards for evaluations and the Ethical Guidelines.

11. Evaluation Criteria

The Consultant will be evaluated based on technical capacities (70%) and financial proposal (30%). The technical evaluation will be based on the following criteria:

- University degree/advanced university degree in law, social sciences or related field – 15 points
- At least 10 years of professional experience in development work –20 points
- Strong record in designing and leading programme and project evaluations (designing, conducting and leading evaluations; applying qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods) – 25 points
- At least 3 years of experience with governance and anti-corruption or closely related issues (such as transparency and accountability, crime prevention) – 20 points
- Communication and drafting skills in English – 5 points.
- Prior work experience with the UNDP and/or UNODC – 10 points.
- Knowledge of the Pacific Region – 5 points

The evaluation will be performed in two stages, the technical evaluation being completed prior to any financial proposals being opened and compared. The financial proposal will be opened only for submissions that passed the minimum technical score of 70% of the obtainable 100 points in the evaluation of the technical

component. The technical component is evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the ToR.

Technically qualified consultants may be selected for an interview before financial evaluation.

Maximum 100 points will be given to the lowest offer and the other financial proposals will receive the points inversely proportional to their financial offers. i.e. $S_f = 100 \times F_m / F$, in which S_f is the financial score, F_m is the lowest price and F the price of the submission under consideration.

The weight of technical points is 70% and financial points is 30%.

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on cumulative analysis, the award of the contract will be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- a) Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation.

12. Application procedure and deadline

Interested applicants must submit the following document/information (in PDF format) to demonstrate their qualifications.

Proposals should contain the following information:

- i) Technical proposal - a P11 form (available on the UNDP website [http://www.undppc.org.fj/resources/article/files/P11%20 Personal History Form.pdf](http://www.undppc.org.fj/resources/article/files/P11%20Personal%20History%20Form.pdf)), and an updated CV, with contact details of at least three referees and a cover letter setting out how the applicant meets the selection criteria*
- ii) Financial Proposal - The consultant is requested to provide a proposal or quotation of the fees/cost for the services which will be rendered using the following format and should be separate from the technical proposal.*

Financial proposal (with your signature):

- The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount in **US Dollar** including consultancy fees and all associated costs i.e. airfares, travel cost, meal, accommodation, tax, insurance, etc. See format of financial officer in Annex. 2
- Please note that the cost of preparing a proposal and of negotiating a contract, including any related travel, is not reimbursable as a direct cost of the assignment.
- If quoted in other currency, prices shall be converted to US Dollar at UN Exchange Rate at the submission deadline.

All applications must be clearly marked and submitted by **5.00pm, XXXth XXX 2015** (Fiji Time) either electronically to dale.kacivi@undp.org or addressed under confidential cover to:

Consultancy application: International Evaluation Consultant

*ATTN: Dale Kacivi
C/- UNDP Fiji Multi-Country office
Private Mail Bag
Suva.*

For further information concerning the ToR, contact Ms. Luisa Senibulu, UN-PRAC Programme Associate, UNDP-PC, Suva, on e-mail luisa.senibulu@undp.org / telephone (679) 3300399.

Incomplete applications will not be considered, and only candidates for whom there is further interest will be contacted.

Women candidates are encouraged to apply.

TOR Annex 1- List of Indicative Questions:

<i>Relevance</i>
1. How relevant is the Project to target groups’ needs and priorities, including the target groups of governments, the private sector and others?
2. To what extent is the Project aligned with and/or complementary to the policies and strategies of other relevant regional and international organizations (with or within the UN) and where applicable, bilateral donors?
3. To what extent has the Project been aligned with the mandate, overarching strategies and policies of the UNDP Pacific Centre and UNODC?
<i>Efficiency</i>
1. Were the actions taken to achieve the outputs efficient?
2. To what extent were the human and financial resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?
3. To what extent was the coordination between UNDP Pacific Centre, UNODC and the UN Country Offices involved in the Project efficient and appropriate?
4. To which extent were the activities of this Project implemented in the Pacific region integrated with UNDP/GAIN and the UNDP Pacific Centre’s and UNODC/CEB’s mandate and portfolio of interventions? And to other relevant global, regional/country programmes?
<i>Effectiveness</i>
1. Were the planned objectives and outcomes in the workplans and Project Document achieved?
2. Were there any unintended results achieved beyond those included in the logical

framework? If so, what were those results?
3. What measures have been taken by Core Learning Partners in-country based on UN-PRAC activities/inputs?
<i>Impact</i>
1. Has the Project raised greater awareness around corruption/anti-corruption efforts in Pacific Island countries?
2. Has the Project contributed to anti-corruption reform (i.e. legislative, institutional amendments) in Pacific Island countries?
3. Has the Project supported Pacific Islands States participation in the UNCAC review process?
<i>Sustainability</i>
1. To what extent and how has the ownership of key stakeholders been sought and institutionalized?
2. What are the major factors that influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project?
<i>Partnerships and cooperation</i>
1. To what extent has the partnership between UNODC and UNDP been successful under this Project?
2. To what extent have partnerships been sought and established with governments, regional/international organizations and others?
3. Was the partnership and collaboration with UNDP effective and to what extent did it add to the achievement of objectives and outcomes?
<i>Human rights and gender</i>
1. Where international human rights standards promoted?
2. To what extent was gender promoted?
3. To what extent were gender and human rights mainstreamed in project development and implementation?
<i>Lessons learned</i>
1. Which lessons, both positive and negative, can be learned from this Project?
2. Could best practice(s) be identified through the Project that could be replicated in other regions or thematic areas?
3. Was there any practice experimented with through the Project, which did not work and should therefore be avoided in the future?

ANNEX 2 – Financial Proposal Template

Daily consultancy rates	A daily consultancy rate proposed by the
--------------------------------	------------------------------------------

	consultant for 25 working days (When in-country, fees will be paid only for working days)
<p>Flight costs:</p> <p>One country visit to Suva, Fiji Total return Air Tickets (Economy class)</p>	<p>To and from home country.</p> <p>The consultant is expected to be in Suva, Fiji for 5 working days in total (1 trip to Fiji required) The consultant is expected to work the remaining 20 days from their home base for researching, preparing / completing documentation, as well as interacting with stakeholders and UNDP and UNODC staff via email / phone / skype.</p> <p>Travel will be as per UNDP travel guidelines</p>
<p>Daily Living Allowance rate per days ⁹</p>	<p>Based on the number of days spent at the respective duty station as per flight itinerary (this per diem rate will be paid for all days spent in-country)</p>
<p>Other miscellaneous expenses</p>	<p>Please itemise</p>

⁸ Consultant not eligible for daily living allowance for time spent in own home country

⁹ Daily Living Allowance should cover costs associated with accommodation, meals and incidentals

TOR ANNEX II. LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS FOR THE DESK REVIEW

- Project Document for the UN-PRAC Project
- Annual and semi-annual reports of the Project
- Donor reports (QAIs) and work plans of the Project
- DFAT-UNODC and DFAT-UNDP Pacific Centre grant agreements and all related reports
- Sample Missions/ Back-to-Office reports of UN-PRAC Project
- Executive Summaries of the UNCAC reviews of the Pacific
- Interventions made by non-UNODC Core Learning Partners during the resumed fifth session of the Implementation Review Group in Vienna in October 2014
- Newspaper articles/radio coverage/other materials pertaining to UN-PRAC Project advocacy
- UNODC Strategy 2012-2015
- Thematic Programme – Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity-related Crime (2012 – 2015)
- UNDP’s Global Anti-corruption Initiative (GAIN) (2014-2017)
- UNDP’s Strategic Plan, “Changing with the World” (2014-2017)
- UNDP’s Regional Programme for Southeast Asia and the Pacific (2014-2017)
- Other documentation, as necessary, including evaluation guidelines, templates, handbook, policy¹⁰

¹⁰ <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html>

TOR ANNEX III. LIST OF CLP MEMBERS

Type	Organisation	Name	Designation	Location	Email
UN agency	UNODC HQ	Ms. Candice Welsch	Chief, Implementation Support Section	Vienna, Austria	Candice.welsch@unodc.org
UN agency	UNODC Field	Mr. Jeremy Douglas	Regional Representative	Bangkok, Thailand	Jeremy.douglas@unodc.org
UN agency	UNODC Field	Ms. Annika Wythes	Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser/ UNODC Project Manager	Suva, Fiji	Annika.wythes@unodc.org
Implementing partner	UNDP Pacific Centre	Mr. Peter Batchelor	Manager of the UNDP Pacific Centre	Suva, Fiji	Peter.batchelor@undp.org
Implementing partner	UNDP Pacific Centre	Ms. Mihaela Stojkoska	Anti-Corruption Specialist/ UNDP Project Manager	Suva, Fiji	Mihaela.stojkoska@undp.org
Implementing partner	UNDP Pacific Centre	Ms. Luisa Senibulu	UN-PRAC Project Associate	Suva, Fiji	luisa.senibulu@undp.org
Implementing partner	UNDP Pacific Centre	Ms. Samita Singh	UN-PRAC Administrative Assistant	Suva, Fiji	Samita.singh@undp.org
Implementing Partner	Bangkok Regional Hub	Mr. Phil Matsheza	Head of Governance Practice	BKK, Thailand	Phil.matzheza@undp.org
Implementing Partner	UNDP Global AC Initiative (GAIN)	Mr. Anga Timilsina	Programme Manager	NY, USA	Anga.timilsina@undp.org
Implementing	UNDP Multi-Country Offices	Ms. Osnat	UN Resident	Suva, Fiji	osnat.lubrani@one.un.org

partner	in Fiji	Lubrani	Coordinator		
Implementing partner	UNDP Multi-Country Offices in Fiji	Ms. Mohammed Mozeem	Governance Analyst, Democratic Governance and Resilience Building	Suva, Fiji	mohammed.mozeem@undp.org
Implementing partner	UNDP Multi-Country Offices in Papua New Guinea	Ms. Debbie Maraki	Governance Programme Analyst	Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea	Debbie.maraki@undp.org
Implementing partner	UNDP Multi-Country Offices in Samoa	Ms. Georgina Bonin	Assistant Resident Representative	Apia, Samoa	georgina.bonin@undp.org
Recipient	Crown Law Office (Cook Islands)	Ms. Kim Saunders	Solicitor-General	Rarotonga, Cook Islands	Kim.saunders@cookislands.gov.ck
Recipient	Crown Law Office (Cook Islands)	Ms. Cheryl King	Crown Counsel	Rarotonga, Cook Islands	cheryl.king@cookislands.gov.ck
Recipient	Attorney-General's Office (Fiji)	Ms. Seema Chand	Legal Officer	Suva, Fiji	seema.chand@govnet.gov.fj
Recipient	Financial Intelligence Unit (Fiji)	Mr. Razim Buksh	Director, Fiji Financial Intelligence Unit	Suva, Fiji	razim@rbf.gov.fj
Implementing partner	Ministry of Justice (Federated States of Micronesia)	Ms. Shanty Sigrah-Asher	Legal Specialist / UN-PRAC Consultant	Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia	ssasher.fsm@gmail.com
Recipient	Ministry of Justice (Federated States of Micronesia)	Mrs. April D. Skilling	Minster of Justice/ Attorney-General	Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia	adms.fsm@gmail.com
Recipient	FSM National Police (FSM)	Mr. Johnny Santos	Chief of Police	Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia	johnnysnts@gmail.com
Recipient	Office of the	Ms. Taare	Deputy	Tarawa,	taarea@ob.gov.ki

	President (Kiribati)	Aukitino	Secretary, Office of Te Beretitenti	Kiribati	
Recipient	Ministry for Justice and Border Control (Nauru)	Mr. Victor Soriano	Paralegal Officer	Nauru	victor.soriano@naurugov.nr
Recipient	Ombudsman’s Office (Palau)	Mr. Francis Llecholch	Ombudsman	Koror, Palau	flecholch@yahoo.com
Recipient	Attorney-General’s Department (Palau)	Mr. John Bradley	Attorney-General	Koror, Palau	bradleylaw@icloud.com
Recipient	Office of the Prime Minister and National Executive Council (Papua New Guinea)	Mr. Trevor Meauri	Deputy Secretary	Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea	tmeauri@yahoo.com
Recipient	Department of Justice and Attorney-General (Papua New Guinea)	Mr. Mark Jumogot	Acting Principal Legal Officer	Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea	Mark.Jumogot@justice.gov.pg
Recipient	Attorney-General’s Office (Republic of the Marshall Islands)	Mr. Bernard Adiniwin	Attorney	Majuro, Republic of the Marshall Islands	bernardadiniwin@gmail.com
Recipient	Public Accounts Committee (Republic of the Marshall Islands)	Mr. Divine Waiti	Legal Counsel	Majuro, Republic of the Marshall Islands	djwaiti@gmail.com
Recipient	Auditor-General’s Office (Republic of the Marshall Islands)	Mr. Jaston Anjain	Officer	Majuro, Republic of the Marshall Islands	jastonanjain@ntamar.net
Recipient	Prime Minister’s	Mr. Derek Derek	Deputy Secretary to	Honiara, Solomon	dfutaiasi@pmc.gov.sb

	Office (Solomon Islands)	Futaiasi	Prime Minister	Islands	
Recipient	Financial Intelligence Unit (Solomon Islands)	Mr. Jimmy Sendersley	Director, Financial Intelligence Unit	Honiara, Solomon Islands	jsendersly@cbsi.com.sb
Recipient	Office of the Attorney-General (Tuvalu)	Ms. Fale Fili	Attorney	Funafuti, Tuvalu	faleneta13@gmail.com
Recipient	Ministry of the Prime Minister (Vanuatu)	Mr. John Ezra	Policy Adviser	Port Vila, Vanuatu	jezra@vanuatu.gov.vu
Recipient	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Vanuatu)	Ms. Jenny Tevi	Senior Desk Officer, Treaties and Conventions Division	Port Vila, Vanuatu	jtevi@vanuatu.gov.vu
Recipient	Ministry of Justice and Community Services (Vanuatu)	Ms. Pacco Siri	Executive Officer	Port Vila, Vanuatu	psiri@vanuatu.gov.vu
Implementing partner	Public Accounts Committee (PAC) (Vanuatu)	Ms. Nirose Silas	PAC Advisor/ UN-PRAC Consultant	Port Vila, Vanuatu	nsilas@vanuatu.gov.vu
Regional organization	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat	Mr. Ioane M. S. Alama	Regional Security Adviser, Political Governance and Security Programme	Suva, Fiji	ioanea@forumsec.org
Implementing partner	Melanesian Spearhead Group	Mr. Molean Kilepak	Deputy Director General	Port Vila, Vanuatu	m.kilepak@msg.int
Implementing partner	Pacific Association of Supreme Audit Institutions	Mr. Eroni Vatuloka	Executive Director	Auckland, New Zealand	Eroni.Vatuloka@pasai.org

ANNEX II. EVALUATION TOOLS: QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES

KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS FOR CLP MEMBERS

Thank you for talking with me today.

I am conducting an independent evaluation of the UN-PRAC Project for UNDP and UNODC. The goal of the evaluation is to learn about what has been accomplished in the region by the Project so far – both what has worked well and what has not worked as well - to potentially improve project performance over the final year of the Project. The evaluation may also be used by UNDP and UNODC as part of the development of future anti-corruption activities in the Pacific region.

The information from our interview will only be used for the review. As is a standard practice in evaluation, all interviews will be conducted using the principles of anonymity and non-attribution. In conducting the evaluation, I will not attribute any information gathered to you or use this information in the report in a way that can be attributed to you or your organization. This is done as a standard best practice in evaluations all around the world as it encourages open discussion.

The interview is voluntary; you have the right to end the interview at any point without any consequences. Are you willing to participate in the evaluation? [Ensure that the participant verbally agrees to participate.]

Do you have any questions for me before I begin with a short list of questions, and follow-up questions as needed, to learn about your experience with the UN-PRAC Project and its activities?

Open-ended questions to start conversation

1. What has been your engagement with the UN-PRAC Project?
2. How relevant is the UN-PRAC Project to your needs and priorities in anti-corruption?
3. To your knowledge, to what extent is the Project aligned with and complementary to the policies and strategies of other organisations and donors?

4. To your knowledge, to what extent has the Project been aligned with the UNDP Pacific Centre and UNODC? [ASK ONLY IF RESPONDENT HAD AN ANSWER TO Q3]
5. Based on your experience, were the actions taken by UNDP and UNODC to achieve the project's outputs efficient? Why or why not?
6. Based on your experience, were the human and financial resources and inputs of the UN-PRAC project converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner? Why or why not?
7. To your knowledge, to what extent has the coordination between UNDP Pacific Centre, UNODC and the UN Country Offices involved in the Project been efficient and appropriate? [ASK ONLY IF RESPONDENT HAD AN ANSWER TO Q3]
8. To your knowledge, to what extent were the activities of the UN-PRAC Project integrated with UNDP/GAIN, the UNDP Pacific Centre, UNODC Corruption and Economic Crime Branch (CEB), and other global, regional/country programmes? [ASK ONLY IF RESPONDENT HAD AN ANSWER TO Q3]
9. To your knowledge, were the planned objectives and outcomes in the workplans and Project Document achieved?
10. Have there been any unintended results, positive or negative, achieved beyond those intended? If so, what were those results?
11. What measures have you and your country taken based on UN-PRAC activities and inputs?
12. Has the Project raised greater awareness around corruption/anti-corruption efforts in your country and Pacific Island countries? If so, how?
13. Has the Project contributed to anti-corruption reform (i.e. legislative, institutional amendments) in your country or Pacific Island countries? How?
14. Has the Project supported Pacific Islands States participation in the UNCAC review process? If so, how?
15. How has country or regional ownership of anti-corruption efforts been sought and institutionalized through the UN-PRAC project?
16. What do you think are the major factors that influence the sustainability of UN-PRAC achievements?
17. To your knowledge, what extent has the partnership between UNODC and UNDP been successful under this Project?

18. To what extent have anti-corruption partnerships been sought and established with governments, regional/international organizations and civil society through UN-PRAC?
19. Was this partnership and collaboration effective and to what extent did it add to the achievement of objectives and outcomes? [ASK ONLY IF RESPONDENT HAD AN ANSWER TO Q18]
20. Where international human rights standards promoted through the UN-PRAC project? If so, how?
21. To what extent was gender promoted in your engagement with the UN-PRAC project? How?
22. What lessons, positive and negative, can be learned from this Project?
23. Was there any practice experimented with through the Project, which did not work and should be avoided in the future?
24. Thank you for talking with me today about the UN-PRAC Project. To conclude, is there anything else I should know for the evaluation about the Project and its work that we have not yet covered?

KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS FOR UNDP/UNODC MANAGEMENT AND STAFF

Thank you for talking with me today.

I am conducting an independent evaluation of the UN-PRAC Project for UNDP and UNODC. The goal of the evaluation is to learn about what has been accomplished in the region by the Project so far – both what has worked well and what has not worked as well - to potentially improve project performance over the final year of the Project. The evaluation may also be used by UNDP and UNODC as part of the development of future anti-corruption activities in the Pacific region.

The information from our interview will only be used for the review. As is a standard practice in evaluation, all interviews will be conducted using the principles of anonymity and non-attribution. In conducting the evaluation, I will not attribute any information gathered to you or use this information in the report in a way that can be attributed to you or your organization. This is done as a standard best practice in evaluations all around the world as it encourages open discussion.

The interview is voluntary; you have the right to end the interview at any point without any consequences. Are you willing to participate in the evaluation? [Ensure that the participant verbally agrees to participate.]

Do you have any questions for me before I begin with a short list of questions to learn about your experience with the UN-PRAC Project and its activities?

1. What has been your engagement with the UN-PRAC Project?
2. How relevant is the UN-PRAC Project to your needs and priorities in anti-corruption?
3. To your knowledge, to what extent is the Project aligned with and complementary to the policies and strategies of other organisations and donors?
4. To your knowledge, to what extent has the Project been aligned with the UNDP Pacific Centre and UNODC? [ASK ONLY IF RESPONDENT HAD AN ANSWER TO Q3]
5. Based on your experience, were the actions taken by UNDP and UNODC to achieve the project's outputs efficient? Why or why not?
6. Based on your experience, were the human and financial resources and inputs of the UN-PRAC project converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner? Why or why not?

7. To your knowledge, to what extent has the coordination between UNDP Pacific Centre, UNODC and the UN Country Offices involved in the Project been efficient and appropriate? [ASK ONLY IF RESPONDENT HAD AN ANSWER TO Q3]
8. To your knowledge, to what extent were the activities of the UN-PRAC Project integrated with UNDP/GAIN, the UNDP Pacific Centre, UNODC Corruption and Economic Crime Branch (CEB), and other global, regional/country programmes? [ASK ONLY IF RESPONDENT HAD AN ANSWER TO Q3]
9. To your knowledge, were the planned objectives and outcomes in the workplans and Project Document achieved?
10. Have there been any unintended results, positive or negative, achieved beyond those intended? If so, what were those results?
11. What measures have you and your country taken based on UN-PRAC activities and inputs?
12. Has the Project raised greater awareness around corruption/anti-corruption efforts in your country and Pacific Island countries? If so, how?
13. Has the Project contributed to anti-corruption reform (i.e. legislative, institutional amendments) in your country or Pacific Island countries? How?
14. Has the Project supported Pacific Islands States participation in the UNCAC review process? If so, how?
15. How has country or regional ownership of anti-corruption efforts been sought and institutionalized through the UN-PRAC project?
16. What do you think are the major factors that influence the sustainability of UN-PRAC achievements?
17. To your knowledge, what extent has the partnership between UNODC and UNDP been successful under this Project?
18. To what extent have anti-corruption partnerships been sought and established with governments, regional/international organizations and civil society through UN-PRAC?
19. Was this partnership and collaboration effective and to what extent did it add to the achievement of objectives and outcomes? [ASK ONLY IF RESPONDENT HAD AN ANSWER TO Q18]
20. Where international human rights standards promoted through the UN-PRAC project? If so, how?
21. To what extent was gender promoted in your engagement with the UN-PRAC project? How?

22. What lessons, positive and negative, can be learned from this Project?
23. Was there any practice experimented with through the Project, which did not work and should be avoided in the future?
24. Thank you for talking with me today about the UN-PRAC Project. To conclude, is there anything else I should know for the evaluation about the Project and its work that we have not yet covered?

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CIVIL SOCIETY PARTNERS

Dear _____:

As part of the independent evaluation of the UN-PRAC Project for UNDP and UNODC, I am conducting a brief e-mail survey of civil society partners of the Project.

The goal of the evaluation is to learn about what has been accomplished in the region by the Project so far – both what has worked well and what has not worked as well - to potentially improve Project performance over the final year of the Project. The evaluation may also be used by UNDP and UNODC as part of the development of future anti-corruption activities in the Pacific region.

The Project and I would like to enlist your help in the evaluation through a short survey to understand your experience with the Project and thoughts about potential future anti-corruption activities in the Pacific region. We expect that this written survey, which requests short answers in your own words, will take 30 to 45 minutes.

The information from the e-mail survey will only be used for the evaluation. As is a standard practice in evaluation, the principles of anonymity and non-attribution will be observed. In conducting the evaluation, I will not attribute any information gathered to you or use this information in the report in a way that can be attributed to you or your organization. This is done as a standard best practice in evaluations all around the world as it encourages reflection and thought.

If willing to participate in the evaluation, the UN-PRAC team and I would greatly appreciate your completing and returning this brief survey to the Evaluator. Please return the survey to the Evaluator directly, without copying UN-PRAC staff to ensure independence, anonymity, and non-attribution.

Thank you for all of your work against corruption, and for supporting the evaluation.

All the best,

Lawrence Robertson
Independent Evaluator

1. How did you find out about the UN-PRAC Project?
2. What have you done with the UN-PRAC Project?
3. In your personal experience with the UN-PRAC Project, what do you think has been done well? Why have these aspects gone well?
4. Based on your personal experience, what do you think has gone less well with the Project? Why have these aspects been more challenging?

5. What do you see as potential areas for improvement in the UN-PRAC Project?
6. What do you think should be addressed in any successor anti-corruption programme in the Pacific region?
7. How do you see that the UN-PRAC Project has addressed women's inclusion and issues of gender?
8. How do you see that the UN-PRAC Project has addressed human rights issues?
9. Thank you for talking with me today about the UN-PRAC Project. To conclude, is there anything else I should know for the evaluation about the Project and its work that we have not yet covered?

ANNEX III. DESK REVIEW LIST

United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC). 2012. "Thematic Programme on Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity related Crime (2012-2015)." Vienna: UNODC.

http://www.unodc.org/documents/corruption/Thematic_Programme/Thematic_Programme_on_Corruption_-2012-2015_sept12.pdf

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 2014. "Changing with the World - UNDP Strategic Plan: 2014-2017." New York: UNDP.

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/UNDP_strategic-plan_14-17_v9_web.pdf

UNDP. 2014. "UNDP Global Anti-Corruption Initiative (GAIN) 2014-2017." New York: UNDP.

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Democratic%20Governance/Anti-corruption/globalanticorruption_final_web2.pdf

UNDP. 2014. "Asia Pacific Regional Programme 2014-2017." New York: UNDP.

<http://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/dam/rbap/docs/programme-documents/Asia-Pacific-RPD-2014-2017.pdf>

UNDP. 2014. "Anti-corruption Strategies: Understanding What Works, What doesn't and Why? Lessons learned from the Asia-Pacific region." New York: UNDP. http://anti-corruption.org/pmb321/pmb/opac_css//doc_num.php?explnum_id=764

UNODC and UNDP. 2015. Pacific Islands Anti-Corruption Directory. Vienna and New York: UNODC and UNDP.

UNODC and UNDP. 2015. "Terms of Reference of the Mid-Term Evaluation UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project." Vienna and New York: UNODC and UNDP.

UNODC and UNDP. 2012. "United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project (2012-2016) Project Document." Suva: UNDP and UNODC.

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/rbap/docs/Research%20&%20Publications/mdg/PC_UNDP_UNODC_Joint_Pacific_ProDoc.pdf

UNODC. 2015. "Annual Progress Report (APR): Period covered by the report: January - December 2014." Suva: UNODC.

UNODC and UNDP. February 2014. "UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project (2012-2016): 2014 [SIC] Annual Progress Report." Suva: UNODC and UNDP.

UNODC and UNDP. November 2013. UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project (2012-2016): Project Report– November 2013." Suva: UNODC and UNDP

Newspaper reports on Project-Supported Activities (provided by project staff)

Executive summaries of Implementation Review Group From the Third Session (Vienna, 18-22 June 2012); Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

Post-Activity Evaluations of UN-PRAC CSO Activities by participants (provided by UN-PRAC project staff)

Trip reports by UN-PRAC project staff

UN-PRAC Factsheet

UN-PRAC Newsletters

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT). April 2015. "Aid Quality Check for [UN-PRAC]. Sydney: DFAT.

DFAT. December 2014. Partner Performance Assessment (PPA) [for UN-PRAC]. Sydney: DFAT.

DFAT. February 2014. "Quality at Implementation Report for UN Convention against Corruption – UNODC, UN Convention against Corruption – UNDP." Sydney: DFAT.

ANNEX IV. LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED DURING THE EVALUATION

<i>Number of interviewees</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Countries</i>
14	UNDP	Fiji, Tonga, Samoa, Papua New Guinea, Palau
3	UNODC	Austria, Thailand, Fiji
2	DFAT	Australia
2	Various government partners ¹¹	Cook Islands
2	Various government partners	Fiji
2	Various government partners	Federated States of Micronesia
2	Government partner	Nauru
7	Various CSO partners	Various PICs
2	Various government partners	Palau
2	Various government partners	Papua New Guinea
2	Various government partners	Republic of the Marshall Islands
2	Various government partners	Solomon Islands
1	Government partner	Tuvalu
2	Various government partners	Vanuatu
<hr/> Total: 45 (26 women ; 19 men) <hr/>		

¹¹ Specific institutions in countries cannot be named without compromising the anonymity promised CLP members in the interview protocol.