



JOINT MID-TERM INDEPENDENT PROJECT EVALUATION

UNITED NATIONS PACIFIC REGIONAL ANTI-CORRUPTION PROJECT (UN-PRAC)

July 2019

This independent evaluation report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of Mr. Kevin Deveaux (Lead Evaluator) and Ms. Slagjana Taseva (Anti-Corruption Expert). The Independent Evaluation Section (IES) 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 IES web site:

<http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/evaluation.html>

The Independent Evaluation Section 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: unodc-ies@un.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 Section (IES) in relation to independent project evaluations is one of quality assurance and support throughout the evaluation process, but IES does not directly participate in or undertake independent project evaluations. It is, however, the responsibility of IES 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. *This evaluation was managed jointly between UNDP and UNODC.*

The views expressed in this independent evaluation report are those of the evaluation team. They do not represent those of UNODC or of any of the institutions or Member States referred to in the report. All errors and omissions remain the responsibility of the evaluation team.

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS	4
MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS	11
I. INTRODUCTION	12
BACKGROUND	12
PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION	15
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	17
LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION	19
II.FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	20
DESIGN	20
RELEVANCE	25
EFFICIENCY	28
Table 1: Project Disbursement Rate	30
EFFECTIVENESS	34
Table 2: Output Achievement Status.....	36
IMPACT	38
SUSTAINABILITY	41
PARTNERSHIPS & COOPERATION	43
HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUALITY & LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND	46
III. CONCLUSIONS	49
IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES	50
V. RECOMMENDATIONS	52
ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference	55
ANNEX 2: Interview Guide & Questionnaire Used in Evaluation	78
ANNEX 3: List of Background Documents	84
ANNEX 4: List of Stakeholders Interviewed	87
ANNEX 5 : Evaluative Questions & Answers	88

ACRONYMS

CoSP	Conference of States Parties
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Australia)
GOPAC	Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption
MTE	Mid-term Independent Project Evaluation
NACS	National Anti-Corruption Strategy
PIANGO	Pacific Islands Association of Non-Governmental Organisations
PIC	Pacific Island Country
PILON	Pacific Islands Law Officer Network
PIPSO	Pacific Islands Private Sector Organisation
PRNGO	Pacific Regional Non-Governmental Organisations Association
PYFAC	Pacific Youth Forum Against Corruption
RTI	Right to Information
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SRPD	UNDP Sub-regional Programme Document
UN	United Nations
UNCAC	United Nations Convention against Corruption
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UN-PRAC	United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project
UNPS	United Nations Pacific Strategy

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Recommendations	Management Response	Timeline	Responsibility
1. Increase the focus of the project on Right to Information (RTI);	Agreed. The Project will be performing an overview of RTI status in the region and publish a policy paper on RTI. All this will inform the design of the next phase of the project	UN-PRAC Phase II and design of project document for the next phase	UN-PRAC
2. Revise how the project is administered, including new posts and new capacity.	Agreed. In the course of the design of the next phase, the project support structure will be revised with a view of incorporating a project manager position	Design of the next UN-PRAC Phase	UN-PRAC, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji and UNODC HQ
3. Consider transitioning UN-PRAC into a regional programme with sufficient resources to operate at the regional level with national components.	<p>Agreed, with the caveat that the existence of specific national components will depend on the circumstances: preparedness of the country and donor availability and interest. In any case, UN-PRAC has already explored this avenue with the initiation of the existing national project in Solomon Islands.</p> <p>From UN-PRAC 's perspective, one more important aspect of a programmatic approach, than national components, is thematic components, which can be then co-financed by various donors.</p>	Ongoing and in view of the design of the next UN-PRAC phase	UN-PRAC, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji and UNODC HQ
4. Increase the Donor Base of the Regional Work	Agreed. UN-PRAC has approached MFAT and also exploring other avenues. Recommendation No3 is also valuable in this regard. One point of caution in this regard is that too big diversification could bring complications around coordinating donor priorities and various approaches. In that regard and considering the long-standing strategic partnership, DFAT is still appreciated as the “core” donor.	Ongoing	UN-PRAC, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji and UNODC HQ

<p>5. Re-consider the added value of the provision of small grants to project beneficiaries.</p>	<p>Agreed to reconsider/review this platform, mainly in exploring innovative ways to engage with partners, particularly from the civic sector. The Project recognises that the grants are a cumbersome exercise and not easy to manage and oversight at a regional level. However, operational vehicles for reaching out to partners and providing them with working tools are needed. The design of the next phase of the project will certainly take this point under consideration.</p>	<p>Ongoing and in view of the design of the next UN-PRAC phase</p>	<p>UN-PRAC</p>
<p>6. Promote more bilateral and multi-lateral interactions between beneficiaries through UN-PRAC platforms.</p>	<p>Agreed. Limited funding is one main impediment in this regard, while a number of platforms have been explored and will continue to be so, particularly in context of peer-to-peer exchange, regionally and bilaterally. Partnerships with government, region and global organizations are explored in this regard and also with other existing UNODC and UNDP projects. This recommendation will be particularly considered in the design of the next phase of the project.</p>	<p>Ongoing and in view of the design of the next UN-PRAC phase</p>	<p>UN-PRAC</p>
<p>7. More interventions – both through mainstreaming and targeting – are required to promote gender equality in the project’s work.</p>	<p>Agreed. UN-PRAC is currently performing scoping of existing initiatives and opportunities, and all this will be factored in the design of the next phase.</p>	<p>Ongoing and in view of the design of the next UN-PRAC phase</p>	<p>UN-PRAC</p>

Background

In the Pacific, the issue of corruption and corruption risks are embedded in a specific development nexus. Pacific Island countries (PICs) face particularly demanding development challenges, in part, due to their limited size and experience in self-governance, physical remoteness, dependence on a narrow resource base, limited trade opportunities and vulnerabilities to natural and environmental disasters. Despite this, Pacific Island countries (PICs) are expected to take on the duties and responsibilities as members of the United Nations and the international community, including the 2030 Development Agenda. All but one of the PICs has ratified the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), which has established requirements for implementation that challenge PIC's compliance. However, UNCAC accession has also provided opportunities for PICs to engage the international community and to advocate for their unique context to be considered in ongoing debates to tackle corruption. PIC's unique circumstances were recognised in a resolution adopted at the 7th Conference of States Parties to UNCAC.

To support PICs in their implementation of UNCAC and to develop anti-corruption systems, a joint project between UNDP and UNODC– the United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project (UNODC: XSPZ91, UNDP: 101018) - was established in 2012 to work with all 15 PICs. Phase II of UN-PRAC started on 1 July 2016 and will run until 30 June 2020.

The primary goal of UN-PRAC (Phase II) is to promote and strengthen measures to prevent and fight corruption more efficiently and effectively in the Pacific region. It is managed jointly by UNODC and UNDP and is based in UNDP's Effective Governance Unit in the UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji. Funding comes from the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) in the amount of AUD 6,159,593.

Purpose, scope and methodology of the evaluation

At the mid-point of Phase II of UN-PRAC, a mid-term Independent Project Evaluation was commissioned to consider the state of the Project and to determine, broadly speaking, what is working correctly, what lessons can be learned and where is there a need for improvement. The evaluation is also aimed at informing the Project team, UNODC/UNDP stakeholders and the donor as to what may need to be adjusted in the second half of this phase of the Project.

The evaluation covered the period between July 2016 and 6 September 2018. The evaluation itself was conducted from August to November 2018. The evaluation was based on an original desk review conducted during the inception phase prior to the development of an inception report. This was followed by a one-week mission to Suva, Fiji in late September 2018 and subsequent telephone/Skype semi-structured interviews with a sample of core learning partners, beneficiaries, partners, Project team, consultants and the donor to gather evidence to answer the key questions listed in the Inception Report produced for this evaluation. The evaluation was conducted by a two-person team consisting of a Lead Evaluator and Anti-Corruption Expert, the former with experience in governance support and project evaluation in the Pacific region and the latter as an anti-corruption expert.

Main findings

Based on the evidence collected through semi-structured interviews, the evaluation team conducted an analysis of the evidence that resulted in the findings listed below. The team considered all the evidence gathered from all sources and triangulated such data and evidence to find the validated conclusions that are reflected in this report.

Based on the criteria listed in the Terms of Reference for this mid-term evaluation, the following are the main findings:

Design: The Project was designed to work comprehensively, ensuring that the Project is engaged with all sectors working in the field of anti-corruption in the region, which allows for multi-sector and multi-stakeholder engagements. The Project is well-aligned with the UN's foundational documents that define its work, including linkages to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the UN Secretariat's Biennial Strategic Framework, UNDP's Strategic Plan and the UN Pacific Strategy.

Relevance: UN-PRAC's work with PIC governments to build rules-based governance and public finance systems is highly relevant, as the region is becoming a focus of the international community that wants to ensure the establishment of such systems. The focus on ratification and implementation of UNCAC, beyond its own core value, has been an entry point for the Project to engage government officials, non-State actors and national oversight institutions to develop the systems and culture, including transparency, inclusivity and participation, that are required to prevent and fight corruption.

Efficiency: The Project team has used partnerships and collaboration with other parts of UNDP and UNODC, as well as other development partners and projects in the region to maximize the use of its resources while gaining from the substantive inputs of other

technical experts. It has provided timely technical advice and other support to beneficiaries. The use of multi-activity missions has allowed the Project to maximize the delivery of support while minimizing costs associated. However, the Project has not yet fully overcome the challenge of the two UN entities operating separate financial systems and this has been somewhat of a burden administratively for the Project. However, the Project could have benefited from more efficiency though allowing the shared staff within the project to access UMOJA, the UNODC financial and administrative system. The allocation of time for the two technical advisers for the Project could have been better utilized if a Project manager post was created to focus on administrative matters. Also, the provision of small grants to beneficiaries was not deemed cost-effective given the administrative burden in issuing and monitoring the grants.

Effectiveness: The Project is on track to achieve all of its outputs and its overall outcome. UN-PRAC has delivered results through bespoke, contextualized engagement of beneficiaries that ensures multi-stakeholder participation and inclusiveness in achieving key results, such as national anti-corruption strategies. It has supported countries as they move towards the development of legal frameworks and building the governance systems required to address corruption. It has also worked with non-State actors, particularly youth, to develop their advocacy skills.

Impact: The Project has been able to show its work has resulted in concrete and lasting systemic changes. Chief among these is the UNCAC accession of Niue and Samoa, the adoption of extensive anti-corruption legislation in Solomon Islands, and the establishment of a Right to Information system in Vanuatu.

Sustainability: There are concrete examples of UN-PRAC building sustainable systems that will last beyond the life of the Project. These include the national anti-corruption strategies developed in a number of PICs. It also includes the networks that have been established, including amongst national financial intelligence units and, separately, among youth activists, that have shown signs of lasting beyond the work of the Project.

Partnerships & Cooperation: The Project established partnerships and cooperation with development partners. This included UNODC and UNDP projects and programmes where synergies and efficiencies were identified. UN-PRAC had also established partnerships with other actors working in the region – universities; non-governmental organizations (NGOs); and regional sectoral forums. UN-PRAC has been able to convene and facilitate additional support for beneficiaries of the Project through the establishment of these partnerships.

Human Rights, Gender Equality & Leave No One Behind: The Project's work with youth in the region has been significant and has resulted in sustainable and impactful networks and activists that are already making a difference in their countries. Specific efforts have been made to ensure the engagement of women in key activities of the Project. However, more can be done to ensure that the Project has targeted activities for women engaged in anti-corruption and to ensure gender is also mainstreamed into all activities.

Lessons learned and best practices

At the mid-point of this phase of the Project, certain lessons and best practices can be discerned. The Project has maintained a focus on the achievement of its outputs and overall outcome, which has allowed for a significant achievement of results. These results have been achieved through the implementation of the Project with flexibility and adaptability that enables the delivery of activities that are contextualized for each country and beneficiary.

The Project is focused at the regional level, which allows for UN-PRAC to have space to maneuver and to focus its resources and expertise in PICs that are ready, willing and able to receive support. The Project has built strong relationships with beneficiaries, thus allowing for greater receptiveness to new approaches and ideas. The use of partnerships has added value and reach to the work of the Project.

As a best practice, UN-PRAC works comprehensively in the region to prevent and fight corruption. This allows for engagement of all key actors and stakeholders which then can lead to multi-stakeholder engagements when required to achieve results, such as the development of national anti-corruption strategies or the ratification of UNCAC.

The Project has also been an incubator of networks and multi-stakeholder relationships that have endured and are supporting the establishment of anti-corruption systems in a number of countries.

Main conclusions

Overall, UN-PRAC is on track to achieve its stated outputs and outcome. This has occurred through the cost-effective delivery of activities, such as technical advice and convening and facilitating stakeholders, in a timely manner. Not only can results be observed at the mid-point of this phase of the Project, but also the work of the Project has had a measurable impact related to establishing anti-corruption systems in the region. Key to its success has been how the Project has worked with partners and has

built effective networks of key actors in the region that allow for sharing of knowledge and the exchange of information amongst anti-corruption champions.

Key Recommendations

Key Recommendation: Consider transitioning UN-PRAC into a regional programme with sufficient resources to operate at the regional level with national components.

The volume of work with regard to anti-corruption in the region will only increase with nearly all countries having ratified UNCAC, support to anti-corruption policies and legislation, including national strategies, and the establishment of more robust integrity systems. This will require a more comprehensive programme to address the needs of PICs both regionally and nationally.

Key Recommendation: Revise how the Project is administered, including new posts and new capacity. The Project has been effectively managed to date, but there is a need for a full-time project manager to ensure the technical advisers are not overburdened with management duties. There is also a challenge within the Project of working with two financial systems which, if overcome, will lead to greater productivity and efficiency.

SUMMARY MATRIX OF FINDINGS, EVIDENCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings	Evidence (sources that substantiate findings)	Recommendations
Project Design		
RTI systems need to be of an increased focus to ensure transparency	Sources: Activity Reports; Interviews	1. Increase the focus of the Project on RTI
Project Efficiency		
Project is administratively challenged	Sources: Annual Work Plans; Interviews; Project Document	2. Consider new capacity and new posts
As PICs develop, new approaches and capacity will be required to meet needs	Sources: Media Reports; Project Reports; Interviews	3. Transition UN-PRAC into a regional programme
Reliance on one donor has limited resources and scope of UN-PRACs work	Sources: Annual Work Plans; Project Document; Project Reports	4. Increase the donor base of the regional work
Small grants have had limited value	Sources: Annual Work Plans; Project Reports; Interviews	5. Re-consider the provision of small grants
Project Effectiveness		
Project has seen results through networks of key actors.	Sources: Media Reports; Interviews	6. Promote more bilateral and multi-lateral interactions between beneficiaries
Human Rights, Gender and Leaving No One Behind		
Need for more women to be engaged in Project activities	Sources: Project Reports; Interviews; Activity Reports	7. More interventions are required to promote gender equality in the Project's work

BACKGROUND

The 15 Pacific Island Countries (PICs)¹ include some of the newest nations in the world, with many only obtaining independence in the 1980s. Many PICs are categorized as micro-states, given populations below 100,000, with a number of PICs having less than 20,000 citizens. Yet the countries are spread over 20% of the world’s surface. Formal, democratically-elected government has only been introduced as a concept in the past half century. The delivery of public services, such as healthcare and education, by governments is still a challenge, especially in more remote parts of the PICs.

Corruption, and its impact on a country’s ability to promote human development, has only been recognised as a barrier to progress in the past 15 years, but is now considered a critical factor impeding development. It has impacted economic growth by limiting foreign investment. It has limited the distribution of wealth and resources, the impact of which is especially seen on marginalised groups. At the level of the state, weak public institutions have eroded public confidence in government and put barriers in the way of good governance. The social costs of corruption include income inequality and poverty that have adversely affected social stability in many countries. In general, corruption is a challenge to sustainable economic development, peace and good governance.

In 2003, the global agenda for fighting corruption was defined by the establishment of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC). It was the first, and still only, global framework for the establishment of national anti-corruption laws and systems, providing the minimum standards for creating such infrastructure. This includes a requirement that countries that ratify the Convention report on a regular basis on their progress in implementation, and submit themselves to peer review from other States parties.² Currently 186 signatories have ratified the Convention. Biennially a Conference of State Parties (CosP) is held to review progress on implementation of UNCAC and to discuss future focus of country reviews.

With the adoption of UNCAC the United Nations (UN) system initiated programmes to support the implementation of the Convention and to establish national anti-corruption

¹ Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tokelau, Tuvalu and Vanuatu

² <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/implementation-review-mechanism.html>

frameworks. In general, there are two UN entities that are the primary vehicles for the delivery of such support. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is a branch of the UN Secretariat and is the specific secretariat for UNCAC, with a focus on the implementation of the Convention. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the largest UN agency with a footprint in almost all developing countries. Its focus with regard to anti-corruption is to support national (and sub-national and local) governments to establish and maintain robust governance systems free of corruption through the establishment of systems that promote accountability, transparency and inclusivity.

The fight against corruption received another boost in 2015 when the SDGs were adopted. All UN Member States, including all PICs, endorsed the 17 SDGs and committed to their implementation and achievement as part of Agenda 2030. For the first time there is a global development goal that reflects the need for effective governance systems as part of the development agenda and to eliminate a critical barrier to development. SDG16 states:

SDG16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

The Goal includes specific targets and indicators related to anti-corruption:

Target 16.5: Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms

Target 16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels

The fight against corruption is relatively new in the Pacific region. Until recently there has been little political will amongst national governments to address corruption through legal frameworks and enforcement structures. However, given local political demand, windows of opportunity do arise and this can result in government action and a cornerstone to this is political will. In the micro PICs, the capacity to establish and maintain anti-corruption systems is complicated by a chronic turnover in government officials in key posts, resulting in a lack of institutional memory and consistency in the application of relevant laws and policies.

There is also international pressure on the PICs to comply with certain laws and rules that are related to corruption. In recent years there has been a demand for the PICs to implement financial intelligence and money laundering monitoring systems. Compliance has been influenced by the need for PIC banks to have access to the international

banking system. The European Union has raised concerns about the tax haven status of a number of PICs, with three PICs (the Marshall Islands; Palau; Samoa) being on the “black list” in the past year and another five PICs on the “grey list” (Fiji, Cook Islands, Niue, Vanuatu, Nauru).³

Despite these challenges, the UN has made an effort to support the PICs in meeting their international obligations with regard to the fight against corruption and to be in compliance with international norms and standards. Both UNODC and UNDP maintain global and regional programmes to deliver on their mandates. In 2012, with support from Australia’s Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), the two entities designed a joint anti-corruption project for the Pacific region. The project, known as the *United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project (UN-PRAC)*, (UNODC XSPZ91, UNDP 101018) works across the 15 PICs. The first phase of the project ran from 2012 to 2016. On 1 July 2016 the second phase of UN-PRAC commenced and is scheduled to run until 30 June 2020. UN-PRAC Phase II is a four-year AUD \$6,159,593 project that offers technical expertise and knowledge sharing, including support to peer exchanges among stakeholders in the region.

The project’s current work is consistent with the overarching framework of the work of the UN in the region. The UN has been working in the Pacific region since the 1970s providing support to PICs as they transitioned to independence and required assistance with their development – both social and economic. As part of its current support to governments in the region, the UN adopted the United Nations Pacific Strategy (UNPS) (2018-22).⁴ Relevant to UN-PRAC, the UNPS sets out, among others, the following outcome for its work in the Pacific Region:

UNPS Outcome 5: *By 2022, people and communities in the Pacific will contribute to and benefit from inclusive, informed and transparent decision-making processes; accountable and responsive institutions; and improved access to justice.*

To measure if this outcome is achieved, certain indicators were identified, including:

³ https://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/sites/taxation/files/eu_list_update_25_05_2018_en.pdf

⁴ https://www.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/Final_UNPS_2018-2022_Pacific.pdf

UNPS Indicator 5.4: Number of PICTs (i.e. – PICs) that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information

UNPS Indicator 5.6: Number of PICTs with established and implemented anti-corruption policies

In line with the broad objectives of the UNPS, the second phase of UN-PRAC is to focus on three core outcomes:

- 1. Niue, Samoa and Tonga are given sufficient information and support to enable their accession to UNCAC and all Pacific States parties actively participate in the UNCAC review process.**
- 2. Pacific States parties more effectively implement UNCAC and work towards the achievement of SDG-16.**
- 3. Social accountability mechanisms and the anti-corruption role of non-state actors [is] strengthened.**

As part of the standard practice in the implementation of UN projects, an independent evaluation is conducted at the mid-point in the life of the project to provide an analysis of the progress being made in the implementation of the project. Therefore, this Mid-term Independent Project Evaluation was commissioned by UNDP and UNODC and undertaken by an external and independent evaluation team.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

In August 2018, UNODC and UNDP contracted two consultants (a Lead Evaluator and an Anti-Corruption Expert) to conduct a Mid-term Independent Project Evaluation (MTE) of their joint project – United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project (UN-PRAC). The MTE is to evaluate the work of UN-PRAC since the start of the second phase of the project on 1 July 2016 until 30 September 2018 (end of field mission).

The objectives of the MTE are set out in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation:

- Assess the effectiveness of the design and relevance of the project
- Consider the effectiveness of the project, including lessons learned and good practices, successes, failures, challenges and areas for improvement

- Provide recommendations that will inform the implementation of the second half of the project's second phase.⁵

The MTE was to consider a cross-section of the work of UN-PRAC, including its geographic, sectoral and thematic work. Geographically the project's scope included all 15 PICs. Sectorally the project worked with government, non-state actors and oversight institutions. Thematically the work of the project was focused on UNCAC ratification and implementation, social accountability and the establishment of accountability systems.

Criteria

The evaluation is based on the norms developed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) with regard to the five key criteria that are the basis of the evaluation of development assistance: Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Impact.⁶ In addition the Terms of Reference identified additional criteria: Partnerships and Cooperation; and Human Rights, Gender and Leaving No One Behind.

Evaluation Team

The evaluation team was composed of the following two international consultants:

Kevin Deveaux (Lead Evaluator) is a Canadian lawyer and former parliamentarian who has worked internationally for more than 15 years. His international work has been focused on democratic governance, with a specific focus on political governance. He was the global Policy Adviser on Parliamentary Development for UNDP from 2008-12. Since 2012 he has been an independent consultant and technical expert who has conducted a number of independent evaluations for the EU, DFID, UNDP and UN Women.

Slagjana Taseva Ph.D. (Expert) is a Macedonian (FYR) lawyer and former member of the State Commission for the Prevention of Corruption in Macedonia and member of the International Anti-Corruption Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (MEC) in Afghanistan who has worked internationally for more than 15 years. Her international work has been focused on anti-corruption, with a specific focus on prevention, legislative solutions, international standards, policy making, integrity, corruption risk

⁵ The full ToR is attached as Annex 1 to this Report

⁶ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

assessment, asset declarations and conflict of interest. She was a global Anti-Corruption Policy Adviser, founder and today member of the International Advisory Board of the International Anti-Corruption Academy in Vienna and first Chair of the UNCAC Coalition. Since 2010 she has been an independent consultant for the UNDP, the European Union (EU), United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and an active member of Transparency International (TI), Chair of TI Macedonia.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The MTE was commenced with a desk review of foundational documents, which, in turn, resulted in the development of an inception report. Data gathering commenced on 24 September 2018 with a field mission by the Lead Evaluator to Suva, Fiji to engage the project team and a number of stakeholders in semi-structured interviews. The interviews continued via telephone or Skype for the next several weeks, with a draft report submitted in December 2018 for review and revisions. A final report was completed by the end of 2018.

In order to answer the questions raised with regard to the criteria for the evaluation, the evaluation team used a number of tools to gather data and evidence to answer the questions and to validate any findings. Relevant data and evidence was identified from the sources noted below and based on the need to answer key questions listed in the Inception Report and the criteria upon which the evaluation was based. By comparing data from different sources, the evaluation team was able to compare and contrast evidence provided to identify findings based on analysis and triangulation of information provided.

Desk review: Initially key operational documents were identified and evaluated by the evaluation team, including the project document, quarterly and annual reports, annual work plans, programme outputs, UNDPs 2014-2017 and 2018-21 Strategic Plans, the UN Biennial Strategic Frameworks (2016-17 & 2018-19) and the UNPS. As the evaluation progressed, the evaluation team also reviewed other documents, including videos produced by youth activists, UNCAC resolutions, media reports, social media, anti-corruption strategies, project knowledge products and other pertinent documents.⁷

Inception Report: In September 2018, the evaluation team produced a detailed breakdown of how it expected to deliver the proposed evaluation. This included

⁷ For a complete list of documents consulted please see Annex 3

preliminary findings of the desk review, data collection instruments, sampling strategy, limitations to the evaluation, timetable and an analytical framework with the refined questions that would be posed for each of the criteria to be reviewed for the evaluation.

Research: An in-depth examination of the history, background and policy and programme responses on the impact of corruption on sustainable development was undertaken. This involved looking at the development, results and impact of previous anti-corruption initiatives, knowledge products and themes in development discourse, the centrality of these to UNDP and UNODC programming, and the relationship of UN-PRAC objectives to the SDGs.

Semi-structured Interviews: The evaluation team conducted a number of interviews to gather evidence for the MTE. Each interview was 30-60 minutes in length and included a series of questions with, where possible, follow up based on the need for further information.⁸ Core Learning Partners were initially interviewed to gather their observations on the work of the project, including both a macro perspective on the role of the project in development work in the region and , at the project level, how the project has functioned. This was followed by interviews with stakeholders who were engaged in the project (partners, donors, beneficiaries).

E-mails were sent to each stakeholder for which an interview was requested with an interview guide attached.⁹ In the end, 42 interviews were conducted representing a cross-section of actors engaged with the project from 13 of the 15 PICs (no engagement was had with stakeholders from Niue and Tokelau) from all sectors. Fifteen of those interviewed were Core Learning Partners (1 donor; 5 UNODC staff; 6 UNDP staff; 3 shared project staff). Twenty-three interviewees were women and 19 were men. Seventeen of the interviews were conducted during the one-week field mission, while the other 28 interviews were conducted via telephone or Skype.

Beyond the initial list of interviewees identified in the Terms of Reference, in consultation with then project team, additional interviewees were identified during the evaluation process and interviews were arranged with them. These additional interviewees were identified based on the desk review and from information gathered during interviews with other interlocutors.

⁸ For the list of interviewees please see Annex 4

⁹ The Interview Guide can be found in Annex 2 to this Report

The project staff provided logistical and administrative support to the evaluation team, including the sending of initial e-mail requests for interviews and completion of the survey. The UNDP Anti-Corruption Specialist and the UNODC Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser for the project provided responses to requests for documentation and reports and provided required inputs during the evaluation process.

Survey: A select number of stakeholders were provided a short questionnaire, as an alternative to participation in an interview. They were selected based on a cross-section of stakeholders including criteria such as relevant actors based on sector, role in the project and geographic location within the region. The survey was sent to 31 potential respondents. In the end, only eight surveys were completed. Despite the lack of data gathered from the survey the evaluation team still had sufficient data and evidence from the interviews conducted to ensure triangulation of evidence.

LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION

The MTE was restricted to gathering evidence and data from a sample of all stakeholders. In accordance with the Inception Report, at the start of the evaluation process a list of Core Learning Partners, beneficiaries, partners, and project was developed and requests for engagement were made. The list of interlocutors for the evaluation was developed and ensured a cross-section of actors based on a number of criteria: project engagement (beneficiary; partner; technical expert); country (at least one interlocutor from each PIC); sector of support (government; non-state actor; oversight body; development partner).

Not all stakeholders on the initial list were able to participate in the evaluation. Given the scope of the project, attempts were made to ensure at least one interlocutor was engaged in the evaluation from each of the PICs, but not all stakeholders from a sector in a country were engaged. The survey resulted in only eight replies and, therefore, the results were not deemed sufficient and were not used for this evaluation.

It should be noted that the limitations listed above did not prevent the evaluation team from gathering sufficient evidence to conduct the necessary triangulation and analysis of the data in order to provide clear findings and recommendations. In particular, the evaluation team was able to conduct a sufficient number of interviews with stakeholders to ensure a robust amount of evidence that reflected a cross-section of geographic, sectoral and thematic interests and this data and evidence allowed for a full analysis and triangulation.

II.FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The following findings include the comprehensive analysis of quantitative and qualitative data on implementation progress as measured by the results framework outcome and outputs targets. The evaluation team has verified the data upon which the report's findings are based through the cross reference of documents and triangulation of evidence gathered from interviews.

DESIGN

Criteria	Key Question	Answer to Key Question
Design <i>(The Design of a project or programme measures the extent to which the logical framework approach was adopted.)</i>	1.1 To what extent has the results-based framework been a useful programme management tool and allowed for an assessment of project outcomes and impact?	The Results-based framework is clear as to its expectations and the indicators to be measured and for evidence to be gathered.
	1.2 How well aligned are activities, outputs and outcomes in the logical framework?	The project does not speak of a theory of change, yet the logic displayed in the document shows an approach that identifies specific activities, and these are then leading to the achievement of specific outputs/results and, in turn, the outcome of the project. (e.g. ratification of UNCAC in Samoa)
	1.3 To what extent does the design of this project enable optimal use of resources and cooperation with other development initiatives?	The project is designed with a small number of full-time project staff. This ensures that the project will need to partner with others to deliver on its outputs and outcome. (e.g. Collaboration with UNODC global projects; Collaboration with UNDP Parliament Project, Fiji Access to Justice Project and other projects in the UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji; Collaboration with regional organizations and universities)
	1.4 How effective has the joint partnership between UNODC	Partnership between UNODC and UNDP in managing and

	and UNDP been in managing and implementing the project?	implementing the project has been very effective. In spite to the administrative barriers there is a spirit of cooperation, they have not divided the work but they work together (e.g. – Beneficiaries see UNDP & UNODC technical advisers as interchangeable and many have worked with both)
	1.5 To what extent was the logical framework based on the Phase One evaluation?	The work in Phase I laid the ground work for the success to date in Phase II. The knowledge shared and the interventions with national governments has now come to fruition. (e.g. – Solomon Islands National Anti-Corruption Strategy (NACS))

The project is regional in its implementation, covering 15 PICs and multiple sectors or beneficiaries in each country, including government officials, political leaders, oversight institutions and non-state actors. As has been noted in the mid-term evaluation from Phase I of the project, it is an ambitious project that attempts to have an impact on many sectors in multiple countries.

To start, the project is well-aligned with the global and regional UN strategies for development. SDG16, particularly Target 16.5, is directly related to addressing corruption and, therefore, the project is directly addressing the achievement of this goal.

The UNDP Strategic Plan (2018-21), though adopted after the start of Phase II of UN-PRAC, is still well-linked to the project’s work. Outcome 1 of the Plan states:

Outcome 1: Advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions

Output 1.2.3: Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption measures to maximize availability of resources for poverty eradication

The UNODC has a biennial strategic framework as part of the broader UN Secretariat Strategic Framework. For 2016-17, the framework noted the fight against corruption as part of the priority areas of work for UNODC:

UN Secretariat Biennial Strategic Framework 2016-17:

Sub-programme 3: Countering Corruption

Objective of the Organization: To prevent and combat corruption, in line with the United Nations Convention against Corruption

The 2018-19 Biennial Strategic Framework is also relevant to the work of this project. The following is of particular note:

UN Secretariat Biennial Strategic Framework 2018-19:

Sub-programme 3: Countering Corruption

Objective of the Organization: To prevent and combat corruption, in line with the United Nations Convention against Corruption

The 2018-19 framework specifically notes the focus of the work of UNODC in promoting ratification of UNCAC and to support Member States in implementation of the Convention and the development of anti-corruption systems.

The UNPS also notes as a focus the fight against corruption in the region. Specifically, Outcome 5 and indicators 5.4 and 5.6 (as noted above).

Beyond the alignment with UN priorities, the project has many key features in its design that can be noted. First, the partnership between UNODC and UNDP is unique and has thrived since the start of the project in 2012. By designing the project in a manner that allows for the integration of the work of both UN bodies, the project has created a synergy that otherwise does not exist globally.

The uniqueness of this UNODC/UNDP collaboration was recognised at the 7th UNCAC Conference of State Parties (CoSP) held in Vienna in November 2017, where Resolution 7/7¹⁰ was passed and noted the following as part of a broader resolution on small island states:

...Welcoming the work of the United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project, which, as a result of close cooperation between the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the United Nations Development Programme, may serve as a model for collaboration on anti-corruption issues among United Nations entities...

Second, the project is designed to be comprehensive. It is also designed to support a number of stakeholders and their role in preventing and fighting corruption. This includes governments, non-state actors and oversight institutions. By working with all of

¹⁰<https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/COSP/session7-resolutions.html>

these actors the project has played the role of a broker in bringing together these actors at the national level to work collaboratively on anti-corruption. For example, in Vanuatu, the project facilitated interactions between civil society, the government and elected representatives to support the implementation of right to information (RTI) legislation with the development of a plan for establishing a government unit and specific policies and systems for implementation.

Third, the project is designed to be flexible. In working at the regional level and across 15 PICs, the project has space to manoeuvre to provide support where the conditions are right for national engagement. This can be seen in the work of the project in Kiribati where support was provided based on demand from key actors, such as the President of the country and key non-state actors. Counter to that, the work in the Cook Islands was more limited, due to the advanced capacity of the government officials engaged and a more limited demand for assistance.¹¹

The staff of the project is small in number and nimble in how they operate, allowing the technical and administrative staff to adjust to demands from beneficiaries in a timely manner. For example, in Samoa, once the country ratified UNCAC, the project was able to provide immediate and ongoing technical support to government officials who were focal points for implementing the country's new international commitments.¹²

Fourth, the project was formulated to promote collaboration and cooperation between stakeholders. This is seen at the national level where government and non-state actors have worked together to deliver reforms, such as in Kiribati, where the anti-corruption strategy was developed based on engagement of non-state actors and government officials working together through activities organized and supported by the project.

The project, working regionally, has also allowed for sectoral collaboration amongst stakeholders at the regional level, by creating space for like-minded counterparts to interact. This can be seen in the work with youth activists where UN-PRAC worked with the Pacific Youth Council to engage youth in developing their skills at regional forums and in-country activities.

Fifth, the project has promoted the use of partnerships to achieve its goals.¹³ The project has worked from its commencement with academic institutions (e.g. –

¹¹ UN-PRAC Annual Report; Interviews with Kiribati non-state actors and Cook Islands government officials

¹² Interview with Samoan Government Officials

¹³ The engagement of partners in the implementation of the project is dealt with in further detail under the sub-section of Partnerships and Cooperation.

University of the South Pacific), oversight institutions (e.g. Fiji Independent Commission Against Corruption (FICAC), Parliament of Kiribati, international NGOs (e.g. – Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC)), regional forums (e.g. – Pacific Islands’ Law Officers Network (PILON)) and other development partners (e.g. – Office of the Commonwealth Ombudsman of Australia) to deliver on its support to beneficiaries. The project was designed to promote such partnerships and this has resulted in the project being able to do more with its limited resources.

Phase I of UN-PRAC was focused on building relationships with governments and served its goal as a first step to broader engagement and set the stage for the anti-corruption efforts in the PIC’s by using methods that resonate with the needs of key stakeholders and mapping of the 15 countries involved and their legislative and institutional capacity. These methods included training workshops (and other forms of knowledge sharing), multi-lateral exchanges of experiences by governments (both regionally and globally) and technical assistance (where demand warranted).¹⁴ This support helped the countries to enhance their knowledge on anti-corruption and to be successful in the UNCAC review processes followed by capacity building and policy making activities.

The second phase of the project has built upon the work of the first phase and has allowed for the continuation of activities that showed results, such as support in Vanuatu to the implementation of the RTI Act and in the Solomon Islands where the national anti-corruption strategy was developed. It has also allowed for the next stage of implementation of anti-corruption systems in countries in which strong relationships with beneficiaries were built. Again, the best example of this has been Solomon Islands where the work started in Phase I of the project has progressed with the Government and non-State actors to the point where the a NACS has been approved and new laws (*Anti-Corruption Act* and the *Whistleblower Act*) adopted.¹⁵

The project has worked in the field of RTI, including important work in Vanuatu. However, the project was not designed to have a specific focus on this aspect of anti-corruption work, which have limited the resources allocated. This is despite the key role that RTI plays in addressing corruption through the institutionalization of open and transparent government actions. RTI is also a key component of SDG-16 and the UNPS.

¹⁴ UN-PRAC Phase I Mid-term Evaluation (2015) UNODC (New York)

¹⁵ Media reports on passage of anti-corruption laws (<http://www.sibconline.com.sb/parliament-passes-whistleblowers-protection-bill/> & <https://www.radionz.co.nz/international/pacific-news/362689/solomons-anti-corruption-bill-passed>); Interviews with youth activist and government officials as part of the evaluation

Going forward, RTI should become a key field of work (among others) and the project document should reflect its importance for the project’s work in the region.

Recommendation: Increase the focus of the project on Right to Information.

RELEVANCE

Criteria	Key Questions	Answers to Key Questions
<p>Relevance <i>(Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.)</i></p>	<p>2.1 How relevant is the project to target groups’ needs and priorities, including target groups of governments, development partners and civil society organizations (CSOs)?</p>	<p>The project is relevant to target groups’ needs and priorities and is built on the need to be flexible. Each of the 15 PICs has different needs and is at different stages of adopting anti-corruption regimes. As a result, the project has to monitor and respond to these unique needs and allocate resources accordingly.</p> <p>(e.g. – Project developed bespoke interventions for each PIC based on routine interventions and where opportunities present themselves)</p>
	<p>2.2 To what extent are the outputs, outcomes and objectives of this project/programme relevant and contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and how have project activities supported partners in implementing the SDGs?</p>	<p>Flexibility in the project implementation is helping countries to address different issues based on their needs. Participative process in developing NACs and multi-stakeholder approach ensures ownership and solution-oriented approach. Development of NACs and new legislation is directly related to implementing SDG16 (specifically, Targets 16.5 and 16.6)</p>

		(e.g. – Kiribati NACS Development Process)
	2.3 How much of an alignment is there between the project and the national priorities of PICs?	Project is implemented in 15 different Pacific countries and they are all different, they have different priorities. However, flexibility provides possibility for a tailor-made approach. (e.g. – Cook Islands, where the need from project was minimal, but support was timely and appreciated)

The UN-PRAC project activities are implemented in the 15 PICs, each with their own set of priorities. Flexibility in the project implementation provides the possibility for a tailor made approach combined with the ratification of the UNCAC and participation in the review mechanism that have been a strong incentive for the governments who “want a seat at the table” and to work within the international norms.

Relevance was noted especially with regard to how the project has worked with the PICs to facilitate an outward looking approach to their governance. In a region in which many PICs have only recently established independent governments, it has taken some time for these governments to become conscience of their place in the global order. To some extent this more outward looking approach was thrust upon the PICs due to international rules to which they are encouraged to comply (e.g. – money laundering), while another factor for PICs is domestic political demand (e.g. – RTI in Vanuatu). No matter the reason, the project has supported these governments in their ambitions to become strong partners in global efforts to prevent and fight corruption, whether that be, for example, supporting Samoa in ratifying UNCAC or Vanuatu implementing its RTI Act.

The outputs, outcomes and objectives of this project are relevant and contributing to the achievement of the SDGs. The project activities have supported partners in implementing the SDGs and flexibility in the project implementation is helping countries to address different issues based on their needs. Participative processes in developing anti-corruption strategies and a multi-stakeholder approach ensures ownership and solution-oriented results. Empowering CSO’s and other non-state actors (e.g. – Pacific Youth Council; Pacific Islands Private Sector Organisation; Pacific Islands Law Officers Network) is one of the most visible outcomes from the project activities, that is further supported by providing a practical guide that can be used in multiple occasions and across countries, as it is the example with the Pacific Youth Anti-Corruption Advocate’s

Toolkit¹⁶ launched by the Project that has been used by different groups and the Kiribati youth are translating it into the local language.

Based on the evidence collected for this evaluation, it can be noted that the project is highly relevant to the beneficiaries receiving support. There was however a consistent acknowledgement of a desire for even more engagement and support from UN-PRAC going forward. This is particularly of note for the work of the project as it relates to Outputs 2 and 3.

Relevance can also be seen in how the project is positioned within a region that has become more relevant in the past number of years. The Pacific is quickly becoming a focal point for the imposition of a rules-based approach to international governance. Efforts to enhance governance capacity are being increased to prevent security lapses that can be exacerbated by weak public finance management systems and the proliferation of corruption. For example, the Government of Australia has recently announced the establishment of the Pacific Fusion Centre in 2019 to “tackle security threats” in the Pacific region.¹⁷

With the European Union’s designation of eight of the 15 PICs on their list of tax havens, the project has also been seen as relevant in addressing this international impact in the region. The designations have placed the project as a trusted partner in working with these PICs to meet these related international standards. It can also be seen through more established global measurements related to public finance and accountability, such as Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability tool¹⁸ and the standards set with regard to money laundering and terrorism funding through the Financial Action Task Force.¹⁹

The project was designed to reflect the need for the implementation of the SDGs, particularly SDG16 and its reference in Target 16.5 to fight corruption. The project has worked with stakeholders to ensure this target is met in the region, which is highly relevant to the anti-corruption agenda in the region and globally.

An example of the relevance of the project has been seen in Vanuatu. In October 2015 14 Members of Parliament of Vanuatu were convicted of corruption. UN-PRAC had

¹⁶ The Pacific Youth Anti-Corruption Advocate’s Toolkit is designed to empower anti-corruption advocates to recognize and develop their skills to mobilize people to be advocates against corruption. For more information, please refer to: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/avuv93f3pmcckmu/Pac%20Youth%20Anti-Corruption%20Advocates%20Toolkit.pdf?dl=0>.

¹⁷ <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-australia-pacific-security/australia-to-launch-new-pacific-security-center-from-next-year-idUSKCN1LL10D>

¹⁸ <https://pefa.org>

¹⁹ <http://www.fatf-gafi.org>

already established relationships with key actors in the country when this came about. With the convictions there was a demand for change in how the country was governed and the project worked with key actors in the country, including the Government of Vanuatu and non-state actors, over the past two years to develop its anti-corruption strategy, which is expected to be adopted soon. This has occurred because the key actors now have ownership of the issue of anti-corruption and have sought the help of UN-PRAC when they were ready to implement the reforms demanded by citizens.

EFFICIENCY

Criteria	Key Questions	Answers to Key Questions
<p>Efficiency <i>(Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs.)</i></p>	<p>3.1 To what extent were the human and financial resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely manner?</p>	<p>There is good balance between the planned activities and resources that enables timely delivery of the outputs.</p> <p>(e.g. Samoa ratification, where use of interventions by a short-term expert and then follow up by project technical advisers allowed for timely engagement)</p>
	<p>3.2 To what extent were the human and financial resources and inputs converted to outputs in a cost-effective manner?</p>	<p>The project implementation is highly cost effective. Use of the UNDP and UNODC internal expertise and short-term experts and consultants provides sufficient support with high efficiency.</p> <p>(e.g. – Use of short-term technical advisers to do some work, with backstopping by full-time staff has allowed the project to maximize resources and to deliver on results)</p>
	<p>3.3 To what extent was the coordination between UNODC and UNDP at different levels efficient and appropriate?</p>	<p>The joint programming model is working well in this project and is at least partially based on personalities and good interpersonal relations.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How well has the joint programming model been working? - What have been its strengths and weaknesses? <p>How can such coordination be further strengthened?</p>	<p>Phase II is facing administrative complication due to the different systems in the two UN organizations of UNODC and UNDP, namely UMOJA and ATLAS</p> <p>(e.g. In some cases the lack of access to the two financial systems has impaired the project administratively, requiring shared administrative staff to use work arounds.)</p>
	<p>3.4 What resources are required to make the project more cost-effective?</p>	<p>A full-time project manager would free technical advisers to focus on their core work (advisory services). Access to <i>UMOJA</i> for administrative staff would make the project more efficient. Consider more resource to allow project to become a programme with regional and national components.</p>

Efficiency is measured based on the cost-effectiveness of a project. At what cost has a project provided its services and delivered outputs? Has a project provided value for money to those that are receiving its support?

TABLE 1: PROJECT DISBURSEMENT RATE²⁰

Time periods throughout the life time of the project	Total Approved Budget²¹	Expenditure	Expenditure in %
1 June – 31 December 2016	<i>UNODC: \$2,329,650</i> <i>UNDP: \$2,329,649</i>	<i>UNODC: \$225,258</i> <i>UNDP: \$249,328</i>	<i>UNODC: 10%</i> <i>UNDP: 11%</i>
1 January – 31 December 2017	<i>UNODC: \$2,329,650</i> <i>UNDP: \$2,329,649</i>	<i>UNODC: \$571,159</i> <i>UNDP: \$598,237</i>	<i>UNODC: 34%</i> <i>UNDP: 36%</i>
Expected delivery for 1 January – 31 December 2018 ²²	<i>UNODC: \$2,329,650</i> <i>UNDP: \$2,329,649</i>	<i>UNODC: \$584,455</i> <i>UNDP: \$570,000</i>	<i>UNODC: 59%</i> <i>UNDP: 61%</i>

The project has been delivering based on annual work plans at an acceptable rate. As of the end of 2018 (30 months into the project), approximately 60% of total project funds had been expended.

The project has generally delivered on its outputs in a cost-effective manner. This can be seen in how the project operates. There are two technical advisers – an Anti-Corruption Specialist (P4 level) from UNDP and a Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser (P4 level) from UNODC (both funded through the project) – who work collaboratively to deliver on the outputs outlined in the project document. It was observed through this evaluation that the two advisers are required to also do project management due to the lack of a dedicated project manager. Project management has been achieved at a great cost in time and effort, which takes away from their core job of providing technical advice and support to beneficiaries in the region.

²⁰ From the UN-PRAC Phase II Mid-term Evaluation Terms of Reference, p.11 with additional numbers for 2018 added

²¹ Based on total budget as of 2018 (after approval of increased funding from DFAT).

²² This is the actual expenditure as of 8 January 2019. Expected expenditure for 2018 will be approx. 2-3% higher after the closing of the 2018 accounts by the end of January 2019.

The remaining staff who support project implementation, including administrative, technical and logistical support, are all cost-shared (50% - 50%) between UNDP and UNODC, while on UNDP contracts. The project has drawn upon expertise from both UN bodies at the headquarters and regional levels.²³ Where possible, the project has used internal technical expertise to deliver on key activities²⁴, instead of relying on external experts.

The coordination between UNODC and UNDP at different levels has been efficient and appropriate mainly due to the good inter-personal relations of the whole project team. The joint programming model is working well at the technical level in this project. As observed during the evaluation, this is based on personalities and good interpersonal relations amongst project staff, especially between the UNDP Anti-Corruption Specialist and the UNODC Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser. The project has also benefited from co-location of the UNODC and UNDP project staff in one office (i.e. - the UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji), which benefits further from co-location within the UNDP Pacific Effective Governance Team in Suva, Fiji, allowing for greater collaboration with other related projects.

However, UN-PRAC does face some administrative complications due to the different systems in the two UN organizations. For example, UMOJA is the finance and administrative system of the UN Secretariat, including for UNODC that has been in place since 2015. The required approval methods that are granted by the UNODC Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific based in Bangkok, Thailand might, in some cases, negatively affect the efficient use of resources. Project administrative staff did not have clearance to use UMOJA and were required to submit approval forms via paper and reliant on staff in the UNODC Regional Office. Therefore, the Project, on the UNODC side, relied heavily on support from the UNODC Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok. After the period of this evaluation, Project staff, who are cost-shared by UNODC and UNDP, will be required to undergo UMOJA trainings and will then be granted access to the system in 2019.

²³ UNDP Bureau for Policy and Programme Support and Asia-Pacific Regional Hub; UNODC Corruption and Economic Crime Branch and UNODC Regional Office for South-east Asia and the Pacific;

²⁴ For example, the project has engaged UNODC's Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer from the Corruption and Economic Crime Branch on repeated occasions to conduct seminars and workshops with beneficiaries from the regional on topics such as the prosecution of corruption cases (June 2017).

Due to the fact that UNDP and UNODC are operating on their own, separate financial systems, there have sometimes been administrative complications, as noted. However, due to the good cooperation, and also thanks to the flexibility of UNDP administrative system and staff, workarounds have been found.

Recommendation: Revise how the project is administered, including new posts, such as a dedicated Project Manager, and new capacity, including access to UMOJA.

The project has also relied on collaboration with other development projects²⁵ to increase its impact and delivery. This collaboration has been both substantive and financial in nature. This has included cooperation with UNDP regional projects working in the areas of parliament, access to justice and SDG implementation²⁶.

Collaboration has also occurred with UNODC entities. The UNODC Corruption and Economic Crime Branch and UNODC Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific have provided notable substantive support to project activities, in particular through missions to deliver regional and national trainings,²⁷ requiring specific technical expertise. The staff time of these UNODC in-house experts has been covered by UNODC. This arrangement has been useful to help the partner countries benefit from this global expertise.

By being co-located with the above-mentioned UNDP projects with a positive operational environment, UN-PRAC has benefited from opportunities for sharing information, knowledge and access to stakeholders, on a daily basis. Collaboration has also occurred with other development partners. For example, the partnership with the Office of the Commonwealth Ombudsman of Australia, which has its own regional project funded by DFAT. UN-PRAC partnered with the Commonwealth Ombudsman in providing advanced investigative training to relevant officials in 14 PICs.²⁸

²⁵ For example: UNDP's Pacific Parliament Effectiveness Initiative (PID: 00100585) and Fiji Access to Justice Project (PID: 00092247) and UNODC's Education for Justice Project under the Doha Declaration programme (GLOZ82).

²⁶ UNDP's Pacific Parliament Effectiveness Initiative (PID: 00100585), Fiji Access to Justice Project (PID: 00092247) and Rule of Law under Effective Governance Project (PID: 00093648).

²⁷ For example, the regional workshop held in Nadi, Fiji in June 2017 for investigators and prosecutors on corruption prosecutions, and the introductory workshop on fisheries crime in Palau in May 2018 for prosecutors and relevant law enforcement officials.

²⁸ Advanced Investigations Training Workshop held in Tonga in October 2017 in cooperation with the Pacific Integrity Network and the Commonwealth Ombudsman (Australia).

There is a good balance between the planned activities and resources that enable timely delivery of the outputs. The project implementation is cost effective and the use of the UNDP and UNODC internal experts and external consultants provides sufficient support with high efficiency. For example, the use of technical consultants contracted through long-term agreements to do some work, with backstopping by full-time staff, has allowed the project to maximize resources and to deliver on results. Moreover, in-kind contributions from PICs themselves is common (e.g. host governments paying for the venue and catering).

The project has also planned its work in a manner that has shown efficiency. In many cases, UN-PRAC staff have planned back-to-back activities in a given PIC to allow for multiple activities from one mission, thereby reducing logistical costs. In some cases, this has also meant missions that include travel to more than one country to again allow for added value for each mission.

Overall, a key to the efficiency of the project is the fact that it is a regional project, which allows it to manage its work in a manner that allows for the allocation of resources where there is demand for its work, instead of being bound by work within one country to which the project would be tied to the political will and demand of one government or a small set of stakeholders. With a regional approach, the project has focused its resources and expertise on those PICs that are ready, willing and able to accept the technical support being provided by the project.

The value and cost efficiency in a regional project also lies in its ability to provide preliminary or nascent support to countries that are just starting to develop their anti-corruption systems. Once a country reaches a “tipping point” in its commitment to anti-corruption systems, such as when it develops a national anti-corruption strategy, it is of value to have national components that can allow for more attention and in-depth technical support. UN-PRAC needs to have the resources to incubate such opportunities and to bridge the gap between regional and national project work. There are examples, such as Solomon Islands, where this has occurred by generating UNDP’s Transparency and Accountability Project, but more resources may be required to make this a routine approach to the project’s work.

To date, UN-PRAC has benefited from the funding of DFAT, which has allowed it to conduct the work it has, but with new opportunities will come greater demands for funding. As PICs establish anti-corruption legal frameworks and regimes, there will be greater demand on the project to provide support and advise. This will likely be greater than the funds allocated by DFAT. Resource mobilization should be a priority to allow for sufficient resources in future years.

Recommendation: Consider transitioning UN-PRAC into a regional programme with sufficient resources to operate at the regional level with national components.

Recommendation: Increase the Donor Base of the Regional Work

It is worth noting that the project has provided small grants to select beneficiaries during Phase II. The resources required to administer and monitor these grants are significant, especially for the results achieved. This raises the issue of the value of such grants for a project that is regional in scope and is otherwise working at a more strategic level with stakeholders.

It is clear from the evidence gathered that the small grants were appreciated by those that received them, but the cost of administering and monitoring the grants resulted in the grants not being cost-effective. In addition, though the funds were appreciated by recipients, their link to the results noted in this report was limited.

Recommendation: Re-consider the added value of the provision of small grants to project beneficiaries.

EFFECTIVENESS

Criteria	Key Questions	Answers to Key Questions
<p>Effectiveness <i>(Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.)</i></p>	<p>4.1 At the mid-point in the project to what extent were the planned outputs and outcomes in the project document (and subsequent project revision) achieved?</p>	<p>All outputs and sub-outputs are either achieved or on track for achievement.</p>
	<p>4.2 At the mid-point in the project are there any good practices and successes, as well as failures, challenges and areas for improvement?</p>	<p>Successes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth Advocate Toolkit published and in use throughout PICs • Solomon Islands anti-corruption laws passed • Niue and Samoa accede to UNCAC

		<p>Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for smaller island countries given capacity absorption issues and turnover in government staff <p>Ability to engage small key countries (Fiji; Papua New Guinea)</p>
	<p>4.3 Were there any unintended results achieved beyond those included in the logical framework? If so, what were those results?</p>	<p>Networks have been established by the project that have created bilateral relations between members beyond any support from the project.(e.g. When youth advocates in Solomon Islands were advocating and protesting for new anti-corruption legislation, they reached out to fellow youth advocates in Fiji to help with drafting a petition that was part of the campaign)</p>

Most of the outputs are clearly achieved or are on track for achievement. In Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, key institutions and monitoring bodies have been established or have been enhanced. However, this project extends beyond national policies and institutions to the needs identified under the outcomes, such as to increase the national integrity systems in terms of preventing corruption, which aligns with both the UNCAC and the spirit of SDG 16. In this regard it is important that all outputs are on-track for achievement by project end.

TABLE 2: OUTPUT ACHIEVEMENT STATUS

Output	Detail	Status
Output 1.1	Understanding and awareness of UNCAC accession increased	Achieved
Output 1.2	UNCAC Pacific reviews supported	On Track to Achieve
Output 1.3	PICs contributed to the broader anti-corruption agenda	On Track to Achieve
Output 2.1	Anti-corruption reforms prioritized by PICs as a result of the UNCAC Review Mechanism	On Track to Achieve
Output 2.2	National anti-corruption legislation and policies strengthened in line with UNCAC and the Development Agenda 2030	On Track to Achieve
Output 2.3	National anti-corruption institutional frameworks and capacities strengthened in line with UNCAC and the Development Agenda 2030	On Track to Achieve
Output 2.4	South-South anti-corruption learning encouraged and effective knowledge sharing promoted	On Track to Achieve
Output 3.1	Engagement of non-State actors in the prevention of corruption increased	On Track to Achieve
Output 3.2	Multi-stakeholder regional networks and for a for anti-corruption functional	On Track to Achieve
Output 3.3	Performance and service delivery of selected institutions improved as a result of enhanced accountability	On Track to Achieve

Many stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation noted the challenges of working in the region, including the cultural and historic nature of how their societies are organized. This results in the need for governments to lead if there is to be systemic reforms related to corruption. The project has been noted for its adaptability and willingness to listen to the needs of each stakeholder in each PIC. Based on this ongoing context analysis, the project identified windows of opportunity that allowed the project to take advantage of good conditions to deliver results and to support reforms.

An example of this is with regard to Samoa. UN-PRAC had as a key output, the ratification of UNCAC by Samoa (among others). It engaged at the political level to promote ratification and to assuage any possible ratification concerns. This included the use of a former parliamentarian as a key expert who was able to engage at the political level. Once there was a political commitment to ratify the Convention, UN-PRAC supported government officials step-by-step in the ratification process. That work has continued, post-ratification, with ongoing support for implementation of the Convention and the establishment of sound anti-corruption systems.

A second example of the success of the project can be seen with NACS adoption and implementation. In the Solomon Islands, the project worked with the government to adopt the NACS. The project has since supported its implementation, including the adoption of the key legislation to establish the legal framework, which occurred in early 2018. NACSs have also been supported in Kiribati, Tuvalu and Vanuatu in the past two years.

The work of the project in Vanuatu with regard to RTI was also of note. UN-PRAC worked with civil society and the Government of Vanuatu to establish an RTI system. The country had passed the first RTI law in the region in 2016 after many years of advocacy by UN-PRAC and civil society. In March 2018, UN-PRAC supported the training of RTI officers and the RTI Unit within the government. It contracted an international technical expert that developed an RTI guide that has been very well received by key government actors engaged in RTI.

Another example is the publication of the Pacific Youth Anti-Corruption Advocate's Toolkit, which was produced in a participatory manner. This started with the project working with the Pacific Youth Council to create a regional platform known as the Pacific Youth Forum Against Corruption (PYFAC)²⁹, where like-minded young people gathered together to share experiences and exchange ideas for advocating against corruption. PYFAC gave the youth a sense of belonging to a group and the space where they can work together. Within Phase II, different youth groups were brought together in partnership with universities (University of the South Pacific; Washington Lee University), which involved an additional 150 new advocates for the SDGs and anti-corruption, and it supported capacity building of youth in the region.

In addition, as an unintended result achieved beyond those included in the logical framework, in establishing PYFAC, the project created space for youth to interact and provide the opportunity to share knowledge and experiences through peer-to-peer support. The platform is not just a personal network or an IT-based network, but builds on both components and is the only regional work that is perceived as a joint platform. It has identified and supported champions in different countries that will lead to non-

²⁹ PYFAC was established with support from UN-PRAC and the Pacific Youth Council and has been an active ecosystem for national youth anti-corruption advocates in the Pacific region. See: <https://www.facebook.com/155995481082309/posts/join-the-100-stories-campaign-an-initiative-by-gosh-cry-tonga-a-youth-led-group-1983300941685078/>

state actor engagement in anti-corruption advocacy. Beyond the direct support to PYFAC, the platform has incubated bilateral relationships between participants that have been developed beyond the space of PYFAC.

For example, when youth advocates in Solomon Islands were advocating in 2017 and early 2018 for the parliament to adopt new anti-corruption laws, they reached out to fellow youth advocates in Fiji to help with drafting a petition that was part of the campaign.³⁰ This shows that beyond the support from UN-PRAC sponsored events, the platform members have created bilateral and multi-lateral relationships in which they are supporting each other beyond the work of UN-PRAC.

Recommendation: Promote more bilateral and multi-lateral interactions between beneficiaries through UN-PRAC platforms.

IMPACT

Criteria	Key Questions	Answer to Key Questions
<p>Impact</p> <p><i>(Impact is the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended other projects.)</i></p>	5.1 What concrete achievements have been made by the project (e.g. ratification of UNCAC; new legislation; institutions established)	Ratification of UNCAC by Niue and Samoa; anti-corruption laws passed in Solomon Islands; RTI systems established in Vanuatu; NACS adopted in Solomon Islands and Kiribati.
	5.2 Which best fit can be identified for adaptation and replication (e.g. in other projects or topics), up-scaling, or prioritization, to ensure achieving outcomes in the most effective way?	In Kiribati and Samoa, the project has provided technical assistance and has conducted a feasibility study for determining the need for establishing a separate anti-corruption agency. It is part of their NACSS. A UNODC specialist provided

³⁰ Interviews with youth anti-corruption advocates from Fiji and Solomon Islands

		<p>technical assistance for finalizing the NACS.</p> <p>Work with youth, as advocates on a regional level, has been a success and can be replicated in other regions.</p>
--	--	---

When considering the impact of a project, an evaluation must look at the real change that has occurred as a result of the interventions of the project. What concrete differences have been made that will have long-term implications?

However, with UN-PRAC, even at the mid-point of Phase II, we can see some significant impacts. To start, the ratification of UNCAC by Niue and Samoa is a clear impact of the project. The project started to engage the governments of Samoa and Niue during Phase I, but its efforts came to fruition in Phase II when the two PICs ratified the Convention. This is directly linked to Output 1 of the project and was achieved through ongoing advocacy and knowledge sharing, especially with political leaders in the countries.

Another impact of UN-PRAC during this phase has been the adoption of the Anti-Corruption Act and the Whistleblower Act in Solomon Islands. The project was part of a broader effort amongst development partners and national activists in advocating for the adoption of the legislation, which had been delayed for a number of years due to political intransigence. The project had helped with the adoption of the NACS for Solomon Islands during the early part of Phase II and then continued with support to its implementation by the Government of Solomon Islands. Also, UN-PRACs work with youth from the country through PYFAC and the provision of the advocacy toolkit, provided local youth with the skills and knowledge to be leaders in the advocacy campaign that was implemented in late 2017 and early 2018, which provided the political demand that overcame the political inertia and eventually led to the passage of these key laws.

A third impact was the adoption of the resolution at the 7th UNCAC CoSP that reflected the work of the PICs in having their perspective reflected in the work of UNCAC and the broader anti-corruption community. The President of Kiribati attended the CoSP in November 2017 and was the highest ranking official at the meeting. The President, along with other delegates from PICs, advocated for and had Resolution 7/7 passed by the CoSP, recognizing the challenges of small island developing states in preventing and fighting corruption and adhering to the provisions of UNCAC. The resolution was a

significant signal of the engagement of PICs in the international framework for fighting corruption and showed their engagement can have an impact on that same framework.

Key highlights of Resolution 7/7³¹ include:

6. Encourages small island developing States to further share with each other information, research and best practices specific to small island developing States on the implementation of the Convention;

7. Also encourages small island developing States to continue efforts aimed at building integrity and preventing and eliminating corruption in the public and private sectors, and invites other States parties and interested donors to support small island developing States at their request in this regard, including with the assistance of other development partners and relevant United Nations agencies, within their existing mandates;

8. Urges small island developing States to strengthen anti-corruption frameworks as part of their steps to enhance good governance in the area of land and ocean resources management, with the aim of building resilience to the impacts of climate change in small island developing States, with the support of the international community and relevant United Nations bodies;

...

11. Recognizes the progress made and challenges faced in the implementation of Conference resolution 6/9, and urges States parties to continue supporting technical assistance efforts focused on the needs of small island developing States, including assistance with ratification of or accession to the Convention, as well as meeting the legislative and other technical requirements to effectively implement the Convention, upon request, and with the assistance of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime...

The Resolution also specifically recognized the work of UN-PRAC in supporting PICs in their efforts to combat corruption, and to ratify and comply with UNCAC provisions. This is a visible acknowledgement of the joint efforts of UNODC and UNDP through the project to support the PICs and their governments to be outward looking with regard to their role in preventing and fighting corruption, and to become full partners in the international anti-corruption community.

³¹ **The full text of Resolution 7/7 can be found here:** <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/COSP/session7-resolutions.html>

Another impact was the work of UN-PRAC in supporting the implementation of the RTI Law in Vanuatu. After the adoption of the legislation, the project worked with the Government of Vanuatu and civil society to design the systems that would be put in place to ensure the law's implementation. Those systems are now in place and were initiated in late 2018.

SUSTAINABILITY

Criteria	Key Questions	Answers to Key Questions
<p>Sustainability</p> <p><i>(Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.)</i></p>	<p>6.1 To what extent has the ownership of key stakeholders been sought and institutionalized?</p>	<p>There are good examples in developing anti-corruption strategies in an inclusive manner that enables ownership.</p> <p>Creation of the youth advocates toolkit in an inclusive manner has resulted in strong ownership. (e.g. Kiribati youth are translating it into local language)</p> <p>The project has used senior short-term technical adviser (former Member of Parliament) to engage at political level in Niue and Samoa, which led to political will to ratify UNCAC.</p>
	<p>6.2 Have the project's activities contributed to outputs, processes, networks etc. that are likely to have some enduring benefit? What have been the barriers to sustainability?</p>	<p>Network of youth advocates has proven to be active beyond work of the project.</p> <p>Through the Financial Intelligence Unit (FIU) attachments, the project incubated a network of FIUs in the region and supported the transfer of knowledge amongst them. The network is still active and works beyond activities organized by the project.</p>

In considering sustainability, the key issue for the evaluation is if the project has created institutions, systems and frameworks that will last beyond the life of the project.

In the case of UN-PRAC, the project has worked effectively with partners and beneficiaries to establish some systems and frameworks that will last beyond the life of the project.

To start, the project has worked to establish ownership of the fight against corruption amongst key stakeholders. There are good examples of how the project supported the development of NACSs in an inclusive manner that enables ownership by government, but also non-state actors. Support of the development of national strategies included the Solomon Islands, Kiribati, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

For example, the project has supported the development and adoption of the Kiribati NACS. This included a November 2016 workshop where national actors came together to develop the strategy in an inclusive manner.³² Part of the workshop was with the participation of a wider stakeholder group, including CSOs, the parliament's anti-corruption committee and faith-based organizations to ensure involvement and ownership of all stakeholders. These activities contributed to achieving partnerships and effective cooperation as a prerequisite for a sustainable process in latter processes of implementation of the UNCAC. In this regard, the activities led towards the establishment of the national Anti-Corruption Committee to develop the strategy and successful outcome of the first review cycle. The Kiribati Parliament Anti-Corruption Committee undertook an intense second retreat (in May 2017) to enable stakeholders to review and refine activities planned under Kiribati's NACS.

UN-PRAC has supported the foundation of at least one stand-alone national anti-corruption project in Solomon Islands, which will allow for the further development of national systems beyond the work of the project. It is anticipated that the national project will be co-funded by the Government of Solomon Islands, showing their commitment and ownership with regard to preventing and fighting corruption, and increasing the likelihood of a sustainable approach to anti-corruption in the country.

The project has also brokered bilateral relationships between sets of beneficiaries from different PICs that have endured beyond the project's interventions. For example, the Fiji FIU partnered with UN-PRAC to provide annual short-term attachments from other PICs' governments to work on a daily basis with FIU to learn how such systems operate. As a follow up of one of these attachments, UN-PRAC supported Fiji FIU's two-week mentoring mission to the Marshall Islands, leading to the strengthening of the Marshall

³² The four-day workshop was organised by UN-PRAC and the Kiribati Public Service office to discuss the development of a NACS.

Island’s financial intelligence management frameworks. Beyond the specific interventions supported by UN-PRAC, FIU has continued to provide guidance and sharing knowledge with other PIC governments on a demand-driven basis. This is a clear sign of sustainable relationships beyond the work of the project.

A third example of where the project’s work has had sustainable implications is with regard to its work in the development of curricula related to anti-corruption. FICAC developed a school curriculum for both primary and secondary school students.³³ It is a mandatory course and is based on the youth advocacy toolkit developed previously by UN-PRAC. The project is working with the University of the South Pacific as it develops a specific module related to anti-corruption for its Bachelor’s programme on Governance, Leadership and Human Rights.

PARTNERSHIPS & COOPERATION

Criteria	Key Questions	Answers to Key Questions
<p>Partnerships & Cooperation <i>(The evaluation assesses the partnerships and cooperation established during the project/ programme as well as their functioning and value.)</i></p>	<p>7.1 To what extent have partnerships been sought and established with and between governments, parliaments, the private sector, civil society and academia?</p>	<p>The project has developed significant partnerships with a number of stakeholders, including universities, NGOs, civil society, regional institutions, parliaments and government agencies. The engagement of multiple stakeholders has also allowed for incubation of multi-sectoral engagement. (e.g. Kiribati, where work with multiple actors from different sectors has resulted in an inclusive process for developing the NACS)</p>
	<p>7.2 What evidence is there of improved capacity of non -State</p>	<p>In the Solomon Islands, civil society advocates, particularly youth who received support</p>

³³ The National Anti-Corruption Curriculum is now in its third phase of piloting. See: <https://www.fijitimes.com/ficac-banks-on-education-to-prevent-corruption/>

	actors to engage in anti-corruption processes?	from the project, used the advocacy toolkit developed and engaged the network established to implement an advocacy campaign that resulted in adoption of anti-corruption laws in 2018.
	7.3 To what extent is the project/programme cooperating with other potential partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs?	To a great extent, the project is cooperating with and developing partners. Work with other UNDP and UNODC projects has ensured sharing of resources and knowledge. Work with universities has resulted in new curriculum on anti-corruption. All work with partners is aimed at reducing corruption in the region, which is related to SDG targets 16.5 and 16.6.

The project has established numerous partnerships that have added value to the work of the project. This has included partnerships with a number of groups from different sectors, such as:

- **Academia:** University of the South Pacific; Washington Lee University
- **National AC Bodies:** FICAC; FIU
- **Regional Sectoral Bodies:** Pacific Islands Law Officers’ Network (PILON); Pacific Islands Private Sector Organisation (PIPSO); Pacific Regional Non-Governmental Organisations Association (PRNGO)
- **NGOs:** Pacific Islands News Agency; Pacific Youth Council
- **iNGOs:** Transparency International; GOPAC
- **Parliament:** Parliament of Tonga
- **Development Partners:** Office of the Commonwealth Ombudsman of Australia; UNDP Regional Projects; UNODC Global Projects.

A good example of how the project has engaged partners is with regard to youth NGOs. More than 30 organizations at the local level cooperated with the Pacific Youth Council and the project in establishing PYFAC. In support of the non-State actors the project and the Pacific Youth Council launched the Pacific Youth Anti-Corruption Advocate's Toolkit. Youth representatives from 13 PICs gathered for the Pacific Youth Anti-Corruption Innovation Lab in Nadi, Fiji, in April 2017 to develop innovative solutions to address corruption challenges in selected policy areas. The Innovation Lab was realized through a partnership between UN-PRAC and the Pacific Youth Council, with the support of UNODC's Education for Justice (E4J) initiative, and the Washington and Lee University's Law School in the United States.

Another example is from the partnership with PILON. The project gathered government law officers who are a part of PILON's Environmental Crime Group in an interactive session designed to discuss international best practices and specific regional challenges with regard to guidelines on whistleblower protection.

During this phase, UN-PRAC also partnered with the Office of the Commonwealth Ombudsman of Australia in conducting a three-day workshop for investigators and prosecutors from 14 PICs' integrity bodies that was held in Tonga in October 2017, with the aim of strengthening collaboration and enhancing their capacity to investigate and prosecute corruption.

With the project's support, Solomon Islands launched their NACS, and UN-PRAC joined the Office of the Prime Minister of the Solomon Islands and the Anti-Corruption Resource Centre in conducting a workshop on implementation, evaluation and monitoring of the Solomon Island's NACS in March 2017.³⁴ The workshop, supported by DFAT, was an immediate follow-up of the recent adoption of the NACS.

UN-PRAC also partnered with the Parliament of Tonga to hold workshops with the Parliament of Kiribati to incorporate good integrity practices into their committee

³⁴ Held in March 2017, the two and a half day workshop was a collaboration between DFAT, the Anti-Corruption Resource Centre and UN-PRAC to discuss the monitoring of the (then) newly adopted national anti-corruption strategy and included government and non-state actors. See the Anti-Corruption Resource Centre's Annual Report (2017), pp. 40-41

<https://cdn.sanity.io/files/1f1lcoov/production/6db64db530bbb514a8c51ecb19067340a094cc8f.pdf>

work.³⁵ Fiji's chapter of the GOPAC worked with the GOPAC Chief Executive Officer in providing knowledge and best practices to the workshop.

Finally, it is important to note that the project has worked effectively in partnership with other development projects. Activities have been organised with UNDP's SDG Implementation Programme and the regional parliamentary and access to justice projects, as well UNODC's Regional Programme for Southeast Asia 2014-2019, Thematic Programme Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity-related Crime, Education for Justice Project under the Doha Declaration programme and the Research and Trend Analysis Branch of the Division for Policy Analysis and Public Affairs. These were all organised in a manner that ensured cost-sharing and the expansion of the work of UN-PRAC and an expansion of those that exposed to the knowledge and information related to anti-corruption that the project can provide to regional actors.

HUMAN RIGHTS, GENDER EQUALITY & LEAVING NO ONE BEHIND

Criteria	Key Questions	Answers to key Questions
<p>Human rights, Gender Equality & Leaving No One Behind</p> <p><i>(The evaluation needs to assess the mainstreaming throughout the project/programme of human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups.)</i></p>	8.1 To what extent are human rights considerations included in the project design and implementation?	No direct consideration of applying a human rights-based approach to the work of the project, though there is a clear understanding of such principles in its implementation. Anti-Corruption interventions are directly related to human rights enforcement.
	8.2 To what extent has the Project promoted women's participation throughout the Project activities and improved	Significant effort by the project to encourage women's participation in activities.

³⁵ In April, 2017 the Kiribati Parliament held a workshop to discuss its role in promoting integrity, including oversight of government action in the field of anti-corruption. This included inputs from the Tongan Chairperson of the Parliamentary Committee on Anti-Corruption and the chair of the local chapter of GOPAC. See: <http://www.pacific.undp.org/content/pacific/en/home/presscenter/pressreleases/2017/05/02/strengthening-kiribati-capacity-to-boost-integrity-.html>

	the active participation of women in discussions?	(e.g. Ensuring women’s voices are heard as part of NACS development processes)
	8.3 How could gender equality considerations be further included in the project design and implementation?	To organize specific activities that will empower women leaders
	8.4 How has the project ensured the involvement of marginalized groups in its activities?	The project’s work on youth advocacy has been a major result of its work to date. Youth now have a network to draw upon and the tools to apply at the national level to advocate for anti-corruption measures

Human rights have not been specifically included in the project design and implementation but considered. On the one hand, corrupt practices violate human rights in many aspects and corruption has a negative impact on the enjoyment of human rights. On the other hand, to investigate, report and prosecute corruption can result in heightened risks of human rights violations and stakeholders will require effective protection.

Therefore, work on promoting anti-corruption includes, at an integral level, the application of human rights principles. By implementing an anti-corruption project, UN-PRAC is inherently also implementing a project consistent with human rights principles.

The project’s work with youth as a disadvantaged group was significant. The establishment of the PYFAC youth platform, the publication of the advocacy toolkit and the knowledge sharing and training that were conducted resulted in a key marginalized group being empowered to advocate at the national level for stronger systems to fight corruption. This was seen especially in Solomon Islands and Kiribati where youth CSOs have led the push for reforms.

With regard to gender equality, the project did not have specific outputs related to targeting women’s role in preventing and fighting corruption. However, the project has made efforts to ensure gender equality as it relates to anti-corruption was considered through its work.

For example, UN-PRAC encouraged the completion of a gender questionnaire as part of national UNCAC evaluation processes, with limited success. A consultant is currently mapping development projects in the region to help identify potential partnerships that can be established to link support for the promotion of gender equality with the fight against corruption in the region.

With regard to non-state actors, the project has had more success in ensuring the significant participation of women in workshops and activities and has encouraged the involvement of gender groups in a number of project activities. The project is currently seeking champions amongst women activists to support the development of their capacity as they become national leaders in anti-corruption activities.

Recommendation: More interventions – both through mainstreaming and targeting – are required to promote gender equality in the project’s work.

III. CONCLUSIONS

At the mid-point in implementation of Phase II of UN-PRAC, the project is on track to achieve all of its outputs and to reach its overall outcome. The project was designed to reflect the work accomplished during the previous phase and is building on those results. The objectives of the project have remained relevant to the beneficiaries in the region who are receiving support.

What the project has accomplished to date has been done in a cost-effective manner. This has included key collaborations with other development partners in delivery of activities and outputs, including UNDP and UNODC projects and experts. Greater efficiency can be found in ensuring a more seamless approach to managing the two finance and administration systems of UNDP and UNODC, and in having dedicated project management capacity.

The project has been effective in delivering on results, including the use of timely technical advice to governments and non-state actors in the region. This has been accomplished through a comprehensive approach to preventing and fighting corruption, and the engagement of multiple actors. It has also been seen in how the project has been an incubator for multi-party cooperation and the identification of new methods in approaching the fight against corruption.

The project's impact can be seen in the ratification of UNCAC by Niue and Samoa. It is also seen in the roll out of the RTI regime in Vanuatu, in anti-corruption laws adopted in Solomon Islands and NACs approved in Kiribati and Solomon Islands. The impact and results have been achieved as a result of strategic partnerships with regional bodies, academics, civil society and national anti-corruption bodies in the region.

There are examples of how the work of the project will have a lasting effect in the region. Networks have been established amongst youth activists and independent oversight institution officials and government officials that have resulted in relationships being established and flourishing on their own.

By working with a number of partners – NGOs, regional forums, development partners, UN projects and programmes – UN-PRAC has been able to extend its work and reach more beneficiaries.

UN-PRACs work in support of youth activists has been highly effective, resulting in new tools, networks and relationships that are benefiting these beneficiaries in the region.

Efforts have been made to engage more women in the work of the project, but greater effort is required to ensure both targeted and mainstreamed engagement of women.

IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

The following are some lessons learned and best practices from the first two years of the second phase of the project:

Focusing at Output and Outcome Levels Creates Greater Results. UN-PRAC has been focused on achieving the outputs and outcomes as outlined in its project document. This has enabled the project team to see the “big picture” and to work with national beneficiaries on impactful results.

Flexibility/Adaptability creates results. The project has been able to adapt to the needs of the beneficiaries and this has resulted in significant impact. This flexibility includes the ability of UNODC and UNDP technical advisers to work together and to share activities under the project. Due to its strong field presence, UNDP processes are able to adapt to the Pacific Region and deliver with flexibility and on a timely basis.

Repeated Use of External Experts is Critical to Delivery. The project has two technical advisers for 15 PICs. However, by repeatedly using external technical experts – both experts within UNODC and UNDP and external consultants - the project has been able to extend its capacity. This includes the repeated use of such experts in a given country to allow them to build their own relationships with political and government leaders that add value to the project and support the delivery of results.

Regional Work Creates Results. Working regionally allows UN-PRAC to have space to maneuver and to focus its resources and expertise in PICs that are ready, willing and able to receive support. In addition, where the regional project can identify where its work can be further advanced through a national project, it should strive to achieve this level of support. This will allow for deeper and more context-specific engagement that can move beyond the level of support a regional project can provide.

Strong Relationships Mean Better Results. Where the project has had the most success is where it has built strong relationships with key national actors – politicians, government officials, non-state actors. Investing in long-term engagement creates a continuity of support for key actors that can result in

greater opportunities for the consideration of the reforms that the project is advocating.

Partnerships Provide Added Value. UN-PRAC has shown that by working with various partners and by making partnerships not a by-product of the project but inherent to its methodology of project delivery, the project has been able to achieve much more than would otherwise be possible.

Comprehensive Engagement Allows for a More Inclusive Approach. By working with government officials, political leaders, non-state actors and oversight bodies, UN-PRAC has allowed for a more inclusive approach to its work and the development of anti-corruption strategies and frameworks. By building bilateral relationships with each sector, it then has the ability to convene them in cross-sectoral work that results in more impactful work.

Incubation is a key Role for the Project. UN-PRAC has had success when it acts as an incubator for new relationships and ideas. By creating space for various sectors and actors to engage and the promotion of new ideas or approaches, the project can initiate a process for change that is more likely to be sustainable and effective.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and analysis of this report, the following recommendations are made for the implementation of the project during the next two years:

Recommendation 1: Increase the focus of the project on RTI.

The project has worked in the area of RTI by supporting the Government of Vanuatu in establishing an RTI system after the adoption of relevant legislation. Yet there has been limited engagement on RTI elsewhere in the region, even though it is a critical component of transparency, which is a measure of SDG16 achievement and key to the fight against corruption and to promote accountability. The project should be an advocate for RTI through the development of NACS and legislation. (Project Management Team; Project Management at the Implementation Support Section, Division for Treaty Affairs, UNODC, and Effective Governance Unit, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji, UNDP)

Recommendation 2: Revise how the project is administered, including new posts and new capacity, including access to Umoja.

The current system is based on finding solutions to the challenges faced by the project due to agencies' different financial systems, policies and procedures. Project technical advisers are also investing a portion of their time in managing the project, which diverts their attention from their core work of advisory services. These issues can be addressed through the establishment of a full-time Project Manager, in addition to the two current technical advisers, who can have the capacity and access to both financial systems and, in turn, reduce the current challenges in managing the project with the noted incompatibility of such systems. The project would also benefit from allowing shared administrative staff to have access to UMOJA. (Project Management at the Implementation Support Section, Division for Treaty Affairs, UNODC, and Effective Governance Unit, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji, UNDP)

Recommendation 3: Consider transitioning UN-PRAC into a regional programme with sufficient resources to operate at the regional level with national components.

Currently UN-PRAC is a regional project and it has had success in this format. However, as the anti-corruption agenda is advancing in the Pacific region and more countries start to implement national strategies and legal frameworks, it is critical that the project transition to a regional programme that provides both regional and national project

elements. This will allow for a consistent approach to anti-corruption assistance in the region and for quality assurance of national projects that will likely proliferate in the coming years. To accomplish this transition, there will be a need to increase the resources allocated to the new programme to allow for it to deliver at the regional and national levels concurrently. (Project Management at the Implementation Support Section, Division for Treaty Affairs, UNODC, and Effective Governance Unit, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji, UNDP)

Recommendation 4: Increase the Donor Base of the Regional Work

If the project is to transition to a regional programme, as noted in the first recommendation, there will likely be a need to expand the number of donors providing resources to ensure there are sufficient resources to work both regionally and directly in certain national settings. This will allow UN-PRAC to benefit from greater resources while diversifying its donor base to ensure it is viable beyond reliance on one donor. (Project Management at the Implementation Support Section, Division for Treaty Affairs, UNODC, and Effective Governance Unit, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji, UNDP)

Recommendation 5: Re-consider the added value of the provision of small grants to project beneficiaries.

The cost of administering the small grants issued by the project, especially as it relates to staff time and resources, has not shown significant results. The project also needs to focus more on strategic relationships with stakeholders in the region and not be seen as a small-scale donor for limited activities. (Project Management at the Implementation Support Section, Division for Treaty Affairs, UNODC, and Effective Governance Unit, UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji, UNDP)

Recommendation 6: Promote more bilateral and multi-lateral interactions between beneficiaries through UN-PRAC platforms.

The project has had success when it plays the role of broker or convener. Establishing space for PIC counterparts (government officials; non-state actors) to interact and to build their own relationships. UN-PRAC should be creating more such opportunities. Its role as an incubator of new projects and approaches to anti-corruption work in the region should also be enhanced. (Project Management Team)

Recommendation 7: More interventions – both through mainstreaming and targeting – are required to promote gender equality in the project’s work.

UN-PRAC has made efforts to identify potential entry points for greater gender-related activities and this work should continue. But the project must also identify in its annual work plans specific activities that can integrate gender equality issues as they relate to anti-corruption. This should include the mainstreaming of gender equality in all activities and the development of specific, targeted interventions, such as the proposed identification and support to women anti-corruption champions. (Project Management Team)

Background and Context

Project number:	UNODC: XSPZ91 UNDP: 101018
Project title:	United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project (UN-PRAC)
Duration:	1 July 2016 - 30 June 2020
Location:	Pacific region; project team based in Fiji
Linkages to Country, Regional and Thematic Programmes:	<p>UNODC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional Programme for Southeast Asia 2014-2019; - Thematic Programme Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity-related Crime. <p>UNDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UNDP Strategic plan; - UNDP Sub-regional Programme Document (2018-2022) for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories

To which UNDAF is the project/programme linked to (if any)	United Nations Pacific Strategy ³⁶
Executing Agency:	UNODC and UNDP
Partner Organizations:	n/a
Total Approved Budget:	USD 4,659,299 (UNODC 50% / UNDP 50%)
Total Overall Budget	USD 4,659,299
Donors:	DFAT Australia
Project Manager/ Coordinator:	Mihaela Stojkoska, UNDP / Maria Adomeit, UNODC
Type and time frame of evaluation:	Mid-term Independent Project Evaluation
Time frame of the project covered by the evaluation:	1 June 2016 – 7 September 2018 (tentative; end of field mission)
Geographical coverage of the evaluation:	Pacific: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tokelau (Territory of), Tuvalu and Vanuatu
Budget for this evaluation in USD:	USD 38,000
Number of independent evaluators planned for this evaluation:	Two (2)
Type and year of past evaluations (if any):	n/a

³⁶<https://ims.undg.org//downloadFile/8611d16530acd54e1f7557ac5603773f75784128233035fd90f7cfa8f20a01c3>

Core Learning Partners (entities):	UNODC, UNDP, DFAT
------------------------------------	-------------------

Project overview and historical context

The second phase (2016-2020) of this joint UNDP-UNODC Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project (UN-PRAC) aims to support Pacific Island Countries (PICs) to strengthen their national integrity systems. This is in order to promote 'clean' governments and to create an enabling environment for trade, business, investment and sustainable development. In turn, this will enhance the delivery of equitable and high-quality services to all Pacific Islanders.

Over the past years, the debate has shifted from 'why' countries should be preventing and fighting corruption to 'how'. The UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) is the only international legally binding framework on how to prevent and fight corruption. It provides a solid basis upon which PICs can develop sustainable anti-corruption reforms. It is for this reason that this Project was designed to build on the platform of UNCAC, as well as the efforts undertaken during the first phase (2012-2016) of UN-PRAC. This includes leveraging the recognition by PICs of the UN as a trusted, impartial partner. One medium by which PICs are addressing the 'how' question is through the Mechanism for the Implementation of UNCAC (UNCAC Review Mechanism). This requires States parties to consider what national legislative, institutional and practical frameworks are in place to effectively address corruption. Another related anchor is the Development Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), recently adopted by UN Member States. SDG 16 (Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies) directly calls for stronger action on anti-corruption, transparency and accountability. This Project also strives to more coherently address the link between anti-corruption and development, and to integrate anti-corruption into national and regional development processes.

One of the key implementation principles of UN-PRAC, as noted in the project document, is the integration of gender and human rights throughout the Project. Both UNDP and UNODC are committed to mainstreaming gender equality in their programme work and as such, this Project is also committed to gender equality. In addition, where appropriate, specific activities in support of gender equality in the anti-corruption context are considered. The Project reporting is designed to be gender responsive and raise gender-related issues to the extent possible.

The goal of UN-PRAC is to promote and strengthen measures to prevent and fight corruption more efficiently and effectively in the Pacific region. This aligns with the purpose of UNCAC in paragraph 1(1) and the spirit of SDG 16.

Main challenges during implementation

Limitations in working with fragile Small Island States, including low capacities, changing political situations and a lack of resources to deal with all issues, naturally affect the project

implementation. However, the main implementing principles outlined in the project document and the close partnerships with a wide spectrum of stakeholders have helped UN-PRAC to address these limitations to some extent.

Another challenge has been the limited financial resources of UN-PRAC, and the challenge of matching supply with the increasing demand, particularly on more in-depth capacity development and institution building as countries progress with their anti-corruption reforms. Besides looking at expanding the project base by mobilizing additional resources, UN-PRAC encourages PICs to look at nationally based programmatic frameworks to supplement the UN-PRAC support. Further, the work with the civil society, in particular youth, will get a new boost with the additional funding announced by the donor (AUD 500,000) for the following two years.

Institutional and non-State platforms for the fight against corruption continue to be scarce in the region. Only one country has a functioning specialized anti-corruption commission, and two have newly established anti-corruption committees, while a couple are in the making. While a number of vibrant (particularly youth) NGOs and activists tackle corruption in their initiatives, anti-corruption focused organizations are very few.

Finally, the region is remote in terms of coverage by global and regional surveys on relevant issues, and there is not much relevant data available, besides the information collected through the empirical experience of UN-PRAC.

Project documents and revisions of the original project document

	Year	Please provide general information regarding the original project document.
Project document	2016	<i>Original project document was developed by UNDP, UNODC and DFAT as a follow up of the first phase of UN-PRAC (2012-2016). It aims at promoting and strengthening measures to prevent and fight corruption more efficiently and effectively in the Pacific region.</i>

Project revision	Year	Reason & purpose (max. 2 sentences per revision)	Change in (please check)
1	2018	Additional funding (AUD 500 000) to expand the work on anti-corruption education and civil society, especially youth. No changes in objective, outcomes or outputs, only in activities and indicators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Budget <input type="checkbox"/> Timeframe <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logframe

Main objectives and outcomes

This project aims to support PICs to increase their national integrity systems in terms of preventing and fighting corruption, in order to promote clean governments and create an enabling environment for trade, business and investment in the region. This, in turn, will enhance the quality of service delivery to the people of the Pacific, and will help promote sustainable development. This Project therefore seeks to balance the advisory, technical services provided to individual PICs with its networking, awareness-raising and advocacy work concerning corruption and its impacts, regionally and globally.

Baselines were established based on experience and knowledge gathered during the first phase of UN-PRAC and have been used in the implementation of the project.

Goal of the project/programme (as per project document/revision):

Goal:	Promote and strengthen measures to prevent and fight corruption more efficiently and effectively in the Pacific region
--------------	--

Outcomes of the project/programme (as per project document/revision)

Outcome 1:	<i>Niue, Samoa and Tonga are given sufficient information and support to enable their accession to UNCAC and all Pacific States parties actively participate in the UNCAC review process</i>
Output 1.1:	Understanding and awareness of UNCAC accession increased
Output indicators:	- 13 PICS ratify/accede UNCAC
Output 1.2:	UNCAC Pacific reviews supported
Output indicators:	- At least 6 Focal Points submit their country self-assessments, focusing on UNCAC Chapter II - Facilitate at least 4 country visits - Support the finalization of at least 4 UNCAC review reports and executive summaries
Output 1.3:	PICs contributed to the broader anti-corruption agenda
Output indicators:	- At least 10 PICs participate in the IRG and CoSP (not necessarily all at the same time)
Outcome 2:	<i>Pacific States parties more effectively implement UNCAC and work towards the achievement of SDG 16</i>
Output 2.1:	Anti-corruption reforms prioritized by PICs as a result of the UNCAC Review Mechanism
Output indicators:	- At least 8 UNCAC review follow-up workshops (both first and second review cycles) held - At least 4 implementation plans to the UNCAC review follow-ups developed
Output 2.2:	National anti-corruption legislation and policies strengthened in line with UNCAC and the Development Agenda 2030
Output indicators:	- At least 4 PICs supported to develop NACS to strengthen/ prioritize anti-corruption efforts - At least 3 PICs implement NACS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 8 PICs supported to establish/ strengthen anti-corruption policies / legislation - At least 2 countries supported to mainstream GOAL 16 into their development strategies and/ or sty and monitor related anti-corruption targets
Output 2.3:	National anti-corruption institutional frameworks and capacities strengthened in line with UNCAC and the Development Agenda 2030
Output indicators:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 4 anti-corruption institutions are trained and are performing their functions - Technical advice on institutional strengthening provided to at least 5 PICs
Output 2.4:	South-South anti-corruption learning encouraged and effective knowledge sharing promoted
Output indicators:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 1 publication on the implementation of UNCAC Chapters II and/ or V produced, stakeholders acquainted with the content and feedback obtained - At least 4 project newsletters produced and disseminated - At least 3 PICs performed peer-to-peer anti-corruption policy development - At least 3 PICs utilized South-South cooperation - At least 1 specific development theme covered by an anti-corruption study
Outcome 3:	<i>Social accountability mechanisms and the anti-corruption role of non-State actors strengthened</i>
Output 3.1:	Engagement of non-State actors in the prevention of corruption increased
Output indicators:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least another 2 CSOs engaged in UNCAC-related processes - At least 2 pilot projects with non-State actors produced results, lessons learned noted and disseminated with support of UN-PRAC - At least 4 PICs have participated in training activities and had follow-up with - Media engaged in AC discussions as a result of at least 1 UN-PRAC supported regional media initiative - At least 3 PICs have formal or informal anti-corruption education programmes/ curricula
Output 3.2:	Multi-stakeholder regional networks and for a for anti-corruption functional
Output indicators:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 2 anti-corruption initiatives generated - At least 2 partnerships on anti-corruption initiated - At least 1 more regional forum/ network functional - Awareness raising activities and training programmes delivered by ToT participants in at least 5 PICs - CSOs, in particular youth and women, from at least 10 PICs participate in regional/ international anti-corruption dialogue
Output 3.3:	Performance and service delivery of selected institutions improved as a result of enhanced accountability

Output indicators:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 4 national Parliaments have engaged in improving their oversight and accountability roles through the work of specific committees in partnership with UN-PRAC - At least 3 partnership initiatives for improved service delivery have demonstrated results, supported through UN-PRAC
--------------------	---

Contribution to UNODC and UNDP’s strategic frameworks, country, regional or thematic programmes

Contribution to the following UNODC strategic framework and programmes:

The project contributes to the UNODC Strategic Framework sub-programme 3. The UNODC Strategic Framework is one of the Programmes of the overall Strategic Framework of the United Nations Secretariat, prepared in form of a biannual plan (e.g. Biennial programme plan and priorities for the period 2018-2019³⁷). The programmes can cover the work of an entire organization or theme. Programme 13 on International drug control, crime and terrorism prevention and criminal justice covers the work of UNODC, including its sub-programme 3 on countering corruption.

The project pursues a regional approach along with country-level assistance. Consequently, the project ties in with UNODC’s Regional Programme for Southeast Asia and the Pacific (2014-2019) which focuses on regional, targeted and tailored support to States parties to prevent and combat crime, such as transnational organized crime, corruption and drug use and to support criminal justice reform. This is envisaged through a broad range of technical assistance measures with the objective of enhancing rule of law, peace, security, justice and health and of contributing to the achievement of SDG 16 and the 2030 Agenda. In particular, Sub-Programme 2 of the Regional Programme is devoted to anti-corruption.

For the Pacific Region, the Regional programme highlights that, at the beginning of the project, there were 11 Pacific Island States that had ratified UNCAC. Currently, with UN-PRAC’s support, this number has gone up to 13 States parties to UNCAC in the region³⁸.

The project also contributes to the UNODC Thematic Programme “Action against Corruption, Economic Fraud and Identity-Related Crimes”.

Contribution to the following UNDP strategic plan and programmes:

³⁷ <http://undocs.org/A/71/6/Rev.1>

³⁸ Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States Of), Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tokelau (Territory of), Tuvalu and Vanuatu. Niue acceded to the Convention in October 2017 and Samoa in April 2018.

The project contributes to the UNDP Strategic Plan Outcome (Signature Solution) #2: Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democracy and governance.

The UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021 is vested in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and committed to the principles of universality, equality and leaving no one behind. The UNDP vision for the Strategic Plan 2018-2021 is to help countries achieve sustainable development by eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development and building resilience to crises and shocks. Fight against corruption is one of the identified areas of support required for achieving peaceful, just and inclusive societies.

The project also contributes to the UNDP Sub-regional Programme Document (SRPD) (2018-2022) for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories - Output 5.1 Increased voice and more inclusive participation by women, youth and marginalized groups in national and sub-national decision-making bodies that are more representative.

The above falls under Outcome 5 of the SRPD, focused on governments, parliaments, civil society and the media as key partners to increase transparency of institutions and accountability of decision-makers in issues of public concern. To further the implementation of UNCAC commitments, under Outcome 5 UNDP commits to support the development of anti-corruption policies and institutions, and strengthen the oversight responsibilities of legislatures, the role of parliamentary committees and the functions of independent constitutional offices. UNDP also commits to work with youth and community organizations to create networks and partnerships to hold elected representatives and civil servants to account.

Linkage to the UN Pacific Strategy and to Sustainable Development Goals

The Project/Programme contributes to the following Sustainable Development Goals, Targets and Performance Indicators:

Relevant UN Sustainable Development Goals	Target(s)	Indicator(s)
16 – Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies	16.5	15.5.1
	16.6	(16.5.2)
	16.10	(16.2.1)
		(16.2.2)
		16.10.2

Moreover, the Project/Programme contributes to the United Nations Pacific Strategy (UNPS) 2018-2022, and to its predecessor - the Pacific Sub-region Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2013-2017.

UNDAF 2013-2017 was a five-year strategic framework that outlined the collective response of the UN system to the development priorities in 14 Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICs), namely Cook Islands, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Republic of Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu.

Productive and Transparent Democratic and Accountability Institutions was one of the main regional priorities that were targeted with the UNDAF 2013-2017, falling under the UNDAF Focus Area 5 - Governance, along with improved public sector efficiency, effectiveness and service delivery; and effective, enlightened and accountable leadership.

UNPS 2018-2022³⁹ is also a five-year strategic framework, with the same scope of countries. The UNPS supports the 14 governments and peoples in the Pacific to advance a localized response to the global 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This response is tailored to each country's national priorities, and responds to the Pacific Leaders' call to the United Nations system to "align its work programmes and operations to support internationally agreed outcomes, including the Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in the Pacific region" (2015 GA res. 69/318).

The UNPS 2018-2022 is a multi-country, outcome level, strategic framework that presents a coordinated approach to support the PICs across the Pacific. The six outcomes address strategic priorities that promote mutual accountability for development results in the Pacific, further Pacific to Pacific cooperation, and enable the targeting of valuable UN resources to areas where they are most needed.

Outcome 5 of UNPS is dedicated to governance and community engagement. Its goal is the following: "By 2022, people and communities in the Pacific will contribute to and benefit from inclusive, informed, and transparent decision-making processes; accountable and responsive institutions; and improved access to justice". UNPS states: "Governments, parliaments, civil society and the media will be key partners in increasing the transparency of institutions and the accountability of decision-makers. With consideration for the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) commitments, the UN will focus on support that will contribute to the development and implementation of anti-corruption policies and institutions, and will strengthen the oversight responsibilities of legislatures, the role of parliamentary committees, and the functions of independent constitutional offices. Holding elected representatives and civil servants to account will be addressed through formal oversight, institutional strengthening, and support for civil society with a focus on organizing youth and community networks."

³⁹<https://ims.undg.org//downloadFile/8611d16530acd54e1f7557ac5603773f75784128233035fd90f7cfa8f20a01c3>

Increasing anti-corruption efforts and transparency for improved service delivery, and promoting open and accessible information is identified as one of the potential areas of joint programming.

Disbursement History

Time periods throughout the life time of the project	Total Approved Budget*	Expenditure	Expenditure in %
1 June – 31 December 2016	<i>UNODC: \$2,329,650</i> <i>UNDP: \$2,329,649</i>	<i>UNODC: \$225,258</i> <i>UNDP: \$249,328</i>	<i>UNODC: 10%</i> <i>UNDP: 11%</i>
1 January – 31 December 2017	<i>UNODC: \$2,329,650</i> <i>UNDP: \$2,329,649</i>	<i>UNODC: \$571,159</i> <i>UNDP: \$598,237</i>	<i>UNODC: 25%</i> <i>UNDP: 26%</i>
TOTAL up to December 2017			<i>UNODC: 35%</i> <i>UNDP: 37%</i>

*This is the total approved budget after a top-up received from the donor in 2018. It is included here as the total approved budget because it is noted in the revised Project Document that will be shared with the evaluator. However, the original approved budget for each agency was 1,961,640, and with that the respective total expenditure to date was 41% for UNODC and 43% for UNDP.

Purpose of the Evaluation

In line with the project document, the mid-term Independent Project Evaluation will be undertaken around 24 months after the initiation of the project. The aim of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of the design and relevance of the project. It will further assess the effectiveness of the project to date, including its good practices and successes as well as any failures, challenges and areas for improvement. Its results will be used to inform the implementation of the second half of the project. The main users of the evaluation results will be project managers and donors.

The following DAC criteria will be assessed during the evaluation: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. In addition, design, established partnerships and

cooperation as well as aspects of human rights and gender mainstreaming will be assessed. Furthermore, lessons learned and best practices will be identified and recommendations based on the findings formulated.

The outcomes of the evaluation will inform as to what extent the project is contributing to the outcomes of the UNDP and UNODC relevant corporate strategic documents, and above towards the operationalization of the SDG agenda.

Scope of the Evaluation

Unit of analysis (full project/programme/ parts of the project/programme; etc.)	United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project (UN-PRAC)
Time period of the project/programme covered by the evaluation	1 June 2016 – 7 September 2018
Geographical coverage of the evaluation	15 Pacific countries and territories covered by the project ⁴⁰ . The field mission will be conducted to Fiji. Stakeholders in other countries will be interviewed via skype and phone due to the vast geographical area and expensive and challenging in-region travel options.

Key Evaluation Questions

Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation will be conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, as well as design, partnerships and cooperation, human rights, gender equality and leaving no one behind as well as lesson learned and best practices. The questions will be further refined by the Evaluation Team.

Design <i>The Design of a project or programme measures the extent to which the logical framework approach was adopted.</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent has the results based framework been a useful programme management tool and allowed for an assessment of project outcomes and impact? 2. How well aligned are activities, outputs and outcomes in the logical framework?

⁴⁰ Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States Of), Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tokelau (Territory of), Tuvalu and Vanuatu

3. To what extent does the design of this project enable optimal use of resources and cooperation with other development initiatives?
4. How effective has the joint partnership between UNODC and UNDP been in managing and implementing the project?
Relevance
<i>Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.</i>
5. How relevant is the project to target groups' needs and priorities, including target groups of governments, development partners and CSOs?
6. To what extent are the outputs, outcomes and objectives of this project/programme relevant and contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and how have project activities supported partners in implementing the SDGs?
Efficiency
<i>Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs.</i>
7. To what extent were the human and financial resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?
8. To what extent was the coordination between UNODC and UNDP at different levels efficient and appropriate?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How well has the joint programming model been working? - What have been its strengths and weaknesses? - How can such coordination be further strengthened?
Effectiveness
<i>Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.</i>
9. To what extent were the planned outputs and outcomes in the project document (and subsequent project revision) achieved?
10. Are there any good practices and successes, as well as failures, challenges and areas for improvement?
11. Were there any unintended results achieved beyond those included in the logical framework? If so, what were those results?
(Expected) Impact
<i>Impact is the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.</i>
12. To what extent is UN-PRAC likely to achieve/already achieved its objectives or parts of it beyond the delivery of activities and progress against output targets?
13. Which best fit can be identified for adaptation and replication (e.g. in other projects or topics), up-scaling, or prioritization, to ensure achieving outcomes in the most effective way?
Sustainability
<i>Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.</i>
14. To what extent has the ownership of key stakeholders been sought and institutionalized?
15. Have the project's activities contributed to outputs, processes, networks etc. that are likely to have some enduring benefit? What have been the barriers to sustainability?
Partnerships and cooperation
<i>The evaluation assesses the partnerships and cooperation established during the project/ programme as well as their functioning and value.</i>

16. To what extent have partnerships been sought and established with and between governments, parliaments, the private sector, civil society and academia?
17. What evidence is there of improved capacity of non-State actors to engage in anti-corruption processes?
18. To what extent is the project/programme cooperating with other potential partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs?
<i>Human rights, gender equality, and leaving no one behind</i> <i>The evaluation needs to assess the mainstreaming throughout the project/programme of human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups.</i>
<i>Human Rights</i>
19. To what extent are human rights considerations included in the project design and implementation?
<i>Gender Equality</i>
20. To what extent has the Project promoted women's participation throughout the Project activities and improved the active participation of women in discussions and decision-making fora?
21. How could gender equality considerations be further included in the project design and implementation?
<i>Lessons learned and best practices</i> <i>Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/ programme.</i>
22. What lessons, both positive and negative, can be learned from this Project?
23. What best practices, if any, in planning and implementing UN-PRAC can be identified that should be replicated and/or scaled up in the remainder of UN-PRAC implementation?

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 TOR and the availability of stakeholders. In all cases, the evaluation team is expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, thematic programmes, programme files, financial reports and any other documents that may provide further evidence for triangulation, on which his/her conclusions will be based. The evaluation team is also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation. While maintaining independence, the evaluation will be carried out based on a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all parties identified as the key stakeholders of the project/ programme, the Core Learning Partners (CLP).

The present ToR provides basic information as regards to the methodology, which should not be understood as exhaustive. It is rather meant to guide the evaluation team in elaborating an

effective, efficient, and appropriate evaluation methodology that should be proposed, explained and justified in the Inception Report.

In addition, the evaluation team will be asked to present a summarized methodology (including an evaluation matrix) in the Inception Report outlining the evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection. The evaluation methodology must conform to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards as well as the UNODC Evaluation Policy, Norms and Standards⁴¹.

While the evaluation team shall fine-tune the methodology for the evaluation in an Inception Report, a mixed-methods approach of qualitative and quantitative methods is mandatory due to its appropriateness to ensure a gender-sensitive, inclusive methodology. Special attention shall be paid to an unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories. Indeed, information stemming from secondary sources will be cross-checked and triangulated through data retrieved from primary research methods. Primary data collection methods need to be gender-sensitive as well as inclusive.

The credibility of the data collection and analysis are key to the evaluation. Rival theories and competing explanations must be tested once plausible patterns emerge from triangulating data.

The limitations to the evaluation need to be identified and discussed by the evaluation team in the Inception Report, e.g. data constraints (such as missing baseline and monitoring data). Potential limitations as well as the chosen mitigating measures should be discussed.

When designing the evaluation data collection tools and instruments, the evaluation team needs to consider the analysis of certain relevant or innovative topics in the form of short case studies, analyses, etc. that would benefit the evaluation results.

The main elements of the evaluation process are the following:

- Preliminary desk review of all relevant project documentation (Annex II of the evaluation ToR), as provided by the Project Manager and as further requested by the evaluation team, as well as relevant external documents (e.g. UNDAFs; SDGs; UN and global/regional strategies; etc.);
- Preparation and submission of an Inception Report (containing preliminary findings of the desk review, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments, sampling strategy, limitations to the evaluation, and timetable) to UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU)

⁴¹ Please note that this independent mid-term evaluation is a joint UNDP-UNODC effort. It was agreed that for this occasion UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates are used, solely for consistency purposes, to avoid potential conflict between the guidelines of the two organizations.

- and UNDP Integrated Results Management Unit of the Pacific Office in Fiji (IRMU) for review and clearance before any field mission may take place;
- Initial meetings and interviews with the Project Manager and other UNODC and UNDP staff as well as stakeholders during the field mission;
 - Interviews (face-to-face or by telephone/skype), with key project stakeholders and beneficiaries, both individually and (as appropriate) in small groups/focus groups, as well as using surveys, questionnaires or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation;
 - Analysis of all available information;
 - Preparation of the draft evaluation report (based on Guidelines for Evaluation Report and Template Report to be found on the IEU website <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>). The evaluation team submits the draft report to the Project Manager for the review of factual errors (copying IEU and IRMU) and the Project Manager shares with IEU and IRMU for review, comments and clearance. Subsequently IEU, with IRMU in copy, shares the final draft report with all CLPs for comments.
 - Preparation of the final evaluation report and an Evaluation Brief (2-pager). The evaluation team incorporates the necessary and requested changes and finalizes the evaluation report in accordance with the feedback received from IEU, IRMU, the Project Manager and CLPs. It further includes a PowerPoint presentation on final evaluation findings and recommendations;
 - Presentation of final evaluation report with its findings and recommendations to the target audience, stakeholders etc. (in person or if necessary through Skype).
 - In conducting the evaluation, the UNODC, UNDP and the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards are to be taken into account. All tools, norms and templates to be mandatorily used in the evaluation process can be found on the IEU website: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/index.html>.

The sources of data

The evaluation will utilize a mixture of primary and secondary sources of data. The primary sources include, among others, interviews with key stakeholders (face-to-face or by telephone), the use of surveys and questionnaires, a field mission for case studies, focus group interviews, observation and other participatory techniques. Secondary data sources will include project documents and their revisions, progress and monitoring reports, external reports and strategies (e.g. UNDAFs; SDGs; country/regional/global strategies; etc.) and all other relevant documents, including visual information (e.g. eLearning, pictures, videos, etc.). Considering the vast geographical area and expensive and challenging travel options in the region, a field mission will be conducted to Fiji whereas stakeholders in other countries will be interviewed via skype or phone.

Desk Review

The evaluation team will perform a desk review of all existing documentation (please see the preliminary list of documents to be consulted in Annex II of the evaluation ToR). This list is however not to be regarded as exhaustive as additional documentation may be requested by the evaluation team. The evaluation team needs to ensure that sufficient external documentation is used for the desk review.

Phone interviews / face-to-face consultations

The evaluation team will conduct phone interviews / face-to-face consultations with identified individuals from the following groups of stakeholders:

- Member States (including recipients and donors);
- Relevant international and regional organizations;
- Non-State stakeholders working with UN-PRAC, including non-governmental organizations, academia, private sector and the media;
- UNDP and UNODC management and staff at HQ and in the field;
- Etc.

Interviewees should be given the possibility to reflect on respective anti-corruption needs and priorities.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire (on-line) is to be developed and used in order to help collect the views of additional stakeholders (e.g. trainees, counterparts, partners, etc.), if deemed appropriate.

Timeframe and Deliverables

<i>Duties</i>	<i>Time frame</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Deliverables</i>
Desk review and drafting of Inception Report	13 August– 26 August 2018 <i>(10 working days for lead evaluator and 7 for team member)</i>	Home base	Draft Inception report in line with UNODC evaluation norms and standards ⁴²
Review of draft Inception Report by IEU and IRMU	27 August – 2 September		Comments on the draft Inception Report to the evaluation team
Incorporation of comments from IEU and IRMU (can entail various rounds of comments from IEU and IRMU)	3 September – 9 September <i>(2 w/d for lead evaluator and 1 for team member + IEU and IRMU)</i>	Home base	Revised draft Inception Report

42 https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html#Inception_Report

Deliverable A: Final Inception Report in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates	By 10 September <i>(overall 12 w/d for lead evaluator and 8 for team member)</i>		Final Inception report to be cleared by IEU and IRMU at least one week before the field mission can get started
Evaluation interviews and mission: briefing, interviews with UNODC and UNDP staff in HQs and at the UN Pacific Office in Fiji (including by phone/skype); observation; focus groups; presentation of preliminary observations (if applicable)	17 September-30 September <i>(10 w/d for lead evaluator and 8 w/d for team member)</i>	Home base; Fiji	Interviews and data collection
Drafting of the evaluation report; submission to Project Management, IEU and IRMU	1 October - 14 October <i>(7 w/d for lead evaluator and 6 for team member)</i>	Home base	Draft evaluation report
Review of IEU and IRMU for quality assurance and Project Management for factual errors	15-28 October		Comments on the draft evaluation report to the evaluation team
Consideration of comments from the project manager and incorporation of comments from IEU and IRMU (can entail various rounds of comments from IEU and IRMU)	29 October - 11 November <i>(4 w/d for lead evaluator and 2 for team member + IEU and IRMU)</i>	Home base	Revised draft evaluation report
Deliverable B: Draft Evaluation Report in line with UNODC evaluation	By 12 November		Draft evaluation report, to be cleared by IEU and IRMU

norms, standards, guidelines and templates	<i>(overall 21 w/d for lead evaluator and 16 for team member)</i>		
IEU to share draft evaluation report with Core Learning Partners for comments, copying IRMU	13 November - 25 November		Comments of CLPs on the draft report
Consideration of comments from Core Learning Partners and preparation of draft Evaluation Brief	26-30 November <i>(3 w/d for lead evaluator and 1 for team member)</i>	Home base	Revised draft evaluation report
Final review by IEU and IRMU; incorporation of comments and finalization of report and Evaluation Brief (can entail various rounds of comments from IEU and IRMU)	3-16 December <i>(3 w/d for lead evaluator and 2 for team member + IEU and IRMU)</i>	Home base	Revised draft evaluation report; draft Evaluation Brief
Presentation of evaluation results (to be reviewed and cleared by IEU and IRMU)	Tentative: 19 December <i>(1 w/d for lead evaluator)</i>		Presentation of evaluation results
Deliverable C: Final evaluation report; presentation of evaluation results; Evaluation Brief (2-pager)	By 19 December <i>(overall 7 w/d for lead evaluator and 3 for team member)</i>		Final evaluation report; Evaluation Brief and presentation of evaluation results, both to be cleared by IEU
Project Management: Finalise Evaluation Follow-up Plan	By 15 February 2019		Final Evaluation Follow-up Plan to be cleared by IEU and IRMU

Project Management: Disseminate final evaluation report	By 15 February 2019		Final evaluation report disseminated to internal and external stakeholders
IEU: facilitate the external Evaluation Quality Assessment of the Final Report	1 st quarter 2019		

The UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit and UNDP IRMU, if both so agree, may change the evaluation process, timeline, approach, etc. as necessary at any point throughout the evaluation-process.

Evaluation Team Composition

The evaluation team will report to the Chief or Deputy Chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit and the Head of the Integrated Results Management Unit of the Pacific Office in Fiji.

Role	Number of consultants/ evaluators (national/international)	Specific expertise required⁴³
Team leader	1 (international)	Evaluation methodology
Team members	1 (international)	Anti-corruption

The evaluation team will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial. The qualifications and responsibilities for the evaluation team are specified in the job description attached to these Terms of Reference (Annex 1). The evaluation team will report exclusively to the chief or deputy chief of the UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit and the Head of the UNDP IRMU, who are the exclusive clearing entities for all evaluation deliverables and products.

Absence of Conflict of Interest

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

Furthermore, the evaluators shall respect and follow the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for conducting evaluations in a sensitive and ethical manner.

Management of the Evaluation Process

Roles and responsibilities of the Project Managers (UNDP Anti-Corruption Specialist and UNODC Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser)

The Project Managers are responsible for:

- managing the evaluation process,
- drafting and finalizing the ToR,
- selecting Core Learning Partners (representing a balance of men, women and other marginalised groups) and informing them of their role,
- recruiting the evaluators (through UNDP recruitment process) following clearance by IEU and IRMU, ensuring issued contracts ahead of the start of the evaluation process in line with the cleared ToR. In case of any delay, IEU, IRMU and the evaluators are to be immediately notified,
- providing desk review materials (including data and information on men, women and other marginalised groups) to the evaluators including the full ToR,
- liaising with the Core Learning Partners,
- reviewing the draft report for factual errors only,
- developing a follow-up plan for the usage of the evaluation results and recording of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations (to be updated once per year),
- disseminate the final evaluation report and communicate evaluation results to relevant stakeholders as well as facilitate the presentation of evaluation results;
- UNDP project manager to ensure that all payments related to the evaluation are fulfilled immediately following the approval by IEU and IRMU, half of which are to be immediately billed to UNODC.

The Project Managers will be in charge of **providing logistical support** to the evaluation team including arranging the field missions, including but not limited to:

- All logistical arrangements for the travel (including travel details; DSA-payments; transportation; etc.)
- All logistical arrangement for the meetings/interviews/focus groups/etc., ensuring interview partners adequately represent men, women and other marginalised groups (including independent translator/interpreter if needed); set-up of interview schedules; arrangement of ad-hoc meetings as requested by the evaluation team; transportation from/to the interview venues; scheduling sufficient time for the interviews (around 45 minutes); ensuring that members of the evaluation team and the respective interviewees are present during the interviews; etc.)

- All logistical arrangements for the presentation of the evaluation results;
- Ensure timely payment of all fees/DSA/etc.

Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation stakeholders

Members of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) are identified by the project managers. The CLPs are the main stakeholders, i.e. a limited number of those deemed as particularly relevant to be involved throughout the evaluation process, i.e. in reviewing and commenting on the TOR and the evaluation questions, reviewing and commenting on the draft evaluation report, as well as facilitating the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action. Stakeholders include all those to be invited to participate in the interviews and surveys, including the CLPs.

Roles and responsibilities of the Independent Evaluation Unit and the Integrated Results Management Unit

The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) provides mandatory normative tools, guidelines and templates to be used in the evaluation process from UNODC perspective. The reference unit on the UNDP side will be the Integrated Results Management Unit of the Pacific Office in Fiji.

Furthermore, IEU and IRMU provide guidance, quality assurance and evaluation expertise, as well as interact with the project manager and the evaluation team throughout the evaluation process. In consultation, IEU and IRMU may change the evaluation process, timeline, approach, etc. as necessary at any point throughout the evaluation-process.

IEU and IMRU review, comment on and clear all steps and deliverables during the evaluation process: Terms of Reference; Selection of the evaluation team, Inception Report; Draft Evaluation Report; Final Evaluation Report and an Evaluation Brief; Evaluation Follow-up Plan. IEU further publishes the final evaluation report and the Evaluation Brief on the UNODC website, as well as sends the final evaluation report to an external evaluation quality assurance provider.

Payment Modalities

The evaluation team will be issued consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNDP rules and regulations. The contracts are legally binding documents in which the evaluation team agrees to complete the deliverables by the set deadlines. Payment is correlated to deliverables and three instalments are typically foreseen:

1. The first payment upon clearance of the Inception Report (in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates) by IEU and IRMU;
2. The second payment upon clearance of the Draft Evaluation Report (in line with UNODC norms, standards, evaluation guidelines and templates) by IEU and IRMU;
3. The third and final payment (i.e. the remainder of the fee) only after completion of the respective tasks, receipt of the final report, Evaluation Brief (in line with UNODC evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates) and clearance by IEU and IRMU, as well as presentation of final evaluation findings and

recommendations.

80 percent of the daily subsistence allowance and terminals is paid in advance before travelling. The balance is paid after the travel has taken place, upon presentation of boarding passes and the completed travel claim forms.

IRMU is the sole entity to request payments to be released in relation to evaluation and payments will be processed in agreement with IEU and the Project Management.

DRAFT

Survey Provided to Select Stakeholders for Completion

UN Pacific Region Anti-Corruption Project (UN-PRAC)

Mid-Term Evaluation

Survey

Name:⁴⁴

Title & Organization:

Country(ies) in Which Your Organization Works:

E-mail:

1. How would you describe your relationship with the UN-PRAC project (Select one):

- UNDP Anti-corruption expert
- UNDP Democratic Governance expert
- UN Agency Implementer (UNODC; UNDESA; UNESCO)
- Partner
- Donor
- Beneficiary

2. What is the focus of your engagement with UN-PRAC (Select as many as you wish)?

- SDG Implementation
- UNCAC Ratification
- UNCAC Implementation
- Non-State Role in Social Accountability

⁴⁴ The content of the questionnaires will remain confidential. The request for a name is for administrative purposes only.

_____ Other: _____

3. How satisfied are your organization with the relationship with the UN-PRAC Project

(1=Not at All Satisfied; 5=Very Satisfied)

___ 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5

___ 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5

4. In the country(ies) in which you work has there been a change in the capacity of the State to integrate anti-corruption into the national development process as a result of Un-PRAC?

_____ Yes _____ No

5. In the country(ies) in which you work has there been a change in the capacity in service delivery or in citizens' capacity to demand accountability as a result of Un-PRAC?

_____ Yes _____ No

6. If neither the State nor Citizen capacities have changed, what do you attribute this to?

_____ lack of political will

_____ anti-corruption legal architecture inadequate

_____ civil society weak

_____ partner country focal point lacks necessary skills

_____ other

7. If "Yes", please list the countries in which you have seen an impact. If 'No' go to question 6.

8. Please state to what extent the work of UN-PRAC has contributed to this increased capacity.

(1=Not at All; 5=Very Important) ___ 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___ 5

9. Please provide one or more concrete examples of how the work of UN-PRAC contributed to an increase in national and/or civic capacity. (Please be as specific as possible).

10. How has UN-PRAC provided support to your work? (Select as many as you wish)

- Policy leadership
- Training Workshops
- Knowledge Products
- Technical Advice from project experts
- Technical Advice from other experts
- Technical Advice from external consultant
- Funding/Grants
- Convening global/national/regional meetings
- Support to national dialogue on anti-corruption
- Other

11. Have these interventions been relevant in addressing the challenges that you face?

Yes No

12. What real difference have the activities made so far to the beneficiaries? How have women benefited?

13. Do you feel that the main bottlenecks to the elimination of corruption are being addressed through UN-PRAC?

Yes No

14. Can you elaborate on your answer to question 12?

15. What are the lessons learned and areas for improving results, impacts, approaches and processes, particularly addressing the integration of anti-corruption in the development challenges into Agenda 2030?

16. Please provide any other comments you believe are relevant to the MTE.

Interview Guide for Semi-Structured Interviews

UN-PRAC Mid-term Evaluation

Context and Objectives of the Review

UNDP and UNODC have been implementing a joint project in the Pacific Region with 15 Pacific Island Countries (PICs) in order to support the ratification and implementation of the UN Convention on Anti-Corruption (UNCAC) and the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG-16, which aspires to develop effective, accountable, inclusive and open government institutions, including specific objectives related to addressing corruption.

UN-PRAC (Phase II) has the following key objectives:

- 1. Niue, Samoa and Tonga are given sufficient information and support to enable their accession to UNCAC and all Pacific States parties actively participate in the UNCAC review process.**
- 2. Pacific States parties more effectively implement UNCAC and work towards the achievement of SDG-16.**
- 3. Social accountability mechanisms and the anti-corruption role of non-state actors [is] strengthened.**

The project has been implemented since 2012, with Phase I running until 2016 and, since 2016, Phase II has been implemented. As part of the evaluation at the mid-point of Phase II of UN-PRAC, an independent evaluation team has been contracted to collect evidence related to the work and activities conducted by the project to date and to identify evidence for the determining if the

project is on track. The evaluation team will provide a set of lessons learned to date and recommendations to enhance the ability of the project to deliver on the objectives listed above.

To that end, interviews will be conducted with key stakeholders, including those that have benefited from the project, partnered with the project and have otherwise engaged in its work. The interviews will be conducted between the interviewer and interviewee and the content of what is discussed will remain confidential.

The following questions are indicative of the types of questions that will be asked during a 30-60 minute interview.

Interview Guide

1. **Relationship to UN-PRAC**
 - What is the nature of your relationship to the project?
 - What is the thematic focus of your engagement in the project?
 - How long have you or your organization been engaged with the project?

2. **Description of Inputs**
 - Describe the activities/projects/inputs that you or your organization have participated in with regard to the project or an institution that receives support from the project?
 - What were the results of these interventions?
 - Have you observed long-term or sustainable impact from such interventions?

3. **Capacity of the Beneficiary**
 - Describe the current capacity of the relevant aspects of an institution or group that has received support from UN-PRAC?
 - Have you observed an increase in the capacity of officials and staff since you started your engagement?
 - Are relevant components of the institution/organisation meeting the standards necessary for a such a group?

4. **Specific outcomes delivered by the beneficiary**
 - Did the institution/organisation effectively implement the relevant aspects of UNCAC?
 - What challenges did you see in how the institution/organisation implemented its work?
 - Was social accountability enhanced through support from UN-PRAC?
 - What efforts have been made to deliver the objectives of the SDGs (specifically SDG-16)?
 - What was the quality of reports filed with regard to UNCAC?
 - Are relevant components of TGNA meeting the standards necessary for a parliament to promote women's participation and leadership?

5. **Challenges**
 - Is the legal framework adequate to allow for an effective system of anti-corruption in your country?

- Are there institutional capacity issues that are preventing realization of anti-corruption in your country?
- What impact (positive/negative) does the allocation of funding have on the ability to achieve these goals?
- What other challenges do you observe that are preventing the achievement of an effective anti-corruption system in your country?

6. Relationship between beneficiaries and stakeholders

- How would you describe the relationship between the government and civil society?
- How would describe the relationship between the government and independent oversight institutions?
- How would you describe the relationship between the government and the project?

7. Recommendations

- What could be done to improve the effectiveness of anti-corruption systems in your country?
- What could be done to improve the implementation of the SDGs in your country?

DRAFT

ANNEX 3: LIST OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- Project document;
- Project revision;
- Annual project progress reports 2016 and 2017;
- UNODC and UNDP organigrams;
- UNODC and UNDP mandates;
- Project log frame;
- United Nations Pacific Strategy 2018-2022
- United Nations Biennial Strategic Frameworks (2016-17 & 2018-19)
- Pacific Sub Regional United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2013-2017;
 - Donor's Partner Performance Assessments;
 - Project newsletters: August 2018, July 2017, January 2017, June 2016;
 - CoSP resolution 7/7;
 - UN-PRAC Youth Advocates Toolkit
 - UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021⁴⁵
 - UNDP website: UNDP and the Sustainable Development Goals⁴⁶
- UNDP Sub-regional Programme Document for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories (SRPD) 2018-2022⁴⁷
- UNDP evaluation resource centre⁴⁸
 - UNODC website: UNODC and the Sustainable Development Goals⁴⁹
 - UNODC brochure: UNODC and the Sustainable Development Goals⁵⁰
- UNODC brochure: Better Data to monitor violence, trafficking, corruption and access to Justice (2017)⁵¹

⁴⁵ <http://strategicplan.undp.org/>

⁴⁶ <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals.html>

⁴⁷ http://www.pacific.undp.org/content/pacific/en/home/operations/legal_framework/_jcr_content/centerparsys/download_13/file.res/Pacific_SRPD_2018-2022.pdf

⁴⁸ <https://erc.undp.org/>

⁴⁹ <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/about-unodc/sustainable-development-goals/sdgs-index.html>

⁵⁰ [https://www.unodc.org/documents/SDGs/UNODC-SDG_brochure LORES.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/documents/SDGs/UNODC-SDG_brochure_LORES.pdf)

⁵¹ http://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/Crime-statistics/Brochure_goal16_2017_web.pdf

- ECOSOC Report of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (E/CN.3/2017/2*)
 - UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit: Meta-Analysis 2011-2014⁵²
 - UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit: Meta-Analysis 2015-2016⁵³
 - UNODC Independent Evaluation Unit: Evaluation-based analysis of good practices in UNODC's approach to capacity building⁵⁴
 - UNODC Position Paper on Human Rights (2011)⁵⁵
 - Guidance Note on Gender Mainstreaming in UNODC (2013)⁵⁶
 - UNODC evaluation guidelines, templates, handbook, policy⁵⁷
 - UNODC Inception Report Guidelines and Template⁵⁸
 - UNODC Evaluation Report Guidelines and Template⁵⁹
 - UNODC Evaluation Quality Assessment⁶⁰
 - UNEG: Integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation⁶¹
 - UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016)⁶²
 - UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation⁶³
 - United Nations Development Assistance Framework Guidance (2017)⁶⁴
 - Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption Fiji⁶⁵
-

⁵² http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Meta-Analysis/UNODC_Evaluation_Meta-Analysis_2011-2014.pdf

⁵³ http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Meta-Analysis/UNODC_IEU_Evaluation_Meta-Analysis_2015-2016.pdf

⁵⁴ http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Knowledge-Products/UNODC_IEU_Evaluation-based_Capacity_Building_Analysis_final_October_2017.pdf

⁵⁵ http://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/UNODC_Human_rights_position_paper_2012.pdf

⁵⁶ <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/directory/docs/UNODC-GuidanceNote-GenderMainstreaming.pdf>

⁵⁷ <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html>

⁵⁸ https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html#Inception_Report

⁵⁹ https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/normative-tools.html#Eval_Report

⁶⁰ <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/evaluation/Evaluation-based-knowledge-products.html#EQAs>

⁶¹ <http://www.uneval.rgdetail/980>

⁶² www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2601

⁶³ www.uneval.org/document/download/548

⁶⁴ <https://undg.org/document/2017-undaf-guidance/>

⁶⁵

<http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/WorkingGroups/ImplementationReviewGroup/ExecutiveSummaries/V1251970e.pdf>

- Review of implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption Fiji⁶⁶

DRAFT

66

<http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/WorkingGroups/ImplementationReviewGroup/ExecutiveSummaries/V1251970e.pdf>

ANNEX 4: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS INTERVIEWED

List of Stakeholders Interviewed in Evaluation (by type)

Government	11
Non-State Actors	5
Oversight Institutions	4
Partners	6
UN Officials	9
Project Team	6
Donor	1
Total	42 (M: 19; F: 23)

ANNEX 5 : EVALUATIVE QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

List of evaluation questions & answers

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation Question	Answers to Questions
<p>Design</p> <p><i>(The Design of a project or programme measures the extent to which the logical framework approach was adopted.)</i></p>	<p>1.1 To what extent has the results based framework been a useful programme management tool and allowed for an assessment of project outcomes and impact?</p>	<p>The Results-based Framework is clear as to its expectations and the indicators to be measured and for evidence to be gathered.</p>
	<p>1.2 How well aligned are activities, outputs and outcomes in the logical framework?</p>	<p>The project does not speak of a theory of change, yet the logic displayed in the document shows an approach that identifies specific activities and these are then leading to the achievement of specific outputs/results and, in turn, the outcome of the project. (e.g. – ratification of UNCAC in Samoa)</p>
	<p>1.3 To what extent does the design of this project enable optimal use of resources and cooperation with other development initiatives?</p>	<p>The project is designed with a small number of full-time project staff. This ensures that the project will need to partner with others to deliver on its outputs and outcome. (e.g. - Collaboration with UNODC global projects; Collaboration with UNDP Parliament Project; Collaboration with universities)</p>
	<p>1.4 How effective has the joint partnership between UNODC and UNDP been in managing and implementing the project?</p>	<p>Partnership between UNODC and UNDP in managing and implementing the project has been very effective. In spite to the administrative barriers there is a spirit of cooperation, they have not divided the work but they work together.</p> <p>(e.g. – Beneficiaries see UNDP & UNODC technical advisers as</p>

UN-PRAC MID-TERM EVALUATION (JANUARY 2019)

		interchangeable and many have worked with both)
	1.5 To what extent was the logical framework based on the Phase One evaluation?	The work in Phase I laid the ground work for the success to date in Phase II. The knowledge shared and the interventions with national governments has now come to fruition. (e.g. – Solomon Islands NACS)
<p>Relevance</p> <p><i>(Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.)</i></p>	2.1 How relevant is the project to target groups’ needs and priorities, including target groups of governments, development partners and CSOs?	<p>The project is relevant to target groups’ needs and priorities and is built on the need to be flexible. However, due to the size of the region and number of countries and diversity for some of the target group’s it is still in the initiating phase. Project is implemented in 15 different Pacific countries and they are all different, they have different priorities.</p> <p>(e.g. – Project has attempted to develop bespoke interventions for each PIC based on routine interventions and where opportunities present themselves)</p>
	2.2 To what extent are the outputs, outcomes and objectives of this project/programme relevant and contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and how have project activities supported partners in implementing the SDGs?	<p>Flexibility in the project implementation is helping countries to address different issues based on the needs. Participative process in developing NACSs and multi-stakeholder approach ensures ownership and solution oriented approach.</p> <p>(e.g. – Kiribati NACS Development Process)</p>

UN-PRAC MID-TERM EVALUATION (JANUARY 2019)

	<p>2.3 How much of an alignment is there between the project and the national priorities of PICs?</p>	<p>Project is implemented in 15 different Pacific countries and they are all different, they have different priorities. However, flexibility provides possibility for a tailor-made approach.</p> <p>(e.g. – Cook Islands, where the need from project was minimal, but support was timely and appreciated)</p>
<p>Efficiency <i>(Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs.)</i></p>	<p>3.1 To what extent were the human and financial resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely manner?</p>	<p>There is good balance between the planned activities and resources that enables timely delivery of the outputs.</p> <p>(e.g. – Samoa ratification, where use of interventions by short-term expert and then follow up by project technical advisers allowed for timely engagement)</p>
	<p>3.2 To what extent were the human and financial resources and inputs converted to outputs in a cost effective manner?</p>	<p>The project implementation is highly cost effective. Use of the UNDP & UNODC internal expertise and short-term experts and consultants provides sufficient support with high efficiency.</p> <p>(e.g. – Use of short-term technical advisers to do some work, with backstopping by full-time staff has allowed the project to maximize resources and to deliver on results)</p>
	<p>3.3 To what extent was the coordination between UNODC and UNDP at different levels efficient and appropriate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How well has the joint programming model been working? - What have been its strengths and weaknesses? 	<p>The joint programming model is working well in this project and is at least partially based on personalities and good interpersonal relations.</p> <p>Phase II is facing administrative complication due to the different systems in the two UN organizations UNODC and UNDP</p>

UN-PRAC MID-TERM EVALUATION (JANUARY 2019)

	<p>- How can such coordination be further strengthened?</p>	<p>(e.g. - In some cases the lack of access to the two financial systems has impaired the project administratively, requiring shared administrative staff to use work arounds.)</p>
	<p>3.4 What resources are required to make the project more cost-effective?</p>	<p>A full-time project manager would free technical advisers to focus on their core work (advisory services). Access to <i>Umaja</i> finance system for administrative staff would make the project more efficient. Consider more resource to allow project to become a programme with regional and national components.</p>
<p>Effectiveness <i>(Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.)</i></p>	<p>4.1 At the mid-point in the project to what extent were the planned outputs and outcomes in the project document (and subsequent project revision) achieved?</p>	<p>All outputs and sub-outputs are either achieved or on track for achievement.</p>
	<p>4.2 At the mid-point in the project are there any good practices and successes, as well as failures, challenges and areas for improvement?</p>	<p>Successes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth Advocate Toolkit published • Solomon Islands anti-corruption laws passed • Niue & Samoa ratify UNCAC <p>Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for smaller island countries given capacity absorption issues and turnover in government staff • Ability to engage small key countries (Fiji; Papua New Guinea)
	<p>4.3 Were there any unintended results achieved beyond those</p>	<p>Networks have been established by the project that have created</p>

UN-PRAC MID-TERM EVALUATION (JANUARY 2019)

	included in the logical framework? If so, what were those results?	<p>bilateral relations between members beyond any support from the project.</p> <p>(e.g. – When youth advocates in Solomon Islands were advocating and protesting for new AC law, they reached out to fellow youth advocates in Fiji to help with drafting petition that was part of campaign)</p>
<p>Impact</p> <p><i>(Impact is the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended other projects.)</i></p>	5.1 What concrete achievements have been made by the project (e.g. – ratification of UNCAC; new legislation; institutions established)	Ratification of UNCAC by Niue & Samoa; Anti-corruption laws passed in Solomon Islands; RTI systems established in Vanuatu; NACS adopted in Solomon Islands & Kiribati.
	5.2 Which best fit can be identified for adaptation and replication (e.g. in other projects or topics), up-scaling, or prioritization, to ensure achieving outcomes in the most effective way?	<p>In Kiribati and Samoa, the project has provided technical assistance and has conducted a feasibility study for determining the need for establishing a separate anti-corruption agency. It is part of their NACs. A UNODC specialist provided technical assistance for finalizing the National AC Strategy.</p> <p>Work with youth as advocates on a regional level has been a success and can be replicated in other regions.</p>
<p>Sustainability</p> <p><i>(Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.)</i></p>	6.1 To what extent has the ownership of key stakeholders been sought and institutionalized?	<p>There are good examples in developing anti-corruption strategies in an inclusive manner that enables ownership.</p> <p>Creation of the youth advocates toolkit in an inclusive manner has resulted in strong ownership. (e.g. -</p>

		<p>Kiribati youth are translating it into local language)</p> <p>The project has used senior short-term technical adviser (former MP) to engage at political level in Niue and Samoa, which led to political will to ratify UNCAC.</p>
	<p>6.2 Have the project’s activities contributed to outputs, processes, networks etc. that are likely to have some enduring benefit? What have been the barriers to sustainability?</p>	<p>Network of youth advocates has proven to be active beyond work of the project.</p> <p>The project established a network of financial intelligence units in the region and supported the transfer of knowledge amongst them. The network is still active and works beyond activities organized by the project.</p>
<p>Partnerships & Cooperation <i>(The evaluation assesses the partnerships and cooperation established during the project/ programme as well as their functioning and value.)</i></p>	<p>7.1 To what extent have partnerships been sought and established with and between governments, parliaments, the private sector, civil society and academia?</p>	<p>The project has developed significant partnerships with a number of stakeholders, including universities, iNGOs, civil society, regional institutions, parliaments and government agencies. The engagement of multiple stakeholders has also allowed for incubation of multi-sectoral engagement. (e.g. – Kiribati, where work with multiple actors from different sectors has resulted in an inclusive process for developing the NACS)</p>
	<p>7.2 What evidence is there of improved capacity of non -State actors to engage in anti-corruption processes?</p>	<p>In the Solomon Islands civil society advocates, particularly youth who received support from the project, used the advocacy toolkit developed and engaged the network established to implement an advocacy campaign that resulted in adoption of anti-corruption laws in 2018.</p>
	<p>7.3 To what extent is the project/programme cooperating with</p>	<p>To a great extent the project is cooperating with and developing</p>

UN-PRAC MID-TERM EVALUATION (JANUARY 2019)

	other potential partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs?	partners. Work with other UNDP and UNODC projects has ensured sharing of resources and knowledge. Work with universities has resulted in new curriculum on anti-corruption. All work with partners is aimed at reducing corruption in the region, which is related to SDG Target 16.5.
<p>Human rights, Gender Equality & Leaving No One Behind</p> <p><i>(The evaluation needs to assess the mainstreaming throughout the project/programme of human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups.)</i></p>	8.1 To what extent are human rights considerations included in the project design and implementation?	No direct consideration of applying a human rights-based approach to the work of the project, though a clear understanding of such principles in its implementation.
	8.2 To what extent has the Project promoted women’s participation throughout the Project activities and improved the active participation of women in discussions?	Significant effort by the project to encourage women’s participation in activities. (e.g. – Ensuring women’s voices are heard as part of NACS development processes)
	8.3 How could gender equality considerations be further included in the project design and implementation?	To organize specific activities that will empower women leaders.
	8.4 How has the project ensured the involvement of marginalised groups in its activities?	The project’s work on youth advocacy has been a major result of its work to date. Youth now have a network to draw upon and the tools to apply at the national level to advocate for anti-corruption measures.
<p>Lessons Learned & Best Practices</p> <p><i>(Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/programme.)</i></p>	9.1 What lessons, both positive and negative, can be learned at the mid-point of this Project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focusing at Output and Outcome Level Creates Greater Results • Flexibility/Adaptability creates results • Repeated Use of External Experts is Critical to Delivery

UN-PRAC MID-TERM EVALUATION (JANUARY 2019)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Work Creates Results • Strong Relationships Mean Better Results • Partnerships Provide Added Value • Comprehensive Engagement Allows for a More Inclusive Approach • Incubation is a key Role for the Project
	<p>9.2 What best practices, if any, in planning and implementing UN-PRAC can be identified that should be replicated and/or scaled up in the remainder of UN-PRAC implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building trusted relationships with beneficiaries • Use of short-term technical expertise • Convening and supporting regional networks • Incubating national projects to carry forward implementation at national level

DRAFT