DAC NETWORK ON DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION

ROOM DOCUMENT 15

DAC Network on Development Evaluation

Joint External Evaluation of Anti-Corruption Approaches

Draft Outline

This note has been prepared by Norway for discussion at the 6th meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 27 – 28 June 2007.

6th meeting
27 – 28 June 2007

Draft Outline (for discussion)

Joint External Evaluation of Anti-Corruption Approaches

Norad's Evaluation Department
22 June 2007

1. Introduction

This paper is meant as input to discuss a proposed evaluation of anti-corruption strategies.

The paper contains background information on anti-corruption efforts within development cooperation, an evaluation proposal, a suggested managerial structure, and a suggested work plan.

2. Background

There has been an increased focus on good governance and anti-corruption within international development aid during the past decade. This increase is mainly due to the realisation that good governance is a prerequisite for development.

Corruption is one of many symptoms of poor governance, including lack of security and democratic deficit. Although corruption is a universal phenomenon, developing countries generally are more severely hit than developed ones. It is now widely recognised that corruption is an obstacle to development – corruption is even seen as a severe developmental problem in itself. The consequences of corruption may be of social, political and economic character, affecting the poor disproportionately.

2.1 Concepts

There are various definitions of corruption, some broader than others. Transparency International defines corruption as "the abuse of entrusted power for private gain"[1], while the World Bank refers to corruption as "the use of public office for private gain"[2]. The concept of corruption can further be differentiated by explaining the different forms which corruption takes. On the one hand there is bureaucratic corruption, often in the form of bribes to officials working within for instance the police force or the health sector. This kind of corruption is also referred to as petty corruption. On the other hand there is grand corruption which includes political corruption where leaders of high social ranking take advantage of their positions, but also corruption related to procurement among private firms and to the exploitation of natural resources. The Anti-Corruption Centre U4 furthermore distinguishes between "corruption of need" and "corruption of greed". Moreover, there are many terms associated with corruption, such as favouritism, nepotism, clientelism, illegitimate payments and embezzlement.

[1] Global Corruption Report 2006
[2] "The Many Faces of Corruption. Tracking Vulnerabilities at the Sector Level", edited by J. Edgardo Campos and Sanjay Pradhan, the World Bank, 2007.

2.2 Approaches to combat corruption

In the fight against corruption there are different approaches to choose between. Firstly, there are preventive measures, including procurement guidelines, codes of conduct, transparency and monitoring procedures. Preventive measures also include support to develop or secure a free press and to civil society which work to hold governments accountable. Secondly, there are measures which aim at curbing actual corruption. Investigation and prosecution of corrupt political leaders are some examples. Various legal measures and justice sector reform are often meant to include both preventive and control measures.

In addition, a distinction can be made between direct anti-corruption strategies which objective could be to for instance on the one hand to establish an anti-corruption body and on the other hand to apply mainstreaming strategies where anti-corruption measures are integrated in for instance sector programmes.

Many donors – both bilateral and multilateral – have developed specific anti-corruption strategies for their development cooperation, for instance based on the principle of zero tolerance. Likewise many partner countries have taken concrete steps to combat corruption, for instance by establishing anti-corruption bodies.

2.3 International conventions and initiatives

A multitude of international anti-corruption conventions exist, but the first global agreement which was reached in the fight against corruption was the UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), which was adopted by the UN General Assembly on 31 October 2003. This convention includes measures on prevention, criminalisation, international cooperation and asset recovery. The UNCAC provides member states with a common framework, with a global language and a coherent approach. As of January 2007 there were 140 signatories to the convention.

The Utstein group of like-minded countries' initiative against anti-corruption is also worth mentioning. This initiative was established by Britain, Germany, the Netherlands and Norway in 2000. Sweden and Canada joined in 2003. The goal of this initiative was to reduce "the damaging effects of corruption on development". Their approach was mainly to support the government, private sector and civil society of the developing countries in combating corruption, while working jointly with each other as like-minded development donors. The Utstein Group has been replaced by the Anti-Corruption Centre U4 which consists of the same six donors and which approach is to assist donor practitioners to address corruption challenges more effectively.

2.4 Monitoring and measuring corruption

There are many challenges related to monitoring and measuring corruption, which by its very nature is meant to be concealed from the public. Perhaps the most acknowledged method is Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI), representing the perceived level of corruption at country level. TI has also developed the Global Corruption Barometer which assesses the general public's experiences with and attitudes towards corruption.

An alternative to the CPI is the World Bank Institute's governance indicators, which include indicators such as "control of corruption". The World Bank uses surveys to measure

corruption, for instance through private sector surveys and perception surveys among households and public officials. According to the World Bank corruption can be measured in three broad ways: 1) By gathering the informed views of relevant stakeholders, 2) By tracking countries' institutional features (e.g. procurement practices and budget transparency). 3) By thorough audits of specific projects.

Under certain conditions a public expenditure tracking survey (PETS) can be used to estimate the level of corruption due to embezzlement in a sector/programme. These studies investigate the quality of the public financial management system and the flow of public money from central to local levels in a country. Combined with user surveys they can also estimate the level of the forms of corruption such as claiming bribes for the use of public services or skimping on quality of services.

The above methods, however, are hampered by large margins of error. Moreover, they are only able to provide aggregated national data, giving indirect measures of corruption. These should therefore be complemented by data at the individual level, for instance through the Victimization Methodology which accounts for personal, direct experience with corruption. Country studies are also valuable sources of more detailed evidence of the effects of corruption for instance in a specific sector. Such studies will help us to better understand the nature of corruption.

2.5 What do we know?

Some conclusions can be drawn as to the perceived levels of corruption and which approaches that are effective in combating corruption.
As an illustration of the level of corruption in Africa, the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) for 2006 shows that South Africa has a score of 4.6, on a range from 0 (highly corrupt) to 10 (highly clean), and therefore the country ranks as no. 51. This score "relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by business people, academics and risk analysts" (TI, Corruption Perceptions Index 2005). The annual change of the CPI for South Africa from 1995 to 2005 has an annual drop by 0.04. Surveys conducted by Afrobarometer, point to resurgent perceptions of corruption in South Africa. For instance, "every other government institution is viewed more cynically now than two years ago"[3].

A book on corruption at the sector level, entitled "The Many Faces of Corruption. Tracking Vulnerabilities at the Sector Level" [4] has recently published by the World Bank. This book confirms the widely recognized lesson that "one size does not fit all" when it comes to developing anti-corruption strategies. It also stresses the need for more focused approaches by looking into area-specific solutions instead of corruption at a more general level. It furthermore states that "(d)espite mounting evidence and increased awareness, governments and the development community more broadly are still struggling to find ways to more effectively translate this understanding into concrete actions and improved outcomes"[5]. Similarly, although reviews and evaluations have covered anti-corruption projects and programmes, there is still a need for evaluations which look into what anti-corruption strategies and approaches are effective, and also the reasons for some being more effective than others.

---

[3] Afrobarometer Briefing Paper No. 43, June 2006
[4] "The Many Faces of Corruption. Tracking Vulnerabilities at the Sector Level", edited by J. Edgardo Campos and Sanjay Pradhan, the World Bank, 2007.
[5] Ibid, p. xv.

3. Evaluation proposal

3.1 Rationale for the evaluation

Following the great emphasis which the anti-corruption work has been given recently, it is now pertinent to gather more knowledge about the experiences gathered from working with anti-corruption. The presentation above also points to a clear lack of evaluations in the area of corruption, despite the need for more information on the effects of anti-corruption measures. Likewise, a synthesis report commissioned by OECD/DAC[6] stressed the importance of donors strengthening evaluation of anti-corruption measures, sharing both positive and negative results, and pointing to the need for more comparative evaluation examining experience of similar types of organizations or developmental situations.

Norad's Evaluation Department has therefore decided to respond to this challenge of evaluating the results of efforts against corruption, proposing a joint effort among donors and partner countries.

3.2 Purpose and objectives

It is suggested that this should be primarily a formative evaluation, where the purpose would be to learn from positive and negative lessons from employing anti-corruption approaches in a selected number of partner countries. [7] The evaluation can be used as input to develop future programmes and strategic plans, by refining the anti-corruption approaches.

The objective of the evaluation could be threefold:

1. To develop an overview of the experiences gained and results achieved.
2. To assess the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches to anti-corruption.
3. To provide recommendations on the future work with anti-corruption.

With reference to the OECD/DAC's evaluation criteria, we would suggest that the following should be included:

a) Relevance[8] - the suitability of the anti-corruption activities and approaches in a given country's institutional and policy environment
b) Effectiveness[9] – to what extent observed changes in the level of corruption can be attributed to the anti-corruption intervention, by applying proxy measures.
c) Sustainability[10] – manifest changes in structures/institutions.

---

[6] Synthesis of Lessons Learned of Donor Practices in Fighting Corruption, DCD/DAC/GOVNET (2003)1.
[7] See Annex for alternative approaches to the field.
[8] OECD/DAC definition of relevance: "The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies" (Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, OECD/DAC).
[9] OECD/DAC definition of effectiveness: "…an aggregate measure of (or judgement about) the merit or worth of an activity, i.e. the extent to which an intervention has attained, or is expected to attain, its major relevant objectives" (ibid.).
[10] OECD/DAC definition of sustainability: "The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time" (ibid.).

It is not considered feasible to apply the criteria of efficiency and impact to evaluate the selected anti-corruption efforts, due to the methodological challenges of establishing whether the funds were spent in an efficient manner and measuring the long-term effects of anti-corruption efforts.

3.3 Scope and delimitations

In order to meet the purpose above, this evaluation could focus on the supported anti-corruption interventions in a selection of partner countries. This would include both direct and indirect measures taken, e.g. through the health sector. Possible delimitations for the evaluation include:

- whether the evaluation should cover both petty and grand corruption
- whether the evaluation should look only at both bilateral and multilateral development cooperation
- whether the evaluation should cover the entire process from the identified need for anti-corruption measures to the lessons learned

The evaluation should furthermore concentrate on a limited time period, for instance covering the past five years. The evaluation is not meant to look at the donors' development assistance management, i.e. internal systems and routines for disclosing corruption connected to their development assistance.

The need for an initial evaluability assessment is to be discussed. Such an assessment could help determine how to deal with methodological challenges (available information sources, baseline data, possible indicators/indexes, attribution, sensitivity concerning corruption, etc.) and try to establish the programme theory(ies) behind the anti-corruption efforts.

Potential evaluation questions would include:

Background - partner countries

- What sources of information on corruption levels exist (international, government, civil society, and media)?
- What is the (perceived) level of corruption in these partner countries according to the above measurements?
- To what extent are women and men affected differently by the anti-corruption measures?
- Do selected partner countries have an official strategy/action plan against corruption?
- Do the selected partner countries have a legal framework to prevent corruption?
- How is the effort against corruption organized? Do selected partner countries have an anti-corruption body?
- To what extent is there a credible political will to address corruption? What parts of the governments/institutions does it include? How is it manifested in concrete actions? In what areas is the will more limited?
- Based on the above, what comprehensive picture can be drawn of the current situation with regards to corruption within the selected countries, taking aspects such as corruption issues in the public debate into consideration?

Relevance of donor support

- Do the donors have specific anti-corruption strategies, and if so, what elements do these strategies contain?

- What kind of activities and approaches to anti-corruption were chosen by the donors? (develop an overview of the entire portfolio at country level)
- What are the similarities and differences among the donor approaches?
- To what extent are the donors' anti-corruption approaches adjusted to the particular context at country level?
- To what extent were the interventions linked to the partner countries' poverty reduction strategies and to the donors' anti-corruption strategies?
- To what extent is the anti-corruption approach based on analysis of past experience, political context and risks, is the policy clearly articulated, is the plan of action feasible, and are there appropriate performance indicators?
- To what extent are current interventions in line with UNCAC?
- Based in the above, to what extent can the selected anti-corruption approaches be seen as coherent?

Results/effectiveness
- What are the stated goals of the anti-corruption interventions? And what is the programme logic behind the interventions?
- To what extent have the intentions of the project and programme designers been followed? If changes were made, what was the rationale?
- To what extent can the results of these efforts be measured? And what results can be documented?
- How can indicators and indexes such as the CPI be used to track results?
- Considering the entire portfolio at country level, what were the reasons provided for selecting certain approaches?
- To what extent are the anti-corruption efforts being coordinated with the donor community?
- To what extent do the anti-corruption strategies target women and men differently?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the anti-corruption strategies in the selected countries?
- What are the detected enablers and barriers when implementing the anti-corruption approaches?

Sustainability
- What characterizes the interaction between donors and partner countries with regards to anti-corruption efforts? What roles do they play?
- How may donors and partner countries cooperate to reduce corruption?

Lessons learned and recommendations
- What are the main lessons from the anti-corruption efforts in the selected countries and to what extent may these lessons be applied to other contexts?
- What would characterize an effective anti-corruption approach?
- What recommendations could be made concerning the future anti-corruption work in these countries, including the cooperation among donors and governments in partner countries?

3.4 Methodology

It will be part of the assignment to develop a detailed methodological framework for this evaluation. Nonetheless, the following methods should be considered:
- Literature review

- Document analysis (relevant policies and other regulatory documents, programme documentation, previous evaluations, etc.)
- Questionnaire survey
- Interview of key stakeholders
- Field visits to selected countries

3.5 Evaluation team

The evaluation will be carried out by an independent team of consultants. The team should consist of minimum three persons and the team must have the following qualifications:

Team leader: Must document relevant experience with managing and leading complex evaluations, as well as advanced knowledge and experience in evaluation principles and standards in the context of international development.

Team as a whole:
- Advanced competence in social sciences
- Experience and knowledge in carrying out similar evaluations/reviews/research
- Good knowledge of anti-corruption and other good governance measures

3.6 Reporting

The Consultant shall submit the following reports:
1. An *inception report* providing an interpretation of the assignment. This includes a detailed description of the methodological design to be applied such as sampling strategies, methods of investigation and data collection, and analytical approach. The inception report should also include an assessment of relevant programmes and modalities for the (comparative) analysis. The inception report will be subject to discussion and approval by the established Steering Committee.
2. A *draft final report* presenting the findings. The draft report shall be subject for discussions with the reference group and other relevant stakeholders.
3. Within three weeks of receiving the reference group's comments on the draft report, a *final report* shall be submitted. The final report shall include the conclusions and recommendations, as well as an Executive Summary. The evaluation report must be presented in a way that directly enables publication.

All reports shall be written in English. The Consultant is responsible for editing and quality control of language.

The Team Leader shall report to the lead agency on the team's progress on a regular basis, particularly should any problems arise that may jeopardize the assignment.

The Consultant is expected to adhere to the DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

The final report should not exceed 50 pages, excluding annexes.

A budget and work plan must include sufficient time for presentations of conclusions and recommendations at workshops/seminars.

4. Managerial structure

In order to manage the joint work required during the evaluation process, a mandate and a common set of principles are needed for the management of this proposed evaluation. A proposed structure for this work is outlined below.

4.1 Steering Committee

If there is interest among other evaluation offices for the proposed evaluation, they would be invited to join in establishing a steering committee. The Steering Committee would then discuss and decide upon the Terms of Reference and the procedures to be used in the evaluation. They would also decide on which partner countries to select for this evaluation, whereupon the governments of the selected countries may be invited to join the Steering Committee.

The evaluation would have to adhere to standard tender procedures to ensure its independence.

4.2 Information sharing

The Steering Committee should aim to have a transparent process where protocols will be kept of every meeting. These protocols will be shared through a common website for this specific evaluation. To apply the principle of transparency, all drafts and final products – Terms of Reference and reports – shall be posted on a common website for the evaluation which the public shall have access to.

In order to make the meetings as efficient as possible, the Steering Committee should aim to share any information not directly related to the meetings through electronic communication outside the scheduled meetings.

The venues for the meetings of the Steering Committee would be set up so as to ensure a rotation among the members of the committee.

4.3 Coordinating organisation

Also depending on the interest for this proposed evaluation, Norway/Norad is willing to assume responsibility as the lead agency of the evaluation process. This includes the management of the information flow during the process, organising and chairing the meetings, writing protocols from the meetings, etc.

Each member is responsible for sharing relevant information with stakeholders in their respective organisation or country.

5. Work plan

5.1 Main tasks

The various steps to be taken – for discussion:

- Establishing the Steering Committee, agreeing on principles and mandates for the Steering Committee
- Development of the ToR
- Selection of consultants, agreeing upon bidding and selection procedures
- Workshop on preliminary findings to ensure learning and quality control
- Final seminars to present the evaluation results

5.2 Tentative timetable

A tentative timetable for the evaluation process is as follows:

Time	**Task**	**Responsibility**
Sept 07	Decide upon the mandate of the steering committee Decide upon the main focus of the evaluation	SC meeting
Dec 07	Finalise ToR Invitation to Tender	
Feb 08	Evaluation of tenders Sign contract with awarded Consultant	SC meeting
April 08	Inception Report Comments by SC	SC meeting
Aug 08	Draft Report Workshop Comments by SC	SC meeting
Oct 08	Final Draft Report Comments by SC?	
Nov 08	Editing of report Printing	
Dec 08	Dissemination of report Seminars	SC meeting

5.3 Budget

Budget and number of person weeks for the assignment to be discussed.

Annex: Some alternative approaches

1. This evaluation could be carried out as an analysis where the approaches/strategies applied by development cooperation agencies are compared at the country level. This could include a comparison of approaches such as anti-corruption funds, a comparison of efforts within the same service delivery sector, a comparison of similar types of developmental situations (e.g. Nicaragua vs Guatemala), a comparison of different types of developmental situations (e.g. African vs Asian country), or a comparison of similar kinds of anti-corruption programmes in different countries. However, the feasibility of comparing different contexts in relation to anti-corruption may be questioned.
2. An evaluation of UN's anti-corruption efforts, both at headquarter (policy) and country (implementation) level. A couple of UN agencies/organisation would be selected, e.g. UNDP. The evaluation would also look at how the UN donors approach this issue in their dialogue with the UN. Discussion point: There is apparently a need for more information on this issue.
3. As a follow-up to the joint evaluation of General Budget Support, initiate a more in-depth evaluation of corruption within budget support since there is little empirical data on this issue.
4. An evaluation of the implementation of broader development cooperation's strategy/policies/action plan for anti-corruption. This would include an assessment of the implementation of anti-corruption as integrated in overall development cooperation both at policy level and programme level. Discussion point: Mainly focus on processes at HQ-level, while limited data on results at country level.