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Annex 1: Evaluation of the Anti-Corruption Initiative Terms of Reference

A. Background

1. The Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia-Pacific (Initiative) was established in 1999 as a regional network for the benefit of officials from member countries and jurisdictions to engage in coordinated and systematic actions in the fight against corruption. As of 2017, 31 Asian and Pacific countries endorsed the Anti-Corruption Action Plan committing to take steps to deter, prevent and combat corruption in the member countries.

2. The Initiative’s Action Plan is a voluntary, non-legally binding agreement with three pillars:
   a. developing effective and transparent systems for public service,
   b. strengthening anti-bribery action and promotion of integrity in business operations, and
   c. supporting active public involvement.

3. Its implementation and stocktaking mechanisms are intended to encourage continuous anticorruption reforms and support the objectives of the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) and the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention in Asia-Pacific. The Action Plan is the Initiative’s main instrument to set goals and standards for sustainable safeguards against corruption (Appendix 1 - Action Plan).

4. The Action Plan includes an Implementation Plan, which identified two core principles: (i) establishing a mechanism by which overall reform progress could be promoted and assessed; and (ii) providing specific and practical assistance to members on key reform issues. The Implementation Plan also recognized that member countries and jurisdictions would establish priorities and that the review of progress would be based on self-assessment reports by members.

5. Partnerships and Alliances: The Initiative has strived to establish partnerships with regional and international bodies including the American Bar Association/Rule of Law Initiative, the Asia-Pacific Group on Money Laundering (APGML), German Development Cooperation (GIZ), Transparency International (TI), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), and the World Bank. The Governance Network (GOVNET) of the OECD Development Assistance Committee and its Anti-Corruption Task Team is also a member. The Initiative is supported by a number of development partners including the Governments of Germany and Japan, and ADB.

6. Membership of the Initiative is open to any economy within the Asia-Pacific region that: recognizes the need for action against corruption and the benefits of sharing knowledge and experience across borders; is actively taking steps to implement anti-corruption measures based on accepted international standards; and commits to undertake reforms under the

---

1 Afghanistan; Australia; Bangladesh; Bhutan; Cambodia; People's Republic of China; Cook Islands; Fiji Islands; Hong Kong, China; India; Indonesia; Japan; Kazakhstan; Korea; Kyrgyz Republic; Macao, China; Malaysia; Mongolia; Nepal; Pakistan; Palau; Papua New Guinea; Philippines; Samoa; Singapore; Solomon Islands; Sri Lanka; Thailand; Timor-Leste; Vanuatu; and Vietnam.

7. The Initiative’s Steering Group, comprised of representatives of member governments, defines the Initiative’s priorities and activities to support the members’ efforts in anti-corruption reform. The Advisory Group, which includes donors, civil society representatives, business organizations, international organizations and other constituencies that support the Initiative, is responsible for assisting the Steering Group by providing technical advice and helping to mobilize resources. It was agreed at the 9th Regional Conference in Seoul, Korea in November 2017 that Steering and Advisory would be merged to streamline the Initiative’s decision making and enhance transparency. A small Secretariat, run by the ADB and OECD, supports the Steering Group.

8. In 2009, an independent review of the Initiative was conducted to assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the Initiative globally, regionally and at the country level to determine whether the Initiative and its associated Action Plan were effective in assisting members in the fight against corruption in Asia and the Pacific (Appendix 2 – Independent Review 2009).

9. In 2011, following the findings of the independent review 2009, the members of the Steering Group adopted Strategic Principles and Operational Activities of the Initiative to guide the Initiative (Appendix 3 - Strategic Principles and Operational Activities 2011) to guide the Initiative. Over time, the Initiative activities have been implemented through a series of multiyear Strategy and Work Programs, the most current of which covers the period 2015 – 2017. (Appendix 4 – Work Program 2015-2017). At the 9th Regional Conference, the members of the Initiative adopted a new Work Program that covers the period of 2018-2020. The Work Program established a new governing structure of the Initiative, confirmed Public Integrity Network and Law Enforcement Network as Initiatives’ main pillars, and proposed to explore Business Integrity as a potential new anticorruption area (Appendix 5 – Work Program 2018-2020).

B. Objective and Scope of Evaluation

10. The objective of the evaluation is to assess the efficacy and relevance of the Initiative regionally and at the country level between 2011 and 2017 to determine whether or not the Initiative and its associated Action Plan, Implementation Plan, Strategic Principles and Operational Activities 2011 and Work Program 2015-2017 have proven effective in assisting members in the fight against corruption in the Asia-Pacific region. It is also required to assess whether the current Work Program 2018-2020 addresses the recommendations included in the independent review dated 2009 and Initiative members’ comments to be received from this evaluation. The evaluation will also identify options for sustaining and enhancing regional and country level anticorruption activities in the future, taking into consideration lessons and in particular needs of the member countries and jurisdictions.

11. The Scope of the evaluation includes the following:

a. the relevance of the Initiative as a regional mechanism to support anticorruption activities in the Asia–Pacific region;

b. the impact, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the Initiative as a framework to address corruption at the regional and country level²

---

² Including an assessment of the degree to which the Initiative’s thematic reviews, country self-reporting and/or
c. the quality, relevance and effectiveness of the Initiative’s outputs delivered during the evaluation period, including seminars and regional conferences and knowledge products on assisting members to implement anti-corruption reforms;

d. the efficiency and effectiveness of the Initiative’s implementation arrangements including (a) membership and structure including the Steering and Advisory Groups; and (b) the business model including administration and operation and performance of the Secretariat (including whether anticorruption expertise at ADB and OECD has been used effectively);

e. whether the Initiative is duplicating other anticorruption programs/initiatives in the Asia-Pacific Region, and suggest options for cooperation and engagement; and

f. recommendations for (1) sustaining and enhancing benefits of the Initiative at the regional and country level; (2) improving organizational structure and implementation mechanism; and (3) optimization and activation of the Steering and Advisory group members’ participation in the Initiative.

C. Approach and Methodology

12. The Initiative has a diverse set of stakeholders, including Steering and Advisory group members, civil society organizations, private sector, funding and other development partners. As such, the evaluation will employ a variety of techniques to gather information, and test and confirm findings from various sources. The techniques will include (i) review of the available documentation, including Action Plan, Implementation Pan, and Work Program/s, regional conference and meeting materials, Initiative’s knowledge products (Appendix 6 - List of ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and the Pacific Events and Publications (2013–2017); (ii) interviews via Skype or other online facilities with members of the Steering and Advisory Groups, Secretariat and other relevant stakeholders; (iii) a survey encompassing not only the members, but civil society, private sector and development partner respondents throughout Asia-Pacific Region which were beneficiaries and/or participants of the Initiative’s capacity development activities.

13. The evaluation will be conducted by an international consultant with extensive and proven experience in anticorruption capacity development at regional and country level in Asia-Pacific Region, and in evaluation of regional program/initiatives in Asia-Pacific Region, evaluating networks, partnerships and knowledge management initiatives. Detailed terms of reference are provided below.

D. Consultant Terms of Reference (2 person months)

14. The consultant should have at least 10 years of relevant experience in anticorruption capacity development in Asia-Pacific region; and evaluating and/or reviewing capacity development regional programs. Specific tasks and responsibilities are as follows:

A. Conduct desk review and research of relevant documents including but not limited to:
(i) minutes of steering group and advisory group meetings; (ii) publications and other knowledge products of the Initiative; (iii) website;

stocktaking exercise have resulted in actual reforms or actions by members.

3 Names and contact details of the organizations and individuals will be provided by ADB.
4 Names and contact details of the organizations and individuals will be provided by ADB.
B. Review of anticorruption networks and/or programs in Asia-Pacific Region;

C. Identify the number and specific individuals and/or organizations to be interviewed at the country and secretariat level, ensuring adequate coverage of all stakeholders;

D. Design a survey questionnaire following indicative evaluation questions and prepare an indicative list of survey recipients (Appendix 7 – Indicative Evaluation Questions);

E. Conduct interviews and survey, and summarize the responses;

F. Assess the impact, relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the Action Plan (including the Implementation Plan) and Work Program 2013-2017 in addressing and reducing corruption in the Initiative’s members;

G. Assess the quality and impact of the Initiative’s knowledge products and events, e.g. country reporting in Steering Group meetings, country self-reporting matrix, stocktaking report, thematic reviews, seminars, conferences;

H. Recommend options for (1) sustaining the Initiative, including appropriate implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes; and (2) increasing Steering and Advisory Groups’ engagement and ownership of the Initiative; and,

I. Prepare the inception, draft final and final evaluation reports. The draft final evaluation report should include a summary of the desk review, interviews and survey findings.

15. The key deliverables and time frame will be:

- Within two weeks: an inception report that will include (a) – (d) from the above TOR;
- Within five weeks: a draft final report that will include (e) - (h) from the above TOR, and
- Within one week: final report that will address comments received on the draft final report.
Annex 2: List of Documents Reviewed

- Action Plan dated 30 November 2001
- 2009 Independent Review Report
- Strategic Principles and Operational Activities of the Initiative
- Work Program 2012-2017
- Work Program 2015-2017
- Discussion Paper on Initiatives Program of Work 2018-2020
- Work Program 2018-2020 (Draft)
- Regional conference and meeting materials (2011, 2014 and 2017)
- Minutes of steering group and advisory group meetings (2011-2017)
- Regional Seminars (2012-2016)
- Thematic Policy Reviews
- Newsletters
Annex 3: List of Persons Interviewed

1. Mr. Bart Edes, ADB
2. Mr. Warren Turner, Former ADB
3. Ms. Elodie Beth, UNDP, Bangkok- Advisory Group
4. Ms. Sarah Dix, Governance Directorate, OECD
5. Ms. Christine Uriarte, Directorate for Financial and Enterprise Affairs (DAF)
6. Ms. Olga Savran, DAF
7. Mr. William Loo, Acting Director, DAF
8. Ms. Sohee Moon, South Korea
9. Ms. Francis Puleiwal, Fiji Islands
10. Ms. Kinley Wangmo, Bhutan
11. Mr. Rinchin, Bhutan
12. Mr. Geoff Stoddart, Cooks Islands
13. Mr. Nhem Bora, Cambodia
14. Mr. Rukshana Nanayakkara, Transparency International
15. Justice Lal Ranjith Silva, Sri Lanka
16. Ms. Clair Wee, former ADB
Annex 4: INDICATIVE EVALUATION QUESTIONS PROVIDED IN THE TOR

Impact

- What are the most significant laws, regulations, institutional reforms, policies and practices that your country/agency has adopted as a result of membership in the Initiative?

- How have these laws, regulations, institutional reforms, or policies been implemented and what has been the impact?

- what issues, practices, lessons has your government or agency shared with other members of the Initiative?

- what are the lessons that your government or agency has taken back from the Initiative?

- what are your needs/expectations of the Initiative? Are these being met? If so how, and if not, what is missing?

Effectiveness

- to what extent has the Initiative achieved its main objectives?

- which activities have proven to be most effective? (i.e. capacity development seminars, Steering Group meetings (including country self-reporting), thematic reviews, publications, website, conferences etc.). Which activities are not or less effective?

- has participation in the Initiative assisted bilateral discussions amongst Members? Have you ever contacted bilaterally another member of the Initiative to discuss a particular point and/or issue or to seek guidance or assistance?

- how effective is the Action Plan (including the Implementation Plan) as a framework for anticorruption interventions regionally and in your country?

Relevance

- to what extent does the Action Plan facilitate or detract from UNCAC implementation?

- what in your view is missing, or inconsistent between the Action Plan (including the Implementation Plan) and the changing anticorruption landscape? Is the Action Plan still relevant given the emergence of the UNCAC? Should the Action and Implementation Plans be modified, and if so, how?

- to what extent, if any, does the Action Plan complement or duplicate other initiatives that your country/agency participates in?
Quality of Knowledge Products

- how useful are the knowledge products prepared and maintained by the Initiative (country self-reporting matrix, stocktaking report, website, newsletter, publications, capacity development seminars, conferences etc..)? Please provide concrete examples of how a knowledge product resulted in changes to your country’s laws, regulations, institutions, policies and practice. * (or in improvements in their implementation – omitted)

- how could the access and/or usefulness of these knowledge products be enhanced?

- what additional knowledge products/activities should be considered to enhance the usefulness and therefore effectiveness of the Initiative?

Administration

- how effective have the Initiative’s processes been to assess implementation of the Action Plan and establish future work priorities?

- Does the administrative structure operate effectively? What suggestions would you have for strengthening these processes/structures?

- is the expertise of the various actors used effectively?

- has the Secretariat provided necessary and timely administrative support?

- is the administrative structure (steering group, advisory group, secretariat) appropriate?

Moving Forward

- How the Initiative can be improved to address members’ anticorruption challenges;

- How to increase members’ ownership and engagement in the Initiative;

- Are you prepared to make contributions to the work of the Initiative, if yes, in what form (monetary, advisory, human resources, other);

- Is there a need to change the Initiative’s set up (Steering and Advisory Groups arrangements), if yes, how the set up should be changed.
### Annex 5: Comparison of 2020 Strategic Directions paper and 2009 Independent Review Recommendations

**Note:** This review compares commitments in the Strategic Principles document with Independent review recommendation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation of 2009 Independent Evaluation</th>
<th>Commitments in the Strategic Directions Paper (relevant paragraphs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Focus on anti-corruption prevention, investigation and prosecution.</strong> The Initiative should recognize that it has mainly evolved into an initiative for ACAs and should therefore focus its activities on building the capacity of ACA's and related agencies to prevent, investigate and prosecute corruption.</td>
<td>Activities will be focused on ACAs but other organizations (government, private sector, and CSOs) can participate when relevant and appropriate. (C.4, D.1.c-d, D.3.c, and D.4.b). <strong>Fully addressed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Retain the club-like character of the Initiative.</strong> The Initiative should continue to be a physical and virtual place where senior staff from ACAs and related agencies can freely and informally exchange experiences and arrange mutual support with a clear objective of improving the performance of the members in reducing corruption.</td>
<td>The meetings will continue to have informal atmosphere and to be attended exclusively by members to encourage open and frank discussion (D.1.f). <strong>Fully addressed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Support UNCAC.</strong> The Initiative should continue to re-orientate its work towards UNCAC and aim to provide even more knowledge management and capacity building support to the implementation of UNCAC.</td>
<td>Objectives include a specific mention of &quot;effective implementation of UNCAC&quot; (B), guiding principle #1 is “Extending support to UNCAC implementation” (C.1), capacity building seminar topics would support UNCAC implementation (3.b.i). <strong>Fully addressed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Support learning with action.</strong> Active follow up could either take the form of a donor commitment to work with the ACA to define what is needed to fill the gap (this could be the job of the proposed peer-led country reviews) and then to follow up with funding for capacity building; or setting up a multi-donor trust fund (MDTF) to which members can apply for capacity building funding. Support could also take the form of one member proving technical assistance to another, as already happens, and expert meeting, or OECD and ADB providing expert advice. A number of member countries have existing training courses for international participants and they should be encouraged and supported to provide tailor made training courses, or —training for trainers‖ for Initiative members.</td>
<td>Adopted as a guiding Principle for the Initiative (C.3, D.3.d, 4.d.). Execution to be assessed under the Work Programs section. Guidelines for mobilizing finances adopted (E) but do not mention MDTF and/or technical assistance among members. <strong>Partially addressed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Pilot voluntary peer reviews.</strong> Peer-led country reviews have proved to be effective in identifying key issues to be addressed and gaps in legislation, processes and capacity. in the past ten years.</td>
<td>Commitment made for 2 pilot country reviews (renamed ‘country scoping exercise’) and then assess value. (D.5). Adopted (or continued?) country self-reporting using a written report template (does a template exist and used?) (D.2.a-c). <strong>Fully addressed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Enhance ownership.</strong> One of the members co-chair the Initiative on a rotating and voluntary basis. The Secretariat would continue to provide support to the Initiative, as currently. Consideration should be given to dropping ADB/OECD from the title of the Initiative. Members from the less as well as more advanced countries should join the Advisory Group on a rotating and voluntary basis</td>
<td>Adopted as a guiding Principle for the Initiative (C.5). Chair of SG will be rotated (D.1.a), participation in SG and AG broadened and opened to diverse set of organizations (D.1.b-d, 3.c.). ADB-OECD mention retained in the Title. <strong>Fully addressed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Be more thematic and practical.</strong> The Steering Group meetings and the other learning activities should focus on more</td>
<td>Principles for choosing capacity building, seminars and regional meetings adopted and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
practical and operational issues of interest to ACAs and similar agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. <strong>Enhance discussion.</strong> There would be even more interaction among members, and thus more peer-to-peer learning, if the Steering Group meetings were characterized by small group, thematic oriented meetings.</th>
<th>emphasize demand driven capacity building and thematic activities focused on UNCAC implementation. (D.3-4). <strong>Fully addressed.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Add the private business sector involvement.</strong> In addition to the CSOs private sector involvement should be added in SG and AG, perhaps in the form of one or two representatives from regional business associations.</td>
<td>SG and AG meetings would have an informal atmosphere to encourage open discussion and will include diverse stakeholders (D.1.). Small group discussions encouraged when considered useful for problem solving and sharing experiences (D.2.c). <strong>Fully addressed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>Increase awareness of the Initiative.</strong></td>
<td>Actions for raising awareness specified. (D.8). <strong>Fully addressed.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>Collect information on improvements in anti-corruption outcomes.</strong> Members and Secretariat set up a small working group to set standards for measuring performance in reducing corruption to be applied by all members. Set up a performance matrix for the Initiative itself, with indicators measuring outcomes in terms of the main activity of the Initiative, learning from others what works best.</td>
<td>Guidelines provide for members to submit country reports during annual steering group meetings to report on progress made in their anticorruption efforts and indicate how the knowledge products and lessons learned in capacity building seminars were disseminated and shared in their respective countries. This recommendation was partially addressed because the Initiative has not set specific indicators yet to measure performance and outcomes. <strong>Partially Addressed.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6: Analysis of Member Survey Responses

Legend: MQ 3 means member survey question 3 and so on.

(MQ3) With 21 responses 10 are OECD members and 11 are not

(MQ4) Members were asked whether their needs/expectations of the Anticorruption Initiative are being met. Roughly half of the members responding indicated needs were ‘Partially Met’ for helping implement UNCAC, mutual support and exchange of expertise, capacity building based on peer learning. In terms of needs being ‘Fully Met’, 55% indicated assisting to promote anticorruption in country, 60% serving as knowledge and learning network, and 47% avoiding unnecessary duplication of other initiatives. There were significant differences between those that were members of OECD and those that were not members. OECD members had higher percentages of ‘Fully Met’ for each objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Not being met</th>
<th>Partially met</th>
<th>Fully met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help members implement UNCAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist to promote anticorruption in your country</td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional cooperation through mutual support and exchange of expertise</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building based on peer learning</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a knowledge and learning network for tackling corruption in Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide value added and avoid unnecessary duplication of other initiatives</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MQ 5) In response to the question as to whether the country/agency adopted significant laws, regulations, institutional reforms, policies and practices as a result of membership in the Anticorruption Initiative, 48% replied ‘Adopted Some’ and 33% replied ‘Adopted Many’. 19% replied ‘Not At All’. Those who were not OECD members responded with a somewhat higher percentage of ‘Adopted Many’ than OECD members who responded with a somewhat higher percentage of ‘Adopted Some’.

(MQ 6) Members were questioned as to what are the most significant laws, regulations, institutional reforms and practices that the country/agency had adopted as a result of membership in the Anti-Corruption Initiative. 20 of 21 responses indicated a range of constitutional amendments, significant laws etc. adopted, laws updated to be in compliance with Initiative, agency regulations drafted including:

- Ratification of UNCAC
- Revisions to country anti-corruption act, national integrity assessments
- Anticorruption practices and prevention mechanism in private sector, business integrity initiatives
- Prevention of money laundering, financial transaction reporting, electronic transaction reporting
- Witness protection laws, whistleblower protection, ombudsman, mutual legal assistance
- Code of conduct for public officials, code of ethics, election law reform
Public procurement  
Right to information, ombudsman  
Amendments to criminal law  
Strategic plans for agencies with core strategies – punitive, preventative, and promotional  
Prosecution of cross border corruption cases  
Drastic reform in national supervision system

(MQ 7) Members were questioned as to how the laws, regulations and institutional reforms or policies have been implemented and what has been the impact. Answers ranged from awareness raising, to draft laws under development to partial implementation to full implementation. Representative responses include:

- Increase in awareness, greater transparency in public sector, more reporting, investigations and prosecutions, expanded scope of targets to be supervised
- Many MOUs on Anticorruption and Prevention signed with private sector and anti-corruption programs introduced into education system.
- Mutual legal assistance for cross border corruption cases
- Appointed witness protection authority, established high court for bribery and corruption cases
- Policy dialogue between anti-corruption agencies.

(MQ 8) The question as to whether participation in the Anti-Corruption Initiative enabled members to increase discussion with other members, seek guidance or learn from their experience received replies of 48% ‘Somewhat’ and 48% ‘Very Much.’ OECD members had a higher percentage of ‘Not At All’ and a lower percentage of ‘Very Much’ than non-OECD members.

(MQ 9) Examples of shared experience or lessons included:

- Experiences in public outreach programs, preventing corruption, managing systems for asset and income declaration
- Case studies on bribery, and fake records and expenditures
- Reform of public service delivery, complaint systems, whistleblower protection enforcement, mutual legal assistance, money laundering and asset recovery processes
- Examples of successful prosecutions and resolution of corruption matters with support of another member country

(MQ 10) Members replied to the question as to the extent to which the Anti-corruption Initiative is helping to contribute to the country’s anti-corruption policies and programs with ‘Somewhat’ 52% and ‘Very Much’ 43%. Comments referenced the Initiative’s Action Plan, regional seminars and conferences, experiences of other countries in countering corruption, and the network of overseas anticorruption organizations as factors that helped to contribute to anti-corruption policies and programs. OECD members had a higher percentage of ‘Not At All’ and a lower percentage of ‘Very Much’ than non-OECD members.

(MQ 11) Members replied to the question about effectiveness of the 2001 Action Plan, 2010 Strategic Principles and 2012-2017 work programs as a framework for anticorruption interventions regionally and in their country with 52% replying ‘Somewhat’ and 43% replying ‘Very Much’. OECD members had a higher percentage of ‘Somewhat’ and a lower percentage of ‘Very Much’ than non-OECD members.
(MQ 12) Members were asked to rate the main activities/outputs under the Anticorruption Initiative during 2012-2017 in terms of how useful they have been in their agency’s work. Steering Group meetings received the highest ratings with 65% replying ‘Very Effective’ and 25% replying ‘Somewhat Effective’, followed by regional conferences with 56% replying ‘Very Effective’ and 25% replying ‘Somewhat Effective’. Regional capacity building seminars received 45% replying ‘Very Effective’ and 40% replying ‘Somewhat Effective’. OECD members reported regional conferences and country self-reporting with a higher percentage of ‘Very Effective’. Non-OECD members gave higher ‘Very Effective’ ratings to steering group meetings, thematic policy reviews, and regional capacity building seminars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities/outputs</th>
<th>Not at all Effective</th>
<th>Somewhat effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional conferences</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering group meetings</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country self-reporting</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic policy reviews</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional capacity building seminars</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual newsletters</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MQ 13) Members responded as to whether the Anticorruption Initiative 2010 Strategic Principles, 2018-2020 Work Program facilitate or detract from UNCAC implementation with 52% replying ‘Facilitates Somewhat’ and 38% replying ‘Facilitates Greatly’. Responses were somewhat lower from OECD members for ‘Facilitates Somewhat’ and ‘Facilitates Greatly’. Representative comments included:

- The Initiative’s workshops have facilitated sharing of best practices and lessons learned.
- The Initiative has identified gaps that need to be addressed locally in order to fulfill UNCAC requirements.
- There is much consistency between the Initiative and UNCAC.
- Level of corruption and resources for combating corruption vary by country so some parts of the work programs are more relevant than others.
- Provide an opportunity to study in greater detail the recommendations of United Nations and OECD.

(MQ 14) Replies to the question ‘What in your view is missing, or inconsistent between the Anticorruption Initiative 2010 Strategic Principles and the 2018-2020 Work Program, as presented at the November, 2017 meeting in Seoul, Korea and the changing anticorruption landscape?’ were generally positive with most respondents stating that there were no inconsistencies. The 2018-2020 Work Program is more strategic than previous work programs and has a targeted approach.

(MQ 15) members were asked on need to modify the 2009 Strategic Principles and the Work Program for 2018-2020, as presented at the November, 2017 Steering Group meeting. 89% of members responding did not find a need and OECD members’ replies were similar.

(MQ 16) Members were asked about their membership in one or more of 11 anticorruption initiatives and organizations. 100% of member respondents to date (21 responses) are members of United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC). 39% are members of Government Procurement Experts Group and Anti-corruption and Transparency Task Force both of APEC. 25% are members of OECD Anti-Corruption Convention. Few
survey respondents have membership in the other anti-corruption organizations listed. For OECD 44% are members of OECD Anticorruption convention compared with 0% for non-OECD.

(MQ 17) In response to the question of the extent to which the Anti-corruption Initiative 2018-2020 Work Program complements or duplicates other initiatives that the country participates in, response for ‘Complements Somewhat’ was 52% and ‘Complements Greatly’ was 14%. 14% replied ‘Neither Duplicates Nor Complements’. Some members commented that even though the work program for the Anti-corruption Initiative sometimes overlaps with that of other initiatives, the membership is different and that is significant. The Initiative covers business integrity, which has not been addressed extensively in other anti-corruption initiatives. Responses were similar for OECD and non-OECD members although OECD members gave a somewhat higher response rating to ‘Complements Greatly’.

(MQ 18) Members were queried regarding whether and how their organization is contributing or planning to contribute to their country’s national action plan for achieving Sustainable Development Goal Number 16 governance related targets and/or anti-corruption commitments under the Open Government Partnership (OGP).

Replies varied greatly depending on the particular target. While 16.4, 16.5, and 16.5 received strong responses, the other targets did not receive as many responses, in most cases because replies indicated that the target was not relevant for their organization.

- For 16.4 - reducing illicit financial flows – 2 are leading on the target, 8 are planning to participate in planning and implementation and 7 would like the Anticorruption Initiative’s help in contributing to this target.
- For 16.5 – reducing corruption and bribery – 15 are leading on the target, 10 have an action plan, 9 are planning to participate in planning and implementation, 11 would like the Anticorruption Initiative’s help. For OECD, a higher percentage are leading on this target, but a lower percentage have an action plan compared to non-OECD.
- For 16.6 – developing effective, accountable and transparent institutions, 11 cooperate with the relevant government agency responsible for the target and 9 would like the Anticorruption Initiative’s help. Non-OECD had a higher percentage leading on this target compared with OECD.
- For 16.7 – ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decisions, 7 replied ‘Not Relevant’.
- For 16.10 – ensure public access to information, 7 replied ‘Not Relevant’
- For anticorruption commitments to OCP national action plan, responses were low.
(MQ 19) In response to a question about how effectively does the structure of the Anticorruption Initiative operate, members responded that the Steering Group operates effectively with 63% replying ‘Very Effectively’ and 37% ‘Somewhat Effectively’. For Advisory Group effectiveness, 53% of the members responding replied ‘Very Effectively’ and 42% ‘Somewhat Effectively’. OECD responded with a higher percentage of ‘very Effectively’ compared to non-OECD. For Secretariat, 58% responded ‘Very Effectively’ and 32% ‘Somewhat Effectively’. OECD had a similar response.

(MQ 20) Members had few replies to the question as to suggestions for strengthening administrative procedures and processes, probably because, as indicated by the previous question, they appear to be reasonably satisfied with administration. Comments suggested that relating examples of prosecution of corruption to principles of monitoring and identification could be helpful. And, having a dedicated Secretariat.

(MQ 21) There is a wide range of responses from Members as to the question whether the expertise of the various Advisory Group members is used effectively. ADB received the highest score with 87% of members replying ‘Very Effectively’, followed by UNODC and OECD with 80% replying ‘Very Effectively’, and UNDP with 73% ‘Very Effectively’. The World Bank was next with 60% replying ‘Very Effectively.’ OECD member responses were similar.

(MQ 22) The question of whether the Secretariat provided necessary and timely administrative support received ‘Provided all necessary and timely administrative support’ from 71% of respondents.

(MQ 23) Members were asked for suggestions as to how the Anticorruption Initiative could be improved and there were a number of concrete recommendations:

- More knowledge sharing/ training courses/workshops/seminars / publications and provide technical support to individual members upon request
- Tailor made technical assistance and capacity building on prevention and investigation and relevant legislative development and implementation
- Better understanding of specific country situations and context since global mandates and generalist approach does not achieve desired results
- Country reviews with statistics and cases of successful and non-successful endeavors to identify and or prosecute alleged corruption

(MQ 24) Members replied with suggestions about how to increase members’ ownership and engagement in the Anticorruption Initiative.

- Maintain updated primary contact information and versing new staff in goals and programs of the Anticorruption Initiative
- Provide regular engagement and information sharing at conferences with more time for experience/best practices sharing at meetings; provide more training
- Provide opportunities to engage members that have not had leading role in Anticorruption Initiative.
**MQ 25** Members were asked about their willingness to contribute in cash and/or in-kind to the Initiative. 29% of members replied ‘Yes’ to willing to provide an in-kind contribution and 71% replied ‘Not Sure’. There were no responses to ‘Willing to Make a Cash Contribution’.

**MQ 26** Recommendations to improve the Anticorruption Initiative’s effectiveness, relevance and sustainability emphasized increased sharing of best practices, cooperation and resources and workshops most relevant to members on a regional basis.

**MQ 27** In response to the question of what anticorruption topics, issues, areas should the Anticorruption Initiative focus on in 2019-2020 regionally and for your country, money laundering/asset recovery received the most mentions. Other areas covered a range of issues including corporate criminal liability/anti-corruption in private sector, witness protection, conflict of interest, code of conducts, financial analysis, foreign dollar influence in political campaigns, wildlife and forest crime, disaster management, water resource management, ethnic and religious conflicts, exclusion of women from political and economic life, monitoring and evaluation to evaluate the effectiveness of anti-corruption initiatives.

**MQ 28** The question of what anticorruption capacity development activities and/or knowledge products would be most useful for the Anticorruption Initiative’s members received responses as follows in no particular order:

- Regional meetings
- Practical trainings / capacity building on specific topics
- Thematic reviews, publications
- Compilation of country agencies with contact and website information
- Country self-reporting

**MQ 29** When asked about the top three priority in the country’s anti-corruption strategy the members mentioned:

- Transparency of governance
- Improving quality of public services – health, education, infrastructure
- Public sector integrity
- Financial investigation
- Public awareness
- Code of conduct workshops
- Training for personnel involved in anti-corruption
- Law enforcement and investigative prosecution
ANNEX 7: ANALYSIS OF ADVISER SURVEY RESPONSES

(5 respondents, though the UNODC contact skipped 10 questions and rarely commented. Legend: AQ 3 means Adviser survey question 3 and so on.)

Strategy. (AQ3) Are your needs/expectations being met in context of varying goals of the Anticorruption Initiative? The majority of the Advisors surveyed responded ‘Partially Met’ to each of the objectives of the Advisory Group. The objective of helping members to implement UNCAC received a response of 100% ‘Partially Met’. Most Successful: Regional cooperation through mutual support and exchange of expertise, & Serve as a knowledge and learning network for tackling corruption in Asia and Pacific. Least Successful: Provide value added and avoid unnecessary duplication of other initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Not being met</th>
<th>Partially met</th>
<th>Fully met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help members implement UNCAC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional cooperation through mutual support and exchange of expertise</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building based on peer learning</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodate geographical and developmental diversity of Members and Stakeholders</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a knowledge and learning network for tackling corruption in Asia and Pacific</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide value added and avoid unnecessary duplication of other initiatives</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(AQ4) In response to whether participation enabled increased discussions with other members and/or the opportunity to provide guidance and assistance, four of the five advisors replied ‘Somewhat’.

Has participation in the Initiative enabled you to increase discussions with other members and/or provide guidance or assistance?
(AQ5) All the advisors expressed instances of sharing issues, practices, and lessons with the members of the Anti-Corruption Initiative. Examples cited include:

- Member participation in Transparency International’s Anti-Corruption Agency Strengthening Initiative (TI)
- The sharing of asset recovery expertise (GIZ)
- Establishment of a South-South/Triangular Cooperation on corruption prevention, which included Indonesia and Afghanistan (GIZ)
- Release of studies on illicit financial flows, sharing of lessons learned and anti-corruption strategies (UNDP)
- Reaching consensus on the strategic importance of cooperating to improve asset recovery

(AQ6) All advisors replied ‘somewhat’ to the question, “to what extent had the Anti-Corruption Initiative helped them contribute to members’ national anti-corruption policies and programs.” Examples cited include:

- Helps to make productive links with member economies who would otherwise be out of contact
- Interaction and networking with Members via Initiative events and activities such as the annual meetings which provides a safe platform to discuss with Anti-Corruption agencies issues of national importance
- Interaction leads to better understanding of member needs in terms of implementation of national plans and policies.

(AQ7) Advisers were asked “How effective the Action Plan and the activities under the 2012-2017 work programs have been in helping member countries’ anti-corruption efforts.” All advisors replied only ‘somewhat effective’ to the question, Suggestions for improvement include:

- A sharper focus on priority themes, which should be helped by the new strategic plan
- Capacity-building workshops and country-level activities facilitated by the Initiative.

(A8) Advisers were asked to rate the main activities/outputs under the Anti-Corruption Initiative during the 2012-2017 in terms of how useful you believe them to be to the members. Response data (% of members responses) is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Not at all effective</th>
<th>Somewhat effective</th>
<th>Very effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Conferences</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Group Meetings</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Self-Reporting</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Reviews/Policy Analysis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional (capacity building) seminars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Newsletters</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional conferences and steering group meetings received the highest combined ratings of ‘Somewhat Effective’ and ‘Very Effective’. Suggestions included:

- Importance of providing a safe haven for ACA’s to talk about barriers and solutions to their work and the potential for ACA-led capacity building on areas of strength
- The main theme of the yearly seminar should be decided the preceding year, and capacities should be invested to develop the knowledge product/training as background to the seminar

- Focus on priority topics in a multi-year way; sharpen purpose of country reports with focus on priorities for capacity building and ability to offer resources and share expertise

(AQ9) When asked to name recent developments in the anti-corruption landscape that have implications for the initiatives, the advisors responses covered a range of issues, entities, and events including, the increase of public private partnerships, a changing donor landscape, the emergence of new regional development partners providing an alternate to ADB, less emphasis on democratic values in multi-national investments, a shrinking space for CSOs to engage with ACAs, the adoption of SDGs and added value of anti-corruption work in sectors, anti-corruption work for achieving the SDGs Discourse on IFFs, asset recovery, focus on law enforcement integrity, financing for development, higher political/donor expectations on the measurability of interventions, a focus on private sector engagement, multi-stakeholder-platforms in the sense of the Agenda 2030, business integrity, and the work of UNCAC and OGP. Commonalities include the impact activities and reforms related to the SDGs and increased emphasis on the private sectors.

(AQ10) Questions asked “are the 2009 Action Plan, 2010 Strategic Principles, and 2018-2020 Work Plan still relevant given the emergence of the UNCAC, SDG 16 and Open Government Partnership?” The 2018-2020 Work Program received the highest combined ratings of ‘Somewhat Relevant’ and ‘Very Relevant’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADB-OECD Output</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
<th>Somewhat Relevant</th>
<th>Very Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 Action Plan</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Strategic Principles and Operational Activities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2020 Work Program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(AQ11) Advisers were asked whether the Initiative detracted or facilitates UNCAC implementation. None of the advisors believed the Action Plan detracted from UNCAC implementation, but rather thought it neither detracts or facilitates, facilitates somewhat, or facilitates greatly.

To what extent does the Action Plan facilitate or detract from UNCAC implementation?

With regards to this topic, the advisors commented that the Initiative amplifies article 12 and 36 of the UNCAC and the Initiative’s work falls generally under the UNCAC framework. An advisor
suggested that ADB/OECD should learn from the model of the APG technical assistance and training forum and devote sessions to pair donors with countries needing assistance. Also, the Public Integrity Network was identified as a mechanism to build on UNCAC standards. Lastly, an advisor suggested that the Action Plan should closely track with the upcoming review cycle of the UNCAC that focuses on corruption prevention and asset recovery, because this could be a good starting point for identifying capacity-building needs of the members.

(AQ12) When asked what may be missing from the 2018-2020 work program, Advisors believed Initiative’s outputs should be better aligned with the changing anti-corruption landscape, including donors and investment partners. And, that there should be more focus on law enforcement integrity. Only three, sparse responses to this question.

(AQ13) When asked whether the 2018-2020 work programs should be modified, two advisor respondents said the 2018-2020 Work Program needs no modification. Whereas one advisor suggested incorporating the SDG 16 targets in context of the present investment, political, and developmental climate of the region. Another suggested making sure explicit sessions are added to pair donors and countries seeking capacity building cooperation.

(AQ14) Advisers were given the list of 11 anti-corruption initiatives (see Annex 8) and asked about complementarity or duplication. Of the 11 anti-corruption initiatives listed, almost none of the advisors believed the Initiative to be ‘Duplicative’. Instead, many considered the Initiative as ‘Somewhat Complementary’ or as a ‘Neither Complementing or Duplicating’ with a few responding ‘Complements Greatly’. One response indicated the Anti-corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia as ‘duplicates somewhat’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-Corruption Initiative</th>
<th>Complements Greatly</th>
<th>Complements Somewhat</th>
<th>Neither Complements or Duplicate</th>
<th>Duplicates Somewhat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD Anti-corruption Initiative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Corruption Hunters Alliance (World Bank)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Procurement Experts Group and Anti-Corruption and Transparency Task Force – both of APEC</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific Regional Program of TI</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Against Corruption Network (UNICORN) of International Trade Unions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business for Social Responsibility</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center of Innovation in Corporate Responsibility</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) standing committee in extortion and bribery</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Industry Advisory Committee (BIAC) to the OECD for implementation of OECD anti-corruption convention</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(AQ15) Advisors were asked to indicate how effectively does the structure of the Anticorruption Initiative operate. While the Secretariat received the highest ratings – 80% ‘Somewhat Effectively’, and 20% ‘Very Effectively’ the Steering Group and Advisory Group received ratings of 40% ‘Somewhat Effectively’ and 40% ‘Not at all Effectively’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Not at all effectively</th>
<th>Somewhat effectively</th>
<th>Very effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steering Group</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Group</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(AQ16) Advisors were asked ‘what suggestions would you have for strengthening these administrative structures and processes’. Comments included:

- a concern as to whether all of the Advisory Group members get equal voice in setting the agenda of the Initiative
- a recommendation to first consider what change the Initiative wants to achieve in the region, and then to identify a set of priority issues for action.
- and a comment that the Secretariat was great.

(AQ17) In response to the question of whether the expertise of the various Advisory Group members is used effectively, 80% responded ‘Somewhat Effectively’ and 20% ‘Not Effectively’. Comments included:

- a recommendation to define the role of the Advisory Group and its impact on strategic direction of the Initiative
- a suggestion that to enlarge the role of private business

(AQ18) When asked about the clarity about the role of the Advisory Group, respondents indicated that the role of the Advisors Group is not clearly defined.

(AQ19) In response to the question as to whether membership of the Advisors Group is appropriate, a comment was made that it was decided to do away with the Advisors Group at the last meeting in South Korea and another that private sector reps should be added.

(AQ20) Members replied to the question as to whether the Advisors Group is sufficiently engaged in the work of the Initiative that there is an opportunity to have TI more actively engaged and to strengthen private sector role.

(AQ21) The question of whether the Advisor Group has the resources it needs to do its work elicited comments that additional efforts could be made to fund raise by focusing on key deliverables of the Initiative rather than focusing on regional events and that private resources and influence could be added.

(AQ22) In response to the question about recommended changes to the Advisors Group moving forward – role, membership, engagement, resources - comments focused on the need to identify the strategic contribution of each group, to identify ways to improve the management of the Initiative, to mobilize additional resources, and to add finance sector expertise. The recommended process is to hold bilateral discussions with members of the Advisors Group.
(AQ23) When asked whether the Secretariat provided ‘All Necessary and Timely Administrative Support’ 75% of respondents said yes and 25% of respondents said provided ‘Some Administrative Support’.

(AQ24) Responses to the question of how the Anticorruption Initiative can be improved to address members’ anti-corruption challenges were limited. A recommendation was to use the Initiative as a platform for anticorruption agencies to discuss challenges and devise strategies, and to become a capacity building hub by learning from the APG model.

(AQ25) In terms of increasing members’ ownership and engagement in the Anticorruption Initiative, comments included:

- Link it more explicitly to UNCAC IRM reports, APG FATF reports, to Asset Recovery Initiative Asia Pacific (ARIN AP)
- Include all agencies fighting corruption – anticorruption agencies, law enforcement authorities etc.
- Add activities throughout the year to supplement annual inputs at seminar or other events
- Identify priority issues through group discussions of members

AQ26) Replies to the question are you prepared to make contributions to the work of the Anticorruption Initiative were 20% ‘No’, 20% ‘Yes In Cash’, 60% ‘Yes In Kind’, and 40% ‘Not Sure’. Cash support would have to be discussed institutionally, in-kind support could include advisory support to sharing knowledge.
## ANNEX 8: Comparative Review of Anti-Corruption Initiatives in Asia and the Pacific

### ADB/OECD Initiative

**Objective:**
The Initiative is a regional forum for supporting national and multilateral efforts to address and reduce corruption in Asia and the Pacific, primarily through the effective implementation of UNCAC. The Initiative seeks to achieve this goal through capacity building based on peer-learning, mutual support and exchange of expertise, while taking into account the geographical and developmental diversity of its members; demands on members’ human and financial resources; and the need to provide value-added in view of the functions and roles of other multilateral anticorruption bodies (1).

**Membership & Geographical Focus:**
*Membership: 31 member countries*
*Focus: Asia and the Pacific*

**Sources and Amount of Funding:**
*Sources: In the past, the Initiative’s Work Program has been funded by member countries in-kind contributions, ADB Technical Assistance Grants and voluntary contributions by donors to the OECD.*
*Amount: For 2015-2017 €1,780,319*

**Main Activities and Outputs:**
*Activities:*

**General**
The Initiative supports the member governments' efforts through three mechanisms:
1) Fostering policy dialogue through Steering Group Meetings and Conferences
2) Policy analysis, including thematic reviews and stocktaking
3) Regional Seminars

**2015-17 Work Program**
1) 3 annual steering group meetings
2) 2 capacity building seminars
3) regional anti-corruption conference
4) Expanding partnerships
5) thematic review
6) country volunteer reviews (not internal, reviewers selected by Advisory Group and Secretariat)

**2001 Action Plan**
1) Developing effective and transparent systems for public service
2) Strengthening Anti-Bribery Actions and Promoting Integrity in Business Operations
3) Supporting Active Public Involvement

**Outputs:**
Country Self-Reports, Volunteer Country Reviews, Seminars, conferences, thematic reviews (analyzes all members efforts in specific areas)

**Assessment of Duplication:**
N/A
| **Objective:** | The OECD Anti-Bribery Convention establishes legally binding standards to criminalize bribery of foreign public officials in international business transactions and provides for a host of related measures that make this effective. |
| **Membership and Geographical Focus:** | *Membership:* The 36 OECD countries and 8 non-OECD countries. *Focus:* Developed Countries |
| **Funding:** | Funds funneled through OECD Working Group on Bribery. These funds are not disclosed in financial statements or the website. Participating countries bear the cost of most activities |
| **Main Activities and Output:** | **Activities:** Implementation and Enforcement of the Convention via peer-review monitoring which is facilitated by the OECD Working Group on Bribery, which meets 4 times a year. **Outputs:** Country monitoring reports, data on enforcement, meetings, official recommendations |
| **Assessment of Duplication:** | Low Duplication: Since there is very little overlap in membership (only Australia and Japan) |

### UNODC’s **UNCAC**

| **Objective:** | “The only legally binding universal anti-corruption instrument” ([source](#)). The 5 main areas covered include preventative measures, criminalization and law enforcement, international cooperation, asset recovery, and technical assistance and information exchange. The Conference of the State of Parties (COSP) is the policy-making body. The Implementation Review Mechanism (IRM) is the peer-review process. |
| **Membership and Geographical Focus:** | *Membership:* Most of the UN members are signatories. See Members *Focus:* Everywhere |
| **Funding:** | *Source:* Donors – UN Regular Budget, and voluntary contributions by individual countries (largest contributors), IGOs, NGOs, private sector |
**Amount:** 2012-15
$57,741,000 (50)

**Main Activities and Output:**

**Activities:**
1) Supports countries in their effective preparation for country reviews
2) Develops, manages, implements and coordinates technical cooperation activities
3) Assists States to strengthen their legislation and policies to counter corruption
4) Helps to develop and implement programs aimed at effective institution-building
5) collects data and develops statistical indicators to provide benchmarks
6) conducts research and analysis
   From 2016 Annual Report (60)
7) Working groups on prevention and asset recovery
8) IRM: Technical assistance and facilitation of the peer-review process
9) COSP: improve the capacity and cooperation of the States, hold biennial meetings to promote and review the implementation of the Convention (source)
10) Development of tools, manuals, and publications

**Outputs:**
COSP: biennial meetings, resolutions, mandates
IRM: Country review reports, national legal texts,
Other: country profiles, technical tools

**Assessment of Duplication:**
High Duplication:
- The ADB/OECD Initiative’s 2001 Action Plan as compared to the content of the UNCAC, the UNODC’s annual report (58-69), and it’s general activities there are numerous areas of duplication.
- Both publish similar peer-reviews (though the UN’s appears to be more comprehensive) and publications/tools.
- ADB/OECD’s includes effective implementation of the UNCAC in its central objective

Specific Content
- Prevention: ADB/OECD - Pillar 1 and UNCAC - thematic area
- Asset Recovery: ADB/OECD – Pillar 1 and UNCAC – thematic area
- Private Sector: ADB/OECD – Pillar 2 and UNCAC – thematic area
- Research and Policy analysis/formation
- Law Enforcement: ADB/OECD – LEN (WP 2018-20) and UNCAC – main area
And more

---

**Anti-Corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia**

**Objective:**
A regional outreach program of the OECD Working Group on Bribery.
Its main objective is to support its member countries in their efforts to prevent and fight corruption. It provides a regional forum for the promotion of anti-corruption activities, exchange of information, elaboration of best practices and donor coordination. The ACN operates through general meetings and conferences, sub-regional initiatives and thematic projects.

**Membership and Geographical Focus:**
Membership: 25 countries in CEE and Central Asia, OECD Member States

Focus: Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia

**Funding:**
Source: Mostly through voluntary contributions – OECD budget, IOs, and ACN countries

**Main Activities and Output:**
Activities:
2016-19 Work Program
1) Istanbul Anti-corruption Action Plan (peer country reviews of 9 states)
2) corruption prevention in the public sector
3) law-enforcement network
4) business integrity
5) Ukrainian and other country-specific projects (source - 2)

Outputs:
Country reviews, thematic studies, topical regional seminars, annual law enforcement meetings

Assessment of Duplication:
Moderate Overlap (in 3 countries):
- ACN country review output, which is active in only 9 countries, is very similar to OECD/ADB volunteer country review. Overlap countries include Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, and Mongolia No other countries overlap in membership
- Both also hold seminars
- Business Integrity, corruption in public service, and law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Corruption Hunters Alliance (World Bank)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosts biennial meetings open to more than 100 countries (however, 2016 appears to have been skipped because the 2014 meeting was the third, and the 2018 will be the fourth).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership and Geographical Focus:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership: Attendance list not provided, 382 heads and senior members of anti-corruption enforcement authorities from 130 countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus: Everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a World Bank body, presumable them, no additional data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Activities and Output:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities and Outputs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biennial meeting within which are working sessions. Ending impunity appears to be a theme. Other topics include supply chain risks, integrity compliance programs, forensic audit techniques, asset recovery etc. Also releases reports on the meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of Duplication:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Duplication:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparatively superficial anti-corruption group – low involvement and demands. Meeting would likely have highly different character than ADB/OECD meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-Corruption and Transparency Working Group – Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The ACTWG is tasked to coordinate the implementation of the Santiago Commitment to Fight Corruption and Ensure Transparency, the APEC Course of Action on Fighting Corruption and the APEC Transparency Standards.” It “also promotes cooperation in areas of extradition, legal assistance and judicial/law enforcement.” (source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership and Geographical Focus:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership: 21 Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members that Overlap: Australia, China, Hong Kong, China, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 of the 31 ADB/OECD Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Focus: Asia-Pacific**

**Funding:**
*Source:* Centrally funded by annual contributions from member economies and additional voluntary contributions
*Amount:* Funds available now – 8 million, doesn’t no specify amount dedicated to anti-corruption task force

**Main Activities and Output:**

**Activities:**
1) “Ratification of, accession to, and implementation of the UNCAC
2) Strengthen measures to effectively prevent and fight corruption and ensure transparency by recommending and assisting member economies
3) Deny safe haven to officials and individuals of public corruption
4) Fight both publics and private sector corruption
5) Public-private partnerships
6) Cooperation among apec member economies to combat corruption and ensure transparency in the region”

**Outputs:**
A handbook on prosecuting corruption and money laundering cases, workshops, events, a code of conduct for business, publications

**Assessment of Duplication:**
Moderate to High Duplication:
- The task also focuses on the implementation of the UNCAC, which as mentioned above is central to the ADB/OECD Initiative.
- There are 12 countries of overlap, which is substantive.
- Also focuses on private sector – partnerships, building integrity; and law enforcement

**The Asia-Pacific Group on Money Laundering (APGML)**

**Objective:**
An inter-governmental ‘task that seeks to generate wide regional commitment to implement anti-money laundering (AML) policies and initiatives and combating the financing of terrorism/proliferation (CFT) (source). In partnership with Financial Action Task Force (FATF) whose 40 AML/CFT recommendations are the international standards for money laundering and financing of terrorism. APG’s TOR commit members to implementing these recommendations (source).

**Membership and Geographical Focus:**
*Membership:* 41 members
*Focus:* Asia-Pacific

**Funding:**
*Source:* Core budget (member dues) and voluntary grants from members (source)
*Amount:* 2017-2018
Core Budget: $2,767,790
Non-core: $1,543,288 (with 558k from NZ)

**Main Activities and Output:**

**Activities:**
1) Mutual Evaluations: peer review assessments of member compliance to AML/CFT standards
2) Technical Assistance and Training: to be compliant
3) Typologies Research: research and analysis to assist lawmakers and enforcers and inform the public about AML/CFT activities
4) Global Engagement: policy development, partners with FATF and network of FSRBs (subset of FATF)
Assessment of Duplication:
Low to Moderate Duplication:
- APG mission and activities are more specific, and oriented toward organized crime and grand-style corruption than the ADB/OECD Initiative. However, whenever the ADB/OECD initiative ventures into OC areas, there would be duplications – 2001 Action Plan speaks of anti-money laundering legislation.
- Both also emphasize public involvement and law enforcement.
Significant member overlap, except APG doesn’t include any Eurasian countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asia and Pacific Regional Program of Transparency International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Objective:
A four-year program running from 2016 – 2019
Overall outcome is “to support effective and accountable governance for sustainable growth” via 4 goals:
1) Enhanced Social Accountability and Role of Civil Society
2) Strengthened Anti-Corruption Legislation
3) Strengthened Enforcement of Anti-Corruption Systems and Organizations
4) Demonstrated Business Integrity
5) Strengthening TI national chapters (over 50% of the budget) (48).

Source

Membership and Geographical Focus:
Membership: Not found
Focus: Asia-Pacific

Funding:
Source: A grant from Australia
Amount: $6.89m

Main Activities and Output:
Activities:
Sampling of activities as corresponding with the goals
1) legal advice, citizen monitoring, analyzing corruption case data, surveying public opinion, social media campaigns (47)
2) advocacy for legislation, policy input, knowledge sharing across TI chapters, assessing implementation of current laws (47)
3) assessing and benchmarking key institutions and developing recommendations for reform, evaluating and supporting ACAs (48)
4) assessing effectiveness of regulatory environment, developing internal capacity and expertise on illicit financial flows, advocating for improved enforcement of business integrity regulations (48)

Outputs:
Annual work plans, milestone reports (not public?), acquittal reports (not public?) (56)

Assessment of Duplication:
Substantive Duplication:
- The TI initiative appears to be more focused on building capacity of non-governmental actors, especially its own chapters
- However, the ADB/OECD 2001 Action Plan and Activity Proposal of the Grant pages 47-48 have significant overlaps including:
  o Adherence to international standards
  o Legislative reform
  o Public involvement and Public awareness campaigns
  o Business integrity regulations

Business and Industry Advisory Committee to OECD
**Objective:**
An international Business network who advocates for “open markets and private sector-led growth” (source). Has an anti-corruption task force. This task force “provides regular input to the implementation of the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention and contributes the business voice to consultations with the OECD Working Group on Bribery.” (source).

**Membership and Geographical Focus:**
*Membership:* Member organizations are limited to the OECD. Observer organizations can be non-OECD, and Indonesia Chamber of Commerce & Industry is only Asia-Pacific

**Funding:**
Not explicitly stated, likely from members and the OECD

**Main Activities and Output:**

*Activities (within task force):*
1) Encourage effective implementation of OECD Anti-Bribery Convention
2) Address the demand side of bribery
3) Encourage capacity building and outreach to non-adhering countries

*Outputs:*
Press releases, reports

**Assessment of Duplication:**
Low Duplication:
Since there is very little overlap in membership (only organizations from Australia and Japan)

---

**Business for Social Responsibility**

**Objective:**
An organization comprised of a network with over 250 companies that seeks to build a just and sustainable world.

**Membership and Geographical Focus:**
*Membership:* 250 from Asia, Europe, and North America

*Focus:* Asia, Europe, and North America

**Funding:**
*Sources:* Consulting, conferences, membership dues, grants, government-funded contracts

*Amount:* $17,192,442 in 2017 (source)

**Main Activities and Output:**

*Activities:*
1) Sustainable Consulting: project-by-project and integrating sustainability into ongoing strategy and operations
2) Collaboration: across sector and geography to address solutions – a networker
3) Research: On sustainability practices - custom, public funded by BSR, public funded by other actors

*Outputs:*
Reports, working papers, and briefs

**Assessment of Duplication:**
Low Duplication:
Targeted at businesses rather than countries. Also lacks structured anti-corruption good governance activities. Performs corruption-related activities ad hoc, such as research, reports, and blogs.
## International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) Standing Committee

**Objective:**
Generally - “The world’s largest business organization working to promote international trade, responsible business conduct, and a global approach to regulation” (source)
Anti-Corruption – “ICC is committed to an efficiently functioning global economy characterized by free and fair competition.” (source)

**Membership and Geographical Focus:**
Membership: Many, many members from across the globe18 National Committees in Asia/Pacific. A sampling of businesses that attended a plenary meeting (45-49  source)
Focus: Everywhere

**Funding:**
Unable to find annual report or financial reports on ICC website. Would likely be membership dues and consulting revenue. The national committees, however, have reports.

**Main Activities and Output:**
Activities:
1) Private sector anti-corruption training and self-regulation
2) The development of ethics, anti-corruption and corporate responsibility advocacy codes and guidelines
3) Particular focus on SMEs

Outputs:
Publications, ethics guidelines, ICC rules, handbooks, online tools

**Assessment of Duplication:**
Low Duplication:
It’s member base is business and chambers of commerce, while ADB/OECD is governments. Additionally, partnerships are likely to be lower involvement, more voluntary. Actors in Asia and Pacific could come to ICC for additional resources, guidelines, trainings etc. However, the services ICC provides fall squarely into Pillar 2 of the Action Plan (4), particularly in regard to corporate responsibility and accountability. Thus, these resources could be drawn on instead created anew (I don’t know if the ADB/OECD initiative has done here).

## B20 Collective Action Hub

**Objective:**
“To assist companies and other concerned stakeholders in enhancing their ability to reduce the risk of corruption” (source)

**Membership and Geographical Focus:**
Membership: With whomever the 34 Initiatives have been implemented in Asia-Pacific
Focus: Everywhere

**Funding:**
Source:
Siemens Integrity Initiative and Basel Institute core funding

**Main Activities and Output:**
Activities:
1) “Facilitates collective action initiatives
2) Builds knowledge
3) Facilitates policy dialogue and peer learning

*Outputs:*
Recommendations at B20 summits which coincide with G20 summits

*Assessment of Duplication:*
Low Duplication:
Only Overlap would be as another source and impetus for anti-corruption in the private sector

Other Groups of Potential Interest

1. **G20 Anti-Corruption Working Group**
2. **World Economic Forum’s Partnering Against Corruption Initiative (PACI)**

7th Regional Anti-Corruption Conference for Asia and the Pacific (India, 2011).
Theme of the conference was: *establishing and implementing in Asia-Pacific some of the main features of an effective multidisciplinary anti-corruption framework: 1) international co-operation in multijurisdictional corruption investigations; 2) measures to prevent and detect corruption in public procurement; 3) corporate compliance, internal controls and ethics measures to fight corruption; and 4) strong citizen contributions to these frameworks.*

President of India welcomed delegates from the 28 member countries as well as experts from international organizations, businesses associations, civil society, and multilateral and donor organizations. Members of the ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative agreed to do the following:

- Overcome challenges to international cooperation on corruption cases by sharing information and evidence with each other by using new and creative methods
- Simplify public procurement contracting procedures to prevent bid-rigging and to promote fair competition;
- Promote the adoption of internal controls, ethics and compliance programs by the private sector to prevent bribery in business, including in particular safe and effective channels for employees to report wrongdoing without fear of retribution; and
- Enable civil society to play an effective watchdog role by fostering an environment in which they can thrive and by providing them with safe and accessible channel for reporting corruption.

The Following documents were posted online at: [www.oecd.org/corruption/asiapacific](http://www.oecd.org/corruption/asiapacific).

- Conference Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Actions
- Conference webpage on the website of the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions of the Government of India
- Programme
- Press release
- Conference conclusions
- Conference proceedings
- Remarks:
  - Inaugural address by H.E. Smt. Pratibha Devisingh Patil, Honourable President of India
  - Opening remarks by Shri V. Narayanasamy, Honourable Minister of State (Prime Minister's Office and Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions)
  - Welcome address by Secretary Alka Sirohi, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions
  - Opening remarks by OECD Deputy Secretary-General Richard Boucher
  - Opening remarks by ADB Vice President Xiaoyu Zhao
  - Vote of Thanks by Additional Secretary Dr. SK Sarkar, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions
  - Valedictory Address, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, Honourable Minister of Finance
- Closing remarks by Shri V. Narayanasamy, Honourable Minister of State, (Prime Minister's Office and Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions)
- Closing address by Secretary Alka Sirohi, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions
- List of participants

### 8th Regional Anti-Corruption Conference for Asia and the Pacific (Cambodia, 2014).

Thematic focus on ‘Fighting Corruption and Building Trust’. Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen welcomed participants from 20 member countries as well as experts from international organizations, business associations, civil society, and multilateral and donor organizations. The Members agreed to restore trust in government by:

- Increasing transparency in government institutions, fiscal matters, and decision-making
- Updating and modernizing anti-corruption strategies, including through the use of technology
- Encouraging companies to adopt measures to prevent and detect corruption
- Increasing prosecutions of individuals and companies that engage in corruption
- Enhancing the right to information, media freedoms and monitoring by civil society

The UNDP/UNODC Workshop discussed a groundbreaking Global Financial Integrity report on illicit financial flows in the Asia-Pacific. Participants called for accelerating efforts in the region to prevent illicit financial flows by:

- Undertaking in-country consultation with different stakeholders to raise awareness about the importance of illicit financial flows
- Conducting more thorough studies of illicit financial flows in individual countries in the region
- Fostering consensus in the region by organizing a high-level regional meeting whose conclusions could feed into the UN’s Post-2015 discussions
- Engage relevant regional and/or sub-regional bodies to ensure policy coherence

The following documents were posted on line: [www.oecd.org/corruption/asiapacific](http://www.oecd.org/corruption/asiapacific).

**Agenda**
- Conference Conclusions
- List of Participants
- Conference Proceedings

### 9th Regional Anti-Corruption Conference for Asia and the Pacific (South Korea, 2017)

Focused on the theme, “Nurturing an Anti-Corruption Culture in the Asia-Pacific Region”. 29 members participated. It was attended by over 100 government leaders and delegates from anticorruption agencies, supreme audit authorities, planning agencies, as well as representatives of private sector and civil society.

The High-Level Panel participants reflected on achievements and challenges in promoting anti-corruption and integrity, and discussed future policy priorities for the Asia and Pacific region. The inaugural meeting of Public Integrity Network (PIN) discussed how
anticorruption strategies can contribute to national development outcomes and to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The following documents are posted online:

**Agenda**

**List of Participants**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Confiscation and Asset Recovery: Challenges in Practice, Claire Daams, Monfrini Bitton Klein Swiss Litigators**

**Confiscation and Asset Recovery: Civil Lawsuits and Insolvency Tools, Claire Daams, Monfrini Bitton Klein Swiss Litigators**

**Asset Recovery: The Malaysian Anti-Corruption Commission Efforts, Siti Zakiah Binti Che Man, MACC**

**Confiscation of Instrumentalities and Proceeds of Corruption Crimes, Vitaly Kasko, ExCo Member of International Association of Prosecutors**

**Asset Forfeiture and Financial Investigations in Corruption Offences, National Anti-Corruption Directorate, Romania**

**ADB-OECD Asia-Pacific Anti-Corruption Initiative Law Enforcement Network: Future Activities, Olga Savran, OECD**

**Case Study on Corruption-related Investigations: Asset repatriation by Governments, Christian Schierholt, Prosecutor General’s Office Celle, Germany**

Note: Guidelines for country reporting at SG effective 2013 are: written self-report biennially using a standard template. Members will be divided into two groups according to the alphabetical order of their names. Each group will be requested to provide a written self-report prior to every second Steering Group Meeting. The written reports will be consolidated and published by the Secretariat. This Annex records whether all 31 countries in the initiative submitted written reports and if not which ones were missing during the 2011-2016 period (see the table) and the 3-year period (2014-2016). The bolded countries are those that didn’t submit, but attended the meeting.

a. 2014:
   i. **Submitted** (15) - 48%
   ii. **Not-submitted** (16): Afghanistan, Australia, Cambodia, PR China, Cook Islands, Fiji Islands, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu
   iii. **Attended** (20): Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Hong Kong China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Macao China, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor Leste, Vietnam

b. 2015:
   i. **Submitted** (16) – 52%
   ii. **Not-submitted** (15): Afghanistan, Cambodia, Cook Islands, Fiji Islands, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Nepal, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu
   iii. **Attended** (20): Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, PR China, Hongkong China, India, Japan, Korea, Kyrgyz Republic, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste, Thailand, Vietnam

c. 2016
   i. **Submitted** (20) – 65%
   ii. **Not-submitted** (11): Afghanistan, Fiji Islands, Japan, India, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu
   iii. **Attended** (23): Australia; Bangladesh; Bhutan; Cambodia; People’s Republic of China; Cook Islands; Fiji; Hong Kong, China; Indonesia; Japan; Republic of Korea; Kyrgyz Republic; Macao, China; Malaysia; Mongolia; Nepal; Pakistan; Philippines; Singapore; Sri Lanka; Timor-Leste; Thailand; and Viet Nam.
   iv. Absent (8): Afghanistan; India; Kazakhstan; Papua New Guinea; Palau; Samoa; Solomon Islands; and Vanuatu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table: Submission of Country Reports by Member Countries, 2011-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bhutan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People’s Republic of China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cook Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fiji Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hong Kong, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Republic of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Kyrgyz Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Macao, China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Timor-Leste, Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Vietnam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Member Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>China, PR</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hong Kong, China</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Macau, China</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No. of member countries**

| 28 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 |

**Notes:**

- 6 Countries that never submitted country reports from 2011-2016
- 9 Countries that submitted all country reports from 2011-2016

Written country reporting was discontinued in 2017

Source: Secretariat
Annex 11: Summary of Regional Capacity Building Seminars

11th Seminar on Tracing Illicit Flows and Asset Recovery of the Proceeds of Corruption in Asia and the Pacific. (2012)

*Topic Selection* was suggested by Bangladesh, Thailand and Pakistan and approved at the 16th SG meeting on 27th September 2011.

*Content and Relevance.* Focus was on: (i) identifying key elements for designing and implementing effective asset disclosure systems; (ii) new developments on illicit flows and recovery of the proceeds of corruption. Self-assessment was that the seminar led to a better understanding of the limitations and potentials of the various asset disclosure measures and illicit flow management and recovery. Topics were of high relevance to the anti-corruption agenda and member interests as well as UNCAC. A review of agenda shows that speakers and cases were sourced from region and outside.

*Participation.* 25 SG and 6 AG members. 6 members included representatives of organizations other than ACA members. Other stakeholders who participated included ABA, UNODC, US Government, Griffith University, APGL, FBI, World Bank and OECD.

*Action Learning and Knowledge sharing.* No evidence on how the countries practiced Action Learning. Conclusions on the website but not the presentations.

*Follow-up-Action learning and reporting.* The Press Release following the Seminar stated that the members agreed to several measures including: (a) Establishing effective and comprehensive asset disclosure systems to manage conflict of interest and illicit enrichment of public officials, including those who administer public funds; (b) Streamlining administrative and legal processes with new technology to support effective verification and/or review of disclosures; (c) Sanctioning those who make false or incomplete declarations to strengthen the credibility of asset disclosure systems and the accountability of declarants; (d) Ensuring adequate expertise and resources to trace new methods of hiding the proceeds of corruption; and (e) Strengthening information-sharing in investigations nationally and internationally. No evidence. There was country reporting at the next SG meeting (2013) where 17 members presented overall country reports [but not specific on seminar].

12th Seminar on Whistleblower Protection and Strengthening Anti-Corruption Agencies (2013)

*Topic Selection:* The 17 SG meeting in October 2012 decided that the 12th Regional Seminar should focus on TA to SG members on issues related to UNCAC implementation and specific issues should be decided on basis of a survey of members.

*Content and Relevance.* Focus was on: (a) an overview of the main features of an effective mechanism to promote whistleblowing and to protect whistleblowers; and (b) how ACAs can be strengthened. Findings of a 2013 APEC workshop on this topic were shared for the benefit of non-APEC members of the Initiative. Topics were of high relevance to the anti-corruption agenda, UNCAC and member interests. A review of agenda shows that speakers were sourced from region and outside and presented cases studies and international practices.

*Participation.* 27 SG and 4 AG members (GIZ, World Bank, UNODC, TI). 1 member included representative of organizations other than ACA members. Other stakeholders who participated included UNODC, US Government, World Bank and OECD.
Action Learning and Knowledge sharing. No evidence on how the countries practiced Action Learning. Conclusions and the presentations on the website. Satisfactory.

Follow-up-Action learning and reporting Outcome (press release): The 27 of the 31 Members of the ADB/OECD Initiative in attendance agreed to strengthen anti-corruption agencies by: (a) strengthening the actual independence of anti-corruption authorities, (b) securing the support of civil society, media, private sector and key government agencies; (c) encouraging whistleblowing as a key tool to detect and deter corruption; (d) providing clear and accessible channels for reporting corruption, and (e) protecting whistleblowers from reprisals. 11 out of 31 members provided reports at 2014 SG on knowledge sharing activities following the 12th Seminar. The Secretariat published them on the website. Satisfactory.


Topic Selection was done through a survey conducted by the Secretariat among members of the Initiative. The 2 topics of the 2015 Seminar were based on the 2 most ranked topics in the survey.

Participation. 20 SG and 4 AG members (ABA, GIZ, TI, and UNDP). 5 members included representatives of organizations other than ACA members. More than a dozen other participants came from organizations such as U-4, Italy, Romania, Indonesia, ADB departments, DFID, G-Watch (CSO), OECD and UNDP. The Regional Seminar was delivered with financial support from the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and in collaboration with Transparency International.

Relevance. Focus was on the constraints, challenges and strategies to tackle corruption in development projects. Experiences were shared on how to safeguard projects so that implementation is not derailed by corruption and that funds reach intended beneficiaries. A review of agenda shows that speakers and cases were sourced from region and outside. The seminar topic and presentations were of high relevance to the anti-corruption agenda and member interests.

Knowledge sharing. Presentations at the Seminar at the website but, unlike previous Seminars, there is no press statement and no conclusions summary.


14th Seminar on Development with Values: Social Fence against Corruption” (November 2016)

Topic Selection. Topic was proposed by the host, the Anti-Corruption Commission of Bhutan in consultation with the Secretariat and the members. Bhutan hosted the Seminar. The Government of Federal Republic of Germany, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation and UNDP supported the Seminar and the concurrent LEN meeting.

Participation. List of Participants indicates that 23 out of 31 SG members attended. 6 AG member organizations were represented and included: American Bar Association, Rule of Law Initiative/Asia Division (ABA-ROLI); Asia Pacific Group on Money Laundering (APGML); German Development Corporation (GIZ); Transparency International (TI); United Nations Development Program (UNDP); and The World Bank. 5 members included representatives of
organizations other than ACA members + other stakeholders came from Thailand, Singapore, Bangladesh, France, and Papua New Guinea.

Relevance. The seminar focused on two topics: (I.) Anti-Corruption Agency Strengthening Initiative, and (II.) Improving Integrity and Coordination among Law Enforcement Agencies. The topics were discussed in five sessions, chaired and discussed by experts from Asia and the Pacific, and beyond. Assessment tools developed by TI and GIZ were applied to country cases and results discussed. Role of multi-stakeholder partnership and social accountability initiatives in fight against corruption were discussed and ACAs encouraged to seek partnerships as no one agency can curb corruption. Participants exchanged views on trends, challenges and lessons in enhancing judicial integrity using Bhutan’s Judicial Integrity Scan report, Nepal’s Integrity Self-Assessment and Integrity and Accountability assessments of Police in Romania, Georgia and Ukraine as case studies. Topics were of high relevance to UNCAC implementation, the anti-corruption agenda and member interests as well as UNCAC. A review of agenda shows that speakers and cases were sourced from region and outside.

Knowledge sharing. A seminar report covering the proceedings was prepared and posted on the website. However, the presentations were not posted on the website limiting the usefulness and impact.

Follow-up-Action learning and reporting. No conclusions and/or action commitments were outlined. There was no press release. There is no record of any action learning reporting at the 2017 SG meeting.
Corporate measures to prevent and detect corruption (2014).

- **Topic selection**: The 15th SG Meeting in 2010 decided to launch this Thematic Review. After some delays due to selection of appropriate consultant, the 17th Steering Group meeting in 2012 agreed that the Thematic Review should commence in 2013 and be completed by 2014. It was completed in September 2014 and report adopted by the SG in September 2014.

- **Coverage**: The Review deals with implementation of the articles on private sector-related corruption contained in the UN Convention against Corruption (art.12) and the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention (art.8). This review covers all 31 member countries of the Initiative.

- **Participation**: The Secretariat sent detailed questionnaires to government officials in all 31 member countries and about half responded.

- **Administration**: Prepared by consultant engaged and by the Secretariat.

- **Follow-up**: Two years after the completion of a Thematic Review, members are asked to report the steps that have been taken to implement the Review’s recommendations. Thereafter, in their periodic self-reports, members are expected to discuss any further steps taken to implement the recommendations.

Mutual Legal Assistance (MLA) in Asia and the Pacific (2017)

- **Topic Selection**: Participants in the 2015 pilot meeting of LEN agreed to conduct a brief study on common barriers to MLA among Network members and best practices used to overcome these barriers. This study builds upon the 2007 thematic review, as well as work by similar international initiatives (see OECD 2012; OECD ACN 2016). This report is the result of that effort. The topic of MLA and a draft version of this report were discussed during the Network’s November 2016 meeting. Based on feedback obtained during these discussions, as well as additional inputs from Initiative members, the study was finalized in January 2017.

- **Coverage**: This report outlines common barriers to MLA among the 31 member jurisdictions of the ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and the Pacific, and describes best practices used to overcome these barriers. UNCAC requires state parties to provide the “widest measure” of mutual legal assistance (MLA) to each other and includes a list of specific forms of MLA included in this mandate. MLA is therefore of high relevance and of high interest to all members. This review builds on the 2007 thematic review on the same topic.

- **Participation**: In preparation for the study, the secretariat of the ADB/OECD Initiative engaged in initial research and prepared a questionnaire (with input from the OECD Anti-Corruption Division). The questionnaire was sent to the 31 Initiative members in July 2016, with a request that they also provide updates to the information about their legal and procedural backgrounds that was published as part of the 2007 report. Eighteen jurisdictions submitted responses to the questionnaire.

- **Administration**: This study was funded by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (German Development Corporation) (GIZ) in the framework of the global program “Combatting Illicit Financial Flows.” On the basis of these responses, along with additional desk research, Ms. Melanie Reed (ADB/OECD Initiative consultant) prepared this report under the direction and coordination of the ADB/OECD Initiative secretariat.

- *Follow-up.* Not yet due.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Meeting Details</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Content Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16th SG Meeting (Delhi, India 2011)</td>
<td>21 members, 8 AG members, 3 observers</td>
<td>Activities for 2011 Q4 and 2012 agreed to conduct a thematic review on corporate compliance, and work with APEC on matters of mutual interest. 2012-2014 work program discussed and approved. 8 SG + 4 AG members made presentations on specific issues and activities. 16 Written reports compiled and circulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17th SG Meeting (Hanoi, Vietnam 2012)</td>
<td>26 members, 6 AG members, 2 observers</td>
<td>13 countries presented reports on what they did to implement the 2010 Thematic Review (criminalization of bribery) recommendations. Revised Country Reporting Template was discussed and approved. 2013 work program discussed and approved. Bhutan committed to do voluntary scoping exercise. 10 SG + 5 AG members + 2 observers made presentations on specific issues and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18th SG Meeting (Dili, Timor-Leste, 2013)</td>
<td>26 members + 3 AG members</td>
<td>Afghanistan became a member. 2010 Strategy was reviewed and updated. 17 countries submitted country reports. 9 SG + 3 AG members made presentations on specific issues and activities. It was decided that the topic(s) for the next SG meeting and Regional Conference would be decided by polling the member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19th SG Meeting (Phnom Penh, Cambodia, 2014)</td>
<td>21 members + 6 AG members, 3 observers</td>
<td>Thematic review report on corporate compliance reviewed. OECD Integrity Scans will be piloted as country scoping exercise. GIZ and SADB will fund the pilot. Several countries showed interest. 2015-2017 Strategy and Work Program reviewed and approved. 4 SG + 4 AG members made presentations on specific issues and activities. In addition, 5 SG members made “Lightening Talks”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20th SG Meeting (Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia, 2015)</td>
<td>19 members + 4 AG members, 1 observer</td>
<td>1 observer. Representatives of media, private sector, and CSOs from Mongolia were invited to a consultation event. The discussion covered topics such as the particular challenges in corruption facing Asia-Pacific, and the role that the private sector, civil society and the media should play in preventing and fighting corruption in Asia-Pacific.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
specific issues and activities. *Knowledge Sharing* – Agenda, List of Participants, Minutes, and Compilation of 16 country Written Reports.

### 6 21st SG Meeting (Thimphu, Bhutan, 2016)

*Attendance* - 23 members + 6 AG members. 1 observer. Representatives of media, private sector, and CSOs from Mongolia were invited to a consultation event. The discussion covered topics such as the particular challenges in corruption facing Asia-Pacific, and the role that the private sector, civil society and the media should play in preventing and fighting corruption in Asia-Pacific. *Content* - OECD report on “Anti-Corruption Reforms in Eastern Europe and Central Asia: Progress and Challenges, 2013-2016” shared. Country scoping outputs/reports shared by Indonesia, Thailand and Kazakhstan. Progress of 2015-2017 Strategy and Work Program reviewed. A Discussion paper on proposed 2018-2020 work program presented and included proposals that the Initiative focus on two work streams (prevention and law enforcement); set longer-term, multi-year, strategic priorities; undertake activities between annual meetings where possible; enhance its use of research; and form stronger partnerships with other bodies. The meeting indicated general support for the proposals. The chair of the session encouraged participants to actively contribute to the discussions and provide inputs to the draft paper. Participants were also encouraged to send their inputs after the meeting. The Secretariat will circulate a revised version of the paper, for further review and discussion. 10 SG + 5 AG members made presentations on specific issues and activities. *Knowledge Sharing* – Agenda, List of Participants, Minutes, and Compilation of 16 country Written Reports.

### 7 22nd SG Meeting (Seoul, South Korea, 2017)

*Attendance* - 29 SG and 4 AG members + 7 observers attended. SG meeting discussed proposed 2018-2020 work program decided on a number of substantive changes. Format and focus of this SG was significantly different than the 16th to 21st SGs summarized below. Key differences were:

- Country reporting by 4 governments was combined with non-governmental perspectives from 5 countries using a multi-stakeholder High Level Panel format.
- Substantive work of the Initiative was conducted in the concurrent meeting of PIN and LEN following the decisions made by SG.
- Written Reports from Countries and AG member presentations were replaced by the presentations at the PIN and LEN meetings.
- Summary of proceedings of LEN and PIN were reported to SG and included in the minutes.
- Some of the presentations (not all) at LEN and PIN meetings were posted online.
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The LEN, PIN and BI work should continue during 2018-2020 period and will include seminars for practitioners and knowledge products such as thematic studies. The seminars for practitioners can be organized back-to-back with the annual meetings of the Initiative, but they may also be held in between the meetings, if resources allow. Business Integrity is a new feature for the Initiative. The Work Program therefore envisages exploratory work such as benchmarking or mapping study of the ongoing business integrity initiatives in the region.

The Asia-Pacific Law Enforcement Network in Corruption Cases (LEN).

- **Purpose and background:** (i) create a forum in which law enforcement officials (both investigating and prosecuting officials) can discuss enforcement-related topics in corruption cases, with a focus on practical challenges and best practices; and (ii) facilitate international cooperation among participating jurisdictions by creating opportunities for officials to build relationships and discuss specific cases. Launched in 2015 at the 20th SG meeting in Mongolia; first regular meeting in November 2016 (supported by Germany) and second meeting in November 2017 (supported by Germany, SIDA and UNDP).

- **Activities.** The 2016 meeting considered the thematic study on mutual legal assistance, and discussed real life case studies and small group exercises on hypothetical cases. Presentations were made by expert speakers from the region and beyond. The 2017 LEN Meeting focused on Confiscation of Proceeds of Corruption and Asset Recovery. The meeting discussed several case studies on confiscation that were shared by law-enforcement practitioners from the Asia-Pacific region (China, Korea, Malaysia and Australia), and from other regions (Switzerland, Ukraine, Germany, Romania). Participants also worked in groups on a hypothetical case, and learned about the updated MLA tool prepared by the UNODC. LEN participants discussed the main takeaways and themes for future meetings on the LEN, and agreed on the following:
  - LEN provides an effective framework for mutual leaning about law-enforcement good practices and building professional network and trust.
  - LEN for Asia-Pacific will need to develop a standing list of contact points of investigators, prosecutors and officers in charge of MLA that can be regularly updated and shared in a secure manner among the countries.
  - International cooperation in complex trans-border cases should be the main overall theme for the LEN, while individual meetings and studies can focus on more specific issues such as “repatriation of fugitive and stolen assets from overseas”, as suggested by China, cooperation with anti-money-laundering prevention and national taxation agencies in detection and investigation of corruption crimes, independence of prosecutors and other issues that are important for the region.
  - Secretariat to seek ways to cooperate with APEC ACT- NET, UNODC and other international and regional bodies working on combatting corruption through law enforcement.
  - China and Australia indicated their potential interest to host the next LEN meeting.
Public Integrity Network (PIN).

- **Purpose and background.** Practitioners from anti-corruption and other institutions from the region learn from each other about effective methods of developing and monitoring anti-corruption and integrity policies. Launched at the 9th Regional Anti-Corruption Conference in 2017 South Korea.

- **Activities.** The first (inaugural) meeting of PIN in 2017 brought together heads and officials of anti-corruption agencies, representatives from audit organizations and civil society from the Asia-Pacific region leaders to exchange experiences and good practices on the following issues:
  
  - Mainstreaming anti-corruption strategies into the national development agenda and the SDGs
  - Building alliance and fostering a whole-of-society approach in anti-corruption and integrity policies
  - Effective measures to promote an anti-corruption and integrity culture in selected sectors

Participants expressed strong interests in undertaking future research on the topics of anti-corruption strategy, code of conduct for public officials, conflict of interest, property reports, and education. It was agreed that the future PIN meetings will be conducted in roundtable to encourage a more intimate and efficient discussion among the participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Secretariat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Particulars</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host country expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB contributions (USD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff time and salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logistical arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Members’ contributions as resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Speakers, Facilitators/Chairs</th>
<th>MACC Malaysia</th>
<th>ACC Bhutan</th>
<th>UNODC</th>
<th>UNODC</th>
<th>GIZ Germany</th>
<th>Ombudsman Philippines</th>
<th>Ti</th>
<th>GIV Vietnam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC Bhutan</td>
<td>ABA Asia</td>
<td>Ombudsman Cook Islands</td>
<td>ACRC Korea</td>
<td>ICAC Hong Kong</td>
<td>KPK Indonesia</td>
<td>ICAC Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPB Singapore</td>
<td>MACC Malaysia</td>
<td>ACRC Korea</td>
<td>NAB Pakistan</td>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>APGML</td>
<td>MOS PR China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA Japan</td>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>MACC Malaysia</td>
<td>MACC Malaysia</td>
<td>ICAC Hong Kong</td>
<td>ACC Bhutan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>APGML</td>
<td>MFA Japan</td>
<td>KPK Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICAC Hong Kong</td>
<td>Ombudsman Philippines</td>
<td>Cabinet Div Bangladesh</td>
<td>TI</td>
<td>OPM Solomon Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPK Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICAC Hong Kong</td>
<td>TI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td>CPIB Singapore</td>
<td>KPK Indonesia</td>
<td>ACRC Korea</td>
<td>MOS PR China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>CPIB Singapore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIABOC Sri Lanka</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC Macao, China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC Macao, China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIZ Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Evaluation of the Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and the Pacific (2018)