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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and Pacific (the Initiative) is a regional forum for supporting national and multilateral efforts to address and reduce corruption in Asia and the Pacific. It was launched in 1999. In 2010, following an Independent Review, it set effective implementation of United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) as the first of its six guiding principles. The Initiative has 31 member countries from Asia and Pacific who set its three-year work programs. The implementation structure consists of a Steering Group (SG), an Advisory Group (AG), and a Secretariat. The SG comprising one Focal Point person from each member country meets annually to conduct substantive and administrative business. An Advisory Group (AG), comprising representatives from the private sector, civil society, donors, and international organizations, provides multi-stakeholder perspectives and expertise. Core operational activities of the Initiative include regional conferences (every three years), annual regional capacity building seminars and SG meetings, and on-demand thematic policy reviews. Part time staff from ADB and OECD, the Secretariat, provide organizational support.

This evaluation aims to assess the efficacy and relevance of the Initiative support to anti-corruption activities in the Asia-Pacific region and at the country level between 2011 and 2017 and make recommendations for sustaining and enhancing the benefits of the Initiative and improving its implementation and monitoring and evaluation. The evaluation was carried out during July-October 2018. It is based on a desk review of documentation related to the Initiative, survey of SG and AG members and interviews of Secretariat staff and selected stakeholders. The interviews were especially valuable as they provided an opportunity to add depth and context to the analysis of survey responses. 60% of members (21 out of 31) and 83% of advisers (5 out of 6) responded to the survey. Survey responses were limited to one response per country in order to ensure that each member country’s response received equal weight. There was no provision for country visits for face-to-face interaction.

Findings

Overall the evaluation found that the Initiative is relevant to the anti-corruption priorities of the member countries as well as regional and global anti-corruption efforts. It is effective in meeting member expectations and members would like more support from the Initiative particularly in their efforts to implement anti-corruption targets in the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) number 16. They are keen to have more demand driven technical assistance and capacity building activities in between the annual events.

The evaluation, the members and the advisers all agree that the Initiative complements rather than duplicates other anti-corruption initiatives and networks.

Members associate several legislative and policy changes in their country with the Initiative. However, attribution is hard to establish. The evaluation found that the Initiative lacks a results framework with performance indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Guiding Principles for the Anti-Corruption Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support UNCAC implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Serve as a regional network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support learning with action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accommodate diversity of members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enhance member ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Avoid duplication with other initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1
All 2016-2017 activities and outputs were considered relevant and effective by the members, AG members and the evaluation. Members would like the regional conferences, capacity building seminars and thematic policy reviews to continue. Country self-reporting is seen by many members to add value but up to one in three members did not submit a written report during the period under evaluation. Member engagement in this area as well as in other ways needs improvement since some members have been passive.

The implementation arrangements have been effective but need strengthening to respond to growing importance of the anti-corruption agenda in the region, rising member’s needs, to improve impact, and to improve communications. The Initiative’s expenses are modest when compared with other anti-corruption projects and provide good value for money as well as substantial leverage opportunities for incremental funding by the present and future donors. The 2018-2020 Work Program remains appropriate but needs enhancements to respond to the changing anti-corruption landscape and member demands for more and better support as expressed during the members survey and interviews conducted during this evaluation.

Recommendations

These findings have led to the following nine recommendations:

1. The Initiative should continue with enhancements.
2. The Initiative should reach out to other anti-corruption networks to establish partnerships for mutual benefit.
3. A results framework with input, output, outcome and impact indicators should be developed by the Secretariat and made a part of the 2018-2020 work program following SG approval.
4. Regional conferences, capacity building training and thematic policy review activities should be continued. Demand driven and interactive learning activities in-between the annual events should be introduced.
5. Commission a review of cost and benefits of country self-reporting and whether it should be continued as is or with modifications.
6. A pro-active effort should be launched to activate relatively passive member’s participation as well as all members participation to a higher level. To accomplish this, a customized outreach should be made by the Secretariat to each member as outlined in the Recommendation 6. More specific actions would emerge from dialogue with members.
7. The Initiative should be supported by a full-time secretariat with adequate staffing to provide more substantive support for the activities, to enhance responsiveness to member needs, and intensify communications. Implementation of this recommendation will make a big difference in dialogue with members and taking actions to increase members ownership of the Initiative.
8. A moderate increase in funding for the Initiative is recommended to better serve member needs and enhance impact. A targeted fundraising initiative should be
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9. Stay on-course to implement the 2018-2020 work program and consider enhancements along the evaluation recommendations.

These findings and recommendations are elaborated in the table below and described in detail in the attached report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finding 1: Relevance of the Initiative is grounded in its strategic objective of helping members implement the UNCAC.</strong> This objective was adopted in 2010 following the 2009 Independent Review. Establishment of the Law Enforcement Network in 2015 and Public Integrity Network in 2017 were appropriate and enhanced relevance as they allow more focused capacity building and mutual support. The members described the following benefits: it is the only network for anti-corruption agencies in the region; has built a sense of community; strengthening of knowledge and capacity for agency staff; exposure to practices of other member countries; and sharing experiences. The Advisers and sponsors (ADB, UNDP and OECD) agreed with these and saw the initiative as a good platform for bringing together important players in fighting corruption in the region and exposing them to new ideas and peer learning. They perceive the Initiative as an efficient outreach mechanism. For the ADB, the Initiative is an effective activity for fulfilling its mandate to promote regional cooperation and partnerships.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation 1. The Initiative should continue with enhancements.</strong> Members and advisers interviewed during the evaluation were unanimous in stating that it should continue. The evaluation finds that the Initiative is relevant to the needs of the members as well as the universal anti-corruption agenda embodied in UNCAC, SDG 16, and priorities of key sponsors (ADB, OECD, GIZ and UNDP). It has been effective in meeting member expectations. A number of suggestions for enhancing the Initiative have been made by the members (MQ26) and should be considered going forward:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The Initiative should remain an effective regional platform for sharing best practices, mutual cooperation and collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Assist members with their work on SDG 16 anti-corruption targets for reducing bribery and corruption, reducing illicit financial flows and enhancing accountability of institutions. Many of the members responding to the survey (MQ18) would like the Initiative’s help in these areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finding 2: Initiative was effective in meeting member needs/expectations but members would like more support. More than 90% of the 21 out of 31 members responding to the survey said that the Initiative is meeting their expectations of: (a) capacity building and peer learning; (b) enhancing regional cooperation through mutual support; (c) assisting them to implement UNCAC and contribute to national anti-corruption frameworks; and (d) serving as a regional knowledge and learning network. 

- Host tailor-made workshops most relevant to member needs (such as prevention, investigation, legislative issues) and increased sharing of best practice cases and cooperation.
- Provide customized technical support to individual or a small group of members upon request
- Emphasize the need for members to share technical know-how and human resources as corruption is becoming more and more trans-national
- Greater use of the Initiative as a platform for anticorruption agencies to discuss specific challenges facing them and devise strategies.

Finding 3: The Initiative is highly valued as the only peer learning network for anti-corruption agencies in the region. It complements rather than duplicates other anti-corruption initiatives in the region. The evaluation reviewed 11 anti-corruption initiatives that operate in the region and asked whether they are members in one or more of them and extent to which this results in duplication. Survey responses indicate that all respondents have signed UNCAC and several are members in 1 or 2 other networks (MQ16 and 17), particularly those pertaining to APEC and/or ASEAN. Members from central Asia are members of the Anti-Corruption Network-Eastern Europe and Central Asia also. 66% of members responded that their participation in other forums ‘Complements’ the membership in the Initiative. Advisers had similar views (AQ14) with many stating that the Initiative is somewhat complementary or as a neither complementing or duplicating.

Recommendation 2. The Initiative should reach out to other anti-corruption networks to establish partnerships for mutual benefit. Prima facie the following initiatives appear promising:

- Anti-corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia
- International Corruption Hunters Alliance (World Bank)
- Anti-corruption and Transparency Task Force of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)
- The Asia-Pacific Group on Money Laundering (APGML)
- Asia and Pacific Regional Program of Transparency International
- International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) standing committee
- World Economic Forum’s Partnering Against Corruption Initiative (PACI)

Finding 4: Members associate several results in their country with the Initiative. However, attribution for many of the results is hard to establish.

1. Impact on legislative and policy changes. During the survey members were asked about the most significant laws, regulations, institutional reforms, policies and practices that

Recommendation 3: A results framework with input, output, outcome and impact indicators should be developed by the Secretariat and made a part of the 2018-2020 work program following SG approval. The main objectives of the Initiative are related to helping with the implementation of UNCAC through activities related to networking, peer learning, mutual support, capacity building and
their country/agency has adopted as a result of membership in the Initiative and what impact they have had. 81% replied 'Adopted Some or Many', and 19% 'Not at All' (MQ5). Members listed more than a dozen examples of legislative and policy changes that they associate with the Initiative however attribution is hard to establish given the multitude of players and processes involved in such changes.

2. Impact on Anti-corruption policies and programs. 95% of the members replied positively to the question as to the extent to which the Initiative is contributing to the country’s anti-corruption policies and programs.

3. Impact on regional co-operation. (MQ8). 96% of members responding to the survey said that the Initiative enabled them to increase discussion with other members. This impact can be directly associated with the Initiative.

Finding 5: The Initiative lacks a results framework with performance indicators. The 2012-2020 Work Programs do not include a results framework with specific indicators to measure performance and outcomes of activities included although the 2009 Independent Review had recommended that such a performance matrix should be set up. The country self-reporting template asks members (Section E) to indicate how the knowledge products and lessons learned in capacity building seminars were used and shared in their respective countries. A review of a sample of such reports indicates mention of some sharing activities but no information on use of knowledge. There is no synthesis of what the countries reported.

Finding 6: All 2012-2017 activities and outputs were considered effective by the members and advisers and there is widespread demand among members for more. Majority of members surveyed rated key outputs as effective (MQ12). Steering Group meetings were considered most effective by members followed by, in descending order, regional conferences, capacity building seminars, country self-reporting, annual newsletters and thematic policy reviews. Several members commented in the survey that the exchange of expertise activities. Main outputs are: Regional conferences; capacity building workshops; and thematic studies. These are done with a modest budget. It is recommended that the Steering Group discuss what changes (results) the group wants to achieve. The results framework needs to be realistic in specifying the impact from the limited set of periodic activities under the Initiative. Focus should be on what differences the Initiative can make rather than performance of the anti-corruption agencies itself. Establishing performance indicators that meet the SMART* criteria and can be reported by the members with minimal transaction costs should be the goal. Part E of the current country self-reporting format could be the starting point for development of this framework.

*SMART = Specific; Measurable; Actionable; Realistic; and Time-bound.

Recommendation 4: Continue regional conferences, capacity building training and thematic policy review activities and introduce more demand driven and interactive policy review activities in between the annual events. Highlights from the responses are:

- Regional conferences/seminars as platform for practitioners to exchange strategies and experiences (11 mentions)
activities have been very helpful in their work. Member interviews suggest that some members: (a) find the duration of capacity building events too short; and, (b) would like capacity building programs to be more interactive by using role playing, case studies and hypothetical problem. The survey included a question (MQ28) on what anti-corruption activities and knowledge products under the Initiative would be most useful? Highlights of their responses are summarized in the Recommendation column and are indicative of the demand. Overall, the survey responses indicate that members found the activities useful, want more of them and have suggestions for making them more useful for them.

Finding 7: Country self-reporting adds value but has been erratic and discontinued in 2017. It was meant to promote peer learning, discussion of issues and challenges common to number of members, enable trend analysis, and reporting on domestic use of the Initiative’s knowledge products and events. The members were required to submit a report every two years. The Secretariat compiled the reports and published them on-line. There is no synthesis of trends, common issues, and impact of the initiative on anti-corruption efforts by members. During the period 2011-2014, 6 countries never submitted country reports and during 2014-2016 this number increased to 10 (one out of three members). At the same time, 9 countries have submitted country report each year during 2011-2016. In 2017, country reporting was discontinued. However, 89% of members surveyed found (MQ12) the country reports to be effective (42% Very Effective and 47% Somewhat Effective).

Recommendation 5: Commission a review of cost and benefits of country self-reporting and whether it should be continued as is or with modifications. The country self-reports are valuable for peer learning, identifying common issues and impact analysis. Most members surveyed consider them useful. Several members mentioned them in their suggestions to improve the Initiative. Thus, there is merit in restoring them. However, compliance has deteriorated, they consume member time to prepare and they need to be reviewed and synthesized for optimizing value added. More resources would need to be allocated for this purpose. On balance, we are of the view that:

- a review should be done to assess whether to restore country self-reporting as is or in a modified form;
- the Regional stocktaking report proposed in the 2018-2020 Work Program should include synthesis report on issues, trends and impact of anti-corruption activities in member countries during 2017-2019. This should be based on each member country self-reporting in the current template with modifications to include activities related to SDG16 anti-corruption targets. Its objective would be to inform the strategic priorities for future work of the Initiative.
### Finding 8: Member engagement varies and needs improvement.

Members have shown their support by hosting events almost annually since 2000 and many have made cash and in-kind contributions. Attendance at most of the events has been reasonably good (about 80%). However, many members have been passive. 10 out of 31 members did not submit written country reports during 2014-16 and response rates for periodic surveys, including the survey conducted for this evaluation, have been low (varied 50-70%). The survey asked members/advisers (MQ25) whether they are prepared to make a contribution to the Initiative and if yes, in cash or in kind. 71% of members replied ‘Not Sure’ while 29% of members replied ‘Yes’ to provide an in-kind contribution. There were no members willing to make a cash contribution. 5 Advisers responding to the survey were more forthcoming (AQ26): 1 said ‘Yes in Cash, 3 said ‘Yes in Kind, and 1 said no. The adviser support would have to be discussed institutionally, but potential is there.

### Recommendation 6: A customized outreach should be made by the Secretariat to each member to solicit their ideas for taking member’s as well as the group’s engagement in the Initiative’s activities to a higher level. A customized approach is needed because members are at different levels in terms of their engagement. Prospects for enhancing engagement are good since, as evident from Findings 2 and 3, there is a lot of goodwill among members for the Initiative. During the survey members put forward several ideas to increase members ownership and engagement that provide a starting point for a discussion on what can be done within the resources available (MQ24).

- Regular information sharing and engagement
- Events to devote more time to share experiences and best practice
- Each country to host events to share experiences
- Inter-country contact database to help sharing
- Avoid ‘another international obligation’ tag
- Members provide good examples for sharing
- More demand driven workshops and training
- Increased and regular Secretariat coordination and dissemination of information.

### Finding 9: Implementation arrangements have been effective but need strengthening to respond to changing needs.

1. **Country Focal Point** is a good system that faces the normal issue of staff turnover which adversely affects continuity. It needs improving.

2. **Steering Group (SG)** meetings were rated effective by members responding to the survey. **Advisory Group (AG)** meetings were rated effective by 95% of the members responding to the survey. The evaluation found the meetings well attended and effective in performing their core responsibilities of approving strategic directions and work programs.

### Recommendation 7: The Initiative should be supported by a full-time secretariat with adequate staffing to provide more substantive support for the activities, to enhance responsiveness to member needs, and improve communications. Priority areas for enhanced attention by a strengthened Secretariat are:

- up-to-date registry of focal points (included in the 2018-2020 Work Program) and an orientation package for new Focal Points, members and advisers
- design and implementation of results monitoring and reporting
3. **Advisers.** Overall majority of the members are of the view that the expertise of the various Advisory Group members is used Very Effectively (MQ21). 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% (MQ21). All Advisers participated in the AG meetings except the World Bank, who has not participated for the past five years. The evaluation finds that some new organizations have been established in the recent years and inviting them to be Advisers may be considered. In particular, the AIIB, NDB, IMF (due to relevance of their new policy on governance), and Asia chapter of the Transparency, Accountability and Participation for 2030 Agenda as the CSO network focused on SDG16.

4. **The Secretariat** was effective in providing all necessary and timely administrative support according to 71% of the members (MQ22) and 75% of the advisers (AQ23). The evaluation found that the current part-time staffing of the Initiative is stretched thin in coping with the current level of activities and will not be adequate for responding to growing member demands. There is a need for substantive support for events, results monitoring, and regular communications.

**Finding 10: Communications and awareness raising activities need to be improved.**

Communications about the Initiative is joint responsibility of members and the Secretariat. The members play their role through domestic activities including publicity generated at the time of the events hosted by them and are expected to report their activities in Section E of the country self-reporting template. Review of a sample of the reports indicates that some members make an effort while others do not. The Secretariat maintains an up-to-date webpage at OECD website with all key documentation. These materials are valuable knowledge products on the anti-corruption and UNCAC themes and significant public goods. A review of the website usage data indicates that during 2012-2018 the website has had 118,815 page views with the thematic reviews being most viewed. The Home, regional seminars, meetings and conferences, Action Plan, synthesis of country reporting and analysis of issues and challenges common to number of members and facilitating their discussion;

- regular communications with members;
- enhancing member relations to increase ownership and engagement;
- fundraising;
- serve as a clearing house for member requests for technical assistance by doing one or more of the following:
  - directing their request to appropriate agency e.g. U4 Anti-Corruption Center
  - circulating request among members to see whether others have similar need and/or whether some member is in a position to provide assistance on a bilateral basis
  - organize topical problem-solving and technical assistance for a small group of members needing such assistance.

During the survey, members have identified a number of topics that are a priority for them and could be the focus of small group based capacity building: asset recovery; business integrity; extradition; beneficial ownership; financial disclosure; foreign funding/influence in campaign financing; investigations capacity building; engaging civil society and media; public procurement.
Partnerships, Policy Analysis, List of Member Countries, and Publications pages account for 72% of total page views. These data illustrate the public goods value of the Initiative’s publications.

Finding 11. The Initiative expenses covered by sponsors are modest and leverage member contributions. ADB, OECD and UNDP sponsor the Initiative and provide the core funding through cash contributions that ranged $10-23,000 per year in most years during 2011-2017. In addition, they make in-kind contributions through staff time and travel for secretariat and resource speakers. Members contribute in three important ways: (i) hosting an event and covering expenses for venue, meals, equipment and airport services. The 2011-2017 events were hosted by: India; Vietnam; Timor-Leste; Cambodia; Mongolia; Bhutan; and South Korea; (ii) in-kind contributions by providing resource speakers, facilitators and case studies; and, (iii) some members and advisers paying their own travel and subsistence for participation. Although exact numbers on relative amounts contributed by the members and sponsors are not available yet it can be reasonably concluded that the small amounts of funding provided by the sponsors leverages a significant amount of member contributions.

Recommendation 8: A moderate increase in funding for the Initiative is recommended to better serve member needs and enhance impact. The members have made several suggestions for enhancing the responsiveness and impact of the Initiative as is evident from the preceding findings and recommendations. Pursuing them will require additional funding. In particular, incremental funding is needed to:

- Strengthen the Secretariat in line with Recommendation 7
- Creating a fund to provide demand-driven capacity building and technical assistance as highlighted in Recommendations 1 and 3.
- Organizing problem solving and capacity building events in-between the annual discussion. These would target smaller groups of members facing a common issue.

Finding 12. The Anti-Corruption Landscape is changed with the adoption of universal anti-corruption goals under the SDG16 and emergence of new development partners and initiatives in the fight against corruption. These include Open Government Partnership, Asian Infrastructure Development Bank, New Development Bank and rise of civil society and private philanthropy as development partners with the government for achieving the SDGs. Another noteworthy development is the research on more effective anti-corruption approaches. These developments open up prospects for the Initiative to broaden its partnerships.

Finding 13. 2018-20 Work Program made important and appropriate adjustments in response to changing landscape but there is room to do more. Survey included a question

Recommendation 9: Stay on-course to implement the 2018-2020 work program and consider enhancements along with the evaluation recommendations listed below for ready reference:

- Determine how to assist members with their work relating to SDG16 targets (Recommendation 1)
- Invite practitioners and technical experts from anti-corruption partners from the public, private and non-state sectors e.g. IMF, AIIB, NDB, TAP network, SDG Philanthropy Platform and anti-corruption initiatives (Recommendation 2).
- Develop and adopt a results framework (Recommendation 3)
on whether the program should be modified.  89% of the members did not find a need to modify (MQ15). The 2018-2020 work program is based on a strategic review of future directions for the Initiative as discussed at the 21st Steering Group meeting. The evaluation found that adjustments made and the activities proposed in the work streams for LEN and PIN networks are appropriate and well aligned with the needs expressed by the members (see Recommendation 4) and some of the recommendations of this evaluation. There is, however, more needed to realize the full potential and impact of the Initiative.

- Introduce more practical assistance through a targeted approach during and between the annual events (Recommendation 4)
- Include a trend and issues analysis based on country reports in the proposed stocktaking (Recommendation 5).
- Outreach to members to enhance engagement (Recommendation 6)
- Full-time staffing for the Secretariat (Recommendation 7 and 8)
I. INTRODUCTION

A. Overview of the Initiative

1. Objective. The Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and Pacific (the Initiative), established in 1999, is a regional forum for supporting national and multilateral efforts to address and reduce corruption in Asia and the Pacific. Its 31 members have subscribed to an Action Plan adopted in 2001. In 2010, following an Independent Review, it has put priority on effective implementation of United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) and adopted the following Strategic Principles to guide it:

   a. Supporting the Initiative’s members to implement UNCAC
   b. Regional network to address common challenges and support regional co-operation
   c. Supporting learning with action and measurable outcomes
   d. Accommodate the diversity in members and stakeholders, including different state institutions, civil society and the private sector
   e. Enhancing member ownership of the Initiative
   f. Avoiding duplication with other international bodies and initiatives.

2. Members and Activities. 31 countries from Asia and Pacific are members of the Steering Group (SG) for the Initiative and set its work programs (for three years at a time). The 2012-2017 Work programs produced the following key operational activities/outputs:

   b. 7 Steering and Advisory Group Meetings (2011-2017) with Country Reporting
   c. 4 Regional Capacity Building and Peer Learning Seminars
   d. A Law Enforcement Network (LEN) established in 2015
   e. A Public Integrity Network (PIN) established in 2017
   f. 2 Thematic (Policy) Reviews (2014 and 2017)
   g. 6 Annual Newsletters (2011-2016)

3. Partnerships. An Advisory Group (AG), comprising representatives from the private sector, civil society, donors, and international organizations, provides multi-stakeholder perspectives and expertise. Beginning in 2018, the AG and the SG will be merged. The six members of the AG as of September 2018 are: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) of Germany; American Bar Association/Rule of Law Initiative (ABAROL); Transparency International (TI); United Nations Development
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Program (UNDP); UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), and the World Bank. The Initiative encourages participation of non-member country observers and organizations interested in the Initiative.

4. **Secretariat.** Comprises part time staff from ADB and OECD and provides organizational support. Funding for annual SG/AG meetings comes from OECD and ADB. Expenses for the Regional Conferences, including PIN and LEN, are funded by the host country, self-financing by participating countries, the Secretariat budget, UNDP and voluntary contributions to the OECD by member states. The two Thematic reviews were funded by the Secretariat. Other donors and members are mobilized on a case by case basis.

**B. Objectives and Scope of the 2018 Evaluation.**

5. **Objective of the Evaluation** is to assess the efficacy and relevance of the Initiative support to anti-corruption activities in the Asia-Pacific region and at the country level between 2011 and 2017. Specifically, it is required to assess:

   
   b. Whether the 2018-2020 Work Program addresses the recommendations of 2009 Independent Review.
   
   c. Options for sustaining and enhancing regional and country level anti-corruption activities in the future by taking into consideration lessons and member needs.

6. **Scope of the evaluation** specified in the Terms of Reference is as follows:

   a. Relevance of the Initiative as a regional mechanism to support anticorruption activities in the Asia–Pacific region
   
   b. Impact, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of the Initiative as a framework to address corruption at the regional and country level
   
   c. 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. 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, operation and performance of the Secretariat (including
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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.

f. Provide recommendations for:

i. Sustaining and enhancing benefits of the Initiative at the regional and country level

ii. Improving organizational structure, implementation mechanism and monitoring and evaluation processes

iii. Increasing Steering and Advisory Groups’ engagement and ownership of the Initiative.

C. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

7. The TOR (Annex 1) called for the evaluation to be based on a desk review of documentation related to the Initiative, survey of participants and stakeholders in the Initiative (Steering and Advisory Group members) and interviews of Secretariat staff and selected stakeholders. The survey and interviews were limited to beneficiary and/or participants in the Initiative; observers were not included. The survey questionnaire and interviews were based on, but not limited to, ‘indicative evaluation questions’ (Annex 4) laid out in the TOR. TOR did not call for: (i) country visits for face to face interactions; and (ii) for substantive review of country reports.

8. Comprehensive Desk Review covered the following documents provided by the Secretariat and/or retrieved from the Initiatives website:

- 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

The full list of documents reviewed is attached at Annex 2. Summaries of key outputs and activities were prepared and attached as Annexes 9-14.
9. **Survey.** Two survey instruments were designed to seek the views of members of the SG from 31 member countries and 7 member organizations in the AG from their respective roles and perspectives (Annexes 6-7). List of survey participants was determined using a 2-step approach. First, the Secretariat sent an email to the Focal Points in each country and members of the Advisory Committee to alert them that a request for survey will be coming and asked them to designate a person to respond to the survey. Second, the Consultant sent an email with the survey link to the designated persons. The survey was conducted during August-October 2018. In all the survey was sent to 31 persons from SG and 6 AG members with a final response rate of 70% (21 SG members) and 83% (5 AG members) respectively.

10. **Interviews** were conducted to probe deeper in survey responses and indicative evaluation questions. Survey participants were asked to indicate whether they would be willing to be interviewed. The self-selected list of interview participants was reviewed and adjusted to ensure diversity of stakeholders, geographic sub-regions in Asia and Pacific, and OECD vs non-OECD members. In all a total of 16 interviews were conducted (Annex 3). An interview template was designed to guide the discussions. Materials from interviews informed various sections of the findings and recommendations.

11. **Assessment Basis (Evaluative Framework).** The evaluation was framed by the 24 indicative evaluation questions attached to the TOR (Annex 4) to assess the Initiative’s results, effectiveness, relevance, quality of knowledge outputs, administration and way forward. The OECD-DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance was followed along with the 2009 Independent Review evaluation methodology. The assessment basis and key evaluative questions are described below:

   a. **Relevance.** The Initiative is considered to be relevant if its objectives, activities and outputs are suited to the current anti-corruption priorities, policies and programs of the member countries and sponsoring partners (ADB, OECD and UNDP) and the global anti-corruption agenda embodied in UNCAC and SDG16.

   b. **Effectiveness** was evaluated by assessing how well the Initiative has met the strategic objectives and member expectations, and the outcomes and impact it achieved. Specifically, by assessing how the initiative has: (a) helped improve anti-corruption frameworks at the legislative, institutional and implementation levels; (b) improved members capacity to fight corruption; (c) met member expectations; (d) enhanced regional cooperation; and (d) helped member organizations enhance their contribution to fight against corruption in their country. Effectiveness of implementation arrangements (Steering and Advisory Groups and the Secretariat) was evaluated by assessing the extent to which they carried out functions assigned to them and the extent to which they were responsive to strategic objectives of the Initiative.

   c. **Efficiency** was assessed in terms of adherence to the guidelines for operational activities and outputs and outcomes relative to inputs (human and financial resources).

   d. **Impact and sustainability:** The changes produced by the Initiative as well as potential for the continuation were assessed by looking at what changes happened as a result of the initiative. Sustainability was evaluated by looking at
member ownership and engagement, donor support, and prospects for continuation and enhancements.

12. **Limitations.** During the seven-year review period several of the focal persons changed job positions, thus some of the respondents may not have first-hand knowledge of all activities and outputs. However, many of the respondents consulted several of their colleagues to ensure informed feedback. The Initiative does not include a results framework defining expected outcomes and performance indicators for measuring them. The results of the are based on self-assessment by members by asking them the indicative evaluation questions in the TOR (Annex 4). These questions related to legislative and policy changes in the country, sharing of experiences with other members, takeaway lessons from participation in the Initiative and extent to which expectations are being met.

**II. EVALUATION OF THE INITIATIVE AS A REGIONAL MECHANISM TO HELP REDUCE CORRUPTION IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC**

**A. Background.**

13. **Strategy.** In 2011 the Initiative adopted [Strategic Principles and Operational Activities of the Initiative](#) (hereafter referred as the Strategy) setting out General Objective, Strategic Principles and priorities and guidelines for Operational Activities for the Initiative. This strategy adopted for implementation many of the recommendations of the [2009 Independent Review](#) of the Initiative.

   a. **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.

   b. **Principles:**

      i. *Extending Support for UNCAC Implementation:* The Initiative’s primary goal should be to help its members implement UNCAC. Where appropriate, the Initiative could also address issues not covered by UNCAC, or provisions in the UNCAC that are not mandatory.

      ii. *The Initiative’s Feature as a Regional Network:* The Initiative should add value to the global fight against corruption by taking advantage of its feature as a regional network, such as by addressing members’ common challenges, and matters requiring regional co-operation.

      iii. *Support Learning with Action and Measurable Outcomes:* The Initiative should develop a system to identify how its activities and events are used by its members in their anti-corruption efforts.

      iv. *Accommodate the Diversity in Members and Stakeholders:* The Initiative should design its activities to also accommodate the different characteristics and needs of its members, and to encourage and support the participation of relevant stakeholders,
including different state institutions, civil society and the private sector.

v. *Enhance Member Ownership:* The Initiative should enhance its ownership by its members, particularly by its members playing a more prominent role in developing the Initiative’s strategies and activities, and in its operation.

vi. *Avoid Duplicating Other Forums:* The Initiative should co-ordinate with other anti-corruption initiatives and design its activities with a view to avoiding unnecessary duplication while providing value-added in view of the functions and roles of other multilateral initiatives.

c. **Core Operational Activities**
   i. Steering Group and Advisory Group Meetings
   ii. Country Self Reporting
   iii. Capacity Building Seminars
   iv. Thematic Reviews
   v. Volunteer Country Reviews
   vi. Regional Conferences
   vii. Raising Awareness of the Initiative

B. **Analysis**

14. **Responsiveness of the Strategy to the 2009 Independent Review.** A comparison of the 2009 Independent Review recommendations with the Strategy adopted in 2010 shows that all but one of them were fully addressed. The one exception was the recommendation for collection of information on improvements in anti-corruption outcomes (Annex 5). The Initiative has not yet set specific indicators to measure performance and outcomes. Therefore, this recommendation can be considered only as partially addressed. However, the guidelines adopted in the Strategy provide for members to indicate how the knowledge products and lessons learned in capacity building seminars were disseminated and shared in their respective countries. This is done as part of the country reports.

15. **Relevance of the Strategy** is evaluated by its responsiveness to the anti-corruption priorities, policies and programs of the member countries and sponsoring partners (ADB, OECD and UNDP), linkages to the global anti-corruption agenda embodied in UNCAC and SDG16, and adherence to the principle of ‘avoid duplicating other forums’.

   a. The Initiative’s relevance is established through its focus on Implementation of United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC)
that is the only universal anti-corruption framework. This focus is in line with the Independent Review recommendation. **UNCAC** has been ratified by all members of the Initiative and encompassed all the elements in the 2009 **Action Plan** that all members have endorsed. A review of the Initiatives activities and outputs shows that they were related to the implementation of UNCAC. Members and advisers were asked in the survey whether the Initiative’s activities facilitated or detracted from UNCAC implementation. None of the advisors believed the Action Plan detracted from UNCAC implementation (AQ11). Three advisers said that it facilitates. They commented (AQ11) that the Initiative amplifies article 12 and 36 of the UNCAC and the Initiative’s work falls generally under the UNCAC framework. Also, the Public Integrity Network was identified as a mechanism to build on UNCAC standards.

### b. Initiative’s relevance would be enhanced by assisting members with their work on the anti-corruption targets in the SDG16. All members have signed the Agenda 2030 that includes targets for reducing corruption, reducing illicit flow of funds and making institutions more accountable. In the survey, a majority of the members indicate that they are leading and/or engaged with SDG16 work in their country and would like the Initiatives help in their work.

### c. A review of the Initiative’s objectives, membership, and activities in comparison with other anti-corruption initiatives indicates more complementarity than duplication (see Annex 8). The evaluation reviewed 11 anti-corruption initiatives that operate in the region and asked whether they are members in one or more of them and extent to which this results in duplication. Survey responses indicate that all respondents have signed UNCAC and several are members in 1 or 2 other networks (MQ16 and 17), particularly those pertaining to APEC and/or ASEAN. Members from central Asia are members of the Anti-Corruption Network-Eastern Europe and Central Asia also.
members responded that their participation in other forums 'Complements Somewhat' while 14% consider 'Complements Greatly' the membership in the Initiative. Advisers had similar views (AQ14) with many stating that the Initiative is somewhat complementary or as a neither complementing or duplicating.

Figure 4

16. **Effectiveness of the Strategy** was evaluated by assessing how the initiative has: (a) helped improve anti-corruption frameworks at the legislative, institutional and implementation levels; (b) improved members capacity to fight corruption; (c) met member expectations; and (d) enhanced regional cooperation.

a. **Effective in helping member country's anticorruption efforts.** 95% consider it effective with 52% of members rating it ‘Somewhat Effective’ and 43% rated it ‘Very Effective.’ (MQ10). Non-OECD members had a higher percentage of ‘Very Much’ and a lower percentage of ‘Somewhat’ than non-OECD members.

b. **Effective in building capacity.** Over 80% of the members indicate that their expectations for capacity building and networking for knowledge are being met (MQ4). Advisers views were also positive but a bit more conservative (AQ3). Members commented (MQ13) that: the 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; and level of corruption and resources for combating corruption vary by country so some parts of the work programs are more relevant than others.

c. **Effective in meeting Member and Adviser expectations.** Members were asked whether their needs/expectations of the Anticorruption Initiative are being met (MQ4). The responses shown in Figure 1 indicate that overall the expectations were met albeit some more than others as might be expected. Roughly 90% of the members responding indicated needs were partially or fully met for helping implement UNCAC, mutual support and exchange of expertise, capacity building based on peer learning and providing value added and avoiding
duplication. The ‘Partially Met’ rating reflects the fact that members, particularly non-OECD members, need much more technical assistance than the Initiative has been able to provide. In terms of needs being fully met, roughly half indicated assisting to promote anticorruption in country, serving as knowledge and learning network and avoiding unnecessary duplication of other initiatives. The majority of the Advisors surveyed responded ‘Partially Met’ for their expectations (AQ3).

**Figure 5**

**Extent to which the Initiative meeting member expectations**

---

**d. Effective in enhancing regional cooperation** is one of the six guiding principle of the Initiative. 96% of the members responding to the survey (MQ4) replied positively to the question on whether participation on the Initiative helped in this regard. 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; and examples of successful prosecutions and resolution of corruption matters with support of another member country.

**Figure 733**

---

17. **Impact (results) of the Initiative** were assessed by surveying member views about the changes as a result of the Initiative’s peer learning, mutual support and
capacity building seminars and studies (based on indicative evaluations in the TOR). The responses should be viewed with caution due to the inherent attribution challenges involved as legislative and policy changes involve many players and forces. The advisers were asked about their views on overall impact of the Initiative as well as the difference they made. The results of the survey are presented below:

a. **In members opinion, the Initiative is helpful in contributing to national anti-corruption policies and programs.** 95% of the members reported positive contributions. Many members said “Somewhat” reflecting the reality that anti-corruption strategies include many elements beyond prevention, investigation and prosecution. Members provided the following examples of activities that helped in this area: The Initiative’s Action Plan; regional seminars and conferences; experiences of other countries in countering corruption; and the network of overseas anticorruption organizations. 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” (AQ6).

b. **Members associate many changes in policy, legislation and regulations with their participation in the Initiative, but attribution is difficult to establish.** 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, 81% responded positively (Figure 5). Those who were not OECD members responded with a higher percentage of ‘Adopted Many’ than OECD members who responded with a higher percentage of ‘Adopted Some’. Respondents provided following examples (MQ6-7):

i. Revisions to country anti-corruption act, national integrity assessments
ii. Anti-corruption practices and prevention mechanism in private sector, business integrity initiatives

iii. Prevention of money laundering, financial transaction reporting, electronic transaction reporting

iv. Witness protection laws, whistleblower protection, ombudsman, mutual legal assistance

v. Code of conduct for public officials, code of ethics, election law reform

vi. Public procurement

vii. Right to information, ombudsman

viii. Amendments to criminal law

ix. Strategic plans for agencies with core strategies – punitive, preventative, and promotional

x. Prosecution of cross border corruption cases

xi. Drastic reform in national supervision system

xii. Increase in awareness, greater transparency in public sector, more reporting, investigations and prosecutions, expanded scope of targets to be supervised

xiii. Many MOUs on Anticorruption and Prevention signed with private sector and anti-corruption programs introduced into education system; and

xiv. Mutual legal assistance for cross border corruption cases

c. Impact of Advisers: In response to whether participation increased discussions with other members and/or the opportunity to provide guidance and assistance, four of the five advisors said somewhat (AQ4). Four of the advisors expressed instances of sharing issues, practices, and lessons with the members of the Anti-Corruption Initiative (AQ5). Examples include:

i. Member participation in Transparency International’s Anti-Corruption Agency Strengthening Initiative (TI);

ii. The sharing of asset recovery expertise (GIZ);

iii. Establishment of a South-South/Triangular Cooperation on corruption prevention, which included Indonesia and Afghanistan (GIZ);
iv. Release of studies on illicit financial flows, sharing of lessons learned and anti-corruption strategies (UNDP).

v. Use of Integrity Scan (OECD).

C. Findings and Recommendations

18. Relevance of the Initiative is grounded in its strategic objective of helping members implement the UNCAC and could be enhanced by helping members with their work on anti-corruption targets in the SDG16. Implementation of UNCAC became the primary focus of the Strategy in line with the Independent Review recommendation and made it highly relevant to the needs of the members and global effort to combat corruption. All activities and outputs during the period under review were linked to UNCAC implementation. Majority of the members expressed the view that the Initiative’s activities facilitated UNCAC implementation. The Public Integrity Network and the Law Enforcement Networks will deepen the Initiatives linkages to the was identified as a mechanism to build on UNCAC standards. All members have signed the Agenda 2030 that includes targets for reducing corruption, reducing illicit flow of funds and making institutions more accountable. A majority of the members indicate in the survey that they are leading and/or engaged with SDG16 work in their country and would like the Initiative’s help in their work.

19. A comparison of the 2009 Independent Review recommendations with the Strategy adopted in 2010 shows that all but one of them were fully addressed. The one exception was the recommendation for collection of information on improvements in anti-corruption outcomes. It was only partially addressed as 2012-2020 work programs did not include a results framework.

20. The Initiative is highly valued as the only peer learning network for anti-corruption agencies in the region. It complements rather than duplicates other anti-corruption initiatives in the region. The evaluation reviewed 11 anti-corruption initiatives that operate in the region (Annex 8) and asked members about duplication other initiatives where they are members. It was found that the Initiative complements rather than duplicate other anti-corruption initiatives. 66% of members responded that their participation in other forums ‘Complements Somewhat’ or ‘Complements Greatly’ the membership in the Initiative. Advisers had similar views (AQ14) with many stating that the Initiative is somewhat complementary or as neither complementing or duplicating.

21. The Initiative was effective at meeting member expectations, but members would like more support in (a) helping the member countries improve anti-corruption frameworks at the legislative, institutional and implementation levels; (b) improving members capacity to fight corruption; (c) meeting member expectations; and (d) enhancing regional cooperation. Several examples of legislative and policy changes, sharing, and learning were cited. Roughly 90% of the members responded indicating their needs were partially or fully met for helping implement the UNCAC, mutual support and exchange of expertise, capacity building based on peer learning and providing value added and avoiding duplication. However, there is unmet demand for more support as evidenced by the fact that ‘Partially Met’ responses exceeded ‘Fully Met’ and the following suggestions were made by the members (MQ26) for more support.
27

a. The Initiative should remain an effective regional platform for sharing best practices, mutual cooperation and collaboration.

b. Assist members with their work on SDG 16 anti-corruption targets for reducing bribery and corruption, reducing illicit financial flows and enhancing accountability of institutions. Most of the members responding to the survey (MQ18) would like the Initiative’s help in this area.

c. Host tailor-made workshops most relevant to member needs (such as prevention, investigation, legislative issues) and increased sharing of best practice cases and cooperation.

d. Customized technical support to individual or a small group of members upon request

e. Corruption is becoming more and more trans-national emphasizing the need for members to share technical know-how and human resources.

f. Greater use of the Initiative as a platform for anticorruption agencies to discuss specific challenges facing them and devise strategies.

22. **Members and advisers highlighted a number of benefits for them from their participation:** it is the only network for anti-corruption agencies in the region; has built a sense of community; strengthening of knowledge and capacity for agency staff; exposure to practices of other member countries; and sharing experiences. The Advisers and sponsors (ADB, UNDP and OECD) agreed with these and saw the initiative as a good platform for bringing together important players in fighting corruption in the region and exposing them to new ideas and peer learning. They perceive the Initiative as an efficient outreach mechanism. For the ADB the Initiative is an effective activity for fulfilling its mandates for promoting regional cooperation and partnerships.

23. **Members associate several results in their country with the Initiative. However, attribution for many of the results is hard to establish and the Initiative lacks a results framework with performance indicators.** The 2012-2020 Work Programs do not include a results framework with specific indicators to measure performance and outcomes of activities included in although the 2009 Independent Review had recommended that such a performance matrix should be set up. The country self-reporting template asks members (Section E) to indicate how the knowledge products and lessons learned in capacity building seminars were used and shared in their respective countries. A review of a sample of such reports indicates mention of some sharing activities but no information on use of knowledge. There is no synthesis of what the countries reported.

24. **Recommendation 1: The Initiative should continue with member demand driven enhancements.** The evaluation finds that the Initiative is relevant to the needs of the members, Action Plan as well as the more recent universal anti-corruption agenda embodied in UNCAC, SDG 16, and priorities of key sponsors (ADB, OECD, GIZ and UNDP). The members and advisers interviewed during the evaluation were unanimous in stating that it should continue. It has been effective in meeting member, adviser and sponsor expectations. The following suggestions for enhancing the Initiative have been made by the members and advisers and should be basis of enhancements going
25. **Recommendation 2: The Initiative should reach out to other anti-corruption networks to establish partnerships for mutual benefit.** The Initiative’s strength is that it is unique as a network for anti-corruption agencies in the region. While preserving its strength the Initiative should reach out to other anti-corruption networks to establish partnerships for mutual benefit. The Initiative’s effectiveness would increase by collaborating and coordinating its operational activities with other key regional business associations and integrity networks. The least cost way would be to invite relevant networks to be observers and/or members of the SG. In-country pre/post event consultations are being done by some members and are a good practice that could be adopted by others. Prima facie the following initiatives appear promising:

- **Anti-corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia**
- **International Corruption Hunters Alliance (World Bank)**
- **Anti-corruption and Transparency Task Force of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC)**
- **The Asia-Pacific Group on Money Laundering (APGML)**
- **Asia and Pacific Regional Program of Transparency International**
- **International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) standing committee**
- **World Economic Forum’s Partnering Against Corruption Initiative (PACI)**

26. **Recommendation 3: A results framework for the Initiative with performance indicators should be prepared by the Secretariat and approved by the Steering Group.** The results framework should be realistic in specifying the impact that is in proportion to the scale and nature of outputs under the Initiative. It should take into account the main objectives of the Initiative i.e. helping with the implementation of UNCAC through activities related to networking, peer learning, mutual support, capacity building and exchange of expertise activities. Main outputs are: Regional conferences;
capacity building workshops; and thematic studies. Focus of the results framework should be on what differences the Initiative’s activities can make rather than performance of the anti-corruption agencies itself. Establishing performance indicators that meet the SMART\(^1\) criteria and can be reported by the members with minimal transaction costs should be the goal. Part E of the current country self-reporting format could be the starting point for development of this framework.

### III. EVALUATION OF ACTIVITIES AND OUTPUTS

#### A. Background and evaluation approach and methods:

27. **The TOR** called for evaluation of the quality, relevance and effectiveness of the Initiative’s outputs and activities delivered during the evaluation period. The findings are presented for each of the activities and outputs shown in Table 2 below:

**Table 2: Activities and Outputs Under the Initiative (2011-2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Regional Anti-Corruption Conferences (RAC)</strong>. Organized every three years to serve as venue for workshops and capacity building seminars.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 9(^{\text{th}}) RAC (2017) on Nurturing an Anti-Corruption Culture, South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 8(^{\text{th}}) RAC (2014) on Fighting Corruption and Building Trust, Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 7(^{\text{th}}) RAC (2011) on Building Multidisciplinary Frameworks to Combat Corruption, India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Steering Group (SG) and Advisory Group (AG) meetings.</strong> SG meetings bring together the member countries and the AG. During the SG meetings: (a) members review progress of work programs and decide the Initiative’s future activities; and (b) discuss their countries’ efforts to fight corruption, assess developments and progress and exchange experiences in the design and implementation of reforms through written reports and oral presentation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 22(^{\text{nd}}) Steering Group November 2017; Seoul, Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 21(^{\text{st}}) Steering Group Meeting November 2016; Thimphu, Bhutan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 20(^{\text{th}}) Steering Group Meeting November 2015; Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 19(^{\text{th}}) Steering Group Meeting September 2014; Phnom Penh, Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 18(^{\text{th}}) Steering Group Meeting September 2013; Dili, Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 17(^{\text{th}}) Steering Group Meeting October 2012; Hanoi, Viet Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 16(^{\text{th}}) Steering Group meeting September 2011; New Delhi, India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Country Self Reporting.</strong> Written reports were submitted by member countries at the SG meetings and these were compiled by the Secretariat and published online. Six compilations are available online for the 2011-2016 period.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Regional Seminars (Capacity Building Seminars)</strong>- Capacity building is a central element of the mechanisms to support the member countries in the implementation of reforms. Regional seminars bring together senior experts from the Initiative’s member countries, experts from ADB and OECD member countries and the OECD Working Group on Bribery. Members suggest topics in SG meetings and seminars are held back to back with SG.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 14(^{\text{th}}) Seminar on Development with Values: Social Fence against Corruption* (November 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 12(^{\text{th}}) Seminar on Whistleblower Protection and Strengthening Anti-Corruption Agencies (2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) **SMART** = **S**pecific; **M**easurable; **A**ttainable; **R**ealistic; and **T**ime-bound
4. 11th Seminar on Tracing Illicit Flows and Asset Recovery of the Proceeds of Corruption in Asia and the Pacific. (2012)

**Policy (Thematic) Reviews.** The Initiative’s members conduct policy reviews on specific priority issues. The reviews allow for more in-depth analysis of specific issues in each member of the Initiative, assessing the existing policies and measures and identifying means for further improvement. The Reviews are demand driven and as needed.

1. Mutual Legal Assistance in Asia and the Pacific: Experiences in 31 Jurisdictions (2017)
2. Corporate measures to prevent and detect corruption (2014)

**Newsletters.** Annual newsletters produced during 2011-2016 to disseminate information on developments in the Asia-Pacific region, activities and reforms undertaken by the upcoming events.

B. Regional Conferences:

28. **Background.** Regional conferences held once every three years allow for greater participation by the private sector and civil society than in the Regional Seminars. They are also generally less technical and provide a forum for dialogue among policymakers and stakeholders. The guidelines provide for:

   a. Conference to be held every three years if funding and host country are available;
   
   b. The conference topic to be chosen in accordance with the Strategic Principles and is subject to approval of the host country in consultation with the Secretariat. One participant from ADF borrowing member country to be funded; other participants pay for themselves;
   
   c. Members to disseminate the learning from the conference and submit conference/seminar follow up report;
   
   d. the Secretariat to gather information from Members using the country self-reporting template on the steps that they have taken to disseminate and follow-up after the conference.

29. **Analysis.** Three Regional Conferences (2011, 2014 and 2017) were held during the period under review, consistent with the guidelines. A summary of the attendance, themes discussed, and documents posted on line is presented in Annex 9. The themes chosen were relevant to the UNCAC implementation. The conferences were well attended. Most of the 31 members attended the conferences in India (28) and South Korea (29) but only 20 members attended the conference in Cambodia. Consistent with the guidelines, experts from international organizations, businesses associations, civil society, and multilateral and donor organizations also participated providing multi-stakeholder perspectives. Conference themes were decided by the Secretariat in consultation with the host country. Conference proceedings were posted online. 56% of members consider the Regional Conferences to be ‘Very Effective’ and a further 39% consider them ‘Somewhat Effective’. (MQ12). 60% of the Advisers consider the Regional Conferences to be ‘Somewhat Effective’ and 40% consider them to be ‘Very Effective’ (AQ8). The conferences are high profile events attracting the head of state of the host
country and covered by national and international media. They therefore have the additional benefit of raising awareness of member country and ADB/OECD efforts to combat corruption. The 2011 and 2014 conferences concluded with public statements (press releases) by members on actions they would take.

**Figure 2682**
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**Figure 3154**
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C. **Country Self Reporting**

30. **Background.** Purpose of the country reports is to provide information on member’s efforts to implement each aspect of the Action Plan and the UNCAC. They are also expected to report how they have disseminated and used knowledge acquired in the Initiative’s previous activities and events in their anti-corruption efforts. Guidelines for
country reporting at SG, effective 2013, are: written self-report biennially using a standard template (see Table 3). 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. In addition, members are invited to make oral presentations (10 minutes) on one or two issues if they would like to do so. The written reports would be consolidated and published by the Secretariat.

Table 3: Country Self-Reports Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNCAC Section</th>
<th>UNCAC Implementation</th>
<th>A. Chapter II: Preventive Measures</th>
<th>B. Chapter III: Criminalization and Law Enforcement</th>
<th>C. Chapter IV: International Cooperation</th>
<th>D. Chapter V: Asset Recovery</th>
<th>E. Additional Developments: In-country dissemination and regional sharing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Measures Undertaken to Implement the provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Measures Being Planned to Implement the provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Issues, Challenges and Constraints facing implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Capacity Building Seminar Topics and Training Needs to Strengthen the Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. **Analysis.** Adherence to guidelines was assessed by analyzing the written reports submitted during 2011-2016 (Table 4). Country self-reporting is intended to support peer learning, discussion of issues and challenges common to number of members, enables trend analysis, and reporting on domestic use of the Initiatives knowledge products and events. The members are required to submit a report every two years. The Secretariat compiles the reports and publishes them on line. A synthesis of trends, common issues, and impact of the initiative on anti-corruption efforts by members would enable their discussion and enhance peer learning. However, such a synthesis has never been done. During the period 2011-2014 6 countries never submitted country reports and this number increased to 10 (one out of three members) during 2014-2016 (Table 4). 9 countries have submitted country report each year during 2011-2016 and 89% of members surveyed found (MQ12) the country reports to be effective (42% Very Effective and 47% Somewhat Effective). Relative to other products country self-reporting received the lowest ratings. In 2017 country reporting was discontinued.
Table 4: Submission of Country Reports by Member Countries, 2011-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Members</th>
<th>Year of Joining</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>No. of reports submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Afghanistan</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Australia</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bangladesh</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bhutan</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cambodia</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 China, PR</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cook Islands</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Fiji</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hongkong, China</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 India</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Indonesia</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Japan</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Kazakhstan</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Korea</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Kyrgyz Republic</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Macau, China</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Malaysia</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mongolia</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Nepal</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Pakistan</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Palau</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Philippines</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Samoa</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Singapore</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Solomon Islands</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Thailand</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Timor-Leste</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Vanuatu</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Viet Nam</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</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
D. Regional Capacity Building Seminars

32. Background. Capacity building seminars are the Initiative’s main tools for delivering technical assistance to its members. The seminars focus on topics with an international or regional dimension, while avoiding duplication with the efforts of other relevant bodies. Capacity building seminars are usually held back-to-back with Steering Group meetings to reduce costs. Seminars therefore take place annually unless a regional conference is held, in which case the Conference would replace the seminar. The 2012-2017 Work Programs called for capacity building seminars in 2012, 2013 and 2015-2016. After each seminar, members submit a seminar follow-up report on how the knowledge obtained in the seminar has been disseminated and applied, and what the outcome was. Consistent with the strategic principle of action learning and knowledge sharing, members are expected to inform Secretariat of their efforts and outcomes before registering for the next training event. The Secretariat is tasked to gather information from members on the steps that they have taken to disseminate and follow-up. The 2013 SG meeting noted that follow-up is not adequate and resolved that Secretariat will make greater efforts to encourage Members to provide such reports.

33. Analysis. Four seminars were held as planned and were attended by a majority of members (65% to 85%), AG members, civil society organizations (CSO), private sector, and intentional organizations. A summary of the 4 seminars is presented in the Annex 11. The topics chosen were highly relevant to UNCAC implementation and member needs: illicit flows; asset recovery; whistleblower protection; strengthening of anti-corruption agencies; corruption in development projects; and the social fence against corruption. The seminar speakers were sourced from within and outside of the region. Members of Advisory Group were among the speakers and thus could contribute their expertise. Selection of topics was participatory for some of the seminars (2012 and 2013) but it is not clear how 2015 and 2016 topics were selected. The events were made possible due to event specific funding from bilateral and multilateral donors. The documentation posted online varied with only conclusions posted in 2011, only presentations posted in 2015, and only a seminar report posted in 2016. The most comprehensive knowledge sharing occurred in 2014 when the documentation posted online included: conclusions, presentations, knowledge sharing reports by some of the members, and press release. About half of the members (45%) consider the Regional Capacity Building Seminars to be ‘Very Effective’ and a further 40% consider them ‘Somewhat Effective’ (MQ12). All of the Advisers consider the Seminars to be ‘Somewhat Effective’ (AQ8). It is noteworthy that 95% of members surveyed said that their capacity building needs were being met ‘Fully’ (45%) or ‘Partially’ (50%). (MQ4).

E. Thematic Policy Reviews

34. Background. The Thematic Reviews are required to be demand driven and conducted only when the SG sees a need and technical and financial resources can be mobilized. They provide in-depth treatment of the topic decided at the SG and based on individual member country reports, they analyze a member's efforts in the area under review, and provide recommendations for improvement. They are prepared by consultants based on an information-gathering questionnaire and independent research to gather more information and include a horizontal study identifying trends that cut across the membership. The Thematic Review is thus a fairly lengthy and intensive exercise. The Secretariat oversees the review. Members are invited to provide written comments on multiple drafts of the report. The final report is then discussed and adopted.
at a Steering Group meeting. The reports are agreed by the member before being published at the Initiative’s website and in print. Two years after a Thematic Review is concluded, members should provide to the Secretariat a written report on steps taken to implement a Thematic Review’s recommendations.

35. Analysis. Two thematic reviews were planned and completed during the period under review. They focused on corporate measures to prevent and detect corruption (2014) and mutual legal assistance (2017). A summary of the review coverage, participation, and follow up is presented in Annex 12. Both topics are fully relevant to the UNCAC implementation and were decided at SG meetings following member requests. They covered all 31 countries but only about half the countries filled out the questionnaires sent to them. The reviews were prepared by qualified consultants under the supervision of the Secretariat. Prescribed processes for review and adoption of the reports were followed and the reports have been published in hard copy and online. A report on actions taken after the 2014 thematic review has not yet been submitted.

Member and Adviser Views on the usefulness and effectiveness of the reviews are mixed. Members were asked how useful the thematic reviews were in their agency’s work (MQ12). 35% of the member respondents said ‘Very Effective’, 35% consider them ‘Somewhat Effective’ and 25% did not express a view. (MQ12). All of the Advisers consider the Thematic Reviews to be ‘Somewhat Effective’ (AQ8).

F. Voluntary Country Reviews.

36. Background. In 2009, the Initiative introduced voluntary country reviews activity and the associated methodology. The main purpose of these exercises is to further promote the sharing of experience among members. Voluntary country reviews will identify and address deficiencies in specific areas of a member country’s anti-corruption framework. The exercise will also identify capacity development needs for obtaining technical assistance. Exercises are entirely voluntary in nature. Members volunteer for an exercise and decide the scope of the exercise in consultation with the Secretariat and the experts. A report of the scoping exercise is adopted with the review country’s consent before it is published. The 2012-2014 Work Program planned two pilot country reviews subject to available funding and volunteering members. Continuation will be decided after a review of experience. The 2015-2017 work program mentions continuing the reviews while noting that these reviews will be conducted alongside or in the form of OECD Integrity Scan to reduce costs. The draft 2018-2020 Work Program envisages country studies upon request using the OECD Integrity Scan methodology (part of PIN activities and outputs).

37. Analysis. Three countries (Kazakhstan, Thailand and Indonesia) initiated voluntary country reviews/Integrity Scans in 2015 with help [from GIZ, ADB and OECD] and provided an update on outputs and activities at the 2016 SG meeting.

G. Raising Awareness of the Initiative

38. Background. Guidelines call for members to take active role in raising awareness of the Initiative through various means: (a) domestic awareness-raising through involving other relevant government bodies in the Initiative’s events and self-
reporting exercises and providing more information about the Initiative on their websites; and (b) participation in other international forums.

39. **Analysis.** Awareness of the Initiative and its work raised through: (a) members activities domestically and internationally; (b) the Initiative’s website maintained by the Secretariat; and (c) newsletter. Information on members communications effort was gathered from their reports at the SG meetings. It is recognized that this is a partial view as members may have done much more than what they reported at SGs. The available information indicates that some members shared information with other agencies in their country and made statements at international meetings. The Regional Conferences and Seminars as well as SG meeting raise visibility and awareness in the host country as well as regional media. The Secretariat communicated information to the public through the Initiative’s website and a widely-distributed annual newsletter during 2011-2016. A majority of the members responding to the Survey found the newsletters to be ‘Very Effective’ while 30% found them to be ‘Somewhat Effective’ (MQ12) (see Figure 9). All of the Advisers consider the Newsletter to be ‘Somewhat Effective’ (AQ8). No newsletter was produced during 2017 as a proposal to replace them with more regular updates on the Initiative’s work on the website. The review of online documentation at the Initiative website indicates that it includes key documents (agenda, minutes, participants list, and country reports) relating to the SG meetings, Regional Conferences, and Seminars. In addition, the Thematic Policy Reviews Reports, Newsletters, Action Plan, Strategic Principles and Work Programs are also posted online. Publication of these materials provides commendable transparency of the Initiative’s purpose, strategy and work. In addition, the conference, seminar proceedings and thematic review reports provides substantial additions to thematic public knowledge. An analysis of the website usage data indicates that during 2012-2018 the website has experienced consistent traffic, and roughly 68% of page views are from unique persons. Also, the website’s average bounce rate of 50% is considered normal according to business standards. Eight pages account for 72% of total page views - Home, Regional Seminars, Meetings and Conferences, Action Plan, Partnerships, Policy Analysis, List of Member Countries, and Publications.

H. **Findings and Recommendations**

40. **The three Regional Conferences** were the flagship activity of the Initiative. They require considerable financial and organizational resources. The fact that the several members have stepped up to host the Conferences and the Initiative has been able to hold a conference every three years since 2003 should be regarded as significant achievements and a success story. The 2011-2017 Conference themes were focused on UNCAC contents and were relevant to the anti-corruption agenda of the members. Multi-stakeholder participation was commendable. The conference organization followed guidelines and the members and advisers consider the conferences to be effective. They attracted high level participation and raised the profile of the Initiative, member actions, Advisers, and the secretariat on the anti-corruption topics in the region. Conference follow-up actions were promised but there is no public record of such reporting.

41. **Country self-reporting.** Most countries but not all used the template (Table 3). Written reports were published online. While a review of quality and substance of reporting is beyond the scope of this evaluation a scanning of reports suggest that they covered relevant materials. The case for continuing country self-reports is based on their value for peer learning, identifying common issues and impact analysis and the finding
that most members surveyed and interviewed consider them useful. Several members mentioned them in their suggestions to improve the Initiative. Thus, there is merit in restoring them. However, compliance has deteriorated, they consume member time to prepare and they need to be reviewed and synthesized for optimizing value added. Moreover, members prepare reports for other initiatives such as UNCAC, OECD and soon SDG. The risk of duplication is therefore high unless there is flexibility of reporting in the Initiative’s template or other formats. On balance, we are of the view that: (i) a review should be done to assess whether to restore country self-reporting as is or in a modified form; and (ii) the Regional stocktaking report proposed in the 2018-2020 Work Program should include a synthesis of issues, trends and impact of anti-corruption activities in member countries during 2017-2019. This should be based on each member country self-reporting in the current template with modifications to include activities related to SDG16 anti-corruption targets. Its objective would be to inform the strategic priorities for future work of the Initiative.

42. The four capacity building seminars were highly relevant to the member interests and UNCAC implementation. They were widely attended and drew on member as well as international and expert experiences. Inclusion of CSOs, private sector and international organizations was appropriate and enriched the discussions. The Secretariat successfully raised event specific funding. Members as well as advisers surveyed regarded the Seminars to be effective.

43. The two thematic reviews were highly relevant, professionally done, in-depth and demand driven. They highlighted trends that cut across the membership and included extensive independent research. They provided useful recommendations to improve matters. The thematic review reports were valuable global public goods as indicated by the number of times they were visited/downloaded at the Initiative’s website. However, the members seem to have a mixed view of their effectiveness. Only half the members submitted the questionnaire sent prior to the thematic review to collect information. 7 out of 20 members responding to this question survey considered them to be ‘Very’ effective, 7 members rated them ‘Somewhat Effective’ and 5 members said “Do Not Know”. The monitoring report 2 year’s after the 2014 Thematic Review, required per the guidelines has not yet been prepared so it is not possible to determine impact. These findings point to a need to review the product to assess how to modify it to enhance usefulness and impact. This is especially important since the 2018-2020 work plan calls for 6 thematic studies under the PIN and LEN work streams. Any thematic studies that are carried out would benefit from a brief description of linkages to UNCAC implementation and/or SDG16 and member demand and arrangements for agreeing on follow up actions and monitoring thereof.

44. Voluntary Country Reviews are still work in progress with no completion reports available. Insufficient information for evaluation.

45. Communications. The Initiative guidelines provide due importance to communications and appropriately consider it to be joint responsibility of members and the Secretariat. The members play their role through domestic activities including publicity generated at the time of the events hosted by them. The Secretariat maintains a commendably up-to-date and complete website with all key documentation. These materials are valuable knowledge products on the anti-corruption and UNCAC themes and significant public goods. The website analytics show that website has seen
consistent traffic.

46. **Recommendation 4:** Continue regional conferences, capacity building training and thematic policy review activities and introduce more demand driven and interactive learning activities. All these activities and outputs during 2012-2017 were considered very effective by some members and somewhat effective by several others indicating room for improvement. The thematic policy reviews were rated relatively lower (Figure 9). Six such reviews are included in the 2018-2020 work streams for PIN and LEN. It would be prudent to review their concept notes to assess how to modify them to enhance usefulness and impact. Overall, the survey and interviews revealed that there is widespread demand among members for more and better capacity building. Member interviews suggest that some members would like: (a) the duration of capacity building events to be longer; and, (b) capacity building programs to be more interactive by using role playing, case studies and hypothetical problem solving. In response to a survey question members indicated their preference for what would be most useful to them in their work making them more useful for them. (see Figure 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member suggestions for activities and knowledge products under the Initiative that would be most useful in their work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Regional conferences/seminars as platform for practitioners to exchange strategies and experiences (11 mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Practical training and capacity building workshops (11 mentions) for practitioners such as investigators (3 mentions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Country self-reporting (4 mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Thematic reviews (3 mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Publications, guidebooks and handbooks (3 mentions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Newsletters (2 mentions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. **Recommendation 5:** Commission a review of cost and benefits of country self-reporting to assess whether it should be continued as is or with modifications. Country self-reporting adds value but has been erratic. It supports peer learning, discussion of issues and challenges common to number of members, enables trend analysis, and reporting on domestic use of the Initiatives knowledge products and events. Some members have included this information in their country reports but many others have not been reporting (para 7 above). There is no synthesis of trends, common issues, and impact revealed by the member reporting. It is recommended that a review of country reporting should be done to assess whether or not to restore country self-reporting as is or in a modified form or not at all. It is further recommended that the Regional stocktaking report proposed in the 2018-2020 Work Program should include synthesis report on issues, trends and impact of anti-corruption activities in member countries during 2017-2019. This should be based on each member country self-reporting in the current template with modifications to include activities related to SDG16 anti-corruption targets. Many members have reported their efforts at domestic dissemination and regional sharing in Section E of the country self-reporting template. The information in Section E of recent country reports (e.g. 2015 and 2016 country reports) can be extracted and analyzed for patterns and areas of improvement and good practices. During the interviews, a good practice for domestic awareness raising emerged. This involves holding a pre- and post- conference/capacity building event meeting with all relevant government agencies, CSOs, private sector, media, academics and donors. Effectiveness of such meetings would be enhanced by documenting key
learning and follow-up action outcomes from each SG/capacity building/conference event. The review report should be revised by the members and the final decision made by the SG.

IV. EVALUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

A. Background

Implementations arrangements for the Initiative were put in place in the 2001 Action Plan and include: (i) a country representative (Focal Point); (ii) Regional Steering Group (SG) composed of Focal Point persons from all members; (iii) Advisory Group (AG); (iv) the Secretariat; and (v) work programming and funding guidelines. A summary description of their purpose follows:

- **Country Representatives** are designated by the government and serve as Focal Points. The Secretariat maintains a list of Focal Points.

- **Steering and Advisory Groups**. The SG is expected to serve three functions described in the Action Plan: (i) review progress in implementing each country’s priorities; (ii) serve as a forum for exchanges of experiences; and (iii) promote multi-stakeholder dialogue and mobilize donor support. SG/AG meet annually and are encouraged to include participants from civil society, partners, private sector as well as from other parts of member country government relevant to the agenda. Starting in 2018, SG and AG will be merged.

- **The Secretariat** is currently composed of ADB and OECD and works in consultation with UNDP and other partners to the Initiative. It provides organizational and logistical support to the Initiative, including liaising with Focal Points, preparation of SG/AG Meetings, workshops, surveys, and publications. In ADB, the Office of Anticorruption and Integrity hosts the Secretariat and includes two part-time staff members. In OECD, the Secretariat is supported by two divisions – the Anti-Corruption Division and the Public-Sector Integrity Division with part-time staff.

- **Work Programming and Funding**. Three-year Work Programs will be prepared and funded by member countries in-kind contributions, ADB Technical Assistance Grants and voluntary contributions by donors to the OECD. These financial contributions are used to finance the travel, accommodation and per diem expenses for resource persons and eligible Initiative-funded meeting participants, communications, Secretariat staffing, and overheads. Finance the attendance in the Initiative’s events of one official from each Member classified as eligible to borrow from ADB’s Asian Development Fund (ADF).

B. Analysis

**Country Focal Point** is a good system that faces the normal issue of staff turnover in members, advisors, partners, ADB and OECD. The draft 2018-2020 Work Program calls for the Secretariat to reconfirm Focal Point. This is a good idea that can be even more effective if it could be done on a six-monthly basis and supplemented by a policy of preparing Handover Notes from the out-going Focal Point to the Incoming Focal
50. **Member engagement.** Members have shown their support by hosting events almost annually since 2000 and some have made cash and in-kind contributions (Annex 15). Attendance at most of the events has been reasonably good (about 80%). These are positive indications of member engagement. However, a part of the membership is not engaged and efforts are needed to take member engagement to a higher and broader level. The need for improving engagement is evident from: 6 out of 31 members did not submit written country reports during 2011-16 and this increased to 10 during 2014-2016 (Annex 10); response rate for periodic surveys for the thematic policy studies has been low (varied 50-70%); response rate for this evaluation survey was 67% despite rigorous follow up; and 71% of members responding to the survey are ‘Not Sure’ whether they are prepared to make contributions to the work of the Initiative. The 10 countries that never submitted a report during 2014-2016 were: Afghanistan, Fiji Islands, Japan, India, Kazakhstan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu. Additionally, Afghanistan, Australia, India, Kyrgyz Republic, Pakistan, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, and Thailand did not respond to the survey for this evaluation. As can be seen, four countries have not participated in either of these activities, indicating a lack of engagement.

51. **Steering Group (SG)** meetings were held in each of the 7-year period (2011-12) under review. A summary of the attendance, content and materials posted online is presented in the Annex 13. Most member countries attended the meetings. The meetings concentrated on their core functions. Consultations with CSOs, the private sector and media representatives’ resident in the host country were organized. This was reasonable as it would be costly for the Initiative to finance travel costs for such representatives. However, consideration may be given to open up the consultations to those CSO, private sector and academia representatives that may wish to attend at their own cost. **Dissemination** of the SG/AG activities was primarily achieved by posting agenda, participants list, and minutes of the meeting online at the Initiative’s website and constitutes good practice on transparency. In response to a question about how effectively does the SG operates, 63% of the members said ‘Very Effectively’ and 37% ‘Somewhat Effectively’ (MQ19). When asked to rate how useful SGs have been in their agency’s work 65% of members rated SG meetings to be Very Effective’ and 25% replying ‘Somewhat Effective’ (MQ12). 60% of Advisers rated the SG meetings as ‘Somewhat Effective’ (AQ8).

52. **Advisory Group (AG)** meetings were held in each of the 7-year period under review. AG members provided technical advice as well as funding for events and program. The survey provides the following insights:

   a. 53% of the members responding rated Advisory Group operating ‘Very Effectively” and 42% ‘Somewhat Effectively’ (MQ19). Members were also asked the expertise of various AG members is being used effectively. Although a solid majority of Members (75% and more) are of the view that the expertise of the various Advisory Group members is used Very Effectively (MQ21) individual adviser ratings varied. ADB received the highest score with 87% of members
replying ‘Very Effectively’, followed by UNODC and OECD with 80%, UNDP at 73% and the World Bank at 60%.

b. In response to the question of whether the expertise of the various Advisory Group members is used effectively, 80% of advisors responded ‘Somewhat Effectively’ and 20% ‘Not Effectively’ (AQ17). A suggestion was made to involve TI more effectively (AQ20). Comments included recommendations to: first consider what change the Initiative wants to achieve in the region and then to identify a set of priority issues for action (AQ16); for AG members to get equal voice in setting the agenda of the Initiative (AQ16); clarify the role of the Advisory Group in setting the strategic directions for the Initiative (AQ17) and to hold bilateral discussions with members of the Advisors Group (AQ22).

The Secretariat. In response to a question about how effectively does the Secretariat operates, 58% of the Members responded ‘Very Effectively’ and 32% ‘Somewhat Effectively’ (MQ19). 80% of the Advisers rated the Secretariat to be ‘Somewhat Effective’ (AQ15). 71% of the Members are of the view that the Secretariat provided all necessary and timely administrative support. 14% replied ‘Provided Some Administrative Support’ and 14% replied ‘Not Provided Administrative Support’. (MQ22). Advisers had a similar view with 75% indicating that the Secretariat provided ‘All Necessary and Timely Administrative Support’ while 25% indicated ‘Some Administrative Support’. (AQ23) Members (MQ24) and Advisers (AQ25) provided the following suggestions for increasing members’ ownership and engagement in the Anticorruption Initiative.

a. Maintain updated primary contact information and versing new staff in goals and programs of the Anticorruption Initiative

b. Provide regular engagement and information sharing at conferences with more time for experience/best practices sharing at meetings; provide more training
c. Provide opportunities to engage members that have not had leading role in Anticorruption Initiative

d. include all agencies fighting corruption – anticorruption agencies, law enforcement authorities etc.

e. add activities throughout the year to supplement annual inputs at seminar or other events

f. identify priority issues through group discussions of members

54. **Funding.** The Initiative expenses are modest and covered by sponsors as well as member contributions. ADB, OECD and UNDP sponsor the Initiative and provide the core funding through cash contributions that ranged $10-23,000 per year in most years during 2011-2017 (See Annex 15). In addition, they make in-kind contributions through staff time and travel for secretariat and resource speakers. Members contribute in three important ways:

- Hosting an event and covering expenses for venue, meals, equipment and airport services. The 2011-2017 events were hosted by: India; Vietnam; Timor-Leste; Cambodia; Mongolia; Bhutan; and South Korea.

- In-kind contributions by providing resource speakers, facilitators and case studies; and,

- Some members and advisers pay their own travel and subsistence for participation.

Although exact numbers on amounts contributed by the members and sponsors are not available yet it can be safely concluded that the small amounts of funding provided by the sponsors leverages a significant amount of member contributions. However, budget constraint at OECD is making it more challenging for them to continue their support. In response to the survey question “are you prepared to make contributions to the work of the Initiative” 29% of members replied ‘Yes’ to willing to provide an in-kind contribution and 71% replied ‘Not Sure’. This could be interpreted to mean that majority would be in favor of current practices of case by case negotiations.

C. **Findings and Recommendations**

55. Implementation arrangements have been effective but should be strengthened to respond to evolving member needs, enhancing member engagement, monitor results and improve communications.

a. **Country Focal Point is a good system that needs to be kept up-to-date.** Staff turnover in members, advisors, partners, ADB and OECD are normal and happen under this initiative. The draft 2018-2020 Work Program calls for the Secretariat to reconfirm Focal Points. This is a good idea that can be even more effective if it could be done on a six-monthly basis and supplemented by a policy
of preparing Handover Notes from the out-going Focal Point to the Incoming Focal Point.

b. **Member engagement varies and needs improvement.** Members have shown their support by hosting events almost annually since 2000 and some have made cash and in-kind contributions. However, a part of the membership is not engaged and efforts are needed to take member engagement to a higher and broader level.

c. **Steering Group and Advisory Group meetings were effective but Advisers have potential to contribute more.** Merging the two groups is appropriate as it has the potential for more effective Adviser participation. Technical expertise of some advisers (e.g. TI, OECD, UNODC) seem underused. The group of advisers could be usefully if enlarged to include new relevant organizations. Hosting the SG meetings in member countries is a good practice that should be continued. It enhances member ownership, the Initiative’s visibility, networking and interactions with CSOs, private and media representatives’ resident in the host country. Agenda, participants list, and minutes of the SG meetings were posted online and should be continued as a good practice on transparency.

d. **The Secretariat was effective but overstretched.** It was effective in providing necessary and timely administrative support according to both the members and the advisers. The evaluation found that the current part-time staffing of the Initiative is stretched thin in coping with the current level of activities and will not be adequate for responding to growing member demands, need for substantive support for events and results monitoring and regular communications. Members suggested having a full time Secretariat.

e. **The modest amount of funding was contributed by sponsors and members but would need augmentation to enable the Initiative to be responsive to member needs and the changing anti-corruption landscape.** Members prefer to provide in-kind contribution and 74% replied ‘not sure’. There were no member responses willing to make a cash contribution. (MQ25). Some of the Advisers are willing to make contributions in cash as well as in kind. During the evaluation interviews, OECD indicated that it is finding it more challenging to continue its support for capacity building at past levels while UNDP appeared keen to expand its support. It is recommended that the evaluation findings and recommendations should be shared with OECD members and OECD secretariat as well as other key sponsors (e.g. UNDP, GIZ) and bilateral discussions pursued to enlist their participation and funding for the enhancements recommended in this evaluation. The Initiative’s membership includes several OECD members (Japan, South Korea, Australia) that may be willing to support the small and developing members in the region with capacity building efforts. The evaluation did not discuss any specifics with them but it is recommended that the Secretariat should intensify its efforts in this area.

56. **Recommendation 6: A customized outreach should be made by the Secretariat to each member to solicit their ideas for taking theirs as well as the group’s engagement in the Initiative’s activities to the next higher level.** Customized approach is needed because members are different levels in terms
of their engagement. Some have been rather passive (see paragraph 50). Prospects for enhancing engagement are good since there is a lot of goodwill among members for the Initiative. However, this will require reaching out to relatively passive members on individual basis to ascertain their concerns and suggestions about becoming more active members. The Secretariat should do this outreach immediately. During the survey members put forward several ideas to increase members ownership and engagement that provide a starting point for a discussion on what can be done within the resources available.

a. Regular information sharing and engagement

b. Events to devote more time to share experiences and best practice

c. Each country to host events to share experiences

d. Inter-country contact database to help sharing

e. Avoid ‘another international obligation’ tag

f. Members provide good examples for sharing

g. More demand driven workshops and training

h. Increased and regular Secretariat coordination and dissemination of information.

57. **Recommendation 7:** The Initiative should be supported by a full-time secretariat with adequate staffing to provide more substantive support for the activities, to enhance responsiveness to member needs and the changing anti-corruption landscape in the region and globally and to improve communications. Priority areas for enhanced attention by a strengthened Secretariat are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member priorities for capacity building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Asset recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Business integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Extradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Beneficial ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Financial disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Foreign funding/influence in campaign financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Investigations capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Engaging civil society and media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Public procurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey

Figure 4114
f. fundraising;


g. serve as a clearing house for member requests for technical assistance by doing one or more of the following:

- directing their request to appropriate agency e.g. U4 Anti-Corruption Center

- circulating request among members to see whether others have similar need and/or whether some member is in a position to provide assistance on a bilateral basis

- organize topical problem-solving and technical assistance for a small group of members needing such assistance (Box xx). The 31 members represent a highly diverse group and finding issues common to all is challenging and poses the risk of not being able to address needs of some members, particularly smaller and non-OECD member countries that are in greatest need for capacity building.

**58. Recommendation 8: A moderate increase in funding for the Initiative is recommended to better serve member needs and enhance impact.** The members have made several suggestions for enhancing the responsiveness and impact of the Initiative as is evident from the preceding findings and recommendations. Pursuing them will require additional funding. In particular, funding will be needed to:

a. Strengthen the Secretariat in line with Recommendation 7

b. Creating a fund to provide demand-driven capacity building and technical assistance as highlighted in Recommendations 1 and 3.

c. Organizing problem solving and capacity building events for smaller group of members facing a common issue.
V. MOVING FORWARD

A. Anti-Corruption Landscape is Changing

59. Universal anti-corruption goals have been adopted enhancing the relevance of and prospects for greater contributions of the Initiative. Building on the operationalization of the UNCAC, nations of the world have adopted goals of reducing corruption and illicit financial flows as part of the targets under the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 under the Agenda 2030. They have also committed to develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions. Members of the Initiative are already engaged (Figure 11) in contributing to fulfillment of these targets and would like assistance from the Initiative as evident from their responses under the survey.

60. New development partners and initiatives have emerged in the fight against corruption opening up prospects for the Initiative to broaden co-operation. Recent developments include:

a. Recognition of CSOs as key development partners together with government and the private sector. For example, the Transparency, Accountability and Participation Network (TAP) with over 250 CSOs (including many in Asia) as members is dedicated to achievement of SDG16 targets.

b. Rise of non-traditional donors such as philanthropic organizations. For example, the SDG Philanthropy Platform facilitates resources, information and efforts for achievement of all SDGs including SDG16.

c. Emergence of new organizations and development banks such as Open Government Partnership (OGP), Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), New Development Bank.

d. Recent commitments by multi-lateral development banks to help their members fight corruption and achieve SDGs. For example, in July 2018 the ADB adopted “Strengthening Governance and Institutional Capacity” as one if its 7 key operational priorities and committed to implement anti-corruption measures in all it projects and programs; in April 2018 the International Monetary Fund adopted a Framework for Enhanced Engagement on Governance, the World Bank adopted “Governance and Institutions” as special theme of the IDA 18 replenishment in May 2016.

---

61. Several initiatives for rethinking anti-corruption approaches have emerged and the Initiative would benefit by developing linkages with them. Rethinking is driven by disappointing results in fighting corruption in the past 20 years. As the charts show the disappointment is both on side of enforcement as well as outcomes.

Prominent rethinking initiatives include:

- **The British Academy/DFID Anti-Corruption Evidence Partnership** (on-going project started in 2015 to identify the most successful ways of addressing corruption in the developing countries)
- **Anti-corruption Policies Revisited** a five-year research project of European Union
- **Why corruption matters: understanding causes, effects and how to address them.** This 2015 meta study synthesizes the existing body of evidence on effectiveness of different approaches (including anti-corruption agencies) for fighting corruption.

The significance of these rethinking and evidence projects for the Initiative is to build communications with them to be informed of their efforts and findings and to facilitate their research on efforts of anti-corruption agencies.

B. **2018-2020 Work Program**

62. The **Discussion Paper on the Initiative’s 2018-20 Work Program** outlined several ideas that would enable it to adapt to the changing landscape. The paper noted the changing international anti-corruption agenda including development of SDG16, OGP and other developments. The following key ideas have the potential to enable the Initiative to adapt to the recent developments discussed above and to stay current:

![Figure 15](Corruption in Asia and the Pacific is perceived to have increased recently)

- Focus on dual work streams on prevention and enforcement
- Introduce more practical assistance through a targeted approach during and between the annual events
- Practitioners and technical experts from anti-corruption partners from the public, private and non-state sectors may be invited to share their perspectives and experiences
d. Develop more partnerships as well as leverage existing partnerships for more technical and financial support

e. Connect with complementary regional or global initiatives

f. Strengthen evidence base for the Initiative’s (and members) anti-corruption activities

63. The draft 2018-2020 Work Program is based on the 2016 SG meeting review of the Discussion Paper. It proposes the following key activities and outputs during 2018-2020:

g. Three annual SG meetings

h. An external evaluation in 2018 to present recommendations for improvement

i. One High Level meeting upon completion of the work program to take stock of achievements and identify priorities for future work

j. Six capacity building meetings (3 each for PIN and LEN networks)

k. Six thematic studies (3 each for PIN and LEN networks)

l. In-country technical assistance or country studies (upon demand)

m. Exploratory work on establishing a work stream on business integrity

n. Maintenance of up-to-date directory of all members of the Initiative and LEN/PIN networks

o. Up-to-date public communications

64. 89% of members responding to the survey did not find a need to modify the 2009 Strategic Principles and the Work Program for 2018-2020, as presented at the November, 2017 meeting (MQ15). Most respondents stating that there were no inconsistencies with the changing anticorruption landscape (MQ14). A member observed that the 2018-2020 Work Program is more strategic than previous work programs and has a targeted approach. All Advisers regarded the 2018-2020 Work Program relevant given the emergence of the UNCAC, SDG 16 and Open Government Partnership (AQ10).

C. Findings and Recommendations

65. 2018-20 Work Program remains appropriate. The 2018-2020 work program is based on a strategic review of future directions for the Initiative as discussed at the 21st Steering Group meeting. The evaluation found that adjustments made and the activities proposed in the work streams for LEN and PIN networks are appropriate and well aligned with the needs expressed by the members (see Recommendation 4). Survey included a question on whether the program should be modified. 89% of the members
did not find a need to modify.

66. **Recommendation 9:** Stay on-course to implement the 2018-2020 work program and consider enhancements along the evaluation recommendations and recent developments in the anti-corruption landscape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity and Outputs in the 2018-2020 Work Program Proposal</th>
<th>Recommended Enhancements from this Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three annual SG meetings</td>
<td>Recommendation 4: Continue regional conferences, capacity building training and thematic policy review activities and introduce more demand driven and interactive learning activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six capacity building meetings (3 each for PIN and LEN networks)</td>
<td>Recommendation 5: The Regional stocktaking report proposed in the 2018-2020 Work Program should include synthesis report on issues, trends and impact of anti-corruption activities in member countries during 2017-2019. This should be based on each member country self-reporting in the current template with modifications to include activities related to SDG16 anti-corruption targets. Its objective would be to inform the strategic priorities for future work of the Initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six thematic studies (3 each for PIN and LEN networks)</td>
<td>Recommendation 6: A results framework with input, output, outcome and impact indicators should be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One High Level meeting upon completion of the work program to take stock of achievements and identify priorities for future work</td>
<td>Recommendation 1: Customized technical support to individual or a small group of members upon request</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| In-country technical assistance or country studies (upon demand) | Recommendation 7: Secretariat to serve as a clearing house for member requests for technical assistance by doing one or more of the following:  
  - directing their request to appropriate agency e.g. U4 Anti-Corruption Center  
  - circulating request among members to see whether others have similar need and/or whether some member is in a position to provide assistance on a bilateral basis  
  - organize topical problem-solving and technical assistance for a small group of members needing such assistance. |
| Maintenance of up-to-date directory of all members of the Initiative and LEN/PIN networks | Recommendation 6: A customized outreach should be made by the Secretariat to each member to solicit their ideas for taking theirs’ as well as the group’s engagement in the Initiative’s activities to the next higher level. |
| Up-to-date public communications | Recommendation 7: The Initiative should be supported by a full-time secretariat with adequate staffing. This would enable:  
  - up-to-date registry of focal points (included in the 2018-2020 Work Program) and an orientation package for new Focal Points, members and advisers  
  - regular communications with members  
  - enhanced member relations to increase ownership and engagement |