EVALUATION OF UNDP CONTRIBUTION TO ANTI-CORRUPTION AND GOVERNANCE INTEGRITY IN A DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

CONCEPT NOTE
July 2015

Evaluation Manager	Vijayalakshmi Vadivelu
Executive Board presentation	September 2016

INTRODUCTION

The Independent Evaluation Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is carrying out an 'Evaluation of UNDP contribution to anti-corruption and governance integrity in a development context', which is part of its medium-term plan (DP/2014/5) approved by the Executive Board in January 2014. In approving the evaluation, the Executive Board recognized the importance of support to anti-corruption and transparency, accountability and integrity measures for equitable governance.[1] The evaluation will include an assessment of UNDP contribution during 2008 to 2014, covering the period of the last Strategic Plan 2008-2011, extended to 2013, and the current Strategic Plan 2014- 2017. Given the thrust to anti-corruption and governance in the Sustainable Development Goals, the evaluation will contribute to UNDPs anti-corruption and governance integrity programme strategy. The evaluation will be presented to the Executive Board at the second regular session in September 2016. The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Strengthen UNDP accountability to global and national development partners, including Executive Board
- Support development of corporate programme strategies
- Support organizational learning

UNDP ANTI-CORRUPTION AND GOVERNANCE INTEGRITY SUPPORT

The negative impact of weak governance and corruption on development is widely acknowledged. Corruption and lack of transparency and accountability in governance remain major challenges in achieving development goals. Hindering economic development, corruption negatively correlates with economic outcomes, and has consequences for public expenditure decisions and investments. Besides being dysfunctional, corruption undermines democratic values and institutions. In civil service and related institutional arrangements corruption has serious implications for meritocracy. A number of governance variables affect levels of corruption. Anti-corruption gains are likely to remain small if interventions aimed at taking action on corruption, are not combined with a wider set of interventions aimed at improving the quality of governance institutions in general.

For two decades, UNDP has extended support to strengthen accountability, transparency and integrity measures as part of its democratic governance interventions. UNDP support to Democratic Governance (Strategic Plan 2008-13) and Inclusive and Effective Democratic Governance (Strategic Plan 2014-17) entails a wide range of activities. Broadly, UNDP support in the Strategic Plan 2008-13 included programmes related to fostering inclusive participation, strengthening accountable and responsive governing institutions, and Grounding democratic governance in international principles.[1] In the ongoing Strategic Plan 2014-17, UNDP outlined support to increased integrity in public institutions, policies and capacities for more effective governance, and rule of law and citizen security. During this period, UNDP supported programmes in the area of conflict prevention and peacebuilding, responsible and accountable institutions, inclusive political processes, rule of law, security and human rights, and HIV and health.[2]

In both the Strategic Plans, UNDP adopted a multi-dimensional and integrated approach to anti-corruption and governance integrity. Although specific support was extended to strengthen anti-corruption legislations, policies and institutions, support to anti-corruption was largely through strengthening governance integrity measures. In its ongoing and past Strategic Plans, key areas of governance support aimed to strengthen mechanisms of public accountability to better address concerns and interests of poor people, women, and other vulnerable or excluded groups. UNDP recognizes that, in addition to support to anti-corruption policies and mechanisms, accountability, transparency, and integrity should be systematically addressed as preventive measures into development programmes.

The Strategic Plan for 2008-13 acknowledged the importance of support to multisectoral accountability mechanisms, specifically oversight mechanisms, public administration reform, public sector ethics, civil service reforms, decentralized governance, and e-governance to enhance accountability and transparency in governance. UNDP implemented programmes to strengthen the justice sector as part of its governance portfolio. In addition, UNDP

---

[1] UNDP Executive Board, 2008, 'UNDP strategic plan, 2008–2011 – Accelerating global progress on human development', (DP/2007/43/Rev.1), New York, May. See, http://web.undp.org/execbrd/pdf/dp07-43Rev1.pdf and

[2] UNDP Executive Board, 2013, 'UNDP strategic plan, 2014–2017 – Changing with the World', (DP/2013/12), New York, June. See http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/UNDP_strategic-plan_14-17_v9_web.pdf

supported anti-corruption policies and institutional mechanisms.[3] While there was a sub-goal on anti-corruption, prevention related support was spread across all governance programme areas. The Strategic Plans broadly emphasised for UNDP to contribute to a) changes in macro policies; b) changes in capacities of state and non-state actors; and c) improved governance quality.

In the ongoing Strategic Plan for 2014-17, support to strengthening integrity measures in public institutions at the national and sub-national levels are emphasized as critical in strengthening governance, especially as countries mobilize a growing share of their development expenditure from domestic resources. Similar to the previous Strategic Plan, the larger preventive issues are addressed across inclusive governance support. As such, assistance to anti-corruption standards and systems are expected to supplement programmes that strengthen accountability and transparency mechanisms.[4] Direct anti-corruption support is an output under the broader governance outcome.[5] Sector specific access to information is an area that is prioritized as part of anti-corruption support. In select sectors and development areas UNDP aims to support assessing/identifying integrity risks.

Under the broad framework of these two Strategic Plans, UNDP country programmes support a range of activities that provide direct support to strengthening anti-corruption measures, as well as preventive issues targeting institutional drivers of corruption through support to strengthening accountability and transparency. UNDP in coordination with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime supports the implementation and review of UNCAC. While about 30 country programmes have supported specific anti-corruption related interventions, over 81 country programmes have supported programmes focused on accountability and transparency and related governance practices. Although not all country offices consistently mainstream anti-corruption across poverty reduction, environment and crisis prevention programmes, most have addressed the drivers of corruption as part of their governance and poverty reduction support.

Besides country-level support to anti-corruption and integrity mechanisms as part of the country programme, UNDP also implemented global and regional anti-corruption programmes. All five Regional Programmes (Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Arab region, Europe and CSIS, and Latin America and the Caribbean) included anti-corruption and governance integrity support, although of different scale. Two anti-corruption global projects, viz., Programme on Anti-Corruption for Development Effectiveness (PACDE) 2008–2011 extended to 2013, Global Anti-corruption Initiative (GAIN) 2014-2017 have been implemented since 2008.[6]

OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will assess UNDPs contribution to strengthening national capacities in anti-corruption and governance integrity. This will include an assessment of UNDPs contribution to global and regional level debates and advocacy. In making the overall assessment of UNDP's contribution, the evaluation, will assess relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability at the country level as against the expectations in the Strategic Plans in term of a) changes in macro policies and awareness; b) changes in capacities of state and non-state actors; and c) improved governance quality.

- *Relevance:* What is the extent to which UNDP support is appropriate for strengthening anti-corruption capacities and addressing corruption drivers?
- *Effectiveness: To* what extent did UNDP contributions to capacity development achieve underlying objectives of establishing governance integrity and reducing corruption?

---

[3] UNDP Executive Board, 2008, 'UNDP strategic plan, 2008–2011 – Accelerating global progress on human development', (DP/2007/43/Rev.1), New York, May.

[4] UNDP Executive Board, 2013, 'UNDP strategic plan, 2014–2017 – Changing with the World', (DP/2013/12), New York, June

[5] Outcome — 'Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance' See SP 2014

[6] A precursor of PACDE was Programme for Accountability and Transparency (PACT), an independent trust fund established with assistance from the Governments of Denmark and the Netherlands, and later on from Germany, enabled UNDP to address the emerging concerns of addressing corruption as part of democratic governance. PACT supported countries to improve financial management and accountability through technical assistance and tools development. CONTACT – Country Assessment in Accountability and Transparency was to assist governments in undertaking comprehensive self-assessments of their public financial management systems.

CONCEPT NOTE

- *Efficiency:* What is the degree to which UNDP programmes and processes used resources in a way to achieve more results for least cost?
- *Sustainability:* What is the extent to which the results of UNDP contribution are likely to be sustainable?

UNDP provides support to a range of countries, including those emerging out of conflict and in transition, lower income countries, and middle income countries. UNDP is extensively involved in supporting countries in conflict and in transition, in building state institutions, while support to strengthening governance is also a key area in regular development programmes. The evaluation will confine itself to UNDP's contribution in the development context. The evaluation will however assess UNDP support to countries in transition.

The evaluation will include an assessment of the contribution of UNDP support during the period 2008 to 2014, covering the last Strategic Plan 2008-2011, extended to 2013, and the current Strategic Plan 2014- 2017; assessment of global, regional programmes, and country level programmes pertaining to anti-corruption and governance integrity mechanisms.

The evaluation will assess UNDPs contribution under the three streams of support, viz., Strengthening anti-corruption policies and institutions, Addressing drivers of corruption, and Bringing changes in governance practices. The evaluation will cover all five regions where UNDP implements programmes, namely, Africa, Arab States, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and the CIS, and Latin America and the Caribbean. Besides support to state actors, the evaluation will assess UNDP's partnership and support to strengthening the capacities of non-state actors — civil society organizations, community forums and media.

APPROACH

Anti-corruption and governance integrity issues are dynamic and systemic and entail a complex set of interactions among various institutions and actors. The evaluation recognizes the non-linear nature of anti-corruption and governance integrity programming results, and the complexity associated with the contextual dynamics in play when reducing corruption or strengthening transparency and accountability in governance. Different composition of institutions operating at the national and sub-national level are often involved, and their differing and interdependent roles, for example, political, legislative, and executive, can make the contribution of programmes at times intangible or less tangible. It is widely recognised that there are limitation in accurately measuring the effectiveness of anti-corruption and public accountability and transparency policies. A fundamental issue is that the independent and dependent variables associated with anti-corruption and /or governance integrity are very similar and the relationship is more reciprocal than strictly causal. The variables of effective anti-corruption, for example, high governance and institutional capacities, or governance integrity, have a reciprocal causality with anti-corruption. Formulating a linear 'input' to 'outcome'/ 'result' causal relationship therefore has inherent limitations. This evaluation consequently adopts a Theory of Change approach to understand the processes of UNDP contribution.

The Theory of Change outlines the causal and reciprocal pathways of the contribution of anti-corruption and governance integrity programmes, to understand the extent of UNDP programme support given a particular governance context (what did UNDP do), approach of contribution (were UNDP programmes appropriate for achieving national results), process of contribution (how did the contribution occur), and the significance of the contribution (what is the contribution — did UNDP accomplish its intended objectives).

The evaluation will use a mixed method approach and a multi-stakeholder consultation process. The methods that will be used include, document review, meta-synthesis of evaluations, country case studies, desk studies, and semi structured interviews.

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The *Independent Evaluation Office* will manage the evaluation process, constitute a quality assurance system, and provide administrative and substantive backstopping support. It will also coordinate and liaise with concerned agencies at headquarters, regional institutions, and UNDP management and programme units. It will also ensure that evaluations are conducted in accordance with the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the United Nations System, as approved by the members of the United Nations Evaluation Group.

The *Regional bureaux*, the *Policy Bureau* in New York and *regional hubs* in five regions will support the evaluation by providing the necessary information and documents requested by the IEO and the evaluation team. In each bureau, and regional centres, a substantive focal point will be identified. The focal point will provide the necessary information, and in

collaboration with the Evaluation Manager, will facilitate meetings with the UNDP partners and programme stakeholders.

A *Technical Reference Group* will be constituted comprising representatives of BPPS Development Impact Group, regional bureau, the BPPS governance unit, and governance and anti-corruption advisors in the regional bureaus and Regional Hubs. During the course of the evaluation two workshops with the Technical Reference Group will be organized — to share the evaluation design at the beginning of the evaluation and at a later stage the emerging findings.

The Organizational Performance Group (OPG*) has the responsibility of reviewing* drafts of the Terms of Reference and draft evaluation report.

The *BPPS Development Impact Group* will coordinate comments from *programme units on the Terms of Reference and the draft reports and provide necessary programme information.*

An *IEO Internal Review Group*, comprising two evaluators of IEO chaired by the Deputy Director IEO will be constituted. The Internal Review Group will review key outputs of the evaluation, including evaluation tools.

An *External Advisory Panel* is constituted consisting of two experts in evaluation and development. The Advisory Panel members are Elliot Stern and Thomas Schwandt. The panel will play an important role in providing strategic, methodological and substantive advice to the evaluation process as well as reviewing key outputs, including terms of reference and draft evaluation report.

An *External Subject Expert Advisor* will provide technical advice to the evaluation at critical junctures of the evaluation.

EVALUATION PROCESS AND TIMEFRAME

Consultations will be held with a range of development actors at the country level, namely, government, civil society and NGO representatives, donors, multilateral and bilateral agencies and other national and international development organizations; representatives of the member states in New York; donor representatives in their respective headquarters; UNDP management, and staff in the programme units at the headquarters, Regional Hubs and the country offices; representatives of relevant UN agencies; development agencies and international civil society organizations.

The evaluation will be presented to the second regular session in September 2016 and prior to that at an informal Executive Board session in July 2016. To allow UNDP management time to prepare the management response, the final evaluation report will be completed and shared by mid-June 2016. A draft report will be shared with UNDP Management and programme units by mid-April 2016.