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# Executive Summary

**Introduction**

The ‘Preventing Corruption through Effective, Accountable and Transparent Governance Institutions in Uzbekistan (PCEAT)’ project is UNDP Uzbekistan’s flagship initiative on anti-corruption (AC), and UNDP’s largest anti-corruption project in Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) region. This project is funded by the Government of Uzbekistan, with a US$8 million budget. The project is jointly implemented by UNDP Uzbekistan, UNDP’s ‘Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies’ (ACPIS) global programme, and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub.

**Purpose, objectives, scope and use of the evaluation**

Purpose

This Mid-term Evaluation (MTE), conducted between October 2020 and January 2021, was commissioned by UNDP to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and overall progress of the PCEAT project. In particular, the MTE had the following five specific objectives (SOs):

* *To document the project's progress and results and assess the project's outcomes and impact achieved through its activities and outputs.*
* *To review the effectiveness of the project's design in assessing project performance and impact.*
* *To review the project’s modality in terms of its structure, coordination between partners, and capacity.*
* *To review what worked and what did not in terms of project implementation and delivery, and document good practices and lessons learned.*
* *To provide recommendations on how PCEAT could strengthen its results by better aligning its priorities and strengthening partnerships as envisioned by UNDP and the Government of Uzbekistan.*

**Scope of evaluation**

The MTE covered three years of the project cycle (2018-2020) and adopted a forward-looking approach to shaping UNDP Uzbekistan’s next phase of anti-corruption support in Uzbekistan.

The outcomes of the MTE should inform the PCEAT project’s partners, such as the Ministry of Justice of Uzbekistan (MoJ), the General Prosecutor’s Office (GPO) of Uzbekistan, the Anti-corruption Agency of Uzbekistan, UNDP Uzbekistan, UNDP’s global and regional anti-corruption teams, project management and its implementation team, and other partners, on how to maximise the impact of the PCEAT project going forward.

**Caveats**

The evaluation faced some constraints and limitations due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which led to it being conducted remotely. Against this backdrop, the Independent Evaluator and the Evaluation Reference Group increased the number of informants, conducted online group discussions, and adjusted the questions to the beneficiaries of the PCEAT project to attain their views on the quality of the deliverables and level of satisfaction with the procured technical expertise, to ensure that the evaluation accurately assesses the progress of the PCEAT project.

**Evaluation approach and methods**

The MTE was based on the main OECD DAC evaluation criteria proposed in the Terms of Reference (ToR) (Annex 2) and in the Evaluation Matrix (Annex 3), which outlines the evaluation questions, illustrative sub-questions, and indicators, methods and sources. The evaluation adopted Gender Equality and Human Rights-Based approaches,

which means that the UNDP team and the independent evaluator ensured that the evaluation process was participatory, and that relevant duty bearers (public sector/government representatives), and rights holders (civil society and academia) were consulted with and participated in this MTE. The evaluation reconstructed the project’s Theory of Change (ToC) based on consultation with stakeholders. Thus, the evaluation was guided by the project’s ToC and results framework, and assessed results against the set goals, inputs, activities, outcomes, outputs, and overall impact of the PCEAT project.

In addition, the evaluation assessed how the PCEAT project ensured gender equality and the equal participation of women and men in decision-making across the activities implemented. Relevant indicators were included in the Evaluation Matrix to measure the project's results in terms of women’s empowerment/representation, and promoting gender equality. This evaluation also ensured that there was gender balance across the informants of this evaluation.

**Data analysis**

The evaluation methodology utilized a mix of techniques and tools to assess the results of the PCEAT project against its ToC and results framework, from inputs and activities to outputs, outcomes and overall impact.

**Interviews**

Over 97 per cent of the interviews were conducted in the Russian language and without interpretation, which allowed for more efficiency and the gathering of a higher quality of information. Interviews were semi-structured but flexible, allowing for new questions to be brought up during the interview.

**Document and secondary data review**

The evaluator studied over 60 reports, case studies, regional assessments and other documents related to the Uzbekistan context, global best practices on anti-corruption, the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), and UNDP’s global reports on anti-corruption and governance.

**Evaluation questions and the Evaluation Matrix (EM)**

The Evaluation Framework consisted of evaluation questions as per the OECD DAC and additional questions developed by the independent evaluator. In total, 18 evaluation questions and findings based on their answers form the core of the evaluation report.

**Context**

Since 2016 the Government of Uzbekistan has been pursuing a series of ambitious anti-corruption reforms, particularly with the enaction of the law ‘On Combatting Corruption’ in 2017, the establishment of the Anti-corruption Agency of Uzbekistan in 2020, and the ongoing development of a National Anti-corruption Strategy (2021-2025). Such a positive political shift has since attracted many development partners. UNDP and UNODC are the two main UN agencies which have supported Uzbekistan’s ambitious Anti-Corruption reforms from the start. In March 2018, the UNDP Country Office in Uzbekistan and the Ministry of Justice of Uzbekistan jointly launched the ‘Preventing Corruption through Effective, Accountable and Transparent Governance Institutions in Uzbekistan’ (PCEAT) project, which has received policy and advisory support from UNDP’s ‘Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies’ (ACPIS) global programme and UNDP’s Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH). While UNDP is involved in the prevention of corruption, UNODC is focused on strengthening the punitive aspects of the legal reforms, thus criminalising corruption by developing a draft new Criminal Code and self-assessment under the UNCAC review. The Council of Europe, with funding from the European Union, has provided technical assistance within the framework of the project ‘Promoting Transparency and Action against Economic Crime’ (CA TAEC). This initiative is a part of the broader Rule of Law Programme for Central Asia, strengthening capacities in preventing economic crime in five Central Asian countries, including in Uzbekistan.

**Key Findings**

**Relevance:** The PCEAT project implements anti-corruption interventions and activities in line with Uzbekistan’s Action Strategy for 2017-2021, the State Anti-Corruption Programme of Uzbekistan 2019-2020 (the PCEAT project directly implements 29 activities out of the programme’s total of 35) and Uzbekistan’s commitments under the 2030 Agenda. The activities implemented by the PCEAT project have also proved to be necessary to support a much-needed active civil society in Uzbekistan. Project relevance could be further strengthened by ensuring its activities effectively address the needs of civil society and communities (focusing on women), particularly by engaging them in implementing the activities. The emerging anti-corruption needs and priorities in Uzbekistan that the PCEAT project could contribute to include building an ecosystem of civil society organizations to promote social accountability, monitoring and oversight in areas such as procurement, investigative journalism, infrastructure, local government, and others.

**Effectiveness:** The PCEAT project has made good progress in delivering expected results in four outcome areas. Most of the planned activities were implemented and have resulted in expected results, and, in some instances, outstanding results have been achieved. However, the effectiveness of project activities could be strengthened by adding impact-level results into the results framework, since during this MTE it became evident that at the mid-point of the PCEAT project’s implementation, it had already produced impact-level results that positively contribute to changing the anti-corruption environment in the country. The governance structure is effectively used.

**Efficiency:** The project outputs have been delivered cost-efficiently. There is a high appreciation for the quality of the training delivered and the international expertise engaged for capacity development. The PCEAT project is staffed with national experts with the strong knowledge of national and local contexts required to manage the project. Furthermore, the PCEAT project receives policy and advisory support from UNDP’s Global Anti-Corruption Programme and the Istanbul Regional Hub, which provide quality assurance and overall monitoring of the project’s implementation. In 2020, $2,006,426 was approved and allocated in total, 93 percent of the total delivery rate[[1]](#footnote-1).

**Impact:** Some of the project’s activities have succeeded beyond expectations. In the mid-term, some outstanding results include delivering IT solutions, business compliance applications and the certification process within state agencies, as well as supporting the Anti-corruption Agency's establishment and functioning. The integrated IT solutions have resulted in the improved efficiency and effectiveness of court’s bailiffs, while the upgraded public system doubled the speed of the delivery of interactive court services to the public, which was especially timely during the COVID-19 restrictions. The digitalization of public officials attestation processes resulted in zero corruption complaints, while the talent acquisition HR system of UzbekOilGas was fully digitalized, and public servants gained awareness of the topic of “Conflict of Interest”. In addition, the PCEAT project provided support to anti-corruption journalists, which has helped pave the way for developing the capacity of investigative journalism in the country.

**Sustainability:** An overarching factor which could sustain the current results and expected impacts of the project, is the top-level political will to advance anti-corruption reforms in Uzbekistan. As such there is an availability of human, technical and financial resources coupled with the coordinated efforts of all the actors within the justice system (investigations, prosecution, adjudication and asset management), public administration (tenders, bids, e-governance, etc.), and line ministries (health, education, construction, etc.). Addressing the bottlenecks in the coordination between key players within the framework of the ongoing reform, and enabling and encouraging the vibrant and active participation of CSOs and independent media, can help contribute to the sustainability of the project’s interventions. A coordinated whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach are necessary to ensure sustained anti-corruption efforts in the long run.

**UNDP added value:** The PCEAT project receives policy and programme support from UNDP’s ‘Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies’ (ACPIS) Global Project and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, both of whom provide an excellent repository of global and regional anti-corruption knowledge and expertise to support the implementation of the PCEAT project. Support has been provided in the form of project quality assurance, assistance in drafting/analyzing various legal amendments and project proposals, strategic advice, and the development of many essential tools to be adapted to the Uzbekistan context. As a result of UNDP’s efforts in coordinating its work with other UN agencies and partners, the PCEAT project has benefitted from UNDP’s integrated approach to anti-corruption. The PCEAT project’s interventions have supported the establishment of the state AC agency and contributed to the Republic of Uzbekistan’s international obligations to the UNCAC and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. UNDP’s integrated anti-corruption approach leverages multi-stakeholder collaboration to prevent corruption and complements development partners in their respective efforts to tackle corruption in Uzbekistan. As UNDP’s largest anti-corruption initiative in the region, the PCEAT project in Uzbekistan receives a considerable amount of positive feedback and attention from development partners and institutions mandated to oversee governance and anti-corruption efforts. UNDP’s global and regional teams’ active involvement in and support to the PCEAT project have amplified its visibility and that of Uzbekistan’s anti-corruption efforts not only within UNDP, but also among the wider international community. This may encourage other regional players to demonstrate their political will to engage in meaningful and joint cooperation for tackling and preventing corruption in Central Asia. The PCEAT project can leverage UNDP’s multi-stakeholder approach in involving civil society, local communities, independent media and investigative journalists to promote a culture of ethics and integrity in the country.

**Human rights and gender equality:** The PCEAT project has strengthened the capacity of female professionals within the participating agencies to promote anti-corruption efforts. PCEAT has actively promoted women’s participation and ensured that some 320 women took part in its activities. However, it was not possible to assess the extent to which the project makes a difference to gender equality and to women and girls’ empowerment, because the result framework of the project does not include specific indicators to measure these factors. In addition, the national partners’ perception of gender equality is not balanced across the sectors, and thus collecting a specific result in this regard was challenging. To incorporate the umbrella objective of gender equality into the next project’s design, it is essential to conduct gender analysis (GA) and apply a do no harm approach to ensure that the upcoming project will not perpetuate or exacerbate gender inequalities. Such a GA's outcome could increase the chances that more relevant inputs and outcomes will be included to spearhead efforts to enhance women’s empowerment in anti-corruption, for instance by fostering equal participation in decision-making, in leading the initiative, and building women’s economic empowerment. The scoring system of the OECD-DAC and its Gender Equality Policy Maker in Projects, including scores of 0 (The project does not target gender equality), 1 (Gender equality is a deliberate objective but not the principal reason for undertaking the project), and 2 (Gender equality is the main objective of the project), could be applied in the future. To evaluate the human rights-based approach (HRBA) impact of the action, the PCEAT team, jointly with national stakeholders, has to develop SMART indicators to adapt its results framework and report PCEAT’s AC efforts to curb corruption, and its impact on vulnerable population groups (final beneficiaries).

**Lessons Learned**

***a) Lesson learned from the literature review during the desk study***

1. The impact of the Anti-corruption Agency and other recipient institutions as a system can be assessed progressively. Anti-corruption reforms encompass legislative and institutional changes, and their implementation is sometimes a costly endeavour which requires an organizational strategy underpinned by human, technical and financial resources. Moreover, it is clear that the fight against corruption must be fully embedded in society, and cannot be a matter of laws and institutional reforms alone.
2. The review of UNDP’s global work in advancing gender equality supports the argument that anti-corruption and gender equality are mutually reinforcing: empowered women, who have an opportunity to participate in decision-making, are powerful actors who can contribute to the fight against corruption[[2]](#footnote-2). The recent studies have shown that promoting anti-corruption measures can advance gender equality and women’s empowerment because of their participation in decision-making and contribution to the fight against corruption[[3]](#footnote-3). Strengthening the collection of gender-disaggregated data and building women's engagement in efforts to reduce corruption will be important to advancing both anti-corruption and gender equality.

***b) Lessons learned from the implementation of PCEAT***

1. The ongoing anti-corruption reforms in Uzbekistan has created a momentum for development partners to invest in. What was learned from this evaluation is that PCEAT is stimulating this momentum and sustaining national stakeholders' interest by introducing best innovative practices and supporting concrete needs.
2. Triangulated support in the implementation of PCEAT provides coordinated and pooled policy support to integrate the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in Uzbekistan. Specifically, all activities envisaged and implemented to date through partners’ joint efforts to establish responsive and accountable institutions to deliver equitable public services at the central level, correspond to SDG 16 ‘The Promotion of Peaceful and Inclusive Societies’ targets. Shifting the focus to local governance and local development in the next phase would make this support stronger.
3. While the political and normative environment remains fragile for the strategic promotion of civic engagement and social accountability, there are circular arguments among the interviewed state agencies that the demand side of the anti-corruption agenda should be taken on board by the State through the participation of young people, civil society and the media. Added to these factors, women’s empowerment in participation and decision-making in anti-corruption reforms should be streamlined in the future implementation and follow-up intervention.

**Recommendations**

**Priority recommendations on project design and results reporting**

**Recommendation 1**. Strengthen PCEAT’s Results Framework for adequate impact-level reporting across all four result areas, by populating the Logical Framework (LF) with specific indicators to measure impact-level results rendered from the support provided to AC institutions.

**Recommendation 2.** Ensure that the prospective small grant scheme for national NGOs includes gender equality, women empowerment, innovation, and the inclusion of IT solutions as criterion in the Expressions of Interest and Call for Proposals.

**Recommendation 3.** Strengthen PCEAT’s governance structure (Steering Committee) in terms of inclusive participation and gender equality by encouraging civil society's participation in the project implementation's monitoring and decision-making structure. Ensure that the implementing partners' progress in achieving outcome and impact-level results are a specific point of discussion in the Steering Committee’s agenda.

**Recommendations for the follow-up phase of PCEAT**

**Recommendation 4.** Conduct a thorough and participatory identification and formulation exercise to identify the systemic determinants and bottlenecks that hamper the effectiveness and sustainability of the ongoing anti-corruption reforms' emerging results.

**Recommendation 5.** Build the capacity of civil society to promote social accountability and monitoring, to create a conducive environment for independent oversight. To that end, support investigative journalists and the development of independent media by sustaining the momentum created by PCEAT to develop a critical mass of independent anti-corruption professionals in the media.

# Background

#

## The State of Anti-corruption Affairs in Uzbekistan

With the change of political leadership in 2016, the State of Uzbekistan has been pursuing an ambitious reform programme. This programme has in particular sought to integrate the country into the world economy, improve its business climate, its justice system and security services, labour conditions, administrative accountability and efficiency, as well as respect for human rights and the development of good governance in general. To that end, the Government has embarked on several ambitious and critical reforms in anti-corruption policies. These policies are based on laws and strategic plans that have created a conducive normative environment for implementing anti-corruption activities, and the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC)[[4]](#footnote-4).

The law ‘On Combatting Corruption’ adopted in 2017 established the legal grounds and mechanisms for implementing anti-corruption measures. It positively highlights that the State has initiated reforms, often radical ones, in many areas for the first time in many years. The State has focused on mid-term priorities which include, among others, public administration reform, access to quality public services and public information, and judicial and legal reform. These priorities have been further supported through the adoption of the Concept of Administrative Reform which outlines the steps needed to establish an effective and transparent public administration system. To support these reforms, the Government launched an Action Strategy on Five Priority Areas of Development of the Republic of Uzbekistan for 2017-2021, and an e-Government masterplan for 2013-2020. The Government has also decided to develop Uzbekistan’s IT Outsourcing capacity.

As of March 2019 the Fourth Round of Monitoring of the Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan has resulted in 47 Recommendations made to the Government of Uzbekistan, while acknowledging the significant anti-corruption efforts and positive shift made towards opening up for more coherent reforms in the country.

The major reforms have served to introduce modern and effective mechanisms for the prevention of conflicts of interest, and also the creation of an asset and interest disclosure system of public officials. To that end, the Government’s adoption of the Law on Civil Service is pending. On 28 October 2020 the President of Uzbekistan Shavkat Mirziyoyev signed a Decree ‘On Organizational Measures to Reduce the Shadow Economy and Improve the Efficiency of Tax Authorities’. This Decree provides for an anti-corruption initiative (ACI), which includes the development of a rating methodology for assessing the level of corruption in government bodies across the national regions, as well as the introduction of a system of periodic publication of rating results, and the results of assessing the personal responsibility of heads of government bodies for anti-corruption operations in their respective bodies.

Following the Decree of the President ‘On Additional Measures to Improve the Anti-corruption System in the Republic of Uzbekistan’, the Anti-corruption Agency of Uzbekistan (ACA) was established on 29 June 2020. By the end of 2020, this newly established institution had become staffed and fully operational. This institution's main mandates are focused on prevention, undertaking the consideration of individual complaints, administrative investigations of corruption offences, and referring cases to designated law enforcement bodies in order to initiate criminal investigations. ACA’s capacity to process the system of income and asset declaration of public officials, and anti-corruption compliance programs in the public sector, while analyzing and raising public procurement effectiveness and budget funds usage, is under development.

At the end of December 2020, the ACA announced that a National Anti-corruption Strategy for 2021-2025 is being developed with the support of international organizations. One of its objectives will be a mandatory declaration of assets by civil servants. In early January 2021 the ACA drafted a law on income declarations which is currently undergoing approval by the relevant state bodies. The draft law covers officials at all levels. According to the draft law, officials of the Cabinet of Ministers, the presidential administration, khokimiyats, republican organizations, courts and prosecutors' offices, will all be required to declare their incomes. This applies to all officials from the lowest to the highest levels, including the President and the prime minister[[5]](#footnote-5).

As a result of these normative and administrative changes, 838 criminal corruption cases were initiated by law enforcement agencies in the first nine months of 2020. These investigations resulted in prosecutions against 647 public officials, with 454 indictments[[6]](#footnote-6). Of these cases, 40.3 percent concerned the misappropriation of public funds (embezzlement), 15 percent concerned fraud, 8 percent concerned bribery, and the remainder related to other various types of abuses of authority[[7]](#footnote-7). The perpetrators represented state institutions at national, city and district levels. The total economic damage amounted to over 200 billion Uzbek Soums, being an equivalent of US$20 million[[8]](#footnote-8).

In 2020 the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) of Transparency International (TI), which ranks 180 countries by their perceived levels of public sector corruption, drawing on conclusions of experts and businesspeople, ranked Uzbekistan at 146th position out of 180 and positioned it as 26th out of 100. The same source reports that from 2012 to 2020, Uzbekistan had positively elevated its score on the index by nine points[[9]](#footnote-9).

Despite these positive developments, the prevalence of corruption in state-provided services remains high. The results of the most recently conducted public opinion poll indicated that the healthcare system, recruitment processes, and the systems of higher and public education, are the most corrupt spheres in Uzbekistan. These are followed by the courts, the General Prosecutor’s Office, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, tax authorities, and bodies of sanitary and epidemiological supervision and control[[10]](#footnote-10).

The other pressing issue is the ongoing challenging situation with independent civil society organizations who have a mandate to promote civil and political rights. The State's role in creating an enabling environment and free space for civil society to operate in, including protecting freedom of speech and the right to organize and protest, is crucial.

Specifically, the non-conducive political and normative environment continues to challenge the development of civil society movements, which is another obstacle to the success of anti-corruption reform. This sector is governed by many normative acts that impose control by many state institutions over the activities of civil society organizations (CSOs). To mitigate this situation, Uzbekistan's Government has tasked the Ministry of Justice to work on a new NGO Code which could help develop a genuine and vibrant civil society in Uzbekistan[[11]](#footnote-11). Another positive milestone is that the MoJ is finalizing a web portal to reduce unnecessary paperwork and provide more online services, including digitalized registration and reporting[[12]](#footnote-12).

The State of Uzbekistan has been progressively promoting anti-corruption reform in the Central Asian region. However, much needs to be done to enable transparency and accountability across the country, including within the private and public sectors, in broader society, and among individuals. Building civil society's capacity and promoting a culture of zero tolerance towards corruption will be quintessential for sustaining current results and achieving expected ones.

## Purpose, Objectives, Scope and Use of the Evaluation

## Purpose

UNDP commissioned the present Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) in order to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, prospective for impact and sustainability, and the overall progress of the ‘Preventing Corruption through Effective, Accountable and Transparent Governance Institutions in Uzbekistan’ (PCEAT) Project, being jointly implemented by UNDP Uzbekistan, ACPIS and IRH.

## Objectives

The MTE has the following five specific objectives (SOs):

1. To document progress and results achieved against the project’s Theory of Change and its Results Framework (impact, outcomes and outputs), and to assess whether the activities and outputs delivered to date have been effectively implemented, and how these have or are likely to contribute to the project’s outcomes and impact.
2. To review the project's design and effectiveness, for instance whether activities, outputs, outcomes, objectives and performance indicators are sufficiently aligned to assess project effectiveness.
3. To review the modality in terms of the current project structure, existing processes among the implementing partners, as well as the overall project’s existing capacity, according to set criteria and expectations.
4. To review what worked and what did not, and to document acceptable practices and lessons learned.
5. To provide recommendations on how PCEAT could strengthen its results by better aligning its priorities and strengthening partnership, as envisioned by both UNDP and the Government of Uzbekistan.

## Scope of evaluation

The present MTE covers three years of the project cycle, including 2018, 2019 and 2020. Therefore it is not limited to assessing the mid-term progress of the PCEAT project, but rather deploys a forward-looking approach which will establish findings and recommendations to shape UNDP Uzbekistan’s next generation of anti-corruption support in the country. The evaluation was scheduled to be completed over 30 working days between October 2020 and February 2021.

###

## Use of the evaluation and the recipients of the MTE report

The present review documents the project's concrete overall progress, intermediate results, lessons learned and impact, and provides recommendations for strengthening the project’s overall performance. These outcomes should inform the direct recipients of the MTE, such as the Ministry of Justice of Uzbekistan, the General Prosecutor’s Office (GPO) of Uzbekistan, the Anti-corruption Agency of Uzbekistan, UNDP Uzbekistan’s senior management, UNDP’s global and regional anti-corruption teams, and the project management and implementation team, as well as other partners, on how to improve PCEAT performance (in terms of its activities, processes and results) going forward.

## Caveats

This evaluation faced some constraints and limitations anticipated within the evaluation inception report and work plan. Due to the COVID-19 global pandemic, the evaluation presented here was conducted remotely. Such limitation prevented the Expert from travelling to the field, meeting with stakeholders, and directly observing the delivered outcomes. Specifically, the validation of IT solutions provided by PCEAT was not possible by means of direct observation. In response to this situation, the independent evaluator and the Evaluation Reference Group planned the following measures:

1. Increasing the number of informants to produce a “complete picture” of the project’s implementation.
2. Whenever possible and relevant, conducting online group discussions.
3. Posing concrete questions to the project’s direct and final beneficiaries regarding the quality of the deliverables, and their level of satisfaction with the delivered technical expertise.

## Evaluation approach and methods

The MTE was based on the main OECD DAC evaluation criteria proposed in the Terms of Reference (ToR) (Annex 2) and the Evaluation Matrix (Annex 3), which outlined the evaluation questions, illustrative sub-questions and indicators, methods and sources.

### APPLYing THE HRBA AND GE APPROACH IN THE EVALUATION

The evaluation adopted a Gender Equality and Human Rights-Based approach, which means that the process was participatory, and that relevant duty bearers and rights holders were consulted with and participated in the evaluation. During the inception phase, the independent evaluator assessed the extent of the application of the **Human-Rights Based Approach** (HRBA) in both the design and implementation phases by measuring relevant outcomes in strengthening government institutions through technical partnerships, creating platforms for grassroots voices to reach policymakers, good practices, and policy advocacy and support for action research. The relevant methodologies of **Guidance for Gender-Sensitive Evaluations** were adopted during the Inception Period.

**Guided by an effective Theory of Change (ToC)**

The evaluation reconstructed the project’s Intervention Logic based on consultations with stakeholders at the Inception Phase. As a result, a ToC which sets clear goals, outcomes, outputs and inputs of the action was used to guide the evaluation exercise. It provided a solid understanding of the roles played by different actors, namely various government institutions, civil society organizations and the donor community, within the ongoing process of anti-corruption reforms in Uzbekistan. Likewise, it provided a basis for understanding the incentives and expectations of such players when participating in the project’s implementation, as well as the dynamics between them.

**Strategy for mainstreaming cross-cutting issues**

The evaluator assessed how the PCEAT project ensured the equal participation of women, including young women and those of marginalized groups, in decision making across the implemented activities. For that purpose, relevant indicators were included in the Evaluation Matrix to measure the project's results in empowering female professionals, gender representation in its implemented activities, and its general scope and scale of gender equality. To that end, the evaluator ensured that a gender-balanced critical mass of informants participated in the evaluation. The use of this approach ensured that specific recommendations on gender mainstreaming are presented in the final report.

**Mainstreaming the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages**

The independent evaluator assessed how the design and implementation of the PCEAT has contributed to the progressive achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and in particular goals 5 (gender equality) and 16 (effective, accountable and inclusive institutions).

**Mitigating COVID-19 – related restrictions in implementing the evaluation task**

Due to COVD-19 – related restrictions, the evaluation presented in this report was conducted remotely. The independent evaluator rigorously assessed possible risks and challenged them to ensure the highest possible standards of data collection and validation. The evaluator used the most advanced IT resources to ensure the seamless undertaking of online interviews. Challenges of a technical nature were mitigated with UNDP Uzbekistan's help, and interviews were adequately planned and sometimes held on an ad-hoc basis, in order to meet beneficiaries' timing preferences.

**Data analysis**

The evaluation methodology was based on a mixture of diverse techniques and tools utilized to assess the results of the PCEAT, to highlight cause-and-effect links between inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and expected impacts.

Interviews

All individual and group interviews followed agreed-upon protocols, tailored to individual categories of stakeholders, and aligned with the overall evaluation framework. The conducted interviews were semi-structured but flexible, allowing new questions to be brought up during interviews, based on what the interviewees discussed. Over 90 percent of the interviews were conducted in the Russian language and without interpretation, allowing for the more efficient and effective use of time, while enhancing the quality of information gathered. The evaluation process, from inception to report submission, took place from October 2020 to January 2021.



Document and secondary data review

During the inception phase, the independent evaluator reviewed selected key documents as they were made available. During the data collection phase the evaluator carried out an in-depth review of documents to generate information needed to address the key evaluation criteria and questions outlined in the evaluation matrix. Relevant information was identified, sorted, analysed and triangulated by the criteria and key questions in the matrix, and with consideration of other key issues that emerged during the evaluation. The list of consulted literature and PCEAT documentation is attached to this present report. Overall the evaluator studied over 60 reports, case studies and regional assessments, Uzbekistan's general situation, best practices on AC, and UNCAC and UNDP core reports on anti-corruption and good governance. This has ensured that the findings are supported by a wide range of sources and various forms of data (subjective, objective, quantitative, appropriate and available).

Evaluation questions and the Evaluation Matrix (EM)

During the Inception Phase the independent evaluator conducted the evaluability assignment and assessed the proposed ToR evaluation questions (EQ). In line with the OECD DAC evaluation criteria, the following evaluation factors constituted the core of the EM, including a) relevance; b) effectiveness; c) efficiency; and d) sustainability (and/or other criteria used). The EM included specific questions on the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) system of the project. Thus, the mid-term review assessed the M&E system's robustness, along with the quality of the generated information and its usefulness for management decision-making, learning and accountability. Present reports addressed how M&E can be further strengthened in the current project and possible future anti-corruption related projects.

Evaluation criteria and questions

The ToR for the MTE included a set of questions clustered against the five of the OECD DAC. In addition, to these areas of inquiry, questions related to the project’s M&E, Gender Equality and Human rights were included, as per the ToR. During the Inception Period the expert conducted the evaluability exercise, which resulted in all evaluation questions as per the OECD DAC and additional questions being included in the evaluation framework. The additional questions were rearranged around the five OECD DAC and other evaluation areas mentioned above. One more criterion was included in the EM to evaluate the objectives and outputs of the PCEAT project, regarding:

1. Value-added by UNDP through the PCEAT project in promoting anti-corruption reforms in Uzbekistan, and partnership building in relation to the fight against corruption;
2. The role of project activities focusing on innovation and technology in fostering anti-corruption reforms in the country; and
3. UNDP’s role in contributing to overall advocacy and awareness, to strengthen national discourse on anti-corruption and zero-tolerance towards society's corruption.

As a result, the independent evaluator developed 24 Key Evaluation questions included in the EM. However, to ensure the clarity of the present report, some of the evaluation questions were merged together. Therefore 18 evaluation questions, and the findings made in connection with these questions, form the core of the evaluation report.

## The context of the ‘Preventing Corruption through Effective, Accountable and Transparent Governance Institutions in Uzbekistan’ (PCEAT) project

Uzbekistan's political changes aimed towards good governance and strengthening the rule of law have attracted many development partners in the Central Asian region. On 22 March 2018 the UNDP Country Office in Uzbekistan, jointly with the Ministry of Justice of Uzbekistan, launched the ‘Preventing Corruption through Effective, Accountable and Transparent Governance Institutions in Uzbekistan’ (PCEAT). This intervention has received policy and advisory support from UNDP’s Global ‘Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies’ (ACPIS) project and UNDP’s Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH). The rating methodology for assessing the level of corruption in government bodies relates to the Korean *Anti-Corruption Initiative Assessment Tool*, which is currently being implemented by the PCEAT project with support from the UNDP Seoul Policy Centre and the Korea Anti-Corruption Commission and is one of the critical outcomes of the current project under the evaluation.

The PCEAT project is UNDP Uzbekistan’s flagship initiative on anti-corruption (AC), and UNDP’s largest project in terms of scope and budget in the Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) region. Uzbekistan's government is the main source of funding, providing for a total budget of $8 million. The project is physically located in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, part of the UNDP Country Office, with three project staff members supporting its local implementation.

### Main partners and their roles

The project's main implementing partners are the leading governmental agencies responsible for implementing state anti-corruption policies and programs. The Project has the following national implementing partners and stakeholders:

1. The Ministry of Justice, being a key organization in countering and preventing corruption and the project’s national coordinator, which communicates with various stakeholders, provides expert support, pilots and implements jointly-developed tools, and informs political and economic priorities and capacity building needs.
2. The General Prosecutor’s Office was initially the leading agency for preventing and countering corruption, and the national coordination agency for UNCAC. Since June 2020, the newly established ACA took over the anti-corruption mandate of the General Prosecutor's Office.

### Other national partners

The National AC Commission, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Supreme Court, the Ministry for Development of Information Technology and Communications, the National Agency for Project Management, the Centre for the Development of Civil Society, and the ‘E-Government’ Centre.

### Educational establishments

The Ministry of Higher Education, the Ministry of Public Education, the Tashkent State University of Law, the Academy for Public Administration, the University of World Economy and Diplomacy, the Academy of the General Prosecutor’s Office, and the Lawyer Training Centre.

### Target groups

Law-enforcement personnel, civil servants, recipients of public services, private entities and businesses, and the broader public.

**project timeframe**

PCEAT has a three-year project cycle running from 2018 to 2021. Since 2020 some of the project's activities have been affected by COVID-related restrictions. However, until present no extension has been requested. The project has successfully and without delay reported its achievements in 2018, 2019 and 2020.

**The governance system of PCEAT**

The Project Board acts as the governance system of PCEAT, and is co-chaired by the General Prosecutor, the Minister of Justice and the UNDP Resident Representative.

### Budget expenditure

For the 2018 project implementation cycle US$1,488,000 was allocated and approved, with $1,506,382 spent, constituting 101 percent of the annual budget.

For the 2019 project implementation cycle $2,739,132 was allocated and approved, with $1,883,898 spent, constituting 70 percent of the annual budget.

For the 2020 Project implementation cycle $2,006,426 was allocated and approved, with $1,866,028 spent (ongoing)[[13]](#footnote-13).

### Intervention logic

The intervention logic of PCEAT has been designed to contain the following elements:

Impact/overall objective: Equitable access to quality public services for all and ensuring that the public, and particularly the project target groups, will be able to enjoy more effective, accountable, transparent and rights-based institutions (including access to quality public services and to justice).

Outcome:The quality of public administration is improved in order to prevent corruption. In addition, PCEAT is also harmonized with a key UNDAF outcome formulated as being “By 2020, the quality of public administration is improved for equitable access to quality public services for all.”

Output:Anti-corruption solutions, principles and tools are integrated into the public administration systems, public service delivery, civil service performance, and the system of law-making and rule-making.

To obtain these results on an output, outcome and impact level, PCEAT has envisaged four intervention (activity) areas as presented below:

**Activity 1**. Legislative and policy support to integrate anti-corruption solutions into the processes of law-making, rule-making, legislation drafting and policy advice, including drafting legal and policy documents on preventing corruption.

This intervention includes 22 sub-activity and four indicative deliverables. These deliverables include:

1. A comparative analytical report on the best practices on preventing corruption;
2. A series of drafts of legal documents on preventing corruption in the public and private sectors;
3. Anti-corruption screening (expertise) conducted for key legal documents included in the Action Strategy for 2017-2021;
4. Policy recommendations for further improving the organizational structure, transparency and openness of public services according to international standards and laws.

**Activity 2**. Strengthening the human resource capacities of civil servants with the aim to further improve their knowledge and skills in preventing corruption.

This intervention area is designed with eight sub-activities which consider civil service management principles (Honesty, Integrity, Impartiality and Objectivity) to be enshrined in the upcoming new law on Civil Service. Three indicative deliverables are expected as a result of engagement with the educational entities in the recipient institutions, namely:

1. Anti-corruption training programmes, curriculums and handbooks;
2. Model departmental instructions on improving the organizational and legal framework for preventing a conflict of interest in the public sector;
3. Knowledge materials, infographics, videos and awareness-raising materials, both printed and digital, on the prevention of corruption.

**Activity 3**. Streamlining and digitalizing public service delivery and interaction among and within government entities, to ensure effective document flow and transparency of public services for effective prevention of corruption.

This area of support includes over 20 sub-activities to strengthen the technical capacity of relevant state bodies and agencies, with the aim of introducing e-governance tools and modern ICT into public service and state governance. The following deliverables have been planned under this area:

1. Development of a National E-government Strategy and a unified registry of all e-services/tools;
2. Comprehensive analysis for further improving the Unified Portal of Interactive Public Services;
3. Through the Interagency Commission's websites, of the Ministry of Justice, the provision of open data and transparent information for preventing corruption;
4. Development of an Open Budget software program;
5. Creation of mobile apps and e-services for citizens and businesses;
6. Corruption reporting tools, including a dedicated website, mobile application, phone and SMS line, a Facebook page, and citizen complaint boxes;
7. Electronic assets declaration portal.

**Activity 4**. Developing a culture of intolerance towards corruption in society through knowledge and advocacy to support anti-corruption efforts, and active cooperation between government, civil society and the private sector.

This support area has been designed with 13 sub-activities aimed to strengthen knowledge, awareness and capacities within the general public, and to build partnership between state bodies, the private sector, non-profit organizations and civil society. There are three main deliverables envisaged under this intervention:

1. A Media Strategy for a fully-fledged awareness-raising campaign;
2. Surveys that demonstrate the extent, dynamics and trends of corruption;
3. Media/information awareness-raising products.

### results framework of the PCEAT project

The PCEAT project is fully harmonized with Uzbekistan’s Action Strategy for 2017-2021, and national commitments under the 2030 Agenda. All interventions within the PCEAT project aims to bolster the emerging national corruption prevention system, and to monitor the UNCAC and OECD Istanbul Plan of Action's implementation in a cohesive manner.

The provided Logical Framework of the PCEAT project is designed with one Expected Output **(EO) being “Anti-Corruption solutions, principles and tools are integrated into the public administration systems, public service delivery, civil service performance, and the system of law-making and rule-making”**. Against this EO, a range of indicators have been designed to measure results from the impact to input/output level. The indicators are gender-desegregated, and the LF is populated with baselines and targets. While the UNDAF/Country Programme Results and Resource Framework are relevant and useful, it is important to understand how PCEAT uses the project’s LF to monitor the results and implementation of the specifically-designed four result areas mentioned in the Intervention Logic.

# Findings and Conclusions per the Evaluation Questions

This chapter presents the findings and conclusions of the evaluation, organized by the evaluation criterion, and an overview of the findings. It translates the experience distilled from the evaluation into relevant knowledge that should enhance decision-making, improve performance, foster the achievement of better results, and support the work of UNDP and partner institutions. Each section is headed by a summary narrative, which reflects the main thrust of the findings.

## Relevance

**Summary**

Relevance is closely linked to the principle of alignment, and, to that end, the PCEAT project is adequately in line with the stated national anti-corruption strategies and plans. The host national government has endorsed the proposed set of activities of the project. The project design is linked to the normative framework and the commitments it intended to deliver. As a result of relevant programming, the PCEAT’s activities are directly related to implementing **29 activities** under the State Anti-Corruption Programme of Uzbekistan for 2019-2020, which itself includes a total of **35 activities**.The action proved relevant to developing a much-needed active civil society and was designed with the ambitious goal of ensuring active cooperation between the government, civil society and the private sector. These factors meant that the challenges faced by the PCEAT project were demanding from the outset, and that there was a steep learning curve for the partners involved. The project’s relevance could be further strengthened by ensuring that its implementation effectively addresses the pending needs of gender equality, and civil society's emerging role in investigative corruption. The results framework needs to be strengthened to reflect PCEAT’s emerging impact-level results on the programmatic level.The developing anti-corruption needs and priorities in Uzbekistan that PCEAT could take on board include building the ecosystem of civil society organizations which have the capacity to take on the role of accountable civic monitoring and oversight in public and private procurement, investigative journalism, improving coordination in anti-corruption infrastructures, and encouraging the transparency of local government, among other matters.

**Full findings**

1. ***How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the target groups and beneficiaries? (Gender dimension to be considered)***

**Support for ongoing national anti-corruption reforms**

1. The project has provided tailored support to the three-phased anti-corruption reform process being undertaken in Uzbekistan. To that end, PCEAT has played a relevant and timely role in the first phase. It constituted a cornerstone of anti-corruption reform, which included the adoption of the Lawon Combatting Corruption in January 2017, the establishment of the Republican Inter-Agency Anti-Corruption Commission, and the approval of the State Anti-Corruption Programme for 2017-2018. Specifically, the project provides relevant support in improving the State Anti-Corruption Policy, and in promoting legislative reforms to strengthen the normative framework with effective preventive measures and integrating anti-corruption policies in the national development agenda. The PCEAT project is directly involved in implementing **29 activities** under the State Anti-Corruption Programme of Uzbekistan for 2019-2020, which in total includes **35 activities**.

**Relevant support for the establishment and functioning of the new Anti-corruption Agency (ACA) of Uzbekistan**

1. The PCEAT project continues to be relevant to the ongoing third phase of the anti-corruption reform process, focused on building the capacity of the ACA in terms of its preventive functions, further strengthening parliamentary oversight and public control, and introducing new mechanisms and systems to improve public service delivery, including promoting effective (good) governance and restoring public trust in government institutions. To that end, the ACA's support was aligned with UNDP’s capacity development framework for public institutions, policy and capacity development support, which is focused on three levels including organizational capacity, functional capacity, and individual capacity.

**Relevance to civil society’s need for oversight**

1. PCEAT’s outcome four, namely ‘Developing a culture of intolerance towards corruption in society through knowledge and advocacy to support anti-corruption efforts, and active cooperation between the government, civil society and the private sector’, is not only relevant but is also a crucial investment towards developing an active civil society and collaboration with the State’s AC agencies and entities. While this was considered an ambitious goal at the outset, PCEAT was able to navigate its implementation considering all associated risks of working in an environment in which the space for CSOs has been shrinking for decades.

**Relevant to the State’s response to COVID-19**

1. The PCEAT response at the time of the global pandemic was well attuned to society's sudden emerging needs as a whole. Thanks to the flexible nature of the project design, PCEAT was able to respond to pressing needs by introducing an Anti-Corruption Management system (compliance control) in the Ministry of Health (MoH) and the overall health care system (with sectoral risk assessment of the core business processes, including the procurement, storing and distribution of medical supplies, and disaster and emergency preparedness).

**Relevance to the global and regional context**

1. Uzbekistan ratified the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) in 2008. Its implementation of the Convention was reviewed in the first cycle of the UNCAC Implementation Review Mechanism, which focused on criminalization and international cooperation. The first cycle review in 2016 noted Uzbekistan’s success in establishing an inter-agency working group to support the improvement of the organizational, practical and regulatory frameworks for combating corruption. It also highlighted several challenges, including the need to adopt measures to further improve the specialization of anti-corruption units and the professional training of their staff, and to ensure their autonomy and independence’ (p.13) (pursuant to UNCAC art. 36). The second cycle review, which focuses on prevention and asset recovery, is currently ongoing. To that end, the project was relevant to the Government’s efforts to fulfil its international commitments to curb and prevent corruption.
2. Finally, the PCEAT project constituted a model for the entire Central Asian region – there was a need for both a flagship intervention of this scale, and the scope and level of political will to build a case for neighbouring countries.
3. Considering the gender dimension, PCEAT’s project design would have benefited from the existence of a gender-specific outcome. At present, the project’s implementation is only measuring the scale of participation and collecting gender-disaggregated data from among its beneficiaries. Regretfully a number of interviewees still perceive anti-corruption efforts to be better handled by male professionals. Thus, gender-biased norms and stigma continue to prevent female professionals from participating equally in anti-corruption activities.
4. ***How clear is the intervention logic (i.e., the Theory of Change), and how effective is the logical results framework?***
5. ***How effective are the current indicators in tracking impact and output results?***
6. PCEAT’s current Theory of Change (ToC) is not sufficiently coherent. Therefore, it has been reconstructed to connect all four result areas of the intervention logic with outcome and impact-level results. The reconstructed ToC for the present evaluation was formulated through the following assumption:

***If*** *the legislative environment is conducive to integrating an anti-corruption solution (Output 1),* ***and*** *if public service is modernized (Output 3)* ***with the*** *capacity of civil servants* ***and*** *society built to prevent corruption (Outcome 2), and promote cultural intolerance of corruption (Output 4),* ***in that case****,**society will be able to enjoy more effective, accountable, transparent and rights-based institutions (Impact)* ***because*** *the quality of public and private entities will be improved to prevent corruption (Outcome).*

The following chart explains the step-by-step constructed Theory of Change envisaged by the project. It shows that: a) the ToC is a bottom-up process; b) at the outcome level (the four result areas) indicators to measure the outcome-level results are missing; and c) that the expected impact is people-centred.

|  |
| --- |
| The PCEAT Theory of Change |
| Preventing Corruption through Effective, Accountable and Transparent Governance Institutions in Uzbekistan Impact Strategies, Outputs Outcome SDGsSO1. Legislative and policy support on preventing corruption.PCEATIndicators Innovative methodologies and e-governance, enhanced civic space and freedom of expression and media for inclusive decision making, inclusive citizen participation, oversight, and monitoring.The quality of public administration is improved to prevent corruption.The public enjoys equitable access to quality public services, and more effective, accountable, transparent and rights-based institutions. SO2. Strengthened capacities of civil servants on preventing corruption.Poverty eradication  PCEATIndicators  SO3. Streamlining and digitalizing PSD and interaction among and within government, for effective document-flow and transparency of public services for effective corruption prevention.Improved governance quality PCEATIndicatorsEnhanced governance integrity  SO4. A culture of intolerance towards corruption developed, and active cooperation between thegovernment, civil society, and private sector. PCEATIndicators    |

1. PCEAT’s Logical Framework (LF) has been developed with one Expected Output (EO), being “Anti-corruption solutions, principles and tools are integrated into the public administration systems, public service delivery, civil service performance, and the system of law-making and rule-making”. Against this EO, a range of indicators has been designed to measure results from impact to the input/output level. Indicators are gender-disaggregated, and the LF is populated with baselines and targets. The PCEAT’s results framework is harmonized with the UNDAF/Country Programme Results and a Resource Framework. However, it falls short in monitoring the results and implementation of four (4) specifically-designed result areas mentioned in the Intervention Logic.
2. The evaluation finds that the LF needs further strengthening to monitor and appraise the implementation at the outcome level. Specifically, PCEAT’s relevance mainly concerns State institutions' needs, affording somewhat limited space to CSOs. In addition, the design of the Intervention Logic does not explicitly explain how rights-holders would benefit from the support lent to AC institutions. The indicators should measure mid-term results at the impact level, against the four envisaged result areas and with consideration of the impact on rights-holders.
3. ***What are the emerging anti-corruption needs and priorities in Uzbekistan, and is the project in a position to help address such priorities effectively?***

A participatory identification assignment conducted jointly with the independent national and international experts would provide a more substantiated response to this evaluation question. However, the evaluator provided her responses based on informants' submissions, the revision of project documents, and best practices that worked in a similar context.

1. **AC institutions’ interconnection and interoperability could be enhanced to improve the prospects of the sustainability of results.** Successful anti-corruption interventions hinge on several overlapping variables, including a strong legal and institutional framework, political will at national, provincial and municipal/local government levels, strong capacity by media, CSOs and citizens to monitor the implementation of anti-corruption reforms and public service delivery, effective anti-corruption education, public awareness, and a unified voice and collective action to fight corruption.

1. **Building capacity of civil society to create an accountable civic monitoring of society.** The evaluation supports the observations shared by almost every interviewee in this review, regarding the significant need to develop civil society organizations' capacity to become a strong advocating and independent oversight sector. The PCEAT project has planned for more engagement with the emerging civil society sector in the final project implementation cycle, by having the Parliamentary Council establish a small grants scheme. Therefore, these grants must be delivered with tailor-made workshops on civil society's role in anti-corruption, and oversight mechanisms and tools.
2. **Reducing the level of corruption and corruption risks in khokimiyats (local self-governance authorities).** Transparency and accountability must be increased under the competent oversight of communities and businesses on the local level and with the local governance bodies. For example, in Ukraine, one project developed with Transparency International (TI) Ukraine has produced a Transparency Ranking of the country’s 100 largest cities[[14]](#footnote-14). Each city's transparency is measured annually using indicators across 14 areas, providing recommendations and facilitating test practices in the field. TI Ukraine reports that, over three years, the average transparency of Ukrainian cities has increased by 53 percent[[15]](#footnote-15).
3. **Critical mass of investigative journalists.** There is an insufficient number of media outlets and bloggers which represent Uzbekistan’s investigative media sector. The number of journalists reporting in the Uzbek language is even less.

1. **Adequate normative environment for data protection.** The national focus on the digitalization of AC agencies’ investigative functions has garnered broad political support. However, the legal framework for Human Rights in the digital era is not developing with the same momentum.
2. **Corruption-proof legislative process**. At present, anti-corruption expertise is the sole mandate of the MoJ. However, to strengthen the transparency, accountability and adequacy of the reform process, CSOs, think tanks and other research organisations play a vital role in the Anti-Corruption Risk Assessment of draft laws. However, what is important is to ensure that, once such independent AC expertise is acquired, the recommended processes and tools are properly sustained and institutionalised by relevant norms.

##

## Effectiveness

**Summary**

The evaluation has found that all the available information points progress toward delivering the planned results in four outcome areas. Most of the planned activities are consistent with the overarching framework of expected results, and, in some instances, outstanding results were achieved. However, effectiveness should be strengthened, employing a more harmonized results framework calibrated against emerging impact-level results. The governance structure is effectively used. However, it could be further strengthened by including impact-level results and existing strategies in the forum’s 2021 agenda. The participation of rights-holders should be ensured in PCEAT’s governance structure, as well as gender-balanced implementation.

**Full findings**

1. ***Are the planned activities consistent with the project’s purpose and overall objectives?***
2. All planned activities within PCEAT’s four result areas are consistent with the overall objective of the intervention. During the second year of implementation, a number of activities related to study tours and training were delayed on account of COVID-related restrictions. Nevertheless, UNDP and its national partners demonstrated an adequate response to the operational difficulties and rapidly changing programmatic environment:
* Seven activities from the Annual Action Plan for 2020 were transferred to 2021, due to the pandemic restrictions.
* The planned legal forum, public service testing system, study tour, participation in the Seoul Conference and the OECD monitoring visit were replaced by the delivery of support to ACA on implementing anti-corruption compliance management systems in 26 other public agencies, the development of several draft laws (pertaining to Assets Declaration, Anti-Corruption Expertise of Legal Acts and ACA), the establishment of an internal structural procedural framework for ACA (functions, responsibilities, SOPs and others), the development of anti-corruption e-tools, and the forging of collaboration with leading foreign anti-corruption agencies (delivery of training and webinars). These activities are also consistent with the PCEAT project’s overall objective and are reported to have been completed.
1. ***Does the analysis of principal factors influence the achievement or non-achievement of objectives?***
2. The triangulated support to PCEAT includes a thorough assessment of the situation and state of affairs surrounding the reform and an appraisal of the needs and gaps of the ACA. This considered, the majority of normative, technical and organizational determinants and bottlenecks are analysed by the team of UNDP advisors.
3. Thanks to these needs and gaps assessments, PCEAT demonstrates the capacity to adapt and rapidly respond to a challenging context. For example, COVID-related challenges, staff turnover within government, lack of anti-corruption coordination between institutions, a limited number of independent journalists and weak civil society continue to be the main factors influencing the achievement of the objectives.
4. ***Does the project’s M&E system generate credible information used for management decision-making, learning and accountability?***
5. The revision of the minutes of the project board meeting held in December 2018 reveals that the PCEAT project team provides an accurate and sufficient amount of information to all implementing partners, to steer the implementation process. Project board meetings take place at an adequate pace and with the participation of all national and international partners. The subjects of discussion such as the state of progress, quality of outcomes, challenges and the quality of coordination with other donor-funded projects, are adequate and have been promptly recorded for application in management, decision-making, learning and accountability.

1. However, the evaluation notes that the representation of rights-holders in such an important management body would have enhanced the level of inclusiveness and provided an equal opportunity for civil society representatives to share their views on the anti-corruption state of affairs.
2. The other major observation made by the evaluation is that not only activities, but also impact-level results should be a specific point of discussion between partners in the agenda of the upcoming project board meeting.
3. ***Is there a need for M&E’s further strengthening in the current project, and in possible future anti-corruption related projects?***
4. Overall, the envisaged M&E system provides timely and credible information that constitutes a considerable part of the monitoring reports. What would have made the M&E system more adequate is more results-oriented reporting. In other words, PCEAT’s results should be reported at the outcome level and, when possible, at the impact level.

##

## Efficiency

**Summary**

The evaluation finds that the action’s outputs have been delivered in a cost-efficient manner with a high appreciation for the quality of the delivered training and handouts and the procured international expertise for AC agencies' training. PCEAT is staffed by national experts who act as managers, experts and advocates for the issues and initiatives they are professionally and personally committed to. That enthusiasm and local knowledge base are invaluable if the long-term, institutionalized change is the support object. Furthermore, it also constitutes an intelligent and significant use of donor funds, resulting in a positive cost-effectiveness analysis of the initiative’s administrative cost compared to contracting an entire team of full-time ex-pat experts.

**Full findings**

1. ***Which other ways of using resources have produced more results, or have used resources sparingly while maintaining the same level of achievements?***
2. ***How appropriately did the project produce the products and services it delivered?***
3. PCEAT was one of the six scheduled UNDP Uzbekistan projects subject to the audit in June 2020, administered by the UNDP Office of Audit and Investigations (OAI), to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of the governance risk management and control processes. Specifically, the audit focused on project governance, project administration, procurement and financial operations. The outcome of the audit on the office’s performance, which included the PCEAT project, was satisfactory.



The 2018 project implementation cycle: US$1,488,000 was allocated and approved, with $1,506,382 spent, constituting 101 percent of the annual budget.

The 2019 project implementation cycle: $2,739,132 was allocated and approved, with $1,883,898 spent, constituting 70 percent of the annual budget.

For 2020 a total of $2,006,426 was approved and allocated. From this amount, $1,866,028 was spent, constituting 93 percent of the total delivery rate [[16]](#footnote-16).

1. The present evaluation did not encounter any instances of the inappropriate use of project funds. The level of transparency of fund distribution per activity was applauded by most of the implementing partners interviewed. However, some IPs requested more factual information on the budget distribution. Such a level of ultimate transparency could be attained if the IPs are provided with an “itemized” financial report during board meetings. This platform is specifically created for all parties to discuss outstanding issues, including matters related to budget distribution.
2. **Quality of outputs.** All national parties interviewed during the present evaluation commended the quality of the procured international expertise. Specifically, representatives of the MoJ, the Prosecutor General’s Office, the Ministry of Health and the private sector were all satisfied with the quality of the training and assessment performed by KPMG (Italy), and the professionalism of the trainers and the anti-corruption law experts.
3. **With the use of national and international expertise**, the PCEAT project is entirely staffed by qualified national experts, which positively impacts overall budget and delivery. This constitutes a strategic move and a sound policy to promote both efficiency in the provision of support to beneficiaries, and the sustainability of the capacity built by PCEAT. The present UNDP Uzbekistan staff are gender-mainstreamed and act as facilitators, experts and advocates for the issues and initiatives they are professionally and personally committed to. That investment, coupled with enthusiasm and a local knowledge base, is invaluable should PCEAT proceed to the next phase. Furthermore, it also represents an intelligent and significant use of donor funds, compared to contracting and relocating a full-time ex-pat expert, resulting in a positive cost-effectiveness analysis of the initiative’s administrative cost. Whenever possible, UNDP has made use of in-house anti-corruption advisors who have worked on comparative analyses, best practices, and who have facilitated diverse online platforms for cross-country discussions.

##

## Prospects of Impact

**Summary**

The PCEAT project has contributed considerably to potential future impacts. Some project interventions have exceeded both expectations and targets, when capacity development support has been targeted and tailored to beneficiaries’ needs. PCEAT has reached this mid-term point with some outstanding results, by facilitating the development of IT solutions, business compliance application and the certification process within state agencies and supporting the establishment and functioning of the ACA. As a result of these integrated IT solutions, the efficiency and effectiveness of 3,542 bailiffs in 14 regions and 209 territorial regions have significantly improved, while 660 billion Soums (an equivalent to $6.5 million) has been saved accordingly. The upgraded public system has doubled the speed of interactive court services provided to the public, especially timely when there have been COVID-related restrictions on people’s movements and physical contact. PCEAT has assisted in the first digitalization of the attestation process used by employees of the Vital Records Office (ZAGS), which has resulted in zero complaints and a fully digitalized talent acquisition within UzbekOilGas’ HR system**.** Thanks to joint efforts, the PCEAT project has raised awareness of the topic of “Conflict of Interest” among public servants. Finally, the project’s activities have provided publicity to the most active AC bloggers and journalists, in order to pave the way for developing the country's critical mass of investigative journalists.

1. ***What are critical mid-term results and significant progress achieved against the project's results and resource framework?***
2. The evaluation has corroborated that, on an outcome level, the PCEAT project has enjoyed an increased level of ownership in leading anti-corruption efforts made by the project beneficiaries. This factor has led to an improvement in the performance of anti-corruption functions in some institutions, which are worthy of mentioning in this report:

**The Anti-corruption Agency of Uzbekistan (ACA)**

PCEAT was instrumental in developing this first Anti-corruption Agency in the Central Asian region, based on the [Jakarta Statement on Principles for ACAs](http://www.unodc.org/documents/corruption/WG-Prevention/Art_6_Preventive_anti-corruption_bodies/JAKARTA_STATEMENT_en.pdf) (and the Colombo Commentary on the said Jakarta Statement). This statement provides a roadmap for strengthening the effectiveness of ACAs, including the provision of examples of good practices, against which ACAs can measure themselves in order to gauge their capacity and performance.

**The General Prosecutor’s Office (GPO)**

The interviewed representatives of the OPG stated that PCEAT had supported the procurement of monobloc equipment integrated into the court bailiffs’ system. At present, the work of 3,542 bailiffs, of whom 3,013 are located in regional Uzbekistan, is supported by the updated system. Furthermore, 14 regions and 209 territorial regions are connected through a corporate chain of bailiffs. In the first nine months of the project’s implementation, the court bailiffs saved 660 billion Soums (the equivalent of US$6.5 million). The upgraded system has improved data processing efficiency three-fold, which has doubled the speed of interactive services provided to the public. The delivery of efficient and effective public service has been especially timely when there have been COVID-related restrictions on people’s movements and physical contact. A further outcome of this engagement has been an emerging positive impact on the environment, thanks to the digital switch and resulting reduction in paperwork.

**The Ministry of Justice (MoJ)**

The MoJ has adapted the business compliance model developed by KPMG. The Italian firm’s collaboration with the PCEAT project has led to identifying many hidden risks in the MoJ’s internal administrative processes. These risks were then adequately addressed and mitigated by the MoJ. With the project’s technical support the MoJ has met all the requirements for the ISO 37001:2016 certification and was subsequently awarded the International Certificate on Compliance with these ISO standards in September 2020 by the foreign certification company CERT International (Slovenia). The other notable result achieved by PCEAT within the MoJ is the digitalization of the vital records office (ZAGS) employees' attestation process. This entire process was digitalized with job tests being invigilated. No complaints regarding the results were submitted.

**The Agency of Public Services and the Agency of Intellectual Property**

The interviewed representatives of these two agencies reported that implementing anti-corruption compliance initiatives has increased awareness of the “Conflict of Interest” concept among its employees. The interviewed senior management of these agencies expects that such knowledge will impact the respective employees' day-to-day behaviour and reduce future risks of nepotism and favouritism.

**The state-owned enterprise UzbekOilGas**

This beneficiary reported that PCEAT had helped improve its normative environment, thereby creating a more transparent human resources (HRS) system. As a result of these HR internal reforms, two outcomes have been achieved. Firstly a transparent recruitment process was launched for the first time, which allowed some 500 people to apply for positions at UzbekOilGas. Secondly, qualified experts were selected via a competitive and transparent testing system developed under this project. The other noteworthy result of this partnership is that UzbekOilGas managed to pass level four of the ISO 37001 which is the new international standard designed to help organizations implement an anti-bribery management system.

**Supporting emerging investigative journalists**

As mentioned earlier in this report, PCEAT operates in a political and normative environment which is compassionate towards independent media and CSOs. Nevertheless, the project has contributed to large-scale Integrity and Anti-Corruption Awards and to International Anti-Corruption Day recognitions in November-December 2020. Related events attracted the attention of professionals who submitted over 17,500 creative entries to the contest across seven nomination categories. PCEAT supported nominations for ‘The Best Journalistic Anti-Corruption Investigation’ (49 entries), ‘The Most Active Media Outlet in Anti-Corruption Advocacy’, ‘The Best Social Video in Anti-Corruption’ (45 entries), and ‘Anti-Corruption Activeness in Social Networks’. The journalist interviewed within this result cluster claimed that these events have sent a positive message to media outlets and independent journalists, that their contribution to curbing corruption in the life of society is appreciated. The journalist also added that the scale of the event and the level of participation revealed a genuine public interest, and marked an opportunity for independent media to tackle corruption.

**Introducing innovative approaches in the country and region**

In terms of the use of innovative approaches, the PCEAT project has delivered an outstanding result by facilitating the development of IT solutions, applying business compliance and the certification process in state agencies, and supporting the establishment and functioning of the Anti-corruption Agency of Uzbekistan.

##

## Prospects of Sustainability

**Summary**

An overarching factor which could sustain the project’s current results and expected impacts is the availability of human, technical and financial resources coupled with the coordinated efforts of all the justice system participants (in investigations, prosecution, adjudication and asset management), and of the public and private system of service administration (in tenders, bids, e-governance, etc.). Naturally each recipient agency in the PCEAT has factors which influence sustainability. However, without addressing the determinants and bottlenecks in coordination between key players in the framework of the ongoing reform, and without the vibrant and active participation of CSOs and independent media, sustainability prospects will not be as strong as desired. Moreover, the outcome of the reforms, including their quality, could be affected.

1. ***Which institutional arrangements allow for maintaining the benefits achieved?***
2. Similar to any development intervention supporting political/legal reform, the sustainability of PCEAT’s results depends heavily on the quality of anti-corruption reforms and their implementation. There has undoubtedly been considerable progress made in anti-corruption reforms in Uzbekistan, but system-wide challenges pose a real threat to sustainability.
3. For PCEAT to maintain its benefits, the project and its national partners must overcome many overarching, interlinked challenges which cannot be tackled individually or consecutively. The underlying reason for this is as follows: PCEAT operates in the context of a) weak institutionalization of the fight against corruption (legal/institution-building); b) wide gaps between law, practice and enforcement (the rule of law issue); c) weak engagement of civil society and the public at large in the fight against corruption, weak collective action and joint advocacy in society (CSOs, media, coalitions and public control); and d) a weak system of evidence-based data collection and available methodologies for measuring corruption. Therefore a common understanding of these challenges, and a concerted and coordinated approach by development partners, national state and non-state actors, can be an adequate approach to sustaining momentum and maintaining benefits.

1. Finally, extending a “zero tolerance” culture towards corruption in private and public institutions could be one of the main factors which could sustain all the partners’ efforts.
2. The evaluation took stock of the factors that PCEAT should consider in sustaining the existing and planned results. Some examples of these are outlined below.

**Sustainability of the ACA**

1. The review of the relevant studies and outcomes of interviews suggests that the newly established ACA's sustainability is heavily dependent on the strength and integrity of other pertinent institutions, in order to ensure a measurable and sustainable impact in fighting corruption in a country. To that end, an effectively analysed case of corruption or the analyses of investigation results of corruption crimes by the ACA needs to be taken over by an effective prosecution, in order to successfully prosecute the case in court. Therefore a high level of professionalism, integrity, independence, and impartiality of all key players are essential requirements for an effective and functional judiciary and judicial system, which can adjudicate corruption cases without fear, favour, or prejudice.

1. The PCEAT project could also improve the ACA’s results-based management and institutional efficiency to effectively roll out anti-corruption initiatives and monitor their results, especially considering its mandate and role in implementing the AC Action Plan.

**The sustainability of OPG’s digitalized bailiff services**

1. As suggested by the interviewed parties, sustaining an effective and efficient bailiff system requires IT and digital solutions which should be supported with enhanced technical capacities, in order to last for at least 18 years. The training of respective OPG staff on data protection should be institutionalized. The relevant personal data should be harmonized across the justice sector, to avoid delays and technical mistakes. Such examples may be caused by a lack of “identification” across other state agencies’ digitalized platforms which deal with personal data.

**Development of exit strategies**

1. At the programmatic level, the beginning of 2021 is the right time to initiate discussions with the exit strategy’s implementation agencies. The development of an exit strategy from the outset of the final project cycle will direct partners’ efforts towards institutionalization, and the identification of the necessary human and financial resources to generate expected results.

##

## UNDP Added Value

**Summary**

The evaluation finds that the value of an extended design process and associated common vision have been demonstrated. As a result of such coherence between UNDP and other UN agencies, many impact-promising efforts are in evidence. The entirety of the interventions proposed by the UN not only seek to support the establishment of state AC agencies, but also address all other crucial sectors to advance the fight against corruption. Specifically, the UN’s agreement on anti-corruption will uphold the Republic of Uzbekistan’s international obligations, including a) integrating anti-corruption into the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the localizing of SDGs, and b) implementing UNCAC requirements and the country’s compliance with the Convention.

**Full findings**

1. ***How effective are the organizational structures and operations, and policy mandates between implementing partners? Such as support from the global anti-corruption team in Singapore, the Istanbul Regional Hub and UNDP Uzbekistan?***
2. The added value of UNDP’s supporting role in ongoing anti-corruption reforms is evident. Working with UNODC has led to the coordination of various successful concerted efforts to influence policy, and joint advocacy initiatives and campaigns to promote the State’s anti-corruption efforts. The joint and well-coordinated support of UNDP’s Global Anti-Corruption Teams in Singapore and the Istanbul Regional Hub to UNDP Uzbekistan, in the fields of policy and policy influencing, has focused on normative frameworks and capacity building. So far the fruits of such joint work to influence policy are evident across all result areas.
3. PCEAT has received policy and programme support from UNDP’s Global ‘Anti-Corruption for the Peaceful and Inclusive Societies’ (ACPIS) Project, and from the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub, in order to undertake its work. Support has been provided in the form of strategic advice and the development of many essential tools adequately adapted to the needs of national beneficiaries. Such examples worth noting include but are not limited to:
* Policy and programme support to integrate anti-corruption solutions into the processes of law-making and policy advice, as related to the AC Decree, the Civil Service Law, Asset Declaration and AC proofing, along with the comparative anti-corruption analysis of the draft Civil Service Law of Uzbekistan, and revisions of draft laws ‘On the Anti-corruption Agency of the Republic Of Uzbekistan’ and ‘On the Declaration of Income, Assets and Conflict of Interest of Public Servants’.
* Strategic advice and technical support to conduct sectoral corruption risk assessments in the most affected public sectors, including health, construction and education.
* Capacity building and capacity development of government agencies in preventing corruption by linking anti-corruption efforts and national SDGs, AC prevention, webinars, Civil Service Law, Asset Declaration, and lectures at the OPG Academy.
* Promoting global and regional advocacy by sharing Uzbekistan’s experience globally.
* Facilitating South-South and triangular cooperation through study visits to benchmark countries, such as Singapore, South Korea, Denmark and Norway.
* Spearheading the day-to-day work of the newly-established ACA, by developing practical tools such as the ‘Practitioner’s Guide: Capacity Assessment of Anti-Corruption Agencies’, serving to strengthen the capacity of ACAs to execute their mandates more effectively.
* Facilitating events and essential exchange platforms, such as the International Forum ‘Anti-Corruption Reforms in the Republic of Uzbekistan: Achievements and Priorities’, as dedicated to the ‘International Day against Corruption’ on 9 December.
* To that end, the UNDP specialists’ team has ensured that implementing agencies have an adequate understanding of the ACA’s mandate, capacity, necessary operational independence, level of political support, transparency, accessibility, and accountability to citizens to combat corruption. UNDP and UNODC, two UN agencies with vast experience in supporting ACAs globally, are currently co-chairing the UN’s Global Task Force on Anti-Corruption and the UN Department of Political Peace-Building Affairs (DPPA), and as such are well-positioned to provide the support requested by the Government of

Uzbekistan.

1. ***To what extent have partnerships been established/supported with the Government, non-state actors and international organizations/partners?***
2. PCEAT works side by side with UNODC ROCA, and the work of these two institutions on anti-corruption is complementary. Specifically, while PCEAT takes the lead on preventing corruption, strengthening the capacities of institutions and systems, and integrating anti-corruption into public service delivery, UNODC takes the lead in UNCAC’s review processes, their implementation, and in providing other technical support such as that related to money laundering, whistle-blower protection, strengthening investigative and prosecutorial capacity, and in other directions. Moreover, as a principle, the UN’s technical, advisory and policy support for Uzbekistan’s anti-corruption reforms is evidence-based. Strong emphasis is placed on collecting data and analysing what works and what does not, identifying corruption risks and gaps in the public sector, and developing risk mitigation plans and methodologies to address these gaps.
3. There have been many partnerships established through so-called triangular /South-South cooperation. Thanks to the support provided by the UNDP Global Anti-Corruption Programme (ACPIS), PCEAT beneficiaries have gained knowledge and skills through exchanges with leading anti-corruption agencies in the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, Bhutan and Hong Kong. The global ACPIS team has organized study visits by Uzbek delegations to Norway, Denmark, Singapore and the Republic of Korea. A partnership has been established between national agencies and the Republic of Korea’s ACRC. As a result of this cooperation, leading anti-corruption approaches and mechanisms, such as the South Korean Anti-Corruption Initiative Assessment Tool (AIA)[[17]](#footnote-17), have been adapted and harmonized within Uzbekistan’s national AC normative acts, such as the President’s Decree # 6013 of 29.06.20.
4. The cross-national cooperation forged within this project between Uzbekistan’s AC entities and those of benchmark countries means there is a good chance of sustaining the project’s results and continuing capacity development and the exchange of expertise and practices.
5. ***What are the advantages and disadvantages of the current approach?***
6. UNDP has taken a context-specific and multi-stakeholder approach to the implementation of the PCEAT project. To that end, from the outset PCEAT has engaged mostly key players to steer its implementation. These entities are relevant and thanks to their participation, the project’s implementation is continuing to benefit from strong political will and national ownership. The disadvantage of the current approach is that, for the time being, it is only driven by government institutions with a limited role given to civil society, the private sector, young people and the independent media.
7. Many advantages uphold the success factor of the current approach, which are worthy of mentioning in this chapter:

**The focus on preventive interventions**

PCEAT is focused on the prevention aspects of anti-corruption interventions within ongoing reforms, and complements development partners in their respective efforts to criminalize corruption in Uzbekistan. The project was carefully crafted around the national partners’ prevention efforts, avoiding duplication, and creating synergies with UNODC ROCA.

**Cascaded capacity building and capacity development**

The current triangular support from various UNDP offices provides continuous cascaded support to a relatively wide range of national beneficiaries and stakeholders. This approach has also resulted in the provision of effective and diversified expertise through webinars hosted for Uzbekistan’s ACA staff, and the operational and legal frameworks of these ACAs. Such an approach and support has been especially crucial during the State-declared COVID-19 lockdown. In other words, the cascade approach provided by the three UNDP agencies assisted with the switch to a digital mode of implementation, in order to avoid delays in 2020.

**Rising regional and global awareness**

The PCEAT project is the largest anti-corruption initiative in the Central Asian region and is a landmark anti-corruption project within UNDP. Since the launch of the anti-corruption reform process in Uzbekistan, the country has received a considerable amount of positive feedback and attention from development partners and institutions mandated to oversee good governance and anti-corruption. As mentioned throughout this present report, PCEAT’s support for these reforms has proved valuable, and is appreciated mainly by direct beneficiaries. UNDP’s regional and global agencies’ active involvement will leverage the visibility of the PCEAT project across UNDP. It may encourage other regional players to demonstrate their political will and openness needed to engage in meaningful and joint cooperation to curb corruption in Central Asia.

## Cross-cutting Issues: Human Rights and Gender Equality

1. ***Gender equality: to what extent does the project make a difference in improving gender equality and empowering women and girls, as well as promoting women’s participation throughout the project activities, and how can gender equality be further incorporated into the project’s design and implementation?***
2. The project reports that it has been able to build female professionals’ capacity within the participating agencies to the extent possible. The PCEAT project has organized 16 anti-corruption education and outreach events, with the participation of approximately 800 people. Out of this number of participants 320 women have taken part, 60 percent of whom are representatives of state agencies. PCEAT has also procured the services of ten female international experts. Overall, each of the recipient agencies can provide sex-disaggregated information regarding this particular intervention. However, to date all activities and their outcomes have remained gender-neutral.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of activity | Number of female professionals |
| Trained for ISO 37001:2016On the anti-bribery management system | 5 |
| Trained by KPMG to implement the anti-corruption compliance system in public agencies, auditing for compliance and managing conflicts of interest in public service | 40 |
| International expertise/technical assistance  | 10 |

1. To further gender equality within the next project design, it is essential to conduct gender analysis (GA) and adopt a do no harm approach, to ensure that the upcoming project will not perpetuate or exacerbate gender inequalities. As a result, specific inputs and outcomes should be included to spearhead works implemented to enhance women’s empowerment in anti-corruption efforts, including fostering women’s equal participation in decision-making, in leading initiatives, and enhancing their economic empowerment. OECD-DAC has developed a scoring system and criteria that classifies projects into three categories. This is the Gender Equality Policy Maker in Projects, which produces scores ranging from 0 (The project does not target gender equality), to 1 (Gender equality is a deliberate objective, but not the principal reason for undertaking the project) and 2 (Gender equality is the main objective of the project).
2. ***Human rights: to what extent have poor, people with disability, women, and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups, benefited from the work of the PCEAT project?***
3. At this stage of evaluation, the collection of credible quantified or qualified data to measure the PCEAT’s impact on the aforementioned vulnerable groups is not possible. However, it can be stated that the project has been working to prevent corruption in the health sector, and consequently such results could be achieved by the project’s conclusion. Therefore, the PCEAT team, together with the MoH, needs to develop SMART indicators to adapt its results framework and report such results. Similarly, PCEAT’s efforts to curb corruption in the Ministry of Infrastructure could be measured through the number of people benefiting from improved accessibility of both private and public buildings.

**Lessons Learned**

1. ***What are the lessons learned and areas for improving results, impact, approaches and processes, particularly when addressing anti-corruption integration in the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda?***

***a) Lessons learned from the literature review during the desk study***

1. The impact of the Anti-corruption Agency and other recipient institutions as a system, can be assessed progressively. Anti-corruption reforms encompass legislative and institutional changes, and they sometimes are a costly endeavour which require an organizational strategy underpinned by human, technical and financial resources. Moreover it is clear that the fight against corruption must be fully embedded in society, and cannot be a matter of laws and institutional reforms alone.
2. The revision of UNDP’s global work in advancing gender equality supports the argument that anti-corruption and gender equality are mutually-reinforcing goals. Empowered women who have an opportunity to participate in decision-making, are powerful actors who can contribute to the fight against corruption[[18]](#footnote-18). At the same time, promoting anti-corruption measures can advance gender equality and women’s empowerment. Recent studies have shown that empowered women who have an opportunity to participate in decision-making, are powerful actors who can contribute to the fight against corruption[[19]](#footnote-19). Strengthening the process of gender-disaggregated data collection and the engagement of women in the fight against corruption will be important to advancing both anti-corruption and gender equality.

***b) Lessons learned from the implementation of the PCEAT project***

1. The ongoing anti-corruption reforms in Uzbekistan have created a momentum for development partners to invest in. What was learned through this evaluation is that PCEAT is stimulating this momentum, and sustaining national stakeholders’ interest by introducing best innovative practices and supporting concrete needs.
2. Triangulated support for the PCEAT project’s implementation has provided coordinated and pooled policy support to integrate the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda in Uzbekistan. Specifically, all activities envisaged and implemented to date with partners’ joint efforts to establish responsive and accountable institutions to deliver equitable public services at the central level, correspond to the targets of SDG 16 ‘The Promotion of Peaceful and Inclusive Societies’. Shifting the focus in the next phase to local governance and development will make this support stronger.
3. While the political and normative environment remains fragile in terms of the strategic promotion of civic engagement and social accountability, there are circular arguments put forward by the interviewed state agencies that the particular demand side of the anti-corruption agenda should be taken on board by the State, through the participation of young people, civil society and the media. Added to these factors, women’s empowerment in participation and decision-making in anti-corruption reforms should be streamlined throughout future implementation and follow-up intervention.

**Recommendations**

Key recommendations presented in this chapter consider all three UNDP offices' roles and responsibilities behind this ongoing successful implementation, and the formulation of PCEAT’s next phase. These recommendations are clustered into two groups, including recommendations aiming to strengthen the project design and its result framework, thus prioritized for the implementing partners, and follow-up recommendations to consider in designing the next project’s cycle. The recommendations are guided by the evaluation framework, discussions held with national implementing agencies and beneficiaries, and the evaluation analysis of findings and conclusions.

**Priority recommendations on project design and result reporting**

**Recommendation 1**. Strengthen PCEAT’s Results Framework for adequate impact-level reporting across all four result areas, by populating the LF with specific indicators to measure impact-level results rendered from support provided to AC institutions.

**Recommendation 2.** Ensure that the prospective small grants scheme for national NGOs includes gender equality, women empowerment and innovation, including IT solutions as a criterion for Expressions of Interest and Calls for Proposals.

**Recommendation 3.** Strengthen PCEAT’s governance structure (Steering Committee) in terms of inclusive participation and gender equality, by encouraging civil society's participation in the project implementation's monitoring and decision-making structure. Ensure that the implementing partners' progress on outcome and impact-level results are a specific point of discussion within the Steering Committee’s agenda.

**Recommendations for the follow-up phase of the PCEAT project**

**Recommendation 4.** Conduct a thorough and participatory identification and formulation exercise to identify systemic determinants and bottlenecks that hamper the effectiveness and sustainability of the ongoing anti-corruption reforms’ emerging results.

**Recommendation 5.** Build the capacity of civil society to promote social accountability and monitoring, **to create a conducive environment for independent oversight. To that end,** support investigative journalists and the development of independent media by **sustaining the momentum created by PCEAT in developing a critical mass of independent anti-corruption professionals within the media.**

**List of Consulted Sources**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of document | Language |
| Project document | ENG |
| 1. 2020-04-13\_KPMG\_Устав Проекта
 | RUS |
| 1. Приказ oб Утверждении Методики Проведения Антикоррупционной Экспертизы Нормативно-Правовых Актов И Их Проектов 25.12.2015, #2745
 | RUS |
| 1. Country anti-corruption context in the time of COVID-19
2. AC compliance in Health\_Uzbekistan\_2020 (PCEAT)
 | ENG |
| 1. Annual Reports for the Years 2018, 2019 and 2020
 | ENG |
| 1. Minutes of the Project Board Meeting signed, December 2018
 | ENG |
| 1. OECD-I-Uzbekistan-4th-Round\_Monitoring-Report-2019-ENG
2. 4th round of monitoring of the Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan
 | ENG |
| 1. Cooperation with the UNDP Seoul Policy Centre (USPC) in establishing the Anti-Corruption Initiative Assessment-like Mechanism in Uzbekistan
2. PCEAT cooperation with the UNDP Seoul Policy Centre on AIA\_25.05.20
 | ENG |
| 1. PCEAT Annual Plan of Activities 2018 signed
 | ENG |
| 1. PCEAT Annual Report 2018
 | RUS |
| 1. PCEAT Annual Plan of Activities 2019 signed
 | ENG |
| 1. PCEAT Annual Plan of Activities 2020 signed
 | ENG |
| 1. Minutes of the Project Board Meeting signed, December 2019
 | ENG |
| 1. PCEAT Annual Report 2019
 | ENG |
| 1. Summary of the President’s Meeting on Anticorruption and Shadow Economy on 27 July 2020
 | ENG |
| 1. Workplan and Progress 2018-2019
 | ENG |
| 1. Устав проекта KPMG, 13.04.2020
 | RUS |
| 1. Текущий статус выполнения проекта ПРООН, 20.02.2020
 | RUS |
| 1. Статус антикоррупционного проекта KPMG, 23.10.2020
 | RUS |
| 1. ЗРУ-419 03.01.2017\_О Противодействии коррупции
 | RUS |
| 1. Постановление Президента Республики Узбекистан О Мерах По Реализации Положений Закона Республики Узбекистан «О Противодействии Коррупции» ПП-2752 02.02.2017\_Госпрограмма о противодействии коррупции 2017-2018
 | RUS |
| 1. Постановление Президента Республики Узбекистан Об Организации Деятельности Агентства По Противодействию Коррупции Республики Узбекистан. Пп-4761 29.06.2020\_Орг-Ция Деят-Ти Агенства
 | RUS |
| 1. Указ Президента Республики Узбекистан О Мерах По Дальнейшему Совершенствованию Системы Противодействия Коррупции В Республике Узбекистан. 27.05.2019. Уп-5729 27.05.2019\_Указ И Госпрограмма 2019-2020
 | RUS |
| 1. Указ Президента Республики Узбекистан О Дополнительных Мерах По Совершенствованию Системы Противодействия Коррупции В Республике Узбекистан. 29.06.2020. Уп-6013 29.06.2020\_Организация Агенства
 | RUS |
| 1. Результаты исполнения госпрограммы по противодействию коррупции 2017-2018
 | RUS |
| 1. Результаты исполнения госпрограммы по противодействию коррупции 2019-2020
 | RUS |
| 1. UNDP Global Anti-Corruption Initiative (Gain) 2014-2017
2. Dozorro: From an Idea of a Platform to the Biggest Monitoring Community in Ukraine. TI 2019
 | ENG |
| 1. Memorandum of Understanding on the Framework for the Restitution of Illegally Acquired Assets Forfeited in Switzerland for the Benefit of the Population of the Republic of Uzbekistan
 | ENG |
| 1. Review on Asset Declaration in the Draft Civil Service Law of Uzbekistan (by the ACPIS Team)
 | ENG |
| 1. Leveraging technology and innovation to advance accountability and public services delivery during COVID-19 in Europe and Central Asia. UNDP. 9 December 2020
 | ENG |
| 1. Curriculum Proposals for Anti-corruption Training at the Academy of the General Prosecutor’s Office of the Republic of Uzbekistan. UNODC. January 2021
 | ENG |
| 1. Curriculum Proposals for Anti-corruption Training at the Academy of the General Prosecutor’s Office of the Republic of Uzbekistan. UNODC. January 2021
 | ENG |
| 1. МЕТОДИКА проведения антикоррупционной экспертизы нормативно-правовых актов и их проектов. Совершенствование нормативно-правовой базы, регулирующей систему государственной службы в Республике Узбекистан (с применением методов антикоррупционной экспертизы). Аналитический доклад. Ma’No (Tashkent, 2019)
 | RUS |
| 1. Transparency International Ukraine. Annual Report 2018
 | ENG |
| 1. Seeing Beyond the State: Grassroots Women’s Perspectives on Corruption and Anti-Corruption, ASPIS, UNDP 2012
 | ENG |
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## Annexes

## 1. List of Interviewed Partners and Stakeholders

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N | Name and surname | Position/Organization | Date of interview | Gender |
|  | **Ministry of Justice** |
| 1. | Ruslanbek Davletov | Minister of Justice | 30.11.2020 | M |
| 2. | Khurliman Aytniyazova | Chief Consultant of the Department  | 03.01.2021 | F |
|  | **General Prosecutor’s Office** |
| 3. | Latif Jalov | Head of Department | 30.11.2020 | M |
| 4. | Karimjon Musashayhov | Senior Prosecutor | 30.11.2020 | M |
| 5. | Khasan Kabirjanov | Director of Enforcement Bureau | 27.11.2020 | M |
| 6. | Alisher Vakhabov  | ICT Implementation Centre engineer | 27.11.2020 | M |
| 7. | Sitora Solaeva  | ICT Implementation Centre engineer | 27.11.2020 | F |
| Anti-corruption Agency |
| 8. | Akmal Muratov  | Chief Inspector  | 01.12.2020 | M |
| KPMG |
| 9. | Farrukh Abdullakhanov  | Director  | 01.12.2020 | M |
| 10. | Irina Burdikova | Director  | 01.12.2020 | F |
| Other organizations |
| 11. | Bakhtiyor Ergashev | Director of the Ma’no Centre for Research Initiative | 01.12.2020 | M |
| 12. | Rustam Kamilov | Director of the Centre for Civil Society Development (CCSD) | 02.12.2020 | M |
| 13. | Dilbar Rashidova | Deputy Director of the Strategy Development Centre (SDC) | 03.12.2020 | F |
| 14. | Dilnoza Muratova | Project Coordinator, SDC | 03.12.2020 | F |
| 15. | Esemurat Kanyazov | Deputy Director of the Agency for Intellectual Property | 03.12.2020 | M |
| 16. | Ulugbek Mukhammadiev | Director of the Public Services Agency  | 01.12.2020 | M |
| 17.  | Shahrukh Sharakhmetov | Deputy Minister of Health | 26.11.2020 | M |
| 18. | Bakhodir Halmetov | Head of the Compliance Control Unit of the State Financial Control Department of JSC UzbekOilGas | 30.11.2020 | M |
| 19. | Aminov Erkin | Head of the Compliance Territories Team | 30.11.2020 | M |
| 20. | Evgeniy Kolenko  | Head of the General Prosecutor’s Academy  | 15.12.2020 | M |
| 21. | Kongirat Sharipov | Rector of the Tashkent State University of Economics | 27.11.2020 | M |
| UNDP Uzbekistan Country Office |
| 22. | Matilda Dimovska | Resident Representative  | 16.12.2020 | F |
| 23. | Doina Munteanu | Deputy Resident Representative  | 16.12.2020 | F |
| 24. | Kamila Mukhamedkhanova | Head of Good Governance, Policy and Communication Cluster | 17.12.2020 | F |
| 25. | Azizkhon Bakhadirov | Programme Analyst on Rule of Law, Good Governance, Policy and Communication Cluster  | 17.12.2020 | M |
| 26.  | Abror Khodjaev | IPSD Project Manager | 17.12.2020 | M |
| 27. | Nariman Muradasilov  | PCEAT Project Manager  | 17.12.2020 | M |
| 28. | Nodira Zikrillaeva  | PCEAT Task Manager  | 17.12.2020 | F |
|  UNDP ACPIS |
| 29. | Anga Timilsina | Global Program Anti-corruption Advisor  | 12.12.2020 | M |
| 30. | Aida Arutyunova | Programme Manager | 12.12.2020 | F |
| UNDP IRH |
| 31. | Irakli Kotetishvili | Programme Specialist  | 12.12.2020 | M |
| UNODC |
| 32. | Koen Marquering | Programme Coordinator, UNODC ROCA | 17.12.2020 | M |
| 33. | Maruf Khakimov | Nationla Project Officer | 17.12.2020 | M |
| National independent media |
| 34. | Shukhrat Latipov | Journalist | 28.12.2020 | M |
| 35. | Kobil Khidirov | Journalist, blogger  | 28.12.2020 | M |

## 2. Terms of Reference

|  |
| --- |
| International Consultant to Conduct the Mid-term Review of UNDP’s ‘Preventing Corruption Through Effective, Accountable and Transparent Governance Institutions in Uzbekistan’ Project |
| **Location:** | Tashkent, UZBEKISTAN |
| **Application Deadline:** | 30-Jun-2020 **(Midnight New York, USA)** |
| **Type of Contract:** | Individual Contract |
| **Post Level:** | International Consultant |
| **Languages Required:** | English |
| **Starting:**(Date when the selected candidate is expected to start) | 01-Jul-2020 |
| **Duration of Initial Contract:** | 30 working days |
| **Expected Duration of Assignment:** | 30 working days |
| **UNDP is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply. All applications will be treated with the strictest confidence.** **UNDP does not tolerate sexual exploitation and abuse, any kind of harassment, including sexual harassment and discrimination. All selected candidates will, therefore, undergo rigorous reference and background checks.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Background** |
| Uzbekistan has put forward an ambitious goal to become an upper-middle-income country by 2030, focusing on promoting decent work and improved well-being of the nation’s most disadvantaged groups. Resilient, agile and adaptive government institutions are needed to cope smartly with current social and economic transformations, and to ensure sustainable development and the inclusion of the entire society in the benefits of development. Therefore, in 2016-2017, the Republic of Uzbekistan’s President initiated a full-scale reform of Uzbekistan’s governance system. Uzbekistan's Government acknowledged the need for an efficient, responsive, transparent and accountable public administration, as one of the main preconditions for sustainable development and a key component for achieving the Action Strategy for 2017-2021. The country's new leadership has set forth mid-term priorities on public administration reform, access to quality public services and public information, and judicial and legal reform. The Government has adopted the Concept of Administrative Reform that outlines steps to create an effective and transparent public administration system. The UN Development Assistance Framework (2016-2020), as well as the Action-oriented Roadmap (2017-2020), signed by both the Government of Uzbekistan and the United Nations, are guided by the Government’s people-centred development vision “to build an open democratic and law-governed state with a stable developing economy.”The ‘Preventing Corruption through Effective, Accountable and Transparent Governance Institutions in Uzbekistan’ (PCEAT) project was launched by the UNDP Country Office in Uzbekistan jointly with the Ministry of Justice of Uzbekistan on 22 March 2018, with the policy and advisory support of UNDP’s Global ‘Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies’ (ACPIS) project and UNDP’s Istanbul Regional Hub (IRH).The PCEAT project is the largest UNDP initiative on anti-corruption in Europe and the CIS region, funded by Uzbekistan's Government with a total budget of US$8 million. The project aims to provide anti-corruption policy and program support to Uzbekistan to prevent and curb corruption countrywide. The project's key output is ‘**Anti-corruption solutions, principles and tools are integrated into the public administration systems, public service delivery, civil service performance, and the system of law-making and rule-making’.** The implementation of the PCEAT project is supported by UNDP’s global and regional anti-corruption teams, who provide policy and programme support. In line with Uzbekistan’s Action Strategy for 2017-2021 and commitments under the 2030 Agenda, the PCEAT project focuses on strengthening the national corruption prevention system and monitoring the UNCAC and OECD implementation of the Istanbul Plan of Action in an integrated manner.In particular, the PCEAT project:* Provides legislative and policy support to integrate anti-corruption solutions in the processes of law-making, rule-making and policy advice.
* Strengthens the capacity, knowledge and skills of civil servants to prevent corruption.
* Supports the digitalization of public service delivery and interaction in government entities, to ensure the effective flow of documents and the transparency of public services.
* Promotes a culture of intolerance towards corruption in society, through knowledge and advocacy, and active cooperation between government, civil society and the private sector.
 |
| **Duties and Responsibilities** |
| **Competencies** |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **Functional Competencies:*** Excellent analytical skills;
* Ability to work independently;
* Ability to perform tasks in a timely manner and produce a quality final product;
* Strong interpersonal, communication and diplomacy skills;
* Openness to change and ability to receive and integrate feedback.

**Corporate Competencies:*** Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards;
* Promotes the vision, mission and strategic goals of UNDP;
* Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability;
* Treats all people fairly without favouritism;

Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity. |

 |
| **Required Skills and Experience** |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **Education:*** Master’s degree in public administration, law, political science, finance, economics, international relations, development studies, or a related field.

**Experience:*** At least ten years of working experience in monitoring and evaluation, and (in addition) policy support, programme management or design of governance and anti-corruption programmes/projects;
* A prior record of producing research studies, preferably in the fields of governance and anti-corruption;
* A prior record of conducting mid-term or final evaluations related to governance and preferably anti-corruption.

**Language Requirements:*** Strong writing skills in English. A command of Russian is desirable, as the majority of interviewees may not speak English.

**Application Process:**Interested candidates need to apply online at [www.jobs.undp.org](http://www.jobs.undp.org/) and upload the documents requested in Part 6 of the Procurement Notice (*Technical Proposal/Methodology*, *CV/P11 form, Offeror’s Letter of Confirmation and Financial Proposal*) **no later than the end of 30 June 2020**(New York time). Please combine all your documents into one (1) single PDF document as the system only allows you to upload a maximum of one document. Your on-line application’s submission will be acknowledged to your email address provided in the application. If you do not receive an e-mail acknowledgement within 24 hours of submission, your application may not have been received. In such cases, please resubmit the application if necessary.You can review the detailed Procurement Notice, Terms of Reference and download templates from the UNDP Procurement Notices Site following the link [http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view\_notice.cfm?notice\_id=66889](http://procurement-notices-admin.undp.org/view_notice.cfm?notice_id=66889).Applications submitted via email, incomplete applications, or those received after the closing date (30 June 2020) will not be given consideration.Failure to submit a *Financial Proposal*by the deadline or without reference to the subject above will result in disqualification.For more detailed information about UNDP Uzbekistan, please visit our website at [www.uz.undp.org](http://www.uz.undp.org/). UNDP is an equal opportunity employer. Qualified female candidates, people with disabilities, and minorities are highly encouraged to apply. UNDP Balance in Manage Policy promotes the achievement of gender balance among its staff at all levels.Requests for clarification must be sent in writing to pu.uz@undp.org, ensuring that the reference number above is included in the subject line. UNDP shall endeavour to provide such responses to clarifications in an expeditious manner, but any delay in such a response shall not cause an obligation for UNDP to extend the submission date for proposals, unless UNDP deems that such an extension is justified and necessary. |

 |

## 3. Evaluation Matrix

**Evaluation Matrix based on the Indicative Evaluation Questions and Judgment Criteria (JC), sample indicators**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Question | Judgment Criteria/Indicator | Data Collection Method | Sources | Data Analysis Methods |
| Relevance  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. How relevant is the project to the needs and priorities of the target groups and beneficiaries? (Gender dimension to be considered)
2. How clear is the intervention logic (i.e., the Theory of Change), and how effective is the logical results framework?
3. How effective are the current indicators in tracking impact and output results?
4. What are the emerging anti-corruption needs and priorities in Uzbekistan, and is the project in a position to help address such priorities effectively?
5. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the current approach?
 | * The extent of alignment between the project objectives and national strategies, policies and plans and the country’s internationally undertaken obligations (Number of relevant outputs);
* Coherence in the Theory of Change and evidence of its consistent translation into activities;
* The validity of the assumptions underpinning the Theory of Change and the chosen outcomes and outputs;
* Strategies undertaken by the project to ensure that activities and outputs are relevant to the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders;
* Evidence of the monitoring of relevance to the needs of beneficiaries (including the use of disaggregated data) and stakeholders;
* Mechanisms established by the project to ensure that the needs of beneficiaries and stakeholders are regularly assessed and considered.
 | * Document analysis and revision of the updated log-frame;
* Interviews with key implementation stakeholders, including the project’s central & local government counterparts, NGO partners and legislative entities, using open format questions without a predetermined set of responses.
 | * Uzbekistan’s Action Strategy for 2017-2021
* The State Anti-Corruption Programme for 2017-2018
* The project document
* Log-frame
* National counterparts
* National AC plans
* Beneficiaries
* The National SDG Agenda, specifically for SDGs 16.3, 16.5 and 16.6
* UNDAF
 | * Qualitative analysis
* Triangulation by using data from multiple sources and stakeholders
 |
| Effectiveness | **Judgment Criteria/Indicator** | **Data Collection Method** | **Sources** |  |
| 1. Are the planned activities consistent with the project’s purpose and overall objectives?
2. Does the analysis of principal factors influence the achievement or non-achievement of objectives?
3. Does the project’s M&E system generate credible information used for management decision making, learning and accountability?
4. Is there a need for M&E’s further strengthening in the current project, and in possible future anti-corruption related projects?
 | * Percentage of progress towards expected results;
* Evidence of cooperation between the implementing parties;
* Use of baselines to establish targets, priorities and timelines;
* LF indicators set on the outcome and impact level;
* Adequacy of the Risk and Mitigation Plan;
* Beneficiaries’ level of satisfaction with the programme’s outputs and outcomes.
 | * Document analysis (annual and donor reports, and others);
* Monitoring records;
* Interviews;
* Revision of the quality of outputs: training modules, draft laws, and proposed AC mechanisms.

  | * Progress reports
* Outcomes of field missions
* Media and CSO report
* Reports (reviews, M&E, peer-to-peer progress) made by international organizations and development partners
* MoJ’s annual statistics
* Level of satisfaction of direct beneficiaries
 | * Quantitative and qualitative analysis
* Understanding the constraints and challenges of informants
 |
| Efficiency | **Judgment Criteria/Indicator** | **Data Collection Method** | **Sources** |  |
| 1. Which other ways of using resources have produced more results, or have used resources sparingly while maintaining the same level of achievements?
2. How appropriately did the project produce the products and services it delivered?
3. How do costs affect the sustainability of the results?
 | * Evidence of clearly established (i.e., in written format) processes to safeguard the use of funds, value-for-money, transparency and accountability in sub-contracting, and other procurement processes;
* Samples of cost-shared events;
* Samples of the appropriate use of funds that led to the multiplayer effect;
* Evidence of the efficiency of partnerships (the use of capacity, resources, coordination, etc.);
* Use of third parties to provide services that could be covered by using their in-project skills, or by using partner’s premises to conduct necessary training;
* Actual expenditure compared to planned expenditure, by project output;
* Actual timeline compared to planned timeline for the delivery of outputs.
 | * Desk review of activity plans, budget records, interim/status/annual reports, partners’ reports, etc.;
* Interviews with project management, partners and stakeholders;
* Interviews with beneficiaries.
 | * Progress reports
* Annual Review of progress on the Action Plan
* Database of training participants maintained by the project
* Financial audit report
* Level of satisfaction of direct beneficiaries
 | * Quantitative and qualitative analysis
* Triangulation by using data from multiple sources and stakeholders
 |
| Perspectives of Impact | **Judgment Criteria/Indicator** | **Data Collection Method** | **Sources** |  |
| 1. What are the key mid-term results and significant progress achieved against the results and resource framework of the project?
2. Are there findings, conclusions (and recommendations) to ensure that the project will achieve its goal and objectives upon its completion?
3. What are the lessons learned and areas for improving results, impact, approaches and processes, particularly addressing the integration of anti-corruption in the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda?
 | * Improved rankings (higher score) for 2020 in the Transparency International CPI;
* The WEF Global Competitiveness Report, Freedom House Ranking, the World Justice Project’s Rule of Law Index, the Bertelsmann Stiftung Transformation Index (BTI), and the WB Doing Business Index;
* Improved public perception of institutions indicated in relevant assessments and indexes.
 | * Document analysis;
* Monitoring records;
* Interviews;
* Individual interviews with key implementation stakeholders: project’s government counterparts, NGO partners, legislative entities.
 | * The annual World Justice Project’s Rule of Law Index
* The annual Bertelsmann Stiftung Transformation Index (BTI)
* The annual Transparency International CPI
* The annual WEF Global Competitiveness Report
* Freedom House Ranking
* The annual WB Doing Business Index
* Official statistics of the MOJ and other relevant national bodies
* Country-wide corruption survey
 |  |
| Perspectives of Sustainability | **Judgment Criteria/Indicator** | **Data Collection Method** | **Sources** |  |
| 1. Which institutional arrangements allow for maintaining the benefits achieved?
2. Which financial resources are available to fund the continuation of the services provided by the project? How long will they be available, from which sources?
 | * The extent to which stakeholders are prepared to continue/allocate funds to the continuation of initiatives facilitated by the programme;
* Evidence of national level/local level leadership on the project’s outputs;
* **The availability of the Exit Plan agreed with the MoJ;**
* The availability of human and financial resources from partner institutions, required to continue activities and maintain IT solutions;
* Identification of factors that promote the sustained functioning of the structures/initiatives facilitated by the project (such as the institutionalized Anticorruption Initiative Assessment tool);
* Number of public institutions using Corruption Risk Assessment and Risk Management for Public Institutions;
* Adequacy of the risk analyses, level of ownership over the current mid-term results, and adequacy of the result framework.
 | * Direct observation;
* Interviews;
* Individual interviews with key implementation stakeholders, including central and local government counterparts, and NGO partners.
 | * Availability of national supporting budgets
* Sustainability strategy
 | * Synthesis of findings
 |
| UNDP Added Value | **Judgment Criteria/Indicator** | **Data Collection Method** | **Sources** |  |
| 1. How effective are the organizational structures and operations, and policy mandates, between implementing partners? Such as support from the global anti-corruption team in Singapore, the Istanbul Regional Hub and UNDP Uzbekistan?
2. To what extent have partnerships been established/supported with the government, non-state actors and international organizations/partners?
 | * Level and quality of technical assistance;
* Examples of police-level changes that promote UN values or best international practices;
* Level of interaction with the UN agencies and established partnerships;
* Extension of the promoted anti-corruption reforms in Uzbekistan;
* Level of UNDP’s contribution to partnership building in Uzbekistan to fight against corruption;
* Role of project activities focusing on innovation and technology in promoting anti-corruption reforms in the country;
* Level of contribution to overall advocacy and awareness in strengthening national discourse on anti-corruption and zero-tolerance towards corruption in society.
 | * Interviews with UNDP staff, and members of donor coordination meetings on anti-corruption, including with WB, UNODC and key other stakeholders at both national and regional levels.
 | * Information is available
* National counterparts are willing/able to meet
 | * Qualitative analysis
 |
| Coherence | **Judgment Criteria/Indicator** | **Data Collection Method** | **Sources** |  |
| 1. How effective are the organizational structures and operations, and policy mandates, between implementing partners? Such as support from the global anti-corruption team in Singapore, the Istanbul Regional Hub and UNDP Uzbekistan?
2. To what extent have partnerships been established/supported with the government, non-state actors and international organizations/partners?
3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the current approach?
 | * Level of the coordinated UNCT and Global Programme approach to development, promoting joint programming and joint actions;
* Adequately tailored partnerships with a broader range of stakeholders and partner countries;
* Level of the contribution to the National Development Plan’s priority area.
 | * Interviews with key stakeholders at both national and regional levels;
* Interviews with staff from UNDP and UNODC;
* Interviews with staff from the MoJ.
 | * The State’s national SDGs Agenda, and progress towards SDGs 5 and 16
 | * Qualitative analysis
 |
| Cross-Cutting Issues | **Judgment Criteria/Indicator** | **Data Collection Method** | **Sources** |  |
| 1. Gender equality: to what extent does the project make a difference in improving gender equality and empowering women and girls, as well as promoting women’s participation throughout the project activities, and how can gender equality be further incorporated into the project’s design and implementation?
2. Human rights: to what extent have poor, people with disability, women, and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of the PCEAT project?
 | * A monitoring mechanism in place at both national and local levels, in which programme-related data is collected and analysed in a sex-disaggregated manner;
* The type of engagement of women at different stages of the project’s implementation;
* The number of women empowered by the programme, including professionals and representatives of CSOs;
* The number of women supported by the programme;
* Specific activities corresponding with the National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security, and the MoJ Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security (2017-2020);
* Specific activities supporting the National Human Rights Action Plan of Uzbekistan.
 | * Desk review;
* Interviews and direct observation.
 | * Progress reports, LF indicators, and programme design
* National Action Plan on Women, Peace and Security
* SDG 5
 | * Qualitative analysis
 |

## 4. Guiding Questions for Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

**PCEAT Staff**

1. How do you assess PCEAT’s support in building the capacity of a national institution in AC efforts and why?
2. What are the most successful aspects of the project?
3. What is your opinion on the quality of the support from UNDP’s Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies (ACPIS) Global Programme and the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub?
4. What are the less and most successful aspects of the project? What are the challenges faced?
5. What are your priority needs for the coming period?
6. What are your recommendations to improve such programmes?

**National Partners / Agencies**

1. Did you participate in trainings provided by the PCEAT project? If yes, how do you rate the trainings in terms of the importance of their topics for you, the quality and duration of the trainings, and the performance of the trainers?
2. To what extent are members of the most vulnerable population groups benefitting from the interventions? Please give examples?
3. Did you participate in a study/exposure tour abroad? If yes, how useful was the tour?
4. What are the most successful aspects of the project?
5. What are the less successful aspects of the project? What are the challenges faced?
6. What are your priority needs for the coming period? What are your recommendations to improve such programmes?
7. What is your perception of the project’s results, and how would you measure them? Will the achieved results lead to the intended impacts?
8. What measures should be planned to sustain the project’s results?

**Civil Society Organizations and the media**

1. How is the situation with the CSOs? The normative environment?
2. Is PCEAT’s support in line with the needs of your community? Can you explain in detail?
3. How do you assess PCEAT’s support for enhancing AC efforts in Uzbekistan? Please elaborate?
4. What are the current gaps and priorities today in promoting the role of the CSOs in AC?
5. Is the timing right for the development of AC journalists? Is this topic a part of university curricula?
6. How can a conducive environment for the development of investigative journalism be created?
7. Are there development partners working in this regard?
8. Is there any improvement in the country regarding the State’s commitment towards AC efforts?
1. See: <https://open.undp.org/projects/00110970>, last visited <12.1.2021> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Seeing Beyond the State: Grassroots Women’s Perspectives on Corruption and Anti-Corruption, ACPIS, UNDP 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See: <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/ratification-status.html>, last visited <20.11.2020> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. #  See: *Президент и премьер тоже будут декларировать доходы — проект (the President and Prime-Minister will also declare their income)*

<https://www.gazeta.uz/ru/2021/01/09/incomes/?utm_source=push&utm_medium=telegram>, last visited <11.01.2021> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. PCEAT Annual Report. December 2020. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. See: https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2020/index/uzb , last visited <20.02.2021> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. p. 34. Anti-Corruption Reforms in Uzbekistan. Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan. Fourth Round of Monitoring. OECD. 2019. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. See: Challenges NGOs in Uzbekistan are Still Facing, https://cabar.asia/en/36019-2 <last visited 12.12.2020> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. See <https://open.undp.org/projects/00110970>, last visited <12.1.2021> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. For further details, please see: <https://ti-ukraine.org/en/research/transparency-ranking-of-the-100-largest-cities-in-ukraine-2019/>. Last visited <1.01.2021> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. See: <https://open.undp.org/projects/00110970>, last visited <12.1.2021> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. The Anti-corruption Initiative Assessment is a self-reporting mechanism which evaluates how public institutions implement specific measures to prevent corruption, combining quantitative and qualitative assessment with a systematic, weighted scoring system. Target institutions are ranked in tiers based on their total scores, and their rankings are released to the public at the end of each year. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Seeing Beyond the State: Grassroots Women’s Perspectives on Corruption and Anti-Corruption, ACPIS, UNDP 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)