

**Final Evaluation:
PROMOTING A FAIR BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT
IN ASEAN COUNTRIES
(FairBiz)**

EVALUATION REPORT

February 2022

Project Summary Table

Project Title:	Promoting a Fair Business Environment in ASEAN Countries
Atlas Project Award:	00112026
Project ID:	00110713
Total Budget	GBP 5,537,167.58 or USD 7,244,682.84 (Budget for June 2018 – March 2022)
Project Dates:	01 June, 2018 – 31 March 2022
Donor:	UK Government – Prosperity Fund
Implementation Modality:	DIM
Responsible Party:	The Infrastructure Sector Transparency Initiative

Table of Contents

Project Summary Table.....	2
List of Acronyms Used	4
Executive Summary	5
Introduction	7
1. Background	7
2. Evaluation Intervention	8
A. Objectives	8
B. Methodology.....	8
General.....	9
Tools.....	9
Sampling Criteria	10
Data Analysis	10
C. Limitations	10
Findings & Analysis	11
1. Relevance.....	11
2. Efficiency.....	14
Implementation Modality.....	14
Technical Advice.....	15
Management Structure.....	15
Expressions of Interest.....	16
Partnership with UK Government	16
3. Effectiveness	17
4. Impact.....	22
5. Sustainability	23
6. Cross-cutting Issues.....	24
A. Gender	24
B. Diversity	25
Conclusion 27	
Recommendations.....	28
Lessons Learned.....	30
Annex 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference.....	31
Annex 2: List of Key Stakeholders.....	45
Annex 3: List of Documents Reviewed	46
Annex 4: Responses to Evaluation Matrix Questions	48
Annex 5: Table of Project's Indicators, Targets & Level of Achievement.....	68

List of Acronyms Used

ACPIS – Anti-Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies
ACT – Anti-Corruption Organisation of Thailand
ADB – Asian Development Bank
ASEAN – Association of South-East Asia Nations
CGD – Comptroller-General Department (Thailand)
CO – Country Office (UNDP)
CoST – The Infrastructure Sector Transparency Initiative
CSO - Civil Society Organisation
EOI – Expression of Interest
FCDO – Foreign and Commonwealth Development Office
FE – Final Evaluation
I&T – Integrity and Transparency
MNC – Multi-national Corporation
OECD - Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PSAG – Private Sector Advisory Group (specific to FairBiz project)
RP – Responsible Partner
RBx - Regional Bureaux
SDG – Sustainable Development Goal
SME – Small & Medium Enterprises
SP – Strategic Plan
TI - Transparency International
ToR - Terms of Reference
ToT – Training of Trainers
TPP – Trans-Pacific Partnership
UN - United Nations
UNCAC - United Nations Convention Against Corruption
UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
UNGA – United Nations General Assembly
UNODC - United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
VCCI – Vietnam Chamber of Commerce & Industry

Executive Summary

UNDP has been working for nearly two decades with government partners and civil society in building anti-corruption systems, legal frameworks and institutions to manage them. This work has been at three levels – global, regional and country-level. Yet absent from this work has been the engagement and support to the private sector and its role in promoting anti-corruption principles and the broader environment, social and governance issues that are now front and centre for the business community. In South-east Asia, a number of countries have signed new trade agreements and/or have adopted new legislation that will have a direct effect on the private sector's tolerance for corruption. In 2018, UNDP's regional hub in Bangkok initiated a project – Promoting a Fair Business Environment in ASEAN Countries (aka – FairBiz) – with a specific task of approaching anti-corruption work from a different angle with more of an emphasis on business integrity and the role of the private sector in combating corruption.

As a project, FairBiz is at the cutting edge of UNDP's development work on two fronts. First, the project is engaging in promoting business integrity as a means of reducing corruption in the ASEAN region. This is a new area of work in the field of anti-corruption. Second, the project has developed a number of platforms and networks that have enabled the robust engagement of the private sector in combatting corruption. Given the greenfield work that FairBiz has been working in, the expectations for results were likely over ambitious for the first phase of the project. But when you add to this context the turnover in senior project staff in the first half of the project's life and the *force majeure* that is the COVID-19 Pandemic, FairBiz has performed very well.

Though the project started slowly, partly the result of the rejection of one of the Responsible Parties that was to support implementation of the project, in the end it was able to meet practically all of the targets identified for the indicators in the results framework. Unfortunately, the indicators do not measure adequately if the outputs have been achieved. This has resulted in the project meeting its targets, but not always achieving the intended results.

A major turning point in the project's work was in early 2020 when the six platforms were established. This provided a clear focus for the project's work. The building of the networks, such as the PSAG and of women business leaders, has allowed for the cost-effective sharing of knowledge, in most cases through strong partnerships with national and regional actors.

Being a regional project, FairBiz was designed based on a number of the principles of regionality – that where the work is best done nationally, it should be done nationally, but where there is added value to regional work, it would be promoted. FairBiz worked closely with COs and allowed them to take the lead in identifying exactly how FairBiz could support business integrity in the context of each country. Through the use of competitive pilot projects, FairBiz was able to lead from behind and support the development of CO partnerships with national actors, including new and vibrant partnerships with government agencies, private sector umbrella organisations and directly with specific private sector firms.

The project has achieved some results, specially at the national level in specific countries where the political will to address corruption is high. Especially where that political will has been expressed through revised legislation, the project has followed up on these legislative agendas with the backstopping and technical expertise that has enabled the effective implementation of such new rules.

However, during the first phase of the project there is limited evidence of the results achieved in select countries being upscaled or replicated regionally. Perhaps this was too much to ask for a project that is working on such a new topic. Efforts have been made to share experiences and to support replication, but such efforts may require a rethink as to how the success in a select number of countries can be repeated in other countries in the region.

It is important to note that since the project has had continuity in its project team, there has been a significant increase in the results and engagements by the project. This is an indication that the early work, which may have started slowly, has built momentum and with a consistent approach from staff, has led to an active and effective project. But this work needs more time to be nurtured. FairBiz has only just started to see results from three years of effort and hard work. It will take many more years of building trusted relationships with partners and supporting their knowledge journey and their transition to advocates for business integrity in order for there to be an impact from UNDP's efforts.

Based on the criteria upon which this review was commissioned, the following is a summary of the project's work:

Relevance: The project was well-aligned with UNDP strategic documents, ASEAN Vision 2025 and with select national development priorities. The design of the project could have benefited from stronger indicators to measure results effectively.

Efficiency: The project used a delivery modality that was based on a mix of responsible party implementation and strong engagement with UNDP COs. The use of seed funding for pilot projects that were proposed by COs resulted in some of the project's most results-oriented work. The turnover in staff, especially in the first year or so of the project, was a challenge. The partnership with the UK Government, in which the project worked with national UK representatives and UNDP COs, did allow for stringer relationships with national partners and, in turn, greater results. The use of competitive EOIs allowed for the leveraging of resources at the national level to compliment the programme's work.

Effectiveness: The project was able to achieve the intended outputs and overall outcome related to its work. In all areas the work progressed slowly, at first, but took on momentum as relationships were built and COs were able to implement pilot projects. Some of the key results were especially noted in Thailand, Vietnam, Malaysia and Indonesia, given each of these countries' governments had made decisions in the past few years to support revived anti-corruption measures and more transparency in procurement processes.

Impact: The most notable impact from the project was the change in regulations and the opening up of the public procurement process in Thailand. The project's support to the Government of Thailand – both directly and through its responsible party – resulted in a confirmed savings of \$460 million USD from an improved procurement process.

Sustainability: The approach to its work, including promoting co-ownership by national partners, showed signs of national sustainability of the results achieved, yet more work will be required to institutionalise such changes to make them fully sustainable.

Gender & Diversity: FairBiz did a very good job of both targeting women as beneficiaries to receive specific support and knowledge, while also mainstreaming gender equality through all of the project's activities. For youth, the project developed strong relationships with key national partners in Thailand to develop well-received knowledge materials that provide young entrepreneurs with the tools to build their businesses based on principles of integrity.

Based on the findings and analysis of this evaluation, the following recommendations are provided:

- **FairBiz should continue as a regional project as its work in this innovative field of governance needs a long-term commitment.**
- **The next phase of FairBiz must reflect the priorities of the new UNDP Strategic Plan, Regional Plan and the principles of regionality**
- **FairBiz must focus in the future on replicating and scaling up the good results observed at the national level in select countries.**
- **Capacity development and knowledge sharing needs to move beyond training and seminars.**
- **FairBiz needs to enhance its capacity for knowledge brokering.**
- **Continue to design targeted activities with women to expand the momentum on gender responsive work and assess the differentiated impact on women**
- **Expand engagement of business leaders from minority and marginalised groups**
- **Maintain staff continuity**
- **Indicators for the results framework must reflect SMART principles**
- **FairBiz needs to capture its knowledge with regard to working with the private sector and UNDP needs to share this knowledge with other regions to build these new partnerships globally.**

Introduction

1. Background

During the past two decades, the fight against corruption has become a key consideration in the delivery of development assistance to promote economic and social well-being. From the adoption of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC)¹ in 2003 to the recognition of the importance of addressing corruption as part of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015, the development community has moved towards the recognition that corruption is a deterrent to development and can also be a significant contributing factor in political instability.

Recognizing the detrimental impact of corruption on sustainable development, nearly all countries have ratified or acceded to UNCAC. With 187 states parties, the Convention has been influential in enabling states parties to adopt national legal instruments to combat corruption, including anti-corruption laws and strategies, and the establishment of anti-corruption institutions.

The Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) Economic Community is the 7th largest economy in the world. In 2020 the member states had a combined Gross Domestic Product of US \$3 Trillion.² All ASEAN member states have endorsed the *Agenda 2030* and the *Sustainable Development Goals*. In addition, ASEAN adopted in 2015 *Vision 2025*, which is noted to work in a complementary manner to the Agenda 2030.

Corrupt practices involving private sector businesses is a global challenge. Transparency International has noted the impact of such practices, including inflated prices for goods and services, breaches of health, safety and environmental protection rules, and reduced public revenues, from tax avoidance, which, in turn, limits funding for the provision of public services.³ This last one is of particular importance, as such corrupt practices will result in fewer and/or poorer quality public services, with those that are marginalised being the most severely impacted.

Therefore, a growing area of development work in the field of anti-corruption is focused on business integrity as a means of countering corruption. By establishing the legal and regulatory frameworks and establishing fair business rules of engagement, it is expected that corruption can be reduced and, in turn, individuals and corporations will benefit from better public services and less environmental and health degradation.

In addition to national and global support, UNDP has established regional projects focused on integrity and transparency (I&T). One of these projects is *Promoting a Fair Business Environment in ASEAN* (FairBiz). The project was initiated in 2018 with support from the UK Government.⁴ The project, initially set to end in March 2021, has been extended until March 2022 and covers six countries in South-East Asia, all of which are member states of the Association of South-East Asian Nations: Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar⁵, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam. The project works in these six countries through UNDP Country Offices (COs) in which annual work plans are funded by the project and implemented through CO focal points providing part-time support.

At the regional level, FairBiz has partnered with CoST – the Infrastructure Transparency Initiative – to support enhancement of public procurement processes in the region. In 2019 the project, among other regional UNDP projects, established the

¹ UNCAC: <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/> and SDG 16 on bribery and anti-corruption: <http://www.anti-corruption.org/themes/anti-corruption-in-sdgs-2/>

² <https://www.statista.com/statistics/796245/gdp-of-the-asean-countries/>

³ <https://www.transparency.org/en/our-priorities/business-and-corruption#>

⁴ At the time of the commencement of the project the funding was from the Prosperity Fund of the UK Government (), Foreign, Commonwealth Office (FCO), which in July 2020 merged with the UK Government Department for International Development (DFID), becoming the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO).

⁵ Following the coup of 1st February 2021, UNDP, guided by the statements of the UN Secretary General, the SG's Special Envoy on Myanmar and the High Commissioner for Human Rights, put on hold all activities engaging with the Government and the military authorities. FairBiz activities were suspended in Myanmar, in agreement with FCDO as of February 2021.

Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG), providing guidance to the projects on their work with the private sector. The project also works with national partners, including governments, CSOs and the private sector.

2. Evaluation Intervention

This is the final evaluation of Phase I of the FairBiz Project, which was implemented from 2018 to 2021 (with a no-cost extension granted in June 2020 until September 2021, and then subsequently a costed extension granted in August 2021, to run the project until March, 2022). The project was implemented as a regional programme through UNDPs Bangkok Regional Hub and was funded by the UK Government for the total amount of GBP 5,537,169 GBP)\$7,312,410 (USD)).

The project was developed to address a growing demand for business integrity as a core aspect of national anti-corruption programmes. Based on Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the ASEAN 2025 Vision, space has been created to promote and support partnerships and mutually-beneficial actions by governments and the private sector to establish sustainable practices by corporations – both multi-national corporations (MNCs) and small and medium enterprises (SMEs) – that will minimise corruption and create demand for governments to be more transparent and to apply a rules-based approach to their engagement with the private sector.

The project objectives are:

- Encourage partnerships between the public and private sectors, as well as civil society and development partners at the regional level, to implement and monitor integrity policies in ASEAN
- Improve transparency in government contracts and increase compliance with international procurement and trade standards
- Promote business integrity and sustainable practices for private companies and state-owned enterprises
- Strengthen anti-corruption strategies, policies and laws and improve redress mechanisms for companies, investors and the broader public.

The project was implemented through one responsible partner – CoST – which was focused on implementing the work related to public procurement. Another responsible partner (RP) was originally identified to implement the project's work related to business integrity and sustainable practices. However, after conducting its due diligence with regard to the potential RP, it was determined that the work would be implemented directly by UNDP. Additionally, the project created synergies with another project run by the same team: “Judicial Excellence to ensure *Justice for All*: The Judicial Integrity Network in ASEAN (JIN ASEAN)” (2017-2023).

A. Objectives

The objective of this final evaluation are threefold:

- To assess progress of the FairBiz project against the project objectives and evaluate whether the project achieved expected results, as envisioned by the project document
- To evaluate the implementation of the project and its capacity to adapt to a rapidly evolving crisis context determined by covid-19 pandemic and in response to recommendations from previous reviews and evaluations
- To assess the project's alignment with and contribution to UNDP RPD and Strategic Plan 2018-2021, and provide forward-looking recommendations, lessons learned and good practices, that can inform the development of FairBiz Gen 2.

B. Methodology

In accordance with the approved Inception Report for this evaluation, the following methodology was developed and implemented for this review.

General

Given the mandate provided to the Evaluator by the ToR for this evaluation, the methodology can be divided into three key variables:

Timing: The final evaluation was conducted from August to November, 2021. A detailed breakdown of the key milestones and timeframe are noted in the Inception Report, but due to COVID-19 travel restrictions, the review was conducted entirely remotely and utilizing Internet-based platforms to engage interlocutors, along with e-mail questionnaires or similar correspondence in cases where follow-on questions need to be posed during the report drafting process.

Stakeholders Engaged: The Evaluator did not engage every stakeholder that has worked with the project since 2018. The Evaluator developed a sample of stakeholders, including beneficiaries, partners, project implementers (staff; technical advisers); UNDP counterparts and the donor to ensure a focused approach to engagement that attempted to gather data and evidence from key stakeholders who can provide qualitative and quantitative evidence for the review.⁶

Approach: Given the limited time to conduct the review along with the timing and pandemic restrictions in place, the Evaluator operated efficiently and effectively. The work was broken down into three stages:

- **Desk Review** – With the assistance of the FairBiz project team, the Evaluator gathered a series of relevant documents⁷ that formed the initial basis for gathering of information and evidence. The review of these documents was applied to the analytical framework provided in the Inception Report (and provided in Annex 4 to this Report with responses to all questions), which included the indicators to be measured. In some cases, the desk review addressed the evidence required to apply to some indicators. In other cases, the desk review directed the Evaluator to identify stakeholders who may have had access to the evidence and data required to be addressed in an indicator.

Where necessary during the desk review stage, the Evaluator engaged the project team to seek further documentation and to reply to initial queries.

- **Evidence Gathering** – Based on the initial desk review, the Evaluator proceeded to collect the data and evidence (i) to apply to each query listed in the analytical framework; and (ii) upon which to base the analysis and findings for the evaluation report. The tools used to gather the evidence are noted in some detail below. The evidence came from primary and secondary sources and from stakeholders engaged in the review and documentation collected. Evidence was gathered from a distance (i.e. – interviews conducted via VOIP or telephone).
- **Analysis, Findings & Reporting** – Once the evidence gathering stage was completed, the Evaluator applied the evidence and data to indicators listed in the analytical framework. The Evaluator applied triangulation to the evidence gathered to identify findings and conclusions that formed the basis of recommendations.

Tools

A range of data collection tools and methods were used to gather information and evidence for this evaluation.

- **Document review:** During the Desk Review and Evidence Gathering stages of the review, the Evaluator collected relevant documents to provide background knowledge and to identify specific data that contributed to the analysis and findings for the evaluation.

⁶ A list of proposed key informants to be engaged for this evaluation are listed in Annex 2.

⁷ An indicative list of documents to be considered for the Evaluation are listed in Annex 3.

- **Key informant interviews/semi-structured interviews:** The Evaluator engaged relevant stakeholders for semi-structured interviews. The interviews were conducted consecutively as scheduled on virtual meeting platforms (such as Zoom, Skype, or WhatsApp). Each interview was from 30-60 minutes in length and included a series of questions with, where necessary, follow up based on information provided. Prior to the interviews, with support from the project team, an initial e-mail was sent to prospective interviewees with a short interview guide to provide some understanding of what the Evaluator is expecting from each interview.

Sampling Criteria

Given the FairBiz project is rooted in the South-east Asia region, the Evaluator proposed that the ET evaluates a sample of the entire body of work conducted by the global project. This was based on two key aspects of the work of FairBiz:

- **Country-level Interventions:** Within a select number of countries that reflect a cross-section of the work, the Evaluator evaluated projects funded by FairBiz in those countries as a means of more fully understanding the impact of the project's work (in terms of impact and synergies between the regional and the country level initiatives).
- **Regional Activities:** Within the ASEAN region, and, more specifically, South-east Asia, the project has engaged civil society networks and government and regional institutions. A cross-section of these were engaged in this evaluation.

The following criteria were applied to determine in which countries and which actors will be reviewed to conduct the FE on the project:

- Geographic diversity – ensuring that the projects evaluated reflect a cross-section of work at the country level;
- Intervention area – covering the project's work with public procurement transparency, improved fair business activities, revised legal frameworks and rules related to business practices, judicial integrity, regional coordination and knowledge sharing;
- Project intervention level – the evaluation included projects that worked at the country and regional levels, and
- Intervention modality – including the provision of technical advice and capacity building support, grants and other modalities provided through direct support and joint activities and partnerships, and research and knowledge sharing.

In addition, the sample of engagements was designed to ensure as close as possible a balance of perspectives from both men and women who were stakeholders engaged in the project's work, as beneficiaries and partners. Specific efforts were made to ensure that the project's work was considered through the lenses of gender and Leaving No One Behind.

Data Analysis

Once the data and evidence was gathered, the Evaluator conducted an analysis of such information with the goal of producing findings. The data was applied to the evaluation criteria, project indicator targets and the evaluation questions. The analysis was based on triangulation, where the Evaluator validates one source of data or evidence with another source. This is aided by using more than one method of data collection. In the case of this review, this included semi-structured interviews and document review. The analysis also attempted to mitigate specific biases that are common in development evaluations, such as response and recall biases, by assuring confidentiality for data received and by designing the questions asked during interviews to solicit specific responses that reflect the data to be collected for the evaluation.

C. Limitations

The FE was conducted during the global COVID-19 Pandemic, which placed significant constraints on how the evaluation as performed. All interviews were conducted remotely through different time zones. Not all stakeholders were invited to participate in the review, as a sample of interviewees was agreed upon at the start of the process between the ET and the project team. Of those engaged the vast majority were available for an interview, though some did decline the request.

Findings & Analysis

1. Relevance

OECD defines the relevance evaluation criteria as:

“The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.”⁸

In answering this key question related to the criteria, it is important to reflect on a few key aspects of the criteria – strategic alignment, context and design of the project.

Strategic Alignment

The FairBiz project was designed and implemented during UNDPs Strategic Plan (SP) (2018-21) to which the project is well-aligned with the SP. Specifically, the SP notes in Output 1.2.3 the following:

1.2.3 Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption measures to maximize availability of resources for poverty eradication

Since FairBiz is a project specifically focused on anti-corruption and integrity matters and is building new relationships and partnerships with the private sector, among others, it is very much aligned with this specific output of the current UNDP SP.

The project is also well-aligned to the SDGs and, particularly, SDG-16 and the targets and indicators related to anti-corruption (AC) (i.e. – Targets 16.5 (anti-corruption measures) & 16.6 (accountable and transparent institutions)).

The UK Government provided funding to FairBiz through its Prosperity Fund. The mandate of that Fund is to support economic development in emerging markets as a means of promoting greater business competitiveness. This includes support for “...improved business regulation, more efficient markets, free trade, anti-corruption, clean energy, and health and education services.”⁹ Given that anti-corruption is seen as a priority area for the funding, the work of FairBiz is well-aligned with UK Government priorities.

With regard to national priorities, FairBiz is also well-aligned. First and foremost, by identifying country-level interventions based on demand and partnerships between UNDP Country Offices (COs) and national governments, the project was designed to support national priorities, as compared to imposing specific modalities on those beneficiaries. Broadly speaking, all ASEAN member states have signed on the ASEAN Vision 2025, which was endorsed in 2015 and includes a list of key elements that define a rules-based, people-centred and people-oriented community, including A2.3:

Instill the culture of integrity and anti-corruption and mainstream the principles thereof into the policies and practices of the ASEAN Community¹⁰

Looking at individual countries within the region, many of the national development plans note the need to combat corruption. For example, the current Thai National Development Plan states as a priority “Improved Public Sector Management, Corruption Prevention and Establishing Good Governance”.¹¹ The Vietnamese plan speaks of corruption under Priority Nine, where it states that the Government will focus its efforts on “Continuing to improve institutions,

⁸ Supra Note 1 – OECD-DAC Criteria Definitions:

<https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

⁹ <https://icai.independent.gov.uk/html-version/prosperity-fund/>

¹⁰ ASEAN Vision 2025 (2015) - <http://setnas-asean.id/site/uploads/document/book/599ed5208874f-asean-2025-forging-ahead-together-final.pdf>

¹¹ 1.3.14 of the Thailand National Development Plan (2017-21) - https://www.sme.go.th/upload/mod_download/download-20201012120836.pdf

mechanisms and policies, ensuring coherence, publicity, transparency and synchronous implementation of measures in preventing and combatting corruption...”¹² Even in countries where the development plan is silent with regard to corruption, such as the Malaysian Eleventh Development Plan (2016-20), there was changes to the legal framework with regard to the fight against corruption that signalled that the FairBiz project’s work was well-aligned with national priorities.

Context

A good development project will be designed based on the context under which it is being implemented. In the case of FairBiz there are external factors that show that the project was timely and was producing activities that were effective interventions. The contextual basis for such a design would include:

- Recent legislative changes in select ASEAN countries (e.g. – Malaysia; Thailand; Vietnam) which indicated a change in approaches to the work of the respective governments with regard to transparency and reducing corruption amongst government officials and the private sector.
- Political will was also expressed by other ASEAN nations and upon which the project could build stronger partnerships with national actors. For example, the adoption in 2018 in Indonesia of a National Strategy for the Prevention of Anti-Corruption and a commitment by the Government to achieve a goal of having 40% of procurement contracts to be awarded to SMEs both created an opportunity for FairBiz and the CO to provide timely, high quality support.
- The adoption of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP) in 2016 by a number of countries, including four ASEAN member states (Vietnam; Brunei; Malaysia; Singapore) provided provisions related to the free trade agreement that required the implementation and enforcement of laws that will make public procurement more open and fair¹³, promoting stronger and more effective supply chains¹⁴, and promoting small and medium enterprises (SMEs) to engage in global trade¹⁵. Chapter 26 of the TPP specifically requires enforcement of anti-corruption rules as defined in Articles 26.6-26.9. Article 26.10.1 goes even further to state that governments will promote and support the engagement of the private sector and other non-state actors in fighting corruption. Article 26.10.2 states that governments will encourage the private sector to develop and implement adequate internal auditing and finance management systems.
- Likely the greatest change in the context has been the global COVID-19 Pandemic which started in March 2020. Here the pre-pandemic work of FairBiz to build partnerships in key sectors allowed for a quick pivot to online learning and knowledge sharing and the ongoing implementation of activities despite the challenges faced during the pandemic.

Design

The third aspect of the relevance criteria is to understand the design logic of the FairBiz project. This can be considered at the macro and micro level. At the macro level, consideration is given to the broad Theory of Change and the strategy through which the project was to be implemented. At the micro level, a consideration is given to the specific indicators in the projects results framework.

Starting at the macro level, FairBiz was designed as a regional project. UNDP has numerous regional projects and programmes implemented by its regional bureaux (RBx). There are different mandates or objectives for regional projects, but generally they have two key elements – backstopping and supporting COs in working nationally and locally on an issue and providing space regionally for sharing of experiences across regional partners and to promote replication of good practices identified through national interventions. FairBiz was designed with this

¹² Vietnam Five-Year Socio-Economic Plan (2016-20); p.107-108 <https://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/839361477533488479/Vietnam-SEDP-2016-2020.pdf>

¹³ Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement – Chapter 15 “Government Procurement” - <https://www.dfat.gov.au/trade/agreements/not-yet-in-force/tpp/Pages/tpp-text-and-associated-documents>

¹⁴ Ibid; Chapter 22

¹⁵ Ibid; Chapter 24

approach in mind. The project worked closely with COs, providing seed funding and technical assistance to backstop locally-identified work on business integrity and reducing /preventing corrupt practices.

A key issue with the project was the changes in foundational documents that created a “moving target” with regard to the Theory of Change and even the outcome(s) to be achieved by the project. For example, the project changed its Theory of Change in 2019 and the revised project document also reduced the number of outcomes to one (from the original two outcomes). Given the project’s key goals, and how they were to be achieved, were changed through the life of the project, this was bound to impact on the project team’s ability to have a clear understanding of how it would intervene to address the development challenge identified in the project document. Notwithstanding the lack of a consistent Theory of Change, the project’s logic is to engage non-state actors, including new actors, such as the private sector, to build networks that can be leveraged to promote ethical business practices (business integrity), sustainable business practices and support to national governments in enforcing current AC rules and laws (public procurement; judicial integrity).

The project has built on work that had already been implemented through previous funding provided by UK posts, including in Thailand and Vietnam. In some ways, FairBiz was a regional “chapeau” that allowed for the consolidation of certain UK-funded work, but also provided added-value to such work through regional aggregation and UNDPs access to government and non-state actors at the national level.

At the micro level, the project has provided indicators for each of its four outputs. Indicators provide a measuring stick by which evaluations, such as this one, can determine if the project did what it was expected to do. Such indicators must comply with SMART principles.¹⁶ SMART stands for indicators that are Specific; Measurable; Achievable; Relevant; and Time-bound.

Overall, the indicators for the outputs, as outlined in the project’s results framework, are measurable, achievable (likely) and have clear deadlines for achievement. As with many projects, the challenge is the specificity and the relevance of the indicators. Here there may be room for improvement for the project. For example, the indicators under Output 1 of the project focus on the establishment of the partnerships and platforms for dialogue. Yet what is the purpose of the partnerships, to just be established, or to be leveraged for action? Assuming it is the latter, the indicators make no attempt to measure how the partnerships have attained results.

Another example can be found under Output 3 (business integrity/sustainable practices by the private sector). Indicator two speaks to business integrity instruments developed and adopted. But it is not clear if this is referring to instruments developed by the project or those developed and adopted by private sector firms. The indicator in question also has led to a focus on trainings as a key instrument, but trainings have limited value and are less results-oriented when implemented in isolation of other actions that can turn the knowledge sharing into results. Indicator three under output three measures the number of knowledge products developed, but it can be asked if this is relevant and specific enough to measure the results of the work on promoting business integrity.

¹⁶ <https://evalcareers.com/magazine/smart-indicators-in-monitoring-and-evaluation/>

Lessons Learned: Relevance
1.1: Regional projects must be well-aligned with national priorities, both UNDP CO and national partners, if there is to be results achieved.
1.2: Adaptability of project modalities and activities is critical where major interruptions occur. Projects must be able to analyse and react to sudden changes in conditions to ensure results can be achieved.
1.3: M&E is more challenging where the project's results framework does not have indicators that reflect SMART principles.

2. Efficiency

Efficiency, in terms of development evaluations, refers to the cost-effectiveness of the inputs of the project towards achieving results. As noted by OECD-DAC, efficiency means:

The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way. Note: "Economic" is the conversion of inputs (funds, expertise, natural resources, time, etc.) into outputs, outcomes and impacts, in the most cost-effective way possible, as compared to feasible alternatives in the context. "Timely" delivery is within the intended timeframe, or a timeframe reasonably adjusted to the demands of the evolving context. This may include assessing operational efficiency (how well the intervention was managed).

Looking at different components of the project's implementation, there were some challenges with regard to the implementation of FairBiz, but also some innovative approaches (i.e. – adaptive programming; competitive project grants) that showed promise.

Implementation Modality

A decision was made prior to the commencement of the project with regard to the modality by which the project would be implemented. The project was originally intended to be implemented by UNDP with support from two "Responsible Partners" (RPs) – the new term used by UNDP to refer to approved organisations that are sub-contracted and responsible for implementing specific components of a project (previously known as an "Implementing Partner").

As originally envisioned, the project would have two RPs – the Construction Sector Transparency Initiative¹⁷ (CoST) was to implement the Output 2 of the project (transparency in public procurement) and the ASEAN CSR Network¹⁸ was to be the RP for implementing Output 3 on business integrity and corporate sustainable practices. Both organisations had well-established work and networks in the region and had received some funding from the UK Government in the past. This made them good partners for the UNDP project given their experience on these specific topics and their regional links.

As part of the process of contracting RPs, UNDP must conduct a thorough due diligence process through a micro-assessment conducted via an independent third party. This process resulted in the contracting of CoST to implement Output 2. However, due to some anomalies found during the due diligence process ASEAN CSR Network could not be contracted to implement Output 3.

The end result was that UNDP was required to directly implement the work that was supposed to be sub-contracted for Output 3. Yet the project was designed in a way that UNDP had not originally considered maintaining technical knowledge related to business integrity, on the assumption this work would be covered by an RP. This meant that UNDP had to scramble to build its internal capacity on the topic. By 2019 this resulted in FairBiz contracting a senior technical adviser to support the implementation of Output 3 (and other components). But this did cause some delay in implementation of the project.

¹⁷ <http://cost.mw>

¹⁸ <https://www.asean-csr-network.org/c/>

Technical Advice

Democratic governance projects are based on the transfer of knowledge that will allow for cultural, institutional and personal behavioural change that will allow for the application and, eventual institutionalisation, of best practices. This will then lead to more effective, accountable, open and inclusive governance institutions, as promoted in SDG-16.

In the case of FairBiz, the project was able to provide technical advice in a cost-efficient manner. This was achieved through a variety of sources of technical capacity. To start, the project had access to the Head of Governance for the BRH Office who is also the Rule of Law Adviser for the region. He provided technical support with regard to the judicial integrity component of the project. The project also recruited, as noted above, a business integrity expert as a technical adviser.

Second, the project relied on the technical capacity of CoST as the RP responsible for a specific component of Output 2 of the project (2.2.2 – Transparency and Social Accountability Initiatives in Public Infrastructure Investments). CoSTs work was focused on the implementation of the new rules in Thailand related to public procurement that were adopted in 2016 and to expand such work into Indonesia under the project.

A third approach involved the engagement of COs. Through the call for proposals and the competitive selection of specific COs to implement pilot projects, FairBiz was indirectly offering technical advice to the national partners. This can be seen, as one example, through the project implemented by the Vietnam CO related to training of private sector firms related to the new anti-corruption rules approved by the Government of Vietnam. The CO contracted Deloitte (a consulting firm) to implement the training with the Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry (VCCI). Therefore, through the national pilot projects Fair Biz was accessing third party expertise to provide technical support to its partners.

In all three modalities employed by FairBiz, the project provided quality technical advice that achieved results, while doing so with no excessive costs associated with the advice. The use technical advisers within UNDP, combined with long-term external consulting and third party capacity, has enabled the project to ensure timely access to quality advice for the partners.

Management Structure

FairBiz was implemented through a dedicated project team which reported to a Project Board. The Project Board consisted of representatives of UNDP, FCDO (Senior Supplier), and beneficiaries of the project, including COs, private sector firms and national governments (Senior Users). The Project Board met once a year to provide strategic direction on the implementation of the project. The project team was originally designed to be led by the full-time Senior Adviser and included a project manager, project analyst and administrative assistant.

However, the project did face staff turnover that did have some impact on the capacity of the project to deliver. To start, by 2019 the Senior Adviser had moved on to other work. As the institutional memory and one of the architects of the project this left a large gap in the capacity of the project to implement its activities. Combined with the rejection of the ASEAN CSR Network as a RP, the project was challenged to deliver what was expected during its first full year of implementation. Subsequently, the project manager departed to another post within UNDP. On paper, the project was able to deliver the activities it was expected to, with nearly 100% of funds spent in each of the first two years of the project, but this required some reconfiguration and reallocation of funding as a result of the rejection of one of the RPs and changes in staffing.

But this line of work – engaging private sector firms in the fight against corruption – is new to UNDP. Even in a perfect world with all staff contracted and active, the project would likely have required an extensive period of time to “ramp up” its work and to build relationships and capacity. This process of building the project’s core partnerships and capacity was hindered by the turnover in staff. It was not until early 2020, just before the pandemic was declared, that the project was able to clearly define its work and how it will approach it in a coherent manner.

Expressions of Interest

A key efficiency in the delivery of the programme was the use of competitive expressions of interest (EOI) from relevant COs. There were two such EOIs, both in 2019. EOI 1 provided up to \$50,000 USD to five COs (Philippines; Vietnam; Malaysia; Thailand; Indonesia). Prior to the call for proposals, each CO was invited to attend a regional workshop in Bangkok in 2019, along with relevant national partners, to discuss business integrity and to establish partnerships for the potential pilot projects. COs then worked with those partners to develop proposals related to business integrity. For example, for the call for proposals in the first-half of 2019, the Indonesia CO, in partnership with the National Secretariat for Corruption Prevention, was awarded \$30,000 USD to produce a baseline study on business integrity in Indonesia with policy implications to promote such work. Vietnam was awarded \$50,000 USD to work with the Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry to produce and promote the adoption of a business integrity pledge for member firms.

For EOI 2, up to \$100,000 USD was provided to two COs – Vietnam and Indonesia – to continue their work on promoting business integrity. The second EOI was conducted in the second-half of 2019. The Indonesia CO used its extra funding to focus on corruption and business integrity in the plantation sector, including the development of a sectoral corruption risk assessment tool, a study on beneficial ownership and the complexity of corporate structures in the sector, and a study on land-use planning and mapping of land-use in the sector. The Vietnam CO continued its partnership with VCCI to conduct a series of trainings for VCCI member firms on business integrity.

In both EOIs, the programme provided knowledge, facilitated partnerships at the national level and shared good practices from within the region. But the key to the results achieved via the EOIs was the work and effort of the COs and their national partners who provided in-kind support to deliver the pilot projects. This was aided by UK embassy staff in each country, where strategic inputs were provided by embassy staff to UNDP CO focal points and the leveraging of their networks in each country.

Partnership with UK Government

Another key aspect of the project’s work was with regard to its leveraging of partnerships to expand its capacity and opportunities for results. Partnerships were formed with a variety of entities and actors at the regional level and in specific countries. Some were more formal, as exemplified by the relationship between ACT, an anti-corruption CSO in Thailand, and the project. Others were less formal, but also contributed to the project’s success. For example, the project benefited from the development of strong relationships with UK High Commissions and Embassies in the region. In select countries, FairBiz, the local UK High Commission/Embassy and the UNDP CO were instrumental in building relationships with key national partners. Now that the UK has been designated as an official ASEAN Dialogue Partner¹⁹, it can be foreseen that the model applied between the UK Government and UNDP at the country level can be leveraged to do similar engagements at the regional level.

Lessons Learned: Efficiency
2.1: Staff turnover can cause delays in delivery, but projects must be adaptive and find creative solutions where conditions change.
2.2: Identification of a RP should include due diligence prior to project finalisation.
2.3: Consistent, timely and quality technical advice – no matter its source – is a key component to achieving results.
2.4: The partnership model between UK government and UNDP can be replicated and leveraged for further regional engagements.

¹⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-becomes-asean-dialogue-partner>

3. Effectiveness

When considering effectiveness as an evaluation criterion, it is important to focus on whether or not the project has achieved results. At the end point of Phase I the expectation is to determine if the project has achieved results. For this review consideration is given to the overall outcome of the project and the four outputs to review the results achieved in delivery of the project.

Before reviewing each outcome, though, it is important to reiterate that the project has been implemented under extremely challenging circumstances. Since early 2020 the COVID-19 Pandemic has impacted almost all aspects of life across the globe and the implementation of development projects in South-east Asia is no exception. In addition, the project was working in Myanmar, which suffered a military coup in February 2021. These external factors need to be considered as part of the overall ability of the project to achieve results.

Having noted this caveat, the project did achieve significant results.

Outcome:

Contribution to improved business practices adopted and corruption risks minimized to create a fairer business environment in ASEAN

ACHIEVED

Output		Status
1	Partnerships strengthened between the public and private sectors as well as civil society and development partners	Achieved
2	Transparency improved in government contracts and compliance increased with international procurement and trade standards.	Achieved
3	Business integrity and sustainable practices promoted for private companies and state-owned enterprises	Achieved
4	Anti-corruption strategies, policies and laws strengthened and redress mechanisms improved through country projects in targeted countries	Achieved

A first challenge with regard to the project's effectiveness is that there is no clearly defined outcome for the project. Both the project document and the results framework refer to different possible outcomes from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the Asia-Pacific Regional Programme, and the SDGs. The project outcome identified above comes from the project document, but is written more as an output than an outcome. This lack of clarity as to the outcome of the project is a challenge that should be addressed in any future phase of the project.

Measured by the outcome indicators outlined in the project document, the project has generally met the targets linked to the indicators in the last revision of the Results Framework.²⁰ However, the challenge with designing development projects lies in the fact that the project indicators are defined at the start of the project, but must still be relevant nearly four years later. At least one of the outcome indicators was quickly obsolete, given the decision to not contract the ASEAN CSR Network as an RP. Others were made obsolete due to external factors, including the military coup in Myanmar. In addition, noting the earlier discussion on the quality of the indicators, it is possible for the project to have met its targets as defined in the project's results framework without substantively achieving the result as defined in the output.

What is critical is that there are clear signs of progress with regard to its initiatives. Perhaps they have not yet been scaled up to the regional or multi-national level, but the efforts of the project have shown significant results at select national levels which may still be replicated regionally. Notwithstanding the staff turnover and the external factors noted earlier in this report, the project was able to carve a niche for UNDP in the region with regard to establishing a network of

²⁰ Annex 5 to this report provides a table that shows each output indicator and target and whether or not the project met such targets.

stakeholders who can support anti-corruption initiatives, advocate for government policy changes and promote fair business practices.

When looking at each output of the project we can see where the early stages of success have been achieved.

Output 1: Partnerships strengthened between the public and private sectors as well as civil society and development partners

The project was somewhat slow in developing the proposed platforms. For the first two years of the project the focus seemed to be more on ad hoc or one-time events where UNDP, with partners in many cases, convened workshops and seminars where the private sector, civil society and government officials were invited to participate. The events varied in content, but a key aspect was that the three sectors were provided an opportunity to interact. This is key, as traditionally in the region the three do not always publicly interact or partner.

However, where one thinks of a “platform” as noted in Output 1, the thought may turn to a more permanent form of interaction. By 2020, FairBiz had acknowledged this and started to establish a series of platforms for dialogue amongst regional stakeholders. The other major change was the establishment of the Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG). These two changes to the work of the project were a paradigm shift in how it operated and provided a clear set of parameters and strategic thinking that would colour all the work of the project. Where previously it was focused more on activity delivery, the establishment of the Business Integrity Hub (BIH) and its five platforms, along with the PSAG, provided a strong structure under which the project could consolidate its work and share experiences across various related sectors and platforms.

The five platforms – youth & entrepreneurship, procurement, environmental, social and governance (ESG) investing, diversity & inclusion, and global supply chains – were established with PSAG members acting as ex-officio members and mentors for the work. The platforms are the basis of project implementation and monitoring related to their area of interest. Each platform was also engaged in knowledge sharing. The experiences from each platform were uploaded to the BIH, where lessons learned and good practices could be shared with other platforms.

This approach has allowed for a stable and long-term basis for the project to operate across related, yet not fully integrated, issues linked to business integrity and the broader anti-corruption agenda in the region. The platforms have been leveraged to build active networks in select countries. For example, the diversity and inclusion platform was utilised to support a network of Thai women business leaders where new skills and knowledge are shared with key private sector actors in the country.

Output 2: Transparency improved in government contracts and compliance increased with international procurement and trade standards.

This Output was partially implemented primarily by CoST, as noted previously in this report. It builds on the work already achieved by CoST prior to the start of the project, but has allowed for progress in public procurement implementation in a transparent manner, especially in Thailand. FairBiz did do some direct implementation in this area, including specific knowledge products and assessments. For example, UNDP through FairBiz supported the assessment of the national procurement process in Indonesia in 2019. UNDP also conducted a survey in Indonesia to identify the needs of suppliers in the procurement process in that country.

By far the most significant work under Output 2 was implemented by CoST. CoST has been working in Thailand since 2015, so was well-established before FairBiz was started as a project. Key to this work in Thailand is that the Government amended the procurement rules in 2016 which has precipitated a more open process for public procurement through the Comptroller-General Department of the Ministry of Finance. CoST and UNDP have provided support to that office since prior to the passage of the law.

CoST uses a four-part system to promote transparency in the building of infrastructure – disclosure, assurance, multi-stakeholder working and social accountability. Key to being able to monitor procurement for infrastructure in Thailand is

for CoST to have data and information from the sector. In 2019 the Government of Thailand adopted a new sub-regulation that provides legal recognition (thereby allowing for government budget to allocate funding) for CoST and formally provides for a CoST sub-committee to be formed. This is a significant and impactful change in policy. A multi-stakeholder group established by CoST - to manage transparency in the procurement process - now has legal standing. A study by CoST showed that the partnership resulted in savings of \$460 million USD.²¹ This was the culmination of a process that started slowly, but eventually led to a significant number of projects being disclosed. For example, in 2018 the number of projects disclosed was only 98. This number rose to 254 by the end of 2019 and 654 by the end of 2020.

In addition, in Thailand, FairBiz worked with the UNDP CO and the UK's Government Digital Service to review the public procurement process in full in Thailand. This included a comparative analysis of different procurement systems and bespoke technical advice on subordinate legislation related to the legislation on procurement.

The work of CoST and FairBiz in Thailand is some of the most impressive work implemented by the project. There are real and tangible benefits and results from the support provided to the Government of Thailand. In addition, UNDP's contracting of a procurement expert allowed for FairBiz to directly provide knowledge materials, including online courses, related to public procurement.

The project also supported the Anti-Corruption Organisation of Thailand (ACT). ACT is a CSO that focuses on transparency in public procurement in the construction of infrastructure. ACT has worked with CoST going back to 2015. FairBiz has provided support to ACT, but generally has left space for the CSO to work with CoST on building the open data portal on public procurement, which was launched for the construction sector in Thailand in 2021. ACT also works with CoST on the social accountability and assurance aspects of their four-part process.

In addition to the work of FairBiz on procurement in Thailand, the project also initiated support to the procurement process in Indonesia. The support included direct engagement with LKPP – Indonesia's National Public Procurement Agency. That work started with a study and comparative analysis as to how the system could be improved to reflect international best practices and standards. It also included the development and operationalisation of a mass online course for suppliers on public procurement went live in 2021. CoST also worked in Indonesia and established a relationship with the sub-national government in West Lombok, which agreed to pursue alignment of its procurement system with CoST's methodology.

By the end of October, 2021, FairBiz convened regional stakeholders for a major workshop on public procurement. This is a positive indication of the next steps in taking lessons learned from the excellent work in Thailand and trying to support similar reforms to the procurement process in other ASEAN nations. However, overall, the project has been challenged to expand public procurement reform beyond the work that had already been started in Thailand by ACT and CoST.

Output 3: Business integrity and sustainable practices promoted for private companies and state-owned enterprises

The engagement and building of partnerships with the private sector is at the heart of Output 3 and is a relatively new area of work for UNDP. In that sense, FairBiz is working with a greenfield or a blank sheet with little in the form of lessons learned or best practices to lean on in implementing this work. This is likely why UNDP intended to use an RP to implement this Output. When that was not an option (as explained elsewhere in this report), FairBiz had to retool to allow for it to directly engage the private sector. This resulted in some delays in the implementation of the activities identified for this Output.

A key driver of the results achieved under this Output are related to the contracting of a Business Integrity Technical Adviser who came onboard the project in 2019. The consultant's work has led to a clear definition of a structure under which the business integrity work is being implemented.

²¹ <https://infrastructuretransparency.org/resource/cost-thailand-impact-story-saving-millions-enabling-participation-and-shifting-mindsets/>

A second factor in the results achieved by FairBiz relates to recent adoption of legislation in two countries – Malaysia and Vietnam. In Malaysia the adoption of section 17A as an amendment to the Malaysian Anti-Corruption Commission Act (2009) provides a provision for corporate liability for any employees who are found to be part of a crime related to corruption.²² The provision was passed in 2018, but it did not come into force until June, 2020. In Vietnam, in 2018, the National Assembly amended the 2005 Anti-Corruption Law to also impose strong penalties for engagement in corrupt practices and, for the first time, this was extended to the private sector.

FairBiz worked at two levels in implementing Output 3 – regional and national.

At the **regional level**, FairBiz was able to convene young entrepreneurs in 2019 and worked with them to develop the Business Integrity Toolkit. The Toolkit is to share knowledge with young business owners on how to manage risks, ensuring their business is well managed and to work collectively for business integrity. The project also commissioned research on how to promote and advocate for gender-equal leadership in the workplace.

By 2020, as noted previously, FairBiz had established the BIH and the thematic platforms, all of which were linked to business integrity, but also had broader remits. By the middle of 2020 the platforms were all active and results could already be observed. For example, the Youth and Entrepreneurship Platform was conducting knowledge sharing exercises using the above-noted toolkit. The Diversity & Inclusion Platform was leveraging a partnership with the B20 Integrity and Anti-Corruption Working Group to develop new research and knowledge related to gender and sustainable business practices.

In 2021 the platforms were fully functional. The Diversity & Inclusion Platform was integral to a new partnership between Thailand Country Office and the Thailand Federation of Business and Professional Women within the FairBiz framework to establish a network of women business leaders who will champion business integrity (by receiving trainings, setting up a ToT system, and with the ultimate goal of creating a movement of female entrepreneurs leading on business integrity. The procurement platform developed an online, regional course on public procurement. The project also commissioned and publishes in 2021 a research report reviewing circumstances in five ASEAN countries to identify key interventions that have promoted gender, diversity and inclusion in business.²³

But it is at the **national level** that FairBiz saw the most traction. This is where the competitive pilot project funding to UNDP COs has provided the most significant results. This included the two EOIs in 2019, in which specific funding was allocated to five and then two COs.

In Malaysia, the project supported the piloting of supply chain trainings for two large multi-national corporations – Johnson & Johnson and Maxis. In both cases the project funded the UNDP CO who, in turn, partnered with Deloitte in Malaysia to implement the training. Deloitte was selected through an open call for proposals. Once awarded the contract, Deloitte designed and implemented a bespoke training programme for SMEs that are part of MNC supply chains. Despite some pandemic hesitancy, the two MNCs were identified. The trainings were presented virtually.

Each training programme was two-days in length. The first day focused on theory and the second day on more practical matters. Based on what was learned, all SMEs were asked to return for an Action Day where they would report on their progress in implementing the action items that were identified during the training for each company. Johnson & Johnson specifically wanted their supply chain SMEs to develop action plans that these were presented at the Action Day.

The use of a subsequent action day is an innovative means of trying to create results from a static training event. By requiring training participants to return in one month with signs of action, it instilled in the SMEs the need to leave the training with an agenda for action and change. Not all SMEs returned with a plan and those that did were likely already committed to combating corruption, but the concrete measures outlined in the training and the link to the MNCs has allowed for a deeper penetration of the business integrity agenda in Malaysia than otherwise would be possible.

²² <https://www.stanleyco.com.my/post/corporate-liability-under-malaysian-anti-corruption-commission-act>

²³ <https://www1.undp.org/content/fairbiz/en/home/resources/gender-diversity-and-inclusion-for-a-fair-business-environment.html>

In Vietnam, FairBiz again partnered with the CO and Deloitte to support the piloting of risk assessment for select large corporations in the country – Vinalines, Traphaco and Fine Scandinavia worked with Deloitte to conduct internal audits of their risk management systems. This included trainings for corporate staff and the development of a template manual for staff that has been adapted and applied by the companies.

FairBiz also had a fruitful partnership with the Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry (VCCI). With VCCI the project has produced and implemented various training programmes for VCCI members. These included a training of trainers (ToT) programme for young entrepreneurs on business integrity, a training for the Vietnam Association of Consumer Goods Development on resisting corrupt practices and awareness raising for VCCI members on the implications of the new Anti-Corruption Law on the private sector in the country. The partnership with VCCI also allowed for the development, with the Vietnam National University, a Handbook on Fundamental Auditing which has been piloted with university classes earlier in 2021. FairBiz also supported VCCI in establishing the Vietnam Business Integrity Network, which is a national network of private sector and state-owned enterprises that provides awareness raising, technical advice and conducts research and analysis on improving corporate governance in Vietnam.

In Indonesia, FairBiz supported the CO to build and maintain a partnership with the National Secretariat for Corruption Prevention and leveraged that partnership to provide baseline data and analysis on business integrity in general and specific tools to promote business integrity in the plantation sector. In addition, the work in Indonesia established a multi-stakeholder platform that has been maintained by the Indonesia CO and has been a valuable venue for promoting co-production of activities and projects related to the fight against corruption.

It is worth noting, however, that the EOIs in 2019 were sequenced in such a manner that the first EOI was not completed before the second one was launched. This approach prevented the evaluation of the implementation of the first set of projects before deciding on which COs would receive funding through the second call for proposals. If there had been a bit more time between each EOI, FairBiz could have evaluated and determined the results from the first EOI before deciding on the recipients for the second one.

Output 4: Anti-corruption strategies, policies and laws strengthened and redress mechanisms improved in targeted countries

Four countries were the focus of Output 4 – Vietnam, Myanmar, Indonesia and Malaysia. The interventions for each are quite different and is very much context-specific. The overarching goal of this Output is to support government ministries/agencies and anti-corruption agencies to build capacity to combat corruption. In addition, FairBiz had a separate, parallel intervention stream related to judicial integrity under this output.

With regard to the work in Indonesia, the project supported the work of the UNDP CO in Indonesia as it developed partnerships with the newly-established National Agency for the Prevention of Corruption. The agency was established after the adoption by Presidential Decree of the National Strategy for the Prevention of Corruption.²⁴ The CO has supported the agency through the commissioning of three corruption risk assessments related to key sectors that are notoriously drivers of corruption (e.g. – plantations in Sumatra) These studies have allowed the agency to “hit the ground running” and to identify drivers of corruption in each sector and the entry points to promote prevention of corruption.

The work with the Malaysian National Centre for Governance, Integrity and Anti-Corruption (GIACC) showed good results. In 2019 the project supported the development of a training programme implemented by GIACC on corruption for middle manager civil servants. The same year the project also supported the development and operationalisation of an online dashboard to track implementation of government commitments related to anti-corruption measures. The project also supported GIACC in developing and distributing to all government ministries a manual on developing their own Operational Anti-Corruption Plans. The project also supported GIACC in producing four knowledge products/manuals for use by government ministries to support their anti-corruption efforts.

²⁴ Indonesian presidential Decree 54/2018 -

Also with regard to Malaysia, the project worked with the International Consortium for Court Excellence which implements the International Framework for Court Excellence.²⁵ The Consortium has developed a self-assessment tool for court systems to evaluate their current compliance with best practices related to human resource management, leadership and systems. The goal is for the self-assessment to lead to an action plan for reforms. The Malaysian Supreme Court conducted the self-assessment in 2018-19 and did develop an action plan that is currently being implemented.

In Vietnam the project has worked with the Supreme People's Court with regard to the capacity of the judiciary to interpret and implement foreign arbitration decisions that have legal implications in Vietnam. This has included updating of the Benchbook for judges related to commercial disputes and insolvencies. It has also included in 2021 the approval by government officials of a *Study on mechanisms for ensuring judicial integrity to promote business environment in some countries and lessons for Viet Nam*. The study promotes the need for judicial integrity if Vietnam is to increase investor confidence and the added value of establishing an independent judiciary. This work is part of a broader engagement where the project has shared knowledge and promoted the value of judicial integrity. Given the baseline for such thinking in Vietnam, the process has been slow, but by building a strong relationship with the Supreme People's Court, the project has started a journey that could have significant impact on the country and region.

Yet the Output was only partially achieved because the work was focused on results in one or more countries in the region. Attempts to promote the judicial self-assessment in other countries were not as successful. Support to ACAs in other countries, such as Thailand, were well received, but there was little to no regional aggregation of such work.

Lessons Learned: Effectiveness
3.1: Where there is a lack of a clear outcome for a project it is impossible to manage the project to achieve the outcome.
3.2: Regional platforms allow for best practices to be shared and promoted throughout the region
3.3: Where governments have expressed political commitment to anti-corruption efforts, usually through new laws, it is easier to engage the private sector who are keen to ensure compliance with new rules.
3.4: Windows for multiple, competitive EOIs should be timed to allow for wvaluation of prior EOI projects before allocating funding under subsequent EOIs.

4. Impact

In considering impact as an evaluation criterion, the evaluation must determine if there have been concrete, institutionalized achievements beyond the scope of the work of FairBiz, as a result of FairBiz interventions (e.g. – new legislation; new institutions; new relationships)?

Given the external challenges (Myanmar military coup; COVID Pandemic) expectations for an impact-level intervention should be limited. In addition, the project is not only in its first phase, but is working in an area of anti-corruption and good governance work (i.e. – engagement of the private sector and the intersection of public and private interests) which is new to UNDP as an organisation. Therefore, in reviewing the work of the FairBiz project it is important to consider not only what impact has been achieved, but also if there are early signs of the work of the project being impactful in the near future.

The most impactful work of the project over the past three years has been the transformation of the public procurement process in Thailand. This work pre-dates the project with interventions from the UNDP CO, ACT and the Thai Institute of Directors. For example, the effort to amend the public procurement law resulted in a more transparent process being established with the law being adopted in 2016. But the project can claim some attribution for the ongoing reforms that continue within the Comptroller-General's Department of the Ministry of Finance. No doubt, much of that impact is a result of the work of the RP (i.e. – CoST) and national partners (i.e. – ACT). However, their work is encompassed within FairBiz. In

²⁵ <https://www.courtexcellence.com>

addition, the project has provided direct backstopping to the UNDP CO as it has continued to work directly with the CGD and the broader Government of Thailand.

With regard to the work in support of public procurement in Thailand, there are two impact-level changes that are noted. First, the adoption by the Government of Thailand of the sub-regulation that now requires procurement entities to report data and information in accordance with CoST standards and the recognition of CoST and its multi-stakeholder group has allowed for a strong, trusted relationship between the RP and the Government to be catapulted into a formal, legal relationship. The fact that CoST standards for data are now the legal standards for the Government of Thailand is a significant and impactful change.

Second, with regard to public procurement in Thailand, was the development and operationalisation of the procurement data disclosure portal. Though not a new law, the portal signifies advancement in how the Government of Thailand discloses public infrastructure data in a user-friendly and visual manner, allowing for a more open and competitive approach to the development of national infrastructure

Beyond the work implemented in Thailand, it is difficult to identify an impact-level intervention. But if the work on business integrity is a greenfield area for UNDP, then to carry on with the analogy, FairBiz has ploughed the ground and planted the seeds for future results and impact. For example, it may not be possible to say that the project’s work in Malaysia and Vietnam was impactful; however, there are clear signs of strong relationships being built with the private sector and civil society that represents the private sector (e.g. – VCCI). The establishment of the PSAG at the regional level has already shown signs of being used to leverage results. These are all new forms of relationships for UNDP, but will a concerted effort and more time, FairBiz should be able to leverage such relationships for specific results and impact related to not only the fight against corruption, but also the ultimate goal of achieving the SDGs.

Lessons Learned: Impact
4.1: Where FairBiz builds trusted relationships and leverages partnerships it is able to have a direct impact on national beneficiary decisions.
4.2: For a project to reach impact-level in its work it will require a long-term commitment to engagement and support of national partners and beneficiaries.

5. Sustainability

When considering the sustainability criterion, the evaluation must look at whether or not the results or benefits of the project will last beyond the interventions and resources of the programme.

Reflecting on the analysis from the previous section, the work of FairBiz with the CGD in Thailand shows strong signs of sustainability. With the adoption of the sub-regulation by the Government of Thailand in 2019, the RP to the project – CoST – has established a permanent and legally recognised multi-stakeholder group that will provide inputs into the Government’s procurement process. CoST itself has attained a quasi-legal status within the Government that will ensure it will have the capacity and legal authority to continue to support the reform of the procurement system top reflect best practices and global standards.

Within UNDP there are also signs that the work of FairBiz is establishing sustainable capacity with regard to anti-corruption and business integrity efforts. Recall that the project, at its commencement, struggled to develop internal capacity to engage the private sector and to support business integrity efforts. Originally this work was to be done through an RP. However, given the project was “thrown into the deep end of the pool” with regard to this work, in the past three years the project has established internal capacity for UNDP. Given UNDP has traditionally worked with civil society and governments, the work of FairBiz is critical to the organisation’s ability to create new partnerships and opportunities for expanding their range of interventions with regard to SDG implementation and leveraging g partnerships for more resources for this cause.

In addition, through the support of FairBiz, a number of COs in the region have also started to build new relationships with the private sector. This has also expanded their network of partners. For example, the work of the Malaysia CO with

Deloitte, Johnson & Johnson²⁶ and Maxis has likely given the CO new perspectives and some gravitas when engaging others in the private sector. It should also result in the CO being able to adapt its work, based on the skills gained through this project, as to how to communicate and work with the private sector, which can be different from the approach to governments and civil society.

The work at the country level has been led by COs in partnership with government, civil society and the private sector. The co-ownership of the project’s activities and outputs in each country has resulted in strong ownership of the project’s mandate by these national partners. In most cases these partnerships are the start of a sustainable national coalition to address business integrity and to promote transparency, but this work will require further nurturing to get to the point of being fully sustainable.

This country-level intervention was made possible by the modality used by FairBiz to engage COs. By providing seed funding and backstopping COs with technical advice, the project is able to “lead from behind” and allow the COs to be the face of UNDP in the engagement of national partners. Yet where there have been results, the project needs to be better at sharing these results and encouraging peer-to-peer exchanges to allow other countries to learn from the reforms implemented by their counterparts in other countries in the region.

Lessons Learned: Sustainability
5.1: Within UNDP, timely, high-quality interventions with seed funding and technical advice have resulted in expanded country office capacity and allows them to build new partnerships.
5.2: South-South and Peer-to-Peer technical support to national beneficiaries, brokered by FairBiz, can lead to sustainable results.

6. Cross-cutting Issues

A. Gender

The FairBiz project was designed subsequently to the new method of project formulation that was applied to all UNDP projects and programmes. That new method a more robust consideration of gender aspects of each project. Through a gender analysis of the project’s planned work each project is assigned a gender marker (1=limited or no gender impact; 3=Significant or major focus on gender impact). In the case of FairBiz the project received a gender marker of 2. This equates to the fact that the work is not primarily focused on gender equality, but it does have components that promote gender equality and support women’s economic and/or political empowerment. In governance projects and programmes there is a need to design activities and outputs to focus on two aspects – targeted support to women as beneficiaries and mainstreaming gender equality throughout all activities.

To start, the project has done an admirable job at collecting gender-disaggregated data. Without such data it is a challenge to know who has been a beneficiary of the project’s work. Given traditional roles can be difficult to change, there is a tendency to assume that men will dominate the list of beneficiaries. The collection of gender-disaggregated data allows the project to monitor that women are also a major beneficiary of the project’s work. For example, the training conducted by VCCI, with FairBiz and CO support, for the Vietnam Association of Consumer Goods Development resulted in 60% of participants being women. Similar data for other activities has shown that women have been close to 40=50% of the participants in almost all activities.

Targeted interventions were also employed by FairBiz. These could be divided into two types of interventions. First, the project convened women to build platforms and networks for them to interact and share experiences. The best example of this would be the partnership with the Thailand Federation of Business and Professional Women to receive training on business integrity.

²⁶ The engagement of Johnson & Johnson was originally done at the regional level, where the company was engaged through one of the project’s platforms. This led to a discussion as to a specific country in the region where the work could be carrying forward.

The work with the Thai Federation and the B20 is also a good example of how the project has built partnerships to gain results related to women and their role in combatting corruption. The B20²⁷ is the business arm of the G20 group of 20 leading economies globally. As part of its work, the B20 has created a specific focus for each G20 summit on corruption. But the B20 had never partnered with the United Nations or any agency of the UN, despite what may look like obvious links in their work. Through a member of FairBiz's PSAG and the Business Integrity Advisor, who was also active in the B20, a partnership was brokered to allow the two entities to collaborate. Another PSAG member had links to the Federation of Business and Professional Women in Thailand and this allowed for the piloting of a training programme for the Federation's members. It is now hoped that the same programme can be replicated in other ASEAN countries.

The second form of intervention was related to technical support to partners and beneficiaries. Here the gender audit by CoST of its work in Thailand was an important marker. FairBiz advocated for the review and the publication of its results in 2020 have had a lasting effect. For example, in 2021 CoST produced a Guidance Note on Mainstreaming Gender Equality.²⁸ This likely would not have been prioritised but for the gender audit a year earlier. The guidance note will impact CoSTs work globally and promotes tools for increasing women's representation on MSGs and otherwise in the work of the CSO.

The above examples highlight how the creation of networks that include a significant representation of women can result in new opportunities that were not envisioned when the project was designed. Yet may be some of the best results achieved by the project.

B. Diversity

When discussing diversity with regard to the work of FairBiz, beyond the specific work with women, the project is most likely reflecting on its work with youth.²⁹ As with other aspects of the work of FairBiz, the work with youth showed traction in one country, but there is limited evidence of the success in that country being replicated regionally or in other ASEAN member states.

The primary activity of the project with regard to youth was the development and distribution of the Business Integrity Toolkit for youth and start-ups. The thinking being that if new business leaders and entrepreneurs can receive knowledge with regard to business integrity that it could be a game-changer in the shift in business culture in the region. The toolkit was finalised in the first-half of 2020. Within weeks of its launch in Thailand in May 2020 more than 4 million youth had become aware of the toolkit and there were 1,400 downloads within weeks of its launch. The toolkit was also piloted in Thailand. Much of the success of this work for the project was the result of a partnership with Youth Co:Lab³⁰ - a national CSO focused on youth economic empowerment to promote social innovation and its role in achieving the SDGs in Thailand.

Building on the success of the Thai experience, FairBiz then replicated the training and toolkit for other ASEAN countries. In the second-half of 2020 the toolkit had been the basis of a ToT programme supported by the UNDP CO in Indonesia as the start of a process of training on business integrity for youth in that country. In Vietnam the approach was tailored to the needs of local partner. As such, FairBiz and VCCI worked with the Vietnam National University to produce business integrity content to be embedded in academic courses at the university.

As with the analysis of other components of the work of FairBiz we are starting to see "green sprouts" emerging from the ground that has been ploughed to create the networks and partnerships within the region. But the results are primarily at one, perhaps two, countries and has not, yet, been replicated or scaled up to a regional level.

Lessons Learned: Gender & Diversity

²⁷ <https://baselgovernance.org/b20-collective-action-hub/b20-anti-corruption>

²⁸ <https://infrastructuretransparency.org/resource/guidance-note-mainstreaming-gender-equality/>

²⁹ There is very limited evidence of other forms of diversity being considered in the work of the project, such as ethnic, religious or racial minorities.

³⁰ <https://www.youthcolabthailand.org/copy-of-youth-co-lab-2020-1>

6.1: Targeted interventions and activities aimed at women and youth groups can show results alongside mainstreamed activities.

6.2: When engaging groups that are marginalised or underrepresented, as was demonstrated by the project's work with youth, building partnerships is key to creating entry points and to building trust with beneficiaries.

Conclusion

As a project, FairBiz is at the cutting edge of UNDPs development work on two fronts, First, the project is engaging in promoting business integrity as a means of reducing corruption in the ASEAN region. This is a new area of work in the field of anti-corruption. Second, the project has developed a number of platforms and networks that have enabled the robust engagement of the private sector in combatting corruption. Given the greenfield work that FairBiz has been working in, the expectations for results were likely over ambitious for the first phase of the project. But when you add to this context the turnover in senior project staff in the first half of the project's life and the *force majeure* that is the COVID-19 Pandemic, FairBiz has performed very well.

Though the project started slowly, partly the result of the rejection of one of the Responsible Parties that was to support implementation of the project, in the end it was able to meet practically all of the targets identified for the indicators in the results framework. Unfortunately, the indicators do not measure adequately if the outputs have been achieved. This has resulted in the project meeting its targets, but not always achieving the intended results.

A major turning point in the project's work was in early 2020 when the six platforms were established. This provided a clear focus for the project's work. The building of the networks, such as the PSAG and of women business leaders, has allowed for the cost-effective sharing of knowledge, in most cases through strong partnerships with national and regional actors.

Being a regional project, FairBiz was designed based on a number of the principles of regionality – that where the work is best done nationally, it should be done nationally, but where there is added value to regional work, it would be promoted. FairBiz worked closely with COs and allowed them to take the lead in identifying exactly how FairBiz could support business integrity in the context of each country. Through the use of competitive pilot projects, FairBiz was able to lead from behind and support the development of CO partnerships with national actors, including new and vibrant partnerships with government agencies, private sector umbrella organisations and directly with specific private sector firms.

The project has achieved some results, specially at the national level in specific countries where the political will to address corruption is high. Especially where that political will has been expressed through revised legislation, the project has followed up on these legislative agendas with the backstopping and technical expertise that has enabled the effective implementation of such new rules.

However, during the first phase of the project there is limited evidence of the results achieved in select countries being upscaled or replicated regionally. Perhaps this was too much to ask for a project that is working on such a new topic. Efforts have been made to share experiences and to support replication, but such efforts may require a rethink as to how the success in a select number of countries can be repeated in other countries in the region.

Finally, it is important to note that since the project has had continuity in its project team, there has been a significant increase in the results and engagements by the project. This is an indication that the early work, which may have started slowly, has built momentum and with a consistent approach from staff, has led to an active and effective project. But this work needs more time to be nurtured. FairBiz has only just started to see results from three years of effort and hard work. It will take many more years of building trusted relationships with partners and supporting their knowledge journey and their transition to advocates for business integrity in order for there to be an impact from UNDPs efforts.

Recommendations

- **FairBiz should continue as a regional project as its work in this innovative field of governance needs a long-term commitment.**

Given that FairBiz is working in an area of governance that is relatively new, especially for UNDP, it has taken some time for the project team and BRH to build capacity and establish partnerships that are only now, as the project draws to a close, starting to show results. UNDP, through FairBiz, has ploughed the ground and planted the seeds of results, so it now needs to reap the results. This will require another three-four year project.
- **The next phase of FairBiz must reflect the priorities of the new UNDP Strategic Plan, Regional Plan and the principles of regionality**

The new UNDP Strategic Plan (2022-25) has identified governance as one of six “signature solutions” that will form the core of its work. The Plan speaks to the need to build new partnerships with the private sector (something already initiated by FairBiz) and the need for a “Triple A” approach to programming – programming that is anticipatory, agile and adaptive. This will require the next phase of FairBiz to be designed with a level of flexibility that will enable the project to open to opportunities and to be forward-thinking in how and where it deliver support to national and regional partners. It will also require more robust monitoring, evaluation and learning to capture and respond to changes in context and to identify and act upon new entry points for the promotion of business integrity. Given the principles of regionality, the project must continue to “lead from behind” and support COs in building trusted relationships with national partners. But this will still leave an important role for the project in sharing knowledge across the ASEAN region, building and maintaining networks for such sharing and the promotion of South-South and peer-to-peer capacity development. Also, given that business integrity is still a new area of work (in general and for UNDP specifically), working regionally offers space for national partners to maintain a dialogue and to raise awareness of how the issue(s) can be addressed in the context of ASEAN countries.
- **FairBiz must focus in the future on replicating and scaling up the good results observed at the national level in select countries.**

In its first years the project has done a very good job at seeding innovative approaches and building networks at the national level in several ASEAN countries. Some of these interventions have seen more results, but the work of scaling up regionally or replicating in other ASEAN countries has been slow. This should be a priority for the next phase of the project.
- **Capacity development and knowledge sharing needs to move beyond training and seminars.**

The project has relied on a significant amount of trainings to transfer knowledge to beneficiaries. While this is not a bad approach in the early stages of its work, especially on a topic for which many do not have a deep knowledge, there is a need for the project to pivot to other modalities for capacity development, including coaching and mentoring. This would be particularly effective for women and youth business leaders and entrepreneurs.
- **FairBiz needs to enhance its capacity for knowledge brokering.**

The project, to date, has been building its knowledge and capacity with regard to business integrity and has utilised partnerships and networks effectively to do so. But in the next phase of its work it needs to anticipate the “tipping point” where the project is no longer obtaining knowledge but will become a knowledge broker, leveraging its partnerships and networks to support peer-to-peer and south-south knowledge exchanges.

➤ **Continue to design targeted activities with women to expand the momentum on gender responsive work and assess the differentiated impact on women**

The project's work in support of women business leaders has shown some results and women are starting to receive the knowledge they require to fully engage in business integrity. This work must continue and be expanded, both in breadth (more countries in the region) and depth (more substantive and result-oriented engagement). The use of national and regional mentoring, for example, may be a logical next step in the evolution of the project's work in this area.

➤ **Expand engagement of business leaders from minority and marginalised groups**

The project's work with youth has shown some promising results. Lessons learned from this has shown the value in building partnerships and co-ownership of the activities and results. The project should try to replicate this model for work with other groups, such as people with disabilities and others from marginalised groups.

➤ **Maintain staff continuity**

The turnover in staff for the project in the early stages of its work was a challenge to the delivery of activities. More recently, the project has benefited from a more stable staffing situation. Going forward, the project must have systems and supports to maintain this continuity. Programmes produce better results with a stable staff team, and again, this would be a consideration for any upcoming projects and programmes.

➤ **Indicators for the results framework must reflect SMART principles**

The design of the next phase of the project must include a strong emphasis on the identification of indicators, as part of the results framework, that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART). The lack of such indicators in the current phase of the project caused challenges with regard to a necessary focus on outcome-level results. Indicators should be a snapshot of what is possible when a planned result is achieved. It may take some extra effort in the design phase of the next project, but, when done correctly, it will have a profound impact on the ability of the project to deliver results. Additionally, investments in measurement of output indicators while ensuring that there is a clear link to the outcome indicators is critical to establish the effectiveness of the project based on data and evidence. This is especially important when we wish to understand how results and impacts are defined and how they will be measured to define success.

➤ **FairBiz needs to capture its knowledge with regard to working with the private sector and UNDP needs to share this knowledge with other regions to build these new partnerships globally.**

Within UNDP, FairBiz has developed a unique set of skills and knowledge with regard to engaging the private sector and the new approaches that work for these new partners. Such knowledge is highly valuable to UNDP as it works towards achieving the SDGs and the need to leverage all actors, including the private sector, in this goal.

Lessons Learned

Lessons Learned: Relevance
1.1: Regional projects must be well-aligned with national priorities, both UNDP CO and national partners, if there is to be results achieved.
1.2: Adaptability of project modalities and activities is critical where major interruptions occur. Projects must be able to analyse and react to sudden changes in conditions to ensure results can be achieved.
1.3: M&E is more challenging where the project's results framework does not have indicators that reflect SMART principles.
Lessons Learned: Efficiency
2.1: Staff turnover can cause delays in delivery, but projects must be adaptive and find creative solutions where conditions change.
2.2: Identification of a RP should include due diligence prior to project finalization.
2.3: Consistent, timely and quality technical advice – no matter its source – is a key component to achieving results.
Lessons Learned: Effectiveness
3.1: Where there is a lack of a clear outcome for a project it is impossible to manage the project to achieve the outcome.
3.2: Regional platforms allow for best practices to be shared and promoted throughout the region
3.3: Where governments have expressed political commitment to anti-corruption efforts, usually through new laws, it is easier to engage the private sector who are keen to ensure compliance with new rules.
3.4: Windows for multiple, competitive EOIs should be timed to allow for evaluation of prior EOI projects before allocating funding under subsequent EOIs.
Lessons Learned: Impact
4.1: Where FairBiz builds trusted relationships and leverages partnerships it is able to have a direct impact on national beneficiary decisions.
4.2: For a project to reach impact-level in its work it will require a long-term commitment to engagement and support of national partners and beneficiaries.
Lessons Learned: Sustainability
5.1: Within UNDP, timely, high-quality interventions with seed funding and technical advice have resulted in expanded country office capacity and allows them to build new partnerships.
5.2: South-South and Peer-to-Peer technical support to national beneficiaries, brokered by FairBiz, can lead to sustainable results.
Lessons Learned: Gender & Diversity
6.1: Targeted interventions and activities aimed at women and youth groups can show results alongside mainstreamed activities.
6.2: When engaging groups that are marginalised or underrepresented, such as the project's work with youth, building partnerships is key to creating entry points and to building trust with beneficiaries.

Annex 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference



TERMS OF
REFERENCE

Post Title:	Final Evaluation for UNDP's Promoting a Fair Business Environment in ASEAN (FairBiz)
Agency/Project Name:	UNDP/FairBiz
Country of Assignment:	Home-based
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Post Level:	International Consultant
Languages Required:	English

1) BACKGROUND

The ASEAN Economic Community is the 7th largest economy with a combined Gross Domestic Product of US\$2.6 Trillion, which represents a huge potential for lifting people out of poverty in the region. However poor governance and corrupt practices have been cited as the most significant challenge to doing business, which increases inequalities and threatens the sustainability of economic and social development in the region. There is a momentum created by the ASEAN Vision 2025 and the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development to work jointly with governments and private sector in "instilling a culture of integrity within ASEAN".

The Project "[Promoting a Fair Business Environment in ASEAN - FairBiz](#)" (2018-2021), supported by the UK Government ASEAN Economic Reform Programme, aims to promote a fair business environment in ASEAN by minimizing corruption risks and encouraging sustainable practices.

The four pillars of the Project corresponds to its four outputs:

1. Encourage partnerships between the public and private sectors, as well as civil society and development partners at the regional level, to implement and monitor integrity policies in ASEAN;
2. Improve transparency in government contracts and increase compliance with international procurement and trade standards;
3. Promote business integrity and sustainable practices for private companies and state-owned enterprises;
4. Strengthen anti-corruption strategies, policies and laws and improve redress mechanisms for companies, investors and the broader public.

The Project targets six countries in ASEAN: Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam. Viet Nam, Myanmar and Thailand were identified in 2018 as "priority countries", receiving the most funding. Since February 2021, project implementation in Myanmar has halted due to the military coup. Allocations to countries were in part decided since the planning phase, while in part were assigned through grants ("expressions of interest") for particular initiatives supporting business integrity and sustainable business practices. Annual workplans by the COs were presented and approved every year, requiring however periodic updates and

adjustments in response to the uncertainty created by the pandemic and subsequent ban to travel, organize meetings, as well as other political and civil unrest in some countries (i.e. Myanmar coup, Thailand protests, Malaysia political changes).

The project is managed by the FairBiz team at UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub, and by FairBiz focal points in the Country Offices (not working full time on FairBiz). At the regional level, CoST, the Infrastructure Transparency Initiative, has been selected as a key implementing partner for some activities under Output 2 on transparent public procurement. All the other components are directly managed and implemented by UNDP, in some cases establishing specific partnerships at the country level.

FairBiz adopted a multi-stakeholders approach and worked not only with government counterparts (mainly public procurement agencies, anti-corruption agencies and judicial institutions), but also with business sector and civil society. FairBiz is one of the key projects driving private sector engagement at Bangkok Regional Hub. A [Private Sector Advisory Group \(PSAG\)](#) was founded in 2019 and comprises experts from within and beyond ASEAN, who participate in their personal capacity, providing advice on the direction and activities our project can take to promote dialogue between public and private sector.

In the course of 2020, the Fairbiz strategy has been defined by setting up the [Fair Biz Integrity Hub](#) and its thematic platforms.

The project was part of several evaluations and reviews to date, whose recommendations were taken into account during project implementation:

- Cycle 1 evaluation of the ASEAN Economic Reform (AER) Programme conducted by independent evaluators of the UK Government Prosperity Fund Evaluation and Learning Unit, in 2019. This focused in particular on design, contextual analysis and alignment with Prosperity Fund thematic objectives. Deepdive on Myanmar and Viet Nam country programmes. Suggestions to edit our Theory of Change were made and accepted by the FairBiz team to better aligned with revisions of the overall AER Programme revisedToC.
- Cycle 2 evaluation of the ASEAN Economic Reform (AER) Programme conducted by independent evaluators of the UK Government Prosperity Fund Evaluation and Learning Unit, in 2020. This focused particularly on implementation and progress towards results. Deep dive on Thailand country programme and CoST partnership's results. UNDP project was highlighted as having surpassed transparency and anti-corruption targets, leading in gender and inclusion among the implementing partners of the UK Government AER Programme.
- [Mid-term Progress Review Report](#) was commissioned by FairBiz team and published in April 2020
- The [Mid Term Review of the Asia Pacific RPD](#), conducted in November 2020, included also a "deep dive" in FairBiz, and CO stakeholders were also interviewed.

The past evaluation reports are already saved here in the [evaluation folder](#) in FairBiz public Teams. Access to the folder will be provided to the selected IC. Access to project documents, reports from first and second project board meetings, annual workplan, donor agreement and all necessary documents are stored in Teams folders and access will be provided to the selected IC.

PROJECT/OUTCOME INFORMATION	
Project/outcome title	Promoting a Fair Business Environment in ASEAN
Atlas ID	00110713
Corporate outcome and output	<p>Contributing Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development (RPD for Asia and the Pacific 2018-2021, Outcome 2; UNDP SP 2018-2021 Outcome 2) • Advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions (UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Outcome 1) <p>Indicative Outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National, local and urban governance institutions are transparent and accountable for equitable access to services. (RPD for Asia and the Pacific 2018-2021, Output 2.2.; UNDP SP 2018-2021 Output 2.2.2)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutions and systems enabled to address awareness, prevention and enforcement of anti-corruption measures to maximize availability of resources for poverty eradication. (UNDP SP 2018-2021 Output 1.2.3) 	
Country	Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam	
Region	ASEAN	
Date project document signed	21 May 2018 (Amendment signed on 30 June 2020)	
Project dates	Start June 2018	Planned end 30 September 2021 ¹
Project budget	5,300,000 GBP (corresponding to 7,312,410 USD at time of signature in 2018)	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	6,037,866.03 USD (as at 21 June 2021)	
Funding source	UK FCDO	
Implementing party ²	UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub – FairBiz Team	

2) EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

Responding to the Theory of Change (ToC) as described in the project document the agreed result framework (RRF) and the approved workplans, the final evaluation should look **at the relevance of the project, quality of the project design, effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation to date and sustainability of the overall project results**. To meet these ends, final evaluation will serve to:

- assess project performance and progress against the expected outcome, expected outputs, targets including indicators presented in the result framework
- review and document the success and draw out lessons for deepening impact
- assess the effectiveness of the project's engagement with stakeholders, particularly procurement offices, Chambers of Commerce, business associations, private sector companies.
- review role of the project in enhancing the importance of and the space accountability and business integrity at the regional level, including through contributing knowledge, guidance and
- identify challenges and the effectiveness of the strategic approaches that project adopted for addressing those challenges
- ascertain the relevance, effectiveness, coherence, efficiency and sustainability of the project interventions

The Scope of the Final Evaluation

The objective of this final evaluation are threefold:

- To assess progress of the FairBiz project against the project objectives and evaluate whether the project achieved expected results, as envisioned by the project document
- To evaluate the implementation of the project and its capacity to adapt to a rapidly evolving crisis context determined by covid-19 pandemic and in response to recommendations from previous reviews and evaluations

¹ Initially set to end in March 2021, in June 2020 it was extended for 6 months to compensate for the delays due to the outbreak of covid-19 pandemic. Currently there are negotiations whether to further extend it until March 2022, in line with the closing of the UK Government financial year and to allow for appropriate evaluation, closure and possible transition to a second phase

² It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

- To assess the project's alignment with and contribution to UNDP RPD and Strategic Plan 2018-2021, and provide forward-looking recommendations, lessons learned and good practices, that can inform the development of FairBiz Gen 2.

The final evaluation will be based on a desk review of project related documents, including the FairBiz project document, cost sharing agreement, workplans, result framework, progress reports, UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub Regional Programme Document Mid-term review (RPD MTR), and along with relevant communication materials and knowledge products and in depth virtual/online interviews as outlined in the methodology section.

The Final Evaluation will target FairBiz countries in Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, Malaysia, Vietnam and Myanmar. It should also focus on the regionality aspect of the project which covers all the regional interventions led by the service advisory team based at UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub.

3) EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY GUIDING QUESTIONS

The Final Evaluation will address the principles of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability as defined by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) Evaluation Criteria. The consultant will evaluate the achievements against its objectives and result indicators. The final evaluation should answer the following **key guiding questions**:

Table 2 - Criteria and Guiding Questions

Criteria	Guiding Questions
Relevance	<p><i>Relevance of the project: review the progress against project outputs and contribution to outcome level results as defined in the project's theory of change and ascertain whether assumptions and risks remain valid. Identify any other intended or unintended, positive or negative, results using following guiding questions.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) To what extent the overall design and approaches of the project were relevant? (ii) To what extent, the inputs and strategies identified were realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? (iii) To what extent did the Project achieve its overall outputs and contributions to outcomes are clear? (iv) To what extent the project was/is able to address the needs of the three tiers of governments in the changed context? (v) To what extent were the output level results achieved and how did the project contribute to project outcomes? (vi) What are UNDP's strengths and comparative advantages in business integrity and anti-corruption work vis-à-vis other partners?
Effectiveness	<p><i>Effectiveness of implementation approaches: review project's technical as well as operational approaches, the regionality and deliverables, quality of results and their impact, alignment with national priorities and responding to the needs of the stakeholders; covering the results achieved, the partnerships established, as well as issues of capacity using following guiding questions;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) How effective was the project's structure, coordination and implementation of work at the regional and country levels, and how it could be improved to contribute to the successful implementation of a possible FairBiz Gen2 project? (ii) How effective is the Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG) for business engagement? (iii) How is the FairBiz Integrity Hub Platforms structure effective to drive multi-stakeholders engagement across key thematic areas? How is it integrated in the

	<p>project implementation modality and is it understood at the Country Office level?</p> <p>(iv) To effective were the partnerships established/supported with governments and non-state actors (e.g. civil society organisations, private sector, etc.)?</p> <p>(v) How effective has been the coordination amongst relevant UNDP teams and country offices and between UNDP and other international and partner organisations (OECD, ADB, UNODC, UNGC, UN Women)?</p> <p>(vi) What are the key internal and external factors (success & failure factors) that have contributed, affected, or impeded the achievements, and how UNDP and the partners have managed these factors?</p> <p>(vii) How effective was the introduction of grants for the support of different country initiatives on business integrity (EOI 1 and EOI 2), in order to provide seed funding to support engagement with the private sector? Did this contributed to achieving impact and results or did it lead to fragmentation? A list of the initiatives supported through EOI 1 and EOI 2 is included in the Annex and a deep dive in at least two initiatives is recommended</p>
Efficiency	<p>Efficiency of the project management structure and the added value of the project's regional approach: review planning, management, monitoring and quality assurance mechanisms for the delivery of the project interventions and the added value of the regionality of the project set up in the context of fiscal reform at national and subnational level using following questions.</p> <p>(i) To what extent is the existing project management structure appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results?</p> <p>(ii) Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?</p> <p>(iii) Was the process of achieving results efficient? Were the resources effectively utilized?</p> <p>(iv) Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions funded nationally and/or by other donors?</p> <p>(v) What are the added value of the project's regionality approach for influencing anti-corruption and business integrity at country levels?</p> <p>(vi) To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents (including private sector), changing partner priorities and recommendations from previous reviews and evaluations?</p> <p>(vii) How did factors beyond the control of the programme, for instance the COVID 19 pandemic, affect programme implementation and what remedial measures did the programme adopt to deal with these external factors?</p> <p>(viii) How did FairBiz manage to incorporate, support and benefit from the stream of work on judicial integrity, mainly known to the public through the Judicial Integrity Network in ASEAN, initiative jointly funded by UK Government FCDO and US State Department, INL?</p>
Sustainability	<p><i>Sustainability of the project results and risks along with opportunities related to future interventions: review and assess if the current project setup has plans for future resource mobilization, synergy, long term partnership and / or taking into account institutionalization of the project impact for continued support after the project end using following questions;</i></p> <p>(i) What tangible results or impact have been achieved through the activities implemented, and is there evidence of sustainability? Are the results embedded in national partners institutions/private sector and can the partners continue to sustain the progress, financially, at the end of the project</p>

	<p>(Gender dimensions should be taken into account.)</p> <p>(ii) To what extent are the project approaches in integrating business integrity measures and learnings into SMEs/ business associations likely to be institutionalized and implemented after the completion of this project?</p> <p>(iii) What is the likelihood of the continuation and sustainability of the anti-corruption and business integrity after the completion of the project?</p> <p>(iv) How were capacities of business associations/SMEs strengthened at the national levels?</p> <p>(v) How did FairBiz contribute to development of knowledge and expertise facilitating advocacy and multi-stakeholders dialogue?</p> <p>(i) Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of Project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?</p> <p>(ii) Can the FairBiz project methodology and approach be replicated and up-scaled in its present form? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology and approach? What would be necessary to support replication and up-scaling?</p>
Diversity and inclusion	<p><i>Sustainability and effectiveness of diversity and inclusion approach:</i> review the project's approaches and strategies in integrating gender and social inclusion (GSI) in the countries, using following questions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects? How can the project further broaden in a future phase its contribution to enhancing diversity and inclusion? • To what extent have local communities, women, youth and other disadvantaged groups benefited from the work of FairBiz?

4) METHODOLOGY

The final evaluation methodology suggested here are indicative only. The final evaluation consultant should review the methodology and propose the final methods and data collection tools as part of the inception report. The final evaluation should build upon the available programme documents, online interviews with key informants and gathered from focus groups discussion, which would provide an opportunity for more in-depth analysis and understanding of FairBiz project. The evaluation consultant is expected to frame the evaluation using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The methods and tools should adequately address the issues of FairBiz project.

The consultant must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The consultant is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, business associations, relevant SMEs, project team, UNDP COs, UNDP BRHand key stakeholders. The final evaluation will provide quantitative and qualitative data adopting appropriate methods. Some of the data collection methods are listed in below table 3.

Table 3 – Some Methods of Collecting Data

Review of related literature	<p>The Final Evaluation Consultant is expected to carry out the following activities while reviewing the related literature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Desk study of relevant literature (ii) Study and review of all relevant project documentation, including the FairBiz project document, Results and Resource Framework, Annual Workplans, Audit Reports, Results-oriented Analysis Reports (ROARs), project evaluations, quarterly and financial reports, etc.) (i) Evidence sources (such as monitoring reports, project studies, guides, , etc.)
Online Interviews/Consultations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) In depth interviews (online) to gather primary data from key stakeholders using a structured methodology (ii) Focus Group discussion (online) with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders. (iii) Interviews (online) with relevant key informants (iv) Online meetings and or discussions with relevant stakeholders to complement the information received from other sources and for triangulation of information. (v) Online surveys or zoom meetings may be conducted to solicit feedback.

5) EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

In line with the above-mentioned scope of work and methodology, the consultant will provide for the following outputs and deliverables:

Table 4 - Expected Deliverables and Descriptions

#	Deliverables	Description	Due date
1	Workplan and methodology	<p>The workplan should provide clear timeline of how each final evaluation steps will be undertaken. Considering the travel restriction due to COVID 19, the consultant is required to provide clear interview and/or focus group discussion scheduled online as this will required coordination support from the FairBiz project team at BRH. As UNDP BRH just completed the RPD MTR, the consultant is expected to review the RDP MTR findings and methodology used for the process as this will help inform the design of final evaluation approach and methodology. The final evaluation methodology should provide a specific assessment framework, covering both quantitative and qualitative dimensions, with a detailed list of required stakeholders who need to be interviewed for the final evaluation. The draft methodology can be adjusted later once the consultant has completed the desk review of the project related documents. The final evaluation approach and methodology can be presented as a part of the Inception Report.</p>	10 days after the contract signed
2	FairBiz Inception report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, building on what has been provisionally proposed in this ToR. • It should be prepared by the consultant before going into the full-fledged evaluation exercise. • It should detail the reviewing approach, proposed format and table of content of the evaluation report. • It must also outline reviewers' understanding of what is being reviewed and why, showing how each area of inquiry will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; 	9 August 2021

		<p>and data collection procedures. This information should be provided through the preparation of a Final Evaluation Matrix.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inception report should provide FairBiz team and the Final Evaluation consultant with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the assignment, the same understanding of the ToC and clarify any misunderstandings at the outset. 	
3	Final evaluation matrix	This matrix should include key evaluation criteria, indicators, question and sub-questions to capture and assess them.	20 August 2021
4	Final Evaluation briefing	After completion of data collection or before sharing the draft report, the evaluator should present preliminary debriefing and findings to UNDP Advisory Team and final evaluation reference group at UNDP BRH.	27 August 2021
5	Draft Final Evaluation report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Final Evaluation Reference Group will review the draft FairBiz Final Evaluation report to ensure that it meets the required quality standards and covers all agreed components and contents of the final evaluation. Detailed comments and feedback on the draft report will be provided to the evaluation consultant, and discussions may be held to provide clarifications as necessary. The draft report will also be shared with stakeholders and other partners, including UK government, for additional feedback and inputs. Evaluator should submit a comprehensive draft report consisting of major findings and recommendations for future course of action. 	31 August 2021
6	Final Evaluation report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final evaluation report will be produced by the Consultant based on feedback received on the draft report. The final report will be shared with UK government, stakeholders and other relevant partners. The final draft report should be submitted within the given timeline with enough detail and quality. 	21 September 2021
7	Audit Trail Form	<p>The comments and changes by the consultant in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator in form of audit trail to show they have addressed comments.</p> <p>This document can be submitted as an Annex to the final evaluation report.</p>	21 September 2021

6) Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The Final Evaluation requires only one international consultant to complete the exercise. Following here is the anticipated number of working days required in each final evaluation process with total number of working days not exceeding 30 working days during August- September 2021.

Deliverables/ Outputs	Estimated Person days to Complete
Final Evaluation inception report (including final methodology, data collection tools and questions, proposed data collection schedules, evaluation matrix, evaluation briefing etc.)	5 days
Desk review and analysis	5 days
Interviews and analysis	5 days

Final evaluation draft report	5 days
Debrief on draft findings and recommendations to the management	2 days
Final Evaluation Second Report	5 days
Final evaluation draft ¹	2 days
Final Presentation	1 days
Total	30 Days

The final report is expected to meet IEO's Quality Criteria³.

Who (Responsible)	What (Responsibilities)
Final Evaluation Advisory Group as <i>Evaluation Manager</i> . The group comprises of UNDP Project Coordinator (representative from UNDP BRH PMU), SDG Finance and Policy Advisor and RBM, M&E Specialist.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assure smooth, quality and independent implementation of the evaluation with needful guidance from UNDP's Senior Management. Prepare and approve ToR and selection criteria. Hire the national consultant by reviewing proposals and complete the recruitment process. Ensure the independent implementation of the evaluation process. Approve each steps of the evaluation Supervise, guide and provide feedback and comments to the evaluation consultants. Ensure quality of the evaluation. Ensure the Management Response and action plans are fully implemented
FairBiz project manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft ToR to be reviewed and finalized by the <i>Evaluation Manager</i> Support in hiring the consultant Provide necessary information and coordination with different stakeholders including donor communities Provide feedback and comments on draft report Prepare management response and action plan and follow up the implementation
FairBiz Project Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide required information, furnishing documents for review to the consultant team. Logistic arrangements, such as for support in setting up stakeholder meetings, arranging field visits and coordinating with the Government.
Final Evaluation Consultant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the relevant documents. Develop and submit a draft and final inception report Conduct evaluation. Maintain ethical considerations. Develop and submit a draft evaluation report Organize meeting/consultation to discuss the draft report Incorporate inputs and feedback in draft report Submit final report with due consideration of quality and effectiveness Organize sharing of final evaluation report
Final Evaluation Reference Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Final Evaluation Reference Group comprised of Programme TeamLead, Head of PMU, Regional M&E Specialist, donors and selected COs from the project board and FairBiz UNDP COs focal points, DRR/RR as relevant, representative from GPN-AP, UK government representative and other relevant stakeholders (implementing partners) Review draft report and provide feedback

³ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

Participate in debriefing session and provide suggestions

The Final Evaluation Consultant will be briefed by UNDP Evaluation Manager upon arrival on the objectives, purpose and output of the evaluation. An oral debriefing by the Final Evaluation Consultant on the proposed work plan and methodology will be done and approved prior to the commencement of the process. The FairBiz final evaluation will remain fully independent. The evaluation Consultant maintains all the communication through the Evaluation Manager during the implementation of the evaluation. The Evaluation Manager should clear each step of the evaluation. Evaluation report must meet the requirements from the Independent Evaluation Office's guidelines which will be provided as part of the inception meeting. Contractors will arrange online final presentation with UNDP BRH and relevant stakeholders and noted comments from participants which will be incorporated in the final report. The final report will be signed off by UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub, Manager.

8. DEGREE OF EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATIONS

The consultant will have the following experience:

Education:

- Master's Degree in Public Administration, Law, Political Science, Finance, Economics, International Relations, Development Studies, or related fields;

Professional experience:

- At least 7 years of professional experience in programme assessment, monitoring and evaluation in a development context, policy support, programme management or design of governance, integrity or anti-corruption projects;
- Prior experience in producing research studies (preferably in governance, integrity or anti-corruption)
- Proven experience in data analysis as well as report writing
- Prior experience in conducting mid-term review or final evaluation preferably related to UN work related to governance, integrity or anticorruption work

Knowledge and Skills:

- Extensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative assessment methods;
- Excellent analytical skills;
- Strong communication and interpersonal skills and experience in holding consultations, build partnerships and maintain impartiality;
- Ability to conduct stakeholder interviews and collect data remotely;
- Knowledge of governance, business integrity, transparency and anti-corruption is an asset.
- Knowledge of the UN / UNDP system is an asset.

Language Required:

- Excellent knowledge, both oral and written, of English with presentational capacities is required;

Functional Competencies:

- Ability to work independently;

- Ability to perform tasks in a timely manner and produce quality final product;
- Strong interpersonal, communication and diplomacy skills;
- Openness to change and ability to receive and integrate feedback.

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling 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 favoritism;
- Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity.

9. SCOPE OF PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

The contract will be on a Lump-sum basis.

Consultant must send a financial proposal based on Lump Sum Amount. The total amount quoted shall be all-inclusive and include all costs components required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, living allowance and any other applicable cost to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be fixed output-based price regardless of extension of the herein specified duration. Payments will be done upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

Milestone/ Deliverable <i>(list of documents or actions expected to be performed by the consultant)</i>	Payment Terms in % of Total Contract Amount
1st instalment: Upon satisfactory completion of inception report	40%
2nd instalment: Upon satisfactory delivery of findings presentation and completion of Final evaluation report	60%

It is important to note that multiple iterations of the report may be required for the satisfactory completion of the report.

In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. Should the IC wish to travel on a higher class he/she should do so using their own resources.

In the event of unforeseeable travel not anticipated in this TOR, payment of travel costs including tickets, lodging and terminal expenses should be agreed upon between the respective business unit and the Individual Consultant prior to travel and will be reimbursed.

Travel costs shall be reimbursed at actual but not exceeding the quotation from UNDP approved travel agent.

10. APPLICATION PROCEDURE

Interested individuals must submit the following documents mentioned below to demonstrate their qualifications. Please group them into **one (1) single PDF document** as the application only allows to upload maximum one document.

Any individual employed by a company, organization or institution who would like to submit a proposal in response to this Individual Contract notice must do so in their individual capacity.

- **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided in Annex II (https://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=78292)
- **A Curriculum Vitae (CV) or P.11 Personal History Form** (available at http://sas.undp.org/documents/p11_personal_history_form.doc), stipulating applicant's official name as shown in identification document, the qualifications and professional experiences (with similar projects) relevant to the assignment/TOR and the contact details (email address, telephone numbers) of 3 professional references
- **A signed financial proposal**, quoted in US dollars, outlining the all-inclusive fee, supported by a breakdown of reimbursable – direct and indirect – costs such as travel, lodging, per diem etc.
Note: if an Offeror is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the Offeror must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP (Annex II of the Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability).
- **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment (max 1 page).

Incomplete proposals may not be considered. The shortlisted candidates may be contacted and the successful candidate will be notified.

11. EVALUATION METHOD AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Evaluation Methods and Criteria

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

Cumulative analysis

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as a) responsive/compliant/acceptable; and b) having received the highest score out of set of weighted technical criteria (70%), and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

Technical Criteria for Evaluation (max 70 points)

Criteria	Criteria Description	Score (points)
1	• An advanced university degree (Master's Degree or higher) in Public Administration, Law, Political Science, Finance, Economics, International Relations, Development Studies, or related fields	2
2	• At least 7 years of professional experience in programme assessment, monitoring and evaluation in a development context, policy support, programme management or design of governance, integrity or anti-corruption projects	30
3	• Prior experience in producing research studies (preferably in governance, integrity or anti-corruption)	13
4	• Demonstrated experience in conducting mid-term review and/or final evaluation related to UN work	30

5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proven experience in data analysis as well as report writing 	15
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent knowledge of English with presentational capacities is required 	10
TOTAL		100

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total 100 points in technical evaluation) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation respectively.

For those passing technical and interview evaluation above, offers will be evaluated per the Combined Scoring method:

- a) Technical Evaluation (70%)
- b) Financial Evaluation (30%)

Applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score and has accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

ⁱ Multiple reiterations may be required prior to approval of the final report which must comply with Independent Evaluation Office's Quality Standards available [here](#).

Annex 2: List of Key Stakeholders

UNDP	
Bangkok Regional Hub	Nicholas Booth
Malaysia CO	Ashvinder Singh Pramjit Singh
Thailand CO	Lovita Ramguttee
Indonesia CO	Siprianus Bate Soro
	Damianus Damianus
Viet Nam CO	Diana Torres
	Nguyen Nhu Quyn
	Do Thuy Van
UNDP ACPIS	Anga Timilsina
	Aida Arutyunova
Project Consultant	Brook Horowitz
UN AGENCIES	
UNODC	Francesco Checchi
FCDO	
Regional (Singapore)	Susan Cunningham
Implementing Partners	
CoST	Clara Feng
Partners	
OECD	Sofia Tirini
Asian Development Bank (ADB)	Cholpon Mambetova
PSAG	
South Korea	Angela Joo-Hyun Kang
Beneficiaries	
Deloitte Business Advisory Sdn. Bhd. (Malaysia)	Jin Qi
Johnson and Johnson Sdn. Bhd (Malaysia)	Vicky Veloso
Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry (VCCI)	Ding Thi Bich Xuan
Vim Industries	Do Thanh Thuy
ACT (Thailand CSO)	Kittidej Changtangul
CAC (Thailand CSO)	Chanunda Phongposob

Annex 3: List of Documents Reviewed

Folder “ Regional project document, reports, workplans ”	<p>Containing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • RRF (different updated versions) • Project Board meetings reports (I and II) • Donors agreements, including no-cost extension requested in 2020 • Quarterly regional reports (13 up to the latest one) • Evaluation reports (two evaluations of the Prosperity Fund Programmed, of which FairBiz is one component, conducted by FCDO independent evaluators in 2019 and 2020; one mid-term review public report; mid-term review of RPD with deep-dive into FairBiz, conducted in 2020) • RPD 2018-2021 ME tracker for 2020 report (ROAR)
Available upon request (ask Pundaree Boonkerd pundaree.boonkerd@undp.org)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial reports
Assessment of the FairBiz EOI 1 (Grants to support COs on business integrity initiatives)	Summary of the initiatives supported and results (2019)
Assessment of the FairBiz EOI 2 (Grants to support COs on business integrity initiatives)	Summary of the initiatives supported and results (2020)
https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/fairbiz/en/home/FairBiz-Integrity-Hub.html	FairBiz Integrity Hub platforms description
https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/fairbiz/en/home/news-centre/-/promoting-a-fair-business-environment-in-asean--project-s-first.html	Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG) description, members and meetings reports

https://www.asia-pacific.undp.org/content/fairbiz/en/home/resources.html	Resources and knowledge products produced by FairBiz regional or CO teams, available online
Knowledge products mapping	Mapping of all reports produces, not all of them for publication
Regional events evaluation results	This folder contains the summary of regional events/webinars feedback surveys. All the results of webinars from May to September 2020 were summarized in this short report
FairBiz Extension II half Y4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal for Fairbiz project extension Oct 21- Mar 22 • Revised RRF related to the proposal of extension
Judicial Integrity Network Second Regional Meeting Report	The report of the second JIN Regional Meeting, jointly supported by US Government and UK Government (through FairBiz) shows the collaboration between the two projects
FairBiz Strategy Report, Jan/Feb 2020	The FairBiz team put this report together at around the mid-stage of the project. This is where we developed and formulated the idea of the FairBiz Integrity Hub, the Thematic Platforms, the integrated role of the PSAG and the business engagement strategy.
FairBiz Gen 2 Presentation to FDCO:	This is our first round of Gen 2 “blue-sky thinking” which we shared in April 2021 with the FDCO as part of our request for the current extension. In the event, for the extension negotiations, they asked us to remove all reference to Gen 2. But now of course, we should be thinking again of our longer-term vision for the project post-March 2022.

Annex 4: Responses to Evaluation Matrix Questions

Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Tools	Indicators/Success Standards	Methods for Data Analysis	Answers to Key Questions
1. Relevance	To what extent the overall design and approaches of the project were relevant?	National development documents in target countries; UNDP Strategic Documents, including SP, regional strategy, UNDAFs, CPDs	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Project document and ToC reflect priorities in national development plans and UNDP strategic documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aligned with national priorities defined through recent laws • NDPs reflect AC priorities • UNDP SP & regional programme promote AC and engagement with private sector

	To what extent, the inputs and strategies identified were realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results?	Project Document; Project Reports; Interlocutor Interviews	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Project inputs and strategies identified meet SMART indicator criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project was somewhat ambitious. Attempting to address 5 priority areas + judicial integrity in a 3-year project • Indicators in RRF generally reflect SMART principles, but some could be more realistic
	To what extent did the Project achieve its overall outputs and contributions to outcomes are clear?	Project Reports; Interlocutor Interviews; Project Outputs; Training Reports; Workshop Reports; Action Day Reports; RP Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	ToC and project intervention logic show clear links between outputs and overall outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	All outputs were achieved.

	<p>To what extent the project was/is able to address the needs of the three tiers of governments in the changed context?</p>	<p>Interlocutor Interviews;</p> <p>Interlocutor Reports;</p> <p>RP Reports;</p> <p>Government Policies/Legislation</p>	<p>Document review;</p> <p>Interviews with interlocutors</p>	<p>Data and policy changes reflect project knowledge shared</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where project intervened there were signs of change, but these are sprouts that need to be nurtured • Project is responding to the needs of stakeholders, including governments
	<p>To what extent were the output level results achieved and how did the project contribute to project outcomes?</p>	<p>Interlocutor Interviews;</p> <p>RP Reports;</p> <p>Project Reports</p>	<p>Document review;</p> <p>Interviews with interlocutors</p>	<p>Output level indicators and targets are met</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<p>All outputs were achieved.</p> <p>Outcome was therefore achieved as well.</p>

	What are UNDP's strengths and comparative advantages in business integrity and anti-corruption work vis-à-vis other partners?	Interlocutor Interviews;	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence of added value from UNDPs interventions on business integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability to work at the local, national and regional levels allows for knowledge sharing and support to all three • UNDP convening status has leveraged MNC and SMEs to want to participate in then project • Long-term partnerships with national governments have built trusted relationships that can be leveraged for new initiatives like FairBiz
--	---	--------------------------	---	--	---	---

2. Efficiency	To what extent is the existing project management structure appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results?	Project Financial Reports; Project Reports; RP Reports; Interlocutor Interviews	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Project management is efficient	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project management team is “lean” and flexible, allowing for adaptive programming • Focus of team is on backstopping CO colleagues, which showed results • Adjustment to the team and turnover in staff did result in some delays in implementation
	Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?	Project Financial Reports; Project Reports; RP Reports; Interlocutor Interviews	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence of project planning meeting strategic priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of CO competitive project funding allowed for resources to be targeted where CO and national partners saw the most value • Adapting the programming in 2020 allowed for a more strategic allocation of resources • Use of technical expertise – in-house & external – showed the

						realistic allocation of resources
	Was the process of achieving results efficient? Were the resources effectively utilized?	Project Financial Reports; Project Reports; RP Reports; Interlocutor Interviews	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Project resources allocated in a cost-effective manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project was originally to have in-house expertise, but with staff turnover this was less the case and more use of external expertise • Use of RP relationship with CoST enabled immediate access to an already established regional network
	Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions funded nationally and/or by other donors?	Project Financial Reports; Project Reports; RP Reports; Interlocutor Interviews; Partner Reports; Donor Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence of overlap or duplication between project and other interventions by UNDP and other implementers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No national overlap with CO programming, as there was close collaboration. • Partnerships with ADB & OECD were fruitful • Relationship between ACPIs & FairBiz could be more productive • May have been some overlap with UNIODC efforts in the region

	<p>What are the added value of the project's regionality approach for influencing anticorruption and business integrity at country levels?</p>	<p>Project Document; RP Reports; Interlocutor Interviews; CO Project Documents</p>	<p>Document review; Interviews with interlocutors</p>	<p>Evidence of the added value of project's regional work</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional backstopping of CO work in AC was effective and appreciated by CO staff • Use of regional platforms and knowledge products provided added-value • Too soon to see how projects at national level can result in replication within the region
	<p>To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents (including private sector), changing partner priorities and recommendations from previous reviews and evaluations?</p>	<p>Mid-term Review Report; Project Reports; Activity Reports; Project Board Minutes; RP Reports</p>	<p>Document review; Interviews with interlocutors</p>	<p>Evidence of project adaptability to national beneficiary needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly adaptive project. Use of country-level projects that worked with needs of national partners showed results • Where national priorities for AC were set (mostly through new laws) project was more effective at leveraging such decisions to support implementation

	How did factors beyond the control of the programme, for instance the COVID-19 pandemic, affect programme implementation and what remedial measures did the programme adopt to deal with these external factors?	<p>Interlocutor Interviews;</p> <p>Project Reports;</p> <p>RP Reports;</p>	<p>Document review;</p> <p>Interviews with interlocutors</p>	Ability of project to adapt and adjust to external factors, including COVID-19 pandemic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National-level projects, especially those focused on training, went online quickly • Project showed strong ability to adapt work to external factors. • The need to directly implement some project work that was originally to be done through an RP did result in some delay, but project adapted how it would work to ensure some results before project ended
--	--	--	--	---	---	---

	How did FairBiz manage to incorporate, support and benefit from the stream of work on judicial integrity, mainly known to the public through the Judicial Integrity Network in ASEAN, initiative jointly funded by UK Government FCDO and US State Department, INL?	Interlocutor Interviews; Project Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Added value of Judicial Integrity Network in ASEAN to overall project work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited evidence of JI incorporation into other work • Regional self-assessment tool worked well where there was political and legal will to engage
3. Effectiveness	How effective was the project's structure, coordination and implementation of work at the regional and country levels, and how it could be improved to contribute to the successful implementation of a possible FairBiz Gen2 project?	Interlocutor Interviews	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Overall added value of project structure and implementation to achieving results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional programming, such as FairBiz, works best when regional work backstops national priorities and creates space for sharing lessons learned to promote replication. Fair Biz used this model to some effect

	How effective is the Private Sector Advisory Group (PSAG) for business engagement?	Interlocutor Interviews	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Added value of PSAG to project achieving results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PSAG was critical to the success of the project. Allowed for partnering between the project and regional experts that was used to expand project network and access best practices
	How is the FairBiz Integrity Hub Platforms structure effective to drive multi-stakeholders engagement across key thematic areas? How is it integrated in the project implementation modality and is it understood at the Country Office level?	Interlocutor Interviews; Project Reports; Project Document; CO Project Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence that Integrity Hub Platforms contributed to project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<p>The platforms have provided a clear delegation of work for the project, something that may have been lacking before 2020.</p> <p>There is evidence that the platforms have been effective at focusing the work of the project and allowing space for multi-stakeholder engagement.</p>

	How effective were the partnerships established/supported with governments and non-state actors (e.g. civil society organisations, private sector, etc.)?	Interlocutor Interviews; RP Reports; Project Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Added value of partnerships with governments and non-state actors to achieving project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where national government showed political endorsement of the need to work on AC and private sector responsibility the project played a key role in convening and brokering different actors to achieve results • Much of the work of the project was only possible through partnerships with other actors
	How effective has been the coordination amongst relevant UNDP teams and country offices and between UNDP and other international and partner organisations (OECD, ADB, UNODC, UNGC, UN Women)?	Project Reports; Partner Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence that project coordination and partnership coordination added to project results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships with some CO was highly effective. But there is a need for CO to own the work and to see the added value of the work • Coordination with OECD & ADB was limited, but appreciated

	<p>What are the key internal and external factors (success & failure factors) that have contributed, affected, or impeded the achievements, and how UNDP and the partners have managed these factors?</p>	<p>Interlocutor Interviews; RP Reports; M&E Reports; Activity Reports</p>	<p>Document review; Interviews with interlocutors</p>	<p>Specific factors that have contributed to or hindered achieving of project results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political decisions at country-level to promote more business integrity through new laws • Leveraging of existing national and regional networks to allow quicker results • Regional project team “leading from behind” and allowing CO to define theirs and their national partners’ needs
	<p>How effective was the introduction of grants for the support of different country initiatives on business integrity (EOI 1 and EOI 2), in order to provide seed funding to support engagement with the private sector. Did this contributed to achieving impact and results or did it lead to fragmentation?</p>	<p>CO Project Reports; Project Reports; Activity Reports; Interlocutor Interviews</p>	<p>Document review; Interviews with interlocutors</p>	<p>Evidence that seed funding grants contributed to overall project results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly effective. This is a key to the success to-date of the project. This is a relatively new modality for UNDP and many other development partners, but allows for stronger national ownership and ensures resources are allocated where they will have the greatest results

4. Impact	What concrete change(s) has occurred as a result of the project?	Legislation; Government Policies; Project Reports; Media Reports; RP Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence of change in law, government policy, new programme(s) or change in behaviour by beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project cannot claim 100% attribution to results and impact, but where conditions were right the project did see its efforts result in significant cost savings for public procurement
	What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?	Interlocutor Interviews; Project Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Change in rules or beneficiary behaviour as a result of project interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perhaps too soon to know the difference made in how beneficiaries work

	Has intra-regional knowledge sharing at the country office level significantly contributed to the corporate results framework?	UNDP CPDs; UNDAFs; UNDP SP; Project Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Added value of regional interventions to CO-level results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	The project's work has contributed to the CO corporate framework. However, there is only limited evidence of intra-regional knowledge sharing contributing to these results. To the contrary, the project's work seems to be building results in specific countries based on local needs and demand and then sharing such information regionally, but with little sign of replication to date.
5. Sustainability	What tangible results or impact have been achieved through the activities implemented, and is there evidence of sustainability?	Interlocutor Interviews; Project Reports; RP Reports; Partner Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence that project results are able to be maintained once funding is stopped	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support to national CSOs in Thailand and Vietnam has allowed for those partners to expand their work on behalf of their members • Work on public procurement in Thailand in construction sector should be sustainable

	<p>To what extent are the project approaches in integrating business integrity measures and learnings into SMEs/ business associations likely to be institutionalized and implemented after the completion of this project?</p>	<p>Interlocutor Interviews; Project Reports; RP Reports</p>	<p>Document review; Interviews with interlocutors</p>	<p>Evidence that business integrity approaches are routine with beneficiaries after project interventions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is likely that such interventions will be sustainable, but more so because of changes in laws that will push for compliance, then because of FairBiz efforts. But FairBiz did contribute to those entities have more capacity to support member compliance
	<p>What is the likelihood of the continuation and sustainability of the anticorruption and business integrity after the completion of the project?</p>	<p>Interlocutor Interviews</p>	<p>Document review; Interviews with interlocutors</p>	<p>Evidence of business integrity and anti-corruption measures are routine after project interventions end</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely to be continuation of AC and BI efforts due to global pressure for BI and national legal changes

	How were capacities of business associations/SMEs strengthened at the national levels?	Interlocutor Interviews; CO Project Reports; Activity Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence of strengthened capacity at national level with private sector partners/beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New tools and access to best practices from FairBiz and CO support • Supporting such beneficiaries to provide knowledge to their members will strengthen their relationship with their members
	How did FairBiz contribute to development of knowledge and expertise facilitating advocacy and multi-stakeholders dialogue?	Interlocutor Interviews; Project Reports; RP Reports	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Link between project interventions and sustained advocacy and dialogue amongst stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too soon to determine if project interventions will result in sustained advocacy and dialogue amongst stakeholders

	Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve the prospects of sustainability of Project outcomes and the potential for replication of the approach?	Project Reports; Interlocutor Interviews	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence of factors or elements that can be improved to ensure sustainability is more likely in the future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since best results came where there was political will, convening and facilitating dialogue amongst national governments to share good practices with those that still lack the will to reform • Working through or establishing a regional partner to assume role of facilitator and knowledge broker that can sustain results
--	---	---	---	--	---	--

	Can the FairBiz project methodology and approach be replicated and up-scaled in its present form? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology and approach? What would be necessary to support replication and up-scaling?	Project Reports; Interlocutor Interviews	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence that FairBiz model can be up-scaled	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certain modalities – partnerships, competitive country-level seed projects – can be replicated within other UNDP regions • May be too soon to see if the other strong aspects of FairBiz are unique to ASEAN or even those ASEAN countries where political will to confront corruption
6. Diversity & Inclusion	To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?	Project Reports; Activity Reports; Interlocutor Interviews; Disaggregated Data	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence that project interventions have promoted gender equality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convening women business leaders to share experiences and gain new knowledge has allowed for targeted support that was appreciated by beneficiaries • Too soon to see if there are clear results from such support

	How can the project further broaden in a future phase its contribution to enhancing diversity and inclusion?	Project Reports; Activity Reports; Interlocutor Interviews; Disaggregated Data	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence of possible positive interventions for future work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any future work in this area should look to integrate inclusivity efforts with more mainstream BI and AC work
	To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects? How can the project further broaden in a future phase its contribution to enhancing diversity and inclusion?	Project Reports; Activity Reports; Interlocutor Interviews; Disaggregated Data	Document review; Interviews with interlocutors	Evidence of unintended effects of project interventions on gender equality and social inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the Project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On gender the work with women business leaders has shown promise and should be replicated in other ASEAN countries • Regional for a for women business leaders has allowed space for sharing of experiences •

	<p>To what extent have local communities, women, youth, people with disabilities and other disadvantaged groups benefited from the work of FairBiz?</p>	<p>Project Reports; Activity Reports; Interlocutor Interviews; Disaggregated Data</p>	<p>Document review; Interviews with interlocutors</p>	<p>Evidence that project interventions showed results for beneficiaries from under-represented groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Descriptive statistical analysis • Process tracing • Triangulation • Discussion of data amongst the consultant and the project team • Verification of data with Stakeholders • Fact checking by UNDP comment and feedback to Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still too soon if there will be results and impact from work in support of key groups that are normally under-represented in such work • But work to-date should lay the foundation for leveraging networks and relationships for further results-oriented engagement
--	---	---	--	---	---	--

Annex 5: Table of Project's Indicators, Targets & Level of Achievement

Output 1	Target	Evidence		
1.1 Number of learning & knowledge platforms for Government – private sector and civil society policy dialogue	Five platforms by end of Year Three (Six by end of Year Four)	Procurement	1	
		ESG Investing	1	
		Global Supply Chain	1	
		Diversity & Inclusion	1	
		Youth & Entrepreneurship	1	
		Court excellence and judicial integrity	1	
		As of September 2021		6
1.2 % of involved stakeholders reporting feeling more comfortable on dialogue on integrity and transparency with counterparts following participation in the platforms (disaggregated by gender) - referring to the ability of understand and trust each other and work for common goals	80% by end of Year Three (90% by end of Year Four)			88.30%
		As of June 2021		
		FBPW training	100%	
		Maxis training	100%	
		Johnson & Johnson training	100%	
		SHE-bid training	100%	
		As of September 2021		97.66%

1.3 - # stakeholders engaged through the regional platforms (gender and sector disaggregated)	500 stakeholders by end of Year Three (3,700 by end of Year Four)	Male	1205	
		Female	1936	
		Other	29	
		Public sector	2094	
		Private sector	379	
		CSO	130	
		Other	567	
		As of November 2020		3170
		IACC 10 December 2020		70
		ABIS 2020		88
		Gender Report Launch 8th March 2021		220
		Male	37	
		Female	176	
		Other	7	
		Public sector	7	
		Private sector	50	
		CSO	19	
		Other	144	
		As of March 2021		3548
		FBPW training		33

	Female	33	
	Private sector	33	
	Johnson & Johnson training		33
	Male	12	
	Female	21	
	Private sector	33	
	As of June 2021		3614
	Maxis training		10
	Male	7	
	Female	3	
	Private sector	10	
	SHE-bid training		28
	Female	28	
	Private sector	28	
	Male	1261	
	Female	2197	
	Other	36	
	Public sector	2101	
	Private sector	533	
	CSO	149	
	Other	711	
	As of September 2021		3652

Output 2	Targets	Evidence		
2.1 - # new/revised policy instruments on public procurement reform developed	Two new/revised policy instruments by end of Year Three (Four by end of Year Four)	Indonesia study on centralized system of public procurement	1	
		Thailand CoST disclosure mandated by law	1	
		Philippines Public Finance Management Roadmap	1	
		Thailand Public Procurement Reform Review	1	
		As of September 2021		4
2.2 - # public procurement interventions conducted in the target countries	Six interventions by end of Year Three (Eight by end of Year Four)	Indonesia Training of Trainers to enhance the performance of public procurement suppliers	1	
		Thailand workshop on international tendering	1	
		Thailand workshop on guidelines and framework agreements	1	
		Philippines dashboard for M&E, internal control mechanism framework for procuring entities	1	
		Thailand workshop on digital marketplace	1	
		Indonesia Study on international Bidding	1	
		As of September 2021		6
2.3 - # of stakeholders involved in procurement monitoring of infrastructure projects (disaggregated by gender)	150 stakeholders involved by end of Year Three (1,200 by end of Year Four)	Male	439	
		Female	536	
		As of Dec 2020		975
		Male	655	
		Female	664	
		As of June 2021		1319
		Male	133	
		Female	239	
		As of September 2021		1691

2.4 - # interventions conducted to analyze and promote women’s inclusion in transparent public procurement processes	Two interventions by end of Year Three.	CoST Gender audit	1	
		Guidance note on promoting gender equality in CoST implementation	1	
				2
		As of September 2021		
Output 3	Targets	Evidence		
3.1 - # of companies engaged in dialogue on gender and inclusion through participation in project platforms	20 companies engaged by end of Year Three (230 by end of Year Four)	As of Sept 2020		136
		Gender Report Launch		31
		FBPW training		33
		Johnson&Johnson training		21
		As of June 2021		221
		Maxis training		10
		SHE-bid training		26
		As of September 2021		257
3.2 - # business integrity instruments adopted/developed (trainings and/or tools on code of conduct, internal control mechanisms or whistleblowing mechanisms developed for business sector)	Four instruments by end of Year Three (23 by end of Year Four)	Trainings on CoC, ICM, whistleblowing in Vietnam	3	
		Business Integrity Pledge in Vietnam	1	
		Business Integrity toolkit for start-ups (regional)	1	
		Training in Myanmar on Business Integrity	1	
		ToT in Vietnam	1	
		Training workshops for young entrepreneurs on business integrity	4	
		Workshop on Business Integrity for start-ups in Vietnam	1	
		Business Integrity toolkit investors in Vietnam	1	
		Business Integrity toolkit for startup-ups in Vietnam	1	

		Trainings for companies on CoC, ICM	7	
		As of June 2021		21
		BiKi - Chatbot supporting Entrepreneurship and Business integrity in Vietnam	1	
		Trainings for companies on Business Integrity in Thailand (FBPW)	1	
		Trainings for companies on Business Integrity in Indonesia (SHE-bid)	1	
		Trainings for companies on Business Integrity in Malaysia (Johnson&Johnson+Maxis)	1	
		As of September 2021		25
3.3 # knowledge products developed to inform multi-stakeholder dialogue	Four knowledge products by end of Year Three (Eleven by end of Year Four)	Regional - Baseline study	1	
		Regional - Good corporate Governance and Gender diversity in ASEAN	1	
		Regional - Gender diversity and inclusion for a fair business environment	1	
		Regional - Resource Guide: transparent and Open Public Procurement systems for achieving SDGs in ASEAN	1	
		Malaysia - Corporate Governance Landscape	1	
		Indonesia - Engendering Business Integrity	1	
		Philippines - Baseline Study on BI practices and Blockchain Feasibility Research	1	
		Philippines - Blockchain Feasibility Research	1	
		Myanmar - Business Integrity Handbook	1	
		Thailand - The uncovering of Thailand's Corruption risk towards sustainable development (resulting from corruption and business integrity survey).	1	
		As of September 2021		
				10
Output 4	Targets	Evidence		

4.1 - # countries supported to develop or update preventive anti-corruption policies, plans or strategies (Indicator 2.2.1 in RPD)	Three countries by end of Year Three (Four by end of Year Four)	Malaysia - National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2019-2023	1	
		Myanmar - Preventive AC policies with setting up CPU in 2019-20	1	
		Vietnam - New Anti-Corruption Law	1	
		Thailand - Review of current AC strategy to inform the development of next phase strategy	1	
		As of September 2021		4
4.2 # of new in country judicial initiatives initiated following regional peer to peer exchanges (targeted countries)	Three countries by end of Year Three	Malaysia - piloting the Judicial Integrity Checklist addendum to the International Framework for Court Excellence	1	
		Thailand - self assessment conducted in 2020	1	
		Vietnam - support re: commercial dispute resolution.	1	
		As of September 2021		3