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# DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGE

### Corruption and Development in the Pacific

Corruption is a global phenomenon that negatively impacts development. However, more vulnerable countries, such as those in the Pacific, are disproportionately affected. Additionally, while even in normal situations, corruption poses a major impediment to human, economic and security development, this effect is exacerbated due to the **COVID-19** pandemic. The lack of sufficient accountability and oversight mechanisms in crisis response and recovery mean that the risks of corruption significantly increase, and these have critical socio-economic implications.

*“It robs societies of schools, hospitals and other vital services, drives away foreign investment and strips nations of their natural resources. It undermines the rule of law and abets crimes such as the illicit trafficking of people, drugs and arms. Tax evasion, money laundering and other illicit flows divert much-needed resources for sustainable development. The World Economic Forum estimates that the cost of corruption is at least $2.6 trillion – or 5 per cent of global gross domestic product. And according to the World Bank, businesses and individuals pay more than $1 trillion in bribes each year. Corruption begets more corruption and fosters a corrosive culture of impunity. The United Nations Convention against Corruption is among our primary tools for advancing the fight. Sustainable Development Goal 16 and its targets also offer a template for action. Through the Convention’s peer review mechanism, we can work together to build a foundation of trust and accountability. We can educate and empower citizens, promote transparency and strengthen international cooperation to recover stolen assets. Millions of people around the world have gone to the ballots this year with corruption as one of their top priorities.”*

António Guterres, Secretary-General’s Message in 2018 on International Anti-Corruption Day2

4 1. Pacific Island countries (PICs) face particularly complex development challenges, in part, due to their

limited size and experience in self-governance, physical remoteness, dependence on a narrow resource base, limited trade opportunities, security challenges, and vulnerabilities to natural and environmental disasters. PICs are also uniquely vulnerable to the health and socio-economic impacts of **COVID-19**, in part due to weak health systems, and the Pacific’s heavy economic reliance on tourism and remittance flows; two areas which border closures have significantly affected.3 Despite this, PICs are expected to both protect their citizens from the impacts of the virus, as well as fulfil their duties and responsibilities as members of the international community.

1. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2030 Agenda) and its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) spell out an ambitious unified framework and an extensive set of targets for UN Member States. The SDGs are the blueprint to achieve a better and more sustainable future for all. They address the global challenges we face, including those related to poverty, inequality, climate change, environmental degradation including sustainability of marine and land-based life, and peace and justice. Amid **COVID-19**, it is key that countries continue to prioritize their actions to progress the SDGs. This pandemic has exposed fundamental weaknesses in the global system. The health and socio-economic impacts of the virus have been further exacerbated because of poverty, weak health systems, a lack of education, and above all, sub-optimal global cooperation. The SDGs offer a framework for combating the impacts of the virus by ensuring that no one is left behind.
2. UN-PRAC aims to assist PICs to accelerate progress against all SDGs. SDG 16, dedicated to promoting peaceful and inclusive societies, provides access to justice for all and supports the building of effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. Within the inter-connected web of the 17 SDGs, SDG 16 has been referred to as the “enabling” and transformative Goal for achieving the other SDGs.4 Attaining
3. Guterres, A. (2018), Message on International Anti-Corruption Day, <http://www.un.org/en/events/anticorruptionday/messages.shtml>.
4. Eliasaf, Ben, and Daweena Tia Motwany. “Why 15 Countries Still Haven’t Reported Any Cases of Covid-19.” The Interpreter, April 14, 2020. [https://www.lowyinstitute](http://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/why-15-countries-still-haven-t-reported-any-cases-covid-19%3B).[org/the-interpreter/why-15-countries-still-haven-t-reported-any-cases-covid-19;](http://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/why-15-countries-still-haven-t-reported-any-cases-covid-19%3B) Ackman, Murray, and Tautalasso Taulealo. “Covid-19 and Pacific Labour.” The Interpreter, April 15, 2020. https://www.lowyinstitute. org/the-interpreter/covid-19- and-pacific-labour.
5. UN (2019), *Sustainable Development Goal 16*, <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg16>.

SDG 16 would help drive long-term development and strengthen resilience against internal and external shocks. Two of the SDG 16 targets are explicitly dedicated to anti-corruption and the promotion of effective governance, namely:

* + Target 16.5: Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms; and
  + Target 16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels.

1. The remaining SDG16 targets directly or indirectly relate to the fight against corruption and the promotion of effective governance, specifically:
   * Target 16.3: Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all;
   * Target 16.4: By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime;
   * Target 16.7: Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels; and
   * Target 16.10: Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements.

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| ***COVID-19 and the Pacific***  While many PICs are yet to report their first cases of **COVID-19**, they are already strongly affected by its collateral socio-economic impact. This is further compounded by natural catastrophes such as the recent Cyclone Harold, as well as existing and new governance challenges.  In terms of medical preparedness, most PICs do not have robust health systems and lack key medical infrastructure, such as intensive care units.5 PICs are highly dependent on imports, which may lead to shortages in medical supplies, food and other necessary goods, and these shortages may lead to profiteering and inflated prices for essential goods, as well as parallel and black markets often run by organized criminal groups.6 While many commentators have advocated that the best way to protect the Pacific is to close borders and stop the virus from reaching PICs in the first place, the Pacific is still vulnerable to transmission of the virus through foreign commercial fishing and other activities, and Pacific Governments are being warned to put urgent **COVID-19** safety measures in place at ports as potential points of transmission.7  The narrow economic base of most PICs has resulted in an economic shock from the impact of **COVID-19**. While the closing of borders is an effective method of keeping the virus out, the Pacific’s reliance on tourism has already seen a large-scale economic downturn with many Pacific Islanders losing their jobs or experiencing a reduction in working hours. Border closures have also affected many PICs’ reliance on seasonal labour mobility to Australia and New Zealand.8 Moreover, remittances are vital in supporting PICs with limited domestic industries; in Samoa and Tonga, these make up around 18% and 40% of GDP respectively.9 Additionally, PICs have a narrow export sector and a high dependence on imports. With a narrow resource base, PICs rely on imports for food, fuel, equipment and industrial material, as well as a wide range of manufactured products. This is particularly the case for small countries in the Pacific, such as Kiribati and Tuvalu, whose small land areas mean their |
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1. E Eliasaf and Motwany, above n 2.
2. Dr Te’o Fairbairn. (1994) “Pacific Islands Economies: Trade Patterns and Some Observations on Trade Policy Issues”, trade and environment, September 25, [https://nautilus.org/trade-and-environment/pacific-islands-economies-trade-patterns-and-some-observations-on-trade-](https://nautilus.org/trade-and-environment/pacific-islands-economies-trade-patterns-and-some-observations-on-trade-policy-issues-4/) [policy-issues-4/](https://nautilus.org/trade-and-environment/pacific-islands-economies-trade-patterns-and-some-observations-on-trade-policy-issues-4/); Coke Hamilton, Pamela. “COVID-19 and Food Security in Vulnerable Countries.” United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, April 14, 2020. <https://unctad.org/en/pages/newsdetails.aspx?OriginalVersionID=2331>.
3. ‘Foreign fishing boats emerge as a new point of Covid-19 transmission in the Pacific’ *One News*, May 26, 2020. [https://www.tvnz.co.nz/](https://www.tvnz.co.nz/one-news/world/foreign-fishing-boats-emerge-new-point-covid-19-transmission-in-pacific-v1) [one-news/world/foreign-fishing-boats-emerge-new-point-covid-19-transmission-in-pacific-v1](https://www.tvnz.co.nz/one-news/world/foreign-fishing-boats-emerge-new-point-covid-19-transmission-in-pacific-v1).
4. Ackman, Murray, and Tautalasso Taulealo. “Covid-19 and Pacific Labour.” The Interpreter, April 15, 2020. [https://www.lowyinstitute.org/](https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/covid-19-and-pacific-labour) [the-interpreter/covid-19-and-pacific-labour](https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/covid-19-and-pacific-labour); This is also likely to affect fruit and vegetable supply and cost in Australia, with a large number of farm workers coming from the Pacific (from 2018-19, it was estimated that 12,000 Pacific Islanders and citizens of Timor-Leste worked on Australian farms for up to six months as part of Australia’s Seasonal Worker Programme). Hunt, David. “Why closing our borders to foreign workers could see fruit and vegetable prices spike”, *The Conversation*, March 31, 2020. [https://theconversation.com/why-closing-](https://theconversation.com/why-closing-our-borders-to-foreign-workers-could-see-fruit-and-vegetable-prices-spike-134919) [our-borders-to-foreign-workers-could-see-fruit-and-vegetable-prices-spike-134919](https://theconversation.com/why-closing-our-borders-to-foreign-workers-could-see-fruit-and-vegetable-prices-spike-134919).
5. Ackman and Taulealo, above n 2.

agricultural and industrial potential is limited. Currently, Australia is the leading source of supply to the Pacific, followed by France, the United States, Japan and New Zealand.10

These challenges, especially during the **COVID-19** pandemic, are further complicated by PICs’ specificities, including their size and physical remoteness, and their development challenges and vulnerabilities, including with regard to security and governance. In addition, climate change and environmental disasters exacerbate the risk to trade and investment in the Pacific.

The economic shock of **COVID-19** is likely to further increase the Pacific’s reliance on foreign aid. The Pacific is already the most aid-dependent region in the world. When measured in aid inflows as a proportion of GDP, over US$2 billion was distributed in foreign aid each year from 2011 to 2017 in the Pacific; equal to approximately 6.5% of the region’s GDP.11 It is crucial now more than ever to ensure that these funds are not diverted from their intended purpose and are used in a transparent, accountable and efficient manner.

1. The debate in the Pacific has shifted from ‘why’ PICs should be preventing and fighting corruption to ‘how’, therefore the anti-corruption momentum being witnessed in the region needs to be maintained and fostered. The **COVID-19** pandemic is escalating the need to ensure that anti-corruption measures protect PICs from the economic damage and other socio-economic harm that an increase in new and existing forms of corruption will create. The United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), as highlighted by UN Secretary General, is one of the primary anti-corruption tools being used by countries. Thanks to the previous work of UN-PRAC, there are now 14 Pacific States parties to UNCAC. All 14 are participating in the mechanism for the review of implementation of UNCAC (UNCAC Review Mechanism). Details on UNCAC and its Review Mechanism are highlighted under section 1.2.
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Australia’s High Commissioner to Tonga, Andrew Ford, addressing UN- PRAC’s Parliament workshop with Tonga PH Pohiva in May 2018.

1. PICs share a set of characteristics that shape their development paths. These features include small but growing populations, dependence on a narrow resource base, remoteness from large markets, vulnerability to natural disasters and other external shocks, fragile environments, and significant dependence on foreign aid and/or international trade. Natural disasters do not stop in a global pandemic, as seen with Cyclone Harold which caused widespread destruction in the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Fiji and Tonga during April 2020. As the frequency and intensity of natural hazards is expected to increase due to climate change. Many of these countries are also highly vulnerable to a globally induced sea level rise.
2. Fairbairn, above n 5.
3. Lowy Institute (2020), *Pacific aid map,* https://pacificaidmap.lowyinstitute.org/.
4. In addition, PICs’ small size provides little room to take advantage of economies of scale. Their development opportunities are further hampered by expensive public administrations and infrastructure, as well as high communication, energy and transportation costs. These factors put them at greater risk of being marginalized from the global economy and suffering more from the impact of climate, food, health and other related global crises. In addition to this complex set of vulnerabilities, poor governance, weak law enforcement and corruption challenges are among the root causes for slow development in the region and a major threat to achieving the SDGs.
5. The Pacific is a transit route and increasingly a final destination for the illicit movement of drugs and transnational organized crime, including human trafficking and migrant smuggling. Effective governance systems for fighting corruption that facilitate such activities are instrumental for the region and clearly acknowledged by the Pacific Islands Forum Leaders in the 2018 Boe Declaration on Regional Security. The recently adopted Action Plan to implement the Boe Declaration, which is in line with the 2014 Framework for Pacific Regionalism and the Blue Pacific Narrative, clearly highlights corruption as a strategic focus in areas 4 and 6. Area 4 on transnational crime specifically includes action viii to “support regional initiatives and strengthen national efforts to combat corruption by public officials.”12 Area 6 on creating an enabling environment for implementation including an appropriate coordination mechanism contains area 6 D (iii) on “strengthening of good governance, rule of law and enhancing anti-corruption and electoral processes under the Biketawa Declaration”. Some of the measures of success include: “(ii) Number of Member Countries that adopt and implement constitutional, statutory and/or policy guarantees for public access to information; (iii) Number of Member Countries that have anti-corruption legislation; (iv) Number of Member Countries that have an established independent anti-corruption institution.”13
6. Corruption risks associated with offshore banking are of growing concern in the region, as was exposed through the Panama Papers. Several countries continue to struggle with the ratings of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF), and some have been grey and even blacklisted. During **COVID-19,** it has been challenging for countries to mitigate illicit financial flows, including fraudulent behaviour and scams related to the

**COVID-19** response. A strong correlation exists between corruption in the private sector and the ease 7

of doing business in any economy. According to the 2020 Ease of Doing Business Rankings for the East Asia region released by the World Bank, Samoa leads the ranking for PICs at number 98 out of 190, an increase from 90th rank in 2019, followed by Fiji, Tonga, Vanuatu, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Solomon Islands, Palau, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia and Kiribati.14 Both UNCAC and the SDGs recognize the private sector in creating a culture of transparency and accountability, as well as enhancing economic development by attracting Foreign Direct Investments.

#### Pacific efforts to address corruption over the last decade

PICs are progressively recognizing the complex landscape of corruption in the region. This has led to an increasing number of PICs adopting/enacting national anti-corruption strategies (NACS), policies and legislation, establishing Independent Commissions Against Corruption (ICACs) and enhancing integrity institutions, and seeking to comprehensively address corruption challenges. Leaders, public officials, the private sector, media and citizens, including young people are increasingly showing that they are committed to preventing and fighting corruption in their communities. Since 2012, the number of States parties to UNCAC in the region has increased from six to 14, with Tonga being the last PIC to join the global UNCAC family in February 2020. Through ratification/ accession and then the UNCAC Review Mechanism, Pacific States parties have undergone or are undergoing a comprehensive review of their implementation of the Convention through this inter-governmental peer review process.15 The UNCAC Review Mechanism consists of two review cycles – the first focused on Chapters III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and IV (International cooperation), and the second on Chapters II (Preventive measures) and V (Asset recovery). Most Pacific States parties having completed the first cycle (Tonga is completing its review only now, as it became a State party in 2020), and are in the process of completing the second. The information collated in the review reports and executive summaries provides for a comprehensive understanding of the existing gaps and challenges, as well as successes of PICS in relation to their

1. PIFS (2019), Boe Declaration Action Plan, p. 18, , [https://www](http://www.forumsec.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/BOE-document-Action-Plan.pdf).[forumsec.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/BOE-document-Action-Plan.pdf](http://www.forumsec.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/BOE-document-Action-Plan.pdf). 12 Ibid, p. 25.
2. World Bank (2019), *Doing Business 2020*, [https://www](http://www.doingbusiness.org/content/dam/doingBusiness/media/Profiles/Regional/).[doingbusiness.org/content/dam/doingBusiness/media/Profiles/Regional/](http://www.doingbusiness.org/content/dam/doingBusiness/media/Profiles/Regional/) DB2020/EAP.pdf.
3. UNODC (2010), *Implementation Review Mechanism*, [https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/implementation-review-mechanism.](https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/implementation-review-mechanism.html) [html](https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/implementation-review-mechanism.html).

implementation of UNCAC. Some of the identified gaps in relation to public procurement, access to information and other accountability and transparency measures have been further challenged during **COVID-19**. UN-PRAC has been able to use this information to effectively work with governments and non-State actors in prioritizing the UNCAC review recommendations and supporting them in their anti- corruption reforms.

1. While the UNCAC review reports provide an in-depth understanding of PICs’ compliance with UNCAC, a meta-analysis that informed the design of the UN Pacific Strategy (UNPS) 2018-2022 confirmed that weak governance and corruption are two of the root causes for weak development performances in the region and threaten the 2030 Agenda. National surveys, such as the 2017 National Perception Survey on Peacebuilding in Solomon Islands,16 and the 2019 UNDP Solomon Islands Conflict and Development Analysis also illustrated prevalent corruption challenges. Moreover, a business survey in PNG consistently identified corruption as the second business constraint (from a list of ten) for doing business in PNG.17
2. At the 7th Conference of the States Parties to UNCAC (CoSP), the President of Kiribati H.E Taneti Maamau spearheaded resolution 7/7 on strengthening the implementation of the UNCAC in small island developing States (SIDS).18 Following this, Kiribati initiated the first regional anti-corruption conference by governments for the Pacific. The initiative was endorsed by the Pacific Leaders Forum at the meeting held in Nauru in September 2018,19 and was held in February 2020. Pacific leaders and representatives in attendance included the President and Vice President of Kiribati, the Prime Ministers of Samoa and the Cook Islands, as well as ministers from Tonga and the Solomon Islands, Ambassador from the Marshall Islands, High Commissioners of Australian and New Zealand and a representative of Fiji from the Fiji Independent Commission Against Corruption (FICAC). They signed the Teieniwa Vision: Pacific Unity Against Corruption, which commits to addressing corruption across the region, “recognising that all of our progress and aspirations for a peaceful, harmonious and prosperous Pacific cannot be realised unless we address corruption.”20
3. Non-State actors have been pursuing various

avenues to further the anti-corruption agenda.

8

The Regional Civil Society Organisations (CSO) Forum takes place in the margins of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) leader’s annual meeting, and regularly calls for increased accountability, openness and whole-of-society approaches.21 At the national level, sector-focused CSOs have expressed interest in oversight mechanisms, while at the regional level, the voice of anti-corruption networks is becoming louder and increasingly prominent in public space. The Pacific Youth Forum Against Corruption (PYFAC), a network established by the Pacific Youth Council and UN-PRAC, has become a prominent actor in

respective countries on anti-corruption. For example, PYFAC Solomon Islands was an active stakeholders in the civic movement that resulted in the adoption of the Anti-Corruption Bill in 2018. It also facilitated leadership integrity debates in the pre-election period, based on the regional Youth Anti-Corruption Advocates Toolkit, developed with UN-PRAC. Youth champions trained by UN-PRAC have also become integral in national integrity institutions such as a PYFAC member now working in the Prime Minister’s

1. UNDP Pacific Office (2018), *UN National Perceptions Survey on Peacebuilding for Solomon Islands*, [http://www.pacific.undp.org/](http://www.pacific.undp.org/content/pacific/en/home/library/eg/un-national-perceptions-survey-on-peacebuilding-for-soi.html) [content/pacific/en/home/library/eg/un-national-perceptions-survey-on-peacebuilding-for-soi.html](http://www.pacific.undp.org/content/pacific/en/home/library/eg/un-national-perceptions-survey-on-peacebuilding-for-soi.html).
2. Asian Development Bank (2014), *The Challenges of Doing Business in Papua New Guinea*, [https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/](https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/31209/challenges-doing-business-papua-new-guinea.pdf) [publication/31209/challenges-doing-business-papua-new-guinea.pdf](https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/publication/31209/challenges-doing-business-papua-new-guinea.pdf); World Bank (2019), *Doing Business 2020*, [https://openknowledge.](https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/32436/9781464814402.pdf) [worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/32436/9781464814402.pdf](https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/32436/9781464814402.pdf).
3. UNODC (2017), *Resolutions adopted by the Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption*, <http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/COSP/session7/V1800228e.pdf>.
4. PIFS (2018), *Forty-Ninth Pacific Islands Forum Nauru*, 3rd – 6th September 2018, [https://www.forumsec.org/forty-ninth-pacific-islands-](https://www.forumsec.org/forty-ninth-pacific-islands-forum-nauru-3rd-6th-september-2018/)

[forum-nauru-3rd-6th-september-2018/](https://www.forumsec.org/forty-ninth-pacific-islands-forum-nauru-3rd-6th-september-2018/).

1. Pacific Leaders (2020), *Teieniwa Vision*, https://issuu.com/effective.governance17/docs/teieniwa\_vision\_puac\_leaders.signed.final. 21 PIFS (2018), Civil Society Organizations’ Statement to Pacific Island Forum Leaders’,

[https://www](http://www.forumsec.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Civil-Society-Organisations%E2%80%99-Statement-to-Pacific-Island-Forum-).[forumsec.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Civil-Society-Organisations%E2%80%99-Statement-to-P](http://www.forumsec.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Civil-Society-Organisations%E2%80%99-Statement-to-Pacific-Island-Forum-)acifi[c-Island-Forum-](http://www.forumsec.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Civil-Society-Organisations%E2%80%99-Statement-to-Pacific-Island-Forum-) Leaders%E2%80%99-2018.pdf.

Office of the Solomon Islands and acts as the Government’s Anti-Corruption Working Group Focal Point. Another PYFAC member is working in the Right to Information (RTI) Unit in Vanuatu. The non-State actors’ platform is further being strengthened, through the inclusion of the private sector, media and academia. Examples of UN-PRAC working with these actors include: a partnership with the Pacific Island Private Sector Organisation (PIPSO) which resulted in a model Code of Conduct being adopted in 2017 for private sector organizations in the Pacific region; facilitation of the Fiji Business Breakfast which brought together 36 representatives from the private sector and civil society in Suva in 2018 and led to the development of an anti-corruption toolkit in 2020 for women-owned micro, small and medium sized enterprises in Fiji; and support of the Pacific Islands News Association’s (PINA)establishment of a Pacific Anti-Corruption Journalists Network. Fiji piloted a special curriculum on anti-corruption in primary and secondary education, the National Anti-Corruption Curriculum, which is currently being finalized. Several other countries are looking at the possibility to design such curricula themselves. In this regard, PNG, Samoa and Vanuatu having already benefited from Fiji’s experience and UN-PRAC support.

1. Anti-corruption engagement in the Pacific is currently in a phase of “consolidation”, as illustrated by the above examples. In its first phase, UN-PRAC focused on demystifying the concept of corruption and breaking taboos. Today, the Programme is looking at an overall increasingly vibrant, dynamic, and more technical in nature, form of engagement. While different countries move at different paces, the conversations and actions are now more concrete and increasingly focused on specific issues and/ or sectors. However, in-depth work on creating an enabling environment for healthy and sustainable growth, access to basic services for all, foreign direct investments and accountable governance overall remains a priority – especially when countries are trying to respond to **COVID-19** in a way that addresses the health, social and economic dimensions of the virus. In that regard, this is a critical period for anti- corruption in the Pacific region, as countries will need to rely on strong governance structures to ensure **COVID-19** related corruption is not allowed to flourish. This makes the availability of technical assistance increasingly critical for maintaining the anti-corruption momentum in the region and supporting concrete, whole-of-society reforms.
2. The information forming the basis of this analysis directly reflects experiences on the ground gained 9

through UN presence in the region, the UN-PRAC Project and the Pacific UNCAC reviews. These primary and direct sources are essential in a region were data availability generally, but particularly on corruption is scarce and often confined to non-published surveys.22 Additionally, while the rest of the world is reporting on specific types of corruption developing during the **COVID-19** pandemic, the lack of reporting in the Pacific means that information on new and existing forms of corruption emerging during **COVID-19** is not available. This is a serious challenge in terms of understanding the impact of corruption on development. Therefore, direct presence in the field and working with all the sectors of society is critical to address this information gap. The wealth of information collated through the UN-PRAC networks and the UNCAC review process is invaluable in accurately understanding the multi-dimensional impact of corruption in the Pacific and the far-reaching ramification of the barrier it poses to the effectiveness of services and governance.

#### UNCAC and the Review Mechanism in the Pacific

1. UNCAC is a legally binding, global anti-corruption instrument that is unique in its holistic approach. It adopts prevention and enforcement measures, including mandatory requirements for criminalizing corrupt behaviours. The Convention reflects the transnational nature of corruption and its links to organized crime, providing an international legal basis for enabling international cooperation and recovering proceeds of corruption (i.e. stolen assets). The important role of government, the private sector and civil society in fighting corruption is also emphasized.
2. UNCAC was adopted by the General Assembly in October 2003 and came into effect in December 2005. As of February 2020, 187 countries including the European Union have become States parties to UNCAC, representing a ground-breaking commitment to address corruption.23 Since the beginning of the UN-PRAC Project, UNODC and UNDP have led efforts to advance UNCAC ratification/ accession and
3. UNDP and UNESCAP (2018), *2018 Pacific SDGs Progress Wheels*, [https://www.pacific.undp.org/content/dam/fiji/docs/UNDP-PO-](https://www.pacific.undp.org/content/dam/fiji/docs/UNDP-PO-2018-Pacific-SDG-Progress-Wheels.pdf) [2018-Pacific-SDG-Progress-Wheels.pdf](https://www.pacific.undp.org/content/dam/fiji/docs/UNDP-PO-2018-Pacific-SDG-Progress-Wheels.pdf)
4. UNODC (2020), *Signature and Ratification Status – United Nations Convention against Corruption*, [https://www.unodc.org/unodc/](https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/ratification-status.html) [en/corruption/ratification-status.html](https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/ratification-status.html).

implementation in the region. All PICs (a total of 14, excluding Tokelau as a territory of New Zealand) have ratified or acceded to the Convention: PNG in 2007, Fiji in 2008, Palau in 2009, Vanuatu, the Cook Islands and the Marshall Islands in 2011, the Solomon Islands, Federated States of Micronesia and Nauru in 2012, Kiribati in 2013, Tuvalu in 2015, Niue in 2017, Samoa in 2018 and Tonga in 2020.

1. In 2009, the CoSP established the UNCAC Review Mechanism, a unique, inter-governmental peer review process. Pursuant to resolution 3/1, States parties undergo, as part of the Mechanism, a self- assessment that is followed by a peer review, resulting in a final report (and its executive summary) on the implementation by the country of the UNCAC provisions under review. There are two review cycles, with the first focusing on Chapters III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and IV (International cooperation), and the second cycle focusing on Chapters II (Preventive measures) and V (Asset recovery).
2. UN-PRAC was integral to the Pacific’s completion of the UNCAC reviews. As UNODC is the guardian of the Convention and its Review Mechanism, the UNODC adviser under UN-PRAC provided a substantive role in supporting PICs during the review process, including providing training to Focal Points and reviewing experts, the completion of the self-assessment checklists (including, upon request, in-country support), attendance during country visits of PICs, and facilitation during the meetings of the Implementation Review Group, CoSP and the Pacific UNCAC reviews (including the drafting of the UNCAC review reports and executive summaries). The UNODC adviser under UN-PRAC has continued this work into cycle two of the UNCAC reviews, as some PICs are preparing for this second cycle, while others have completed the process.
3. During Phase I (2012-2016) of UN-PRAC, the Project assisted 13 PICs in completing their UNCAC self- assessments. Countries’ self-assessments not only focused on their legislative frameworks in terms of implementing UNCAC, but also their institutional frameworks and how they operationalize this in practice. This included an examination of the laws, other measures and how institutions coordinate and collaborate, and research on case law, statistics on the number of complaints received, investigations carried out, prosecutions taken forward, outcomes of cases and so forth. A comprehensive self-assessment is crucial to a successful UNCAC review, as it provides the basis upon which reviewers develop their findings
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and recommendations. In cases where self-assessments are weak, reviews are often delayed, and

the outcomes are less well grounded in evidence and the current context. The UNCAC reviews of the Pacific were delivered in a relatively timely manner, which can be attributed to the comprehensive self- assessments and support provided by UN-PRAC.

1. While the Convention is a solid anti-corruption framework and provides a benchmark for assisting countries with their reforms, it has been the UNCAC reviews that have acted as a driver for the provision of technical assistance, and these reviews will also be key in determining how PICs are responding to the new and existing forms of corruption occurring in response to **COVID-19**. The review process allows governments to assess existing frameworks and consider how they might be further strengthened in line with the Convention. Being involved throughout the UNCAC review process, the UN-PRAC team has a solid appreciation for where reform priorities exist and can advocate and advise governments and other stakeholders on how to prioritize and address review recommendations. It is to be noted that countries are at different stages of development and national anti-corruption priorities vary. The UNCAC review recommendations will therefore neither be implemented uniformly across the Pacific nor at the same pace. The UN-PRAC team is merely a facilitator of the process and can support Pacific States parties to address recommendations, upon request.
2. In the Pacific, emphasis is placed on Pacific-Pacific learning and sharing of experiences. Pacific Islanders have appreciated the experiences of fellow Pacific Islanders as contexts may be unique but are relatable.

#### Phase I (2012-16) and Phase II (2016-2021) of the UN-PRAC Project

1. To support PICs in their implementation of UNCAC, achieve progress towards SDG 16 and develop anti-corruption systems, a joint project between UNDP and UNODC – the UN-PRAC Project – was established in 2012 to work with all 14 PICs.24 Phase I was funded by the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) in the amount of USD 4,302,968. With the success of its first phase, UN-PRAC
2. The countries include: the Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tokelau (Territory of), Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

is currently in its Phase II. This started on 1 July 2016 and with the recent no-cost extension due to the **COVID-19** crisis, will run until 30 June 2021. UN-PRAC aims to support PICs to promote effective, transparent and accountable governments as primary vehicles of effective and fair services to citizens and create enabling environment for trade, business, investment and sustainable development in the Pacific. The two main backbones of UN-PRAC are UNCAC and SDG 16. UN-PRAC is managed jointly by UNODC and UNDP and is based in UNDP’s Effective Governance Unit in the UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji. Phase II is also funded by DFAT in the amount of AUD 7,159,592.



1. The Project was recognized by the CoSP as a global model for joint UN action in the fight against corruption and noted this in resolution 7/7 from 2017 and resolution 8/11 from 2019. DFAT has also referred to UN-PRAC as a globally unique partnership between two UN agencies. More on this resolution is noted in the next section. This unique inter-agency partnership also aligns with the main objectives of the UN reform process and the idea of UN delivering as one and achieving joint results.
2. Phase I (2012–2016) of the UN-PRAC Project aimed to support PICs fight corruption by: i) strengthening political will to endorse strong policy and legal frameworks aimed at implementing UNCAC; ii) strengthening the capacity of key national anti-corruption institutions and non-State actors to more effectively tackle corruption; and iii) promoting more informed anti-corruption policy and advocacy by conducting tailored research and sharing knowledge.
3. Phase II (2016-2021) of the UN-PRAC Project aims to help PICs fight corruption by: i) promoting the accession to UNCAC by Niue, Samoa and Tonga and supporting Pacific States parties to actively participate in the UNCAC review process; ii) supporting PICs to strengthen national anti-corruption legislation and policies, as well as institutional frameworks and capabilities to advance their effective implementation of UNCAC; and iii) providing support on the demand side of accountability, mainly through support of stronger engagement of non-government actors in the oversight of corruption, and in design of tools for more transparent service delivery.
4. As noted earlier, UN-PRAC was successful in fostering the ratification/ accession of 14 PICs, most recently, the accession of Niue, Samoa and Tonga in Phase II of the Project. The UNCAC review process allowed governments to assess their countries’ existing frameworks and consider how they might be further strengthened in line with the Convention. Dialogue initiated through the review process further provided a solid basis for in-depth cooperation on UNCAC implementation. Being involved in the self- assessment, review process and its follow-up, the UN-PRAC team has a solid appreciation for where reform priorities exist and how to advocate and advise governments and other stakeholders to address recommendations. These can be addressed by the government, other national stakeholders, through UN- PRAC or by other technical assistance providers. In relation to strengthening key national anti-corruption institutions, UN-PRAC worked closely with the Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati,
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Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, PNG, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu (for details, see UN- PRAC’s annual progress reports).

1. UN-PRAC conducted considerable advocacy activities, awareness-raising and strengthening of non- State actors of 14 PICs, varying from CSOs to youth groups, the media and private sector, to prevent and fight corruption. South-South exchanges have been key to the UN-PRAC Project. Pacific-Pacific capacity- building was also proven beneficial as States parties shared their expertise and sought assistance from their neighbours. For example, for three years, Fiji’s Financial Intelligence Unit (FIU) hosted visiting Pacific FIU personnel at its Suva Headquarters. UN-PRAC’s intensive work in the Solomon Islands led to the design and development of the Transparency and Accountability Project (TAP), a unique partnership funded by the Government of Solomon Islands itself to provide support and structure to the implementation of the Solomon Islands Anti-Corruption Strategy. UN-PRAC provided support to TAP by complementing and reinforcing the nationally-led activities and facilitating access to regional and global knowledge networks. UN-PRAC also focused on South-South learning in the Pacific and internationally, including through the International Anti-Corruption Conference (IACC), UNDP’s Community of Practice, the International Global Organization of Parliamentarians against Corruption (GOPAC) Conferences and CoSP. UN-PRAC also supported the Pacific Youth Council in its establishment of PYFAC, a prominent network in respective countries on anti-corruption.
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1. UN-PRAC has also played a role and provided technical support in a variety of anti-corruption legislative efforts in PICs. In 2018, the Solomon Islands adopted a package of anti-corruption legislation and are already in a process of recruitment of management for the Solomon Islands Independent Commission Against Corruption (SIICAC), which will seek to adopt legislation on RTI. Samoa, Kiribati and Vanuatu are currently looking at the institutional set-up for preventing and fighting against corruption with also UN-PRAC’s support. The demand for specialized trainings on investigation, prosecution, anti-money laundering and other specific issues has increased. Vanuatu has started implementing its RTI legislation and oversight reports have noted an impact. In PNG, the Government has declared anti-corruption to be an immediate policy priority, specifically the adoption of the ICAC Bill, which was reviewed and commented on by UN-PRAC on two separate occasions (in 2013 and 2019). UN-PRAC also supported Kiribati with the regional anti-corruption conference for the Pacific held in February 2020, which lead to the adoption of the Teieniwa Vision: Pacific Unity Against Corruption. UN-PRAC further supported Pacific States parties in spearheading resolution 7/7 at the 7th session of the CoSP and resolution 8/11 at the 8th session of the CoSP, both on strengthening the implementation of the UNCAC in SIDS.
2. In relation to knowledge products, the UN-PRAC team develops bi-annual newsletters and factsheets on relevant anti-corruption themes and practices. This has included the Advisory Note: **COVID-19** and Corruption in the Pacific, which provides recommendations for Pacific Governments to respond to the increase in new and existing forms of corruption inhibiting and, at times, brought about by the **COVID-19** response.25 The Pacific Islands Anti-Corruption Directory, developed by UN-PRAC, detailed the governance and integrity institutions in each PIC relevant to preventing and fighting corruption in PICs. The UNCAC review information of 10 PICs was analyzed and published as thematic publications on Chapter III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and Chapter IV (International cooperation). These publications drew on regional trends, challenges, good practices and areas of common interest. UN- PRAC also collaborated with the PYFAC to publish a regional Youth Anti-Corruption Advocates Toolkit. Other UN-PRAC led publications have included: informational notes on holistic integrity frameworks to address corruption, RTI in the Pacific, action taken by Pacific legislatures to address corruption and promote public accountability and transparency, Pacific civil society engagement to address corruption and promote public accountability and transparency, economic and social impacts of corruption in the Pacific, and good practices in public service excellence to prevent corruption; papers on holistic integrity frameworks to address corruption, the role of non-State actors and citizens in corruption prevention in the Pacific, and the status of RTI in PICs; and factsheets on UNCAC, including an overview of UNCAC, Chapter II: Preventative measures, Chapter III: Criminalization and law enforcement, Chapter IV: International cooperation, and Chapter V: Asset recovery; a briefing note on public service excellence to prevent corruption; and UN-PRAC’s submissions to the Australian Parliament’s *Inquiry into strengthening Australia’s relationships with countries in the Pacific Region,* the *Inquiry into Australia activating greater trade and investment with Pacific Island countries* and the *Inquiry into the implications of the* ***COVID-19*** *pandemic for Australia’s foreign affairs, defence and trade*.
3. On a broader educational front, UN-PRAC is supporting the University of the South Pacific (USP) in the development of a 200-level anti-corruption course, as part of the Diploma in Leadership and Governance Programme to be finalized in 2020 and rolled out in 2021. Complementing this partnership with the USP, UN-PRAC also signed a partnership with the Australia Pacific Training Coalition (APTC) as a recognized centre of training excellence, helping Pacific Islander citizens gain Australian-standard skills and qualifications for a wide range of vocational careers. This partnership between APTC and UN-PRAC is framed around development, delivery and long-term integration of anti-corruption contents into the APTC’s educational programmes. This provides a strategic entry point for anti-corruption education for a broad range of stakeholders, including managers and leaders with different educational and professional backgrounds who could apply and share this knowledge in their daily work in the Pacific region.
4. The mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the UN-PRAC Project’s second phase was performed in the second half of 2018. The MTE concluded that UN-PRAC continues to work comprehensively throughout the region and is well aligned with the UN foundational documents that define its work, including the SDGs, the UN Secretariat’s Biennial Strategic Framework, UNDP’s Strategic Plan and UNPS. The evaluation also found that UN-PRAC’s work is highly relevant in the region and is becoming a focus of the international community that wants to ensure the establishment and maintenance of anti-corruption systems. The MTE found that the Project is on track to achieve its stated outputs and outcomes through its cost-effective delivery of activities in a timely manner. The MTE also noted that the Project has had a measurable impact related to establishing anti-corruption systems in the region and that these systems are sustainable beyond the duration of the Project. Working with partners and building effective networks of key actors in the region that allow for the sharing of knowledge and the exchange of information amongst anti- corruption champions has been key to this success. The evaluation identified that the Project’s regional focus has allowed space to manoeuvre and focus its resources and expertise in PICs that are ready, willing and able to receive support. UN-PRAC has worked comprehensively to prevent and fight corruption and has contributed to the establishment of anti-corruption systems in several countries by promoting networks and relationships throughout the region. The Project’s partnerships and collaborations have also contributed to its efficiency and ability to provide timely technical advice and support to beneficiaries. The MTE found that UN-PRAC’s use of multi-activity missions has also made the Project more efficient and cost-effective. However, the evaluation noted that more can be done to ensure that the Project has targeted activities for women and mainstreams the gender dimension in all activities. To address
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1. UNODC and UNDP (2020), *Advisory Note: COVID-19 and Corruption in the Pacific*, [https://www.undp.org/content/dam/fiji/docs/](https://www.undp.org/content/dam/fiji/docs/COVID19-and-Corruption-in-the-Pacific.pdf) [COVID19-and-Corruption-in-the-Pacific.pdf](https://www.undp.org/content/dam/fiji/docs/COVID19-and-Corruption-in-the-Pacific.pdf).

this recommendation, the Programme will specifically work on improved analysis of gender implications and integration of gender considerations across all outputs and activities, but also on specific tools that would address women’s capacity and knowledge needs in the fight against corruption. The MTE also recommended that the focus on RTI should be increased, both of which shall be incorporated into Phase III of UN-PRAC.

1. Encouraged by these findings and results, as well as eight years of implementation of UN-PRAC, Phase III of the Programme will continue to draw on the lessons learned and successes of UN-PRAC. Some lessons to highlight include: the need for political will; the active and supportive involvement of national stakeholders, often public officials, is pertinent to furthering national anti-corruption reforms; support and networking of integrity champions, nationally and regionally, builds a sense of collective purpose, trust and support; the use of existing entry points, notably the UNCAC reviews to work with governments to assess their existing anti-corruption frameworks, but also the fostering of dialogue has led to in-depth collaboration and cooperation between UN-PRAC and PICs on UNCAC implementation; being involved in the self-assessments, the UNCAC review process and its follow-up, the UN-PRAC team has a solid appreciation for where reform priorities exist and how to advocate and advise governments and other stakeholders to address the UNCAC review recommendations; the institutional and capacity-building of national stakeholders needs to be tailored to the right participants and be more of a focus of Phase III; the fostering of notably Pacific-Pacific learning and capacity-building is to continue; that advocacy and awareness-raising is best guided and delivered by national State and non-State actors with technical support from UN-PRAC; the regional focus of UN-PRAC has provided it with space to manoeuvre and focus its resources and expertise in PICs that are ready, willing and able to receive support; the use of multi-activity and multi-sectoral missions has allowed the Project to maximize its impact, while minimizing costs associated; UN-PRAC’s long-term engagement with PICs has promoted a network of relationships that support the ownership and sustainability of anti-corruption reforms; partnerships with a wide range of actors in the Pacific are key to development effectiveness; and a whole-of-society approach to preventing and fighting corruption is key with a wide range of stakeholders for long-term impacts. Phase III of the Programme will be a natural progression from the outcomes pursued under Phase II. UN-PRAC
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will continue to work with PICs to achieve its objectives through activities informed by national anti-

corruption policies/ NACS adopted by PICs and an enhanced support through capacity-building and trainings. This Phase will also incorporate an enhanced focus on innovation (also a lesson learned during **COVID-19**), which will play a substantial role in the design of Programme activities.

# 2. STRATEGY

### Theory of Change

1. The indicative theory of change is derived from the situation analysis described above, and the findings of the MTE and DFAT feedback in the Partner Performance Assessments. In light of this, the proposed theory of change takes into consideration the following factors:

* Continued use of UNCAC and SDG 16 as the backbone and normative frameworks for the Programme;
* Ensure continuity of UN-PRAC’s approach, building on the last eight years of investment in the Pacific region;
* Explore new and more nuanced governance interventions, particularly for PICs that have adopted anti-corruption policies/ NACS and legislations;
* Nourish established partnerships and explore new ones;
* Increase innovation, utilization of networks and peer-exchange as an operating platform;
* Maintain focus on youth, increase gender-focused and gender mainstreaming activities and other non-State actors;
* Strongly integrate the implications of **COVID-19** specifically on anti-corruption and overall sustainable development efforts through the analysis, objectives and activities.

UN-PRAC’s proposed theory of change is informed by the situation analysis represented in Figure 1 below.

**PATHWAY FROM THE PROBLEM TREE**

Corruption is challenging across most levels and sectors of the Pacific, with weak governance structures in place to address corruption. COVID-19 has further exacerbated corruption in the region.

PICs ratified/acceded UNCAC and committed to the SDGs but implementation has been challenging

No universal adoption of Pacific anti- corruption committment (although the Boe Action Plan includes anti-corruption)

Weak institutions Outdated or weak laws Limited progress on anti- corruption policies

Weak enforcement of existing laws and policies

Poor public sector HR practices Poor delivery of public services Competing priorities and need for balance between emergency response (e.g. COVID-19) and long-term development and structural reforms

Limited number of CSOs working on anti-corruption and limited capacities of these CSOs

Media lacks anti-corruption training to sufficient report on corruption and media freedoms can be limited

Private sector engagement weak on corruption

Limited capacities of non-State actors to proactively contribute to the fight aganst corruption during and post COVID-19

Global agendas still often seen by PICs as extenally imposed Regional bodies still not actively engaged with key global governance agendas

Small societies have limited HR capacities

Close kinship ties can lead to conflicts of interest

Some Pacific citizens are not fully aware of the role of government in service delivery

COVID-19 crisis has additionally stretched the limited institutional and HR capacities

Role of civil society and media not often regarded as being an accountablity tool for democracy Many Pacific citizens have limited understanding of their role in

ensuring accountable governance COVID-19 created new risks, but also new opportunities for improved role of civil society,

media and the private sector to address corruption risks
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Corruption still a sensitive issue for PIC leadership - not yet actively accepted by all Leaders as an area for action

Modern concepts of democracy such as accuntability and transparency are still maturing in the region

Leadership can be influenced by traditional and customary structures

Many Pacific citizens still rely on customary structures for service delivery

1. Based on this situation analysis, Phase III of UN-PRAC will focus on corruption prevention and the strengthening of national integrity systems, so that an enabling and transparent environment for economic and sustainable development is created. This increases regional collaboration and the greater exchange of information, and focuses on disrupting the flow of criminal proceeds, also generated by organized crime, for a more safe and secure Pacific.
2. To achieve this theory of change, UN-PRAC takes a whole-of-society approach. Governments are arguably the most responsible parties, but sustainable results can only be achieved through consolidated efforts by governments, the private sector, civil society and the media, as well as citizens. The first layer of the whole-of-society approach requires transparency, accountability and dialogue as the main vehicles that will enable governments and citizens of PICs to build the necessary trust and create checks and balances for a healthy governance environment. The second layer is the strengthening of regional exchange and building joint capacities wherever appropriate, in an environment of small jurisdictions.



* PIC Governments willing to continue to devote resources to anti- corruption efforts
* MPs committed to enacting laws and using oversight powers to address corruption
* Integrity institutions willing and able to work with UN-PRAC
* Service delivery institutions willing to try pilots to improve accountability
* Education institutions have the will and capacities to integrate anti-corruption into the curriculum
* Non-State actors interested in working on anti-corruption and willing to devote energy and time to learning and implementing anti-corruption initiatives
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**Assumptions at each level**

* Supportive leadership shown on anti-corruption from PIC leaders/ integrity champions
* PIC Governments remain committed to UNCAC and SDGs implementation
* Integrity institutions seek to be strengthened
* Public service open to reforms
* Government officials and MPs willing to work with non-State actors
* Anti-corruption integration into the education curriculum prioritized by governments and adopted by education authorities
* Non-State actors prepared to effectively engage on anti- corruption
* Pacific leaders and governments willing to further analyze and address COVID-19 governance risks

Political instability stalls legislative and high-level reforms Changing Government Staff in partner countries

Lack of human and financial resources on the side of the governments

Local cultures and traditions not aligned with the contemporary understanding and addressing corruption

Lack of relevant corruption related statistics and data in the region Geographically challenging region with a risk of natural disasters and pandemics (e.g. COVID-19), difficult accessibility and commuting, and weak internet capacities

•

•

* Lack of political will

•

•

•

•

**Risks**

**Target countries:** Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu.

## UN PACIFIC REGIONAL ANTI-CORRUPTION PROGRAMME: THEORY OF CHANGE

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **GOAL:** The UN-PRAC Programme aims to support Pacific Island countries (PICs) and the territory of Tokelau:  (i) to strengthen their national integrity systems, in order to promote effective, transparent and accountable governments; (ii) to create an enabling environment for trade, business, investment and sustainable development; and (iii) to foster an environment that ensures emergency responses and socio-economic recovery efforts (for example, in response to COVID-19) are free from corruption. In turn, this will enhance the delivery of equitable and high-quality services to all Pacific Islanders. | | |
| **GLOBAL**  Outcome 1: PICs more effectively implement UNCAC and work towards achievement of SDG 16 | **NATIONAL**  Outcome 2: PICs strengthen broader governance frameworks in line with UNCAC and SDG 16 | **COMMUNITY**  Outcome 3: PICs’ State and non-State actors more effectively engage and partner to prevent and fight corruption |
| * **Output 1.1:** Broader anti-corruption agenda contributed to by PICs * **Output 1.2:** Follow-up to the UNCAC peer reviews recommendations successfully implemented by PICs * **Output 1.3:** UNCAC and SDG requirements addressed by PICs through anti-corruption policies and laws | * **Output 2.1:** Key PIC integrity institutions strengthened * **Output 2.2:** PICs’ public service excellence enhanced * **Output 2.3:** Effective knowledge sharing in and among PICs promoted | * **Output 3.1:** Anti-corruption knowledge and oversight capacities of PICs’ Parliaments increased * **Output 3.2:** Pacific civil society, gender equality organizations, media and private sector enhanced as proactive actors in awareness- raising and corruption oversight * **Output 3.3:** Anti-corruption education platforms in the Pacific increased |
| * Regional and/or sub-regional anti- corruption vision for the Pacific developed in line with UNCAC, SDG 16 and regional agendas * Pacific Anti-Corruption Community of Practice/network established and supported * Pacific States parties to UNCAC participated in the CoSP and other relevant anti-corruption fora * The 2030 Agenda in the Pacific supported * Follow-up on the UNCAC reviews ensured through national workshops * UNCAC review recommendations prioritized by Pacific States parties * National anti-corruption policies/ strategies developed/ strengthened and their implementation monitored * Anti-corruption legislation strengthened | * Institutional capacity on anti-corruption measures enhanced through technical assistance * Establishment/ strengthening of integrity institutions enhanced * Pilot public service training strategies designed to build a cohort of public servants committed to accountable, transparent, people centred service- delivery * Support pilots to improve public service delivery integrity, with a particular focus on services critical to marginalized people * PICs benefitted from technical support and peer-to-peer exchanges through Pacific- Pacific cooperation * Regional and country-level partnerships on corruption prevention supported * Knowledge products, reports and policy briefs on Pacific trends, challenges, good practices and related information   developed and shared with the Pacific anti- corruption network | * Parliamentarians engaged and capacitated to support national anti-corruption efforts * Oversight and accountability functions of legislative bodies improved * Regional CSO anti-corruption networks supported * Regional and national anti-corruption civil society, media and private sector initiatives enhanced and integrate specific gender/ corruption issues * Anti-corruption integration into the education curriculum at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels supported * Partnerships on anti-corruption integration into skills development and research enhanced |

**Inputs:** Technical advice + national and regional dialogues + South-South/peer-based exchanges + small grants + knowledge sharing

**Colour key: Activity Output Outcome Impact**

1. Some of the “tools” that UN-PRAC has at its disposal to drive this theory of change forward, include:

* UNCAC and SDG 16 as entry points for the anti-corruption discourse in PICs;
* UN-PRAC’s reference to the two key UN agencies working on corruption: UNODC brings the technical capacity in terms of UNCAC, its Review Mechanism and related processes, and UNDP brings the wider governance scope, including an extensive network of institutional and non-governmental partners and focus on democratic and economic governance in a wider sense. The latter also brings a platform for engagement and cross-fertilization with other development initiatives, for which there is already a strong track record;
* UN-PRAC’s success in using the UNCAC review cycles, reflected in the universal accession to UNCAC in the Pacific and high number of UNCAC reviews completed, allowing the Programme to work with PICs on high-level strategic reforms and frameworks. UN-PRAC’s unique positioning to engage with partners and access information relevant to anti-corruption, also through the UNCAC Review Mechanism, allows it to be at the forefront in this area;
* UN-PRAC’s proven record in using the UNCAC review information and being able to provide technical assistance to not only governments, including at the highest levels, but also non-State actors in furthering the anti-corruption agenda not only nationally, but also regionally and internationally;
* UN-PRAC’s role as a broker and convener, bringing State and non-State actors into dialogue and providing them with capacity-building and “safe spaces” for discussion and collaboration;
* UN-PRAC’s long-term presence and established relationships with decision and policy-makers and non-State actors throughout PICs;
* UN-PRAC’s ability to work at regional and in-country levels, and access to global networks, exposing State and non-State actors from the Pacific to international good practices and peer exchanges;
* UN-PRAC’s holistic approach, looking at both increasing the infrastructure for better democratic and economic governance from the perspective of anti-corruption;
* Variety of technical support tools, ranging from policies and legislation, to institutional development and work on very specific issues, such as anti-money laundering, RTI and oversight on public financial management.
* UN-PRAC’s strong internal expertise and team capacities to respond and adjust to changing needs and priorities, and therefore remaining relevant, even in times of crisis (like **COVID-19**) and during/ post natural disasters (like recently Cyclone Harold).

#### Key Implementation Principles

1. The implementation of the Programme will be guided by the following key principles:

* *Responding flexibly, rapidly and effectively to Pacific needs:* In the Pacific, windows of opportunity for enabling effective reform can often be narrow and come about very quickly, particularly when governments are working quickly to respond rapidly to **COVID-19** and natural disasters. This Programme aims to be responsive to the needs of PICs as they arise, underpinned by strong partnerships and based upon impartiality, openness and mutual respect. Where demand is likely to exceed available resources, the UN-PRAC team will prioritize requests accordingly to what is in line with the outcomes of the Programme and as highlighted in the Multi-Year Work Plan. Within this ambit, the UN-PRAC team will respond not only flexibly but also effectively to different Pacific needs. This support extends beyond national anti-corruption policies and bodies to needs identified under the outcomes of this Project Document and in line with UNCAC and SDG16.

|  |
| --- |
| **Indicative Criteria for Prioritizing Country Requests** |
| 1. Link to Programme Outcomes 2. Potential for sustainability and impact as determined by the UN-PRAC team 3. Link to national policies and budgets 4. Potential to co-fund activity/task with respective governments/ other partners |

* *Responding sensitively to the Pacific context:* One-size-fits-all solutions do not work in strengthening governance and fighting corruption and can do more harm than good. This Programme supports implementing locally identified solutions led by local reform leaders, which are designed to address the country-specific context. UNDP and UNODC have therefore designed this Programme flexibly, to
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ensure that initiatives are demand-driven and, as such, respond appropriately to each PICs’ unique local circumstances. The Programme will further seek to take into consideration the outcomes of relevant fora for the Pacific, including the SIDS Acceleration Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathways and the adopted 2019 Action Plan to implement the Boe Declaration, which is in line with the 2014 Framework for Pacific Regionalism and the Blue Pacific Narrative.

* *Supporting holistic yet practical approaches and addressing short-term to long-term needs:* Sustainable anti-corruption reform requires changing attitudes and incentives over a long period of time, and this cannot be achieved through simplistic approaches or one-off activities. While this Programme is not designed to support every anti-corruption activity across the Pacific, it is intended to support strategic and long-term approaches that leverage political will and existing resources, building the momentum for reform and making practical in-roads in the fight against corruption. For there to be long-term change, long-term investment and commitment is required. Taking into consideration the need for long-term action and the structural challenges in the Pacific in terms of reforming legal and institutional frameworks, the Programme will expand its focus on exploring the axis of anti-corruption and service delivery, as well as design practical tools and actions for the prevention of corruption.
* *Promoting transparency for, and accountability to, citizens for achieving sustainable human development and SDG 16:* The UN places priority on fighting corruption in order to achieve the sustainable development outcomes for citizens, also in light of the 2030 Agenda, notably SDG 16. As such, this Programme will prioritize advocacy and support for increasing transparency and accountability of government decisions and activities, as well as ensuring citizen participation in the identification and implementation of anti-corruption reforms towards achieving sustainable human development.
* *Integrating gender and human rights throughout the Programme:* Empirical evidence supports a strong correlation between countries that have more open societies and greater empowerment of women, tending to have less corruption. At the same time, while society suffers from the negative effects of corruption, corruption has well known differential impacts on social groups, including differing impacts on women and men. With the recognition that the concepts of gender equality and anti-corruption are mutually reinforcing, the Programme will seek to prioritize a gendered approach
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to corruption which can support inclusive anti-corruption efforts in the Pacific.

As both UNDP and UNODC are committed to mainstreaming gender equality in their programme work, this Programme will tap into and build on existing agency resources and guidelines on integrating gender considerations into all of its activities. In addition, where appropriate, specific activities in support of gender equality in the anti-corruption context will also be considered. A specific focus of the Programme will be to improve women’s participation and, where possible, effective leadership throughout the Programme activities, as well as improve the active participation of women and girls in discussions and decision-making fora. The Programme will work on promoting and reinforcing regional gender-related norms and standards, and reporting will be designed to be gender responsive and raise gender-related issues to the extent possible. During **COVID-19**, it has also become increasingly evident that an environment conducive to protecting human rights has to be better fostered, including the rights to health, to education, to work and to an adequate standard of living, and the adoption of a human rights-based approach to addressing corruption.

* *Strengthening partnerships to further the implementation of the Programme:* Partnership is the foundation of this Programme. While the

collaboration of UNODC and UNDP is central to effectively implementing the Programme together with partner countries, there is a further commitment to strengthen existing and foster new partnerships with relevant regional organizations. The aim of strengthening partnerships is to draw on comparative advantages of different partners, as well as to leverage each other’s resources and influence. This, in turn, can complement the work of others in the region and aligns with SDG 17 on revitalizing global partnerships for sustainable development.

#### UNODC and UNDP Comparative Advantages

1. Corruption is a sensitive topic and is often difficult for donors and other partners to address in the Pacific region. This is the reason why the UN, through this Programme, has the comparative advantage and a proven track record of working with PICs on how to prevent and fight corruption. UN-PRAC uses the internationally accepted anti-corruption framework of UNCAC as the basis for engagement and the UNCAC reviews as the entry point for the provision of technical assistance. Drawing on the previous phases, the UN-PRAC team has developed extensive networks and relationships across the Pacific, being viewed as a trusted and reliable partner, to support the anti-corruption work of PICs.
2. As the Secretariat to the CoSP and its Review Mechanism, UNODC has a formal responsibility of supporting States to ratify and implement the Convention. UNODC has international expertise in reviewing and providing advice to States parties to strengthen their legislative frameworks, particularly in the areas of criminalization and law enforcement, international cooperation, and asset recovery. UNODC has worked with criminal justice systems around the world, including in the Asia-Pacific region, in notably on both prevention (e.g. judicial and prosecutorial integrity) and investigation (e.g. capacity-building for investigators, prosecutors and judges). This is further supported by UNODC’s Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok and by UNODC Headquarters.
3. As the UN’s largest development agency, UNDP has extensive experience in working with national counterparts across the Pacific and globally, to advance sustainable development and good governance, including through supporting anti-corruption reforms and strengthening collective actions of governments, civil society and the private sector in fighting corruption. UNDP has an extensive in-country presence in the Pacific, through the Pacific Office, Fiji Multi-Country Office, Samoa Multi-Country Office, PNG Country Office, UNDP Solomon Islands Sub-Office and local UN Joint Presence Offices in the Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Kiribati, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. As a result of its in-country presence and range of complementary in-country governance projects, the UN- PRAC Project was able to collaborate with colleagues in-country, leveraging existing relations and the practical ‘know how’ to deliver aid projects and results in PICs. UNDP has a proven track record in the Pacific of supporting locally-led reform efforts, aligned with national development priorities and building the capacity of Pacific Islanders to realize their development goals.

# 3. RESULTS AND PARTNERSHIPS

#### Expected Results

1. This Programme aims to support PICs and the territory of Tokelau: (i) to strengthen their national integrity systems, in order to promote effective, transparent and accountable governments; (ii) to create an enabling environment for trade, business, investment and sustainable development; and (iii) to foster an environment that ensures emergency responses and socio-economic recovery efforts (for example, in response to **COVID-19**) are free from corruption. In turn, this will enhance the delivery of equitable and high-quality services to all Pacific Islanders.

**Goal: To promote and strengthen measures to prevent and fight corruption more efficiently and effectively in the Pacific region**

1. The goal of the Programme is to promote and strengthen measures to prevent and fight corruption more efficiently and effectively in the Pacific region, which aligns with the purpose of the Convention in paragraph 1(a) and the spirit of SDG 16.

*Paragraph 1. Statement of purpose The purposes of this Convention are:*

(a) *To promote and strengthen measures to prevent and combat corruption more efficiently and effectively; …*
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1. UNCAC is the guiding framework of this Programme. In order to achieve the overarching goal of this Programme, three outcomes are prioritized:

* Outcome 1: PICs more effectively implement UNCAC and work towards the achievement of SDG 16
* Outcome 2: PICs strengthen broader governance frameworks in line with UNCAC and SDG 16
* Outcome 3: PICs’ State and non-State actors more effectively engage and partner to prevent and fight corruption

1. The outcomes are a natural progression from Phase II of UN-PRAC. For example, UNCAC accession, one of the objectives of the outcome 1 of Phase II, was achieved. However, that automatically increases the demand for technical support in the other two outcomes. Requests range widely, from support for policy and legislative reviews and advice, institutional capacity development, dialogue/ convening among various actors, support to specific issues such as anti-money laundering and RTI, social accountability mechanisms, transparent service delivery and addressing corruption in the private sector. UN-PRAC interventions are increasingly informed by the national anti-corruption policies/ NACS that are being adopted by PICs. While maintaining a similar structure and focus at the outcome level, the intention is to factor in lessons learned, introduce an enhanced focus and innovation in implementation.

**Outcome 1: PICs more effectively implement UNCAC and work towards achievement of SDG 16**

1. This outcome is envisioned as the new iteration of outcome 1 of Phase II of UN-PRAC and aims is to consolidate the work achieved on UNCAC accessions throughout the years, further increase the Pacific’s exposure to the global anti-corruption discourse and to follow through on the two cycles of the UNCAC Review Mechanism. Three indicative outputs are planned under this outcome:

* Output 1.1: Broader anti-corruption agenda contributed to by PICs;

20 • Output 1.2: Follow-up to the UNCAC peer reviews recommendations successfully implemented by PICs;

* Output 1.3: UNCAC and SDG requirements addressed by PICs through anti-corruption policies and laws.

1. Within the above outputs, UN-PRAC will work with PICs on systematically enhancing their national systems to follow through on their UNCAC and SDG 16 commitments. For PICs to contribute to the broader anti-corruption agenda, their exposure and participation will be important at the CoSP, IACC and other Indo-Pacific and international platforms offered by UNDP, UNODC, other UN agencies, TI and other relevant anti-corruption stakeholders. PICs’ contribution includes being increasingly responsive and active in these anti-corruption settings, and vice versa, regionalizing/ localizing global anti-corruption concepts.
2. Considering the transnational nature of corruption and its connection to other crimes and threats, the work under this outcome will explore ways of standardizing anti-corruption platforms and increasing collaboration and exchange, within the Pacific and between the Pacific and other countries, predominately in the Indo-Pacific region and with other SIDS.
3. The UNCAC Review Mechanism has and will continue to allow Pacific States parties to take stock of what national anti-corruption measures exist in line with UNCAC and what are the UNCAC review recommendations that they wish to focus on and prioritize going forwards. The follow-up to the UNCAC peer reviews have been important for PICs to appreciate not only what exists, but also what are good practices to share and challenges to take stock of, which may not be unique to any one country. The UNCAC Review Mechanism has provided an excellent entry point for UN-PRAC to work with governments in the Pacific region to support them with their anti-corruption narrative, to be owned and driven by PICs. The follow-ups to the UNCAC reviews have often led to the development or enhancement of national anti-corruption policies/ NACS and laws.
4. Based on the above, there has been increased demand for legal technical support. It is expected that more substantive resources will be spent on policy and legal work going forwards, particularly on national anti-corruption policies/ NACS, anti-corruption legislation such as whistleblower protection, money- laundering and addressing corruption in the private sector. Attention will also be paid to RTI policies and legislation, also outlined in the MTE findings and recommendations.
5. Under this outcome, UN-PRAC will seek to continue and build on furthering existing partnerships with PIFS, Pacific Islands Law Officer’s Network (PILON) and Australian Attorney-General’s Department, Pacific Legal Drafters’ Association, Commonwealth Ombudsman’s Office and others. The initiated collaboration with the Security Sector of PIFS will be furthered, in order to ensure bigger prominence of anti-corruption in also the regional security discourse through the Boe Declaration Action Plan.

#### Output 1.1: Global anti-corruption agenda informed by PIC priorities and experiences/ Broader anti- corruption agenda contributed to by PICs

1. This output is envisioned to focus primarily on CoSP and its subsidiary bodies, and other relevant anti-corruption fora, including the IACC and possibly the UN General Assembly special session against corruption in 2021. This output links to the goal of increasing the Pacific’s exposure to the global corruption discourse. For PICs to contribute to the broader anti-corruption agenda, their exposure and participation will be important at the CoSP, IACC and other Indo-Pacific and international platforms offered by UNDP, UNODC, other UN agencies, TI and other relevant stakeholders. PICs’ contribution includes being increasingly responsive and active in these anti-corruption settings, and vice versa, regionalizing/ localizing the global anti-corruption concepts.
2. Considering the transnational nature of corruption and its connection to other crimes and threats, such as transnational organized crime, the work under this output will explore ways of standardizing anti-corruption platforms and increasing collaboration and exchange, within the Pacific and between the Pacific and other countries, predominately in the Indo-Pacific region and with other SIDS.

*Activity Result 1.1.1: Pacific regional and/or sub-regional anti-corruption vision for the Pacific developed in line with UNCAC, SDG 16 and regional agendas*

1. This activity will support the emerging regional and/or sub-regional discourses that are evolving in the Pacific, including the development of an agreed regional vision for the fight against corruption in the Pacific. The Teieniwa Vision adopted at the Kiribati Conference held in February 2020 could be built upon and supported to garner broader Pacific endorsement. The Programme will continue to support the research, publications, events and communication products facilitating the formulation and recognition by Pacific States representatives of a Pacific anti-corruption vision/ Teieniwa Vision. This activity will be closely coordinated with PIFS, in line notably with the Boe Declaration Action Plan which recognizes tackling corruption as a priority to support the enabling environment for implementing the Declaration. Visibility for the regional and sub-regional engagements will be supported at the regional and global levels through the Programme supporting representation of the Pacific at relevant forums (cf: activity result 1.1.3).
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*Activity Result 1.1.2: Pacific Anti-Corruption Community of Practice/ network established and supported*

1. Building on the existing networks across the region, which already include a diverse range of officials, Members of Parliament (MPs), CSOs and experts, the Programme will more systematically support the establishment of a Pacific Anti-Corruption Community of Practice/ network, which will, in turn, support anti- corruption focal points and institutional champions in line with an adopted Pacific anti-corruption vision and in collaboration with PIFS. The network will be supported through a biennial meeting. Focus topics for the biennial meetings will be informed by the regional comparative analysis of UNCAC reviews and SDG Voluntary National Reports (VNRs), identified trends and entry points, as well as opportunities for regional partnerships such as collaboration with PILON, Pacific Association of Supreme Audit Institutions (PASAI) and/ or the Ombudsman’s Office of Australia and Chief Ombudsman’s Office of New Zealand. Space will be provided for line-Ministries and sector champions to present innovative solutions and promote whole- of-government approaches. The network will be further supported through peer-to-peer activities.

*Activity Result 1.1.3: Pacific States parties to UNCAC participate in the CoSP (and its subsidiary bodies where necessary) and other relevant anti-corruption fora including the IACC*

1. This activity allows for Pacific States parties to continue providing an invaluable voice not only for the region, but also for SIDS more generally at the sessions of the Implementation Review Group, as necessary, and the sessions of the CoSP, as well as other relevant anti-corruption fora including the IACC. There will be a degree of flexibility exercised by the Programme team, such as by allowing a Pacific State that has just completed its UNCAC review to be given preference to attend the following session of the Implementation Review Group. Funding for Pacific States to participate at the sessions of the Implementation Review Group and CoSP may be provided by UNODC Headquarters or through UN-PRAC, in consultation and by mutual arrangement with DFAT. The aim of this is to support the active participation of Pacific States parties to attend CoSP (and its subsidiary bodies). This may require preparatory activities under UNODC leadership, notably pre-CoSP workshops and/or trainings for the Pacific. The Pacific will be encouraged to actively participate through statements, including the sponsorship of CoSP resolutions and leadership of and/ or participation at side events.
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1. The participation of the Pacific at other relevant anti-corruption fora, including the IACC, will also be flexibly applied. The aim of such participation is to highlight specific anti-corruption impacts and/ or ensure the sharing of knowledge and expertise both to and from the Pacific. UN-PRAC will also substantively contribute to the IACC deliberations by consolidating and presenting the Pacific experiences in the fight against corruption, including through UN-PRAC led workshops and identification of anti-corruption champions from the region.

*Activity Result 1.1.4: The 2030 Agenda in the Pacific supported, with specific focus on innovative anti- corruption activities that can accelerate progress against SDG 16 targets and enable overall progress across all SDGs*

1. This activity involves mapping of existing efforts and identification of innovative anti-corruption activities that cannot only accelerate progress against the SDG16 targets, but also facilitate progress against all SDGs. The Asia and the Pacific SDG Progress Report 2019, based on the analysis conducted in partnership by UNDP, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia (UNESCAP) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB), notes that the Pacific region has effectively regressed since 2000 on several Goals, including peace, justice and strong institutions (Goal 16). Several indicators of SDG 16 have been identified as priorities for the Pacific by the Pacific Sustainable Development Indicators under the Pacific Roadmap for Sustainable Development. Given that some of the relevant anti-corruption and governance indicators, including in particular indicators 16.5.1, 16.5.2 and 16.6.2, have not been identified among the priority indicators in the Roadmap, the Programme’s activities will be instrumental in drawing attention to their continued importance not only for overall achievement of SDG 16, but also in terms of their horizontal relevance for achieving progress against all of the SDGs.
2. In this activity, the Programme will take advantage of the UNDP engagement and on-going partnerships at the regional and national levels on planning and reporting on the SDGs. The activity will commission a review of the existing literature and SDG planning and reporting publications and analysis using the lenses of anti-corruption as an accelerator and enabler of SDG achievement. The review will

help in identification of innovative anti-corruption activities that can accelerate progress against SDG 16 targets and facilitate overall progress across all SDGs. It will also be used to inform output 1.3. activities (technical support to legislation and NACS) and output 2.2 activities related to public service excellence and innovation.

1. In the context of the SDGs, these efforts and analytical work will also take into account the findings and recommendations of the UN’s ongoing socio-economic impact assessment of **COVID-19** in the Pacific with specific reference to the impact of **COVID-19** on governance and structural vulnerabilities under Pillar 5 on social cohesion and community resilience. Under the current Phase II of UN-PRAC, the team is already substantively contributing to these deliberations, including with the provision of anti- corruption inputs and reference to methodology on mainstreaming anti-corruption in the socio-economic impact assessment developed by the UNDP’s global anti-corruption team.
2. The above approach will help the Programme in reaffirming the indivisibility of the issues of sustainable development and the necessity of the fight against corruption. This, in turn, will ensure effective governance in the context of the Agenda 2030 and the SDGs.
3. The Programme will additionally work with UNESCAP and UN representation in the Pacific to ensure SDG reporting and planning takes into account the multiplier effect of anti-corruption achievements. This might take the form of joint events for SDG national focal points and taskforces or targeted publication or research to inform VNR or other SDG related processes.

#### Output 1.2: Follow-up to the UNCAC peer reviews recommendations successfully implemented by PICs

1. UNCAC States parties are required to participate in the inter-governmental peer review process on their implementation of the Convention. The first cycle of the UNCAC Review Mechanism addressed the legislative, institutional and practical frameworks in place to implement UNCAC Chapters III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and IV (International cooperation). The second cycle of the Mechanism commenced in 2016, focusing on UNCAC Chapters II (Preventive measures) and V (Asset recovery). The future of the Mechanism, including whether or not it will be extended and in what form, will be decided at the CoSP in the near future.
2. The UNCAC Review Mechanism has and will continue to allow Pacific States parties to take stock of what anti-corruption measures exist in line with UNCAC and what are recommendations to focus on and prioritize going forwards. The follow-up to the UNCAC peer reviews have been important for PICs to appreciate not only what exists, but also what are good practices to share and challenges to take stock of, which may not be unique to any one country. UN-PRAC see these reviews as being particularly important notably now, in times of a global pandemic, because UNCAC reviews can ensure that PICs are considering how corruption and insufficient accountability, transparency and oversight, can impact immediate responses to **COVID-19** and also in the socio-economic recovery efforts. The UNCAC Review Mechanism has provided an excellent entry point for UN-PRAC to work with governments in the Pacific region to support them with their anti-corruption narrative, to be owned and driven by PICs. The follow- ups to the UNCAC reviews have often led to the development or enhancement of national anti-corruption policies/ NACS and laws.

*Activity Result 1.2.1: Follow-up on the UNCAC reviews ensured through national workshops*

1. This activity focuses on supporting UNCAC-nominated Focal Points to organize and coordinate national workshops to discuss in detail the findings of the completed UNCAC reviews with a broad range of stakeholders. While the UNCAC review executive summaries are public documents, several Pacific States parties have also published their full reports.26
2. The workshops provide a forum in which the implementation of each UNCAC article is discussed, notably the good practices, and challenges including recommendations. The recommendations, together with the broader national anti-corruption agenda, are the basis of the workshops and links to activity result 1.2.2 on in how to progress UNCAC implementation. The Programme will encourage civil society,
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1. This documentation is available under the country profiles at: <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/country-profile/index.html>.

the private sector and other non-State actors to also be included, in particular as the recommendations of the UNCAC reviews may also include them. Where possible, the Programme will therefore work with the UNCAC Focal Points for the inclusive and participatory workshops to be the starting point of whole- of-society discussions on anti-corruption roadmaps or NACS, in line with output 1.3.

*Activity Result 1.2.2: Technical assistance to PICs regarding the implementation of UNCAC review recommendations, as requested*

1. This aims to support Pacific States to prioritize the recommendations of their UNCAC reviews. The focus would be on the mandatory provisions of the Convention, but PICs may also prioritize optional provisions. This prioritization phase may also result in an anti-corruption implementation plan or a NACS (e.g. the Cook Islands) that takes into account the recommendations of the UNCAC reviews (see activity result 1.3.1). As highlighted above, countries are at different stages of development and national anti- corruption priorities vary, which is the reason for why the form of technical assistance is likely to also vary between PICs. The UNCAC review recommendations will neither be implemented uniformly across the Pacific nor at the same pace nor in the same manner.

#### Output 1.3: UNCAC and SDG requirements addressed by PICs through anti-corruption policies and laws

1. As noted above, the UNCAC review process provides a wealth of information that can be used to develop or enhance national anti-corruption policies and laws. Based on the review process, there has been increased demand for legal support. This output targets this demand by providing more substantive resources to policy and legal work, particularly on national anti-corruption policies/NACS, anti-corruption legislation, such as whistleblower protection and money-laundering, and addressing corruption in the private sector, notably now during and post **COVID-19**. This output acknowledges the need for increased dedication to RTI policies and legislation and will focus particular attention on this work; as seen during **COVID-19**, the importance of timely access to up-to-date and accurate information through open, clear communication and outreach channels between the public and government is crucial.
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*Activity Result 1.3.1: National anti-corruption policies/ strategies developed/ strengthened, and their*

*implementation monitored*

1. This activity focuses on the development, establishment and strengthening, as well as the monitoring of anti-corruption polices/ NACS, often drawing on the recommendations and technical assistance needs identified through the UNCAC reviews. The Programme will also encourage NACS that provide a holistic anti-corruption approach to preventing and fighting corruption that take into consideration the increases in corruption and new forms of corruption that can come about during global pandemics (e.g. **COVID-19**) and other health emergencies, and natural disasters. UN-PRAC also encourage NACS to include broad stakeholder involvement that includes a cost-benefit analysis to reform prior to commencement as well as clearly established interlinkages with SDG agenda. An anti-corruption policy/ NACS could then be used by PIC Governments to manage a coordinated multi-donor approach to anti-corruption in-country. This allows for a reduction of transaction costs for PICs and avoids a piecemeal approach of donors and technical assistance providers. Ideally, a PIC would be the driver of this coordinated approach, allowing it to align donor interests with its own anti-corruption policy/ NACS. Activities will include, inter alia: support to the development of anti-corruption policies/ NACS in line with UNCAC article 5; support to the establishment of a coordinating body to ensure the implementation of NACS in line with UNCAC article 6; and support to the national monitoring, evaluation and reporting of the NACS through institutional processes, as well as the oversight of national stakeholders.

*Activity Result 1.3.2: Anti-corruption legislation strengthened*

1. The UNCAC review recommendations have highlighted legislative drafting as required in key areas of the Convention, including for mandatory provisions. The aim of this activity is to support Pacific States parties to strengthen their legislation in this regard. The aim of this activity is therefore to, inter alia: review draft anti-corruption legislation; and provide legislative drafting to Pacific States parties in addressing their UNCAC review recommendations. This activity may also include national and regional anti-corruption trainings on specific legislation (e.g. whistleblower protection, procurement, RTI) and policies, as requested.
2. As seen during **COVID-19**, adequate legal frameworks need to be in place to order to be able to address such a crisis. This includes being able to adopt emergency legislation and policies, as well as public procurement measures and more to handle disasters such as **COVID-19**. For example, procurement guidance should be updated to ensure that it is straight-forward, transparent and accountable, and that the urgent need to disburse funds and resources quickly is met with adequate auditing, oversight, accountability and reporting mechanisms. Centralized procurement procedures to assure the nationwide supply of essential goods may further assist to avoid individual hoarding and price-gouging.

**Outcome 2: PICs strengthen broader governance frameworks in line with UNCAC and SDG 16**

1. Outcome 2 will build on the policy and legal work of outcome 1, complemented by support to institutional capacities and the building of integrity platforms to implement those policies and laws effectively. The activities would capitalize on the information received in line with UNCAC reviews in order to support PICs in realizing their obligations under UNCAC and SDG 16. The activities will be prioritized by the UN- PRAC team based on the needs identified by PICs on demand and through specific requests. These activities will be in line with the focus areas of UNDP and UNODC, and as provided for in the UNDP Regional Programme Document for Asia and the Pacific, UNODC’s Regional Programme for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and the UNPS (2018-2022), noting that these will be updated.
2. This Outcome will consist of three outputs:

* Output 2.1: PICs’ institutional anti-corruption frameworks strengthened;
* Output 2.2: PICs’ public service excellence efforts and initiatives enhanced through anti-corruption tools and innovation;
* Output 2.3: Effective knowledge sharing in and among PICs promoted.

1. The increasing demand for activities under outcome 2 and tremendous appreciation by PICs for assistance received in this regard was highlighted in Phase II of UN-PRAC. Capacity-building is increasingly important as PICs’ progress with their policy and legislative frameworks. This is particularly true of Pacific States willing to embrace a holistic approach to anti-corruption where a wide range of stakeholders need to contribute. Outcome 2 builds on this and aims to explore an even more nuanced approach towards ongoing support, as articulated by DFAT in its Partner Performance Assessments.
2. Under the three outputs, UN-PRAC will further explore how to best contribute to capacity-building. Besides standard trainings and workshops, UN-PRAC will likely dedicate more resources to peer-to-peer exchanges and fostering of networks. It will also explore potential to develop inter-regional technical capacity, such as on legislative drafting, money-laundering, RTI, public excellence innovation and other emerging issues, such as sectoral corruption and corruption risks that can arise during pandemics, including **COVID-19**. Existing examples such as the UNDP supported “Floating Budget Office”, joint- interparliamentary capacities on budget accountability and oversight will be explored as case studies. This will be supported by activities under output 2.3, focused on building consolidated knowledge resources, in which UN-PRAC will look at collaboration with PIFS, PILON, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, PASAI, Pacific Legal Drafters’ Association, TI and others. This approach also reflects on the MTE recommendation to increase multilateral and bilateral interactions among beneficiaries.
3. Output 2.2 focuses on broader anti-corruption related governance reforms in the public sector. A more comprehensive effort to address corruption risks in the public service notably in the provision of services to citizens, as well as ensuring the on-going initiatives on public administration reforms and specific reforms during pandemics (e.g. clear, objective and transparent criteria for the qualification of beneficiaries and recipients of **COVID-19** funds). These initiatives will be supported through adequate anti-corruption tools and innovation. This approach also aims to reflect DFAT’s recommendation for a more nuanced approach to the governance structure around anti-corruption.27 To enrich the operational modalities and draw on extensive change management and public service technical assistance already provided by DFAT in the region, the
4. UNDP (2015), *Complexity in Small Island Developing States*, [https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/global-centre-for-public-service-excellence/complexity-small-islands/) [building/global-centre-for-public-service-excellence/complexity-small-islands/](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/global-centre-for-public-service-excellence/complexity-small-islands/)
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purpose would be for UN-PRAC to look at people-centered design exercises, strategic coalition-building, behavioral science and innovation overall. Collaboration with relevant innovation partners will be explored. Considering that the Pacific has challenges in accessing technology and resources, low technological and community-based solutions will be the focus. The main imperative will be to find collaborative and Pacific- sensitive solutions. The 2030 Agenda will serve as an overarching framework for cross-fertilization of governance benefits across various services, sectors and actors.

1. This outcome acknowledges that capacity-building is increasingly important as PICs’ progress with their policy and legislative frameworks, addressed under outcome 1. Therefore, the Programme will seek to use capacity-building and technical assistance to support deeper country engagement.

#### Output 2.1: Key PIC integrity institutions strengthened

1. Major challenges in PICs include: a lack of transparency and accountability; resources and capabilities to deal with the complexity of corruption; law enforcement and often the trust required to collaborate on this sensitive topic; and harmonizing traditional and customary ruling structures with existing governance models. PICs are exploring ‘multi-functioning’ institutions; institutions with compatible functions and skill- sets with checks and balances in existence. There is an argument to be made for an affordable and cost- effective model to both prevent and fight corruption, based on available resources. This model is to be country-led and country-prioritized, taking into account regional and international obligations.
2. UNDP and UNODC draw on existing tools, approaches and experiences in supporting the institutional development and capacity-building of anti-corruption related institutions. Capacity-building may include trainings for personnel, varying from general skills on how to investigate and prosecute corruption cases to specific trainings. The scope of the technical assistance will also draw on the findings and technical assistance requested identified for Pacific States parties through the UNCAC Review Mechanism, through specific requests received from PICs or through the existing anti-corruption network in the Pacific. UN- PRAC will therefore aim to explore how to best contribute to capacity-building by engaging in standard trainings and workshops, as well as fostering peer-to-peer exchanges and networks.
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1. The aim is also to support effective cooperation between relevant government agencies, including anti-corruption authorities, to address various corruption-related risks emerging in crises, including through corruption prevention. This is necessary for a coherent whole-of-government response to pandemics, such as **COVID-19**.
2. Through this output, the Programme will support horizontal institutional capacity-building interventions that will help strengthen corruption resilience of PICs. The capacity-building interventions will be tailored to specific sectors, departments and areas to match specific country needs and address specific corruption risks

*Activity Result 2.1.1: Institutional capacity on anti-corruption measures enhanced through technical assistance*

1. This activity facilitates technical assistance, such as through national, sub-regional and/or regional anti-corruption trainings, in order to enhance the capacity of institutions, including the establishment of institutions (e.g. SIICAC). Depending on the scope of the assistance, technical advisers or consultants will be called on to deliver this assistance. There will be a wide range of flexibility deployed in relation to what specific form of technical assistance will be provided, as it will be based on specific country requests. Online forums to also provide technical assistance during and post **COVID-19** are a priority.

*Activity Result 2.1.2: Key integrity institutions established and/or capacities strengthened*

1. This activity focuses on supporting the establishment and strengthening of integrity institutions. This will include working not only with ICACs (which exist in Fiji and Solomon Islands, will soon be established in PNG and are being explored in a handful of other PICs), but also integrity institutions with a direct role in addressing corruption, such as Leadership Commissions, Offices of Attorney-General’s, prosecution services, Ombudsman’s Offices, FIUs and Supreme Audit Institutions. Support will be tailored to the specific-context, bearing in mind the key implementation principles of the Programme. For example, during

the previous phases of UN-PRAC, the team supported the establishment of new institutions, supporting law reform in support of the ICACs in PNG and the Solomon Islands, and strengthening existing institutions to focus on corruption-related issues, such as for example in the FIU of the Marshall Islands and the Office of the Banking Commission’s Financial Institutions Supervision of the Marshall Islands on anti-money laundering and combating the financing of terrorism. Twinning programmes and peer-to-peer learning were also facilitated, such as between the FIUs of Fiji and Marshall Islands.

1. In Phase III, the Programme will provide technical advice to the establishment of anti-corruption related bodies, such as ICACs and FIUs, upon request. The Programme will also support institutional strengthening

activities within integrity institutions, upon request, including facilitating trainings on key corruption issues, commissioning research, supporting internal policy development, and facilitating Pacific-Pacific attachments and twinning programmes between integrity institutions, where appropriate.

#### Output 2.2: PICs’ public service excellence enhanced

1. This output will focus on broader anti-corruption related governance reforms in the public sector. In order to improve public service excellence, UN-PRAC will make a more comprehensive effort to address corruption risks in the public service, such as: promoting meritocracy in the public service; strengthening procurement processes; improving transparency and accountability in public finance management (in collaboration with UNDP’s existing Public Financial Management Project and other such projects run by the World Bank, ADB and DFAT); promoting a service culture within the public service; and facilitating citizen engagement in design and monitoring of service delivery. Reflecting DFAT’s recommendations, UN-PRAC will take a more nuanced approach to the governance structure around anti-corruption.
2. To enrich the operational modalities and draw on extensive change management and public service technical assistance already provided by DFAT in the region, UN-PRAC would focus on trialling people- centered design exercises, which integrate lessons learned from behavioural science and innovation approaches. Collaboration with relevant innovation partners will be explored, including UNDP’s Asia Pacific Regional Innovation Hub and the UNDP Accelerator Lab. Noting that the Pacific has challenges in accessing technology and resources, low technological, community-based, Pacific-sensitive solutions will be the focus.

*Activity Result 2.2.1: Pilot public service training strategies designed to build a cohort of public servants committed to accountable, transparent, people centred service delivery*

1. UNCAC articles 7 to 13 cover a range of measures including merit-based civil service, codes of conduct, public reporting, preventive measures in the private sector and risks of conflict of interest. Human potential should be one of the main priorities for the effective functioning of government, but it is often neglected. Recognizing that Pacific public services remain challenged in delivering accountable, transparency, efficient and people-centred services, in particular to poorer classes, marginalized groups and people living outside capital cities, this activity will progress a small number of pilots at national level which will focus on testing new approaches to providing leadership training to senior public servants which focuses on ensuring people-centred, accountable and transparent service-delivery. This work will
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draw on the emerging thinking captured in recent global discussions and publications on anti-corruption and public excellence.28

1. Based on this research, the Programme will develop a methodology for support on public sector anti-corruption and accountability champions in a small cluster of countries. National partners will be selected based on their own expressed motivation and their strategic ability to progress change. The Programme will then take them through a tailored regional programme of training and coalition building. The training will focus on leadership skill building and tools promoting a “people-centered” interpretation of the regulatory framework. The methodology will be developed in close collaboration with the UNDP’s innovation and public administration experts and will be based on public service excellence experiences of UNDP, to ensure it reflects modern, innovative approaches to public sector management. Strong monitoring and evaluation elements will also be included in the pilots to measure and document results modelled on behavioural approaches. The methodology and the training and coalition-building programme will ensure to factor in the capacity and knowledge needs relevant to the public sector implications of the **COVID-19** crisis and beyond.

*Activity Result 2.2.2: Support pilots to improve public service delivery integrity, with a particular focus on services critical to marginalized people*

1. Complementary to the work under activity result 2.2.1 which aims to build better public service leadership which is committed to public accountability and transparency, this activity will seek to focus on piloting short to medium-term interventions aimed at reducing risks of corruption in the public sector and remove corruption bottlenecks to access key public services. The focus aim to run a small set of pilots with key institutions responsible for delivering critical services to communities. In this context, in 2015, UNDP already produced three handbooks on fighting corruption in the: (1) education sector; (2) health sector; and (3) water sector,29 which collect together good practice and lessons learned, as well as suggesting strategies for taking action.
2. To identify and design these pilots, the Programme will seek to first map: the recommendations
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related to corruption prevention in public administration and services contained in the UNCAC reviews

from the second cycle; the corruption bottlenecks identified in NACS and SDG roadmaps from the region and priorities allocated to the public service institutions by those documents; and the lessons learnt and on-going initiatives related to this area of work in the Pacific. The mapping will be shared at a validation workshop, which will also be used to identify possible entry-points for action, including priority countries and central or sectoral institutions within those countries with whom pilots could be co-designed and implemented. Pilots will also be designed considering existing public service strengthening activities being supported by development partners. UN-PRAC’s focus will be on co-designing interventions that promote innovative approaches which are specifically tailored to the Pacific and national context, use tested, adapted and refined methodologies. Special attention will be dedicated to prioritizing improvements to public services which impact women and marginalized groups’ opportunities and rights in the Pacific. Specific attention will be paid to public services particularly affected by COVID-19 crisis, including but not limited to health care. In particular, certain aspects of social and welfare services will be considered, including in relation to seeking innovative solutions for the provision of services for persons with disabilities. Activities will vary according to the national context, but will include a strong monitoring and evaluation component to measure and document results. The pilot results will be showcased at Pacific Anti-Corruption Community of Practice/ network meetings (see activity result 1.1.2) and possibly globally, at relevant forums. This latter showcasing will also be designed to facilitate the integration of Pacific public service stakeholders with global and regional innovation and public service excellence networks and forums (e.g. Open Government Partnership, Innovation Labs, Public Service Excellence Awards).

1. UNDP (2018), *Good Practices in Public Sector Excellence to Prevent Corruption: A Lessons Learned Study in Support of the Implementation of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption*, [https://www](http://www.mn.undp.org/content/mongolia/en/home/library/).mn.undp[.org/content/mongolia/en/home/library/](http://www.mn.undp.org/content/mongolia/en/home/library/) democratic\_governance/good-practices-in-public-sector-excellence-to-prevent-corruption.html.
2. UNDP (2015), *Fighting Corruption in the Education Sector*, [https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/anti-corruption/fighting_corruptionintheeducationsector.html) [governance/anti-corruption/fighting\_corruptionintheeducationsector.html](https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/anti-corruption/fighting_corruptionintheeducationsector.html).

#### Output 2.3: Effective knowledge sharing in and among PICs promoted

1. As noted above, inter-regional technical capacity is a focus area for development. This output will capitalize on the potential for regional peer-to-peer exchange and collaboration to enhance anti- corruption efforts in the Pacific. Acknowledging the MTE’s recommendation to increase multilateral and bilateral interactions among beneficiaries, this outcome will take a collaborative approach to capacity- building. This output will explore existing examples of capacity-building such as the UNDP supported

“Floating Budget Office”, joint-interparliamentary capacities on budget oversight, as case studies. These activities will focus on building consolidated knowledge resources through collaborations with Pacific institutions, such as PIFS, PILON, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, PASAI, Pacific Legal Drafters’ Association, Transparency International (TI) and others. There is also the need for a ‘convening authority’ that will ensure an impartial and safe space for knowledge sharing and networking opportunities at the regional level.

*Activity Result 2.3.1: PICs benefitted from technical support and peer-to-peer exchanges through Pacific- Pacific cooperation*

1. This activity seeks to implement one of the key priorities of this Programme, namely, prioritizing technical support provided through peer-to-peer exchange of knowledge and expertise among PICs, and where possible, beyond the region through South-South cooperation. It is a lesson learned that external technical assistance to the Pacific is not always properly contextualized; to address this, UN-PRAC has been proactive in trying to connect up PIC jurisdictions and officials grappling with similar challenges to enable them to collaborate to find Pacific-appropriate solutions. Under this activity, the Project will identify technical support needs both by drawing on the assessments supported under outcome 1, as well as in response to specific requests. All technical assistance will therefore be demand-driven and flexible in nature.
2. For each such mission or exchange, the Programme will seek to capture lessons learnt through pre- and post- mission debriefing. The Programme will prioritize peer-to-peer assistance or exchanges which will strengthen existing institutional partnerships (e.g. with ICACs, national anti-corruption committees, Attorney-General’s Offices, Parliaments) and/ or focus on achieving specific priority outputs (e.g. legislative reform, key policy developments). As appropriate, the Programme will also organize an annual capacity development activity for fellows of this peer-to-peer learning programme, which will offer both technical skills development training, but also be used as an opportunity to identify good practice and lessons learned from the exchanges which can be used to improve these exchanges over the course of the UN- PRAC Phase III.

*Activity Result 2.3.2: Regional and country-level partnerships on corruption prevention supported (links to Activity Result 3.2.1 that specifically focuses on CSOs)*

1. With this activity, the Programme attempts to exercise its more ‘political’ nature, by promoting the establishment of specific partnerships between governmental bodies and non-State actors. While closely linked to the activities of other outputs, this activity focuses on building awareness among the various actors, government and non-State, on the importance of such partnerships and the stakes and benefits for each of them. An example of such a partnership that UN-PRAC supported was between the Prime Minister’s Office of Vanuatu and TI Vanuatu on the joint dissemination of information on the then newly established RTI policy and legislation, ensuring that citizens were aware of its effect and how it was there to support them in accessing information from the Government. UN-PRAC is ready to support such partnerships with technical inputs on defining the principles and scope, and also their promotion. Activities, inter alia, include: brokering dialogue and partnerships among Government and non-State actors; and providing technical support in designing/ enhancing partnership arrangements.

*Activity Result 2.3.3: Knowledge products, reports and policy briefs on Pacific trends, challenges, good practices and related information developed and shared with the Pacific anti-corruption network (cf: activity result 1.1.2)*

1. UN-PRAC is committed to promoting effective knowledge sharing, which includes the collection, creation and dissemination of relevant information to key Pacific stakeholders, including Government officials, MPs, CSOs and the media. Already, UN-PRAC shares information on its own activities through
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newsletters produced twice a year and also provides updates on Pacific activities through the Asia- Pacific Integrity in Action Network (AP-INTACT). In this Phase, UN-PRAC will continue to produce these knowledge products and disseminate them widely. The Programme will further draw on the knowledge products and platforms of UNDP and UNODC (especially the Asia-Pacific focused projects) to ensure consistency and the sharing of experiences and knowledge across the Indo-Pacific region. UN-PRAC will also work with the Asia-Pacific projects on dissemination and promotion of the achievements in the Pacific region, as well as knowledge exchange beyond the Pacific.

1. As appropriate, the Project will also develop knowledge products which aim to systematically collect and share lessons and expertise. In support of activity 1.1.1 which aims to agree a broader Pacific anti- corruption vision, the Programme will commission and support knowledge collection and/or commission research that aims to support implementation of that vision. Under UN-PRAC Phase II, the Project produced the publication *Criminalization and Law Enforcement: The Pacific’s Implementation of Chapter III Of the UN Convention against Corruption*30 and *International Cooperation: The Pacific’s Implementation of Chapter IV of the UN Convention against Corruption*31, and a resource guide on “*Anti-money laundering and forestry in the Pacific*”, with a focus on the Melanesian region, which are very useful comparative resources. As more Pacific UNCAC States parties complete their UNCAC reviews, similar publications will be produced to offer a comparative analysis of implementation. Noting some of the new areas that the Programme will be moving into (e.g. supporting public service excellence, tackling sector-specific corruption), the Programme will also produce on-demand knowledge products designed to take global concepts or approaches and make them more relevant for Pacific audiences. The Programme will also commission applied research, designed to capture and reflect upon lessons learned from implementation of UN-PRAC over the last decade. Targeted research on the gender aspects of anti-corruption policies may be conducted, as appropriate. Such research will be undertaken taking into account the specific approaches that will be supported through activity result 3.3.3.
2. In order to use knowledge collection and dissemination as a positive mechanism for educating people around the region about the realities of corruption issues and anti-corruption activities in the region, the Programme will also proactively conduct one to two information campaigns each year . These will be
3. supported by the development and release of key knowledge products (including using different forms

of media) and other tools. Recognizing the growing use of using social media and other channels to this end, these campaigns and products will be designed for maximum regional impact. One campaign will likely be held each year in support of Anti-Corruption Day on 9 December, while a second campaign will be designed around key Pacific events.

**Outcome 3: PICs’ State and non-State actors more effectively engage and partner to prevent and fight corruption**

1. While all outcomes will ensure the application of a whole-of-society approach, outcome 3 will pay specific attention to encouraging the engagement of various stakeholders in realizing the anti-corruption agenda. The outcome will focus on the following outputs:

* Output 3.1: Anti-corruption knowledge, oversight capacities and internal integrity framework of PICs’ Parliaments increased
* Output 3.2: Pacific civil society, gender equality organizations, media and private sector enhanced as proactive actors in awareness-raising and corruption oversight;
* Output 3.3: Anti-corruption education platforms in the Pacific increased.

1. UN-PRAC’s experience has shown that Parliaments are often an obstacle in progressing anti-corruption legislation and reforms and can be detached from the anti-corruption discourse of the Executive. The factors for this are various and contextual. In this regard, UN-PRAC, together with UNDP’s Parliament and Public Finance Management Programmes, will tailor specific activities varying on the country context.
   1. UN-PRAC (2016), *Criminalization and Law Enforcement: The Pacific’s Implementation of Chapter III Of The UN Convention against Corruption*, [http://www.pacific.undp.org/content/pacific/en/home/library/eg/unprac-criminalization-and-law-enforcement.html.](http://www.pacific.undp.org/content/pacific/en/home/library/eg/unprac-criminalization-and-law-enforcement.html)
   2. UN-PRAC (2016), *International Cooperation: The Pacific’s Implementation of Chapter IV of the UN Convention against Corruption,*

<https://www.unodc.org/documents/corruption/Publications/2016/Pacifics_Implementation_of_UNCAC_Chapter_IV.pdf>.



Capacity development to Parliaments and the developing of knowledge products will be continued as an approach. UN-PRAC will further explore how it can increase legislative knowledge on anti-corruption legislation and the engagement of Parliaments with the Executive and non-State actors on anti-corruption.

1. Particularly in times of crisis, civil society organizations and the media have an important role to play in monitoring the spending of resources and in ensuring that corruption remains in the spotlight. With civil society and the media, UN-PRAC will continue the ongoing work, with increased resources dedicated to youth, media and gender networks. This follows the MTE, which identified shortcomings in the current engagement modality with civil society stakeholders. It notably highlighted the limited capacity of CSOs and advocacy groups in the region to deliver results without sustained technical and capacity-building support. Experience shows that for the non-State actors to meaningfully engage significant knowledge development and oversight is needed. TI’s intervention in the Pacific could be helpful in this regard. At the same time, UN-PRAC will continue to explore alternative ways to engage non-State actors. To follow- up on the lessons learned and the MTE recommendation on gender mainstreaming, UN-PRAC will look at annually defining at least one to two gender specific activities in cooperation with relevant stakeholders. The activities will notably target aspects of corruption disproportionately impacting women as well as promote female leadership and access to opportunities in the fight against corruption. Some prospective partnerships have already been identified with the recent strategy paper on gender and corruption in the Pacific produced by UN-PRAC.
2. This analytical work has identified new entry points and impactful actions for achieving medium to long gender equality results in the Pacific. These actions will aim to specifically link SDG 16 with SDG 5 for development effectiveness and integrated results under Phase III.
3. On the education side, UN-PRAC will continue the work that it commenced with USP and initiated workshops in several PICs. UN-PRAC will also continue to work with the APTC to explore opportunities to build on the anti-corruption education programmes currently being developed by APTC under Phase

II. Through this, a more direct impact on the corruption in the private sector will be enabled. Additionally, working with academia on corruption research will be further explored. UN-PRAC will also seek to explore innovative ways for integration of anti-corruption content in regular public services trainings and vocational education activities.

1. UN-PRAC utilizes a whole-of-society approach, and this outcome pays specific attention to encouraging the engagement of various stakeholders in realizing the anti-corruption agenda. This outcome incorporates both State and non-State actors in an attempt to engage all actors in society in the fight against corruption.
2. The work of national institutions needs to be reinforced through increased accountability. Engaging citizens, media and businesses with policy-makers in an articulate and well-informed manner can only increase the chances of anti-corruption efforts being effective in the Pacific. Under this outcome, partnerships with regional and regionally-present global organizations will be actively pursued. The
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experience of UN-PRAC showed that the voice and engagement of non-State actors, particularly civil society, is very important for mobilizing the wider circles of society for recognizing and addressing corruption. This is especially important in the Pacific region, where the overall awareness on corruption fairly low. UNCAC also refers to the participation of civil society in corruption prevention in paragraph 13. On the other hand, the enthusiasm and interest of CSOs to engage on the topic are limited by a lack of resources and information.

#### Output 3.1: Anti-corruption knowledge, oversight capacities and internal integrity framework of PICs’ Parliaments increased

1. Experience from the region and around the world has shown that one of the most important, and yet often overlooked, actors in tackling corruption and promoting public accountability and transparency are national legislatures. Particularly when legislatures are tasked with enacting new, emergency legislation that quickly responds to the impacts of pandemics such as **COVID-19**, it is key that legislatures are engaged with to ensure that governance and corruption concerns are taken into account. Across the Pacific, legislatures are extremely variable, in size, resources and capacities. PNG is the largest Pacific legislature with 111 MPs, but smaller island states such as the Federated States of Micronesia and Tuvalu have 14 and 15 members respectively in their legislatures. Most Pacific legislatures are structured in some form of Westminster Parliamentary system, but Palau and the Federated States of Micronesia have directly elected Presidents, similar to the US-Presidential system; in the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the President is elected by members of the Legislature; Kiribati has a hybrid system whereby presidential candidates are nominated from amongst MPs elected to the legislature and then voted upon by the public.
2. Pacific legislatures have variable capacities, largely due to their different sizes and the resources available to recruit and retain skilled parliamentary staff. Nonetheless, over the last two decades, several organizations have specifically worked with Pacific legislatures to develop the capacities of MPs and parliamentary staff to efficiently discharge their constitutional mandates. In the area of corruption, UNDP, UN-PRAC and GOPAC have been especially active.
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1. The UN-PRAC Phase I MTE (2015) noted that stakeholders “recognized the value of targeting MPs

as is done in the design for anti-corruption work, as Parliaments provide a venue for discussion and exposure of corruption and the political competition between parties and leaders encourages checks and balances on governments through opposition MPs”32. UN-PRAC has utilized South-South learning in its Parliamentarian engagement.

1. Another key point-of-difference in UN-PRAC Parliamentarian engagement is the engagement of legislators and Parliaments within holistic country-specific missions where integrity and UNCAC issues are addressed by UN-PRAC with the bureaucracy, civil servants, Executive, private sector, CSOs and other stakeholders: thus, Parliamentarians see their role in the whole process not just as a silo actor. This holistic, whole-of-society, approach forms the rationale behind the two pillar of UN-PRAC engagement with Parliamentarians in its Phase III, namely engaging Parliamentarians on substantive anti-corruption topics as well as facilitating the pro-activeness of Parliaments to lead by example and tackle the risks and weaknesses of their own institutional settings.

*Activity 3.1.1. Engagement and capacities amongst MPs linked to anti-corruption legislative agenda and oversight of anti-corruption policies supported*

1. Parliaments play a critical role in enacting strong governance frameworks and undertaking oversight of executive power, but UN-PRAC’s experience has shown that Parliaments are often an obstacle in progressing anti-corruption legislation and reforms and can be detached from the anti-corruption discourse of the Executive and even the broader community. The reasons for this are various and contextual. In this regard, UN-PRAC, in alignment with the portfolio and leadership of the UNDP’s Parliamentary Development and Public Finance Management Projects, will tailor specific activities with legislatures, varying according to the country context. A specific focus will be on the following activities: ensuring that Parliamentarians are aware of and engaged with UNCAC post-review implementation
   1. UN-PRAC (2016), *Mid-term Evaluation Report 2015*, pp. 7-8, [https://www](http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Independent_Project_).unodc.[org/documents/evaluation/Independent\_Project\_](http://www.unodc.org/documents/evaluation/Independent_Project_) Evaluations/2015/XSPX70\_Mid-term\_evaluation\_report\_2015.pdf.

activities; ensuring engagement with and information-sharing about proposed anti-corruption legislative reforms to encourage prompt enactment; ensuring that the anti-corruption angle is adequately included into activities aiming at strengthening parliamentary oversight during emergency responses, including **COVID-19**, and engagement in regional/international fora to share learnings and good practices. GOPAC will continue to be a key partner in implementing these priorities.

1. Capacity development to Parliaments and the development of knowledge products will be continued. UNDP produced a handbook with the Inter-Parliamentary Union on Parliaments and the SDGs, which is now being used to start more structured discussions with Pacific legislatures about SDGs implementation. This work will be used as an entry-point for engaging with parliamentarians to discuss accountability more broadly, and corruption specifically in relation to SDG 16 implementation. Depending on the priorities then identified by MPs themselves, UN-PRAC will develop various knowledge produces (e.g. policy briefs, comparative legislative analyses, etc.) on key topics and/ or support trainings with MPs on key accountability issues, whether related to UNCAC specifically or corruption related to sectoral issues or post **COVID-19** corruption risks for the socio-economic recovery efforts. UN-PRAC will also leverage its work under output 3.1 on civil society engagement to support parliaments to engage more effectively with CSOs and the media to address corruption.

*Activity 3.1.2. Internal integrity systems of Parliament supported*

1. UNDP has been actively supporting capacity strengthening of Parliaments across the Pacific for more than 15 years through the Parliamentary Development Portfolio, which implements activities across the region. UN-PRAC has contributed to this effort by providing a space and expertise on specific anti- corruption issues wherever possible. For example, UN-PRAC offers experts to speak at Parliamentary post-election induction workshops and other training workshops. Based on the level of advancement and demand from Parliaments, in Phase III the Programme will continue to provide capacity-building, training and tools, with a specific focus on strengthening internal integrity mechanisms of Parliaments. For example, the use of public accounts and finance committees to undertake proper oversight of budget expenditures is a critical anti-corruption activity – particularly when emergency responses are requiring governments to rapidly outlay large amounts of funding to procure essential resources and services due to the impacts of **COVID-19**. More generally, UN-PRAC will support committee secretariats to provide better services for oversight inquiries, upon a demand basis. For the most advanced Parliaments and based on the demand and capacity assessments conducted by UNDP Parliament Development portfolio, tools linked to Parliamentary transparency, openness, and innovation for accountability will be explored. UN-PRAC will periodically strategize with the UNDP Parliamentary Development Portfolio to address the needs of the beneficiaries, adjust accordingly and remain relevant.

#### Output 3.2: Pacific civil society, gender equality organizations, media and private sector enhanced as proactive actors in awareness-raising and corruption oversight

1. As Figure 1 below shows, UNCAC specifically recognized the value of civil society to anti-corruption efforts in several provisions focused on prevention strategies. Globally, as well as in the Pacific, experience has shown that civil society can be very useful in working with communities to build their understanding
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Art. 12: Private sector must be regulated to prevent corruption

**UNCAC**

**Participation of civil society in corruption prevention**
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Art. 13(b): Ensuring public access to information

Art. 13(c): Undertaking public education activities on anti- corruption incl. in school/ university curricula

Art. 13(d):

R

especting, promoting

and protecting right to seek, receive, publish and disseminate information concerning corruption

of what effective, transparent and accountable government looks like in practice and encouraging them to demand more accountability from their officials and leaders. In the Pacific, civil society has been particularly effective when working across sectors and even across countries to build coalitions and networks which aim to leverage different types of expertise (e.g. legislative lobbying, media engagement, grassroots outreach) to raise awareness of the specific impacts of corruption on Pacific communities and the particular strategies that governments should take to tackle corruption problems. Civil society have also worked with communities and officials to break down taboos, promote learning, and remind Governments that corruption should be taken seriously.

1. Although civil society is critical to anti-corruption efforts, in the Pacific, CSOs have been less active in this space until recently, with accountability usually raised as a collateral issue to sector-specific advocacy, such as climate change action or gender equality. However, during Phase II of UN-PRAC, the Project proactively focused on working with Pacific civil society to support their efforts to engage with Pacific Governments. Some immediate tangible successes were achieved which can be built on in Phase III. For example, UN-PRAC supported the development of PYFAC, which has been active in bringing together young Pacific Islanders to address corruption, in particular, by growing local chapters. The Solomon Islands PYFAC Chapter was very active in the national coalition that successfully lobbied the Government to pass the Anti-Corruption Act in 2018.
2. The successes that UN-PRAC achieved in growing and strengthening civil society engagement with anti-corruption work have been promising, but experience has also shown that new local coalitions and structures are fragile and continue to face sustainability challenges. The MTE also identified shortcomings in the UN-PRAC Phase II engagement modality with civil society stakeholders, in particular, the administrative challenges in dispersing and monitoring small grants. It also highlighted the limited capacity of CSOs and advocacy groups in the region to deliver results without sustained technical and capacity-building support. That said, it is a well-known lesson in the Pacific that civil society strengthening efforts can take a decade or more to develop sustainable capacities, though most Pacific CSO’s remain reliant on donor funding support. In responding to the MTE’s observations, the design of activities under this Output are informed by consultations held in the second semester of 2019 with the several regional
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and the Pacific Disability Forum. They are also informed by a more in-depth report commissioned by UN-PRAC on Pacific CSOs and anti-corruption, which highlighted several initiatives that were initially supported in Phase II and can be built upon and strengthened in Phase III.

*Activity Result 3.2.1: Regional civil society anti-corruption networks supported*

1. This activity will be implemented complementary to activity result 1.1.2 which focuses on developing a Pacific network of anti-corruption public officials and institutions. These two activities will of course be implemented in concert, but have been separated in recognition of the reality that both officials and civil society may prefer separate “safe spaces” at times, to discuss sensitive issues and strategic approaches. As appropriate however, networks can also be combined, to facilitate information sharing and collaboration across government and civil society.
2. This activity will focus on building on one of the major achievements of UN-PRAC Phases I and II by dedicating increased resources to strengthening youth, media and gender networks. Online approaches will be used, where appropriate. Existing regional meetings will also be used as an opportunity to engage key CSOs, for example the annual PIFS civil society dialogue preceding the Pacific Islands Leaders Forum. Success stories will also be more systematically collected and shared across the network, in order both to inspire action but also to share good practice and lessons learned. The Programme will also invest in collecting stories on video, to be shared on social media, which is increasingly being used in the region, particularly by young people. As appropriate, CSOs from outside the region will also be included, where they may be able to provide particular insights in relation to specific priorities or sectors identified by CSOs themselves. The Programme will also work with TI’s Pacific regional team, which will also enable this Pacific network to tap into TI’s global networks.

*Activity Result 3.2.2. Regional and national anti-corruption civil society, media and private sector initiatives enhanced and specific gender/ corruption issues integrated*

1. As noted earlier, the small size of many PICs and limited human resources mean that efforts to grow and strengthen civil society can take many years to bed down. UN-PRAC has been actively working with CSOs, the media and private sector since 2012; Phase I focused on building trust and systematically identifying entry-points and possible partners, while Phase II actively invested in working with a range of civil society actors. In this context, although the MTE identified concerns with the complexity of disbursing small grants to CSOs, it also accepted the value of engaging with civil society as a key anti-corruption strategy.
2. In Phase III, recognizing the critical importance of strengthening the “demand side” of anti-corruption activities, the Programme will continue to invest substantial resources in working with civil society, through activities with CSOs, the media and the private sector. CSO engagement will pick up where Phase II left off – working with existing groups such as PYFAC and its chapters, PIANGO, the Pacific Disability Forum, local peak bodies and coalitions and relevant NGOs (e.g. Kiribati Islands Corruption Kickers (KICK), Kiribati Citizens Against Corruption (KCAC) and Kiribati Climate Action Network (KiriCAN)). The Programme will also invest in new CSO initiatives, as appropriate. Effort will be made to connect different activity lines across UN-PRAC in this regard. For example, the Programme may support RTI legislation and policies under activity 1.3.2, but can also work with CSOs to build their capacities to use RTI to demand greater (social) accountability from government.
3. Phase III will also continue to invest in working with the media, including through PINA, but also through collaborations with national media associations and other donor-supported media programmes (e.g. the Pacific Media Assistance Scheme). South-South exchanges will be particularly useful in this context, as media people have reported their interest in practical skills development activities. The Programme will also continue to work with the private sector, building on the existing partnership with the PIPSO and initial efforts to encourage Pacific Chambers of Commerce to work with members to adopt anti-corruption codes of conduct. This may also intersect with efforts to support sectoral activities, such as the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative.
4. A key lesson learned in Phase II that will be applied in Phase III is the knowledge that work with non-State actors will only be effective if it is accompanied by specific capacity development and close oversight. It is not only funding that is needed, but intensive engagement to build and mentor civil society partners to develop their own expertise, skills and networks. To this end, the Programme will dedicate a specific person in the team to act as a community coordinator to proactively work with civil society partners to identify their capacity needs and provide support, either directly, through other Programme staff or through other experts. This person will also offer mentoring to CSO partner staff. The Programme will also organize one to two capacity development activities per year, on specific subjects (e.g. RTI and social accountability, budget analysis) or skills sets (e.g. legislative lobbying and advocacy, risk assessments) which will aggregate over time to build a cadre of non-State actors with a deeper expertise on corruption issues.
5. To follow-up on the lessons learned and the MTE recommendation on gender mainstreaming, UN-PRAC conducted an internal analysis of gender and corruption, which provided several practical recommendations. In Phase II, UN-PRAC also developed an anti-corruption toolkit for women-owned micro, small and medium enterprises in Fiji in partnership with and contributions from the Women Entrepreneurs Business Council, Fijian Competition and Consumer Commission, and Fiji Independent Commission Against Corruption. The Programme will encourage activities which address aspects of corruption disproportionately impacting women across different sectors. Champion women journalists will also be identified to advocate for relevant anti-corruption issues and contribute in the design of targeted gender sensitive activities. For example, CSOs can be supported to engage on issues such as corruption in health services. The Programme will also be active in ensuring that funding for CSOs to engage regionally and globally are utilized to provide platforms for women’s voices to be heard on their experience of corruption and proposals to address it. The Programme will also identify opportunities for enabling Pacific women’s group to help shape and implement anti-corruption initiatives.
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1. The Programme will also work on promoting business integrity and collection action for a fair business environment. This need has become particularly relevant in the context of the **COVID-19** pandemic and socio-economic crisis, and the related challenges for businesses. Corruption has long been a major obstacle for businesses in emerging markets; in order to fast-track economic recovery, businesses have the opportunity to raise their commitment to mitigate corruption and its impact, as well as increase integrity and transparency in their business practices. Capitalizing on the global and regional experiences of UNDP and UNODC, the Programme will seeks ways to: support compliance and due diligence processes carried out by the private sector to prevent corrupt businesses to capture the market; promote transparency and openness in public procurement; and explore businesses through innovative platforms to facilitate business processes and streamline administrative procedures.
2. In Phase III, UN-PRAC will continue working with youth by building on the achievements so far and taking careful consideration of the future opportunities for youth involvement, on the one hand, but also the effects of corruption on the developmental outcomes for youth in the Pacific, on the other. More evidently, corruption tends to impoverish young people through worsening social, political and economic inequalities. This situation has now worsened as an effect of the **COVID-19** crisis, which threatens to further deprive youth of opportunities for meaningful livelihoods. Moreover, as an effect of **COVID-19**, corruption is expected to aggravate the equitable distribution of social services such as health, water and education, and render the youth particularly vulnerable. For this reason, youth cannot afford to be passive about the need for stronger action against corruption and the Programme remains committed to continue assisting in these endeavours.
3. Therefore, in Phase III, UN-PRAC will remain the key supporter of the youth to ensure that they are not marginalized from mainstream anti-corruption efforts and to encourage them to act through civil society and other channels. For this purpose, the Programme will design more targeted efforts built on UN-PRAC investments in youth so far, aimed to create opportunities for youth to be at the forefront of anti-corruption efforts in the region.
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#### Output 3.3: Anti-corruption education platforms in the Pacific increased

1. As various aspects of the enabling environment are in place (e.g. through UNCAC ratification and the creation of key anti-corruption institutions), Phase III of

the Programme is heavily focused on tackling the more complex aspects of fighting corruption, in particular, addressing the “demand side” of public accountability and anti-corruption and encouraging changes in social norms and acceptable behaviours. In this context, one of the most effective strategies has been education, in particular, education activities focused on school-age youth and/or younger citizens. UN-PRAC has already been engaging in this space, in particular, with Fiji that rolled out its National Anti-Corruption Curriculum across all schools in 2019, commissioning of a new course on anti-corruption through USP’s School of Government,

Development and International Affairs and supporting

the development of an anti-corruption course for vocational training purposes through APTC.

1. This output will build on previous work which focused on the power of education platforms to increase awareness regarding corruption throughout the Pacific. UN-PRAC will continue the work commenced with USP in 2019 and APTC in 2020. The Programme will also explore options for embedding anti-corruption themes into professional accreditation course, including in relation to training for public administration officials. Additionally, the Programme may seek to strengthen partnerships with Pacific academics.

*Activity Result 3.3.1: Anti-corruption integration into the education curriculum at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels supported*

1. UN-PRAC has already supported Pacific efforts to educate school students on the basic principles of good governance, accountability and transparency. The Fiji National Anti-Corruption Curriculum is the

most successful example of this, but it is notable that this initiative took some time to roll out. Already, UN- PRAC has supported South-South curriculum exchanges between Fiji and with PNG, Samoa and Vanuatu, and several other PICs have also expressed an interest in such work. In Phase III, the Programme will facilitate in-country trainings in three to four PICs on how anti-corruption might be integrated into the education curriculum, drawing on UNODC’s Education for Justice (E4J) Programme and existing regional and international best practices. Depending on interest and feasibility, UN-PRAC will support at least one more country to explore curriculum development options in more detail.

1. By the end of UN-PRAC Phase II, USP would have developed a tertiary-level course on anti-corruption. 2021 will see the roll-out of the course to students. UN-PRAC will support this roll-out, in particular, an evaluation of implementation of the course which will include feedback from students. This evaluation will be used to support the evolution of the course, as well as to inform the development of similar such courses at other universities, such as the University of PNG and/or the integration of anti-corruption themes into other subject streams (e.g. law, accounting, media studies). Integrating anti-corruption into existing courses is valuable as it will also ensure that graduates in key professional sectors have a strong understanding of anti-corruption values and strategies before they enter the workforce.
2. The Programme will also support the sharing of expertise with university students through guest lectures on specific anti-corruption topics. This will serve both to expose students to different expertise as well as to directly expose Programme staff to the specific corruption issues of most interest to the next generation. **COVID-19** implications for the governance systems will be integrated into the lectures. A small amount of funds has been allocated to fund guest lecturers from other PICs or from outside the region, as it could also be invaluable to expose young Pacific Islanders to anti-corruption activists from other jurisdictions.

*Activity Result 3.3.2: Partnerships on anti-corruption integration into skills development and research enhanced*

1. While recognizing that tertiary education is a key entry-point for educating future professionals on anti-corruption, at the same time, the Programme is keen to ensure that it continues seeking ways to support professionals already in the workforce, to build their understanding of and commitment to tackling corruption. The world is changing quickly, such that people in the workforce need regular in- service training to keep up with new developments; this is also the case in relation to strategies for addressing corruption. In this context, and building on the partnership with APTC on the development and delivery of an anti-corruption course for work-force professionals, the Programme will try to go a step further and explore options for embedding anti-corruption training into existing in-service public service training, including potentially developing some form of in-service anti-corruption accreditation. This will be a new area of work, requiring new multi-stakeholder partnerships to involve also public service institutions and public administration authorities. Moreover, as **COVID-19** has affected all areas of socio-economic development and the related response and recovery efforts cut across all Government sectors, it is now increasingly important that public administration staff be sensitized to corruption in performing their duties. In the post **COVID-19** context specifically, assessment will be made for the selection of prioritized sectors that can lead on promoting corruption resilience and maximizing the impact of the response efforts. The Programme will also engage development partners to identify specific opportunities for collaboration with ongoing public-sector training initiatives. The annual Pacific Public Service Commissioners Conference might also be an opportunity to identify opportunities for investing in such training development opportunities at national levels.
2. Complementary to activity result 2.3.3, which aims to develop and share knowledge on Pacific anti- corruption challenges and strategies, this activity will also harness the partnerships with educational institutions developed under this output to inspire further research. Already, UN-PRAC has identified key research issues that will need to be progressed in Phase III, such as the role of youth in fighting corruption post **COVID-19** and promoting inclusive development. The Programme will be proactive in using Pacific researchers, where it might be appropriate to do so, to explore specific aspects of the anti-corruption agenda as a specific academic priority.
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# 4. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

### Resources Required to Achieve the Expected Results

1. Implementing the Programme will require considerable resources, as UN-PRAC is one of the only development partner programmes to specifically support anti-corruption programming and works with a large and diverse range of stakeholders. Specific, anti-corruption technical assistance is required to provide on-demand advice and guidance to partners to ensure scarce resources are harnessed for maximize impact, drawing on global and regional good practices and experiences. In addition to the Programme Team described below, the Programme will also draw on expertise from the global anti- corruption team of UNODC and UNDP. The Programme will specifically link with UNDP’s ongoing Anti- Corruption for Peaceful and Inclusive Societies (ACPIS) Global Project, as UNDP’s main vehicle for policy and programming support on anti-corruption,33 and UNODC’s Regional Programme for Southeast Asia and the Pacific (Anti-Corruption Component) and UNODC’s Action against Corruption and Economic Crime Programme.
2. UN-PRAC, for its part, will continue complementing and providing technical assistance towards the implementation of national anti-corruption projects, including TAP in the Solomon Islands and the proposed UNODC-UNDP project in Papua New Guinea. In this manner, the resources allocated to national Pacific projects can be maximized for achieving development effectiveness.

**TABLE 1: PROJECT TEAM (DETAILED TORS ARE ATTACHED FOR REFERENCE)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Position** | **Level** | **Key Functions** |
| Project Manager | P3 | Provide managerial expertise to the UN-PRAC Programme team in developing, implementing and reporting on Programme activities in accordance with the Project Document and in line with UNDP and UNODC rules and procedures, and ensure in- ter-agency coordination by two UN agencies in the implemen- tation of UN-PRAC, and across UNDP’s Effective Governance portfolio and UNODC’s Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific (ROSEAP) portfolio. |
| UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti-Corruption | P4 | Provide substantive and technical advice and advocacy on anti-corruption initiatives at the regional and national levels (including policy advise, technical expertise). The Adviser will provide specific support for UNDP’s policy and programming, both in general governance-related work. |
| UNODC Regional Anti-Cor- ruption Adviser - Pacific | P4 | Provide substantive and technical advice and advocacy on anti-corruption initiatives at the regional and national levels (including legal and policy advice, capacity-building and tech- nical expertise). The Adviser will provide specific support for UNODC’s policy and programming, also in general govern- ance-related work. |
| UN Pacific Regional An- ti-Corruption Programme Associate | ICS7/ SCB- 3 | Provide support and assistance to the UN-PRAC Team in the implementation and management of the Programme initiatives, with as specific focus on civil society and local governance as well as other governance service lines that may be assigned in future. |
| UN Pacific Regional An- ti-Corruption Programme Assistant | SB4 | Assist in the administration and implementation of UN-PRAC Programme delivery through ATLAS for UNDP and UMOJA and ProFi for UNODC, adapt processes and procedures, and support results-based management, by focusing on the achievement of the following results, including |
| Consultants |  | Will be recruited by the Programme, according to outputs focused TORs, to provide technical support in key specialist areas to partners, as necessary. |
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33 UNDP (2020), *Anti-Corruption*, [https://www](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/democratic-governance-and-peacebuilding/).undp.[org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/democratic-governance-and-peacebuilding/](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/democratic-governance-and-peacebuilding/) responsive-and-accountable-institutions/anti-corruption/.

1. Resources have been budgeted in the Programme for technical advisers as this type of support comprises the core of UN-PRAC’s work. Providing high quality technical advice to PIC Governments, agencies and non-government stakeholders is one of the major aspects of comparative advantage that UNODC and UNDP can provide compared to other development partners working in this sector, but to do so requires the ability to recruit highly skills technicians who often have quite specialist skills in areas such as law reform. Additionally, sizeable resources have been allotted to provide ongoing capacity development support to partners. Experience has shown that this requires close mentoring and engagement with partners, which may require both a travel budget but also small amounts of funding available to support new/ growing agencies to recruit in specialist skills that can help them to discharge their new mandates. Substantial resources have also been allocated to supporting CSO and community engagement work. This also requires a decent investment at this juncture, as much of this work is still at the development or early implementation stage and needs close support to ensure that it stays on track and beds itself among local partners.

### Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness

1. As described throughout this Project Document, throughout the history of UN-PRAC efficiencies have been achieved through a partnership between UNDP and UNODC, which has enabled the two agencies to pool their resources and expertise for the benefit of PIC stakeholders. UN-PRAC was an early adopted of such a joint programming approach, which has borne fruit by eliminating duplication of efforts and maximizing the different mandates and skills sets within UNDP and UNODC for the benefit of the Programme. Phase III of the Programme will again be implemented as a joint UNODC-UNDP programme with parallel funding and in accordance with the applicable UN guidelines on joint programming.
2. For UNDP, the Programme will be implemented as part of the overall Effective Governance Outcome in the Pacific Regional Programme, as a sub-project, and will be aligned with the UNDP Global Anti- Corruption Programme. For UNODC, the Programme will be implemented as part of its Regional Programme for Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and will be aligned with UNODC’s Action against Corruption and Economic Crime Programme. Both organizations will receive funding in accordance with their separate respective funding arrangements and the approved joint annual workplan.

### Project Management

1. The Programme will be implemented as a joint UNODC-UNDP programme with parallel funding and in accordance with the applicable UN guidelines on joint programming. In addition to the joint Project Document, UNDP and UNODC will develop joint annual workplans, to ensure maximum coordination of efforts. This Programme takes note of the fact that UNODC and UNDP Headquarters will both be receiving funding from DFAT for primarily the Indo-Pacific region. The UN-PRAC team will work with both Headquarters to align the submission of their reporting to DFAT. In the same context, for coherence with the global, regional and country level activities, the Programme will ensure that there is regular interaction with the respective UNDP and UNODC projects, for synchronization and quality assurance purposes. This will be ensured through the Steering Committee structures and regular coordination and exchange of information at operational level. The UNODC Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser based in Fiji will manage the UNODC component of the Programme in coordination with the Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific (ROSEAP) under the overall supervision of the UNODC Regional Representative, and substantive guidance will be provided by the UNODC Corruption and Economic Crime Branch in Vienna.
2. In addition to the joint Programme Document, UNDP and UNODC will develop joint annual workplans, to ensure maximum coordination of efforts. This Programme takes note of the fact that UNODC and UNDP Headquarters will both be receiving funding from DFAT for primarily the Indo-Pacific region. The UN-PRAC team will work with both Headquarters to align the submission of their reporting to DFAT. Under this Programme, UNDP and UNODC will prepare one joint substantive annual narrative report. As the two organizations will sign separate funding arrangements with DFAT, the primary donor for this Programme, they will provide separate financial reports in line with their respective applicable financial rules and regulation.
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### Partnerships

1. Partnership is the foundation of this Programme. As noted above, while the collaboration of UNODC and UNDP is central to effectively implementing the Programme together with partner countries, there is a further commitment to strengthen existing partnerships with relevant regional organizations, such as PIFS, GOPAC, PYFAC, PASAI, USP, PILON, PIPSO, PRNGO, its regional members including the Pacific Islands Alliance of Non-Governmental Organisations, the Pacific Disability Forum and APTC. Further partnerships with national and regional non-governmental organizations, including TI in the Pacific, Australia and New Zealand, such as under the Commonwealth Ombudsman’s Office and Chief Ombudsman’s Office are key to this Programme.
2. New partnerships will be also explored and strengthened with suitable and interested partners, for example, the University of PNG in terms of tertiary level anti-corruption curriculum, perhaps the annual Public Service Commissioners Conference and the Pacific Institute of Leadership and Governance. The aim of strengthening partnerships is to draw on comparative advantages of different partners, as well as to leverage each other’s resources and influence. This, in turn, can complement the work of others in the region. For example, the UNCAC reviews and follow-ups draw on and further the work of the Asia/ Pacific Group on Money Laundering. In addition, PIFS provides a forum in which to collaborate and work together with partners on common topics and where possible, to address the needs of PICs collectively.

### Risks and Assumptions

1. The Programme is being implemented in a complex operating environment, with interventions to be designed and implemented across 14 different countries, each with their own particular political, social and cultural contexts. This complexity is both a strength and a potential risk for UN-PRAC. On the one hand, it allows for flexible implementation, where interventions will be designed according to each PIC’s interests and willingness to partner. On the other hand, it requires UN-PRAC to effectively manage a diverse and complicated range of partnerships across many different PICs at the same time. This risk is mitigated by the fact that UN-PRAC Phase III builds on existing networks and partnerships developed

40 over Phases I and II; these relationships will enable UN-PRAC to hit the ground running and to grow and develop these partnerships for maximum impact.

1. This Programme is also being implemented in an area which is extremely politically sensitive. UN- PRAC is one of the few major programmes working on anti-corruption in the Pacific, in part because many other development partners have concerns about whether PIC Governments would be willing to work on such issues. UN-PRAC has managed the risk of poor political buy-in and/or active political resistance over the last two phases of the Programme by building strong relationships both with PIC Governments and with key Pacific inter-governmental partners (e.g. PIFS). This has resulted in strong buy-in, across PIC Governments and cross multiple agencies within those Governments. This has led to strong local ownership over UNCAC and the local/regional anti-corruption agenda, as born out by the 2020 Kiribati Anti-Corruption Conference, being driven by the Kiribati Government and PIFS, with UN-PRAC support. This local ownership provides a very strong foundation on which UN-PRAC Phase III will build.
2. Another risk that will require close monitoring and real-time adjustment are the implications of the **COVID-19** crisis on the anti-corruption and governance agenda. Under the Phase II of UN-PRAC, extensive analytical work on **COVID-19** has been undertaken, which will inform also Phase III of UN-PRAC.

### Stakeholder Engagement

1. As described throughout this Project Document, Phase III builds on almost eight years of work by UNDP and UNODC in the Pacific to engage Pacific stakeholders in the global anti-corruption agenda. Accordingly, Phase III of UN-PRAC has been developed to reflect the ongoing participation of key anti- corruption and good governance stakeholders with UN-PRAC’s work and is a direct response to feedback and interest from PIC Governments and non-State actors. It has also benefited from the analysis and inputs gathered by the UN-PRAC team’s engagement with partners over the course of Phases I and II.
2. During implementation, Phase III has been specifically designed to proactively engage with a wide cross-section of stakeholders, in recognition of the need for anti-corruption efforts to be grounded in as

wide a constituency of supporters as possible. While exploring new partnerships, Phase III will deepen its existing partnerships with: PIFS, PIC Attorney-General’s Offices/ Ministries of Justice, Ministries of Education, anti-corruption authorities including ICACs, Ombudsman’s Offices, Supreme Audit Institutions/ Offices, FIUs, Prime Minister’s Offices, Police, Judiciary, Pacific Parliaments, PYFAC national chapters, PIPSO, Chambers of Commerce and selected CSOs.

### South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSC/TrC)

1. Global experience demonstrates that sharing lessons from similar contexts is more likely to result in a better reform uptake in developing countries. In that context, this Programme aims to promote and apply the lessons and experiences of, in particular, PICs and SIDS, drawing also on the UN’s extensive networks from across the Pacific and globally. UNDP’s and UNODC’s global and regional structures will be utilized to support this exchange, such as the global programmes and the regional presence offices (including the UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub for Asia and Pacific and UNODC Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific). The proximity of the 14 PICs to Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America as an opportunity which UN-PRAC will keep leveraging upon to facilitate learning and exchange of good practices with more established and mature democracies and systems.

### Knowledge

1. Results from the Programme will be disseminated within and beyond the 14 target countries of the Programme through existing information sharing networks and forums. The Programme will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to Programme implementation though lessons learned. The Programme will identify, analyze and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar/ future projects. In the same context, the Programme will pay special attention to communication and visibility activities.
2. Although a substantial part of the Programme will be focused on direct institutional capacity-building of key institutions and stakeholders. Nonetheless, knowledge sharing, public education and stakeholder communication are also key elements of the Programme. In particular:

* The UNCAC review reports and executive summaries produced through the UNCAC Review Mechanism;
* In support of policy and legislative reforms, upon request, the Programme will support the drafting of implementation plans to support PICs’ implementation of prioritized UNCAC review recommendations, develop anti-corruption policies e.g. NACS and draft/ review anti-corruption legislation, notably in addressing UNCAC review recommendations.;
* Based on all the information gathered, UN-PRAC will produce and disseminate bi-annual Programme communication products/ campaigns, develop UNCAC-related publications, including of Pacific States’ implementation of the Convention, produce and disseminate knowledge products relevant to the Pacific anti-corruption vision and of benefit to the Pacific Anti-Corruption Community of Practice/ network;
* Produce policy briefs and other knowledge products, such as under Output 3.1 for MPs;
* Under output 3.3, substantial work will include support to public education and awareness-raising in relation to anti-corruption, both to encourage more ethical behaviour by the public, but also to improve public understanding of what the Pacific authorities and non-State actors are doing to address corruption and how the public can be involved. As part of this work, UN-PRAC will support the development of national anti-corruption curriculum pilots and work with PIC tertiary institutions to consider the development of anti-corruption components/ courses;
* UN-PRAC will continue to produce a semi-annual newsletter. The newsletter will be uploaded on the designed UN-PRAC website for easier access, as will all other relevant UN-PRAC knowledge products.

### Sustainability and Scaling Up

1. As noted above, Phase IIII has been designed to reflect the specific needs of PIC Governments and other stakeholders, as expressed during Phases I and II of UN-PRAC. Grounding the Programme in locally-owned activities will encourage more sustainable engagement and achievement in line with
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country-specific objectives and approaches. By embedding the Programme within PIC Governments’ own national policy frameworks, notably through NACS, the work supported by the Programme will be implemented under government leadership and fully in line with the governments’ priorities. As a result, that there will be a more sustainable commitment by partners and ownership of the eventual outcomes supported by the Programme. Regionally, an adopted Pacific anti-corruption vision, ideally anchored to a regional body, could provide a solid Pacific framework, in line with UNCAC and SDG 16, that will support the anti-corruption agenda of the region going forwards.

1. The Programme is also specifically designed to focus on building sustainable capacities within PIC Governments’ own institutions and systems, most notably by building and supporting anti-corruption authorities to become the drivers of change within their own governance systems. One of the key assumptions of the Programme is that by strengthening institutions embedded within PICs’ own systems, and building the individual commitment of key stakeholders to ensuring those institutions work effectively, those institutions can be effective in promoting anti-corruption efforts more widely, within their own governments and across society as a whole. Sustainable capacity development will be prioritized, which requires both individuals to be supported, as well as the development of institutional rules, procedures and processes that can withstand the departure of individuals.
2. Realistically, considering the number of countries being covered, the corruption risks that exist in the Pacific, the current capacities of PIC Governments and CSOs to address corruption and the relatively small UN-PRAC resource envelope available, Phase III is unlikely to result in complete sustainability of anti-corruption efforts across the region. This is why the Programme has not attempted to “do everything” in every single PIC, but has instead focused on supporting core institutions and activities, on which future programming can continue to build. Phases I and II have reinforced the learning that slow and steady is best in the Pacific, if outcomes are to be truly locally-owned and therefore sustainable. This also allows interventions to be designed and delivered in a way that is locally appropriate in terms of the intensity of financial and human resources being provided, so that the Programme will not support unsustainably large activities, institutional footprints and/or expectations. In addition, work to engage directly with the public and other civil society stakeholders has been included to ensure that immediate benefits from the
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Programme are perceived by the community, in order to build and strengthen their own commitment to

longer-term anti-corruption efforts.

# RESULTS FRAMEWORK

|  |
| --- |
| **Intended Outcome as stated in the United Nations Pacific Strategy (UNPS) 2018-2022:**  **Outcome 5:** Governance and Community Engagement- By 2022, people and communities in the Pacific will contribute to and benefit from inclusive, informed and transparent decision-making processes; accountable and responsive institutions; and improved access to justice.  **The Programme will also contribute to Outcome 2: Gender Equality:** By 2022, gender equality is advanced in the Pacific, where more women and girls are empowered and enjoy equal opportunities and treatment in social, economic and political spheres, contribute to and benefit from national development and live a life free from violence and discrimination. |
| **Outcome indicators as stated in the United Nations Pacific Strategy (UNPS) 2018-2022:** Number of PICTs with established and implemented anti–corruption policies |
| **Applicable Output(s) from the UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021/ SRPD 2018-2022:**  The Programme falls directly under the UNDP Strategic Plan (SP) 2018-2021 and responds to Signature Solution 2 to strengthen effective, inclusive and accountable governance; and Signature Solution 6 to strengthen gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls.  The Programme also falls directly under the sub-regional programme document for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories (SRPD) (2018-2022) Output 5.3. More women and men benefit from strengthened governance systems for equitable service delivery, including access to justice: people and communities in the Pacific will contribute to and benefit from inclusive, informed and transparent decision-making processes, accountable and responsive institutions, and improved access to justice.  For UNODC, the UN-PRAC Programme will fall directly under UNODC’s Regional Programme for Southeast Asia and the Pacific and will be aligned with UNODC’s Action against Corruption and Economic Crime Programme.  **Applicable Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and relevant targets**  **SDG 16:** Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels   * Target 16.5: Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms; and * Target 16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels.   The remaining SDG16 targets additionally directly or indirectly relate to the fight against corruption and promotion of effective governance:   * Target 16.3: Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all; * Target 16.4: By 2030, significantly reduce illicit financial and arms flows, strengthen the recovery and return of stolen assets and combat all forms of organized crime; * Target 16.7: Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels; and * Target 16.10: Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements.   **SDG 5:** Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls   * Target 5c: Adopt and strengthen sound policies and enforceable legislation for the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of all women and girls at all levels. |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Title: UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Programme** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS** | **OUTPUT INDICATORS** | **DATA SOURCE** | **BASELINE** | **TARGETS**  **(by frequency of data collection)** | | | | | | **DATA COLLECTION METHODS** |
| **Value** | **Year of the**  **Baseline** | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **FINAL** |
| **Output 1.1**  Broader  anti-corruption agenda contributed to by PICs | ***1.1 Anti-corruption (AC) vision for the Pacific adopted*** | *AC Vision documents; UN-PRAC annual reports* | 0 | 2020 | *1* | 0 | 0 | 0 | *1* | *Verification through UN- PRAC annual reports* |
| ***1.2 Pacific Community of Practice (CoP)/ network established*** | *UN-PRAC annual reports; COP reports* | *No CoP exists, but UN-PRAC supports informal networks of Pacific AC supporters* | *2020* | *1* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *2* | *Verification through the reports of the CoP and UN-PRAC annual reports* |
| ***Number of meetings of Pacific CoP***  *1 =* At least 2 Pacific CoP meetings held | *UN-PRAC annual reports; CoP reports* | *0* | *2020* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *1* | *2* | *Verification through the reports of the CoP and UN-PRAC annual reports* |
| ***1.3 At least 10 PICs participate at CoSP (and its subsidiary bodies) and other relevant anti- corruption fora including***  ***the IACC*** | *UN-PRAC annual reports; relevant CoSP/ IACC reports* | PICs featured in the CoSP report and sponsored CoSP  resolutions | *2020* | *5* | *6* | *5* | *4* | *1034* | *Verification through lists of participants and mission reports; CoSP/ IACC reports; UN-PRAC annual reports* |
| **1.1.4 At least 3 PICs supported in reporting on the SDG16 targets** | *UN-PRAC annual reports; national and regional SDG reports/ Voluntary National Reviews*  *(VNRs); UN reports on SDG progress; SDG dashboards; UNESCAP data; surveys/ reports by other partners (TI, World Bank, etc)* | Limited SDG16 monitoring and reporting; | 2020 | *1* | *1* | *1* | *0* | *3* | *Verification through review of reporting documents, UN-PRAC annual reports; national and regional SDG reports/ VNRs; UN reports on SDG progress; SDG dashboards; UNESCAP data; surveys/ reports by other partners (TI, World Bank, etc)* |
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34 At least 10 PICs participate at CoSP and other AC fora, but the same PICs may participate in events at least twice, meaning that the cumulative number of countries participating over the four years period would be 20, but this will only include at least 10 PICs.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 1.2**: Follow- up to the UNCAC peer reviews recommendations successfully implemented by PICs | ***1.2.1 UNCAC reviews recommendations discussed***  *1 =* At least 10 UNCAC review follow-up workshops held | *UN-PRAC*  *workshop reports and annual reports; UNCAC review documentation* | 8 UNCAC  review follow-up workshops held during Ph. II of UN-PRAC | 2020 | *3* | 2 | 3 | 2 | *10* | *Verification through UN- PRAC workshop reports and evaluations of participants; UN- PRAC annual reports* |
| ***1.2.2 UNCAC reviews recommendations followed up on***  1= At least additional 4 implementation plans to the UNCAC review follow-ups developed (also as NACS) | *UN-PRAC*  *workshop reports and annual reports; UNCAC*  *implementation plans; UNCAC review documentation* | 4 UNCAC  implementation plans developed during Ph.II of UN-PRAC | *2020* | *1* | *1* | *1* | *1* | *4* | *Verification through review of UNCAC*  *implementation plans; UN-PRAC annual reports* |
| **Output 1.3:**  UNCAC and SDG  requirements addressed by PICs through anti- corruption policies and laws | ***1.3.1: NACs endorsed in at least 3 more PICs and coordinating committees established*** | *AC plans/ NACS; UN-*  *PRAC annual reports; UNCAC review reports* | 3 PICs have endorsed NACS | 2020 | *1* | 2 | 0 | 0 | *3* | *Verification through review of policies/ NACS; UN-PRAC annual reports* |
| **1.3.2: Implementation of NACS reviewed in at least 3 PICs** | *AC plans/ NACS; UN-*  *PRAC annual reports; UNCAC review reports* | 3 PICs have finalized and adopted NACS | *2020* | *1* | *2* | *0* | *0* | *3* | *Verification through review of policies/ NACS; UN-PRAC annual reports* |
| **1.3.3 Anti-corruption legislation strengthened in at least 6 PICs** | *Legal analysis, draft Bills; laws enacted; UNCAC review reports* | 6 PICs have been supported with draft anti- corruption legislation | *2020* | *2* | *2* | *0* | *0* | *6* | *Verification through legal analysis,/review; UN-PRAC annual reports* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 2.1:** Key PIC integrity institutions strengthened | **2.1.1: Institutional capacity on anti-corruption measures enhanced through technical assistance** | *UN-PRAC*  *reports; partner emails; UNCAC review reports* | Existing integrity institutions (FIUs, SAIs, Ombudsman Offices, LCCs, etc) function variably | 2020 | *1* | 1 | 2 | 0 | *4* | *Verification through on-ground monitoring and feedback from*  *AC institutional partners; UN-PRAC annual reports* |
| **2.1.2: Establishment/ strengthening of integrity institutions enhanced** | *Workshop reports, feedback from partners; workshop evaluation*  *reports; UNCAC review reports* | Only Fiji has an ICAC: Solomon Islands is establishing the SIICAC; Papua New Guinea has an interim ICAC | *2020* | *0* | *1* | *2* | *1* | *4* | *Verification through on-ground monitoring and feedback from training recipients; UN-PRAC annual reports; UNCAC review reports* |
| **Output 2.2:** PICs’ public service excellence enhanced | **2.2.1: Number of PICS benefit from pilot public service training strategies designed to build a cohort of public servants**  **committed to accountable, transparent, people- centred service-delivery** | *Concept notes, workshop reports, research reports, emails, evaluations* | * ADB/DFAT have been supporting some public service cap. development * Pacific Institute for Leadership+ Governance established but   focuses primarily on  PNG | 2020 | *2* | 2 | 2 | 2 | *8* | *Verification through review of documents and evaluation of pilots; feedback from government*  *institutions/ reports* |
| **2.2.2: At least 3 service delivery pilots rolled out and evaluated** | *Concept notes, workshop reports, research reports,*  *Action plans,*  *evaluations* | Service delivery in most PICs faces challenges re accountability, transparency and efficiency | *2020* | *1* | *1* | *1* | *0* | *3* | *Verification through review of documents and evaluation of pilots* |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 2.3**: Effective knowledge sharing in and among PICs promoted | **2.3.1: PICs benefitted from technical support and peer- to-peer exchanges through Pacific-Pacific cooperation** | *Concept notes, emails, reports from participants in*  *exchanges; UN- PRAC annual reports* | Pacific-Pacific cooperation and peer-to- peer exchanges  increasingly used | 2020 | *0* | 1 | 0 | 1 | *2* | *Verification through reports from exchanges and interviews with participants; evaluation reports; UN- PRAC annual reports* |
| **2.3.2: Regional and country-level partnerships on corruption prevention supported (links to activity result 3.2.1 that specifically focuses on CSOs)**  *1 =* At least 1 institutional partnership on anti-corruption developed/ strengthened  *2 = At least 2 total* institutional partnership on anti-corruption developed/  strengthened | *Concept notes, emails, reports from participants in partnerships; UN-PRAC*  *annual reports* |  | *2020* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *2* | *2* | *Verification through relevant documents*  *and on-ground monitoring* |
| **2.3.3: Knowledge products relevant to the Pacific**  **AC Vision, programme communication products reports and policy briefs on Pacific trends, challenges, good practices and related information developed and shared with the Pacific**  **anti-corruption network (cf: activity result 1.1.2)** | *Knowledge products produced* | Weak documented knowledge base on AC in the Pacific exists | *2020* | *1* | *1* | *2* | *1* | *5* | *Verification through review of publications and campaigns produced* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *1 =* At least 1 Programme commu- nication project/ campaign pro- duced and disseminated + at least 1 knowledge product (KP) relevant to the Pacific AC vision produced/ disseminated  *2 =* At least 2 total Programme com- munication project/ campaign pro- duced and disseminated + at least  1 total UNCAC-related publication produced/disseminated + at least 1 total KP relevant to the Pacific AC vision produced/disseminated  *3 =* At least 3 total Programme com- munication project/ campaign pro- duced and disseminated + at least  1 total UNCAC-related publication produced/disseminated + at least 2 total KP relevant to the Pacific AC vision produced/disseminated  *4 =* At least 4 total Programme communication project/ campaign disseminated + at least 2 total UN- CAC-related publication produced/ disseminated + at least 2 total KP relevant to the Pacific AC vision produced/disseminated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 3.1** Anti-corruption knowledge and oversight capacities  of PICs’ Parliaments increased | **3.1.1: Parliamentarians engaged and capacitated to support national AC efforts**  1 = At least 1 workshop supported with Pacific MPs on AC topics  2 = At least 2 total workshops sup- ported with Pacific MPs on AC topics  + at least 1 KP/tool produced for MPs on AC topic  3 = At least 3 total workshops sup- ported with Pacific MPs on AC topics 4 = At least 4 total workshops sup- ported with Pacific MPs on AC topics  + at least 2 total KP/tool produced for MPs on AC topic | *Workshop reports, evaluation feedback from MPs* | Most Pacific MPs have some basic skills training - capacities remain variable, esp re use of oversight and inquiry powers   * Most Pacific Parliaments have some budget oversight committees, but   variable capacities   * Pacific Parliaments have staff but ltd analytical skills, know-ledge of   AC, Parliamentary  inquiry processes | 2020 | *1* | 2 | 2 | 1 | *6* | *Verification via workshop reports and evaluation feedback from MPs* |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **3.1.2: Oversight and accountability functions of legislative bodies**  **improved (note link to UNDP Parliamentary Projects in the Pacific)**  *1 =* At least 1 workshop supported with Pacific MPs on AC topics  *2 =* At least 2 total workshops supported with Pacific MPs on AC topics  *3 =* At least 3 total workshops supported with Pacific MPs on AC topics  *4 =* At least 4 total workshops supported with Pacific MPs on AC topics + MPs and parliamentary staff skills  developed in relation to budget oversight in at least 4 Pacific legislatures | *Workshop reports, evaluation feedback from MPs* |  | 2019 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6 | *Verification via workshop reports and evaluation feedback from MPs and on ground monitoring* |
| **Output 3.2** Pacific civil society, gender equality organizations, media and private sector enhanced  as proactive actors in awareness- raising and corruption oversight | **3.2.1: Regional CSO anti- corruption networks supported** 1 = Online network for Pacific CSOs developed  2 = At least 2 capacity development trainings rolled out to partner CSOs and/or media and/or private sector on anti-corruption issues and/or approaches  3 = Online network of Pacific CSOs developed, with at least 25 active members sharing content  4 = At least 2 capacity development trainings rolled out to partner CSOs and/or media and/or private sector on AC issues and/or approaches |  | PYFAC + 3 national chapters established  + active but still require capacity development and support   * Limited AC technical capacity developed within CSO partners * CSOs in at least 10 PICs have participate in training on UNCAC and AC issues | 2020 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | *Verification through review of online exchanges; UN-PRAC*  *annual reports* |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **3.2.2: Regional and national**  **anti-corruption civil society, media and private sector initiatives enhanced and integrate specific gender/ corruption issues**  *1 =* Roll out at least 2 cap dev trainings to CSOs/media/private sector on AC issues and/or approaches  *2 =* Roll out at least 4 total cap dev trainings to CSOs/media/  private sector on AC issues and/or approaches  *3 =* Roll out at least 6 total cap dev trainings to CSOs/media/ private sector on AC issues and/or approaches  *4 =* Capacities of at least 10 CSO staff to undertake AC advocacy developed + At least 4 CSOs actively lead/involved in AC campaigns + Pacific Media engaged in AC discussions as a result of  at least 3 UNPRAC supported regional media initiatives + At least 3 Chambers of Commerce give serious consideration to adopting AC codes of conduct | *Workshop*  *reports, evaluation feedback from participants, review of online articles; UN-PRAC*  *annual reports* |  | 2020 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | *Verification*  *through workshop reports and review of any outputs produced by*  *CSOs/ media/ private sector; UN-PRAC*  *annual reports* |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 3.3** Anti-corruption education platforms in the Pacific increased | **3.3.1: At least At least 2 PICs have formal or informal**  **anti-corruption education programmes/curricula -Anti- corruption integration into the education curriculum at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels supported**  *1 =* 1 national training delivered on AC curriculum development  *2 =* First year roll out of new USP AC course evaluated + UN- PRAC supports at least 1 guest lecture on AC at Pacific learning institutions  *3 =* Technical support provided to 1 PIC to flesh out options for integrating AC into curriculum  + Concept note provided to interested tertiary institution on new AC course/integration + UN- PRAC supports at least 3 total guest lectures on AC at Pacific learning institutions  *4 =* Pilot curriculum designed and rolled out in at least 1 PIC  + - Support provided to design new AC course/integrate into subjects in 1 PIC University + UN- PRAC supports at least 5 guest lectures on AC at Pacific learning institutions | *Concept notes, workshop reports, participants feedback, curriculums developed, feedback from participants; UN-PRAC*  *annual reports* | Fiji rolled out National AC Curriculum to all levels of schools from 2019  - USP developed tertiary level  AC course for students from 2020 | 2020 | *1* | 2 | 3 | 4 | *4* | *Verification through review of documents produced and any curriculum materials; evaluation reports; UN- PRAC annual reports* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **3.3.2: At least 1 more Pacific tertiary institution canvasses options for developing a stand-alone anti-corruption course and/or integrating anti- corruption into existing courses** | *Concept note, workshop report, curriculum, feedback from participants; UN- PRAC annual reports* | No Pacific- specific in- service courses for public officials available on AC issues | *2020* | *1* | *0* | *1* | *0* | *2* | *Verification through review of documents produced; UN- PRAC annual reports* |
| **3.3.3: At least 1 Pacific training institute canvasses options for developing accredited course in relation to anti- corruption** | *Concept note, workshop report; feedback from participants; UN- PRAC annual reports* |  | 2020 |  | - | 1 | - | *1* | *Verification through review of documents produced; UN- PRAC annual reports* |
| **3.3.4 UN-PRAC supports at least 5 guest lectures on anti-corruption**  **at Pacific learning institutions** | *Concept note, workshop report; feedback from lectures given* |  | *2020* | *1* | *1* | *1* | *2* | *5* | *Verification through review of documents produced* |
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# MONITORING AND EVALUATION

1. In accordance with UNDP and UNODC’s programming policies and procedures, the Programme will be monitored through the following monitoring and evaluation plans:

### Annual Work Plan and Budget

1. The Programme will be monitored based on the outline in the results and resource framework, translated into annual plans. The annual costed workplans will serve as the primary reference documents for the purpose of monitoring the achievement of results. A single joint UNDP-UNODC annual workplan, setting out the detail of the activities to be implemented under this Programme annually, will be developed by the Programme management team and approved by the Programme Steering Committee. The Programme management team is tasked with the responsibility of ensuring implementation of the Programme in accordance with these documents.
2. Within two months of the start-up of the Programme, the Programme team will organize a communication exercise with the relevant UN offices and relevant Government entities, in order to continue ownership and supply information for outlining the initial annual plan that would follow the calendar year in the first two months. The same exercise will be repeated annually, in order to maintain strong ties with stakeholders and ensure Programme relevance throughout the years.

### Communication

1. Under the 2012-2016 phase of the UN-PRAC Project, weekly updates on corruption-related news of the Pacific were shared with AP-INTACT that were disseminated to its subscribers across predominately the Indo-Pacific region. UN-PRAC also produced bi-annual newsletters that were shared with a wider range of stakeholders. Similar updates will continue during this Programme, but will further include more explicit reference to other UN platforms (e.g. courses and materials). In the course of the inception period, the Programme will develop its communication strategy, taking under consideration the elements above and aiming at communicating Programme objectives, mobilizing stakeholders and promoting results. In this, the Programme will benefit from the UNDP Communication Officer, sitting in the UNDP Pacific Office.
2. UN-PRAC will engage in regular and consistent communication with DFAT during the implementation of this Programme. In particular, UN-PRAC will send to DFAT short email updates, as and when deemed relevant. This is to provide information on: a) major activities or events undertaken; b) any upcoming events; c) suggestions for tweets or other social media that DFAT could post; and d) any key issues that DFAT should be made aware of.

### Steering Committee

1. The Steering Committee will be the final instance to validate the collected inputs and provide more strategic guidance and be the critical instance in the monitoring platform, as part of their oversight functions.

### Activities within the Annual Project Cycle

1. The Programme Team will on a quarterly basis record the progress towards the completion of the results, track the potential problems and seek for solutions. In the same context, the initial risks will be updated. These exercises are also required by the involved agencies corporate rules and procedures and involve specific corporate platforms, such as specific modules in UNDP’s electronic corporate platform- Atlas and UNODC’s UMOJA and ProFI. Those modules incorporate the Quality Management Module, an Issue and Risk Logs, Programme Lesson-learned log and Monitoring Schedule Plan. All these modules compel the Programme team to be diligent in maintaining and updating the relevant issues and obtain timely information that will feed into the Annual Programme Report.

### Annual Project Review

1. In line with the above, an Annual Review Report will be prepared by the Programme Manager, with the support of the UNODC Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser and the UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti-
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Corruption. The Report will be submitted to the Steering Committee Review Meeting. As a minimum requirement, the Annual Review Report will consist of a narrative report, reporting against each of the outputs in the results and resource framework and a financial report in compliance with UNDP’s and UNODC’s reporting requirements. The review of the report will focus on the extent to which progress is being made towards outputs, and that these remain aligned to appropriate outcomes. Any changes to the budget will be considered at this meeting. The progress will be considered against the outputs and contributions made towards the outcomes of the Programme. Main reference points for reporting will be the targets and indicators set in the results and resource framework. Qualitative and quantitative information will be used. Additionally, the narrative reports will include updates on relevant country developments and regional trends relating to the issue of corruption.

### Mid-term and Final Independent End of Programme Evaluation

1. A mid-term Independent Programme Evaluation will be undertaken after 18 months in (2022) and a final Independent Programme Evaluation before completion at the end of the project in (2025) to determine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the Programme and to derive identify lessons to be learned and recommendations to inform future programming, policy making and organizational learning in accordance with the relevant policies and guidelines on evaluation for UNDP and UNODC. The final evaluation will further assess the implementation of the recommendation of the mid-term evaluation. The final Evaluation will be commissioned in Quarter 3 of the final year of the Programme, to allow time for a proper response to the recommendations of the Evaluation, prior to the end of the Programme. More details on the purpose, scope and duration of the evaluations as well as a detailed list of major stakeholders to be consulted will be provided in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation to be drafted by UNODC and UNDP, and cleared by UNODC Independent Evaluation Section (IES). DFAT will be consulted in the course of preparation of both envisioned evaluations and will be asked to provide clearance on the evaluation reports. The evaluations will be conducted by the independent and external evaluators, selection as cleared by the Programme team, with tasks e.g. desk review and evaluation methodology first hand research in the form of an inception report, draft report, final report (also to be cleared by IES), with substantive and logistical support from the Programme team,

54 and with methodological support and quality assurance from UNODC IES. Funds to cover evaluation costs have been set aside for both UNDP and UNODC in the Project budget (a total of USD 74,000 for the two evaluations).

**MONITORING PLAN**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Monitoring Activity** | **Purpose** | **Frequency** | **Expected Action** | **Partners (if joint)** | **Cost (if any)** |
| **Track results progress** | Progress data against the results indicators in the MYWP will be collected and analyzed to assess the progress of the Programme in achieving the agreed outputs. | Quarterly, or in the frequency required for each  indicator. | Slower than expected progress will be addressed by Programme management. | UNODC/ UNDP | None |
| **Monitor and Manage Risk** | Identify specific risks that may threaten achievement of intended results. Identify and monitor risk management actions using a  risk log. This includes monitoring measures and plans that may have been required as per the UN’s Social and Environmental  Standards. Audits will be conducted in accordance with the UN’s audit policy to manage financial risk. | Quarterly | Risks are identified by project management and actions are taken to manage risk. The risk log is actively maintained to keep track of identified risks and actions taken. | UNODC/ UNDP | None |
| **Learn** | Knowledge, good practices and lessons will be captured regularly, as well as actively sourced from other projects and partners  and integrated back into the Programme. | At least annually | Relevant lessons are captured by the project team and used to inform management decisions. | UNODC/ UNDP | None |

**EVALUATION PLAN**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Annual Project Quality Assurance** | The quality of the Programme will be assessed against the UN’s  quality standards to identify project strengths and weaknesses and  to inform management decision making to improve the Programme. | Annually | Areas of strength and weakness will be reviewed by Programme management and used to inform decisions to improve Programme performance. | UNODC/ UNDP | None |
| **Review and Make Course**  **Corrections** | Internal review of data and evidence from all monitoring actions to inform decision-making. | At least annually | Performance data, risks, lessons and quality will be discussed by the Steering Committee and used to make course corrections. | UNODC/ UNDP | None |
| **Programme Report** | A progress report will be presented to the Steering Committee and key stakeholders, consisting of progress data showing the results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level, the annual Programme quality rating summary, an updated risk long with mitigation measures, and any evaluation or review reports prepared over the period. | Annually, and at the end of the project (final report) | Project Steering Committee will consider the reports and provide guidance and take action as necessary to ensure the Programme continues to meet its objectives. | UNODC/ UNDP | None |
| **Steering Committee** | The Steering Committee will hold regular Programme reviews to assess the performance of the Programme and review the Multi- Year Work Plan to ensure realistic budgeting over the life of the Programme. In the Programme’s final year, the Steering Committee shall hold an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to socialize Porgramme results and lessons learned with relevant audiences. | At least annually and ad-hoc meetings as needed | Any quality concerns or slower than expected progress should be discussed by the Steering Committee and management actions agreed to address the issues identified. | UNODC/ UNDP | None |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Title** | **Partners (if joint)** | **Related Strategic Plan Output** | **UNDAF/CPD**  **Outcome** | **Planned Completion Date** | **Key Evaluation Stakeholders** | **Cost and Source of Funding** |
| **Mid-Term Evaluation** | UNODC  and UNDP |  |  | 2022 | PIC Govts, integrity institutions, civil society, DFAT | $37,000 |
| **Final Independent End of Programme Evaluation** | UNODC  and UNDP |  |  | 2025 | PIC Govts, integrity institutions, civil society, DFAT | $37,000 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***OUTCOME 1: MULTI-YEAR WORKPLAN (1 July 2021- 30 June 2025)*** | | | | | | | | |
| **Outcome 1: PICs more effectively implement UNCAC and work towards the achievement of SDG 16** | | | | | | | | |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS** | **PLANNED ACTIVITIES** | **Planned Budget by**  **Year** | | | | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **PLANNED BUDGET** | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** | **Y4** | **Amount USD** | **Amount AUD** |
| **Output 1.1: Broader anti- corruption agenda contributed to by PICs** | **Activity Result 1.1.1: Regional and/or sub-regional anti-corruption vision for the Pacific developed in line with UNCAC, SDG 16 and regional agendas** | | | | | | | |
| Adopt a Pacific anti-corruption vision | X |  |  |  | UNDP | 0 | 0 |
| UNODC | 0 | 0 |
| **Activity Result 1.1.2: Pacific Anti-Corruption Community of Practice/ network established and supported** | | | | | | | |
| Establish the Pacific Community of Practice/ network in line with the Pacific anti-corruption vision in collaboration with PIFS | X |  | X |  | UNDP | 60,000 | 88,889 |
| Biennial meeting of the Pacific Community of Practice/ network | UNODC | 90,000 | 133,333 |
| **Activity Result 1.1.3: Pacific States parties to UNCAC participated in the CoSP (and its subsidiary bodies where necessary) and other**  **relevant anti-corruption fora including the IACC** | | | | | | | |
| Support the active participation of Pacific States parties to attend CoSP (and its subsidiary bodies), including the sponsorship of CoSP resolutions and leadership of and/ or participation in CoSP side events. This may include  preparatory activities, notably pre-CoSP workshops and/or  trainings. |  | X |  | X | UNDP | 50,000 | 74,074 |
| Support the active participation of identified anti-corruption  champions from the Pacific at other relevant anti-corruption fora, including the IACC. | UNODC | 150,000 | 222,222 |
| **Activity Result 1.1.4: The 2030 Agenda in the Pacific supported, with specific focus on innovative anti-corruption activities that can accelerate progress against SDG 16 targets and also enable overall progress across all SDGs.** | | | | | | | |
| Mapping of existing efforts and potential entry points for innovative anti-corruption activities that can accelerate progress against SDG16 targets, and enable progress across all SDGs, with due consideration of the findings of the COVID-19 socio-economic impact analysis under Pillar 5 on social cohesion and community resilience | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 50,000 | 74,074 |
| - Possible joint events for SDG national focal points/ taskforce on SDG 16 reporting and planning | UNODC | 0 | 0 |
| **Sub-total (UNDP, including 8%, GMS)** | | | | | | | 172,800 | 256,000 |
| **Sub-total (UNODC, including 13% PSC)** | | | | | | | 271,200 | 401,777 |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | | | | | | | 444,000 | 657,777 |
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# MULTI-YEAR WORK PLAN
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 1.2: Follow-up to the UNCAC peer reviews**  **recommendations successfully implemented by PICs** | **Activity Result 1.2.1: Follow-up on the UNCAC reviews ensured through national workshops** | | | | | | | |
| Facilitate in-country UNCAC review follow-up workshops and  promote wide stakeholder involvement | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 40,000 | 59,259 |
| UNODC | 70,000 | 103,704 |
| **Activity Result 1.2.2: UNCAC review recommendations prioritized by Pacific States parties** | | | | | | | |
| Facilitate the prioritization of UNCAC recommendations with a focus on mandatory UNCAC provisions | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 0 | 0 |
| Support the development of implementation plans to support PICs’ implementation of prioritized recommendations (NB: some plans form part of NACS; cf: activity result 1.3.1.) | UNODC | 0 | 0 |
| **Sub-total (UNDP, including 8%, GMS)** | | | | | | | 43,200 | 64,000 |
| **Sub-total (UNODC, including 13% PSC)** | | | | | | | 79,100 | 117,186 |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | | | | | | | 122,300 | 181,185 |
| **Output 1.3: UNCAC and SDG**  **requirements addressed by PICs through anti-corruption policies and laws** | **Activity Result 1.3.1: National anti-corruption policies/ strategies developed/ strengthened and their implementation monitored** | | | | | | | |
| Support the development anti-corruption policies/ NACS in line with UNCAC article 5 | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 70,000 | 103,704 |
| Support the establishment of a coordinating body to ensure the implementation of NACS in line with UNCAC article 6 |
| Support the national monitoring, evaluation and reporting of NACS | UNODC | 80,000 | 118,519 |
| **Activity Result 1.3.2: Anti-corruption legislation strengthened** | | | | | | | |
| Review draft anti-corruption legislation, also in relation to COVID-19 and corruption risks | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 20,000 | 29,630 |
| Provide legislative drafting to Pacific States parties in addressing UNCAC review recommendations |
| Where relevant, conduct national/ regional trainings on  specific legislation | UNODC | 40,000 | 59,259 |
| **Sub-total (UNDP, including 8%, GMS)** | | | | | | | 97,200 | 144,001 |
| **Sub-total (UNODC, including 13% PSC)** | | | | | | | 135,600 | 200,889 |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | | | | | | | 232,800 | 344,890 |
| **Advisers/Advisory Services** | | | | | | | 340,932 | 505,084 |
| 381,090 | 564,578 |
| **Outcome Total by Agency** | | | | | | | 654,132 | 969,084 |
| 866,990 | 1,284,430 |
|  |  |  |  |  | **TOTAL OF OUTCOME** | | **1,521,122** | **2,253,514** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome 2: PICs strengthen broader governance frameworks in line with UNCAC and SDG 16** | | | | | | | | |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS** | **PLANNED ACTIVITIES** | **Planned Budget by Year** | | | | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **PLANNED BUDGET** | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** | **Y4** | **Amount USD** | **Amount AUD** |
| **Output 2.1: Key PIC integrity institutions strengthened** | **Activity Result 2.1.1: Institutional capacity on anti-corruption measures enhanced through technical assistance** | | | | | | | |
| Upon request, facilitate specific technical assistance | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 80,000 | 118,519 |
| Facilitate national/ sub-regional/ regional anti-corruption trainings, where applicable, including online | UNODC | 100,000 | 148,148 |
| **Activity Result 2.1.2: Establishment/ strengthening of integrity institutions enhanced** | | | | | | | |
| Upon request, provide technical advice to the establishment/ strengthening of integrity institutions, such as ICACs and Financial Intelligence Units | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 50,000 | 74,074 |
| Facilitate Pacific-Pacific attachments between integrity institutions, where appropriate | UNODC | 60,000 | 88,889 |
| **Sub-total (UNDP, including 8%, GMS)** | | | | | | | 140,400 | 208,000 |
| **Sub-total (UNODC, including 13% PSC)** | | | | | | | 180,800 | 267,852 |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | | | | | | | 321,200 | 475,852 |
| **Output 2.2: PICs’ public service excellence enhanced** | **Activity Result 2.2.1: Pilot public service training strategies designed to build a cohort of public servants committed to accountable, transparent, people centred service-delivery** | | | | | | | |
| Explore development of partnerships, such as with Public Service Commissioners Conference and other PSCs | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 80,328 | 119,004 |
| Commission mapping of existing activities to develop anti- corruption focused public service leadership and good practice globally or regionally in this area |
| Development of a methodology for strengthening public service leadership with a focus on integrating anti-corruption themes and strategies, including strong M&E methodology | UNODC | 0 | 0 |
| Identify and work with interested Government partners to identify an initial cohort of public servants to pilot  methodology and provide trainings, including in consideration of specific COVID-19 capacity needs in relation to anti-  corruption |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Activity Result 2.2.2: Support pilots to improve public service delivery integrity, with a particular focus on services critical to marginalized people** | | | | | | | |
|  | Mapping of existing analysis and recommendations regarding public service and bottlenecks identified in national reports and lessons learned to identify entry points for work |  | X | X | X | UNDP | 50,000 | 74,074 |
| Organize workshop to discuss mapping and related recommendations for action |
| Work with partners to identify pilot institutions or sectors keen to explore new approaches to improving accountable public service delivery, with specific attention to COVID-19 relevant services and the needs of vulnerable groups including specifically persons with disabilities |
| Design pilot activities, including strong M&E methodology to effectively assess progress and/or identify pilot problems | UNODC | 0 | 0 |
| Roll out pilots in at least 2 countries, including by providing TA, funding, mentoring and close oversight |
| **Sub-total (UNDP, including 8%, GMS)** | | | | | | | 140,754 | 208,524 |
| **Sub-total (UNODC, including 13% PSC)** | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | | | | | | | 140,754 | 208,524 |
| **Output 2.3:**  **Effective knowledge sharing in and among PICs promoted** | **Activity Result 2.3.1: PICs benefitted from technical support and peer-to-peer exchanges through Pacific-Pacific cooperation** | | | | | | | |
| Identify and engage in/ strengthen existing institutional partnerships to further PICs’ anti-corruption efforts | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 60,000 | 88,889 |
| Support peer-to-peer exchanges between PICs through cooperation |
| Support Pacific-Pacific capacity-building, including possible attachments between integrity institutions | UNODC | 60,000 | 88,889 |
| **Activity Result 2.3.2: Regional and country-level partnerships on corruption prevention supported (links to activity result 3.2.1 that specifically focuses on CSOs)** | | | | | | | |
| Broker/ support dialogue and partnerships among Government and non-State actors | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 20,000 | 29,630 |
| Provide technical support in designing/ enhancing partnership arrangements | UNODC | 20,000 | 29,630 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Activity Result 2.3.3: Knowledge products, reports and policy briefs on Pacific trends, challenges, good practices and related information developed and shared with the Pacific anti-corruption network (cf: activity result 1.1.2)** | | | | | | | |
| Produce and disseminate bi-annual Programme communication products/ campaigns | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 20,000 | 29,630 |
| Develop UNCAC-related publications, including Pacific States parties’ implementation of the Convention |
| Produce and disseminate knowledge products relevant to the  Pacific anti-corruption vision and of benefit to the network (cf: activity result 1.1.2) and others | UNODC | 20,000 | 29,630 |
| **Sub-total (UNDP, including 8%, GMS)** | | | | | | | 108,000 | 160,001 |
| **Sub-total (UNODC, including 13% PSC)** | | | | | | | 113,000 | 167,408 |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | | | | | | | 221,000 | 327,409 |
| **Advisers/Advisory Services** | | | | | | | 340,932 | 505,084 |
| 381,090 | 564,578 |
| **Outcome Total by Agency** | | | | | | | 730,086 | 1,081,610 |
| 674,890 | 999,838 |
|  |  |  |  |  | **TOTAL OF OUTCOME** | | **1,404,976** | **2,081,448** |
| **Outcome 3: PICs’ State and non-State actors more effectively engage and partner to prevent and fight corruption** | | | | | | | | |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS** | **PLANNED ACTIVITIES** | **Planned Budget by Year** | | | | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **PLANNED BUDGET** | |
| **Y1** | **Y2** | **Y3** | **Y4** | **Amount USD** | **Amount AUD** |
| **Output 3.1**  **Anti-corruption knowledge and oversight capacities of**  **PICs’ Parliaments increased** | **Activity Result 3.1.1: Parliamentarians engaged and capacitated to support national anti-corruption efforts** | | | | | | | |
| Undertake anti-corruption awareness-raising activities with MPs, in particular, in support of key national anti-corruption law reform or policy activities | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 15,000 | 22,222 |
| Organize workshops for parliaments to provide updates on UNCAC Review outcomes |
| Produce policy briefs and other knowledge products for MPs, in relation to key global/regional/ national anti-corruption issues/ activities | UNODC | 0 | 0 |
| **Activity Result 3.1.2: Oversight and accountability functions of legislative bodies improved (note link to UNDP Parliamentary Projects in**  **the Pacific)** | | | | | | | |
| Provide raining to MPs and parliamentary staff on key oversight committees to develop their analysis and inquiry capacities | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 15,000 | 22,222 |
| Provide training to MPs and parliamentary staff on budget analysis with an accountability focus, including during  emergency responses (e.g. COVID-19) | UNODC | 0 | 0 |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sub-total (UNDP, including 8%, GMS)** | | | | | | | 32,400 | 48,000 |
| **Sub-total (UNODC, including 13% PSC)** | | | | | | | 0 | 0 |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | | | | | | | 32,400 | 48,000 |
| **Output 3.2 Pacific civil society, gender equality organizations, media and private sector enhanced as proactive actors in awareness-raising and corruption oversight** | **Activity Result 3.2.1: Regional CSO anti-corruption networks supported** | | | | | | | |
| Support facilitation of online networking and knowledge sharing amongst Pacific CSOs (incl through social media) | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 70,000 | 103,704 |
| Support CSOs (in particular youth and women) to gain exposure and contribute to high-level regional/ international anti-corruption dialogues |
| Provide capacity building and other support to regional CSO anti-corruption initiatives/ networks | UNODC | 0 | 0 |
| **Activity Result 3.2.2: Regional and national anti-corruption civil society, media and private sector initiatives enhanced and integrate specific gender/corruption issues** | | | | | | | |
| Organize trainings and knowledge exchange workshops for CSOs, media and private sector on key anti-corruption issues and strategic approaches, including in relation to their role in addressing COVID-19 implications for governance and anti-  corruption work | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 103,000 | 152,593 |
| Provide mentoring, capacity development and small funding support to empower partner CSOs (incl youth and women CSOs) to engage in anti-corruption activities |
| Support training and exposure opportunities to develop capacities of young leaders |
| Provide capacity-building training and exchange opportunities to journalists and editors, incl through Pacific Journalists for Integrity Network | UNODC  (specifically for gender work) | 23,000 | 34,074 |
| Support training with private sector on specific business anti- corruption issues and codes of conduct |
| Roll out gender and anti-corruption training for CSO partners and officials to identify concrete entry-points for support |
|  | **Sub-total (UNDP, including 8%, GMS)** | | | | | | 186,840 | 276,800 |
|  | **Sub-total (UNODC, including 13% PSC)** | | | | | | 25,990 | 38,504 |
|  | **SUB-TOTAL** | | | | | | 212,830 | 315,304 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 3.3 Anti-corruption education**  **platforms in the Pacific increased** | **Activity Result 3.3.1: Anti-corruption integration into the education curriculum at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels supported** | | | | | | | |
| Facilitate in-country trainings on how anti-corruption might be integrated into the education curriculum drawing on E4J and regional/ international best practices | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 39,600 | 58,667 |
| Support South-South exchanges for interest PICS to learn  from Fiji NACC |
| Support the development of national anti-corruption curriculum pilots, drawing on the NACC good practice |
| Collaborate with PIC tertiary institutions beyond USP in considered the design and development of anti-corruption  components/ courses | UNODC | 20,000 | 29,630 |
| Support the sharing of expertise through guest lecturing |
| **Activity Result 3.3.2: Partnerships on anti-corruption integration into skills development and research enhanced** | | | | | | | |
| Explore partnerships with key public service/in-service education training institutions (e.g. PSCC, PILG) | X | X | X | X | UNDP | 20,000 | 29,630 |
| Produce a concept paper on in-service anti-corruption training options, incl how this could fit in with existing institutions  and donor programmes, with particular consideration of  implications of COVID-19 and related capacity needs |
| Undertake advocacy/relationship building with possible partners to take up recommendations in concept paper |
| Support design of in-service anti-corruption training, incl. 2-3 research/validation workshops with partners and beneficiaries | UNODC | 0 | 0 |
| Develop formal or informal partnerships with Pacific research/  academic institutions to undertake more anti-corruption related research |
| Design internal UN-PRAC policies encouraging the Project to  use Pacific researchers where possible |
| **Sub-total (UNDP, including 8%, GMS)** | | | | | | | 64,368 | 95,361 |
| **Sub-total (UNODC, including 13% PSC)** | | | | | | | 22,600 | 33,482 |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | | | | | | | 86,968 | 128,843 |
| **Advisers/Advisory Services** | | | | | | | 340,932 | 505,084 |
| 381,090 | 564,578 |
| **Outcome Total by Agency** | | | | | | | 624,540 | 925,245 |
| 429,680 | 636,564 |
|  |  |  |  |  | **TOTAL OF OUTCOME** | | **1,054,220** | **1,561,809** |
| **TOTAL OUTCOMES 1-3** | | | | | | | **3,980,318** | **5,896,771** |
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SUPPORT STAFF SERVICES AND OPERATIONAL COSTS** | **Agency** | **INPUTS** | |
| **USD** | **AUD** |
| Project Manager (P3) | UNDP | 434,154 | 643,190 |
| UNODC | 434,154 | 643,190 |
| Anti-Corruption Governance Associate | UNDP | 68,364 | 101,280 |
| UNODC | 68,364 | 101,280 |
| Anti-Corruption Governance Assistant | UNDP | 43,384 | 64,272 |
| UNODC | 43,384 | 64,272 |
| Operational Costs | UNDP | 57,139 | 84,650 |
| UNODC | 61,735 | 91,459 |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | UNDP | 37,000 | 54,815 |
| UNODC | 37,000 | 54,815 |
| **TOTAL PER AGENCY** | UNDP | 691,243 | 1,024,064 |
| UNODC | 728,439 | 1,079,170 |
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TOTAL** | **Agency** | **INPUTS**  **USD AUD** | |
|  |  |
| Outcome 1 | UNDP | 654,132 | 969,084 |
| UNODC | 866,990 | 1,284,430 |
| Outcome 2 | UNDP | 730,086 | 1,081,609 |
| UNODC | 674,890 | 999,837 |
| Outcome 3 | UNDP | 624,540 | 925,244 |
| UNODC | 429,680 | 636,563 |
| Support Staff Services and Operational Costs | UNDP | 691,243 | 1,024,064 |
| UNODC | 728,439 | 1,079,170 |
| **TOTAL PER AGENCY** | **UNDP** | 2,700,000 | 4,000,000 |
| **UNODC** | 2,700,000 | 4,000,000 |

# GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

### Programme Management

1. The day-to-day implementation of the Programme will be managed by the UN-PRAC Programme team, comprised of a UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti-Corruption, UNODC Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser, and three cost-shared positions, namely the Programme Manager, Programme Associate and Programme Assistant. The team will physically sit under the ‘Effective Governance’ team, led by a Team Leader, in the UNDP Pacific Office. The Programme Team will be located in Suva, Fiji Islands where the UN Pacific Office is located. However, members of the Programme Team will be expected to rove across the Pacific, to provide direct technical assistance and undertake liaison, stakeholder management and oversight of Programme delivery.
2. The UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti-Corruption and UNODC Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser will be supported by a Programme Manager, Programme Associate and Programme Assistant, which are positions that will be cost-shared by both organizations.
3. In accordance with the Executive Board Decision and as per its Cost Recovery Policy, UNDP charges 8% as a General Management Services fee (GMS). For UNODC, the Budget set out in section 3 of the Results Based Framework includes: (a) 13% of the Contribution amount, to cover indirect administrative costs of the Recipient incurred in relation to the implementation of the Project, referred to as Project Support Cost (PSC); and (b) costs associated with Full Cost Recovery, including administrative, field management and security costs.

### Programme Oversight

1. The Programme will be guided by a joint Steering Committee composed of representatives of UNODC, UNDP and DFAT at the Pacific level. This will consist of the UN-PRAC Programme team, DFAT and other stakeholders, as appropriate and mutually determined by all the members of the Committee;

64 this will be referred to as the ‘Steering Committee’. The Terms of Reference of the Steering Committee is detailed in Annex 2.

1. The Steering Committee will review and assess progress, approve the annual workplan and provide overall policy guidance on Programme implementation. UNDP and UNODC functions as the Secretariat to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will meet annually, either in person or by video-conference.
2. In order to ensure accountability, Steering Committee decisions should be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In case a consensus cannot be reached within the Steering Committee, final decision shall rest with UNDP and UNODC. In addition, the Steering Committee plays a critical role in UN-commissioned project evaluations by quality assuring the evaluation process and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. The Terms of Reference for the Steering Committee are annexed.

# 9. LEGAL CONTEXT

1. This Programme is directly implemented by the UNDP Pacific Office, located in Fiji, and UNODC Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific. As Fiji, the host country, has signed the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA), this Programme Document will be the instrument referred to as such in Paragraph 1 of the SBAA between the Government of Fiji and UNDP. Consistent with the Paragraph III of the SBAA, the responsibility for the safety and security of the executing agency and its personnel and property, and of UNDP’s property in the executing agency’s custody, rests with the Implementing Partner. The executing agency will:
2. Put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the Programme is being carried;
3. Assume all risks and liabilities related to the executing agency’s security, and the full implementation of the security plan.
4. UNDP reserves the authority to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder will be deemed a breach of this arrangement. The executing agency will undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the UNDP and UNODC funds received pursuant to the Programme Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP and UNODC hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to Res 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via [http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1267/1267ListEng.htm.](http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1267/1267ListEng.htm) This provision will be included in all sub-contracts or sub-arrangements entered into under this Programme Document.

# 10. RISK MANAGEMENT

1. UNDP and UNODC as the Implementing Partners will comply with the policies, procedures and practices of the United Nations Security Management System (UNSMS).
2. UNDP and UNODC as the Implementing Partners will undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the project funds35 are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP or UNODC hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via [http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq\_sanctions\_list.shtml.](http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq_sanctions_list.shtml) This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document.
3. Social and environmental sustainability will be enhanced through application of the UN Social and Environmental Standards and related Accountability Mechanism.
4. UNDP and UNODC as the Implementing Partner will: (a) conduct project and programme-related activities in a manner consistent with the UN Social and Environmental Standards, (b) implement any management or mitigation plan prepared for the project or programme to comply with such standards, and (c) engage in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism. UNDP and UNODC will seek to ensure that communities and other project stakeholders are informed of and have access to the Accountability Mechanism.
5. In the implementation of the activities under this Project Document, UNDP and UNODC as the Implementing Partners will handle any sexual exploitation and abuse (“SEA”) and sexual harassment (“SH”) allegations in accordance with its regulations, rules, policies and procedures.
6. All signatories to the Project Document shall cooperate in good faith with any exercise to evaluate any programme or project-related commitments or compliance with the UN Social and Environmental Standards. This includes providing access to project sites, relevant personnel, information, and documentation.
7. UNDP and UNODC as the Implementing Partners will ensure that the following obligations are binding on each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient:
8. Consistent with the Article III of the SBAA, the responsibility for the safety and security of each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient and its personnel and property, and of the UN’s property in such responsible party’s, subcontractor’s and sub-recipient’s custody, rests with such responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient. To this end, each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient shall:
   1. put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
   2. assume all risks and liabilities related to such responsible party’s, subcontractor’s and sub-recipient’s security, and the full implementation of the security plan.
9. UNDP and UNODC reserve the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security
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35 To be used where UNDP is the Implementing Partner.

plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of the responsible party’s, subcontractor’s and sub-recipient’s obligations under this Project Document.

1. In the performance of the activities under this Project, UNDP and UNODC as the Implementing Partners shall ensure, with respect to the activities of any of its responsible parties, sub-recipients and other entities engaged under the Project, either as contractors or subcontractors, their personnel and any individuals performing services for them, that those entities have in place adequate and proper procedures, processes and policies to prevent and/or address SEA and SH.
2. Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will take appropriate steps to prevent misuse of funds, fraud or corruption, by its officials, consultants, subcontractors and sub-recipients in implementing the project or programme or using the UNDP and UNODC funds. It will ensure that its financial management, anti-corruption and anti-fraud policies are in place and enforced for all funding received from or through UNDP and UNODC.
3. The requirements of the following documents, then in force at the time of signature of the Project Document, apply to each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient: (a) UN Policy on Fraud and other Corrupt Practices and (b) UN Office of Audit and Investigations Investigation Guidelines. Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient agrees to the requirements of the above documents, which are an integral part of this Project Document.
4. In the event that an investigation is required, UNDP/ UNODC will conduct investigations relating to any aspect of UNDP/ UNODC programmes and projects. Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will provide its full cooperation, including making available personnel, relevant documentation, and granting access to its (and its consultants’, subcontractors’ and sub-recipients’) premises, for such purposes at reasonable times and on reasonable conditions as may be required for the purpose of an investigation. Should there be a limitation in meeting this obligation, UNDP/ UNODC shall consult with it to find a solution.
5. Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will promptly inform UNDP/ UNODC as the

66 Implementing Partner(s) in case of any incidence of inappropriate use of funds, or credible allegation

of fraud or corruption with due confidentiality.

1. Where it becomes aware that a UNDP/ UNODC project or activity, in whole or in part, is the focus of investigation for alleged fraud/corruption, each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will inform the UNDP/ UNODC Resident Representative/Head of Office, who will promptly inform UN’s Office of Audit and Investigations (OAI). It will provide regular updates to the head of UNDP/ UNODC in the country and OAI of the status of, and actions relating to, such investigation.

# ANNEX 1: RATIFICATION OF THE UNCAC BY PACIFIC STATES AND PARTICIPATION IN THE REVIEW MECHANISM

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **UNCAC** | | **Country Review** | |
| **Signed** | **Ratified/ Acceded** | **Review Cycle 1** | **Review Cycle 2** |
| **Cook Islands** | - | 17 Oct 2011 | Qatar  Belarus | Oman  Maldives |
| **Federated States of Micronesia** | - | 21 Mar 2012 | Mongolia Republic of Korea | Singapore China |
| **Fiji** | - | 14 May 2008 | Bangladesh USA | Samoa UK |
| **Kiribati** | - | 27 Sep 2013 | Vanuatu Côte d’Ivoire | Cambodia Niger |
| **Marshall Islands** | - | 17 Nov 2011 | Papua New Guinea Central African Republic | Kazakhstan Lithuania |
| **Nauru** | - | 12 Jul 2012 | Timor-Leste  Jamaica | Nepal  Burundi |
| **Niue** | - | 03 Oct 2017 | Republic of Korea Saudi Arabia | - |
| **Palau** | - | 24 Mar 2009 | Malaysia Cambodia | Tuvalu Cyprus |
| **Papua New Guinea** | 22 Dec 2004 | 16 Jul 2007 | Tajikistan Malawi | Kyrgyzstan Burundi |
| **Samoa** | - | 18 Apr 2018 | Oman South Sudan | - |
| **Solomon Islands** | - | 06 Jan 2012 | Iraq Slovakia | Viet Nam Republic of Korea |
| **Tonga** | - | 06 Feb 2020 | - | - |
| **Tokelau** | - | - | - | - |
| **Tuvalu** | - | 4 Sep 2015 | Afghanistan Grenada | Afghanistan Fiji |
| **Vanuatu** | - | 12 Jul 2011 | Solomon Islands India | Malaysia Argentina |

67

Source: UNODC (2020), Signature and Ratification Status – United Nations Convention against Corruption, [https://www](http://www/). unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/ratification-status.html; UNCAC (2020), Country Profiles, [https://www](http://www.unodc.org/unodc/).unodc.[org/unodc/](http://www.unodc.org/unodc/) en/treaties/CAC/country-profile/index.html.

# ANNEX 2: RISK LOG

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project Phase III | **Award ID:** | **Date:** |

**Likelihood: 1 =** very likely and 3 = not very likely)

**Impact: 1 =** very serious and 5 = not serious)

The Risk Log presented in the table below is a summary overview of the potential risks that have been identified based on the experience of the first and second phases of UN-PRAC, comparative experiences of UNDP and UNODC, as well as experiences of other governance programmes in the region. It is important to note that the outlined initial set of risks is not elaborating into detail every single potential threat but summarizes the risks that could have a substantive effect on the Programme life and dynamics. Thanks to the valuable experience gained with the first phase of UN-PRAC, most of the risks have been met before, lessons have been learned and mitigation strategies developed. Therefore, the current Programme design and its activities have already incorporated a comprehensive set of counter-measures, through the way the Programme activities have been selected and designed. Also, the serious investment in a permanent Programme team will assist that the risks are thoroughly and regularly monitored and mitigated, based on knowledge, experience and good networking and trust with partners and stakeholders. The strong component of technical assistance through the two advisers will be the anchor of the element of trust with the partners. This has proven sometimes to be the key (and only) way of mitigating some of the risks (particularly the ones of political and policy nature). The regional nature of the Programme is itself a “measure” of addressing a number of the risks, particularly the ones linked to the limitation of financial and human resources throughout the PICs. The comprehensive management and oversight structure, including the Steering Committee (involving the donor), will be of substantive importance for recognizing and mitigating the recorded, but also newly occurred risks. The mid-term evaluation is also a concrete tool that will alert on any omitted and newly occurred risks and propose mitigation measures. In the meantime, the regular corporative UNDP and UNODC tools described under the ‘Monitoring and Evaluation’ section will ensure corporative accountability for the risk mitigation aspect.
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Description** | **Risk Category** | **Risk Level** | **Risk Treatment / Management Measures** | **Risk Owner** |
| 1 | Lack of political will | Programmatic & Political | Likelihood =2  Impact = 2 | * Utilizing the UNCAC processes, as entry point in anti-corruption reforms, and where possible, VNRs, the UNPS and SDG progress   \*Specific work with MPs across parties to build political commitment   * Rely on requests for assistance to ensure sufficient political will prior to engagement * Approach of linking corruption and development will help to demystify corruption and secure necessary political will and buy-in from wider stakeholders * Utilize existing tools and methodologies to assess the political economy of a country and tailor activities accordingly * Strengthening outreach to non-State actors to enhance social pressure for transparency and accountability | UNDP/ UNODC |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2 | Political instability stalls legislative and high-level reforms | Operational & Programmatic & Political | Likelihood =2  Impact = 2 | * Wide stakeholder consultations to get cross-party support * Close liaison with key political actors * Work in multiple countries, to allow for flexibility * Strengthen outreach to non-state actors through project activities   \*Promote UN’s impartiality principle of work  \*Maintain good reporting lines with the donor and adjust Programme activities accordingly | UNDP / UNODC |
| 3 | Changing Government Staff in partner countries | Operational & Programmatic | Likelihood =2,  Impact = 2 | \* Multiple partners included in Programme across departments  \*Maintain communication at the highest level | UNDP / UNODC |
| 4 | Lack of human and financial resources on the side of the governments | Fiscal/ Programmatic | Likelihood =2, Impact=2 | \*The regional nature of the Programme enables selection of the best prepared partners to become the champions and also proposing of regional solutions  \*The Programme will focus on promoting the value (financial and democratic) of prevention versus repression  \*The nature of the Programme is such that it is based on providing of technical and sometimes financial assistance for start-up of reforms  \*The Programme will work on proposing rational and cost-effective institutional solutions, as well as support partnerships with the non-State actors for better cost-efficiency;  \*The Programme will invest in networking, partnering and advocacy for mobilizing other supporters for this important endeavour | UNDP/ UNODC |
| 5 | Potential lack of commitment due to an “externally” driven agenda | Programmatic & Political | Likelihood =3,  Impact = 2 | \* Wide stakeholder consultations in preparation of Programme  \*Utilization of peer-to-peer and South-South exchange  \*\*International obligation of UNCAC, supported through the UN as a neutral actor | UNDP/ UNODC |
| 6 | Local cultures and traditions not aligned with the contemporary understanding and addressing corruption | Social/ Programmatic | Likelihood =2,  Impact =3 | \*Use local actors/champion CSOs, businesses and individuals, as catalysts  \*Localizing activities  \*Promote the issue through the support of regional for a and networks and broad engagement in the UNCAC review processes  \*Strong focus on youth as a driver of change and accountability  \*Focus on social accountability tools  \*Focus on innovation and use of ICT to the extent possible | UNDP/ UNODC |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 7 | Lack of relevant corruption related statistics and data in the region | Programmatic | Likelihood =2,  Impact =3 | \*Use UN PRAC I and II findings as baselines  \*Use UNCAC review information and from the VNRs and SDG progress reports  \*Engage with relevant CSOs and use their findings and observations  \*Use SDG 16 related data  \*Design an information sheet based on a basic anti-corruption data needs assessment and distribute it to data providers  \*Partner with academic institutions to generate research | UNDP/ UNODC |
| 8 | Geographically challenging region with a risk of  natural disasters and pandemics (e.g. **COVID-19**), difficult accessibility and commuting, and weak internet capacities | Natural/ Programmatic | Likelihood =1  Impact =2 | \*The ability to shift activities throughout the countries of the region  \*Good planning and organizing back-to-back missions in several PICs  \*Good networking and using local peer networks for facilitating communication with stakeholders in various PICs  \*Utilizing local UNDP presence, and maintaining regular communication and updates with the local offices, notably through the Resident Coordinators’ Offices | UNDP/ UNODC |
| 9 | Risks with fluctuations of currencies, exchange rates and/or inflation and related reporting | Financial/ Programmatic | Likelihood =2;  Impact =4 | \*Maintain good and quality relations with the donor, including regular updates and joint discussions on mitigating the effects  \*Putting efforts to engage other donors and cross-fertilize with other existing governance projects and technical assistance partners | UNDP/ UNODC |
| 11 | Institutional and operational differences between the two implementing partners at corporate levels | Operational | Likelihood =1; Impact=3 | \*Staff with experience from the first and second phases of UN-PRAC will be able to predict and mitigate at least some of the challenges  \* Good understanding and trust at programmatic level between the respective teams of the two organizations | UNODC/ UNDP |
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# ANNEX 3: STEERING COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Overall Objective of the Steering Committee

The overall objective of the Steering Committee is to provide guidance and direction to the Programme management team in order to reach the Programme’s overall objective, as well as be aligned to UNDP and UNODC regional programmes and initiatives.

### Specific Objectives of the Steering Committee

The specific objectives of the Steering Committee are as follows:

* To discuss and find solutions to challenges to the timely and high-quality implementation of the Programme;
* To ensure that the Programme is progressing in a manner which is satisfactory to all the stakeholders;
* To ensure that the Programme continuously adopts an integrated approach with other similar support being provided by other multi-lateral or bilateral development partners at the regional level;
* To ensure that synergies are maintained and enhanced between the Programme and other relevant governance projects in the Pacific region;
* To improve coordination and information sharing among the Programme stakeholders and ensure that any internal or external risks to the successful implementation of the Programme are brought to light in a timely manner and ensure that potential solutions are forthcoming;
* To ensure that any potential change of approach, strategy or mechanism for the implementation of any part of the Programme’s components is shared and approved by the stakeholders;
* To ensure that there is a sufficient information flow between the various stakeholders at the regional level.

### Composition of the Pacific Steering Committee

The Steering Committee will consist of representatives of the UN-PRAC Programme team, DFAT and other stakeholders (such as the UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub and the UNODC Regional Office for South- east Asia and the Pacific), as appropriate and mutually determined by all the members of the Committee. Moreover, representatives from other organizations relevant to the implementation of the Programme may also be invited as observers on an ad hoc basis, such as PIFS and selected Pacific Island countries, through their embassies in Suva.

The Resident Coordinator in Suva will chair the Steering Committee. The level of the participants will be at a senior technical level. The names of the representatives of each organization will be submitted to the Programme management team two weeks before the first Steering Committee meeting. Any subsequent changes of a representative should be sent in writing to Programme management team that functions as the Secretariat to the Steering Committee and chairs the meetings.

This arrangement will be for an initial one-year phase covering at least one Steering Committee sitting. Thereafter, a review will be undertaken by the Committee members after the second meeting to discuss whether any modifications to the Steering Committee structure are required or whether to maintain the Committee in the present structure.

### Organization of Pacific Steering Committee Meetings

The meetings will be organized annually, either in person or by video-conferencing. Where possible, the timing of Steering Committee meetings will be aligned with Programme activities, other relevant work- shops or meetings and/or as arranged by the Steering Committee members. In principle, the venue for the Steering Committee will be determined by Programme implementation team.
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All Steering Committee members are required to submit the following documentation to the Programme management team two weeks prior to the Committee meeting:

* Summary progress reports, highlighting the main activities undertaken since the last Pacific Steering Committee meeting;
* A brief work plan of activities to be undertaken in the next calendar year; and
* Other documentation deemed relevant.

The Programme management team will compile the necessary information for the Steering Committee meeting one week in advance of the meeting to other Steering Committee members. This will allow time for initial comments, feedback and suggestions to be provided on the documents. The information to be distributed is to include:

* The documentation received from the Steering Committee members, as outlined above;
* A draft agenda including action items and recommendations from previous Steering Committee meetings;
* A copy of the minutes of the last Steering Committee meeting; and
* Other documentation deemed relevant.

For urgent matters, such as unforeseen difficulties in any of the components of the Programme, an ad hoc Steering Committee meeting may be convened, upon the request, of any of its members.

### Outputs of the Steering Committee

The minutes of each Steering Committee meeting will be produced by the Programme management team and a draft circulated to Steering Committee members within one week after the meeting, request- ing for comments. Any comments should be sent back to the Programme management team within the following week. Thereafter, the final minutes will be produced within five days of receipt of comments and re-circulated.
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Aside from these minutes, it is anticipated that the Steering Committee will have a positive effect on the

dissemination of information among the regional stakeholders to the Programme and reinforce cooper- ation and coordination.

# ANNEX 4A: TOR – UNDP TECHNICAL ADVISER: ANTI-CORRUPTION

|  |
| --- |
| **II. Organizational Context** |
| Corruption is a global phenomenon that has existed for a long time in many parts of the world. Evidence from across the world continues to confirm that corruption negatively impacts development. In the Pacific, it is clearly evident that corruption hurts the poor disproportionately, hinders economic development, undermines State accountability and capacity to provide equitable and responsive public services, and diverts investments from infrastructure, institutions and social services. Furthermore, corruption fosters an anti-democratic environment characterized by uncertainty, unpredictability and declining moral values and disrespect for constitutional institutions and the rule of law. Corruption, therefore, reflects a democracy, human rights and governance deficit that negatively impacts on poverty and human security and undermines the ability of countries in the region to achieve the SDGs.  Although Pacific island countries now have various accountability institutions, recent research has found that they have struggled to be effective in combating corruption. At the heart of their limited impact has been a problematic lack of genuine political will. At a more operational level, limited skilled staff, small budget allocations and problems of coordination amongst existing institutions continue to be serious problems. In small islands states, capacity issues and lack of resources are particularly challenging problems, compounded by often un-costed proposals to set up multiple separate institutions (e.g. Ombudsman, leadership tribunals, national human rights institutions, anti- corruption commission).  In this context, UNDP has been working for the last ten years with Pacific partners to raise awareness and build capacity on tackling corruption regionally and nationally. UNDP has worked closely with partner countries, in particular within the framework of promoting ratification and implementation of the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) together with the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC). Since 2012, the number of States parties to UNCAC in the region has increased from 6 to 13, with Samoa being the latest member to join the global UNCAC family in April 2018. To date, all but one PIC (Tonga) and the territory of Tokelau,36 which are covered by UN-PRAC, are not States parties to UNCAC. Through ratification and then the UNCAC Review Mechanism, Pacific States parties have undergone or are undergoing a comprehensive review of their implementation of the Convention through an inter-governmental peer review process.  Building on the work that UNDP Pacific Centre had done, the UNDP Pacific Office is providing technical support, advisory service and implementing project activities in 15 countries and territories in the Pacific.The project activities are notably implemented through the UN Pacific Regional Anti- Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project. This joint UNDP-UNODC Project promotes and strengthens measures to prevent and fight corruption more efficiently and effectively in the Pacific region. This aligns with the purpose of UNCAC in paragraph 1(1) and the spirit of SDG 16. The objectives of this Projects are |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **I. Position Information** | |
| Job Code Title:  UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti-Corruption  Position Number: 00072424 Department:  Reports to: Team Leader Governance (P4)  Position Status: (Non-Rotational) | Current Grade: P4 Approved Grade: P4  Position Classified by: ODU, UNDP. Classification Approved by: ODU, UNDP. |
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36 New Zealand ratified UNCAC on 1 December 2015. However, upon ratification, the Government notified the Secretary-General of the following: “... consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zea- land to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, [the ratification by New Zealand of this Convention] shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory”.

|  |
| --- |
| three-fold. The first is to enable PICs to more effectively implement UNCAC and work towards the achievement of SDG 16. The second objective is to support PICs to strengthen broader governance frameworks in line with UNCAC and SDG16. The third is to provide support to PICs’ State and non- State actors to more effectively engage and partner to prevent and fight corruption.  The range of UNDP Anti-Corruption activities in the Pacific are wide and the support from the donor community expected to increase, notably with a new phase of the UN-PRAC project. The UN-PRAC project daily operations and anti-corruption activities implementation are managed by a Project Manager, under the joint supervision of the UNODC Regional Adviser and UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti-Corruption. |
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|  |
| --- |
| **III. Functions / Key Results Expected** |
| Summary of key functions:   * Regional (and National) Policy Advocacy and Advisory Services * Policy Development * Partnership Building * Quality Control and Assurance * Knowledge Management. |
| The UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti-Corruption in the Pacific Office will provide substantive and technical advice and advocacy on anti-corruption initiatives at the regional, and national levels. The Technical Adviser will provide specific support for UNDP’s policy and programming, both in general governance-related work, and specifically in: (i) implementing the UN-PRAC Project together with UNODC; ii) strengthening the quality of UNDP’s policy advice and technical support to Pacific governments and UNDP country offices to promote transparency and accountability, in particular to address the effects of corruption on the poor and disadvantaged groups; and (ii) mainstreaming and applying accountability and anti-corruption norms and principles in UN/UNDP programming.   * **Regional Policy Advocacy and Advisory Services:** * Engage in effective advocacy with UNDP Country Offices towards Pacific Governments, CROP agencies, regional and international organizations and CSO counterparts on the value and means of promoting accountability and addressing corruption in the Pacific; * Provide technical advice to UN/UNDP Country offices and government counterparts on how to promote accountability and tackle corruption in the Pacific, including by providing technical advice and support to implement UNCAC, with a special focus on UNCAC Chapters II (Preventive Measures) and III (Criminalization and Law Enforcement); * Advocate with UNDP Country Office/UN Country Teams Senior Managers to support the inclusion of accountability and anti-corruption norms and principles in country-level programming frameworks at various stages in the UN/UNDP’s programme planning cycle, and to support the design of national/sub-regional anti-corruption projects as appropriate; * Work with UNDP Country Offices to:   + Engage with government and other stakeholders (including civil society) on developing and implementing policies and programmes to progress development efforts and governance interventions in the area of anti-corruption, including specific anti-corruption programmes and sector-specific anti-corruption interventions, with a focus on anti-corruption and SDGs achievement;   + Support the establishment and strengthening of effective national accountability institutions, in locally-appropriate ways for small island states, including through the establishment of multi-function accountability institutions; |
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|  |
| --- |
| * Provide technical support to governments and CSOs to develop and implement national freedom of information (FOI) policies and laws; * Manage a CSO small grant mechanism and other interventions designed to specifically strengthen Pacific CSO capacity to support anti-corruption initiatives; * Work with UN country teams and UNDP country offices to leverage technical and other resources for governance and anti-corruption programming, including through regional partnerships. |
| * **Policy Development** * Facilitate regional and global policy developments on accountability, anti-corruption and FOI that are grounded in cutting edge policy developments and practices from the region, fed into HQ policy processes, and replicated in countries throughout the Pacific; * Strengthen UNDP’s policies and programmes in the areas of governance, accountability, anti- corruption and FOI, as well as UNDP potential for influence within the international community by effectively channelling the views and perspectives from partners in the region to the global level; * Promote UNDP policy on democratic governance, accountability, anti-corruption and FOI, grounded in international norms and standards and best practices at the country level through expert advice to country teams and by facilitating engagement between HQ and country teams in priority areas. |
| * **Partnership Building** * Effectively collaborate with UNODC in implementing the UN-PRAC project, as well as with the various UNDP and UNODC global anti-corruption projects, with a view for a third phase of UN- PRAC (2020-2024). * Effectively position the regional governance programmes and initiatives to ensure that the Pacific Office’s approach to accountability, anti-corruption and FOI policy and programming is understood and supported by UN agencies, CROPs, regional and international organizations and other external partners; * Effectively position UNDP’s contribution to the democratic governance practice area: o Within the UN System, to foster consistency in approach;   + Within the global and regional level by continually scanning and assessing activities of non- UNDP players in the local context;   + In support of UNCTs and UNDP Country Office programming arrangements with government counterparts; * Under the leadership of UNDP Country Offices / UNCTs, engage national, regional and global partners in programme responses (including but not limited to UNODC, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Pacific Islands Legal Officers Network, Pacific Association of Supreme Audit Institutions and other relevant donors and/or development partners); * Lead partnership building with regional / local institutions and consultancies which are conversant in UNDP’s position and approaches and well placed to formulate and support the implementation of the practice area in response to local, national and global strategies; * Mobilize resources in support of the Pacific Office’s regional governance programme and national level programming by UNDP country offices. |

|  |
| --- |
| * **Quality control and assurance** * Provide quality assurance to ensure alignment of democratic governance, human rights and justice policies and programming, with UNDP’s global development policies and international norms and standards * Coordinate the delivery of demand-driven technical advisory services to UNDP country offices, government counterparts and/or regional and international organizations ensuring professionalism in support (e.g. timeliness / responsiveness, quality in deliverables, with global coordination etc.); * Apply an integrated and holistic approach to UNDP’s work on democratic governance and ensure cross-practice and cross-regional collaboration linking to global experiences and international best practices, norms and principles. |
| * **Knowledge Management** * Collaborate with UNDP Country offices, the Asia-Pacific regional Governance team in APRC in Bangkok, and UNDP’s regional and global anti-corruption programmes to support Pacific governments and other national and regional stakeholders in using knowledge to strengthen democratic governance, and the application of international accountability, anti-corruption and FOI norms and standards; * Prepare practical, action-oriented and relevant knowledge products pertaining to democratic governance, accountability, anti-corruption and FOI in the Pacific region; * Broker and promote local, regional and global knowledge exchange, through learning networks, partnerships and programme implementation, codification of lessons learned * Work with UNDP Country Offices and other stakeholders, the democratic governance team in the Asia-Pacific Regional Centre in Bangkok and in other UNDP regional centres, the Asia Pacific Anti-Corruption Community of Practice, and the Pacific Accountability Network, to support Pacific countries in developing and disseminating evidence and lessons; * Contribute to, and participant in, relevant country level, regional and global knowledge sharing events. |
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|  |
| --- |
| **IV. Impact of Results** |
| The key results have an impact on the overall performance of development projects and success in implementation of global operational practice area strategies. They also help to strengthen UNDP’s image and position as a trusted capacity development partner for both governments and development partners. |

|  |
| --- |
| **V. Competencies** |
| ***Corporate:***   * Demonstrates integrity and fairness, by modelling the UN/UNDP’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.   ***Functional:***  1. Strong ability to apply various governance related development theories to the specific context, |

|  |
| --- |
| including translating democratic governance principles into effective anti-corruption policy and programme interventions in the field.   1. Ability to identify opportunities for integrating accountability, transparency and integrity into UNDP democratic governance programmes and its linkages to poverty/MDGs. 2. Capacity to interact with senior government officials and credibly influence senior decision makers in UNDP programme countries and other international development organizations 3. Strong analytical, negotiation and communication skills, including ability to produce high quality practical advisory reports and knowledge products  * Demonstrated practical professional experience in designing, implementing and monitoring anti- corruption and/or FOI initiatives in developing country settings * Knowledge of accountability, transparency and anti-corruption assessments and other methodologies for evaluating vulnerabilities in governance systems, institutions and processes and risks in policies, programs and projects.   ***Leadership:***   1. Strong managerial/leadership experience and decision-making skills; 2. Ability to conceptualize and convey strategic vision from the spectrum of global development experience; 3. Knowledge and expertise in UN/UNDP’s programming processes; 4. Proven ability to lead a thematic area of work and drive for results with a strong knowledge of results-based management and budgeting.   ***Managing Relationships:***   * Well-developed people management and organizational skills; * Strong ability to work in teams; creating an enabling environment, mentoring and developing partners and colleagues; * Excellent negotiating and networking skills; * Strong resource mobilization and partnering skills.   ***Managing Complexity:***   * Ability to address global development issues; * Substantive knowledge and understanding of development cooperation with the ability to support the practice architecture of UNDP and inter-disciplinary issues; * Demonstrated substantive leadership and ability to integrate global knowledge with broader strategic, policy and operational objectives; * A sound global network of institutional and individual contacts.   ***Knowledge Management and Learning:***   * Ability to strongly promote and build knowledge products; * Promotes knowledge management in UNDP and a learning environment in the office through leadership and personal example; * Seeks and applies knowledge, information and best practices from within and outside of UN/ UNDP. * Provides constructive coaching and feedback. |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **VI. Recruitment Qualifications** | |
| Education: | Post-graduate (Master’s) degree in development studies, economics, law, international relations, political science or related area. |
| Experience: | At least 7 years of progressively responsible relevant work experience in international development in the area of anti-corruption, accountability and/or FOI, as well as general governance-related work  Proven professional record in the areas in the area of anti-corruption, accountability, and/or FOI  Demonstrated ability to handle discrete/sensitive political issues with tact and diplomacy  Demonstrated team building and project management skills in a multi- disciplinary and multi-cultural environment.  Good knowledge and understanding of UN/UNDP  Familiarity with Pacific development issues at regional and national levels, and working experience in the Pacific would be an advantage.  Passion and commitment to knowledge management and innovation |
| Language Requirements: | Excellent command of written and spoken English essential. Knowledge of other UN languages, or languages of the region would be an asset. |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Judgment/Decision-Making:***   * Mature judgment and initiative; * Proven ability to provide strategic direction in practice area; * Independent judgment and discretion in advising on handling major policy issues and challenges. |
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# ANNEX 4B: TOR – UNODC REGIONAL ANTI-CORRUPTION ADVISER - PACIFIC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Position Information** | |
| Functional Title of Post: Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser - Pacific  Classified Level of Post: P-4  Organizational Location: Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific (ROSEAP) | Duty Station: Suva, Fiji  Duration: 1 year (Extension for a second year subject to availability of funds) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Organizational Setting and Reporting Relationships:** |
| This position falls under the Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific (ROSEAP), but is located in the UNDP Pacific Office in Suva, Fiji. The incumbent will report to the Representative of ROSEAP. S/he will receive substantive and policy guidance from UNODC Headquarters, Vienna, in particular the Chief (ISS/CEB) and other senior staff of the Branch. S/he will work as part of the UNDP Pacific Office’s Effective Governance Team and in close consultation with the UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti-Corruption. Within the duration of the assignment, the incumbent might be posted for shorter periods in national anti-corruption agencies of the respective region. |
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|  |
| --- |
| **Responsibilities:** |
| The Adviser (Anti-Corruption) is primarily responsible for the implementation of anti-corruption technical assistance activities (including policy advice, technical expertise and practical day-to-day support to anti-corruption bodies).  The incumbent will be responsible for the following duties:   * Together with the UNDP Technical Adviser, Anti-Corruption implement the UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Programme, a joint initiative of UNODC and UNDP, in 15 of the Pacific Island countries and territory (Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tokelau (Territory of), Tuvalu and Vanuatu); * Assist in the design and development of further technical assistance programmes and programme sub-components in anti-corruption at the regional and/or national levels in the Pacific, in accordance with the UNODC’s overall strategy and as an integral element of the UNODC Regional Programme for Southeast Asia and the Pacific; * Contribute to resource mobilization for the anti-corruption programme by establishing and maintaining close liaison with donor countries and other partners in coordination with ROSEAP, the UNDP Pacific Office and other relevant field offices. * Support States parties selected to be reviewed during the second cycle of the implementation review mechanism of UNCAC, and States parties in the region that perform reviews in second cycle. Conduct and/or follow-up on anti-corruption technical assistance needs assessments. Provide technical guidance and expertise to national counterparts and the UNODC field offices on anti-corruption. * Assist, where necessary and required, in enhancing and upgrading the relevant legislation and other legal instruments in conformity with UNCAC. Support the establishment and capacity-building of independent national anti-corruption bodies including development of their mandate, structure and operational practices. Provide advisory services and technical expertise to specialized anti- corruption bodies and units on preventing, detecting, investigating and prosecuting cases of corruption and related offences. |

|  |
| --- |
| * Assist in designing and further upgrading and developing anti-corruption strategies and anti- corruption campaigns in collaboration with civil society, media, business sector, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs). Develop targeted anti- corruption training courses based on needs analysis, especially for key personnel in the area of prevention, criminalization, enforcement and asset recovery. * Foster contacts and, where appropriate, co-operation and partnerships with bodies and institutions at national, regional and international levels tasked with the prevention and control of corruption. Work with government counterparts to strengthen capacity to deal with proceeds of crime, mutual legal assistance and asset recovery, in particular with relevant government agencies, but also with legislatures, the private sector and the public at large, as appropriate; * Coordinate closely all activities carried out by UNODC and UNDP on anti-corruption at the global level, and where opportune implement such activities jointly. Liaise and share information regularly with other partners on Programme activities. Prepare regular progress reports on the development of his/her work, as may be requested by the host institutions or UNODC; * Working with the UNDP Pacific Office’s Governance team and in close consultation with the UNDP Technical Adviser, Anti-Corruption on all UN-PRAC-related activities. |
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|  |
| --- |
| **Work implies frequent interaction with the following:** |
| Counterparts, officers and technical staff of UNODC units and field offices, UNDP Pacific Office, Resident Coordinators’ Offices, UN Join Presences in the Pacific, other relevant UN Secretariat departments and offices, specialized agencies, funds and programmes, representatives and officials of national governments, international organizations, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations, experts, consultants. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Results Expected:** |
| Accession of UNCAC; enhanced effective capacity of the national anti-corruption agencies; effective planning, development, organization, coordination and implementation of the UN-PRAC Programme; timely and efficient delivery of assigned tasks and responsibilities; development of well-reasoned and innovative approaches; provision of well-researched and sound analysis and expert advice on related developments in countries and regions; effective dissemination of best practices and methodologies; organization and delivery of specialized training; effective liaison and interaction with concerned parties internally and externally. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Competencies:** |
| ***Professionalism:*** Has knowledge and understanding of theories, concepts and approaches relevant to the particular sector and functional area with a focus on economic crime and corruption related issues. Has good knowledge of legislative aspects of preventing and combating corruption, including their international dimensions. Has ability to identify issues, analyze and contribute to the resolution of problems/issues. Has conceptual analytical and evaluative skills to conduct independent research and analysis. Has knowledge of the mandates of UNODC, as well as of the work of the United Nations in crime prevention and criminal justice, in particular substantive knowledge of UNCAC. Has ability to apply good judgment in the context of assignments given and ability to provide effective specialized advice. Shows pride in work and in achievements; demonstrates professional competence and mastery of subject matter; is conscientious and efficient in meeting commitments, observing deadlines and achieving results; is motivated by professional rather than personal concerns; shows persistence when faced with difficult problems or challenges; remains calm in stressful situations. Takes responsibility for incorporating gender perspectives and ensuring the equal participation of women and men in all areas of work. |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Planning & Organizing:*** Develops clear goals that are consistent with mutually determined strategies; identifies priority activities and assignments; adjusts priorities as required; allocates appropriate amount of time and resources for completing work; foresees risks and allows for contingencies when planning; monitors and adjusts plans and actions as necessary; uses time efficiently.  ***Teamwork:*** Good interpersonal skills and ability to establish and maintain effective partnership and working relationships in a multicultural environment.  ***Client Orientation:*** Considers all those to whom services are provided to be “clients” and seeks to see things from clients’ point of view; establishes and maintains productive partnerships with clients by gaining their trust and respect; identifies clients’ needs and matches them to appropriate solutions; monitors on-going developments inside and outside the clients’ environment to keep informed and anticipate problems; keeps clients informed of progress or setbacks in projects; meets timeline for delivery of products or services to client. |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Qualifications:** | |
| Education: | Advanced university degree (Master’s degree or equivalent) in law, criminal justice, international relations, economics, political and social sciences or a related discipline. A first-level university degree in combination with qualifying experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced university degree. |
| Experience: | A minimum of seven years of professional experience working within or providing advisory services to anti-corruption bodies or investigating and prosecuting corruption cases in anti-corruption agency, law enforcement, prosecution services or the judiciary, or as technical adviser on anti-corruption in international organizations or a non- governmental organization is required. Experience with mutual legal assistance, proceeds of crime and/or asset recovery legislation and casework and in designing national anti-corruption policies, strategies, and public campaigns, is desirable. Experience in the Pacific region or in a Small Island Developing State is a strong asset. |
| Language Requirements: | Fluency in written and spoken English. |

# ANNEX 4C: TOR – PROGRAMME MANAGER

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **I. Position Information** | |
| Job Title: Programme Manager Position Number:  Department: UNDP  Reports to: UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti- Corruption and UNODC Anti-Corruption Adviser  Direct Reports: UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti- Corruption and UNODC Anti-Corruption Adviser  Position Status: Non-Rotational Job Family: Yes | Grade Level: P3  Duty Station: Suva, Fiji  Family Duty Station as of Date of Issuance: Date of Issuance:  Closing Date:  Duration and Type of Assignment: More than a year; Fixed Term Appointment |
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|  |
| --- |
| **II. Job Purpose and Organizational Context** |
| UNDP Pacific Office (PO) in Fiji, serves 10 countries directly.37 UNDP in the Pacific has three focus areas:   1. Effective Governance 2. Inclusive Growth 3. Resilience and Sustainable Development   The UNDP PO in Fiji also coordinates regional initiatives and policy advice in 15 countries covered by the three UNDP offices in the region (Fiji, Samoa and Papua New Guinea).  The UNDP PO programme is guided by the Sub-Regional Programme Document (SRPD) (2018 – 2022) for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories. The SRPD outlines a programme strategy aligned with the vision of the Pacific Leaders, contributes to the achievement of Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development and forms part of the UN Pacific Strategy 2018-2022 (UNPS)38.  The Effective Governance Programme has begun implementation of the United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project, a joint UNDP/UNODC programme, now in its second stage (2016– 2020). The Project focuses on assisting Pacific Island Countries to tackle corruption through ratifying and implementing the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) and in line with Sustainable Development Goal 16, assisting those Pacific Island Countries that have ratified UNCAC to undergo the peer review process and strengthen their policies and institutional capacities, and it supports non-State actors in increasing social accountability.  Under the direct supervision and technical guidance of the UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti-Corruption and UNODC Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser, the Project Manager (P3) will work with the UN-PRAC team to ensure implementation and coordination of activities under the joint UNDP-UNODC UN- PRAC Project portfolio.  The technical adviser will be based in Suva, Fiji with travel to other Pacific Island Countries. |

1. 10 Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) are namely Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, Republic of Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu, with technical support also provided to PNG, Samoa, Cook Islands, Tokelau and Niue.
2. The United Nations Pacific Strategy (UNPS) 2018-2022 is a five-year strategic framework that outlines the collective response of the UN system to the development priorities in 14 PICTs.
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|  |
| --- |
| **III. Duties and Responsibilities** |
| Summary of Key Functions:   * Provide managerial expertise to the UN-PRAC Project team in developing, implementing and reporting on Project activities in accordance with the Project Document and in line with UNDP and UNODC policy and procedures; * Ensure inter-agency coordination by two UN agencies in the joint delivery and implementation of UN-PRAC and across the Effective Governance portfolio and across the UNODC Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific portfolio; * Contribute to development of strategic partnerships, implementation of the resource mobilization strategy and facilitation of knowledge building and management. |
| 1. **Provide managerial expertise to the UN-PRAC Project team in developing, implementing and reporting on Project activities in accordance with the Project Document and in line with UNDP and UNODC policy and procedures:**    * Provide inputs to development of work plans, including implementation and monitoring according to the Project results and resources framework;    * Contribute to corporate planning, evaluation and results reporting (UNPS, CCA, SRPD, Regional Programme Document, ROARs, IWPs, Regional Project Boards, donors, etc.) of UNDP and UNODC;    * Manage the UN-PRAC Project, including budget, in both UNDP and UNODC systems of ATLAS and UMOJA/ ProFi, and in line with UNDP and UNODC policy and procedures;    * Responsible for the coordination and compilation of the UN-PRAC Project Reports (FPSP, SLIP, PPEI, Regional, ProFi) to UNDP, UNODC and donors through the inputs of both UN agencies;    * Provides background papers, briefing notes and concept notes to inform decision-makers to engage in a comprehensive, long-term approach to UN-PRAC development in the Pacific;    * Oversee hiring processes for the expertise required for Project needs: draft Terms of Reference for experts and other requested documentation related to the areas of the Project intervention, approve the progress against the working targets, monitor performance and report on results accordingly. |
| 1. **Ensure inter-agency coordination by two UN agencies in the implementation of UN-PRAC and across the Effective Governance portfolio and across the UNODC Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific (ROSEAP) portfolio:**    * Facilitate inter-agency coordination between UNDP and UNODC under the UN-PRAC Project and more broadly, between UNDP PO and ROSEAP;    * Draft policy recommendations to improve the management and inter-agency coordination of UN-PRAC processes in the Pacific;    * Ensure that the UN-PRAC Team is well linked to and complementary of UNDP and UNODC interventions in the Human Rights area, as well as focuses on gender mainstreaming throughout the Project, where possible. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Contribute to development of strategic partnerships, implementation of the resource mobilization strategy and facilitation of knowledge building and management:**    * Maintaining effective and positive communication with national counterparts from Government, Parliaments and non-State actors, as well as with other stakeholders, as necessary;    * Liaison with key development partners, implementing partners and collaborating partners as needed in UN-PRAC activities;    * Active contribution to the overall UN-PRAC Team and Project effort in resource mobilization;    * Sound contributions to knowledge networks and communities of practice in close collaboration with the Communications Team;    * Effective application of RBM tools, establishment of management targets (BSC) and monitoring achievement of results;    * Assess project-specific M&E frameworks and ensure that the monitoring and reporting requirements for the Project are met consistent with UNDP’s POPP, including on planned evaluations in collaboration with IRMU and UNODC’s Independent Evaluation Unit;    * Contribute to the harmonization of UN-PRAC under UNPS Outcome Group 5 and as necessary, contribute to the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework and on behalf of UN- PRAC, liaise with Resident Coordinators’ Offices in the Pacific on UN-PRAC related activities and efforts. |

84

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IV. Competencies and Selection Criteria** | |
| In this section list all core competencies as well as the most relevant technical/functional competencies the role will require along with the appropriate level. A Detailed list of competencies can be accessed through the following link: https://intranet.undp.org/unit/ohr/competency-framework/SitePages/ Home.aspx | |
| ***Core*** | **Description of Competency at Level Required**  (For more comprehensive descriptions please see the competency inventory) |
| **Innovation**  *Ability to make new and*  *useful ideas work* | Level 5: Creates new and relevant ideas and leads others to implement them |
| **Leadership**  *Ability to persuade*  *others to follow* | Level 5: Plans and acts transparently, actively works to remove barriers |
| **People Management** *Ability to improve performance and satisfaction* | Level 5: Models high professional standards and motivates excellence in others |
| **Communication**  *Ability to listen, adapt,*  *persuade and transform* | Level 5: Gains trust of peers, partners, clients by presenting complex concepts in practical terms to others |
| **Delivery**  *Ability to get things done while exercising good*  *judgement* | Level 5: Critically assesses value and relevance of existing policy / practice and contributes to enhanced delivery of products, services, and innovative solutions |
| ***Technical/Functional*** | Detailed list of competencies can be accessed through [https://intranet.undp.](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/ohr/competency-framework/SitePages/Home.aspx) [org/unit/ohr/competency-framework/SitePages/Home.aspx](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/ohr/competency-framework/SitePages/Home.aspx)  and hiring managers are encouraged to familiarize themselves for more  information |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **V. Recruitment Qualifications** | |
| Education: | Master’s degree in social policy, law, public policy, politics, development studies or a related area. |
| Experience: | * A minimum of 5 years of progressively responsible work experience in programme and project management, strategic planning, sustainable development policy, and/or resource mobilization in the context of development cooperation; * Proven project management experience, preferably within UNDP, UNODC and/ or another UN agency, with sound knowledge and experience in all aspects of project cycle (design, implementation, reporting, monitoring & evaluation); * Proven experience in inter-agency joint programming and/ or joint programme management and collaboration; * Demonstrated understanding of governance topics and especially anti-corruption related areas is preferred, with proven experience of integrating cross cutting issues such as in the Sustainable Development Goals, human rights and gender is required. * Knowledge and experience of working with countries in the Pacific ideal. * Excellent knowledge of donor policies and funding modalities. Knowledge of UNDP and UNODC programming practices is an asset. |
| Language Requirements: | Proficiency in English. Working knowledge of other UN language desirable |
| Other: | Describe any additional qualifications:   * Non-Smoking environment |

# ANNEX 4D: TOR – UN PACIFIC REGIONAL ANTI-CORRUPTION PROGRAMME ASSOCIATE

|  |
| --- |
| **II. Organizational Context** |
| The UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji has the functions of a country office for ten Pacific Island Countries, and provides regional support services fifteen pacific islands and territories, including the countries covered by the UNDP country offices in Papua New Guinea and Samoa. The Office delivers an incorporated approach to development as well as policy and technical advice through the UNDP Country Offices.  The four main projects undertaken by the Office are known as practice areas and include:   1. Effective Governance 2. Inclusive Growth 3. Resilience and Sustainable Development   Thicies and institutional capacities, and it supports non-State actors in increasing social accountability.  The Effective Governance Programme has begun implementation of the United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Programme, a joint UNDP/UNODC programme, now in its second stage (2020– 2024). This Programme aims to support Pacific Island countries (PICs) and the territory of Tokelau to strengthen their national integrity systems. This is in order to promote effective, transparent and accountable governments and to create an enabling environment for trade, business, investment and sustainable development. In turn, this will enhance the delivery of equitable and high-quality services to all Pacific Islanders. The first objective is to enable PICs to more effectively implement UNCAC and work towards the achievement of SDG 16. The second is to support PICs to strengthen broader governance frameworks in line with UNCAC and SDG 16. The third is to provide support to PICs’ State and non-State actors to more effectively engage and partner to prevent and fight corruption.  Under the guidance and direct supervision of both the UNDP and UNODC Regional Anti-Corruption Advisors, the Programme Associate provides a substantive support role in the UN-PRAC team in the design, planning and management, evaluation and monitoring and reporting of initiatives on anti- corruption, specifically working with national legislatures and representative institutions, civil society and local governance, as well as other governance service lines that may be assigned in future. The Associate will promote a results-oriented approach in UNDP/UNODC initiatives, consistent with UNDP/UNODC mandates.  The Programme Associate works in close collaboration with the effective governance team and the operations and other teams in the UNDP Pacific Office in Fiji and UNODC Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific staff for resolving programme - related issues and information delivery. |

|  |
| --- |
| **I. Position Information** |
| Job Code Title: UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Programme Associate Pre-classified Grade: ICS7/SCB-3  Supervisors: UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti-Corruption – UN-PRAC Programme and UNODC Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser – UN-PRAC Programme |
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|  |
| --- |
| **I. Functions / Key Results Expected** |
| **Summary of Key Functions:**   * Analytical support to the UN-PRAC Team in the conceptualization and formulation of UN- PRAC initiatives. * Support in the creation of strategic partnerships and implementation of the resource mobilization strategy for UN-PRAC initiatives. * Provide support and assistance to the UN-PRAC Team in the implementation and management of the team initiatives, with as specific focus on civil society and local governance as well as other governance service lines that may be assigned in future. * Administration and implementation of programme delivery through ATLAS and UMOJA, adapt processes and procedure, and support results-based management. * Support to knowledge building and knowledge sharing based on anti-corruption. |
| 1. **Provide analytical support to the UN-PRAC Team in the conceptualization, formulation, monitoring & evaluation and reporting of UN-PRAC initiatives**    * Conduct analytical research and collect relevant information as inputs in the conceptualization of UN-PRAC initiatives.    * Assist in the drafting of and as required, delivering conferences/ workshops/ other, lessons learned reports, project accomplishment reports and other knowledge products.    * Provide comments to Consultants Reports, Concept Notes, Programme Documents and other documents. |
| 1. **Support in creation of strategic partnerships and implementation of the resource mobilization strategy for UN-PRAC initiatives**    * Assist in the analysis of information on donors and partners, preparation of donor’s and partners profile and database, drafting of project proposals / concept notes, and the establishment of contacts with donor and partner counterparts.    * Assist in monitoring and reporting on mobilized resources.    * Provide support to donor reporting. |
| 1. **Provide support and assistance to the UN-PRAC Team in the implementation and management of the team initiatives, with as specific focus on civil society and local governance as well as other governance service lines that may be assigned in future**    * Provide support in the delivery of capacity development and training activities to governments, regional organizations, civil society organizations and other development partners.    * Assist in the collection, and presentation of information for project, work plans, budgets, proposals on implementation arrangements, MOUs, and submission to the Contracts, Assets and Procurement (CAP) Committee, etc.    * Assist in the initiation of a project, entry of projects into Atlas; generation of monthly financial delivery reports, updating of issue and risk logs, and other Atlas-based requirements    * Assist in the follow up on performance indicators/ success criteria, targets and milestones, preparation/review/comments of/on reports.    * Assist in the preparation of Unit workplan, preparation of periodic project reports and results reporting |
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|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Assist in the administration and implementation of programme delivery through ATLAS and UMOJA, adapt processes and procedure, and support results-based management. Support to results-based management focusing on achievement of the following results:**    * Logistical arrangements for conferences/workshops/Forums/meetings undertaken by the UN-PRAC Team.    * Creating information packages, letters of invitation relevant to upcoming events, liaison with Foreign Affairs for conference-related activities.    * Assist in logistical arrangements for visiting missions and in obtaining visas for staff and consultants traveling to the field.    * Presentation of information on the status of financial resources as required.    * Presentation of information/ reports for identification of areas for support and interventions. |
| 1. **Support to knowledge building and knowledge sharing**    * Dissemination of information on UN-PRAC activities to UN agencies, donors, & development partners.    * Support in the drafting of knowledge products.    * Provide support to the organization of regional and national conferences & workshops, knowledge fairs, training and capacity development activities.    * Maintaining knowledge management database for UN-PRAC, including the continuous updating of AP-INTACT in relation to relevant anti-corruption news/ updates from the Pacific, as well as UNODC’s Smartsheet for reporting purposes.    * Sound contributions to knowledge networks and communities of practice. |

|  |
| --- |
| **IV. Impact of Results** |
| The key results have an impact on the overall UN-PRAC efficiency in programme and success in implementation of programme strategies on anti-corruption. Accurate analysis and presentation of information enhances UNDP/UNODC position as a strong development partner. The information provided facilitates decision making of the management. |

|  |
| --- |
| **V. Competencies** |
| ***Corporate Competencies:***   * Demonstrates commitment to UNDP/UNODC’s mission, vision and values. * Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability   ***Functional Competencies:***  **Knowledge Management and Learning**   * Shares knowledge and experience * Actively works towards continuing personal learning, acts on learning plan and applies newly acquired skills |

|  |
| --- |
| **Development and Operational Effectiveness**   * Ability to perform a variety of specialized tasks related to Results Management, including support to design, planning and implementation of programme, managing data, reporting. * Ability to provide input to business processes re-engineering, implementation of new system, including new IT based systems   **Leadership and Self-Management**   * Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback * Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude * Remains calm, in control and good humoured even under pressure * Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **VI. Recruitment Qualifications** | |
| Education: | Completion of Secondary Education. University Degree in Business or Public Administration, Economics, Political or Social Sciences is desirable. |
| Experience: | 7 years of progressively responsible relevant programme experience is required at the national or international level. Experience in the usage of computers and office software packages. |
| Language Requirements: | Fluency in the English language. |

# ANNEX 4E: TOR – UN PACIFIC REGIONAL ANTI-CORRUPTION PROJECT ASSISTANT

|  |
| --- |
| **II. Organizational Context** |
| UNDP Pacific Office (PO) in Fiji, serves 10 countries directly.39 UNDP in the Pacific has three focus areas:   1. Effective Governance 2. Inclusive Growth 3. Resilience and Sustainable Development   The UNDP PO in Fiji also coordinates regional initiatives and policy advice in 15 countries covered by the three UNDP offices in the region (Fiji, Samoa and Papua New Guinea).  The UNDP PO programme is guided by the Sub-Regional Programme Document (SRPD) (2018 – 2022) for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories. The SRPD outlines a programme strategy aligned with the vision of the Pacific Leaders, contributes to the achievement of Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development and forms part of the UN Pacific Strategy 2018-2022 (UNPS)40.  The Effective Governance Programme has begun implementation of the United Nations Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project, a joint UNDP/UNODC programme, now in its second stage (2016– 2020). The Project focuses on assisting Pacific Island Countries to tackle corruption through ratifying and implementing the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) and in line with Sustainable Development Goal 16, assisting those Pacific Island Countries that have ratified UNCAC to undergo the peer review process and strengthen their policies and institutional capacities, and it supports non-State actors in increasing social accountability.  Under the guidance and direct supervision of both the UN-PRAC Project Manager, the Project Assistant will provide an administrative support role to the UN-PRAC team in the design, planning and management, evaluation and monitoring and reporting of initiatives/ activities on anti-corruption under the Project. The Project Assistant will promote a results-oriented approach to UNDP/UNODC initiatives, consistent with UNDP/UNODC mandates.  The Programme Assistant will work in close collaboration with the UN-PRAC team, under the overall supervision of the UNODC Regional Anti-Corruption Adviser and the UNDP Technical Adviser: Anti- Corruption, the broader Democratic Governance Programme team, the finance team in the UNDP Pacific Office and the financial and administrative teams in the UNODC Regional Office for Southeast Asia and the Pacific for resolving UN-PRAC Project-related issues and information delivery. |

|  |
| --- |
| **I. Position Information** |
| Job Code Title: UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project Assistant Pre-classified Grade: SB-4 Salary Scale  Supervisor: UN-PRAC Project Manager |
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1. 10 Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) are namely Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, Republic of Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu, with technical support also provided to PNG, Samoa, Cook Islands, Tokelau and Niue.
2. The United Nations Pacific Strategy (UNPS) 2018-2022 is a five-year strategic framework that outlines the collective response of the UN system to the development priorities in 14 PICTs.

|  |
| --- |
| **I. Functions / Key Results Expected** |
| **Summary of Key Functions:**   * Assist in the administration and implementation of UN-PRAC Project delivery through ATLAS and for UNODC, UMOJA, adapt processes and procedures, and support results-based management. * Provide support and assistance to the UN-PRAC team in the management of Project initiatives/ activities. * Support in the creation of strategic partnerships and implementation of the resource mobilization strategy for UN-PRAC Project initiatives/ activities. * Participation in knowledge building and knowledge sharing. * Enhanced learning and professional development. * Other functions, as required. |
| * **Assist in the administration and implementation of UN-PRAC Project delivery through ATLAS and for UNODC, UMOJA, adapt processes and procedures, and support results-based management, by focusing on the achievement of the following results, including but not limited to:**   + Logistical arrangements for conferences/workshops/Forums/meetings/other undertaken by the UN-PRAC team, including the use of both ATLAS and UMOJA.   + Creating information packages, letters of invitation and other relevant documentation for events, as well as liaising with Foreign Affairs in relation to the above-related activities.   + Assist in processing procurement requests, Staff/ Participants Travel Claims in line with financial procedures and other actions required by the UN-PRAC team through both ATLAS and UMOJA.   + Assist in the logistical arrangements of the UN-PRAC team, including for visiting missions, in obtaining visas for Staff/ others travelling to the field and in tracking the overall work of the team.   + Presentation of information on the status of financial resources, including budgetary support, as required.   + Assisting in timely disbursement of payments and acquittals accordingly.   + Preparing bank documents, e.g. T/T and assist in banking runs for events.   + Presenting information/ reports for identification of areas for support and interventions. |
| * **Provide support and assistance to the UN-PRAC team in the management of Project initiatives/ activities:**   + Assist in the collection and presentation of researched information for Project concepts, and draft Project documents, work plans, budgets, proposals on implementation arrangements, MOUs, contracts and other relevant documentation.   + Assist in the initiation of a project, entering such a project into Atlas/ProFi/Umoja.   + Assist in the follow-up on performance indicators/ success criteria, targets and milestones, preparation/review/comments of/on reports.   + Assist in the preparation of Project work-plan and results-based reporting. |

91

|  |
| --- |
| * **Support in the creation of strategic partnerships and implementation of the resource mobilization strategy for UN-PRAC Project initiatives/ activities.**   + Assist in the analysis of information on donors, preparation of donors’ profiles and database such information, establishment of contacts with donor counterparts.   + Assist in tracking and reporting on mobilized resources.   + Provide support to donor reporting. |
| * **Participate in knowledge building and knowledge sharing.**   + Dissemination of information on the UN-PRAC Project, such as on its initiatives/ activities, to partner Governments/ stakeholders, UN agencies, donors and development partners.   + Coordination /liaison on editing and lay-out work of UN-PRAC Project reports before publishing.   + Coordinate post-production work for publications.   + Maintaining a knowledge management database for the UN-PRAC Project.   + Liaising with other partner Governments/ stakeholders, Regional Centres, UNDP and UNODC Offices, development partners and other relevant actors. |
| * **Enhanced learning and professional development.**   + Enrolling and completing online learning courses, including all mandatory UN, ATLAS and UMOJA courses.   + Participate in UN-PRAC Project workshops, trainings and capacity development initiatives/ activities. |
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|  |
| --- |
| **IV. Impact of Results** |
| The key results have an impact on the overall efficiency of the UN-PRAC Project and success in the implementation of Project’s initiatives/ activities. Accurate analysis and presentation of information enhances UNDP/UNODC’s position as a strong development partner, particularly in the fight against corruption in the region. The information provided facilitates the decision-making of management. |

|  |
| --- |
| **V. Competencies** |
| ***Corporate Competencies:***   * Demonstrates commitment to UNDP’s mission, vision and values. * Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability   ***Functional Competencies:***  **Knowledge Management and Learning**   * Shares knowledge and experience * Actively works towards continuing personal learning, acts on learning plan and applies newly acquired skills |

|  |
| --- |
| **Development and Operational Effectiveness**   * Ability to perform a variety of specialized tasks related to Results Management, including support to design, planning and implementation of programme, managing data, reporting. * Ability to provide input to business processes re-engineering, implementation of new system, including new IT based systems   **Leadership and Self-Management**   * Focuses on result for the client and responds positively to feedback * Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude * Remains calm, in control and good humoured even under pressure * Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities |
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **VI. Recruitment Qualifications** | |
| Education: | Completion of Secondary School. University Degree in Governance, Business or Public Administration, Economics, Political or Social Sciences is desirable |
| Experience: | 5 Years of progressively responsible relevant project experience is required at the national or international level.  Experience in the usage of computers and office software packages.  Demonstrated experience and positive evaluation in positions requiring Excellent writing, communication and organization skills; Excellent team working skills; Good interpersonal skills; High level of accuracy and reliability  Familiarity with UN ATLAS-based processes, and UNDP or UNODC procurement guidelines would be an advantage |
| Language Requirements: | Fluency in the English language. |