

Independent Assessment of the UN Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption Project

Lawrence Robertson, Independent Consultant

June 2016

Table of Contents

Goal and Purpose

Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) Recommendations

Post-MTE UN PRAC Implementation

UN-PRAC Phase II Project Document

Suggested Guidance for the Implementation of UN-PRAC II Activities

Goal and Purpose

UNODC and UNDP have jointly implemented the United Nations (UN) Pacific Regional Anti-Corruption (UN-PRAC) Project since July 2012. The implementation of the project has led to substantial lessons being learned by the project team, stakeholders, and beneficiaries. The team has distilled some of these lessons through knowledge products produced by the project and in regular project reporting to donors. In addition, the project commissioned an independent mid-term evaluation (MTE) in mid-2015, three years into the four year project; sections of the MTE focused on lessons learned and recommendations for further implementation.

The Mid-Term Evaluation of the joint UNODC-UNDP UN-PRAC project consulted with project staff, UNODC and UNDP managers, donors, stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries across the 15 countries and territories of the Pacific region over June and July 2015. The accumulated findings of the MTE led to summary conclusions about the experience of the project to that point. The MTE then made a short set of recommendations as suggestions relevant to implementation in the last year of the project as well as to potentially contribute to the development of a successor anti-corruption project in the Pacific region with donors, partners, and stakeholders.

The UN-PRAC II project has now been approved by the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) through separate signed agreements with UNODC and UNDP. The successor project will begin implementation when UN-PRAC concludes at the end of June 2016. The project is planned to run for four years, through June 2020.

To reinforce learning, the UN-PRAC team supported an April to May 2016 independent assessment of UN-PRAC. The assessment focuses on two objectives; the assessment was to:

1. Assess the actions taken to implement the recommendations that resulted from the mid-term review; and
2. Develop concrete guidance on how to continue the implementation of those recommendations which are relevant for phase II with reference to the phase II project documents.

The independent consultant pursued these two objectives through the review of documents, conversations with UN-PRAC staff and telephone interviews with key UN-PRAC partners and donor staff.

The results of the assessment may be useful for the implementation of activities going forward as well as for suggesting additional areas where the project could be effective with additional donor resources. Some of these results may be useful for engagement with donors by UNODC and UNDP, either on a regional or a country-basis, towards additional activities and needed funding support for anti-corruption (AC).

Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) Recommendations

The MTE noted the strengths of UN-PRAC and its implementation, including the solid framework provided by UNCAC which the project has successfully been able to leverage towards high-level policy advice. The neutrality of the UN makes it possible for the UN-PRAC project to engage PIC countries in ways that bilateral donors and agencies cannot.

The 2015 MTE's main recommendations are summarized in the following four paragraphs.

Since the project has effectively made progress towards its outcomes and outputs, in particular by supported substantial impact in meeting UNCAC obligations, the UN-PRAC should maintain

this effort in its final year. With a year left in implementation, the current programme should also emphasize building relations and the base for AC institutions, legislation, and practical implementation that could be developed further in the future, including through a potential UN-PRAC II project.

The UN-PRAC team should focus, based on demand from partners and the limited time remaining, on a subset of outcomes and outputs that they determine best support and institutionalise a base for broader anti-corruption (AC) reform in Pacific Island Countries (PICs). Since in many PICs, interest in AC and institutional development (with UN-PRAC support) has focused on parliamentary oversight and financial investigations, the project should consider focusing more in this area to help pilot concrete changes that are more visible to people in the region. Other areas to consider increasing the focus on based on substantial interest are in FOI legislation and practices as well as protection of rights through Ombudsman's offices.

Other avenues for AC in PICs should be further explored as part of the prospective development of a follow-on AC project through stakeholder engagement with CLPs, outreach to CSOs, and research. These areas may include other priorities of donors, governments, and people across the region: youth, private sector development, natural resource management, the environment, and climate change. A future project should retain substantial flexibility to provide various types of AC assistance to national partners based on their demand for AC, which cannot be specified *ex-ante*.

As part of developing future AC initiatives, UNDP and UNODC should explore ways to build a stronger institutional partnership and reduce the burden that joint projects place on project staff in relationship-building, implementation, and reporting. A future project should retain substantial collaboration between project staff and UNDP staff across the region. UNDP and UNODC should explore ways to reduce the time-lag between project approval and staffing, and look for methods to involve implementing staff in project design to increase the realism of project planning documents and speed of start-up, particularly staff hiring.

Some MTE recommendations build on the clear successes of the project's approaches, such as using UNCAC to anchor the programme, using the project to build support for comprehensive AC reforms via international instruments like UNCAC, supporting capacity and institution building with key national and international organisations, and working with civil society organisations on the demand side for AC, including with women and youth.

Other recommendations focus on what comes next based on project approaches, such as supporting the follow-through on UNCAC ratification/review via assistance to concrete AC initiatives.

A third recommended approach is to continue broad outreach, including to civil society and through research, in a flexible way to identify opportunities for demand-driven AC reform.

Fourth, the MTE noted many ways that managing a joint project between UNODC and UNDP was demanding for the staff of the project, and suggested changes within UNDP and UNODC to reduce the burdens of working with and through two different organisations with different requirements and systems on staff. The prospects for implementing these recommendations has always been low; a push for institutional change based on a single joint project is not likely to find adequate support in either organisation and changes at the level of international organizations in their processes, procedures, and regulations would be slow. Staff efforts to carve out some limited exceptions for UN-PRAC to organizational procedures that did not make sense in the context of UN-PRAC had some successes in the past, but may have less rather than more potential to simplify project implementation going forward with increased efforts to harmonize project processes within both UNODC and UNDP.

These four categories of recommendations will be used as subcategories in the remainder of the paper. For simplification, the four have been restated as categories:

Building on Successes of Project Approaches
Developing Projects with Widely Visible, Concrete AC Achievements
Continue Support to Demand-Side Initiatives
Streamlining Procedures to Manage UNDP and UNODC Processes

Post-MTE UN PRAC Implementation

The MTE was finalized and approved by UNDP and UNODC at the end of September 2015. The UN-PRAC team has thus had less than seven months to act on the recommendations of the MTE; an additional one month (June) remains under the current project. Phase II will begin immediately afterwards at the start of July 2016.

Given this limited time and the approved final year's work plan for the project before the finalisation of the MTE, modifications to project implementation to date may be expected to be modest – but nevertheless notable. Project reporting and interviews with staff, partners, and the donors noted changes and modifications.

UN-PRAC now has in place a full team, with a dedicated UNDP staff person coming on board full-time in March 2016. The UNODC advisor has continued on to the conclusion of UN-PRAC, as have the two key national staff that provide key programmatic and administrative support.

Building on Successes of Project Approaches

Evidence suggests that the dialogue initiated through the UNCAC review process by UNODC and other member states to the Convention has provided a solid basis for in-depth cooperation on the implementation of the Convention with the 10 PICs that have completed UNCAC reviews with the support of the project. Tuvalu, which ratified the convention in 2015, is currently undergoing its review and has benefitted from project support for ratification and the initial review. Follow-up workshops to the UNCAC reviews have helped the project work with governments to address the review outcomes and help PIC's to prioritize recommendations for further action. The project has often managed an inclusive approach that brings civil society and private sector involvement into plans for follow up. UN-PRAC work with influencers and civil society is underway or planned to connect the demand and supply side and support UNCAC ratification as well as the implementation of AC measures.

The project has demonstrated that sustained awareness-raising and technical assistance, combined with encouragement via regional institutions and other PICs, continues to work effectively towards getting non-UNCAC Pacific Island states to ratify the convention. This is most recently notable for Kiribati and Tuvalu.

The project continues to effectively use UNCAC reviews as entry points for the provision of technical assistance to PIC states parties to the Convention. As is also suggested by the UNODC's "National Anti-Corruption Strategies - A Practical Guide for Development and Implementation" ([http://www.unodc.org/documents/corruption/Publications/2015/National Anti-Corruption Strategies - A Practical Guide for Development and Implementation E.pdf](http://www.unodc.org/documents/corruption/Publications/2015/National_Anti-Corruption_Strategies_-_A_Practical_Guide_for_Development_and_Implementation_E.pdf), pp. 4-5), the project uses the process of review to help not only support the development of national anti-corruption strategies but also processes to build political and social support for the implementation of national strategies.

Project annual reports, most recently the Annual Progress Report for 2016, note landmark achievements as well as how the type of approaches utilized by the project build towards these kinds of successes. A prominent example is:

A key turning point for anti-corruption engagement in the Pacific was the October conviction of 14 Vanuatu MPs for bribery and a Leadership Code violation. The sentence was appealed unsuccessfully and 13 MPs were gaoled with the lone MP, who pled guilty, given a suspended sentence. While there have been bribery convictions of MPs and leaders in Vanuatu previously, pardons have prevented serious gaol time. The difference this time was that intensive capacity-building of civil society and the media enabled peaceful public mobilization to support an independent judiciary and the prosecution service, overturn a brazen pardon attempt while the President was overseas, and allow the course of justice to proceed. The key citing of violation of the Leadership Code process in the sentencing reinforces the capacity-building that DFAT, UN-PRAC and others have invested in these Codes and their implementation. (p. 4)

This example points to how linking civil society/media demand side pressure with government institutions central in anti-corruption can work effectively to enforce codes of conduct – validating two different key approaches of the project (linking the supply and demand side in anti-corruption as well as using codes, such as the Leadership Code).

The project also continues to effectively use South-South, particularly Pacific-Pacific, learning by supporting training and attachments that bring participants from PICs to train and work with more well established PIC institutions (such as using the Fiji FIU to train investigators from other countries of the Pacific).

UN-PRAC has continued to be more successful in taking advantages of synergies with UNDP offices and staff across the Pacific, such as collaborating with the Parliamentary strengthening project in UN-PRAC's initial visit to Niue. In Samoa, collaboration between the sub-regional office and UN-PRAC has led to four collaborative engagements since the MTE. The Samoa and Niue examples also demonstrate how making progress with some key partners, such as with Parliament, leads to increased demand for AC (and project support for AC) from the public sector and from civil society.

Developing Projects with Widely Visible, Concrete AC Achievements

With under a year remaining from the MTE to the completion of UN-PRAC, limited additional efforts towards AC achievements that can be widely recognized within PICS was all that was possible within UN-PRAC. This is seen as consistent with the overall approach of UN-PRAC in the challenging conditions of the Pacific region. Having a dedicated UNDP staff person on the UN-PRAC project, who is experienced in and focused on supporting governance reform towards AC, should contribute to additional project development going forward that targets precisely these kind of visible, concrete achievements in countering corruption.

The first phase of UN-PRAC is seen by staff and partners as setting the stage for successful policymaking and institutional building work in UN-PRAC II; this stage setting from the first project is the groundwork for what is recognized as the challenging endeavour of building institutional capacity and supporting legal/policy changes in PICs. It must continue to be recognized that not all engagements will result in concrete, AC successes given the many challenges in combatting corruption.

Within this emphasis and focus, the project has invested in sustained technical assistance towards concrete achievements in a number of cases. One recent example highlights some of the challenges in this approach. UN-PRAC provided support for capacity building in the Republic of the Marshall Islands on banking regulation was noted to be problematic, as consultant-supplied technical assistance did more of

the work rather than helped build national capacity to do the work. It should be noted that this challenge is not unique to AC in the Pacific but a general one with the methodology of supporting capacity building through consultant-based technical assistance, where there is always a tension between the time-bound need to produce concrete results and the sometimes challenging processes of increasing the skills and knowledge of counterparts towards their ability to produce these concrete achievements.

Continue Support to Demand-Side Initiatives

Project reporting, discussions, and interviews noted continued efforts to broaden the base of clients that UN-PRAC works with, such as more workshops working with the media, parliaments, and civil society. These methods and stakeholders/beneficiaries were seen as part of the focus on building support for AC measures by building the coalition that is knowledgeable and engaged on AC in each country and across the region.

A recent example was noted for Vanuatu, where a push from Transparency International Vanuatu and collaborative work with the government and communities was cited as promising for the expected passage of Right to Information (RTI) legislation in the country. The demand side work was seen as not only leading to higher probability of passage in Parliament but also greater prospects for the use of RTI measures once passed. Challenges without such demand-side support were also noted, for example in RTI in the Solomon Islands.

Streamlining Procedures to Manage UNDP and UNODC Processes

The MTE noted clear challenges for the small staff of the project with having two lines for reporting and management – both to UNODC and UNDP. This leads to substantial duplication – as for example the project needs to provide annual reports to both UNODC and UNDP. While these reports have similar content, the need to use two different formats and processes clearly creates additional work. The financial arrangements for the programme are more complex, and again involve different management systems for the two different organizations.

While the MTE suggested it would be a good thing to reduce this complexity and duplication, this recommendation has always been unlikely to be met. UNODC and UNDP are not at all likely to make changes to core institutional practices used globally based on improving the implementation of one small, unique joint project like UN-PRAC.

Project staff have been adept in looking for ways to have their institutions adapt procedures and politics in particular cases to the concrete situation of the project. This is evident, for example, in turning the anticipated Final Evaluation - which would have required a large set of formal, rigid processes to satisfy UNODC and UNDP - into a more informal assessment that may hopefully be targeted more at UN-PRAC II implementation and be more useful for UN-PRAC staff and partners. This may be a unique case; however it would benefit the project and its partners to be able to have some flexibility – through dialogue with headquarters units - to modify some institutional mandates from UNDP and UNODC that are not seen to fit UN-PRAC or the Pacific context.

Project staff note that these larger corporate issues cannot be addressed directly via reform, but that staff can and have worked successfully to manage within these constraints.

UN-PRAC Phase II Project Document

Based on the progress made across the Pacific under UN-PRAC, ongoing needs in PICs for support to prevent and combat corruption, and the potential to promote and strengthen measures to prevent and fight corruption more efficiently and effectively through a new phase of the UN-PRAC project, a successor

project has been developed by the UN-PRAC project team, approved by UNODC, UNDP and DFAT (as the donor), and was signed 19 April 2016 by UNDP, UNODC, and DFAT.

The new approved Project Document (ProDoc) for Phase II of the project, for 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2020, provides a situational analysis of the issues in countering corruption in the Pacific region, including the experience of UN-PRAC over 2012 to 2016. The ProDoc notes project strategies and how they are informed by a set of key implementation principles of UN-PRAC as well as UNODC and UNDP comparative advantages. The ProDoc develops clear expected Project Outcomes and a results-based framework and management arrangements, including monitoring framework and evaluations, to manage for results. An initial risk log is also included, as are Terms of Reference for key staff.

The Phase II ProDoc develops an updated goal and three revised outcomes. UNCAC remains the guiding framework of the project. The restructuring of outcomes was shaped by what had been achieved in Phase I and lessons learned from the project, including through the MTE.

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

Outcome 1: Niue, Samoa, and Tonga are given sufficient information and support to enable their accession to UNCAC and all Pacific States parties actively participate in the UNCAC review process.

Outcome 2: Pacific States parties more effectively implement UNCAC and work towards the achievement of SDG 16

Outcome 3: Social accountability mechanisms and the anti-corruption role of non-state actors strengthened.

The objectives of the project as similarly three-fold:

To provide Niue, Samoa, and Tonga with sufficient information and support to enable their accession to UNCAC and to support Pacific States parties to actively participate in the UNCAC review process.

To support PICS to strengthen their national anti-corruption legislation and policies, as well as institutional frameworks and capabilities to effectively implement UNCAC.

To provide support on the demand side of accountability, primarily through support a stronger engagement of non-State actors in the oversight of corruption and in the design of tools for a more transparent service delivery.

Building on Successes of Project Approaches

Phase II of UN-PRAC continues to focus on UNCAC; Outcome 1 of the project works towards the accession of Niue, Samoa, and Tonga to the Convention, which would mean that all 15 PICs were members. The Outcome is clearly about more than accession, as continued participation of all Pacific States parties in the review process provides for avenues to work with UNCAC members; Output 1.1, Understanding and awareness of UNCAC accession increased, has resonance not only for building political will in the non – members to join the Convention but also to use the Convention to build support for combatting corruption (as was done in Phase I). The dialogue initiated through the UNCAC review process by UNODC and other member states to the Convention has provided a solid basis for in-depth cooperation on the implementation of the Convention with 11 PICs. Follow-up workshops to the UNCAC reviews have helped the project work with governments to address the review outcomes and to prioritize recommendations

for further action. The project has often managed an inclusive approach that brings civil society and private sector involvement into plans for follow up.

The project will also continue to work at the regional level as evidence from the first Phase of UN-PRAC demonstrates that results at this level can translate into country-level results as well.

With the support of UN-PRAC for UNCAC implementation, PICs are developing a new norm that agreements should have reviews and assessments of progress. The system under UNCAC where reviews serve as entry points for policy dialogue and concrete actions has been and can continue to spread to other areas where PICs endorse rights and undertake international obligations. This kind of “trickle down” has potential effects in many other areas within PICs.

Developing Projects with Widely Visible, Concrete AC Achievements

The second phase of the UN-PRAC project has prioritised support for national anti-corruption legislation and policies, as well as institutional frameworks and capabilities to effectively implement UNCAC. This objective then stresses making concrete progress with AC in countries of the region.

The SDG anchor may help with this emphasis on concrete achievements as it conceptualizes and emphasizes the links between AC and successes in sustainable development. Demand-side initiatives are also directed at moving from awareness raising and networking to advocacy and the implementation of concrete achievements in AC that are felt by the population of PICs.

Implementation is likely to take time to deliver concrete results given the challenging nature of AC issues and activities in the region and may not produce the same results in all cases. Staff will continue to need to work to maintain mutual understanding with the donor on expectations and results as they deliver on outputs in the project document.

The project document respects the importance of national ownership and is clear that the particular areas of AC focused on in any PIC depends on the country itself. Thus the concrete areas where the project will support AC within PICs are not specified in the ProDoc but left to the countries themselves (in dialogue with UN-PRAC on what the project can support and how it can support their chosen AC priorities).

Continue Support to Demand-Side Initiatives

Phase II targets awareness raising among non-state actors as part of striving for UNCAC ratification and implementation, as well as targeting concrete AC outcomes. Demand-side initiatives are thus relevant in all PICs (whether members or not of UNCAC). One of the ways Phase II can continue focus on the demand side is through additional attention, largely through civil society, on marginalized populations in AC, particularly women, youth, and people living with disabilities.

Supporting endeavours with these populations does not exclude working with key influencers such as chiefs that are already well placed to advocate policy change, explain issues and policies, and support implementation when AC reforms are taken.

UN-PRAC II recognises explicitly that partnerships can be taken to the next level in strengthening social accountability mechanisms and the anti-corruption roles of non-State actors (Outcome 3). The ProDoc envisions supporting a wide range of initiatives from partners – including private sector partners – to reinforce the work of national institutions against corruption.

Streamlining Procedures to Manage UNDP and UNODC Processes

Phase II will continue as a joint project as well as continue to use networking practices and UNDP Offices and staff across the region. The complexity of having two different UN organisations with different systems and processes for program management, budgeting, and reporting creates substantial added work for project staff. This structure is not likely to change; however the project can become adept at managing these challenges with practice over time and should strive to develop ways to minimize this complexity when possible.

Suggested Guidance for the Implementation of UN-PRAC II Activities

UN-PRAC project staff note and emphasize lessons learned in their own work, and collaborate to ensure that lessons are shared across the team. The team will thus continue to learn and modify project implementation based on this learning going forward.

This assessment, based on the MTE, modifications in UN-PRAC implementation in the wake of the evaluation, and the plans in the new ProDoc makes several suggestions for the implementation of activities in Phase II of UN-PRAC. These suggestions, phrased as guidance, can be considered by project staff – in light of their extensive experience and contact with stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries across the region.

Phase II incorporates explicit “Key Implementation Principles” into the ProDoc; this approach is designed to provide support to the team to help in prioritising country requests. With a team of four (when fully staffed), UN-PRAC must make choices about priorities and balance the benefits of flexibility to meet new opportunities and requests with strategically planned interventions towards project targets in the ProDoc.

Building on Successes of Project Approaches

The dialogue initiated through the UNCAC review process by UNODC and other member states to the Convention has provided a solid basis for in-depth cooperation on the implementation of the Convention with 11 PICs. Follow-up workshops to the UNCAC reviews have helped the project work with governments to address the review outcomes and to prioritize recommendations for further action. The project has often managed an inclusive approach that brings civil society and private sector involvement into the discussions and concrete plans for following up on treaty obligations and opportunities for AC activities opened up through the dialogue.

The project can leverage the successful work with 11 PICs on UNCAC to encourage the remaining three PICS to ratify UNCAC and participate fully in UNCAC reviews. UN-PRAC is well placed to facilitate relationships that support accession; UN-PRAC staff themselves do not need to do all the push for ratification, but can use existing project partners from states parties and ongoing engagement with regional institutions (such as GOPAC) to encourage Niue, Samoa, and Tonga to accede to the convention.

As the project is small for a regional project, with costly regional aspects such as travel, it will remain important to continue to use efficient means of implementation such as collaboration with other UNDP projects and networking with multi-lateral institutions like GOPAC to support implementation and manage the costs relative to benefits of activities (as has been done effectively by UN-PRAC).

UN-PRAC’s engagements may also produce other opportunities to support AC in PICs that cannot be pursued given budget constraints under UN-PRAC II. While facilitated or developed through the project, these opportunities can potentially be followed up on via other partnerships, including potential bilateral support and funding from donors (such as DFAT offices in PICs). These partnerships would be two-ways: between the project and national counterparts and between the project and donors. These kind of partnerships with bilateral donors and with national partners in PICs may particularly target concrete AC achievements in individual countries and help embed AC deeper into the social fabric of countries of the

region. UN-PRAC's experience and engagement can thus be a vehicle for additional AC activities and other partnerships facilitated by but pursued outside of the framework of UN-PRAC II. UN-PRAC may also be potentially highly relevant for donors in countries with less donor presence; in these cases UN-PRAC has the potential to be an important lever for policy dialogue and engagement for countries on AC.

To manage the challenges of working in small countries where AC progress can depend on a few key individuals within government institutions, the project should continue to have an approach that helps build the general expertise of these key individuals around AC as the project. These countries cannot over-specialize given their small sizes; UN-PRAC must continue to recognize that its individual key collaborators have and will continue to have a range of responsibilities and are unlikely to solely focus on AC. UN-PRAC also should continue to diversify by building and preparing other approaches to AC in these countries that do not depend on these few key individuals in the public sector – as experience shows key individuals can be and are replaced within governments and the civil service. This approach to addressing this problem requires building the broader constituency for AC in other domains, such as civil society and parliament, so that replacement does not lead to abandonment or the minimization of AC efforts.

Developing Projects with Widely Visible, Concrete AC Achievements

One of the main challenges in AC work around the world is identifying areas to make visible, concrete achievements in countering corruption that are widely recognized by citizens. UN-PRAC has contributed to positive, visible achievements but seeks to and plans to do more in the final months of implementation and under UN-PRAC II.

UN-PRAC's engagement with focal points can be – and is – connected with other activities of the project which helps build support for specific achievements and wider understanding of this anti-corruption progress. For example UN-PRAC has supported workshops with civil society that draw in key government officials that are focal points, which adds visibility, links, and importance to activities such as youth. This style of activity implementation helps build connections towards action on both the government and civil society sides (e.g. the project's recent engagement in Vanuatu in April 2016).

With sustained technical assistance costly, the project will have to make choices about where to invest to support concrete AC achievements. Project staff should continue to communicate closely with the donor on these investments to align expectations and ensure that it is clearly understood that not all investments will produce the same kinds of results.

Continue Support to Demand-Side Initiatives

UN-PRAC envisions continuing to work with civil society, the media, and parliamentarians to stimulate the demand for anti-corruption engagement. This is understood as demand-side initiative in that work with these groups helps them demand that their government's combat corruption. In societies across the Pacific, the project and stakeholders see getting key non-state actors as important parts in building understanding of corruption and anti-corruption and helping to create demand for countering corruption. "Top-down" approaches that work with key government leaders who then push anti-corruption within government institutions and influence the population are recognized to be insufficient. Influence makers outside of the state - in non-government organisations, churches, and traditional institutions like chieftaincies – are widely seen by the project staff and stakeholders as important resources to work with to build broad popular understanding of corruption and how it can be combatted as well as to create demand for action, including concrete initiatives, within governments in the struggle against corruption.

It is recognized that civil society and governments will not always be aligned; this complicates demand-side initiatives as governments may have issues with some CSOs or other groups, including parliamentarians that they see as oppositional.

As with work with governments, UN-PRAC recognizes that the number of CSOs, media institutions, and space for parliaments to engage in demand-side initiatives are limited, substantially by the small number of key personnel in these organizations in PICs. Similar to work with key counterparts in government, changes in the roles and responsibilities of a few key partners can make a tremendous difference – positive or negative – in how effective demand-side efforts are in many cases.

Non-State actor partnerships may have particularly important potential roles in what UNDP's "Anti-Corruption Strategies: Understanding What Works, What Doesn't and Why? Lessons learned from the Asia-Pacific Region" (http://www.undp.org/content/dam/rbap/docs/Research%20&%20Publications/democratic_governance/RBAP-DG-2014-Anti-Corruption-Strategies.pdf) identified as “the weakest” link in the implementation of anti-corruption strategies – monitoring and evaluation (p. 27). The paper focuses on the importance of establishing baselines and tracking implementation to address this weakness. Engaging independent partners in the monitoring and evaluation adds potential benefits by injecting independent review and furthering the push for AC through civil society.

Phase I of the project has demonstrated that awareness raising can be done through civil society, parliaments, and the media, and that this awareness raising can be connected directly to governments. The project has made it explicit that its activities aim to connect the supply and the demand side for more productive AC engagement. The awareness raising efforts among PIC societies, done through strong engagement by the Project, beneficiaries, and stakeholders with the media across the region, helps feed into concrete initiatives by civil society actors to engage in AC. Many of these concrete civil society engagements focus on working with government stakeholders and through coalitions across the Pacific.

UN-PRAC should continue to work with and report on demand-side initiatives, including how they connect with governments. UN-PRAC reporting should provide substantial information to explain initiatives, how these encourage advocacy, and the results of this advocacy (including how civil society partners with governments, pushes government institutions, and supports monitoring).

Streamlining Procedures to Manage UNDP and UNODC Processes

The success of the project continues to depend on key staff and key counterparts across the region. One of the central tasks of UN-PRAC staff is to effectively manage the UNDP and UNODC processes needed to develop, implement, and report on activities (including financial reporting). UNODC and UNDP staff will need to maintain strong relationships with their respective headquarters and regional offices as they are part of the essential processes of operating UN-PRAC smoothly. This may especially be the case for UNODC as management and reporting systems have not been devolved down to Suva (compared to UNDP); some essential reporting for UNODC is thus done in Vienna by UNODC staff as a favour for UN-PRAC staff. This is not an institutional but a personal arrangement. If this kind of informal support from Vienna does not continue, UNODC will need to either create a formal support structure or provide the needed software systems and training in UNDOC software for UN-PRAC's UNODC manager to be able to complete the reporting independently. UNDP and UNODC project staff should remain focused on the development and implementation of national anti-corruption policies/strategies, providing high-level strategic AC advice, and developing and institutionalizing partnerships; a manageable administrative load is important in enabling an appropriate balance in the responsibilities of UNDP and UNODC project staff between providing advice and being engaging and the administrative tasks of managing project implementation.