



GUIDANCE NOTE: UNCAC SELF-ASSESSMENTS

Going Beyond the Minimum



**A practical guide to undertaking a participatory self-assessment of
implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption**

Editors: Pauline Tamesis and Samuel De Jaegere
Authors: Jan Christoph Richter and Gretta Fenner
Designer: Keen Media

In partnership with:



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	2
MESSAGE FROM UNDP ASIA-PACIFIC REGIONAL CENTRE	3
PREFACE	4
I. INTRODUCTION	6
II. BACKGROUND	6
III. OBJECTIVES	8
IV. BENEFITS	8
V. KEY ISSUES	9
VI. METHODOLOGY	15
PRELIMINARY STEPS:	15
1. <i>Designation of a Lead Agency</i>	15
2. <i>Establishment of a Steering Committee</i>	16
PHASES:	17
1. <i>Initial stakeholder workshop to launch and plan the process</i>	17
2. <i>Data collection</i>	18
(a) Document gathering	18
(b) Stakeholder consultations	19
3. <i>Analysis and drafting of the reports</i>	20
4. <i>Validation workshop and finalization of the reports</i>	21
5. <i>Publication and dissemination of the reports</i>	22
6. <i>Follow-up</i>	22
VII. UN AGENCIES AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS	23
ANNEX A: UNCAC SELF-ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE	24
ANNEX B: UNCAC SELF-ASSESSMENT TIMELINE	27
ANNEX C: SELF-ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST WORKING TOOL	28
ANNEX D: GLOSSARY OF TERMS	29
ANNEX E: RESOURCES AND FURTHER READING	31
ANNEX F: USEFUL CONTACTS	33

Acronyms

ARGP	Asia Regional Governance Programme
BIG	Basel Institute on Governance
CoSP	Conference of the States Parties
CSO	Civil Society Organization
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation
IGS	Institute of Governance Studies
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
PACDE	Programme on Anti-Corruption for Development Effectiveness
UN	United Nations
UNCAC	United Nations Convention against Corruption
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Message from UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre

Corruption knows no boundaries. When the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) came into force in 2005, it was an unprecedented opportunity for countries to join together and fight corruption as one community. UNCAC provides an international normative framework—a binding instrument—to shape development policies and programming in signatory countries.

Learning from our long-standing experience in integrating international normative standards into domestic legislation and national development plans and policies, UNDP understands that local ownership, proper enforcement and genuine commitment to implement are crucial if all of our efforts are not simply to remain good intentions. This Guidance Note draws its inspiration from these lessons, particularly from our past efforts to help introduce new laws and legislation as a cornerstone for broader policy reforms in our partner countries. We have tested the idea that laws and policies take deeper root in the broader political culture, if the decision-makers and the public at large are involved in shaping them, understand what they mean, and take action to fulfil the spirit of what these laws and policies embody.

This Guidance Note is only a starting point. It does not guarantee successful implementation of the UNCAC. But it does attempt to broaden the parameters for engagement and to change the mindset—of going beyond the minimum required to comply with laws and standards and ensure full participation and commitment of a wide coalition of stakeholders. As the Chair of the Anti-Corruption Commission of Bhutan reminded us during the discussions to develop this Guidance Note, “UNCAC is not an end in itself, but a means towards achieving the goal of reducing corruption.” If we strive to facilitate an inclusive process for reforms, then we begin to create conditions for improving accountability.

It is in this spirit that the UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre spearheaded the development of this Note—as a contribution to the global interest to implement the UNCAC beyond the minimum requirements. Indeed, corruption knows no boundaries. The resulting response against it must know no boundaries as well.

We have many partners to thank. First, this Guidance Note would not have been possible without the core investment made under the UNDP Asia Regional Governance Programme (ARGP) and the Programme on Anti-Corruption for Development Effectiveness (PACDE). In keeping with the participatory nature of this effort, a draft was presented and discussed at the 3rd Asia-Pacific Regional Community of Practice Meeting on Anti-Corruption held in Bangkok on 1-3 February 2010. It was further developed in close partnership with various UNDP programmes and units, specifically with the Democratic Governance Group of the Bureau for Development Policy, the Programme on Governance in the Arab Region, the Oslo Governance Centre, as well as with the UNODC Corruption and Economic Crime Section, Division for Treaty Affairs, the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ), the Basel Institute on Governance (BIG) and the Institute of Governance Studies (IGS) of BRAC University.

Specific colleagues contributed to this publication and need to be acknowledged: Samuel De Jaegere (UNDP) who single-handedly coordinated and steered the drafting process; Jan Christoph Richter (BIG) and Gretta Fenner (IGS) for providing the first cut of this Note; and Arkan El-Seblani, Marie Laberge, Phil Matsheza, Robert Onus, Charmaine Rodrigues, Pauline Tamesis and Anga Timilsina (UNDP), Giovanni Gallo, Brigitte Strobel-Shaw, Dimitri Vlassis and Annika Wythes (UNODC), Manzoor Hasan (IGS), Alan Bacarese and Pedro Gomes Pereira (BIG), and Johanna Wysluch (GTZ) for peer reviewing and providing extensive and in-depth comments.

As such, I would like to express my gratitude to everyone for their insightful and valuable contributions.



Nicholas Rosellini

*Deputy Regional Director, Regional Bureau for Asia and the Pacific
UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre
October 2010*

Preface

Corruption is one of the major impediments to human development.¹ It debases democracy and the rule of law, distorts markets and stifles economic growth. The annual estimated cost of corruption is equal to more than 5 percent of global GDP (\$2.6 trillion), with over \$1 trillion paid in bribes each year.² Corruption hurts the poor disproportionately and constitutes an obstacle to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), by diverting resources away from basic social services and limiting access to health, education and water and sanitation.³

Since its entry into force, the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) has become a rallying point across the world for efforts to combat corruption because it seeks to provide a comprehensive framework to address corruption. It not only provides for punishment of perpetrators of corrupt acts but also seeks to promote preventative measures and to facilitate the recovery of stolen assets. The implementation of the UNCAC, however, is a challenging multi-faceted process. It requires the proper gathering and analysis of data and information on de jure and de facto compliance gaps as well as related technical assistance needs. Such data and information are indispensable to the implementation of the Convention because they guide capacity development efforts and inform policy decisions, implementation, and the monitoring of progress.

On 13 November 2009, the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention (CoSP or the Conference), established the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the UNCAC (UNCAC Review Mechanism).⁴ Pursuant to Resolution 3/1, States parties under review are requested to complete the UNCAC comprehensive Self-Assessment Checklist and return their Self-Assessment Reports to the Secretariat. The Checklist is to be used as a tool to facilitate the provision of information on implementation of the UNCAC.

Prior to the establishment of the UNCAC Review Mechanism, UNCAC Compliance Reviews and Gap Analyses (UNCAC Gap Analyses) had been conducted in countries such as Indonesia, Bangladesh and Kenya. The UNCAC Gap Analyses, as pioneered by the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) and with support from the Basel Institute on Governance (Switzerland) and the Institute of Governance Studies (Bangladesh), involved a three-step process. First, there was a systematic comparison of national legislation and practices with the UNCAC provisions through a broad national consultative process. Second, there was an investigation of the extent to which the legal framework and the institutional set-up implement UNCAC in practice. Third, the country conducting the UNCAC Gap Analysis identified reform priorities and technical assistance needs. The final report outlined the findings in narrative and matrix format and included recommendations to bring the country into full compliance with the Convention.⁵

¹ UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon, Official statement on the occasion of Anti-Corruption Day, 9 December 2009.

² International Chamber of Commerce, Transparency International, UN Global Compact, World Economic Forum, Clean Business is Good Business, 2009.

³ See Asia Pacific Human Development Report (2008), Tackling Corruption, Transforming Lives, Accelerating Human Development in Asia and the Pacific.

⁴ See Resolution 3/1 adopted by the Third Conference of the States Parties to the UNCAC in Doha on 13 November 2009.

⁵ See UNCAC Compliance Review – Why and How?, GTZ, <D:\cd\downloads\gtz\uncac\factsheets\en-gtz-uncac-compliance-review-why-and-how-2009.pdf>.

Such comprehensive UNCAC Gap Analyses remain valuable, as they contribute towards national anti-corruption reforms and support the UNCAC review process. This Guidance Note aims to apply the UNCAC Gap Analysis methodology to UNCAC Self-Assessments, which are intended to comprehensively analyse countries' anti-corruption systems, legislation and practice. Whilst the UNCAC Review Mechanism will only review chapters III (Criminalization and law enforcement) and IV (International cooperation) during its first cycle, and chapters II (Preventive measures) and V (Asset recovery) during its second cycle, States Parties are invited to go beyond the minimum and conduct comprehensive UNCAC Self-Assessments in order to promote national reforms and to prepare for an eventual review under the Review Mechanism.⁶

Furthermore, States parties are encouraged to engage all national stakeholders in this process from the very start, notably ministerial departments, parliament, independent institutions, civil society, private sector, academia, media, and development partners, as this will strengthen the UNCAC Self-Assessment and provide for comprehensive UNCAC Self-Assessment reports. This Guidance Note provides a suggested methodology for all stakeholders involved in national processes to conduct UNCAC Gap Analyses, through the use of the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist, thus ultimately contributing to the UNCAC Review Mechanism.



Geraldine Fraser-Moleketi

Director
Democratic Governance Group
UNDP Bureau for Development Policy
New York



Dimitri Vlassis

Chief
Corruption and Economic Crime Branch
UNODC Division for Treaty Affairs
Vienna

⁶ Each cycle is for five years and only one quarter of the States parties will be reviewed in each of the first four years of each review cycle. The States parties to be reviewed in each year have been selected by a random drawing of lots.

I. Introduction

1. UNCAC Self-Assessments seek to achieve a comparative analysis of the extent to which a country's national anti-corruption systems, notably its laws, regulations, policies, institutions and programmes are complying with the requirements of UNCAC, both de jure and de facto. This Guidance Note provides a methodology for UNCAC Self-Assessments by drawing upon the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist as adopted by the CoSP and by encouraging broad national stakeholder consultations, to promote national anti-corruption reform and to prepare the country for review under the UNCAC Review Mechanism.
2. In the Background section, this Guidance Note provides a brief overview of UNCAC and the recently established UNCAC Review Mechanism. The Guidance Note then summarizes the objectives, benefits and key issues to consider in an UNCAC Self-Assessment, taking into account lessons learned from past UNCAC Gap Analyses. In the Methodology section, the Guidance Note elaborates on the practical steps to conduct an UNCAC Self-Assessment, emphasizing the importance of a participatory assessment process that leads to strategic recommendations and monitoring and evaluation of the results. Finally, the Guidance Note outlines the role that UNODC, UNDP and development partners may play in the context of UNCAC Self-Assessments. In the Annexes, the Guidance Note includes a self-assessment planning schedule and timeline, a self-assessment checklist working tool, a glossary of terms, a list of resources and suggested reading, and a list of useful contacts.
3. This Guidance Note is by no means prescriptive, but rather it seeks to provide an indicative roadmap for UNCAC Self-Assessment processes. Obviously, every country context is different and the organization of the Self-Assessment process will vary in terms of timing, stakeholder involvement, support from international experts and scope.

“The State party under review shall endeavour to prepare their responses to the comprehensive self-assessment checklist through broad consultations at the national level with all relevant stakeholders, the private sector, individuals and groups outside the public sector.”⁷

Resolution adopted by the Third Conference of the States Parties, November 2009

II. Background

4. UNCAC is the most comprehensive international treaty on anti-corruption, and it has been ratified or acceded to by over 145 States (as of September 2010). As such, it is widely accepted as the international framework guiding the fight against corruption.
5. UNCAC covers four main areas: prevention in Chapter II, criminalization and law enforcement in Chapter III, international cooperation in Chapter IV, and asset recovery in Chapter V. In addition, Chapter VI outlines technical assistance and information exchange measures aimed at helping States comply with UNCAC requirements.
6. In November 2009, the Conference of the States Parties to UNCAC established the UNCAC Review Mechanism⁸ at its third session in Doha. The CoSP agreed that UNCAC implementation by States parties will be reviewed in two successive five-year review cycles. Under this scheme, each State party to the Convention will review, and be reviewed by its peers, once every five years. The identification of reviewing and to-be-reviewed States

⁷ See Resolution 3/1 adopted by the Third Conference of the States Parties to the UNCAC in Doha on 13 November 2009, Annex I, paragraph 28.

⁸ See Article 63, paragraph 7 of the UNCAC and Resolution 3/1 adopted by the Conference of the States Parties in Doha on 13 November 2009.

for the first cycle was determined by a random drawing of lots at the Implementation Review Group meeting held in Vienna from 28 June to 2 July 2010.⁹ Approximately 30 countries will be reviewed in the first year of the first cycle. As previously mentioned, the first five-year cycle will review compliance with chapters III and IV of UNCAC while the second five-year cycle will review compliance with chapters II and V.¹⁰

7. The CoSP also endorsed the comprehensive UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist as the tool to be used by States parties to gather information under the Review Mechanism.¹¹

UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist: Brief historical background

At its first session held in 2006, the Conference of the States Parties requested UNODC to develop an experimental Self-Assessment Checklist to gather information on States parties' efforts to implement UNCAC. The experimental Self-Assessment Checklist was distributed to UNCAC States parties and signatories in June 2007. It focused on 15 articles of UNCAC. To date, 87 States parties and three signatories have filled it out. At its second session, held in 2008, the Conference welcomed the effective use of the checklist to gather preliminary information on States' efforts to implement UNCAC and technical assistance needs, and requested UNODC to develop a comprehensive tool to be used in any future UNCAC review of implementation.

In furtherance of its mandate, UNODC initiated the development of the comprehensive UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist as a computer-based system and, to validate its approach and methodology, activated a broad consultation process. The contents and functionalities of the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist were reviewed by relevant international experts three times from March 2008 to September 2009. In March 2009, UNODC invited 15 States parties, ideally three per Regional Group, to test the application on a voluntary basis. Thirty-seven States parties and signatories to the UNCAC responded to this call and tested the application from March to June 2009. All the comments provided by such States were duly incorporated. The UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist was then presented to and endorsed by the Conference of the States Parties at its third session held in November 2009.

8. The Self-Assessment Checklist, a computer-based application, requests countries to indicate whether they have complied with each provision of UNCAC and to provide or attach detailed information to substantiate their responses. If States parties report partial or non-compliance with a given provision, they are requested to explain why. They are further requested to explain what action should be taken to achieve full compliance and whether technical assistance would facilitate greater compliance. By responding to this set of questions, countries are stimulated to analyze implementation gaps and their underlying causes, and identify the most suitable forms of technical assistance that can support implementation. The Self-Assessment Report that the software generates captures the outcome of this data collection and analytical exercise.
9. The guiding principles and the characteristics of the review process described above are laid down in more detail in the Terms of Reference for the UNCAC Review Mechanism, annexed to Resolution 3/1 adopted by the CoSP.¹² The blueprint for country review reports and the guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat in the conduct of country reviews were finalized by the UNCAC Implementation Review Group at its first meeting from 28 June to 2 July 2010.¹³

⁹ See Annex II, Report of the Implementation Review Group of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, First Meeting <http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/WorkingGroups/ImplementationReviewGroup/28June-2July2010/V1055385e.pdf>

¹⁰ See Resolution 3/1 adopted by the Conference of the States Parties in Doha on 13 November 2009.

¹¹ <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/self-assessment.html>

¹² <http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/COSP/session3/V0988538e.pdf>

¹³ See Annex I, Report of the Implementation Review Group of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, First Meeting <http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/WorkingGroups/ImplementationReviewGroup/28June-2July2010/V1055385e.pdf>

10. A State party selected for review in a given year may, with a reasonable justification, defer participation to the following year of the review cycle. Once participation in the review process is confirmed, countries selected for review are required to fill out the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist and submit their Self-Assessment Report to UNODC (in its role as Secretariat to UNCAC) within two months of the commencement of the review process. The Self-Assessment Reports of each State party will then be reviewed by two other States parties.
11. The Terms of Reference of the UNCAC Review Mechanism encourage States parties to consult broadly with relevant stakeholders when preparing their responses to the Self-Assessment Checklist.¹⁴ States parties can also go beyond the two chapters prescribed in the Terms of Reference for the first cycle of the UNCAC Review Mechanism and conduct a comprehensive national self-assessment of UNCAC implementation. This would not only maximize time and resources but also provide the foundations for developing comprehensive and integrated anti-corruption strategies, action plans and policies.

III. Objectives

12. The UNCAC Self-Assessment is pivotal in allowing countries to make progress in the fight against corruption. More specifically, the UNCAC Self-Assessment aims to:
 - ▶ Encourage a participatory and nationally driven process towards anti-corruption reform, by assessing the capacities of national anti-corruption systems, laws and institutions (de jure and de facto), and identifying possible reforms to address capacity gaps; and
 - ▶ Support and contribute to the UNCAC Review Mechanism.
13. To achieve these two objectives, the UNCAC Self-Assessment should involve a wide range of national stakeholders and take advantage of the computer-based UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist adopted by the CoSP (see also the Checklist's simplified working tool in Annex C to this Guidance Note).

IV. Benefits

14. Undertaking an UNCAC Self-Assessment process has several important benefits. It will **stimulate broader national involvement in anti-corruption efforts** and raise awareness about the country's efforts to implement the UNCAC and fight corruption. When carried out thoroughly and with strong in-country commitment, an UNCAC Self-Assessment will be a nationally driven process whereby national governmental and non-governmental actors have ownership of the entire exercise and its outcomes.
15. By applying a participatory approach to the UNCAC Self-Assessment and widely publicizing the results and process, the UNCAC review will **encourage inter-institutional dialogue and cooperation**. It will facilitate a national reflection process among relevant stakeholders on how the national legal, regulatory and institutional anti-corruption framework is structured, what laws and institutional capacities need to be strengthened, and whether any additional assistance may be needed.
16. The UNCAC Self-Assessment will **provide policymakers with detailed information and analysis**, which can be used to inform the development of a national anti corruption strategy and the implementation of an action plan, with timelines and assigned responsibilities to deliver remedial actions.
17. As such, it will also be **useful as a benchmark for successive governments and stakeholders to measure**

¹⁴ See Annex 1 of Resolution 3/1 adopted by the Conference of the States Parties in Doha on 13 November 2009.

progress over time. The results of the UNCAC Self-Assessment will also provide a baseline on which government reformers can ground their anti-corruption reforms.¹⁵

18. The information gathered through the UNCAC Self-Assessment will provide a **clear overview of the technical assistance needs** of the State Party. This will be useful for governments that wish to draw on international technical assistance providers. UNODC has been mandated by the CoSP to utilize the Self-Assessment Checklist software to identify technical assistance needs globally and to share this information with technical assistance providers.¹⁶ This has the potential to improve donor coordination and facilitate more targeted interventions by technical assistance providers, as governments will be in a better position to communicate their needs and priorities to development partners.¹⁷
19. States parties to the UNCAC will be able to **fulfil their international reporting obligations under the UNCAC Review Mechanism** by completing the computer-based UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist as part of the process.
20. The UNCAC Self-Assessment also provides an opportunity for countries to **share knowledge and expertise with other countries on implementing the UNCAC.** Promoting South-South sharing of good practice and lessons learned has proven to be invaluable in developing policy responses that are appropriate for local country contexts.¹⁸

V. Key Issues

21. The UNCAC Self-Assessment process, as outlined in the Methodology section below, proposes a range of activities and strategies, including the use of the Self-Assessment Checklist as an indispensable information gathering instrument. Nevertheless, the ultimate design and focus of the process will depend on the **country context.** There is no “one size fits all” approach. Factors such as the status of UNCAC ratification/ accession (signatory or State Party), the demands imposed by the UNCAC Review Mechanism, the level of UNCAC implementation, the political context, the legislative and institutional framework, existing human resource capacities within the government, and the socio-economic environment will all need to be taken into account.
22. **Strong political will** is undoubtedly the most critical success factor if an UNCAC Self-Assessment is to be useful as a reform tool. Being self-critical is not easy. It requires strong and courageous leadership to acknowledge and publicly identify weaknesses in national legislation, institutions and/or enforcement efforts. Such leadership needs to come from national leaders, both at the political and technical levels. Experience has shown that the establishment of a high-level Steering Committee to manage the UNCAC Self-Assessment process can give respectability and authority to the UNCAC Self-Assessment and help mobilize political will.
23. Several issues should be taken into consideration with respect to **timing.** Most commonly, an UNCAC Self-Assessment will take place following the ratification of or accession to UNCAC, both to feed into the UNCAC Review Mechanism and to assist the government identifying compliance issues and subsequently prioritize and sequence its anti-corruption reforms. An UNCAC Self-Assessment, however, can also take place before accession to UNCAC. At that stage, it can assist governments to ensure compliance with UNCAC prior to ratification and also to inform countries about the legislative and practical reforms required to implement the Convention.

¹⁵ See Repucci, Sarah, “Maximising the potential of UNCAC implementation: Making use of the self-assessment checklist”, U4 Issue 2009:13.

¹⁶ See Resolution 3/4, paragraph 10, adopted by the Conference of the States Parties in Doha on 13 November 2009.

¹⁷ The information gathered through the UNCAC Self-Assessment will also provide an overview of technical assistance already provided to the State party, which will be useful for identifying successful approaches to anti-corruption.

¹⁸ See UNODC, “South-South cooperation in the fight against corruption: Background paper prepared by the Secretariat”, <http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/COSP/session3/V0987479e.pdf>.

Case study: Indonesia's UNCAC Gap Analysis experience

In 2006, Indonesia was the first country to conduct a comprehensive and voluntary self-assessment of its compliance with the UNCAC as part of its commitment to the fight against corruption and implementing UNCAC. Unlike most other States parties, Indonesia initiated this "Gap Analysis" prior to ratifying the Convention. With no formal guidance for this process available then, Indonesia devised its own methodology. While not as comprehensive as the later checklists developed by the UNCAC CoSP, the matrix used had a similar intent and content and served the country well.

The Gap Analysis was mandated by the Indonesian Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) to a team of Indonesian academics and foreign experts and supported by GTZ. The local team of experts was responsible for the initial gathering and analysis of information on relevant laws, institutions and processes. These findings were then jointly analysed by the local and foreign experts and completed through broad consultation with key government agencies and relevant actors from civil society, the private sector and academia. A final multi-stakeholder workshop served to verify and generate broad buy-in for the key findings and recommendations. Indeed, it is largely attributed to the use of this inclusive process that the Gap Analysis has enjoyed a high degree of national ownership and widespread acceptance.

The findings from the Gap Analysis have provided relevant stakeholders with a comprehensive understanding of key weaknesses and gaps in the Indonesian legal and institutional framework to combat corruption and with an overview of the country's overall level of compliance against the standards set by UNCAC. As such, and in combination with findings from the pilot self-assessment and peer review process, in which Indonesia participated between 2007 and 2009, they provide an excellent basis for Indonesia to participate in the official UNCAC review mechanism starting in 2010.

The findings from the gap analysis were widely disseminated (in English and Bahasa Indonesia) domestically and internationally. As such, all stakeholders at the national and international level were effectively informed about the recommendation and about Indonesia's efforts in implementing UNCAC. Finally, Indonesia's pioneering efforts to review compliance with UNCAC led other countries to undertake similar efforts and since then a network of likeminded countries who regularly share experience in these matters has evolved.

Domestically, the relevance of the gap analysis is demonstrated by its long-term impact on the Indonesian national anti-corruption framework. Indeed, the findings from the 2006 Gap Analysis have been a critical source of information for the recently completed 2010-2025 national anti-corruption strategy (Stranas-PK). As such, the Gap Analysis is an example of how assessment processes under an international treaty can be used to inform and guide national development planning.

As with the Gap Analysis, Stranas-PK evolved from widespread consultations across government and the non-government sector and thus has the potential to stimulate broad national involvement in its implementation and encourage inter-agency and multi-stakeholder cooperation. The strategy contains relatively detailed action plans, timelines, core responsibilities and deliverables and foresees a comprehensive monitoring mechanism. By using the Gap Analysis as the strategy's basis, implementation of Stranas-PK over the coming years will directly contribute to further enhancing Indonesia's compliance with UNCAC and, through this, strengthen its overall legal and institutional anti-corruption framework. In addition, as Stranas-PK follows UNCAC's chapter structure, Indonesia will be able to directly benchmark its success in implementing Stranas-PK against the standards of UNCAC, and vice versa.

Indonesia's experience exemplifies that with a domestically endorsed participatory approach to understanding, reviewing and implementing UNCAC, it is possible to enable substantial endorsement of international standards at the national level and hence improve quality, focus, effectiveness and coordination of national anti-corruption reforms.

24. Countries that have already ratified or acceded to UNCAC must consider **sequencing the UNCAC Self-Assessment with the UNCAC Review Mechanism**. In 2010, the first five-year review phase will start; however, some countries may not be reviewed until 2014. Therefore, some countries may want to initiate the UNCAC Self-Assessment before their year of review to accelerate national anti-corruption reform efforts and prepare for the review. Moreover, countries under review will be requested to submit the UNCAC Self-Assessment within two months of the commencement of the review process. In order to submit the UNCAC Self-Assessment Report in time, countries are encouraged to start the UNCAC Self-Assessment process prior to the review year, as the entire UNCAC Self-Assessment process may take up to six months.¹⁹
25. **A team of highly competent, experienced and trained professionals** (Team of Technical Experts), who can effectively undertake the UNCAC Self-Assessment process is important for comprehensive analysis. Identifying appropriate governmental and non-governmental experts is recommended to drive the UNCAC Self-Assessment process forward and lead the day-to-day substantive work.²⁰ This Team of Technical Experts can also draw on international expertise during the process, as required.
26. Experience has shown that an UNCAC Self-Assessment will produce the most useful results by bringing together an **interdisciplinary and integrated team**, including various government departments, civil society, private sector, and academia. This approach has been successfully implemented in a number of countries, including for example in Bangladesh and Kenya.
27. It is essential that the UNCAC Self-Assessment process includes **all relevant government departments and national institutions**. Inter-departmental groups can effectively share knowledge and experience across sectors, give greater authority to the process and help build trust and open lines of communication between institutions which can be leveraged when later implementing reforms.
28. It is critical to **engage civil society** throughout the UNCAC Self-Assessment process and in the resulting UNCAC implementation efforts. Articles 5 and 13 of the UNCAC specifically highlight the importance of civil society participation in the fight against corruption. Civil society brings a different perspective to the table and can offer insights from outside the public sector on weaknesses in the system. This will enrich the UNCAC Self-Assessment process and its outcomes, as demonstrated in Kenya and Bangladesh. Civil society is frequently well-placed to bring credibility to the UNCAC Self-Assessment process.
29. It is equally important to **involve the private sector** during the UNCAC Self-Assessment process. The private sector is a key stakeholder in the implementation of UNCAC. Article 12 of UNCAC specifically mentions the private sector and the measures that ought to be taken to prevent corruption involving the private sector. The UN Global Compact has also adopted a tenth principle stating that “Businesses should work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery.”²¹ In the same vein, the G20 is promoting a drive towards a “strong, fair and clean economy”. As such, employers’ associations and other private sector organizations should take part in the UNCAC Self-Assessment process to suggest and promote relevant anti-corruption reforms.

¹⁹ See the UNCAC Self-Assessment timeline in Annex B at the end of this Guidance Note.

²⁰ Under the UNCAC Review Mechanism, each State Party must appoint up to 15 experts for the purpose of the review process. In order to maximize available human resources, it is recommended that the main experts participating in the Team of Technical Experts include those officially appointed by each State party for the purpose of the review process.

²¹ <http://www.unglobalcompact.org/AboutTheGC/TheTenPrinciples/anti-corruption.html>.

Case study: Kenya's Gap Analysis experience

As the designated lead body, the Kenyan Anti-Corruption Commission (KACC) started in 2006/2007 an initial UNCAC Gap Analysis under the assumption it could all be done internally. KACC then planned to simply review the Convention, determine the articles that required to be implemented, and then recommend the laws to be enacted.

However, they learned along the way that the answers to some articles especially in Chapter II required the input of officers from other institutions such as the national audit office, public procurement, public service, civil society and the private sector. In 2007, the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs (MOJCA) also attempted an UNCAC Gap Analysis on its own and arrived at the same conclusion.

In September 2007, the KACC and MOJCA agreed to combine their efforts. They established an Oversight Committee comprising the two institutions plus the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and GTZ. The KACC led the team conducting the gap analysis efforts, whilst the MOJCA took responsibility for overseeing implementation of the Gap Analysis report.

The Oversight Committee established a technical committee to brainstorm and write the Gap Analysis Report. To determine which institutions were required in the technical committee, the Oversight Committee reviewed the articles of the Convention. They then agreed that some institutions would be invited to participate full-time in the technical committee and others would be invited for consultations on an ad hoc basis. For example the judiciary would only be consulted at certain stages.

The KACC invited the selected institutions to nominate suitable experts for the technical committee. Some institutions were to nominate more than one officer, depending on the required input. For example, the Attorney General's Office nominated three officers; one from prosecution, one from treaties, and one from the legislative drafting section.

The Oversight Committee decided to use the template from Indonesia for the report and hired external consultants to give comments at various stages to enrich the process. GTZ appointed the Basel Institute on Governance (BIG) for this purpose.

When the task commenced, the Oversight Committee divided the technical committee into teams according to their specializations and the UNCAC Chapters. The biggest and most diverse team was on Chapter II, Prevention. At certain stages, additional officers from outside the technical committee were invited to specific meetings to expand the range of discussion and to gain additional insights.

When the first draft was complete, the technical committee sent the report to BIG for comment and exchanged initial views via teleconference. The first draft was also discussed in separate consultative meetings with civil society, private sector and the judiciary, which led to some amendments to the report, including the introduction of a new column on enforcement and implementation gaps. As civil society advanced conflicting points of view, the Oversight Committee hired a local CSO representative to collect the views from CSOs and help them establish agreed positions. This facilitated CSO input into the process.

The revised draft was then circulated to a wide cross-section of stakeholders in government, civil society, religious organisations, private sector, and academia. After comments were received, the technical committee presented the report at a stakeholders retreat. Due to the passage of time, some gaps had disappeared while others had emerged. The technical committee updated the report to reflect these changes and the suggestions from the stakeholders, including the addition of an implementation plan.

The Oversight committee then hired an editor to correct the grammar and the flow of the document as the various chapters had been drafted by different teams with different styles. The edited report was presented to the technical committee to ensure that the initial meaning had not been altered. The Gap Analysis Report and Implementation Plan were finally published in 2009 and disseminated to the UNCAC Conference of the States Parties.

30. At a practical level, it is essential that **all concerned stakeholders are brought together and actively engaged in the process**, including the public sector, civil society, business, and academia. Experience has shown that stakeholder workshops at the beginning and the end of the UNCAC Self-Assessment process are critical to ensure that all stakeholders are meaningfully informed about the process and its ongoing progress and are given opportunities to provide feedback and input.
31. In the same way, it is important that the **public is kept informed** of the process and that the final outcome of any UNCAC Self-Assessment is publicly available and widely disseminated. Engaging the media in the self-assessment process can greatly enhance its exposure and help to raise the public's general awareness about corruption.²²
32. Throughout the process, it is useful to keep a **gender perspective** in mind, as corruption may affect women and men differently. Any anti-corruption response will have to be grounded in an accurate assessment of the types, degrees and impacts of corruption on men and women in order to be effective and address corruption adequately.²³
33. The UNCAC Self-Assessment should comprise the first step in a longer-term process of anti-corruption reform. The UNCAC Self-Assessment may result in the development of a comprehensive national anti-corruption strategy and the implementation of an action plan. A **regular review of the UNCAC Self-Assessment Report's findings and monitoring of the progressive implementation of reforms** will be critical in ensuring that the recommendations are implemented and sustained over time. The UNCAC Review Mechanism will play an essential role in monitoring reform implementation. Through the peer review process, States parties will be encouraged to continue with successful reforms and be supported to identify areas that require ongoing technical assistance.

²² For more information on the importance of engaging the media in anti-corruption efforts and how best to do this see the World Bank and UNODC report "Building Public Support for Anti-Corruption Efforts" at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTGOVACC/Resources/CorruptionWhitePaperpub311110screen.pdf>.

²³ See upcoming publication by UNDP and UNIFEM, "Corruption, Accountability and Gender: Understanding the Connections" at <http://www.unifem.org/materials/>

Case study: Bangladesh's Gap Analysis experience

In February 2007, the Government of Bangladesh acceded to UNCAC; a symbolic and significant step, whereby the Government expressed its commitment to fight corruption in compliance with international standards. The UNCAC provided an excellent benchmark for the Government of Bangladesh to measure its progress in the fight against corruption and provided an opportunity to inspire its anti-corruption reform programme.

With that end in mind, an initial compliance and gap analysis was undertaken and an initial version of the report "UNCAC: A Bangladesh Compliance & Gap Analysis" was published by the Government in January 2008. It provided a comprehensive assessment of the current status of Bangladesh's anti-corruption system vis-à-vis the UNCAC. The Government of Bangladesh subsequently used the Gap Analysis report as the basis for reporting on progress in implementing the UNCAC at the second Conference of the States Parties in Bali, Indonesia, in January 2008.

Since January 2008, the Government implemented several anti-corruption reforms, most notably specific legislative developments, including the enactment of the Money Laundering Prevention Act (MLPA) 2009, the Anti-Terrorism Act 2009, the Representation of the People (Amendment) Act 2009, the Right to Information Act 2009 and the Public Procurement Rules 2008. The MLPA, in particular, is a consequence of the Compliance and Gap Analysis report as it was drafted in consideration of the UNCAC. Furthermore, the Government nominated the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Attorney General's Office as the 'Central Authorities' to provide mutual legal assistance under UNCAC, and improve Bangladesh's coordination in international anti-corruption efforts. As such, Bangladesh made huge strides in becoming compliant with the Convention.

Given these important developments, the Government decided to revise the initial report so that it may offer a current picture of Bangladesh's status with regard to the UNCAC. In this report, the Government added additional UNCAC articles to provide a more thorough analysis and ensure the report serves as an effective instrument for fighting corruption. The revised report, published in July 2008, enabled an up-to-date evaluation of the Government's progress in implementing anti-corruption reforms over time, which allowed civil society and the general public to monitor the Government's commitment to combating corruption. It also informed and guided anti-corruption reform programmes undertaken by the Government and other concerned stakeholders.

The Bangladesh Compliance and Gap Analysis reports were the result of an extraordinary effort of coordination and cooperation among various government institutions of Bangladesh. The work was coordinated by the Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs, who acted as the focal point for this exercise. The reports were planned and drafted jointly with the experts from IGS of BRAC University, and financial and technical support from GTZ. Additional expert advice was provided by BIG, UNODC and UNDP.

Based on the findings of the two Gap Analysis reports the Government undertook capacity building workshops for civil servants and formulated a draft National Integrity Strategy under the Cabinet Division's leadership with technical assistance from IGS and financial assistance from the Asian Development Bank. Furthermore, the Government completed an action plan for compliance in November 2009.

VI. Methodology

34. Based on past experience in completing the earlier version of the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist in a number of Arab countries²⁴ and in conducting UNCAC Gap Analyses in Indonesia, Bangladesh and Kenya,²⁵ **an UNCAC Self-Assessment is ideally composed of two preliminary steps and six successive phases.**

Preliminary steps:

1. Designation of a Lead Agency
2. Establishment of a Steering Committee

Phases:

1. Initial stakeholder workshop to launch and plan the process
 2. Data collection:
 - a. Document gathering
 - b. Stakeholder consultations
 3. Analysis and drafting of the reports
 4. Validation workshop and finalization of the reports
 5. Publication and dissemination of the reports
 6. Follow-up
35. After each phase, progress should be formally reported to the Steering Committee by the Team of Technical Experts. The Lead Agency or Steering Committee should also seek to publish information about the process to the wider public on a regular basis and in particular at the beginning and end of the UNCAC Self-Assessment process.
36. The outline below provides detailed guidance on the proposed steps and phases. In addition, an indicative UNCAC Self-Assessment schedule at Annex A can be used to ensure all key issues are considered when preparing and conducting the UNCAC Self-Assessment.

Preliminary steps:

1. Designation of a Lead Agency / Focal Point

37. Although each country's bureaucracy operates according to its own political and institutional imperatives, experience has shown that undertaking a whole-of-government activity such as the UNCAC Self-Assessment requires high-level endorsement by the government to be successful. As such, it is important at the outset that the government designates a senior official, agency or working group to take the lead on completing the UNCAC Self-Assessment. Ideally, a reform leader with the necessary political clout to support the assessment and the reform process in general should be selected. Other criteria for the selection of the Lead Agency might include relevant responsibilities and expertise, and exposure to international work.

²⁴ These countries include: Iraq, Jordan, Morocco and Yemen. For more information see the experience of the Arab Governmental Expert Group (AGEG) annexed to Sarah Repucci's "Maximising the potential of UNCAC implementation: Making use of the self-assessment checklist", U4 Issue 2009:13.

²⁵ See list of resources in Annex E for more details.

38. Depending on the country context, departments like those of the President, the Prime Minister, the Attorney General or the Justice Department may be mandated to organize the UNCAC Self-Assessment process. Alternatively, in some countries, the national Anti-Corruption Commission, in its role as the coordinator of anti-corruption policies, may be tasked with completing the Self-Assessment. A national anti-corruption taskforce or working group or another independent body could also be given this task, provided they have a strong mandate from the political leadership.
39. It is important that there is clarity within and outside the government regarding which institution is the Lead Agency. Ideally, this will be captured in a Cabinet or Ministerial Statement or written Terms of Reference, which clarifies reporting requirements and deadlines. Even if no written statement is provided, it will be useful for the government to make it clear that the Lead Agency has a mandate to complete the UNCAC Self-Assessment and to call on all agencies explicitly to support the process actively.
40. Under the UNCAC Review Mechanism, States parties are requested to appoint a Focal Point to coordinate their participation in the peer review process. The Focal Point chosen for the UNCAC Review Mechanism should ideally be the same office, agency or individual designated as the Lead Agency for the UNCAC Self-Assessment. The Focal Point will be recognized by the UN system and will be the primary point of contact through which the UN can channel and manage support, if requested, for the UNCAC Self-Assessment process under the UNCAC Review Mechanism. These considerations should be taken into account when selecting the Lead Agency.

2. Establishment of a Steering Committee

41. Once a Lead Agency has been identified, it will be important for that Agency to consult across government to identify which other bodies have a stake in the UNCAC Self-Assessment.²⁶ Some agencies will have a direct interest, such as, for example, the Audit Office, Anti-Corruption Commission, Financial Intelligence Unit or Police Anti-Corruption Unit, while others may be less directly involved, including, for example, the Health and Education Ministries. Broad participation across government will add depth and credibility to the UNCAC Self-Assessment process.
42. Experience has shown that an inter-departmental meeting is a useful way to bring together key agencies to discuss the UNCAC Self-Assessment process and identify the officials who will be involved. At this meeting, participants should formally decide upon a Steering Committee. This group should consist of high-level representatives of the main government institutions involved. Generally the Chairperson will be from the Lead Agency and will be responsible for managing the process. Consideration should also be given to inviting representatives from Parliament²⁷, civil society, academia and the private sector to form part of the Steering Committee. In the Solomon Islands, for example, the National Anti-Corruption Taskforce includes ten government agencies as well as a CSO representative and a representative of the Chamber of Commerce. The Steering Committee should agree on a Terms of Reference to guide its work.

²⁶ These can include: National Anti-Corruption Commission or institutions with similar responsibilities, the Ministry of Legal Affairs, the Judiciary, Civil Service Commission or Ministry in charge of Public Service, the Public Prosecution Services, the Attorney General's Office, the police (special branch on white collar crime, if any), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the National Audit Office, the Ministry of Finance, the Central Bank, the Financial Intelligence Unit, the Ministry of Interior, the Public Procurement Department, other relevant government departments from central and regional level, and the national parliament.

²⁷ For an assessment tool aimed at facilitating more active parliamentary involvement in the implementation, oversight and monitoring of UNCAC, see "Preventing Corruption: An UNCAC Toolkit for Parliamentarians", developed by UNDP and GOPAC. For more information, visit <http://www.gaportal.org/tools/preventing-corruption-toolkit-parliamentarians>.

Phases:

1. Initial stakeholder workshop to launch and plan the process

43. To launch the UNCAC Self-Assessment process, it is useful to bring together all relevant stakeholder groups at a public and participatory event. To this end, an inclusive stakeholder workshop can be convened. It should be designed to clarify the goal and scope of the UNCAC Self-Assessment, agree on the methodology, officially assign responsibilities and leadership, and establish rules of cooperation between all concerned parties.²⁸
44. The Lead Agency, with support from the Steering Committee where possible, should organize the stakeholder workshop, in coordination with any relevant development partners, and where applicable, international experts. The workshop is a critical and essential phase of the UNCAC Self-Assessment process because it is the first opportunity to develop broad-based support for the process across government and the public. The timing of the first workshop may depend on the country's selection for review under the UNCAC Review Mechanism. The workshop should include relevant government agencies, civil society, private sector, academia, research institutions, and possibly the local donor community. Ensuring a good and balanced representation of all these groups and adequate representation of various political affiliations as well as of central and regional constituencies is essential to ensure the success of the workshop.
45. The workshop provides an opportunity to identify a Team of Technical Experts, which will comprise professionals drawn from ministries, Parliament, national institutions, civil society, the private sector, and academia, who will actually undertake the review of national legislation and practices. Depending on the country context and the resources available for the UNCAC Self-Assessment, the Team of Technical Experts can be sub-divided into teams with specific thematic responsibilities under UNCAC.
46. The Team of Technical Experts should be inclusive and multi-disciplinary. It should consist of all relevant stakeholders, the private sector, individuals and groups outside the public sector. In order to fulfil their tasks, the members of the team should cover a cross-section of government agencies which have responsibilities for issues covered by UNCAC. At least one member should have a thorough knowledge of the national legal system, and anti-corruption legislation in particular. At least one person should also have expertise on how to conduct interviews as an additional way of gathering data for the UNCAC Self-Assessment process.
47. The initial stakeholder workshop should be used to familiarize all members of the Team of Technical Experts with the provisions of UNCAC, the UNCAC Review Mechanism and the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist software. A specific session may be organized, as part of the stakeholder workshop, with the Team of Technical Experts, to explore these issues further and clarify their roles and responsibilities. This will ensure a proper understanding of the UNCAC, the tasks and deliverables and allow team members to get to know each other, as relevant.²⁹

²⁸ If the country is reporting under the UNCAC Review Mechanism, the scope of at least two chapters is pre-determined. In this case, however, the workshop can agree to go beyond the two mandatory chapters to be reviewed.

²⁹ The UNODC Secretariat will also organize periodic training courses for experts who participate in the review process, in order to familiarize them with the Guidelines of the UNCAC Review Mechanism and increase their capacity to participate in the review process.

48. The initial stakeholder workshop could also be used to conduct a preliminary mapping of available resources and data to conduct the UNCAC Self-Assessment, by asking participants to complete a form detailing the documents they could share with the Team of Technical Experts after the stakeholder workshop. This will facilitate the research and consultation process led by the Team of Technical Experts (see Phase 2 below). It will also ensure commitment from the participants to share this information with the Team of Technical Experts and actively participate in the process.
49. A Team Leader for the Team of Technical Experts should be selected and assigned the responsibility of overall coordination of tasks. It is recommended that the person appointed as Team Leader be able to dedicate 20-30 percent of their time to coordinating the UNCAC Self-Assessment process. The Team Leader should have sufficient authority and resources to complete the tasks, and the reporting lines between the Team of Technical Experts and the Steering Committee should be clearly defined.
50. If, at the request of the beneficiary country, the UNCAC Self-Assessment process will use international experts, they could be included in this initial workshop. If international experts are to be used but are not included in this stage, their role and responsibilities should be discussed and decided upon at this meeting. The level of engagement of international experts in the UNCAC Self-Assessment process is an issue for the relevant stakeholders to decide upon, taking into account the national context.

2. Data collection

(a) Document gathering

51. Once the methodology, responsible parties and deadlines for the UNCAC Self-Assessment process have been agreed upon, the Team of Technical Experts, in collaboration with UNDP, UNODC and other stakeholders as appropriate, will start collecting basic background information, including relevant laws, regulations and policies as well as reports from previous anti-corruption or governance assessments. Wherever possible, if international experts are providing support to the process, English translations should be provided.
52. Generally, it is recommended that the UNCAC Self-Assessment covers the entire Convention rather than only certain provisions, chapters or thematic areas. The components of an anti-corruption system are interconnected and should be considered jointly to provide a complete picture of reform requirements and enable the country to prioritize and sequence its reforms in recognition of their relative importance and urgency. Of course, if the country conducting an UNCAC Self-Assessment is also selected under the UNCAC Review Mechanism, priority shall be given to collecting information related to the chapters of UNCAC to be reviewed under the given cycle.
53. The documentation collected by the Team of Technical Experts will feed into the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist. As an intermediate step between collecting the data and using it to complete the Self-Assessment Checklist, a generic Word or Excel-based data gathering document may be used. The intermediate working tool should be carefully developed and seek to cover all questions that will be asked in the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist. A suggested working tool is included in Annex C.

UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist

The computer based UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist is a user-friendly application that can be downloaded from the UNODC website³⁰ or installed on a computer with a DVD.³¹ The Self-Assessment Checklist details all the technical requirements under each substantive article of UNCAC and is an information gathering tool to give a comprehensive national overview and provide the basis for developing recommendations to achieve full compliance. It also enables researchers to edit and process a wealth of information in a structured format.

Using the Checklist as the primary data collection tool will ensure a consistent and structured approach to the UNCAC Self-Assessments. This has many advantages. It ensures a comprehensive assessment of all the provisions under UNCAC and includes cross-references to the Legislative Guide³² and other relevant instruments. It facilitates a standardized format for all UNCAC Self-Assessments. It allows for comparison of the findings and results of an UNCAC Self-Assessment across countries and across anti-corruption bodies. Furthermore, once the Self-Assessment Checklist has been completed, it automatically generates an UNCAC Self-Assessment Report.

(b) Stakeholder consultations

54. The data collection process should include consultations and discussions with government officials and specialists in various sectors including non-governmental actors such as civil society, academia and the private sector. Written submissions may be solicited on specific parts of the UNCAC. Focus group discussions, notably thematic panels, public hearings, or parliamentary hearings may help clarify gaps and technical assistance needs in key thematic areas in a time-efficient and concise manner. One-on-one interviews with key specialists may also explore more complex and sensitive issues in a private environment. This will very much depend on the country context. If international experts are used to support the process, such interviews and discussions may also help answer any outstanding issues or questions they may have following the desk review.
55. Undertaking face-to-face consultations can serve two purposes: (i) to confirm or correct information that has been collected during the desk analysis; and (ii) to gain further insight into the practical implementation and effectiveness of existing laws, regulations and institutional processes, including key challenges, gaps and needs. Stakeholder consultations can also assess capacities of key institutions in the fight against corruption, looking at the enabling environment, their organizational capacities (in terms of standard operating procedures, planning, human resource management, knowledge management, etc.), as well as individual capacities (skills and training needs).
56. During the stakeholder consultations, it is recommended to have a special focus on the actual implementation of laws, the effectiveness of institutions and the implementation of policies in practice, as this might be more difficult to explore by means of a desk review. In preparation for the interviews, the Team of Technical Experts (or the international experts, if they are involved) should prepare questionnaires which address any missing information. Once it is established what information is lacking, the relevant interviewees can be identified. The problem of potential bias of interviewees can be addressed by selecting a broad range of interviewees from different backgrounds and by presenting them with the same questions and comparing their answers. The persons conducting the interviews should be trained and briefed on how to do so.³³

³⁰ <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/self-assessment.html>.

³¹ The UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist DVDs and technical assistance to install them are available upon request from UNODC. See useful contacts in Annex F.

³² http://www.unodc.org/pdf/corruption/CoC_LegislativeGuide.pdf.

³³ See Transparency International: National Integrity System Assessment Toolkit, 2009, Annex 3: Key Informant Interview Guide.

Consultations with international experts³⁴

In countries where international experts support the UNCAC Self-Assessment, the targeted interviews and focus group discussions will usually occur during an on-site visit of the international team of experts. Preparation for the interviews and the on-site visit will be primarily coordinated by the Team of Technical Experts with input from the international experts.

These international experts need to be sensitive to the country's needs and should be careful not to assume the role of Team Leaders but rather support the on-going process with advice and assistance. It is recommended that the on-site visit commences with meetings with the Steering Committee and Team of Technical Experts to build rapport between the different actors and give the international experts a good overview of the progress to date. Each country will devise its own consultation schedule, but consideration may be given to running "thematic panels" which bring together relevant state officials and civil society actors on common issues. Alternatively, separate consultations with civil society and/or foreign missions could be held.

Where international experts are involved in stakeholder consultations, the meetings provide an ideal opportunity to consider international good practice for addressing some of the gaps identified in the data collection phase and to exchange ideas, which may prompt thinking on reforms. They may also highlight lessons learned from other States and thereby contribute to South-South or North-South cooperation.

The on-site visit can also provide an opportunity to generate further interest among development partners to support the implementation of the proposed reforms that will result from the UNCAC Self-Assessment process. A proper discussion on Technical Assistance should take place upon completion of the UNCAC Self-Assessment Report, but these discussions can be initiated at the time of the on-site visit to enable development partners to plan ahead and integrate new requests for assistance into existing activities and programmes.

Where international experts will be supporting the process of writing the Self-Assessment Report, the on-site visit also provides an opportunity to agree on the report format³⁵ and drafting procedure.

3. Analysis and drafting of the reports

57. Once the data has been collated and entered into the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist, a report containing this information can be generated using the Checklist software. This report, the **UNCAC Self-Assessment Report**, collates the country's detailed responses to each substantive article of the Convention.
58. Following stakeholder consultations, the Team of Technical Experts will finalize the inputs to the Self Assessment Checklist and generate the UNCAC Self-Assessment Report. To ensure that the results of the UNCAC Self-Assessment can be easily understood and acted upon by policymakers, it may be useful to also produce a shorter summary of the UNCAC Self-Assessment Report, which highlights the most important achievements and challenges in the implementation of the UNCAC, the key reform priorities and the proposed sequencing of those reforms. A first draft of this **UNCAC Self-Assessment Summary Report** should be produced by the Team of Technical Experts, based on their analysis of the findings of the UNCAC Self-Assessment Report.

³⁴ The methodology described under this section is not to be confused with the country visit regulated by the UNCAC Review Mechanism. The country visit to be possibly conducted during a UNCAC Self-Assessment does not substitute for that to be undertaken – upon request – under the UNCAC Review Mechanism.

³⁵ Although the UNCAC Self-Assessment Report generated by the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist software is standardized, the Team of Technical Experts and the International Experts may need to discuss a reporting format for the Summary UNCAC Self-Assessment Report (see below under Section 3 on analysis and preparation of reports).

59. Where international experts support the process, the Summary Report should be drafted in close collaboration between the national and international experts. Alternatively, international experts may be called upon to specifically support this one aspect of the process, by reviewing the draft UNCAC Self-Assessment Report and the draft Summary Report, and providing detailed feedback to validate and strengthen these drafts.
60. The Steering Committee can provide guidance on the format of the Summary Report in consultation with the Team of Technical Experts and any international experts.³⁶ The Summary Report could consist of an article or chapter-level analysis of UNCAC implementation. It could also briefly describe the Self-Assessment process (Lead Agency, Steering Committee members, composition of the Team of Technical Experts, number of meetings, stakeholders involved, etc.). More importantly, it could highlight the successful practices and the main challenges in implementation of the UNCAC, key reform priorities, and identified technical assistance needs.
61. Once a draft Summary Report is agreed upon by the Team of Technical Experts, it should be submitted to the Steering Committee for review and comments. The Steering Committee should also have access to the UNCAC Self-Assessment Report so that they can review the results of the UNCAC Self-Assessment in more detail as necessary. The process of agreeing on a final draft of the Summary Report may take some time, and this should be factored into the timelines.

4. Validation workshop and finalization of the reports

62. The final step in the UNCAC Self-Assessment process is to finalize the UNCAC Self-Assessment Report and any Summary Report and substantiate their findings through a **Validation Workshop**. Depending on the country context, the Validation Workshop may also be used to prepare for the development of an UNCAC Implementation Action Plan to outline future reforms and their respective timelines.
63. The final Validation Workshop should be held with the same group of participants that attended the initial Stakeholder Workshop. Additional participants who became involved once the process had already started should also be included.
64. Workshop participants should be provided with drafts of the Self-Assessment Report and the Summary Report in advance, so they can prepare adequately for the meeting. During the Validation Workshop, the draft reports should be presented and the results discussed.
65. In addition, the Validation Workshop may serve as a useful opportunity to discuss with stakeholders the priorities for a national anti-corruption strategy or an UNCAC Implementation Action Plan. Experience from the UNCAC Gap Analyses that have been conducted to date shows that the development of an Implementation Action Plan can contribute to maintaining the momentum for the recommended reforms. The Validation Workshop is an opportunity to strengthen political (and donor) support for anti-corruption reform.
66. After the Workshop, the Team of Technical Experts will make changes to the drafts of the Self-Assessment Report and Summary Report based on the feedback and comments made during the Validation Workshop. The Team Leader will then submit the final Self-Assessment Report and Summary Report to the Steering Committee for endorsement. If appropriate, consideration may be given to submitting the final documents to Cabinet for approval.

³⁶ Annex B to the 2009 CoSP Resolution 3/1 on the UNCAC Review Mechanism attaches a "Blueprint" for Country Review Reports, which provides a good model of how a Summary Self-Assessment Report could be designed.

UNCAC Self-Assessment Reports

In essence, the UNCAC Self-Assessment process described in this Guidance Note will generate two products: the UNCAC Self-Assessment Report and its Summary Report. While primarily serving national purposes, such reports also complement the UNCAC Review Mechanism. The Self-Assessment Report should be submitted to the CoSP Secretariat (UNODC) for analysis by the reviewing States parties under the UNCAC Review Mechanism. The Summary Report may be regarded as “additional/supplementary information” that, if requested by the reviewers, can be provided to enable a more substantiated country review report.³⁷

5. Publication and dissemination of the reports

67. The products of the UNCAC Self-Assessment process should be discussed and disseminated to all relevant stakeholders. Ideally, the final UNCAC Self-Assessment Report and Summary Report will be published on the website of the Lead Agency and any other government institution charged with fighting corruption. A press conference may be organized to launch the reports. The Lead Agency should ensure translation of the final Self-Assessment products into the national language(s) and should facilitate dissemination of the products to relevant public agencies and NGOs.
68. Recognizing the importance of the UNCAC Self-Assessment Reports in terms of national legislative reform, consideration should also be given to tabling the final UNCAC Self-Assessment Report and Summary Report in parliament.
69. The final Self-Assessment Reports should also be shared with the local donor community, international organizations and other development partners. The Lead Agency should also send the reports to the UNCAC CoSP Secretariat (UNODC).³⁸
70. When completing the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist for the UNCAC Review Mechanism, the Checklist includes a specific question on whether the CoSP Secretariat can make the results public. Governments are encouraged to answer positively, so that the results of their UNCAC Self-Assessment are shared with other countries and they can demonstrate their commitment to anti-corruption reform at the national level.

6. Follow-up

71. Once the UNCAC Self-Assessment has been completed, the Steering Committee can play an ongoing role in progressing the government’s anti-corruption reform agenda. As noted at the outset, the Self-Assessment process is not an end in itself; rather it serves as a means towards an end. The Steering Committee may request the Team of Technical Experts or relevant ministerial departments to report within a year or on a bi-annual basis on the actions undertaken as a result of the report. A formal national monitoring mechanism may be established by the Steering Committee to ensure that the recommendations do not remain on paper only, but actually translate into concrete action and tangible results.
72. To be useful, the UNCAC Self-Assessment must be acted upon. As noted above, the next step may be the development of a comprehensive anti-corruption strategy and implementation action plan. Even in the absence of such a plan, individual institutions may already proceed to address gaps identified during the UNCAC Self-Assessment process. Civil society organizations may also use the results of the UNCAC Self-Assessment to mobilize political will for reform and engage in national dialogue on various anti-corruption issues.

³⁷ Note the following relevant passages of the resolution that adopted the UNCAC Review Mechanism: “The reviewing states shall carry out a desk review of the responses to the comprehensive Self-Assessment Checklist by the State Party under review...the reviewing States Parties may request the State Party under review to provide...additional information...The desk review shall be based on the responses to the comprehensive Self-Assessment Checklist and any supplementary information provided by the State Party under review...The country review shall lead to the elaboration of a Country Review Report...”

³⁸ The UNCAC Self-Assessment Report should be sent to uncacselfassessment@unodc.org and the UNCAC Self-Assessment Summary Report to uncacreviewmechanism@unodc.org.

73. In Parliament, the reports can be referred to a relevant parliamentary committee for more detailed review and follow-up action. Legislative initiatives may also be initiated by the relevant parliamentary committees. Feedback from Parliament can be integrated into the development of any anti-corruption strategy and/or Implementation Action Plan.
74. The Lead Agency may also convene a follow-up meeting with the local donor community and development partners to ensure that technical assistance is integrated in their programmes and delivered in practice. The UNCAC Self-Assessment Reports should serve to help coordinate technical assistance.
75. Furthermore, the UNCAC Review Mechanism serves as an immediate follow-up mechanism through the peer review process. Further technical assistance needs may be identified at that stage and fed back through the UNCAC Country Review Reports to the CoSP Secretariat.

VII. UN Agencies and Other Development Partners

76. The UN and its agencies, notably UNODC and UNDP as key agencies with a mandate in anti-corruption, are committed to responding to the growing international demand for support for UNCAC Self-Assessments. UNODC acts as the Secretariat to the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention and has played a leading role in developing the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist to assist States parties in collecting information on compliance and technical assistance needs. UNDP, with its country-level presence in 166 countries, its decades-long anti-corruption programme experience, and its ongoing anti-corruption support to over 100 countries, has a keen understanding of the importance of broad-based participation for national anti-corruption reform and stakeholder involvement in UNCAC Self-Assessment processes.
77. The current Guidance Note presents a methodology that may assist countries in implementing a nationally-owned UNCAC Self-Assessment process. UNDP and UNODC are available to support these processes with their respective strengths in prevention and enforcement. UNDP has the capacity to facilitate the UNCAC Self-Assessment process in the field through its Country Offices and Regional Centres and Programmes. Where UNODC has field presence, UNDP and UNODC work closely together.
78. In every country context, the constellation of national and international actors will differ. There are already a number of development partners that have in-depth knowledge on UNCAC Self-Assessment processes. For example, the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) through GTZ has been a pioneer in supporting countries to conduct UNCAC Gap Analyses in conjunction with technical assistance providers, such as the Basel Institute on Governance (Switzerland) and the Institute of Governance Studies (Bangladesh). Many of the best practices and know-how around the world have sprung from these experiences. Undoubtedly, these actors and other development partners will continue to play a crucial role in supporting UNCAC Self-Assessment processes.
79. Given the time constraints of the UNCAC Review Mechanism and the workload that will follow, the partnership between UNODC, UNDP and other development partners on the ground will be critically important to ensuring that any UNCAC Self-Assessments are effective and are adequately resourced. The engagement of all stakeholders, notably national agencies and departments, Parliament, media, the private sector, civil society, academia and development partners from the very start will be fundamental to ensuring a successful UNCAC Self-Assessment process. The strength, integrity and credibility of the final UNCAC Self-Assessment Report and its Summary Report will largely depend upon this. This wide level of engagement will be equally, if not more, important in taking forward the implementation of any action plan that arises from the Self-Assessment. In this context, UNDP and UNODC can play an important role in facilitating and coordinating donor support for reform efforts that the government seeks to undertake based on the Implementation Action Plan.

ANNEX A: UNCAC Self-Assessment Schedule ³⁹

Preliminary steps	Responsible actors	Timing
1. Designation of a Lead Agency ⁴⁰ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The indicative criteria in the Guidance Note (under Section VI Methodology) could inform the selection of a Lead Agency All the main stakeholders should be consulted to ensure their acceptance of the Lead Agency 	The government NB: UNODC will request official notification from the government on the appointment of a national Focal Point for the UNCAC Review Mechanism.	Before starting the Self-Assessment
2. Establishment of a Steering Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidate members for the Steering Committee should be identified An internal meeting among government agencies and other stakeholders should be convened to discuss the establishment of the Steering Committee All the main stakeholders should be consulted to ensure their sense of being represented The Steering Committee should be established (formally or informally) Terms of Reference should be drafted and agreed upon, including details about the frequency of subsequent meetings to ensure that the Steering Committee is kept updated on progress with the Self-Assessment process 	The Lead Agency	Week 1 (One month before the stakeholder workshop)
Phase 1: Initial stakeholder workshop		
Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An adequate venue should be selected An agenda with a concise note explaining the purpose of the stakeholder workshop should be developed and disseminated to all participants Representatives from all relevant stakeholder groups should be invited Potential candidates for the Team of Technical Experts should be identified and invited. A request to nominate members for the Team of Technical Experts may be sent out to all relevant stakeholders. Ideally, the main government officials would coincide with those appointed under the UNCAC Review Mechanism The Guidance Note on UNCAC Self-Assessments and other key documents should be disseminated to all participants 	Lead Agency	Weeks 1-4 (Begin one month before the stakeholder workshop)
Stakeholder workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An overview of the UNCAC provisions should be provided, as appropriate - the participants' level of knowledge of UNCAC should be assessed An update should be provided on current national anti-corruption systems (institutions, legal framework, etc.) by relevant anti-corruption stakeholders (e.g. ACC Head, AGs Office, FIU, Police Anti-Corruption Unit) An overview of some of the current corruption challenges facing the country should be provided to provide a context for the discussions The purpose of the UNCAC Self-Assessment and the UNCAC Review Mechanism should be presented The UNCAC Self-Assessment Methodology should be presented The members of the Steering Committee should be introduced, and their role in the UNCAC Self-Assessment process should be explained The importance of the Team of Technical Experts should be explained in terms of moving the process forward and conducting the research The composition of the Team of Technical Experts should be discussed. The Lead Agency may present a list of members of the Team of Technical Experts for discussion and endorsement, as appropriate, during the meeting. The stakeholders may suggest other experts for inclusion in the list of members of the Team of Technical Experts A Team Leader for the Team of Technical Experts should be designated The relevant ministry, department, agency and/or official should be identified as the responsible party for each chapter and/or specific provisions of UNCAC (if the Team of Technical Experts has been confirmed at the meeting, specific officials can be designated) The exact process and timeline should be clarified, notably in terms of the data collection, first draft, <i>on-site visit of international experts (if requested)</i>, additional stakeholder consultations, final draft, final workshop, Implementation Action Plan, and follow-up 	Lead Agency	Week 5 (Two months before the <i>on-site visit of international experts – if requested</i>)

³⁹ This schedule may guide the national programming efforts for the Self-Assessment process. The process can be run entirely by national stakeholders. The government may also request support from UNDP/UNODC Country Offices and bilateral donors, as appropriate. It may also involve international consultants to guide and support the process. The role of international consultants is included in *italics* in the schedule below.

⁴⁰ It is advised that the Lead Agency is the same entity as the national Focal Point for the UNCAC Review Mechanism (see Annex 1 of Resolution 3/1 adopted by the Conference of the States Parties in Doha on 13 November 2009).

Phase 2: Data collection		
<p>(a) Document gathering and translation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic background information should be collected, including relevant laws, regulations, policies, reports and any previous assessments Meetings and interviews should be organized with key officials and stakeholders to gather additional information Data should be entered into the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist computer-based tool If international experts are involved, all relevant laws, regulations should be translated into English and sent to them (Under the UNCAC Review Mechanism translation of responses to the Self-Assessment Checklist and annexed documentation from/into the six official languages of the UN will be provided) A first draft of the initial results gathered by the Team of Technical Experts should be sent to any international experts in advance of their arrival (based on the official UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist) Based on a desk review of the first draft of the UNCAC Self-Assessment Report, where appropriate, meetings should be set up, and an agenda for the on-site mission of the team of international experts should be developed and sent to all relevant stakeholders (all relevant officials, civil society, private sector representatives, development partners, etc.) 	<p>Team of Technical Experts</p> <p>Team Leader of the Team of Technical Experts</p> <p>International experts</p> <p>Team Leader of the Team of Technical Experts</p>	<p>Weeks 6-12 (Start two months before the on-site visit of the international experts – if requested)</p> <p>Week 8 (One month before the on-site visit)</p> <p>Week 9 (Three weeks before the on-site visit)</p> <p>Week 10 (Two weeks before the on-site visit)</p>
<p>(b) Stakeholder consultations (and on-site visit by the team of international experts, if applicable)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where applicable, a preparatory meeting should be held between the Team of Technical Experts and the international experts Where applicable, the international experts should also meet with the Steering Committee and other key public officials Other stakeholders should be consulted to supplement the data already collected. Depending on the country context, consultation may be organized in various forms, such as thematic panels, one-on-one meetings or public hearings Additional data from the consultations should be entered into UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist computer-based tool Where applicable, wrap-up meeting among the experts Where applicable, wrap-up meeting with the Steering Committee 	<p>Team Leader of the Team of Technical Experts Chair of the Steering Committee, Team Leader of the Technical Team of Experts, other key public officials Team Leader of the Team of Technical Experts and key public officials</p> <p>Team of Technical Experts Chair of Steering Committee</p>	<p>Weeks 13-14 (Two months before the validation workshop)</p>
Phase 3: Analysis and drafting of the reports		
<p>Drafting reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data entered into the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist computer-based tool should be finalized and the Summary Report should be drafted The draft UNCAC Self-Assessment Report and draft Summary Report should be circulated to the Steering Committee, as well as to UNDP, UNODC, relevant development partners, and where applicable, the team of international experts for comments and feedback 	<p>Team Leader of the Team of Technical Experts</p>	<p>Weeks 15-16 (Four weeks before the validation workshop)</p>
<p>Review of draft reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Steering Committee, as well as UNDP, UNODC, relevant development partners and/or the team of international experts will provide input 	<p>The Steering Committee, UNDP, UNODC, relevant development partners, and/or international experts</p>	<p>Week 17 (Three weeks before the validation workshop)</p>
<p>Finalization of draft reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft UNCAC Self-Assessment Report and draft Summary Report should be finalized Any internal government sign-offs should be obtained by the Team Leader, Team of Technical Experts 	<p>Team of Technical Experts</p>	<p>Week 19 (One week before the validation workshop)</p>

Phase 4: Validation workshop and finalization of the reports		
Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An adequate venue should be selected • An agenda and a short note updating progress should be developed and disseminated to all participants • Representatives from all relevant stakeholder groups should be invited • Draft UNCAC Self-Assessment Reports should be circulated in advance 	Team Leader of the Team of Technical Experts	Weeks 16-20 (One month before the validation workshop)
Validation Workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft UNCAC Self-Assessment Reports should be presented by the Team Leader of the Team of Technical Experts • The draft Reports should be discussed among all stakeholders • The recommendations should be reviewed and agreed upon 	Team Leader of the Team of Technical Experts All participants	Week 21 (Two weeks before the publication of the report)
Finalization of the reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comments and suggestions from the Validation Workshop should be integrated into the final draft UNCAC Self-Assessment Reports • The final draft Reports should be submitted to the Steering Committee for review and approval • Any additional internal government approval should be obtained 	Team of Technical Experts Team Leader of the Team of Technical Experts Steering Committee Chairperson	Weeks 22-23
Phase 5: Publication and dissemination of the reports		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final UNCAC Self-Assessment Reports should be translated, as relevant, in the national language(s) • The Reports should be published on a government website • The Reports should be published on the UN websites • A press conference should be organized to launch the Reports • The Reports should be printed in reasonable numbers and disseminated to all relevant stakeholders including national media • The Reports should be tabled in parliament for consideration and follow-up 	Chair of the Steering Committee UNDP and UNODC Chair of the Steering Committee Responsible minister	Week 24 (Two weeks after the validation workshop) At the next parliamentary sitting
Phase 6: Follow-up		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An anti-corruption strategy and/or Implementation Action Plan may be developed from the UNCAC Self-Assessment Reports • Political will for reform should be mobilized • Reform steps should be launched to address shortcomings identified • Implementation of the reform steps should be monitored 	Steering Committee (supported by UNDP and UNODC, as appropriate) Media/civil society The government, Parliament, and relevant public institutions Steering Committee, reviewing State parties under the UNCAC Review Mechanism	

ANNEX B: UNCAC Self-Assessment Timeline



* This box refers to the UNCAC Review Mechanism. Countries that have been drawn to undergo review in a specific year are requested to submit their Self-Assessment Reports approximately two months into their review year. In order to report in time, countries are therefore encouraged to start the UNCAC Self-Assessment process several months in advance.

ANNEX C: Self-Assessment Checklist Working Tool

UNCAC Provision	Collected Data
Has any measure been adopted / implemented? - Yes/No/In part - Cite and summarize the law or the policy - State the (other) steps taken so far	
What led to the adoption of this measure? A study? A strategy? An incident? Other?	
Which institution(s) are responsible for implementation?*	
Cite example(s) of successful implementation**	
Has the effectiveness of this measure been assessed? If yes, by whom? When and what were the main findings? If not, cite if you need any assistance to do so.	
What are the main challenges of implementation?***	
What steps need to be taken to ensure full compliance?	
What technical assistance is needed, if applicable?	

* If more than one, indicate respective roles and which institution has lead.

** Include, where applicable, information (statistics, types of cases, outcome) on related legal (civil, administrative or criminal) cases or other processes. Per annum figures should be provided where available since 2003 (or further back, if available).

***This can include: Inter-agency coordination; specificity in legal system; competing priorities; limited capacity (e.g. human/technological/institution/other – please specify); limited resources for implementation (e.g. human/financial/other – please specify); other issues (please specify).

ANNEX D: Glossary of Terms

UNCAC Compliance Review / UNCAC Gap Analysis

UNCAC Compliance Review and UNCAC Gap Analysis are terms that have been used in the past by a number of countries to denominate a voluntary process of assessing compliance with UNCAC. The Self-Assessment Methodology described in this Guidance Note is largely based on the experience gathered in the context of these countries' compliance reviews and gap analyses. See Annex E for examples of such compliance reviews and gap analyses.

Country Review

This term refers to the review procedure defined in the Terms of Reference of the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the UNCAC (also referred to as the UNCAC Review Mechanism) as adopted in Resolution 3/1 by the CoSP in Doha in November 2009.⁴¹

Country Review Report

The Country Review Report is one of the outputs of the UNCAC Review Mechanism. The reviewing States parties will prepare a Country Review Report in coordination with the State Party under review and assisted by the Secretariat (see Annex II to the Guidelines for governmental experts and the secretariat in the conduct of country reviews⁴²). The Self-Assessment Report will be used as the primary source of information for the Country Review Report, as well as any other additional information as mandated by the UNCAC Review Mechanism.

Lead Agency

The Lead Agency is the body mandated by the government to organize the Self-Assessment process and to explicitly call on all agencies to actively support the process. Ideally, this will be captured in a cabinet statement or written Terms of Reference which clarify reporting requirements and deadlines. The Lead Agency should also be the institution nominated as Focal Point in the context of the Review Mechanism (see pages 15-16 for further details).

UNCAC Review Mechanism

The UNCAC Review Mechanism (formally referred to as the Mechanism for the Review of Implementation of the United Nations Convention against Corruption) is an intergovernmental process established by the Conference of the States Parties to the UNCAC in Resolution 3/1 adopted in Doha in November 2009. The UNCAC Review Mechanism calls on States parties to peer review UNCAC implementation. Under this scheme, each State party will review and be reviewed by its peers (through governmental experts of the States parties) in five year cycles. (See pages 6-7 for further details.)

UNCAC Self-Assessment

An UNCAC Self-Assessment is a process through which a country assesses its national anti-corruption systems, laws, regulations, policies, institutions and programmes in comparison to the requirements of UNCAC, both de jure and de facto. This process occurs at the national level. The outcomes of an UNCAC Self-Assessment will be used as the main source of information for reviewing States parties under the UNCAC Review Mechanism.

⁴¹ See <http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/COASP/session3/V0988538e.pdf>.

⁴² <http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/WorkingGroups/ImplementationReviewGroup/28June-2July2010/V1053798e.pdf>

UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist

The UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist is a computer-based tool which forms part of the UNCAC Review Mechanism and facilitates the gathering of information related to the States parties' compliance with the UNCAC. The Self-Assessment Checklist is composed of a comprehensive set of questions for each substantive provision of the UNCAC. When completed, the Checklist provides highly-detailed, in-depth information on the level of compliance with the UNCAC, as provided by the country, and identifies existing technical assistance needs. The Self-Assessment Checklist is the official information gathering tool for the UNCAC Review Mechanism and is equally recommended for UNCAC Self-Assessment processes. (See pages 7 and 19 for further details.)

UNCAC Self-Assessment Report

The UNCAC Self-Assessment Report is the main output of the UNCAC Self-Assessment process and is generated through the UNCAC Self-Assessment Checklist software. The Self-Assessment Report provides a comprehensive overview of the concerned country's level of implementation of UNCAC. (See pages 20-22 for further details.)

UNCAC Self-Assessment Summary Report

The UNCAC Self-Assessment Summary Report summarizes the key findings of the UNCAC Self-Assessment process in a narrative form with a particular focus on successful practices, challenges, key reform priorities and technical assistance needs. This concise report is useful for high-level policymakers and advocacy purposes. (See page 22 for further details.)

Steering Committee

The Steering Committee provides guidance to the UNCAC Self-Assessment process and ensures support for the process across government and other involved stakeholders. The Steering Committee should consist of high level representatives of the main government institutions involved in the process. A representative from the Lead Agency may chair the Steering Committee. Consideration should also be given to including representatives from civil society, academia and the private sector in the Steering Committee. (See page 16 for further details.)

Team of Technical Experts

The Team of Technical Experts comprises the officials who will undertake the review of national legislation and practices during the UNCAC Self-Assessment. The identification of highly competent, experienced and trained persons to fulfil this role is of paramount importance. Depending on the country context, the team may be sub-divided into teams with specific thematic responsibilities under UNCAC, such as a team looking into enforcement matters and another looking into preventive measures. It is important that the selection of governmental experts participating in the Team of Technical Experts is coordinated with the official appointment of experts for the purpose of the country review process under the UNCAC Review Mechanism. (See page 17 for further details.)

ANNEX E: Resources and Further Reading

UNODC

United Nations Convention against Corruption

<http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/index.html>

Report of the Conference of States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption on its third session, held in Doha from 9-13 November 2009

<http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/COSP/session3/V0988538e.pdf>

Report of the Implementation Review Group of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, First Meeting, held in Vienna from 28 June to 2 July 2010

<http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/WorkingGroups/ImplementationReviewGroup/28June-2July2010/V1055385e.pdf>

UNDP

Global Anti-Corruption Portal

www.anti-corruption.org

Governance Assessment Portal: Corruption assessments

<http://gaportal.org/areas-of-governance/corruption>

Governance Assessment Portal: A toolkit for Parliamentarians

<http://www.gaportal.org/tools/preventing-corruption-toolkit-parliamentarians>

Going Beyond the Minimum: UNCAC Gap Analyses and UNDP Internal Integrity,

Asia-Pacific INTACT Community of Practice Workshop, 1-3 February 2010, Bangkok, Thailand

http://regionalcentrebangkok.undp.or.th/practices/governance/documents/APIntact2010/UNCAC_Gap_Analyses_and_UNDP_Internal_Integrity-Full_Report.pdf

GTZ

A Comparison of Compliance Reviews based on the UN Convention against Corruption (Indonesia, Colombia, Cameroon and Germany), Wysluch, Johanna Beate, 2007: German UNCAC Team Working Paper

<http://www.gtz.de/de/dokumente/gtz-en-uncac-compliance-indonesia-2007.pdf>

Implementing the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), UNCAC Compliance Review - Why and How?

GTZ UNCAC Project, 2007: Factsheet 10

<http://www.gtz.de/de/dokumente/en-gtz-uncac-compliance-review-why-and-how-2007.pdf>

Implementing the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), Compliance Review (Gap Analysis),

GTZ UNCAC Project, 2007: Factsheet 8

<http://www.gtz.de/de/dokumente/en-gtz-uncac-compliance-review-indonesia-2007.pdf>

Implementing the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), Compliance and Gap Analysis Bangladesh

GTZ UNCAC Project, 2008: Factsheet 24

<http://www.gtz.de/de/dokumente/gtz-en-factsheet-compliance-review-bangladesh-2008.pdf>

U4

The United Nations Convention against Corruption. A Primer for Development Practitioners, Schultz, Jessica (U4 Brief 2007:3)

<http://www.u4.no/document/publication.cfm?2750=the-united-nations-convention-against-corruption>

Maximising the potential of UNCAC implementation: Making use of the self-assessment checklist, Repucci, Sarah (U4 Issue 2009:13)

<http://www.u4.no/document/publication.cfm?3484=maximising-the-potential-of-uncac-implementation>

How prepared are we to assess real implementation of anti-corruption conventions? Lessons from the Americas, Peñailillo, Miguel (U4 Issue 2009:3)

<http://www.u4.no/document/publication.cfm?3331=how-prepared-are-we-to-assess-real-implementation>

The Recovery of Stolen Assets: A Fundamental Principle of the UN Convention against Corruption, Smith, Jack; Pieth, Mark; Jorge, Guillermo (U4 Brief 2007:2)

<http://www.u4.no/document/publication.cfm?2751=the-recovery-of-stolen-assets>

World Bank

Building Public Support for Anti-Corruption Efforts

<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTGOVACC/Resources/CorruptionWhitePaperpub31110screen.pdf>

Comparative Experiences Papers

Corruption Eradication Commission, The Republic of Indonesia, Gap Analysis Study Report, Identification of Gaps Between Laws/Regulations of the Republic of Indonesia and the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (2006)

<http://www.u4.no/pdf/?file=/document/literature/UNCAC-Gap-Analysis-Indonesia.pdf>

The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh: UNCAC – A Bangladesh Compliance and Gap Analysis (2008)

http://www.igs-bracu.ac.bd/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=61&Itemid=62

Kenya: UN Convention against Corruption Gap Analysis Report and Implementation Plan (2009)

<http://www.kacc.go.ke/docs/kenya-uncac-gap-analysis-report.pdf>

ANNEX F: Useful Contacts

UNDP			
UNDP Bureau for Development Policy, Democratic Governance Group – New York – #304 East 45th Street, New York, USA			
Phil Matsheza	Policy Advisor – Anti-Corruption	+1 212 906 5043	phil.matsheza@undp.org
Anga Timilsina	Global Programme on Anti-Corruption for Development Effectiveness Coordinator	+1 212 906 6440	anga.timilsina@undp.org
Julia Keutgen	Policy Analyst – Anti-Corruption	+1 212 906 6042	julia.keutgen@undp.org
UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre – Bangkok – UN Service Building, Rajdamnern Nok Avenue, Bangkok 10200, Thailand			
Pauline Tamesis	Democratic Governance Practice Team Leader	+66 2 2882790	pauline.tamesis@undp.org
Samuel De Jaegere	Policy Analyst – Public Administration Reform and Anti-Corruption	+66 2 2882642	samuel.de.jaegere@undp.org
UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre – Suva – 7th Floor, Kadavu House, 414 Victoria Parade, Fiji Islands			
Charmaine Rodrigues	Regional Legislative Strengthening Expert	+679 322 7508	charmaine.rodrigues@undp.org
UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre – Bratislava – Grosslingova 35, 81109, Slovak Republic			
Dan Dionisie	Policy Specialist, Public Administration Reform and Anti-Corruption		dan.dionisie@undp.org
Francesco Checchi	Project Associate		francesco checchi@undp.org
UNDP Programme on Governance in the Arab Region (POGAR) – Beirut – Lazarieh Center, Block (02A), Lebanon			
Arkan El Seblani	Programme Legal Specialist	+961 1 981 641	arkan.el-seblani@undp.org
UNDP Regional Centre in Dakar – 5, Boulevard de l’Est, Point E, P.O. Box 154, Senegal			
Patrick Van Weerelt	Democratic Governance Practice Team Leader	+221338690687	patrick.van.weerelt@undp.org
Sofi Halling	Policy Analyst – Anti-Corruption		sofi.halling@undp.org
UNDP Regional Centre for Eastern and Southern Africa – Johannesburg – 7, Naivasha Road, Sunning Hill, 2157, South Africa			
Job Ogonda	Policy Advisor – Public Administration Reform and Anti-Corruption	+27116035243	job.ogonda@undp.org
UNODC Corruption and Economic Crime Branch, Division for Treaty Affairs Vienna International Centre - P.O. Box 500, A - 1400 Vienna, Austria			
Dimitri Vlassis	Chief – Corruption and Economic Crime Branch	+43 1 26060 4534	dimitri.vlassis@unodc.org
Brigitte Strobel-Shaw	Chief – Conference Support Section	+43 1 26060 4407	brigitte.strobel-shaw@unodc.org
Giovanni Gallo	Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer	+43 1 26060 5179	giovanni.gallo@unodc.org
Annika Wythes	Associate Expert in Criminal Justice	+43 1 26060 4039	annika.wythes@unodc.org
German Technical Cooperation, Germany			
Stefanie Teggemann	Head of Program, Anticorruption and Integrity	+49 6196 79 2303	stefanie.teggemann@gtz.de
Basel Institute on Governance, Centre for Governance and Anti-Corruption, Switzerland			
Juanita Olaya	Director	+41 612055510	juanita.olaya@baselgovernance.org
Institute of Governance Studies, BRAC University – Dhaka, Bangladesh			
Manzoor Hasan	Director	+8802 8810306	manzoor.h@bracu.ac.bd

United Nations Development Programme

Asia-Pacific Regional Centre
United Nations Service Building
3rd Floor, Rajdamnern Nok Avenue
10200 Bangkok, Thailand
Email: ap-intact@groups.undp.org
<http://asia-pacific.undp.org>