

## ANNEX 7. Illustrative Statement of Work for an Anticorruption Assessment

### Introduction

This scope of work calls for the completion of two interrelated tasks: (1) an assessment of the corruption problem and anticorruption initiatives in \_\_\_\_\_ [country]; and (2) the development of an anticorruption strategy and prioritized programmatic recommendations for USAID. The assessment team will use the USAID Anticorruption Assessment Framework handbook attached to this scope of work as guidance in conducting the assessment and developing the strategy and recommendations. This scope of work does *not* call for a full and detailed program design.

### Background [to be completed by Mission]

This section should provide a brief description of:

- Corruption trends in the country and the political, economic, legal and institutional factors in \_\_\_\_\_ [country] that have produced them.
- The challenges of corruption, where it hurts governance and growth, and where there are opportunities to control corruption.
- Ongoing USG, other donor, and host government initiatives to fight corruption and their performance to date.

*Note: In keeping with USAID's Paris Declaration commitments to reduce duplication of assessments, improve coordination with local government and non-government stakeholders, and do more to follow host government priorities, a number of steps should be considered. At minimum, Missions should provide other donor assessment documents to the team. In addition, Missions should determine in advance and include in this scope of work: 1) whether there are opportunities to coordinate assessments with other donors or conduct joint assessments; 2) the degree to which the assessment team will work directly with host-government counterparts and/or incorporate host-government anticorruption strategies and plans in their recommendations; 3) whether the team will provide briefings for host-government counterparts (or other host-country stakeholders) at the beginning, middle and/or end of the assessment. Experience shows that the groundwork for better coordination with government counterparts must be laid by Mission staff well before the assessment team arrives in the country.*

- Specific issues of concern for the assessment (if any).

### Objectives of Assessment

The goals of the assessment are to provide a clear and detailed understanding of the nature and causes of corruption in \_\_\_\_\_ [country], a strategic vision of the problem, and a set of

strategically-justified recommendations as to how USAID can develop programmatic initiatives to control the problem.

## **Assessment Methodology and Scope of Work**

The team will apply the Anticorruption Assessment Framework attached to this scope of work as guidance in conducting the assessment. The purpose of this Framework is to provide USAID Missions and their implementing partners with an integrated approach and set of practical tools to conduct tailored anticorruption assessments efficiently, but at a level detailed enough to produce targeted and prioritized recommendations for programming. It provides a framework that facilitates both a broad view of the factors influencing corruption and a way to drill down to understand the detailed dynamics of the problem in specific sectors, institutions and government processes. Most importantly, the framework guides the assessment team to identify and prioritize appropriate and practical program options to deal with strategically selected corruption problems.

The main objective of the assessment approach is to *assure that assessments start by casting a wide analytical net* to capture the breadth of issues that affect corruption and anticorruption prospects in a country *and then provide a clearly-justified, strategic rationale for their final programmatic recommendations*. The handbook provides step-by-step assistance in both implementing the methodology and producing the assessment report. The guidance is based on international best practices and pilot assessments that tested earlier versions of the methodology. The tools and framework are meant to provide useful guidance and direction to the assessment team, not necessarily “the” answers. Given this guidance, the assessment team will have to analyze what it has learned from a variety of sources and integrate that understanding into the assessment and program recommendations that result from the activity. Each assessment team may find that it will want to adapt, expand or otherwise alter these approaches based on the needs of the final users and/or the specifics of the country being assessed.

The assessment methodology is divided into eight tasks. While some of the tasks lend themselves to being completed in a certain order, others may be completed throughout the course of the assessment. Below are the tasks recommended by the framework.

### ***Early Activities***

The team should spend a substantial amount of effort preparing for the field work.

1. **Team Planning Meeting (TPM) and initial review of literature.** The proposed assessment team shall begin their tasks by preparing a detailed work plan which can be refined as the team begins its work. While it is optimal if the team members are co-located, TPMs can be conducted with members in different locations through the use of teleconferencing tools. If a TPM during the pre-trip phase with all team members is not possible, it may be necessary to conduct two TPMs -- before departure and upon arrival in-country. In addition, during this task, the team should collect and review reports, documents, previous assessments, indicators, and other existing materials that will help to inform the assessment.

- Product: Draft work plan

2. **Analysis of the legal-institutional framework** related to fighting corruption. This work can be done by a local legal expert(s) who are well-versed in the current status of laws, regulations and institutions that are typically considered to be the prerequisites of a comprehensive anticorruption regime. The results of the analysis should be summarized in the Assessment Report by highlighting the weaknesses and gaps in the formal legal-institutional framework, as well as in ways the provisions are implemented. The complete text of the analysis can be used in its entirety as an appendix to the report.
  - Product: Completion of the legal-institutional framework chart.
3. **Political-economic analysis.** Throughout the assessment, the team will conduct a political-economic analysis of corruption so that proposed programs are properly targeted at the underlying causes of the problems, not just their symptoms. The handbook provides a methodology for applying the “corruption syndrome” tool that can start this process even before arrival in country, though preliminary hypotheses based on this analysis will need to be tested during the in-country stage. The assessment team should draft a short narrative for the assessment report that elaborates on the political-economic drivers of corruption in the country based on the syndrome analysis or other research.
  - Product: Narrative of the political-economic analysis of corruption in the country, identifying root causes and dynamics.
4. **Initial stakeholder analysis.** The broad range of stakeholders that can facilitate or inhibit implementation of anticorruption reforms needs to be examined. The political will, capacity and resources, and readiness of government sectors, political parties, NGOs, and external actors should be evaluated to provide an understanding of opportunities and problems, and champions and opposition. The “stakeholder mapping” approach is a potential tool to conduct this analysis. This analysis should be validated once the team is in country.
  - Product: Narrative of the stakeholder analysis.
5. **Initial assessment of government sector and function priorities and “readiness” for anticorruption reforms.** In this task, the team reviews key government sectors and functions to understand *where* corruption hurts the most and *where* opportunities exist to address the problem. The team will use several inputs: the legal-institutional analysis conducted in Task 2 as well as the hypotheses about political-economic dynamics and core causes of corruption derived from syndrome profiles and available research reports, analyses, assessments and opinion surveys; and US Government, other donor, and host government priorities. To the degree possible, begin collecting data on these targeted sectors and functions, find appropriate local consultants, and start scheduling meetings and interviews prior to arriving in the country. The decision about the key sectors and functions can be revisited once the team is in-country.
  - Product: Initial list of priority sectors and functions that ought to be diagnosed in greater depth while in-country.
6. **Initial strategic approach.** Based on the previous tasks, the assessment team should have sufficient insight into the country’s corruption problems and anticorruption opportunities to develop preliminary strategic hypotheses that can guide the more detailed in-country work that will follow. “Strategy,” in this sense, refers to sustained action against the underlying

causes shaping a country's particular corruption causes and dynamics, not to specific tools or controls aimed at particular practices. The strategic framework should elaborate on the core problems that drive corruption in the targeted country, strategic goals, and working hypotheses about the underlying causes of corruption and what can be done to reduce the problem. In addition, initial ideas on the priority sectors, functions and institutions that should be diagnosed in more detail will be identified.

- Product: Initial strategic framework. Finalized work plan.

### ***In-Country Activities***

Having accomplished the above, the team will be able to undertake more in-depth analyses in-country.

- a. **Validation of earlier analyses and hypotheses** through meetings with experts, USAID and Embassy staff, and local specialists. Based on these meetings, the team should assess the extent that the political-economic analysis, the sector and functional priorities, and the strategic approach need to be adjusted.
  - Product: Revised list of priority sectors and functions, and strategic plan
7. **In depth diagnosis of priority sectors, functions and institutions.** In this task, detailed diagnoses of the most problematic or priority sectors, functions and institutions are conducted based on document reviews, interviews and focus groups with major stakeholders. The team should refer to the library of *Diagnostic Guides* in the Annex for key questions to ask in order to understand critical sector/function/institution-specific corruption weaknesses. The diagnostic results need to be analyzed within the context of the strategic plan, considering the key problem statements and priorities.
  - Product: Program recommendations at a sectoral, functional and institutional level.
8. **Finalizing the strategic plan and prioritizing recommendations.** In this last task, the team will present a Strategic Plan for an integrated anticorruption program by updating the earlier framework and using the sector/function/institution diagnoses. In addition, the team will produce an integrated set of recommendations for programmatic options to fight corruption in the targeted country that addresses the goals set forth in the Strategic Plan. The ultimate product of this step is a well-considered integrated plan for anticorruption action for USAID to consider in the context of the overall Anticorruption Assessment Report. Recommendations should be designated as high, medium or low priority. Importantly, each recommendation should be linked back to the Strategic Plan and described briefly, major implementers and counterparts listed, potential obstacles to success recognized, and anticipated impacts on corruption identified.
  - Product: Anticorruption Assessment Report

### **Deliverables**

1. Work plan and timeline for the assessment (within two weeks of receipt of CTO approval to begin work) including:

- List of document sources, a list of standard corruption indicators, and names of targeted participants/institutions for interviews and focus groups. (This initial list will be enlarged as research progresses.)
  - Tools for data collection (questionnaires, facilitation guides, etc.)
  - Brief explanation of how team will plan and organize itself so that the assessment and its conduct will be informed by the local cultural, political and social context.
2. Initial strategic framework (prior to or upon arrival in country) with delimited core problem definitions, strategic goals, working hypotheses around the strategic approach, and a preliminary list of key sectors, functions and institutions for in-depth analysis.
  3. Entrance and exit briefing with USAID.
  4. End of assessment documents:
    - One draft and one final report (approximately 40 pages plus additional appendices). The draft report shall be submitted one week after departure from the country. The final report will be due two weeks after receipt of comments on draft from USAID. *The report should cover the following topics, though each does not necessarily require a separate section; other sections and discussions may also be included:*
      - a. **Executive summary**
      - b. **Introduction** - Discussion that puts the state of corruption and anticorruption programs into historical context and in the perspective of political-economic and developmental dynamics; brief description of the report's structure and methodology
      - c. **Overview of corruption in the country** - Overview of corruption in the country which outlines scope, nature and actors, including any relevant conclusions drawn from the political-economic analysis. Major corruption vulnerabilities, factors that contribute to or reduce the spread of corruption in the country; corruption trends as measured by corruption indicators, surveys and past assessments.
      - d. **Policy and legal-institutional framework to fight corruption** - Outline of anticorruption legislation and status of implementation/enforcement. The status of corruption prevention legislation and institutions, including, at a minimum, reviews of laws on internal controls, external oversight, conflicts of interest, codes of conduct, public hiring and appointments, assets disclosure, access to information, citizen complaint mechanisms, whistleblower protection, sunshine laws and citizen participation. Recommendations for improvement.
      - e. **Anticorruption stakeholders** - Overview of actors and institutions that fight corruption, including, at a minimum, government oversight and law enforcement institutions; civil society organizations; business organizations; and mass media outlets. Discuss political will and readiness to fight corruption. Recommendations for improvement.
      - f. **Initial Strategic Framework for Country X** - Based on analysis of preceding data and trends, identify core problems, proposed strategic goals for anticorruption programs, and working hypotheses about the underlying causes of corruption and what can be done to reduce the problem. Identify key sectors and functions for in depth anticorruption assessment and provide rationale for selection.

- g. **Corruption and anticorruption options in priority government sectors, functions or institutions** - For each key sector, function or institution identified for the assessment provide the following: overview of corruption in the sector or function, major corruption vulnerabilities, opportunities and obstacles for future anticorruption programs, and practical recommendations for program options. As a potential option, provide summary table of anticorruption options that summarizes each option, major counterparts that would be involved in program implementation, potential obstacles, nature and level of impact on corruption (high, moderate, low), likelihood of short-term success (high, moderate, low), likelihood that option can be implemented quickly (high, moderate, low), and priority for the short-, medium- or long-term.
- h. **Strategic plan and priority recommendations for anticorruption programming**
- Present a Strategic Plan for an integrated anticorruption program by updating the earlier framework and using the sector/function/institution diagnoses.
  - Describe key recommendations – those that can be implemented quickly, deal with a prominent corruption vulnerabilities and priority USG areas, and have a high likelihood of success. Point out the linkages of each recommendation to the core problems and strategic goals in the Strategic Plan.
  - Integrated summary table of priority recommendations from across sectors/functions/institutions that lists high and moderate priority program options, linking each to core strategic goals and ongoing or planned USAID/USG programs, if appropriate.

All deliverables are subject to USAID approval by USAID/\_\_\_\_\_ (See “Technical Direction” below.)

### **Team Composition and Proposed Level of Effort**

Implementation of this assessment calls for a team of two international specialists, one or two local specialists and a local logistician/scheduler. The contractor shall propose the technical specialties that it thinks is needed for the team based on its initial assessment of the types of issues, sectors or functions that will require targeted analysis. Typically, the international team members should be country or regional experts with specialties in corruption and sectoral issues (especially, but not limited to, the judicial and public finance sectors). As to the local experts to be included on the team, typically they should include (a) a legal/regulatory specialist who can elaborate in detail on the current legal, regulatory and institutional framework related to anticorruption issues; (b) an economist who specializes in public finance issues; and/or (c) sector specialists in country-specific vulnerable or priority areas, such as health or education. In addition, one local logistician/scheduler should be identified.

Familiarity with programmatic approaches as well as theoretical concepts in relevant subject areas is critical. All team members must be fluent in English; at least one team member must have a good command in \_\_\_\_\_.

**Team Leader (international)** shall be a senior social scientist, public administration expert or individual with a similar profile with an advanced degree in a relevant discipline. S/he must have at least five years experience in anticorruption research and/or

programming. Experience in assessing corruption, evaluating anticorruption efforts and strategy development is critical. Knowledge of the anticorruption literature and measurement approaches is necessary. Knowledge of DG issues is required. Regional experience and/or country knowledge is required. Ability to conduct interviews and discussions and to write in English is required. Knowledge of host country language is a plus but not required as long as another team member is fluent (written and spoken). Knowledge of USAID is preferable.

**Team Member (international)** shall be a social scientist, public administration expert or individual with a similar profile, with graduate level training. At least three years experience in anticorruption research and programming is required. Experience in conducting assessments and developing strategies is also required. Regional experience and/or country knowledge is expected. Ability to write in English is required. Knowledge of host country language is a plus but not required as long as another team member is fluent (written and spoken). Knowledge of USAID is preferable.

**Team Member (local consultant/expert)** will be an attorney, social scientist, public sector management specialist, economist or legal researcher. Minimum degree BA/BS (advanced degree preferred). Good understanding of political dynamics and political actors in the host country is essential. At least three years of work experience in a relevant field is required. Knowledge of USAID and other donors in host country is preferable. Ability to read, write, and speak in host country language/s is required; ability to converse and write in English is required.

### **Proposed Level of Effort and Period of Performance**

*Note: The following levels of effort are based on a 2-3 week in-country assessment. Experience with previous assessments highlighted the importance of providing sufficient preparation time to allow teams to make the best use of existing reports and documentation. Missions should adjust the balance of pre-trip preparation and in-country time based on factors including the amount of existing information and reports that need to be reviewed, whether the Mission will require an initial briefing with initial plans and hypotheses based on existing information, and the complexity of the country and local logistics, as well as budget.*

**Team Leader (expat) –**  
18-24 days work in country  
2-4 days travel  
5-8 days U.S. preparation  
5 days report finalization  
5 days report revision  
**35-46 days total**

**Team Member (expat) –**  
18-24 days work in country  
2-4 days travel  
5-8 days U.S. preparation

5 days report finalization  
3 days report revision  
**33-44 days total**

**Local consultant/s (in country only)**

10 days preparation  
18-24 working days with the team  
2 days follow-up after the team leaves the country  
**30-36 days total**

The team leader will have responsibility for drafting the report, but team members will also be expected to contribute written material as decided by the team under the leadership of the team leader.

The local team member/s will be responsible for the initial analysis of the legal-institutional framework, will facilitate contacts with key officials and other sources, and will provide expert input to the report as directed by the Team Leader. Local team members should be considered carefully and chosen early in order to assist with pre-trip analysis and contribute to assessment process planning. Local consultants should have broad credibility in-country.

Logistical support: While USAID will assist in arranging selected meetings, the contractor team will make most of its own contacts and appointments and will provide all of its own transportation, work space and communications.

Work week: A 6-day work week is authorized in the field with no premium pay.

The work will begin o/a \_\_\_\_\_ and will be completed by o/a \_\_\_\_\_. Field work should begin o/a \_\_\_\_\_.

**Technical Direction**

Technical Direction during the performance of this delivery task will be provided by \_\_\_\_\_.

USAID/XXXX will provide, to the extent possible, assistance in setting up appointments with government officials, civil society and other community leaders. The Mission will help to compile the document resource list and provide as many documents on that list as possible.

USAID/XXXXXX will not participate in all of the contractor's meetings with various stakeholders; however, on a case by case basis, USAID may want to attend meetings with high level governmental officials or community leaders. USAID requires prior notification for, and will join any meetings with, government officials at the Ministerial level. USAID/XXXXX expects the contractor to provide weekly oral briefings on the assessment's progress and provide a heads-up on any sensitive issues.

## Gender Considerations

Within the course of conducting anticorruption assessments, especially during the detailed diagnostic phase, the team should inquire about gender-related issues within sectors and government functions where corruption risks are deemed to be high. For example,

1. What is the variable impact of corruption on men and women?
  - a. In each sector or function, are there significant differences in the extent to which men and women interact with potentially rent-seeking government officials?
  - b. In each sector or function, are there significant differences between men and women in terms of degraded public services received due to corrupt practices?
2. What are reasonable responses to corruption among men and women?
  - a. In each sector or function, are there significant differences in gender participation in citizen advocacy aimed at controlling corrupt practices?
  - b. Can recommended program options be developed that promote realistic gender participation in combating corruption?

### ATTACHMENTS:

1. USAID Anticorruption Assessment Handbook
2. Background Materials (*provide the following documents if available*):
  - USAID country strategy.
  - Corruption studies and reports including, but not limited to:
    - National Integrity System Country Study by Transparency International (TI);
    - TI Corruption Perception Index:  
[www.transparency.org/policy\\_research/surveys\\_indices/cpi](http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi)
    - Global Integrity Index: <http://report.globalintegrity.org>
    - World Bank's Control of Corruption Index:  
[http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/mc\\_countries.asp](http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/mc_countries.asp)
  - USAID resources available through USAID's Anti-Corruption technical areas webpage:  
[www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/technical\\_areas/anti-corruption](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/technical_areas/anti-corruption):
    - USAID Anti-Corruption Strategy (2005)
    - A Handbook on Fighting Corruption
    - Promoting Transparency and Accountability: USAID's Anti-Corruption Experience