



ANNEX 1

to the COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING DECISION on the ENI East Regional Action Programme for 2019, Part 2, including some actions to be carried out in 2020, to be financed from the general budget of the European Union

Action Document for EU for Integrity Action for the Eastern Partnership

<u>ANNUAL PROGRAMME</u>			
<p>This document constitutes the annual work programme in the sense of Article 110(2) of the Financial Regulation and action programme in the sense of Articles 2 and 3 of Regulation N° 236/2014.</p>			
1. Title/basic act/ CRIS number	EU for Integrity Action for the Eastern Partnership CRIS number: ENI/2019/041-954 financed under the European Neighbourhood Instrument		
2. Zone benefiting from the action/location	Eastern Partnership countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Republic of Moldova and Ukraine The action shall be carried out at the following location: the six Eastern Partnership countries.		
3. Programming document	ENI Regional East Strategy Paper (2014-2020) and Regional East Multiannual Indicative Programme (2017-2020)		
4. SDGs	<p>Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels (and, in particular, paras; 3-7, 10, A-B);</p> <p>Goal 8: Promoting sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all.</p> <p>Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls (and, in particular, para. 2).</p>		
5. Sector of intervention/ thematic area	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%; padding: 5px;">Strengthening Institutions and Good Governance</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">DEV. Assistance: YES</td> </tr> </table>	Strengthening Institutions and Good Governance	DEV. Assistance: YES
Strengthening Institutions and Good Governance	DEV. Assistance: YES		
6. Amounts concerned	Total estimated cost: EUR 7 000 000 Total amount of EU contribution EUR 7 000 000		

	<p>The contribution is for an amount of EUR 7 000 000 from the general budget of the European Union for 2019.</p> <p>This contribution is subject to the availability of 100 % of appropriations for 2019.</p> <p>This action is co-financed in joint co-financing by:</p> <p>OECD for an amount of EUR 157 500 for the activities under the Specific Objective 1</p>			
7. Aid modality(ies) and implementation modality(ies)	<p>Project Modality</p> <p>Indirect management with the OECD (with regard to component 1);</p> <p>Direct management through: grant – direct award (with regard to component 2)</p>			
8 a) DAC code(s)	<p>15130 (Sector: Legal and judicial development)</p> <p>15113 (Sector : Anti-corruption organisations and institutions)</p> <p>15110 (Sector: Public sector policy and administrative management)¹</p>			
b) Main Delivery Channel	<p>OECD - 21000</p> <p>Open Government Partnership (OGP) – 20000²</p>			
9. Markers (from CRIS DAC form)³	General policy objective	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Participation development/good governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	x
	Aid to environment	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Gender equality and Women's and Girl's Empowerment ⁴	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Trade Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	RIO Convention markers	Not targeted	Significant objective	Principal objective
	Biological diversity	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Combat desertification	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change mitigation	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change adaptation	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) thematic flagships	N/A			

¹ Please see CRIS Manual 3.4.1 DAC Sector code(s)

² <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/annex2.htm>

³When a marker is flagged as significant/principal objective, the action description should reflect an explicit intent to address the particular theme in the definition of objectives, results, activities and/or indicators (or of the performance / disbursement criteria, in the case of budget support).

⁴ Please check the Minimum Recommended Criteria for the Gender Marker and the Handbook on the OECD-DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker. If gender equality is not targeted, please provide explanation in section 4.5.Mainstreaming.

SUMMARY

The overall objective of the ‘EU for Integrity Action for the Eastern Partnership’ Programme is to provide assistance to Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine to prevent and combat threats to the rule of law, to support justice sector and public administration reform, in line with the Eastern Partnership ‘20 Deliverables for 2020’.⁵

The proposed action will focus on the ‘supply and demand-side’ of necessary reforms in the Eastern Partnership (EaP), including measures to foster evidence-based anti-corruption policy implementation in the Eastern Partnership countries through regional analysis and pressure tools, as well as in-depth regional analysis and experience-sharing on specific corruption-prone sectors, such as education and business (component 1). Further, the programme will help enable open, inclusive and responsive governments and citizen-centered service delivery through enhanced civil society participation and engagement in the Eastern Partnership region (component 2).

The proposed actions will be implemented, when appropriate, at the regional level but also at the countries’ level to address specific needs of the individual EaP countries according to the differentiated approach of the revised European Neighbourhood Policy⁶ and to specific situation in the countries.

1. CONTEXT ANALYSIS

1.1 Context Description

Despite the countries’ individual differences, **similar challenges** remain with a view to the domestic governance systems in the six Eastern Partnership countries. While progress may differ from partner country to partner country, the consolidation of deep and sustainable democracy, respect for the rule of law and responsive public administrations is still to be achieved across the region. Poor governance and in particular corruption are closely interlinked, while the administration of justice and public sector reform do not always meet European standards.

While there has been progress in the EaP countries in implementing **anti-corruption, justice and public sector reform**, and in improving efficiency and transparency of public services through, for example, one-stop shops and e-governance, several challenges remain in the region, particularly in tackling high-level corruption, progressing judicial independence, and ensuring that public services are responsive to the needs of all, including businesses and, first and foremost, citizens.

⁵ [Eastern Partnership - 20 Deliverables for 2020 Focusing on key priorities and tangible results.](#)

⁶ http://eeas.europa.eu/enp/documents/2015/151118_joint-communication_review-of-the-enp_en.pdf

As the EU joins forces with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) to support the ‘supply side’ by facilitating evidence and exchange to inform reform launched by their members or beneficiary, they all recognise that there are many challenges and opportunities still ahead in the Eastern Neighbourhood. With the OGP, the EU aims at supporting the ‘demand side’ by creating an enabling environment for a wide range of stakeholders to engage with governments to inform and participate in the decision-making process.

At the Eastern Partnership Summit on 24 November 2017 participants re-committed themselves to strengthening democracy, rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms. Promoting democratic consolidation and governance through reinforcement of the rule of law, justice and public sector reform on the basis of the EaP deliverables 9, 10 and 11 of the 20 Deliverables for 2020 agenda endorsed at that Summit is thus at the centre of the EU's cooperation with its Eastern partners. This programme under component 1 and 2, including regional and bilateral actions, is designed to assist the six ENP East countries – Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Republic of Moldova⁷ and Ukraine – in continuing their efforts to strengthen their national institutions and local good governance systems.

1.2 Policy Framework (Global, EU)

Through the **revised European Neighbourhood Policy** (ENP) the European Union seeks to enhance its cooperation with the neighbouring countries, especially with the Eastern neighbours in key areas of social and political life. Strengthening democratic processes in the ENP countries, good governance, economic growth and integration, energy security, involving civil society, are among the priorities. Furthermore, these sectors also contribute to greater state and societal resilience in the Neighbourhood, which is a key priority contemplated in the **EU Global Strategy**.

1.3 Public Policy Analysis of the partner country/region

The revised European Neighbourhood Policy introduced **differentiation** among the countries, in accordance with their ambitions in the relationship with the European Union, while maintaining the inclusivity of all six partners in the Eastern Partnership policy framework. It also calls for **prioritisation** and for a more focused approach in order to deliver tangible and noticeable results to the citizens, as reflected in the Joint Staff Working document "Eastern Partnership – Focusing on key priorities and deliverables" identifying a list of 20 deliverables for 2020.

Until 2020, seven specific targets under deliverable 9 are set to **strengthen the rule of law** and anti-corruption mechanisms in the EaP region, including on enhancing the integrity of legislatures, politicians and high-ranking officials through e-asset declarations and robust political party financing rules; in the area of fighting money-laundering the measures include amongst others the introduction of public beneficial ownership registries, centralised bank account registries, and fully-fledged asset recovery offices that are supported by improved

⁷ Thereafter referred to as Moldova

asset recovery and confiscation frameworks; and lastly, on preventing and combating corruption through fully operational independent, specialised anti-corruption institutions.

The focus of the **implementation of key judicial reforms** in 2019-2021, and thus of deliverable 10, will be on enhancing the independence of the judiciary (through track records of transparent, merit-based recruitment systems, and of judges' and prosecutors' performance, through strengthening domestic training institutions⁸, including on ethics; and through strengthened independence of Supreme Councils); on improving the quality of justice (through improved access to justice and legal aid for both women and men); and on the efficiency of the judiciary (through improved enforcement of judgements and recovery rates, reduction of case backlogs). Furthermore, the EaP Rule of Law Panel of October 2017 agreed on a set of indicators, and the added value of justice surveys, which will be launched in spring 2019.

Public administration reform targets of deliverable 11 aim in particular at upgraded PAR strategies in line with the Principles of Public Administration; at depoliticised civil services through the adoption of civil service laws, improved merit-based recruitment and promotion; at strengthened accountability and openness of state administrations (through access to information laws, accessible, service-oriented administrations, including e-services and one-stop shops); at reinforced budget oversight, fiscal rules and councils; and at revised statistical laws for the provision of accessible statistics data of high quality in support of more transparent decision-making in the region. In recent years, the Eastern Partnership Panel has provided a platform to systematically discuss the areas mentioned above, in particular the OECD/ SIGMA Principles of PAR.

By assisting beneficiary countries in focusing on common challenges, a **regional approach** has the potential to increase confidence and peer pressure among partner countries, and thus to promote increased security, stability and prosperity in the region, while **allowing for bilateral actions** to address country-specific needs.

Strengthened institutions and good governance are essential to support the implementation of these policies and democratic processes, while building up democratic societies in the Eastern partner countries. Promoting the rule of law, justice and public sector reform is at the basis of all other policies and a **precondition for economic growth and citizens' trust** in the state.

All the proposed areas of cooperation are central to the new European Consensus on Development adopted in May 2017, partly to the EU agenda 'New Start for Europe: Agenda for jobs, growth, fairness and democratic change', and the Association Agreements (AA) and related agendas between the EU and Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine.

⁸ Regarding judicial training, this will be done in line with the “Declaration of judicial training principles” of the International Organization of Judicial Training. Training methodologies will build on the European Commission “Advice for training providers”, on the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN)’s [Handbook on Judicial Training Methodology in Europe](#) and [Judicial Training Methods Guidelines for Evaluation of Judicial Training Practices](#).

1.4 Stakeholder analysis

Direct beneficiaries of the programme will be **governments, public administrations, civil society** and other representatives in Multi-Stakeholder Forums (MSFs), where stakeholders work together to co-create, implement and monitor reform progress in the EaP countries. The programme will involve EU, OECD and OGP country representatives to act as peers. Specific target groups are the state institutions, ministries and central agencies of the EaP countries responsible for anti-corruption, justice and public governance reforms, including policy-making, coordination, implementation and monitoring. In addition to the specialised policy, preventive and law enforcement anti-corruption institutions at all levels, the following public institutions will be engaged, among others: prime minister's offices and government administrations, ministries of justice, ministries of interior, prosecutors' offices, financial monitoring units, ministries of education and science, related accreditation and qualification commissions, business ombudsman and other state functions relevant to promoting business integrity. The OECD will also engage, CSOs, business community and academia.

The long-term and ultimate beneficiary of the actions under this programme are **EU and EaP citizens** as well as **economic actors** who will benefit from the results of reform implementation.

1.5 Problem analysis/ priority areas for support

1.5.1 Weak impact of anti-corruption reform

All EaP Partner countries have declared commitment to the anti-corruption agenda. However, this declaration is not always accompanied by comprehensive and **rigorous action against corruption**. Whereas institutional and legal frameworks have been substantially reformed throughout, the quality of legislation calls in some instances for improvement, particularly where the laws were not properly consulted or not based on reliable impact and cost-benefit analyses. As a consequence, the **level of implementation** of these laws and policies, as well as efficiency of institutions in charge, have mostly remained low and did not result in any significant impact on the level of corruption, which remains high in the region.

Most of the EaP countries have developed anti-corruption strategies and action plans. However, lack of solid evidentiary basis, deficient budget planning, the absence of clear objectives and related measurable indicators to assess impact of implementation, remain among the main common challenges. **Civil society** engagement in policy development has increased. Yet **participation in the implementation and monitoring is still limited, while public trust remains to be rather low**. As a consequence, the recent protests in the region leading in Armenia to a peaceful transformation were primarily based on citizens' demand to increase anti-corruption efforts.

Whereas the EU neighbourhood policies and the targeted actions of the relevant international organisations have significantly contributed to the achievements so far, a new level of rigorousness, **coordinated action** and **smarter soft pressure** is required to further push the Eastern Partnership countries' anti-corruption agenda, build on the achievements so far, take them to a new level and increase impact.

Although there is an abundance of hard and soft international anti-corruption standards and good practices, against which the international organisations measure the EaP Partner

countries' performance, these are scattered in various instruments, reports and analysis and have not yet been put together as clear operational benchmarks that the countries should aspire to adhere to. Furthermore, heavy and detailed formats of the evaluation reports often make it difficult to use them as tools for public policy advocacy.

Some critical reforms have reached full implementation in the Eastern partnership countries. Yet, many potentially transformative reforms are stymied by **lack of technical and financial resources for implementation and general lack of enforcement or political will**. There is also a need to depoliticise civil service sectors, which prevent the reforms from trickling down, while reinforcing vested interests. As a result, fewer of these ambitious reforms surface in co-creation processes.

Whereas low performance is sometimes related to the lack of political will, quite often this is also due to the public administrations themselves not being clear on what targets they are required to meet and how exactly their work toward meeting the standards will be assessed. At the same time, most of the EaP countries to a certain degree are committed to international processes that evaluate their anti-corruption performance, they take related assessments and ranking seriously and work towards meeting international standards to improve their international assessments.⁹

Furthermore, **monitoring of progress** within the EU to assess the progress in meeting the anti-corruption targets of **20 Deliverables for 2020** is not systemic or rigorous and none of the existing monitoring instruments outside the EU can serve that purpose either, considering either their limited substantive scope, limited focus, depth and frequency.

1.5.2 High-level corruption as a major challenge for the EaP

High-level corruption has been one of the key challenges for political stability and economic development recognised by both EaP countries and international organisations providing support to them. It led to a series of revolutions and public outcries in EaP countries in the last decade. It is this corruption, which requires serious and concerted response from the Eastern Partnership countries and their partners if corruption were to be reduced and the rule of law established. Finally, it is this corruption, which presents highest economic, political and social threats going beyond national borders and affecting the neighbouring EU countries and the rest of the world. EaP countries face various challenges in addressing high profile corruption, including¹⁰:

- **Lack of true political commitment to pursue such crimes**, which results in political pressure and interference into activities of law enforcement institutions responsible for detection, investigation and prosecution of high-profile corruption.
- **Weakness of law enforcement institutions** to resist undue pressure and meddling is another challenge. Prosecution services are in most cases now independent institutions

⁹ The level of compliance with the IAP recommendations under the 4th round of monitoring is about 70%. This figure includes 4 EaP countries and Central Asia and is drawn from the OECD/ACN activity reports.

¹⁰ This information has been drawn from the OECD/ACN monitoring reports primarily. All these challenges are also relevant to Moldova as identified by the EU in its monitoring of the implementation of the EU association agreement with Moldova.

and not an organisational part of the Ministry of Justice anymore, while instructions by the executive on individual cases are largely prohibited in most countries. In practice, however, the law enforcement bodies often lack independence on the individual level avoiding picking up politically sensitive cases and going rather for petty corruption instead (Armenia, Georgia, to some extent Ukraine, where GPO were identified with such problems).

- **Low capacity to pursue such cases**, many law enforcement institutions do not have necessary resources, many still do not use financial investigative tools (Armenia, Azerbaijan) and lack other types of non-criminal law expertise (Ukraine). Most of the specialised anti-corruption law enforcement bodies struggle with access to financial, bank information and other databases, including asset declarations (Armenia, Azerbaijan, to some extent Ukraine), do not apply confiscation, especially confiscation of proceeds of corruption crimes. Many do not go after new or more complex crimes, such as corruption perpetrated by legal persons, trading in influence, illicit enrichment, foreign bribery, money laundering in which corruption is predicate offence (Azerbaijan, Armenia, and to some extent Georgia and Ukraine).
- **Insufficient level of interagency cooperation and coordination** is another challenge faced by various EaP countries in pursuit of high-profile corruption.
- **Not enough international cooperation** is another challenge that countries face when working on high-profile corruption cases. Many EaP countries resort to international cooperation when all other methods have been exhausted (Azerbaijan) and are still reluctant to use modern methods of international cooperation (Armenia), most rely exclusively on formal Mutual Legal Assistance (MLA) requests. Many of the EaP requests have been left pending. This could be partially explained by the low quality of requests, or lack of understanding and knowledge of the requirements of the country where the request is being sent, but also by the lack of trust between law enforcement officials of various jurisdictions: this is true among the EaP and between EaP and EU.

1.5.3 Challenges relating to business integrity

Promoting business integrity as a corruption prevention measure remains a new area in the EaP region. There is a limited understanding of the **role of government agencies** in promoting business integrity and, apart from some isolated positive instances, EaP Partner countries have not yet engaged in proactive action to promote ethical business conduct.

Meaningful public-private dialogue in order to identify most effective business integrity measures and commit to their implementation is also lacking across the board and the private sector, while complaining about high levels of corruption, does not mean to be ready to engage in anti-corruption work. According to a survey of the companies that included the EaP partner countries, “the main reasons for the ineffective fight against corruption seem to be the lack of cooperation between business organisations and the public domain, absence of trust between the public and private sectors, clashes of understanding about who shall take the primary initiative and leadership”.¹¹ These findings are confirmed with the recent OECD Anti-

¹¹ OECD/ACN 2016, [Business Integrity in Eastern Europe and Central Asia](#).

Corruption Network monitoring report as well. Corruption risks in the **publicly owned or controlled enterprises** and in **public procurement** are other key challenge in the EaP countries.

As these countries get acquainted with the good practices and standards in this area, the interest and readiness to undertake some of the related measures is growing. **Business integrity** is gaining increased attention from both private sector and from state bodies in the EaP region. Stronger application of anti-corruption standards in international markets and adoption of corporate liability for corruption in many EaP countries created the need for companies to improve their compliance. Introducing **Business Ombudsman** institute to protect legitimate business interests from administrative abuses is a recent rising trend. Whereas in **Georgia**¹² and **Ukraine**¹³ such institutions are already operating with the varied degree of success, **Armenia**¹⁴ is considering introducing such a function in the state administration and **Azerbaijan**¹⁵ has been recommended to choose the similar path. These new functions of public administration require guidance as to the international standards and good practices to maximize performance of the new institutions and support their capacity building on promoting business integrity. **Private sector collective actions** are becoming important in promoting business integrity as well. There is a big potential for EaP Partner countries to learn from its peers – member of the EU and the OECD prioritize business integrity in their policies and practices. Private sector is moving closer to taking collective actions against corruption, as demonstrated by UNIC, **Ukrainian** Network for Integrity and Compliance. While multi-national enterprises are better equipped to deal with corruption risks, small and medium enterprises and state-owned companies are the two main risk groups.

There is a need for governments to take more **focused measures** to prevent corruption in the business sector. Governments also need to **strengthen incentives** for companies to improve their **compliance** that are still weak. Companies and business associations need to take a **proactive stance** and engage themselves in awareness raising, collaborating with the government and exploring potential for collective actions, and inform the measures that governments, companies and business associations can take to further promote business integrity in the region.

1.5.4 Challenges relating to integrity in education

With major parts of national budgets usually spent on education, the education sector is naturally prone to corruption – at the political, administrative (central and local), and classroom level. The Eastern Neighbourhood is not an exception to this rule. According to public surveys, **Ukraine** tops the list of high risk European countries. Households in Ukraine are more likely than those from any other country to have paid a bribe for public primary and secondary education with 38 per cent, and 29 per cent of households respectively paid a bribe when accessing schooling in the past 12 months.¹⁶ **Moldova** and **Armenia** also have worrisome trends when it comes to bribery practices to access basic public services, including education, especially vocational education. With bribery rates closer to those of EU member

¹² OECD/ACN Istanbul Anti-corruption Action Plan (IAP) monitoring and progress reports on [Georgia](#).

¹³ OECD/ACN IAP monitoring and progress reports on [Ukraine](#).

¹⁴ OECD/ACN IAP 4th monitoring round report on [Armenia](#)

¹⁵ OECD/ACN IAP 4th monitoring round report on [Azerbaijan](#).

¹⁶ Cf. Transparency International, Global Corruption Barometer (2016).

states, **Georgia** is a less worrying exception to this trend. However, media and civil society in Georgia have raised concerns about alleged nepotism cases in secondary schools and corruption in text book procurements.

When already young people become familiar with corruption at schools and universities, the crucial role of the education sector to convey ethical values and behaviour is hampered, risking corruption becomes the norm at all levels of society. Apart from such social acceptance, corruption in the education sector can also lead to the reduced access to education for the poor; it can lead to unjustified teacher absence and thus less teaching hours, and it can also lead to ill-equipped schools due to fraud. Corruption in the education sector can directly impact on a country’s growth in that teaching staff is under-qualified, while degrees and qualifications are not reliable.

Some efforts in the Eastern Partnership region to address these issues have already lead to some tangible results. For example, in Armenia, the joint **EU-CoE Partnership for Good Governance programme** has provided assistance between 2015-2017 helping to improve the quality of education for Armenian citizens by addressing corruption and poor governance in the higher education system. As a result, the draft Law on Education required the provision of public governance disclosure and the implementation of codes of ethics by higher education institutions. In addition, fifteen piloted universities published for the first time via an online reporting platform (<https://etag.emis.am>) annual institutional reports focusing on transparency in six key governance areas facilitating the institutional inspection process. Baseline assessments on integrity in higher education have also been conducted by the Council of Europe in other regions, such as the Western Balkans, to provide country-specific recommendations on developing tools to fight corruption in the **higher education** system using the Council of Europe’s approaches.

However, interventions in the education sector have limited effect if they are not embedded in a **broader, integrated reform agenda** involving large parts of the public sector and other relevant stakeholders. Further, adequate, **country-specific evidence and evidence-based data on the systemic weaknesses and causes** inviting corruption in the education sector is essential.¹⁷ Likewise, efforts to support local stakeholders in their demand for accountability is crucial. An **active citizenry demanding education and fair use of funds** is crucial for the sustainability of reforms.

2. RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Risks	Risk level (H/M/L)	Mitigating measures
1. Geo-political tensions, political instability in countries 2. Economic instability in the region hindering the provision of sufficient, local resources to implement the activities and	M M	Risks resulting from political and economic instability in any of the six Eastern partner countries will be addressed through multi-lateral, political dialogue. Continue communication with partners

¹⁷ Coordination with bilateral EU assistance will be crucial, where projects on anti-corruption in the education sector are envisaged, such as for the Republic of Moldova.

<p>follow-up actions.</p> <p>3. Weakening of the government’s political will and commitment to reforms agenda</p> <p>4. Shrinking civic space</p> <p>5. EaP partner countries will refuse to join the programme</p>	<p>M</p> <p>H</p> <p>M</p>	<p>government representatives; strengthening of the role played by the civil society, especially in country monitoring.</p> <p>Strengthen current ACN focal points and support setting up of national-interagency coordination mechanisms meeting regularly (at least annually) before annual reporting</p>
<p>Assumptions</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The governments of the EaP countries maintain their foreign policy objective of closer political and economic integration with the European Union and continue to implement policies pursuant to that objective; • There is willingness to pursue further measures to prevent and combat corruption in public sector, in particular political and economic elites; • The stakeholders are willing to allocate appropriately skilled staff to act as counterparts; • Civil Society Organisations are prepared to play an active and constructive role in the process • Moldova and Belarus (countries currently not covered by ACN monitoring) agree to step up their commitments and join the OGP as partners • All countries approve and accept proposed methodology of the action, as a part of the renewed commitment to the ACN’s work, its new Work Programme in 2020, and adopt and implement OGP Action Plans. 		

3. LESSONS LEARNT AND COMPLEMENTARITY

3.1 Lessons learnt

Corruption raises the cost of business, undermines public trust and hampers growth. It disproportionately affects the poor and vulnerable by diverting resources from essential public services, including for example education.

Various international and regional organisations promote **international anti-corruption standards** in the EaP region; some of them as monitoring bodies of the relevant international conventions (OECD/WGB, CoE/GRECO, UNODC). The OECD has long been engaged in the fight against corruption and in the promotion of integrity, while the Open Government Partnership has successfully engaged partner countries to make more than 3,000 commitments on transparency, integrity and accountability. In addition, various international rankings include **survey data** on perception and experience of corruption, trust towards governments and on other rule of law and governance indicators.¹⁸ In collaboration with the World Bank, the EU is currently implementing **Regional Justice Surveys** in the Eastern Partnership countries, including a part on corruption/integrity in order to track the way how corruption is

¹⁸ Transparency International surveys (CPI and GCB), World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators, Control of Corruption, World Bank’s Enterprise Survey and others.

used in practice. Moreover, the **EU-CoE Partnership for Good Governance** aims at further aligning EaP anti-corruption legislation/mechanisms and justice sector reforms to European standards, while also providing for capacity-building. These efforts will be taken into consideration when implementing the Action.

The Action will primarily build on the OECD Anti-Corruption Network's twenty years of a successful track record in driving anti-corruption agendas in its member countries; the results of the four rounds of monitoring under its robust peer review programme known as Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan; its pool of experts including from the OECD and the EU countries; the deep thematic and operational expertise accumulated in all three overarching pillars targeted by the Action as well as the knowledge products on law enforcement, business integrity and prevention of corruption that also include the themes of the EaP deliverable 9, as well as some of the targets of deliverable 10 and 11.¹⁹

Further, the OECD Anti-Corruption Network's horizontal assessment of achievements and challenges with trends and benchmark recommendations will be instrumental for the Action.²⁰ Similar review will be developed in 2019 and proposed for high-level political endorsement in 2020 just before the proposed start date of the Action, that will serve as the basis for the work under the Action.

With regard to the Open Government Partnership, providing a platform for a wide range of stakeholders to contribute meaningfully to the decision-making and reform processes has proven to fill the gap of local ownership and to be useful in achieving political commitments in the EaP. Similarly, the organisation of the last OGP Summit in the EaP region (in Georgia) facilitated public awareness raising and resulted in the government and civil society participants to co-create the Paris Declaration on Open Government highlighting 20 areas of open government action, which serve as guiding framework for OGP members in the process of developing their Action Plans, including open contracting, beneficial ownership transparency, citizen engagement, and open and inclusive lawmaking. However, lack of technical and financial resources for implementation and the general lack of enforcement and political will remain a challenge and require further attention, as they can hamper ambitious reforms to surface in co-creation processes.

3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination

Reinforcing good governance in the area of rule of law, justice and public administration reform have been identified as the main areas where cooperation with the OECD and the OGP will be needed. However, complementarity with currently ongoing and future national and EU funded projects, both at bilateral and regional level is crucial, particularly in the field of anti-corruption and judicial reform amongst others, as a number of Delegations as well as the Headquarter are active in the same fields, for example through bilateral EU assistance²¹ or, at

¹⁹ The latest publications are available at the ACN website.

²⁰ This document will not have in-depth analysis for Moldova and Belarus, since they have not been part of the monitoring programme of the ACN, however, it may include information on these countries obtained separately. The future reports will include all EaP Partner countries if the funding is available.

²¹ For example, in Ukraine, coordination is essential with a view to the PRAVO Justice and the EU Anti-Corruption Initiative. In Armenia, the same applies to the currently drafted Anti-Corruption Strategy 2019-2023, the new PAR Strategy, and the SIGMA Baseline Measurement exercise (the final report expected by 1Q 2019); as well as the planned anti-Corruption Twinning, the upcoming peer review on Law Enforcement, the ongoing

headquarter level, in all six EaP countries through the EU-CoE Partnership for Good Governance (PGG) programme. Further, the Eastern Partnership Civil Society Facility, as well as a number of other civil society projects supported by the European Commission's Directorate for the Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations have pursued supporting civil society in pushing for anti-corruption reforms, while regional hackathons focused on the development of IT tools for civic participation and public accountability.

In the framework of this programme, the OECD and OGP together with the EU will seek complementarity and synergies with currently ongoing and planned projects (including through possibly a mapping) to avoid duplication of efforts and ensure coordinated, result-driven implementation. The coordination will be achieved through reporting as well as via regular involvement of the key actors at the planning and implementation stage of the activities. In particular the OECD will seek to ensure that there are no overlaps with current bilateral and planned regional programmes in the law enforcement sector, but rather synergies are created and stakeholder actively consulted. Similarly synergies will be ensured by OECD and OGP with the EU4Business initiative and its efforts to seek both to strengthen local business support organisations as well as foreign direct investments. Work will also be undertaken to ensure complementarity and synergies with the EU4Youth initiative and existing support in the education sector.

Complementarity, synergies and coordination in the EaP Partner countries will simplify the work of the authorities, since usually the same agencies and officials deal with the cooperation with various international organisation on a specific theme. As an example, the OECD/ACN's established system of national coordinators and inter-agency policy coordination mechanisms could complement the EU EaP local architecture, ensuring civil society and wide stakeholder participation and driving forward the performance. Similarly, the OGP dialogues with the partner countries in the East can assist in coordination and the creation of synergies.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

4.1 Overall objective, specific objectives, expected outputs and indicative activities

The overall objective of the programme is to increase stabilisation and resilience in the Eastern Neighbourhood through contributing to achieving the 2020 targets as laid out in the EaP deliverable 9 (strengthening the rule of law and anti-corruption), deliverable 10 (implementing key judicial reforms) and deliverable 11 (implementation of public administration reform in line with the Principles of Public Administration). Strengthening institutions and good governance is one of the four key policy priority areas that the EU will focus on until 2020 and beyond.

For the cooperation with the OECD and the OGP for the period 2019-2023 and building upon the common strategic objectives and comparative advantages, this can be translated into the following more **specific objectives**:

- (i) to strengthen evidence-based anti-corruption, justice and PAR policy and enforcement;

direct grant to Armenian Lawyer's Association (CSO responsible for constructive RA Government-CSO dialogue). For Georgia, an overlap should be prevented with the "PAR" and "SAFE-Security sector reform" programmes and potentially complementary support to CSOs.

- (ii) to enable open, inclusive and responsive governments and citizen-centered service delivery in the Eastern Partnership region.

The programme will target and engage with all 6 EaP countries across its two specific objectives, while taking into account their different levels of readiness.

The activities listed below (indicative) will seek to involve relevant EU agencies, existing EU cooperation networks and EU Member States where possible.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 1: TO STRENGTHEN EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY ON ANTI-CORRUPTION, JUSTICE AND PAR FOR INCREASED ENFORCEMENT

Output 1.1: Supporting evidence-based EaP anti-corruption, justice and PAR policies and enhanced implementation through tailored anti-corruption standards and innovative pressure tools

The activities under this component of the action will support informed anti-corruption policy-making and reform in EaP countries, including through outputs such as (indicative list):

- Comprehensive ‘baseline report’ covering all EaP countries in 2020;
- Monitoring methodology, including anti-corruption standards/benchmarks and annual indicators, taking into consideration already existing indicators, such as the justice indicators, and work carried out by OECD/SIGMA through the PAR core principles;
- Interim monitoring/progress review reports on the state of play of implementation per EaP country of the targets under deliverable 9 (rule of law/ anti-corruption mechanisms), 10 (key judicial reform) and 11 (public administration reform) of the 2020 deliverables;
- Pressure tools, including governance scorecards, infographics, fact-sheets and, where useful, rankings and alike;
- Final comparative report on the implementation of deliverable 9 (rule of law/ anti-corruption mechanism), deliverable 10 (key judicial reform) and also deliverable 11 (public administration reform)

Main indicators indicating impact and change:

- Level of awareness of the remaining gaps to meet deliverable 9-11 under the 2020 deliverables
- Alignment and multiplier effect of key messaging of international and national stakeholders promoting reform areas as laid out in the deliverables 9-11 under the 2020 deliverables
- Policy reform processes in the area of anti-corruption, justice sector and PAR along the lines of the gaps identified and the recommendations provided

Output 1.2.: Reinforcing law enforcement action against high profile and complex corruption

The activities will contribute to the increased attention to the investigation and prosecution of high-level corruption cases - as a part and not part of organised crime - through data analysis and experience-sharing and more specifically through outputs such as the following (indicative list):

- Analysis of high-level corruption in the Eastern Partnership countries and best practice guidelines to tackle it (e.g. through the use of financial investigation tools and international cooperation);
- Data collection and analysis of alleged high-level corruption cases concerning or involving any of the EaP countries (case matrix), including the monitoring of the follow-up given to each case;
- Multi-stakeholder experience-sharing network events for EaP officials, law enforcement, practitioners and civil society with EU and EU Member States counterparts;
- Multi-stakeholder regional simulation/table-top exercises for EaP countries in the framework of the LEN, potentially involving EU relevant services and agencies, EU Member States and with an specific component involving civil society and practitioners.
- Explore the possibility of setting-up a regional EaP specific online platform for informal, practical exchange of law enforcement authorities..

Main indicators indicating impact and change:

- Level of enforcement of high profile corruption action
- Level of cooperation on high-level corruption cases
- Level of trust in prevention and fight against corruption among citizens of the EaP increased

Output 1.3.: Increasing integrity across the EaP countries in corruption-prone sectors that affect citizens the most, including education and business

The activities under this component will support promoting integrity in EaP and will contribute to the evidence-based policies in specific corruption-prone sectors such as, but not limited to, the business and education sector, including through outputs such as (indicative list):

- Sector-specific integrity assessment methodology, including integrity indicators to monitor progress;
- Country-specific analyses of systemic, sector-specific weaknesses with recommendations for the development and implementation of corruption risk reduction and prevention strategies, also taking into account and stock of experiences identifying, preventing and reducing gender-specific manifestations of corruption ('gender analysis') and those for people in socially vulnerable situations;

- Sector-specific multi-stakeholder partnerships meetings, including key ministries and other state actors, civil society, private sector and other relevant actors to develop, monitor and implement integrity measures and sectoral anti-corruption policies;
- Monitoring reports based on the developed integrity methodology and indicators in the respective public service sectors (business and education).

Main indicators indicating impact and change:

- Level of awareness of systemic weaknesses in particularly corruption-prone sectors of relevance to citizens (such as education and business) and of sound policy responses reducing the corruption risks, while enhancing integrity
- Level of capacity of government in implementing integrity measures in key anti-corruption areas, including education and business
- Political will for and initiation of anti-corruption reform to enhance integrity in specifically corruption-prone sectors, including the education and business sector

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE 2: TO ENABLE OPEN, INCLUSIVE AND RESPONSIVE GOVERNMENTS AND CITIZEN-CENTERED SERVICE DELIVERY THROUGH STRENGTHENED CSO PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Output 2.1: Enhancing EaP government and civil society dialogue to foster implementation of open government reforms in the areas of anti-corruption (deliverable 9), justice sector (deliverable 10) and public administration (deliverable 11)

The activities under this component will support the Open Government Partnership in enhancing EaP government and civil society dialogue through informed evidence-based communication and enhanced access to international fora to develop and implement open government reforms, including through outputs such as (indicative list):

- Civil Society shadow reports to the OECD platforms;
- Dissemination of pressure tools

Main indicators indicating impact and change:

- Level of government commitment to engage with civil society
- Level of civil society participation in anti-corruption, justice sector and PAR policy development, implementation and monitoring
- Level of civil society involvement in public consultations on national anti-corruption, justice sector and PAR strategy and action plans

Output 2.2: Increased civil society engagement and support of new digital tools to tackle high-level corruption as a particular reform obstacle

The activities under this component will support the engagement and involvement of civil society²² in tackling high-level corruption and, through a sub-grant scheme and in close coordination with the EU delegations, the development and effective use of innovative digital tools that enable civil society (and other relevant actors) to monitor high-level corruption as a watchdog for integrity, including through outputs such as (indicative list):

- Participation and active engagement of civil society organisations of the OECD contact list in OECD plenary meetings and, where feasible, in OECD Law Enforcement Network (LEN) meetings to foster cooperation and exchange specifically on high-level corruption between civil society, government and law enforcement/practitioners;
- Provision of publicly available data on ongoing and alleged high-level corruption cases concerning or involving any of the EaP countries for the purpose of feeding into, completing, and verifying the OECD case matrix, including monitoring the follow-up of each case;
- Harnessing new technologies to strengthen the fight against high-level corruption by fostering innovative ideas and tools facilitating civil society participation and citizens engagement in policy-making and monitoring of political commitments, through digital integrity tools in support of open government's, enhanced transparency, integrity and accountability, such as (indicative list):
 - EaP Citizens' Governance Scorecards to assess the level of service delivery (e.g.: <https://www.demsoc.org> or <http://municipalityscorecard.argudenacademy.org/scorecards>);
 - Open Court databases matching different data sets that allow for analysis whether justice is delivered;
 - Digital tools on undue money flows, including EU funds (e.g: [OpenCoesione](#));
 - Citizen participation and government responsiveness tools (e.g. [DoZorro](#));
 - Open government participation and monitoring platforms (e.g. [Consul](#)).

Main indicators indicating impact and change:

- Level of involvement and engagement of civil society in tackling high-level corruption
- Creation of and effective use of innovative technology tools enabling civil society (and other relevant stakeholders) to monitor as a watchdog for integrity
- Increased number of high-level corruption allegations are reported (i.e. to the media/public and police) and brought to justice (i.e. to the courts and to conviction)

Output 2.3: Building alliances and supporting reform champions in corruption-prone sectors that affect citizens the most

²² Including also organisations that are not affiliated to the Open Government Partnership (OGP).

The activities under this action will assist civil society and other relevant stakeholders to forge coalitions with a view to advocating jointly together for increased integrity in the corruption-prone areas selected under this programme (including but not limited to the education sector and the business sector) as well as celebrate integrity champions (institutions/organisations/individuals) for good practice in the relevant sectors, including through outputs such as (indicative list):

- Coalition-building workshops to help reform teams navigate political economy challenges through stakeholder and influence mapping, building trust and resilience and leadership training;
- Capacity building workshops with government and civil society to develop shared vision and plans for more open governments and adapt on strategies with the view to implementing the EaPs political commitments under the OGP National Action Plans and the 2020 deliverables;
- Regional and/or cross-country peer learning on open government-related advocacy successes and challenges and on crafting effective strategies on specific commitments (e.g. open contracting, beneficial ownership);
- Awareness raising and engagement activities with civil society organisations in the EaP to ensure targeted bottom-up demand and ownership of the OGP agenda and the targets under the 2020 deliverables to hold EaP governments to account to their political commitments under the OGP National Action Plans and the 2020 deliverables;
- Tailored technical assistance through subject matter experts or OGP's thematic partners for specific commitments under the OGP National Action Plans and the 2020 deliverables;
- Awards ceremonies for integrity champions (institutions/organisations/individuals) in the education and business sector to support and promote good practice, in the context of EU-EaP events.

Main indicator indicating impact and change:

- Civil society and other relevant stakeholders alliance advocating for increased integrity in corruption-prone sectors (such as education and business)
- Support for reform champions promoting integrity in corruption-prone sectors of education and business

4.2 Intervention Logic

The overall objective of the 'EU for Integrity Action for the Eastern Partnership' Programme is to address persisting challenges in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine in preventing and combating threats to the rule of law and to the administration of justice, and in delivering citizen-centered services.

To complement the legal standard-setting and capacity-building work already carried out by the Council of Europe under the Partnership for Good Governance (PGG) programme, this proposed action will focus on the 'supply and demand-side' to facilitate reform efforts in the Eastern Partnership (EaP) through **360degree stakeholder involvement** in policy reform that

meets the targets under the 2020 deliverables, through sector-specific analysis and pressure tools, through hands-on practitioners' exchanges and independent civil society monitoring.

The **multiplier effect** of this intervention approach will be manifold: the publication of the sector-specific analysis and pressure tools developed by the OECD under Specific Objective 1 will enable also change agents that are not directly targeted under this action and could inspire and be applied to other sectors and services in the mid-term. Similarly, the civil society monitoring of the implementation of political commitments under Specific Objective 2 will empower a crucial stakeholder to contribute in an informed and meaningful way to a more evidence-based policy-making process.

Moreover, sector-specific expert exchanges that are fostered through Specific Objective 1 and 2 are geared **to share and learn from best practice**, as well as to apply the same approaches to similar practical challenges. This contributes, inter alia, to increasing trust among EaP countries and the EU, which can have a catalyst effect to steering reform as well as to, for instance, tackling cross-border corruption and weak delivery of justice.

4.3 Mainstreaming

The activities will have a positive influence on gender equality, which will be taken into consideration in the design of activities. Wherever relevant, reports on results and impact achieved should have data disaggregated by sex. Achieving gender equality is not only a goal in itself – as confirmed by the EU Gender Action Plan II and the 2020 Deliverables - but essential for sustainable democracy, economic development and the respect for the rule of law, which the implementing partners will be working towards in the years to come (2019-2021).

The actions will be implemented following a **right-based approach**, encompassing all human rights, which will be particularly relevant for people in vulnerable and disadvantaged situations and those living in rural areas. The five working principles below will be applied at all stages of implementation: legality, universality and indivisibility of human rights; participation and access to decision-making processes; non-discrimination and equal access; accountability and access to the rule of law; transparency and access to information. The Steering Committees co-chaired by the European Commission and the implementing partners will ensure that this approach is taken across all projects implemented throughout the different policy areas identified.

Co-creation processes involving **civil society** through consultation and close cooperation is a core element of component 2 and critical to ensuring inclusive and responsive processes and sustainable results on the ground particularly in the areas of rule of law/anti-corruption, justice and public sector reform.

The cooperation with the OECD and the OGP is expected to be neutral on the **environment**. Addressing anti-corruption, justice and public administration reform in the Eastern Partnership countries is even expected to positively contribute to the implementation of the Aarhus Convention, notably its third pillar 'access to justice on environmental matters'.

4.4 Contribution to SDGs

This Action is relevant for the **Agenda 2030**. It contributes primarily to the progressive achievement of **SDG Goal 16** 'Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels'. The Action will also contribute to the **SDG 8**: 'Promoting sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all'

5. IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is not foreseen to conclude a financing agreement with the partner country.

5.2 Indicative implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 72 months from the date of adoption by the Commission of this Financing Decision.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission's responsible authorising officer by amending this Decision and the relevant contracts and agreements.

5.3 Implementation modalities

The Commission will ensure that the EU appropriate rules and procedures for providing financing to third parties are respected, including review procedures, where appropriate, and compliance of the action with EU restrictive measures²³.

5.3.1 Indirect management with an entrusted entities

A part of this action may be implemented in indirect management with the OECD.

This implementation entails activities related to the Specific Objective 1 focusing on the rule of law, justice sector reform and PAR that will be carried out by the OECD.

The envisaged entity has been selected using the following criteria: cutting-edge experience, knowledge of specific needs of project stakeholders, and well-established networks engaging the stakeholders from the region. In particular:

- The OECD has a widely respected capacity for robust and credible analysis and evidence-based policy advice on anti-corruption policies and regulations, as well integrating anti-corruption consideration into sectoral policies and promoting integrity in general.

²³ www.sanctionsmap.eu Please note that the sanctions map is an IT tool for identifying the sanctions regimes. The source of the sanctions stems from legal acts published in the Official Journal (OJ). In case of discrepancy between the published legal acts and the updates on the website it is the OJ version that prevails.

- It also supports peer-review mechanisms that gather around the table the OECD, EU and Eastern partner governments on an equal footing to exchange good practices in an impartial setting.
- The OECD has also established a network of local civil society organisations that contribute through Alternative Reports to the anti-corruption monitoring of the Eastern Partnership countries that are members of the OECD Anti-Corruption Network.
- The organisation has also built a solid relationship with various parts of governments of EaP countries through the EU4business and SIGMA Programme.
- The OECD adds value also due to its existing and already practiced convening power relying on an extensive network of expert practitioners from the OECD and EU Member states who provide in-kind support and policy expertise based on their own countries' experience in the form of lead reviewers and expert inputs to policy papers during seminars, working groups and peer reviews.

The OECD is currently undergoing an ex-ante assessment of its systems and procedures. Based on its compliance with the conditions in force at the time previously other indirect management actions were awarded to the OECD and based on a long-lasting problem-free co-operation, the OECD can also now implement this action under indirect management, pending the finalisation of the ex-ante assessment, and, where necessary, subject to appropriate supervisory measures in accordance with Article 154(5) of the Financial Regulation.]

5.3.2 Grants: (direct management)

(a) Purpose of the grant

The Grant will contribute to achieving the objectives and results specified in Component 2 above in section (4).

(b) Type of applicants targeted

The Open Government Partnership (OGP) Europe Office is a private, not-for profit foundation established under Belgian law.

(c) Justification of a direct grant

Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to the Open Government Partnership (OGP).

Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the recourse to an award of a grant without a call for proposals is justified because the Open Government Partnership enables an environment for reform ownership and co-creation processes between government and civil society with a proven track record of gaining high-level political commitments in the form of OGP Action Plans and enforcement, which so far no other organisation does with a view to a wide spectrum of areas, including measures that contribute to anti-corruption, justice sector reform and also PAR. The conditions of specific characteristics that require this particular type of body on account of its technical competence, its high degree of specialisation and the nature of the action with regard to Article 6(1)(c) of the CIR are therefore given in this case.

5.4 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply subject to the following provisions.

The Commission's authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

5.5 Indicative budget

	EU contribution (amount in EUR)	Indicative third party contribution, in currency identified
Objective 1 – Anti-Corruption Network composed of:	3 500 000	
- Indirect management with the OECD (Components 1) - cf. section 5.4.4		
Objective 2 – Inclusive, responsive governments composed of:	3 500 000	157 500
- Direct grant to the Open Government Partnership (direct management of Component 2) – cf section 5.4.1		
Total	7 000 000	

5.6 Organisational set-up and responsibilities

Components 1 of the programme will be indirectly managed by the **OECD** in close cooperation with the European Commission and the six ENP-East countries. Component 2 will be managed by the **Open Government Partnership** in close cooperation with the European Commission. The Open Government Partnership shall ensure coordination and synergies with other projects currently being implemented and planned at the bilateral level to make sure that there are no duplications.

The **European Commission will ensure**, with the support of the OECD and the OGP, **the coordination and communication** with the interested stakeholders, including relevant Commission Services and EU Delegations. The OECD and the OGP will identify synergies with other relevant programmes, projects and initiatives related to or having impact on strengthening institutions and good governance.

For components 1 and component 2, there shall be a governance structure involving both implementing partners. The **Programme Steering Committee** will be co-chaired by the Commission, the OECD and OGP and include representatives of both implementing partners,

of the European External Action Service and of any other concerned Directorate-General of the Commission.

The Steering Committee is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the Integrity programme on the basis of activity reports presented by the OECD and OGP and for agreeing on the activities for the following year, following the formal consultation with EU Delegations. The Steering Committee shall meet **twice a year** to decide on the annual activities at the outset of the year and for the monitoring of the implementation at the end of the year. The **Secretariat of the Steering Committee** is ensured by the OECD and the OGP respectively.

Where feasible, the Programme Steering Committee will take place back-to-back with a **Local Steering Committee**, involving EU delegations in the form of a video-conference call. In the Local Steering Committee recommendations can be concluded to inform the Programme Steering Committee with the primary goal of ensuring complementarity with other ongoing EU assistance on the ground, internal communication and involvement as well as visibility of the activities.

5.7 Performance and Results monitoring and reporting

Performance measurement will be based on the intervention logic and the log frame matrix, including its indicators.

- Performance measurement will aim at informing the list of indicators that are part of the log frame matrix.
- In certain cases, mainly depending on when the monitoring exercise is launched, contribution to the outcomes will also be part of monitoring and for this to happen indicators defined during planning/programming at the outcome level will be the ones for which a value of measurement will need to be provided.
- In evaluation, the intervention logic will be the basis for the definition of the evaluation questions. Evaluations do mainly focus on the spheres of direct (outcomes) and indirect (impacts) influence. As such, indicators defined for these levels of the intervention logic will be used in evaluation. Depending on the specific purpose and scope of the evaluation exercise, additional indicators will be defined.

Monitoring is a management tool at the disposal of the action. It is expected to give regular and systemic information on where the Action is at any given time (and over time) relative to the different targets. Monitoring activities will aim to identify successes, problems and/or potential risks so that corrective measures are adopted in a timely fashion. Even though it is expected to focus mainly on the actions' inputs, activities and outputs, it is also expected to look at how the outputs can effectively induce, and actually induce, the outcomes that are aimed at.

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process, and part of the implementing partner's responsibilities. To this aim, the implementing partner shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular annual progress reports and final reports. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (outputs and direct outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the logframe matrix.

SDGs indicators and, if applicable, any jointly agreed indicators as for instance per Joint Programming document should be taken into account.

The report shall be laid out in such a way as to allow monitoring of the means envisaged and employed and of the budget details for the action. The final report, narrative and financial, will cover the entire period of the action implementation.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

Beside the Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) review, the Commission may undertake action results reporting through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews). Their aim would be to identify and check the most relevant results on the action.

5.8 Evaluation

Having regard to the importance of the action, a mid-term evaluation will be carried out for this action or its components via independent consultants contracted by the Commission.

It will be carried out for learning purposes, in particular with respect to tangible results of the action and the mid-term impact achieved for citizens, the visibility of the action, internal and external communication and lessons learnt and impacts on reforms in the partner countries.

The Commission shall inform the OECD and Open Government Partnership in advance of the dates foreseen for the evaluation missions. The OECD and Open Government Partnership shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner countries and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyse the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

The financing of the evaluation shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.9 Audit

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

The financing of the audit shall be covered by another measure constituting a financing decision.

5.10 Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.

This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action, to be elaborated at the start of implementation.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner country (for instance, concerning the reforms supported through budget support), contractors, grant beneficiaries and/or entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in, respectively, the financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

The Communication and Visibility Requirements for European Union External Action (or any succeeding document) shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations. Additional Visibility Guidelines developed by the Commission (European Neighbourhood Policy and Enlargement Negotiations) shall be strictly adhered to.

In particular, the OECD and the Open Government Partnership will ensure adequate visibility of EU financing and of the results achieved. The OECD and the Open Government Partnership will draft a communication and visibility plan containing communication objectives, target groups, communication tools to be used and an allocated communication budget.

Key results will be communicated to all governmental, non-governmental and other stakeholders. All reports and publications produced will be widely disseminated. All activities will adhere to the European Union requirements for visibility on EU-funded activities. This shall include, but not be limited to, press releases and briefings, reports, seminars, workshops, events, publications.

Visibility and communication actions shall demonstrate how the interventions contribute to the agreed programme objectives. Actions shall be aimed at strengthening general public awareness of interventions financed by the EU and the objectives pursued. The actions shall aim at highlighting to the relevant target audiences the added value and impact of the EU's interventions. Visibility actions should also promote transparency and accountability on the use of funds.

As implementing organisations, the OECD and the Open Government Partnership shall report to the Steering Committee on its visibility and communication actions, as well as the results of the overall action. This action will be communicated externally as part of a wider context of EU support to the respective country, where relevant, and the Eastern Partnership region in order to enhance the effectiveness of communication activities and to reduce fragmentation in the area of EU communication.

APPENDIX - INDICATIVE LOGFRAME MATRIX

The activities, the expected outputs and all the indicators, targets and baselines included in the log frame matrix are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the action, by mutual agreement and no amendment will be required for the financing decision. The indicative log frame matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the action: new lines will be added to include the activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) for the output and outcome indicators whenever it is relevant for monitoring and reporting purposes. Note also that indicators should be disaggregated by sex whenever relevant.

	Results chain: Main expected results (maximum 10)	Indicators (at least one indicator per expected result)	Sources of data	Assumptions
Impact/ Overall Objective	TO INCREASE STABILISATION AND RESILIENCE IN THE EASTERN NEIGHBOURHOOD	<p>Number of countries in which resilience improves</p> <p>Degree of synergy between the EaP countries in implementation of reforms</p> <p>Level of trust in rule of law, justice and public administrations among citizens of the EaP</p> <p>Level of protection of fundamental rights</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OECD/OGP and European Commission reports on the scope of recommendations taken into consideration with regard to reforms prompting resilience and stabilisation - Monitoring reports of international experts (including CEPEJ, GRECO, Venice Commission and European Court of Human Rights findings) - Available international, European and national statistics - Public surveys and indexes on perception levels regarding the rule of law, justice and PAR (including, but not limited to, TI Corruption Perception Index, Corruption Barometer, World Bank indicators and Justice Survey analysis, Bertelsmann Transformation Index for Rule of Law, Index of Public Integrity, SIGMA assessments, etc.) - National stakeholder reports, including from civil society - Available international, European and national statistics - Parliamentary monitoring reports related to anti-corruption, judiciary reform and PAR - Resolutions and decisions of Committee of Ministers - Media coverage 	<i>Not applicable</i>

<p>Outcome/ Specific Objective 1</p>	<p>TO STRENGTHEN EVIDENCE-BASED ANTI-CORRUPTION, JUSTICE AND PAR POLICY AND ENFORCEMENT</p>	<p>Level of trust in prevention and the fight against corruption among population of the EaP countries</p> <p>Domestic legislative and institutional frameworks to fight corruption, to ensure a functioning justice system and public service delivery in the EaP countries in line with the European and international standards</p> <p>Rule of law and anti-corruption mechanisms in place and efficiently used ensuring the delivery of justice and public services</p> <p>Independence of anti-corruption special bodies, of justice and the public sector increased</p> <p>Level of resilience of public authorities against undue influence of private interests increased</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public surveys and indexes on perception levels regarding the rule of law, justice and PAR (including, see above) - Media coverage - OECD/OGP and European Commission reports on the scope of recommendations taken into consideration in the drafting of legal acts, adoption of legal acts - National stakeholder reports, including from civil society - Missions and meetings reports of the OECD, OGP and the European Commission - Monitoring reports of project and international experts (including, see above) - Available international, European and national statistics - Parliamentary monitoring reports related to anti-corruption, judiciary reform and PAR - Resolutions and decisions of Committee of Ministers 	<p>Political commitment of the ENP-East governments to reform initiatives in the project areas</p> <p>Cooperation of national authorities in the beneficiary countries</p>
<p>Outputs 1.1</p>	<p>Supporting evidence-based anti-corruption, justice and PAR policy reform and implementation across the EaP</p>	<p>Level of awareness of the remaining gaps to meet deliverable 9-11 under the 2020 deliverables</p> <p>Alignment und multiplier effect of key messaging of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased awareness of the remaining gaps in meeting the 2020 deliverables among EaP governments, EU and EU member states representatives, law enforcement, practitioners, media and civil society - Communication tools are disseminated and 	<p>Political commitment of the ENP-East governments to reform initiatives with a view to meeting the targets under deliverable 9, 10 and 11</p> <p>Cooperation of national</p>

	through gap analyses with recommendations, benchmarks and annual indicators, combined with illustrative communication tools	international and national stakeholders promoting reform areas as laid out in the deliverables 9-11 under the 2020 deliverables Policy reform processes in the area of anti-corruption, justice sector and PAR along the lines of the gaps identified and the recommendations provided	used by third actors to hold the EaP governments to account - Media coverage and social media take ups - OECD, OGP and European Commission reports on the scope of recommendations taken into consideration in the implementation of anti-corruption policies - National stakeholder reports, including from civil society - Available international, European and national statistics -Parliamentary monitoring reports related to anti-corruption, judiciary reform and PAR	authorities in the beneficiary countries
Output 1.2	Reinforcing law enforcement action against high profile corruption	Level of enforcement of high profile corruption action Level of cooperation on high-level corruption cases Level of trust in prevention and fight against corruption among citizens of the EaP increased	- Reported enforcement action against high-level corruption (by media, media prosecutors, crime statistics, government) - Increased informal/ formal cooperation and exchanges on high-level corruption among EaP countries and vis-à-vis EU member states - Public surveys and indexes on perception levels regarding the rule of law, justice and PAR (including, see above)	Political commitment of the ENP-East governments to anti-corruption enforcement Cooperation of national authorities in the beneficiary countries
Output 1.3	Increasing integrity across the EaP countries in corruption-prone sectors that affect citizens the most, including education and business	Level of awareness of systemic weaknesses in particularly corruption-prone sectors of relevance to citizens (such as education and business) and of sound policy responses reducing	- Increased awareness of the systemic weaknesses in corruption-prone sectors that are relevant to citizens of EaP governments, EU and EU member state representatives, law enforcement, practitioners, media and civil society	Political commitment of the ENP-East governments to integrity reform initiatives Cooperation of national authorities in the

		<p>the corruption risks, while enhancing integrity</p> <p>Level of capacity of government in implementing integrity measures in key anti-corruption areas, including education and business</p> <p>Political will for and initiation of anti-corruption reform to enhance integrity in specifically corruption-prone sectors, including the education and business sector</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - OECD/OGP and European Commission reports on the scope of recommendations taken into consideration in the drafting and adoption of legal acts, codes of conduct - National stakeholder reports, including from civil society - Missions and meetings reports of the OECD, OGP and the European Commission - Monitoring reports of project and international experts - Public surveys and indexes on perception levels (including, see above) - Media coverage and social media take ups 	beneficiary countries
Outcome/ Specific Objective 2	<p>TO ENABLE OPEN, INCLUSIVE AND RESPONSIVE GOVERNMENTS AND CITIZEN-CENTERED SERVICE DELIVERY THROUGH STRENGTHENED CSO PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT</p>	<p>Level of openness, inclusiveness and responsiveness across the EaP region</p> <p>Quality of service delivery to citizens</p> <p>Level of civil society participation and engagement in decision-making processes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outreach and co-creation between government and civil society increased - Number of positive citizen responses to satisfaction surveys for public service delivery - Number of public consultation, of requests for CSO expert input, of meetings with civil society, of invitations to high-level dialogues 	<p>Political commitment of the ENP-East governments to reform initiatives in support of openness, inclusiveness and citizen-centered service delivery</p> <p>Cooperation of national authorities in the beneficiary countries</p>
Output 2.1	<p>Enhancing EaP government and civil society dialogue to foster</p>	<p>Level of government commitment to engage with civil society</p> <p>Level of civil society participation in anti-corruption,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of co-created OGP National Action Plans adopted and implemented in EaP countries - Number of commitment targets under deliverable 9, 10 and 11 of the 2020 	<p>Political commitment of the ENP-East governments to reform initiatives in support of openness, inclusiveness and citizen-centered service delivery</p>

	<p>implementation of open government reforms in the areas of anti-corruption (deliverable 9), justice sector (deliverable 10) and public administration (deliverable 11)</p>	<p>justice sector and PAR policy development, implementation and monitoring</p> <p>Level of civil society involvement in public consultations on national anti-corruption, justice sector and PAR strategy and action plans</p>	<p>deliverables that are not yet met are reflected in OGP National Action Plans' commitments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Open Government Self-Assessment Reports by EaP governments are delivered to OGPs Independent Reporting Mechanism, while government online platforms and respositories are created and operational - Provision of support to Belarus to join the OGP initiative - Number of CSO capacity-building workshops, awareness-raising activities, technical assistance and peer-learning activities are delivered - Increased citizen engagement (including civil society, private sector and other stakeholders) in the anti-corruption, justice sector and PAR policy development, implementation and monitoring - Increased number of OECD progress monitoring shadow reports delivered by civil society 	<p>Cooperation of national authorities in the beneficiary countries</p> <p>Participation and engagement of civil society with government</p>
<p>Output 2.2</p>	<p>Increased civil society engagement and support of new digital tools to tackle high-level corruption as a particular reform obstacle</p>	<p>Level of involvement and engagement of civil society in tackling high-level corruption</p> <p>Creation of and effective use of innovative technology tools enabling civil society (and other relevant stakeholders) to monitor as a watchdog for integrity</p> <p>Increased number of high-level corruption allegations are</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of innovative digital tools created and effectively used to monitor undue influence, undue money flows and alike - Number of data delivered on alleged high-level corruption cases - Increased civil society participation in network events of law enforcement and practitioners on high-level corruption, including at the OECD 	<p>Political commitment of the ENP-East governments to reform initiatives in support of openness, inclusiveness and citizen-centered service delivery</p> <p>Cooperation of national authorities in the beneficiary countries</p> <p>Participation and engagement of civil</p>

		reported (i.e. to the media/public and police) and brought to justice (i.e. to the courts and to conviction)		society with government
Output 2.3	Building alliances and supporting reform champions in corruption-prone sectors that affect citizens the most	<p>Civil society and other relevant stakeholders alliance advocating for increased integrity in corruption-prone sectors (such as education and business)</p> <p>Support for reform champions promoting integrity in corruption-prone sectors of education and business</p>	<p>- Multi-stakeholder networks of change agents created and operational for experience-sharing, dissemination of evidence-based data and for coalition-building</p> <p>- Number of nominations for champions promoting anti-corruption, justice and PAR reform and awards given</p>	<p>Political commitment of the ENP-East governments to reform initiatives in support of openness, inclusiveness and citizen-centered service delivery</p> <p>Cooperation of national authorities in the beneficiary countries</p> <p>Participation and engagement of civil society with government</p>