



The Expert Group for Aid Studies

Invitation for proposals: Evaluation of Sida's efforts to reduce corruption in partner countries

The Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA) is a government committee mandated to evaluate and analyse the direction, governance, and implementation of Sweden's official development assistance (ODA). EBA engages researchers and other experts to carry out studies of relevance for policymakers and practitioners.

EBA hereby invites proposals for an evaluation of Sida's efforts to reduce corruption in partner countries.

Background and motivation for the study

Swedish development cooperation is largely conducted in contexts where corruption is prevalent. Corruption constitutes a risk for aid misuse and theft as well as a serious obstacle to development in many of Sweden's partner countries. The work against corruption within Swedish development cooperation therefore includes efforts to protect Swedish aid funds as well as to support anti-corruption work in partner countries. This study concerns Swedish efforts to combat corruption as a hindrance to development in countries where Sweden conducts development cooperation.

The government recently drafted an action plan against corruption in the public sector for the period 2021-2023, which highlights the need for enhanced anti-corruption work and lists development cooperation as a special risk area (Regeringskansliet, 2021). The Swedish government explicitly prioritises anti-corruption work within development cooperation and according to Sida, the work against corruption as a development obstacle in partner countries has been strengthened during the last few years.

But despite many bilateral and multilateral donors' increasing attention to and focus on anti-corruption during the last 20 years, studies and evaluations point to inadequate approaches and poor results when it comes to reducing corruption in partner countries (see e.g. Mason, 2021; Mungiu-Pippidi, 2017; Ronceray & Sergejeff, 2020; Rothstein & Tannenbergh, 2015). This leads to a number of questions related to Sida's approach to combating corruption as an obstacle to development: To what extent is it in tune with current knowledge of what works in anti-corruption? What are the likely effects of Sida's

aid portfolio in terms of contributing to reduced corruption? To what extent are the anti-corruption strategies and efforts in specific partner countries relevant and coherent? Are interventions and overall working methods adjusted to national contexts, preconditions, and priorities? (How) are they coordinated with national and international actors?

Background: Sida's anti-corruption work

The Policy Framework for Swedish Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid emphasises corruption as a central democratic problem. Countering corruption is also a priority area in the government's Drive for Democracy, and a target (16.5) in the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) agenda to which Sweden has subscribed.¹ To prevent and combat corruption are central parts of the Swedish government's instruction to Sida. In addition, in line with a 2020 government decision, Sida is instructed to adopt a holistic approach to anti-corruption work with the aim to strengthen transparency and accountability within the organisation's thematic working areas.

Sida addresses corruption at four different levels, by:

1. contributing to the international anti-corruption agenda;
2. supporting partner countries' efforts to combat corruption;
3. preventing corruption in Swedish-funded projects and programmes;
4. promoting ethics and integrity within Sida and at Swedish embassies.²

Historically, the focus of Sida has been on countering corruption within development cooperation. Sida's anti-corruption rule, to "never accept, always inform and always act on suspicions of corruption", was introduced in 2004. In 2013, the ambition to "always prevent" corruption was added to the rule in order to emphasise the importance of preventive efforts. Since the introduction of the anti-corruption rule, the work has gradually broadened and in 2006, an anti-corruption advisor function was introduced; in 2008, the annual corruption report was launched; a transparency guarantee was introduced in 2010; and in 2012, Sida established a whistleblower function (Sida, 2019b). In recent years, Sida has increasingly highlighted the importance of countering corruption as an obstacle to development in partner countries and of integrating the anti-corruption perspective in the overall work.

During the last few years, the anti-corruption agendas of Sida as well as of other donors have also broadened to include non-monetary forms of corruption. For example, Sida's work against corruption now also encompasses efforts to counter sexual exploitation, abuse, and harassment (SEAH) (Sida, 2020b:5). Furthermore, as part of its work against corruption as a development obstacle, Sida underscores the importance of analysing the occurrence of and countering "sextortion" (Sida, 2021), a form of gendered corruption (Eldén et al., 2020). Several of the strategies that currently guide Sida's work contain the goal to combat corruption and the resources allocated to direct and indirect anti-corruption interventions have increased. But despite almost doubling during the last decade, aid

¹ See [Policy framework for Swedish development cooperation and humanitarian assistance](#) and [Drive for Democracy](#).

² Sida, 2021.

going to anti-corruption organisations and institutions today amounts to just under 84.2 MSEK, or 0.22% of Sweden’s total bilateral aid in 2020 (in 2019, the amount was 137.5 MSEK and for 2021, it currently sums to 134.93 MSEK).³

The aid that Sida categorises as contributing to SDG 16.5 (substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms) amounted to 521.37 MSEK in 2020. However, since the anti-corruption work shall be systematically integrated in the implementation of strategies as well as in the support to specific interventions and in Swedish development cooperation at large, Sida’s anti-corruption efforts ought to in practice be broader than the support allocated to these specific aid categories.

Sida’s current action plan for preventing and mitigating corruption concerns the period 2020-2023. An operationalisation of and a monitoring and evaluation framework for the action plan were finalised in 2022. The action plan highlights that the understanding of the many dimensions and damaging effects of corruption as well as of its pervasiveness has improved in recent years, which allegedly has resulted in a more “holistic approach” to corruption, which also strives to address corruption as an obstacle to development (Sida, 2020a). The two cornerstones in Sida’s anti-corruption work are thus the “risk perspective” and the “development perspective”, where the latter primarily aims to support partner countries in their fight against corruption and in their promotion of democratic governance (Sida, 2020a). The overarching areas/goals associated with each perspective are presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Sida’s anti-corruption work

<i>Development goal</i>			
Contribute to better living conditions for people living in poverty and oppression			
<i>Two perspectives of Sida’s anti-corruption operations</i>			
Reduce corruption in partner countries “Development perspective”		Counter corruption in Sida’s operations “Risk perspective”	
<i>Key areas</i>			
Support partner countries’ own efforts to combat corruption	Coordination with other donors and strategic partners	Prevent and investigate corruption in Swedish funded projects and programmes	Promote a culture that counteracts corruption within Sida and Embassies

Source: Sida (2020) Action Plan for preventing and mitigating corruption 2020-2023, p. 2.

In 2019, Sida developed a guidance for the work against corruption as a development obstacle, which is directed at Sida staff as well as partners (Sida, 2019a) and was updated in 2021. The guidance lists four building blocks in Sida’s work with this perspective:

1. Understanding corruption;

³ Since reporting for 2021 is ongoing until June 2022, this amount might increase.

2. Supporting strategic interventions against corruption;
3. Systematic integration of anti-corruption;
4. Coordination and dialogue.

In its annual report for 2021, Sida reinforced the importance of contextual analyses and understandings of corruption and its driving forces, the systematic integration of anti-corruption in country strategies, sectors, and thematic areas, and innovative technology for anti-corruption (Sida, 2022). In addition, Sida reported that a pilot project involving the implementation of the holistic approach – including comprehensive analyses, strategic interventions, systematic integration, strengthened coordination, and policy dialogue on anti-corruption – had been initiated in two countries (Moldova and Zambia) in 2021 and will run until 2023.

In sum, the efforts to address the development perspective of corruption through Swedish development cooperation has developed in the last couple of years, at least on paper, and Sida claims to adopt an evidence-based approach. However, the extent to which policies and overall approaches in fact are evidence-based, and what steps have been taken to ensure their context-adjusted, relevant, and coherent implementation need to be assessed in relation to current knowledge and through analyses of specific country portfolios and efforts.

Previous studies and evaluations

The literature on the anti-corruption work conducted within development cooperation points to poor results in terms of reducing corruption in partner countries. For example, in an EBA report from 2015, Rothstein and Tannenbergh conclude that “after almost twenty-five years of intensive research, it is not possible to identify one single aid policy initiative that can be shown to have had a significant effect on reducing corruption in recipient countries” (2015:9). The authors further point to five institutional changes that can have a positive effect on quality of government: 1) a functioning and legitimate system of taxation; 2) a merit-based system of recruitment and promotion of civil servants; 3) universal and free education; 4) gender equality in the public sphere; and 5) a professional national audit agency whose results are made publicly available (ibid:12).

In line with Rothstein and Tannenbergh, Mungiu-Pippidi (2017) in another EBA report highlights, along with Ronceray and Sergejef (2020) in a study of the international anti-corruption work conducted by the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Sweden, and Germany, that few approaches within development cooperation have been effective in reducing corruption. Both these studies emphasise the need for coordinated approaches and joint action on the part of donors. Moreover, they highlight the importance of supporting domestic change actors, such as civil society organisations, in order to contribute to normative change and to support national long-term strategies for public integrity and ethical universalism. Ronceray and Sergejef also argue that direct anti-corruption interventions (such as support to anti-corruption organisations and institutions) as well as indirect anti-corruption work (such as diplomacy and addressing norms and the driving forces behind corruption) are needed in order to address the problem effectively (2020:5).

A report published by Chr. Michelsen Institute's U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre also concludes that comprehensive evidence points to the ineffective approaches and strategies of donors in fighting corruption (Mason, 2021). The report suggests major changes in aid donors' ways of working in partner countries, such as increased support to local systems and actors, longer-term perspectives, enhanced flexibility, better donor coordination, and increased attention to contextual factors and partner countries' vulnerability to transnational corruption (ibid).

A joint evaluation of the anti-corruption efforts of multiple donors, commissioned by SADEV, Sida, Norad, Danida, DfID and ADB, was published in 2011 (Poate & Vaillant, 2011). The evaluation concluded that while the donors had contributed to strengthening national anti-corruption institutions and systems in the studied countries (Bangladesh, Nicaragua, Tanzania, Vietnam, and Zambia), this had not led to reduced corruption at the national level (Poate & Vaillant, 2011). Nevertheless, donor interventions had demonstrated some positive effects on local accountability and could, moving forward, contribute to strengthening the process of normative change that had been initiated.

Several of the evaluation's country reports pointed to the challenges that characterise anti-corruption work and that lead to poor results in contexts where national driving forces to fight corruption are weak or non-existent. For instance, the Bangladesh report concluded that:

"The main conclusion of this evaluation is that there are no proven ways to promote AC efforts in a country like Bangladesh. Notwithstanding a long-term engagement and responsive approach to opportunities, donors have had mixed success in demonstrating tangible results in their support to AC [...] This evaluation shows that donors can only go so far in their support to institutions and processes. It confirms that lasting achievements do not happen without strong political support, which in turn raises real issues of impact and sustainability (Poate et al., 2011:xvi-xvii)."

In the same vein, the Nicaragua report emphasised that the lack of political will in the country had obstructed the efforts of the donors and contributed to fragmented interventions (Poate et al., 2011). The synthesis report recommended, for instance, the development of more explicit, coherent, and evidence-based theories of change and approaches within the anti-corruption area. It also underscored the importance of supporting inter-agency partnerships as opposed to working with institutions in isolation, of analysing the driving forces behind and effects of corruption in specific sectors, and of improving donor coordination.

The difficulties in getting results in terms of legislation and reforms to lead to further change is also reflected in other evaluations. A report published by the European Court of Auditors in 2022 about EU support for the rule of law in the Western Balkans (which amounted to €700 million for the period 2014–2020) found that:

"[W]hile EU action has contributed to reforms in technical and operational areas, such as improving the efficiency of the judiciary and the development of relevant legislation, it has had little overall impact on fundamental rule of law reforms in the region. A key reason for this is the insufficient domestic political will to drive the necessary reforms (European Court of Auditors, 2022:4)."

A recently published evaluation of Norway's support to anti-corruption found that the interventions – support to international anti-corruption work, Public Finance Management (PFM) reforms in Somalia, and anti-corruption efforts in forestry in Indonesia – have been relevant for partner countries and effective in strengthening specific institutions and local participation (Vaillant, 2020). Yet, also in this evaluation, further effects as well as the sustainability of the observed results were deemed limited. Furthermore, the indirect anti-corruption efforts, such as integration in priority sectors and partner dialogue at the country level, were found to have been inadequate.

In sum, studies and evaluations point to major challenges when it comes to combating corruption through development cooperation in partner countries. Meanwhile, a vast number of conclusions, learnings, and recommendations have accumulated through the research, monitoring, and evaluation that have been conducted during the last two decades. These should imply a great potential to strengthen donor interventions, coordination, and preconditions in an evidence-based manner within the anti-corruption area.

Aim and questions

The aim of this evaluation is to explore and assess Sida's work against corruption as a development obstacle. More specifically, the evaluation will study the extent to which Sida's efforts to contribute to the reduction of corruption in partner countries are in line with current knowledge about effective approaches to anti-corruption. It will also assess the relevance, coherence, and expected impact of Sida's work.

While the importance of supporting the fight against corruption in partner countries is increasingly stressed by the MFA and Sida, and efforts have been strengthened in recent years, the overarching approach and methods that form the basis for Sida's current anti-corruption work have not been evaluated. This evaluation will take a broad approach to the assessment of the efforts to fight corruption as a development obstacle. Both direct and indirect measures will be explored as well as the relevance, coherence, and expected impact of strategies and interventions at different levels. The evaluation will ultimately seek to complement the knowledge derived from Sida's results monitoring and contribute to learning for both Sida and the MFA in the continued work against corruption in partner countries.

The evaluation shall include three main components:

1. A mapping of evidence, derived from research and evaluations, of what approaches, methods, and interventions are considered effective in contributing to reduced corruption in partner countries.
2. An in-depth overview and analysis of Sida's overall approach, theory/ies of change, specific methods, and portfolio pertaining to the work against corruption as a development obstacle in partner countries. This should be analysed in relation to the findings from component 1.
3. Country studies mapping overall aid portfolios and assessing the relevance, coherence, and expected impact of the (direct as well as integrated) work against corruption as a development obstacle in specific country settings. This analysis

should be informed by current knowledge regarding relevant and effective anti-corruption approaches in different national contexts.

Comments, component 1

While evaluations of aid donors' efforts to reduce corruption in partner countries point to limited effectiveness and inadequate approaches, there is an extensive and growing literature that stipulates pathways to more effective practices. In carrying out component 1, it is central to synthesise relevant and current knowledge about what approaches or methods are deemed most effective in reducing corruption at the national level – both in general and through development cooperation. It should also summarise evidence of what works in different country contexts. For instance, which approaches or interventions are effective in fragile and non-fragile contexts, respectively? How should donors approach the fight against corruption in countries with more or less resistance to democratic governance reform and anti-corruption measures and with stronger or weaker domestic efforts, institutions, political momentum or civil society actors supporting anti-corruption?

This component is an important part of the evaluation since it will form the basis for the assessment of the extent to which Sida's anti-corruption work is evidence-based and likely to contribute to anti-corruption outcomes. However, in terms of time and resources, the focus of the evaluation should be on components 2 and 3. Thus, the evaluation should make use of existing syntheses and overviews of the relevant literature(s).

Comments, component 2

Component 2 involves the analysis of Sida's overall approach to the work against corruption as a development obstacle and of Sida's aid portfolio. The overall approach and portfolio should be analysed in order to explore all efforts within anti-corruption, such as policies, corruption, and multidimensional poverty analyses at country or sector level; direct and indirect anti-corruption interventions; integration or mainstreaming in strategies, contributions, sectors, or thematic working areas; and anti-corruption coordination and dialogue. This analysis should focus on the current approaches and the active portfolio of interventions.

This component also involves the assessment of Sida's theories of change within this working area. Are the theories of change that underpin the work against corruption as a development obstacle in partner countries clearly articulated and evidence-based? If the theories of change are not explicitly articulated, these should be rearticulated based on implicit assumptions, goal-formulations, interventions, and results chains reflected in policy documents. Importantly, Sida's anti-corruption approach and portfolio should be analysed in relation to the conclusions arrived at in component 1. Is Sida's work within this area aligned with current knowledge? Is Sida doing the right things, i.e. approaching anti-corruption work in a manner that is likely to lead to results in terms of reduced corruption in partner countries?

Comments, component 3

Component 3 involves in-depth studies of Sida's work against corruption as a development obstacle in specific country contexts, focusing on relevance, coherence, and expected

impact. In conducting the country studies, it is essential to first explore and provide an overview of the aid portfolios and the anti-corruption work (including theories of change, direct and indirect interventions, integration, and coordination and dialogue) carried out by Sida in the studied partner countries.

Based on this overview, the evaluation should assess if the approach, portfolio, and specific interventions in each country setting are **relevant**. Are they thoroughly anchored in and based on an analysis and existing knowledge of what is suitable and effective in the specific context, and do they respond to national, global, and partner needs, priorities, and policies?

The evaluation should also include an analysis of the **coherence** of anti-corruption efforts in the studied partner countries. This includes an assessment of internal coherence, which should explore the interlinkages and synergies between Sida strategies at different levels of relevance to the work in the country and between different types of interventions. It should also consider external coherence and the compatibility of Sida's efforts with those of other donors and national actors as well as coordination with others.

The evaluation should not study the *effects* of earlier or ongoing interventions but should conduct an ex ante **impact assessment** of the current work against corruption in the studied partner countries. The assessment should be based on the analyses and findings from components 1 and 2 and the assessment of relevance and coherence in component 3. Are the overall country portfolios likely to contribute to reducing corruption and, if so, in what ways? Are the efforts expected to achieve their objectives and to affect different forms of corruption in the partner countries? Which approaches or interventions are likely to be more or less effective and why? Are there risks that the portfolio or specific interventions may increase corruption?

Study design

The proposal should include a theoretical and methodological framework. It is up to the authors to further develop the study design, methods, and delimitations but the choices should be clearly justified.

EBA proposes that the evaluation is conducted in three steps, according to the three components described above. Steps are not necessarily expected to be sequential. For example, interaction between the literature review and the portfolio analysis might prove fruitful.

The synthesis of existing knowledge, or evidence map, of what works in anti-corruption should focus on summarising the most important sources, including studies and evaluations along with previous research syntheses or systematic reviews, in order to ensure effective use of time and resources. It is important, nevertheless, that this provides a relevant and current overview of the state of the art within the field.

EBA proposes that component 3, the country studies, are based on case studies of the overall work against corruption as an obstacle to development in 2-3 partner countries. The case studies should include document and portfolio analyses and, advisably, field work in the selected countries. The findings from component 1 and 2 can potentially be used to inform case selection for component 3 as they might point to divergent ways of working

and expected impact in different types of contexts, which deserve further exploration and present opportunities for interesting comparative analyses and learning.

Examples of factors to consider when selecting cases for the in-depth country studies could potentially be the prioritisation of and resources allocated to anti-corruption in the countries by the MFA/Sida, degree of fragility, regime type, level of corruption, and/or the status of domestic anti-corruption work. The selection of countries that differ with regard to some of these aspects would enable a comparison of, and learning about, the relevance, coherence, and expected impact of Sida's anti-corruption efforts in divergent contexts. For instance, do approaches differ in countries with endemic and moderate levels of corruption, which are likely to require different types of interventions?

The criteria for case selection most suited to the purpose of the study should be further developed and motivated by the evaluator(s).

The study has the objective to contribute to learning. This underlines the importance of attempting to understand the overall work within this area, how it resonates with current knowledge, and its relevance, coherence, and expected impact in the country context. To stimulate learning, EBA welcomes proposals that engage key audiences, especially the MFA and Sida, during the process.

The evaluator(s) should in their proposal (step 2, below) clearly demonstrate how they will relate the questions and study to a broader research field or literature of relevance to the study, such as democratisation, political governance and institutions, and/or anti-corruption.

If needed, the evaluator(s) may refine or adjust the formulation of the three questions after the award decision, in dialogue with EBA and the study's reference group.

Potentially important empirical material for the study includes written sources from the MFA, Sida, and other Swedish actors, such as country, regional, and thematic strategies, evaluations, mid-term reviews, and final reports, as well as previous research etc. While there is no requirement for the main applicant to understand Swedish, the evaluation team should include someone with the ability to analyse documents written in Swedish.

General structure and conditions

EBA works under what is termed "double independence". This means that EBA defines which questions and areas are to be studied, independently of the MFA. At the same time, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations in each study are the responsibility of the author(s).

For all studies, EBA sets up a reference group consisting of experts in the field of study (members are designated by EBA in dialogue with the authors). The overall purpose of the reference group is to strengthen the quality of the report. The group will be chaired by one of the EBA members. For more information about EBA's work with reference groups, see the guidelines at our website: www.eba.se

The evaluator(s) shall deliver a report (in English) presenting the results from the study to be published in the EBA report series (www.eba.se/en/published-reports/). The length of the report should not exceed 40 000 words (about 80 A4-pages).

The evaluator(s) shall present preliminary results at a pre-launch meeting/workshop with the MFA, Sida, and EBA, and present the final report at a public dissemination event, preliminary to be held in Stockholm (details to be specified in consultation with EBA at a later stage).

Intended users

The primary target audience for this evaluation include those who work with anti-corruption at the MFA, Sida, and Swedish missions abroad. The study is also expected to be of interest to other bilateral and multilateral aid donors as well as civil society organisations and non-governmental organisations that work with anti-corruption.

The primary target audiences (MFA and Sida) will be invited to participate in the study's reference group in order to ensure the opportunity for process learning and successive feedback on the study process and results.

Procurement procedure, budget, and timetable

The procedure will be a restricted procedure in two stages.⁴ At both stages, tenderers are expected to disclose potential conflicts of interest pertaining to members in the evaluation team, as this may be a ground for exclusion of a proposal.

First stage: Application to submit tenders

All suppliers have the right to apply to submit tenders (expression of interest). EBA will invite five (5) suppliers to submit tenders.

Applications to submit tenders shall be registered at the tender portal Kommers Annons eLite www.kommersannons.se/elite, no later than 25 May 2022. The application shall contain:

1. CV of the team leader/principal investigator.
2. A list of the team leader/principal investigator's most relevant publications (at most 10 studies from the last 10 years are to be listed).
3. Preliminary team (if more than one author. Described using at most 300 words.).
4. Three sample studies conducted by members of the proposed team. At least one shall have been authored by the team leader/principal investigator. Note that the studies should be sent in as files, not as links in a document.
5. A short account for how, according to the authors, respective study has contributed to new, reliable knowledge of relevance for this evaluation (at most 300 words, i.e. 100 words per study).

Applicants are kindly asked not to submit any unsolicited material.

Selection of applicants to invite to submit tenders will be based on the submitted material assessed against sub-criteria 1-4 of criterion 2 (see the table at the end of this document).

⁴ The Public Procurement Act (2016:1145), chapter 6, section 3.

Since the proposed team is preliminary, main weight will be put on the team leader/principal investigator's experience and competence.

Suppliers must submit a self-declaration in the form of a European Single Procurement Document (ESPD) by filling in the tender form at www.kommersannons.se/elite. Please make sure enough time is allocated for completing the ESPD form when submitting the expression of interest.

Second stage: Submission of tenders

Selected suppliers are invited to submit a full proposal. The proposal shall be written in English and no longer than 15 pages. The proposal shall include a detailed presentation of study design, methods used, and delimitations. Choices made shall be clearly justified. The proposal shall also include a presentation of the members of the evaluation team, a detailed schedule, allocation of time and tasks between the members of the group, and a budget (stated in SEK, including price per hour for each team member).

As appendices to the proposal shall be included: (i) CVs; (ii) at most three sample studies (reports or articles) carried out by members of the proposed team. At least one shall have been authored by the team leader/principal investigator. These studies may be the same as or different from the ones in the first stage; (iii) A brief account for how, according to the authors, respective study has contributed to new, reliable, knowledge of relevance for this evaluation (at most 300 words, i.e. 100 words per study, may be the same as or different from the application to submit tenders).

The maximum cost for this evaluation is SEK 2 000 000 excl. VAT. The budget shall be denominated in SEK. The budget shall enable three to four meetings with the study's reference group (to be appointed by EBA following dialogue with the authors), a workshop in Stockholm, and participation at the launching event. The reference group will meet in Stockholm, but one or two meetings may be conducted by video link.

Tenderers shall give an account of all potential conflicts of interest pertaining to members in the evaluation team, as this may be a ground for excluding tenders.

The proposal shall be registered at the tender portal Kommers Annonns eLite www.kommersannons.se/elite, no later than 7 September 2022. Tenderers are advised to monitor the tender portal regularly, as it is not possible to guarantee the receipt of e-mails.

Proposals shall be valid until 31 December 2022.

Questions to EBA during the process

During the procurement process, EBA is not permitted to discuss documentation, tenders, evaluation, or any such questions with tenderers in a way that benefits one or more tenderers. All questions shall be sent to the Questions and Answers function on the procurement portal Kommers Annonns eLite, www.kommersannons.se/elite. Questions and answers to questions are published anonymously and simultaneously to everyone registered for the procurement.

Questions related to the first stage may be posed until 18 May 2022.

Questions related to the second stage may be posed until 29 August 2022.

Preliminary timetable

Last day to apply to submit tenders	25 May 2022
Invitation to (5) suppliers to submit tenders	13 June 2022 (at the latest)
Last day to submit tender	7 September 2022
Decision by EBA	October 2022
Contract signed	October 2022
Presentation of preliminary findings	May 2023
Final report delivered	September 2023
Launch event	December 2023

Selection of proposals in the second stage

An assessment group comprising members of EBA will assess proposals received based on the relationship between price and quality. The following criteria will be used when assessing proposals received:

- Quality of proposal, in terms of design, methods, and plan for implementation (weight: 50 per cent).
- Experiences and qualifications of team members in the areas of interest (weight: 40 per cent).
- Cost (weight: 10 per cent).

See the table at the end of this document for the factors that will be considered under each of these three criteria. The assessment of each proposal will be based on the material submitted by the tenderer by the end of the bidding period.

Confidentiality

After the communication of EBA's selection, all submitted proposals will become official documents, meaning that the Swedish principle of public access to official records applies. Sentences, sections, or paragraphs in a document may be masked in the public version if "good reasons" (thorough motivations in terms of causing economic damage to the company) can be provided and deemed valid. The tenderers are fully responsible for making their claims of confidentiality.

About the Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA)

The Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA) is a government committee mandated to evaluate and analyse the direction, governance, and implementation of Sweden's official development assistance. The aim is to contribute to an efficient implementation of well-designed aid. EBA focuses primarily on overarching issues within Swedish development assistance, not on individual projects. EBA consists of an expert group of ten members, an expert from the MFA, and a secretariat placed in Stockholm.

In 2022, the Expert Group consists of: Helena Lindholm (chair), Johan Schaar (vice chair), Kim Forss, Torgny Holmgren, Sara Johansson De Silva, Staffan I. Lindberg, Magnus

Lindell, Joakim Molander, Julia Schalk, Janet Vähämäki and Anders Trojenborg (adjunct expert from the Swedish MFA).

References

- Eldén, Å., D. Calvo, E. Bjarnegård, S. Lundgren and S. Jonsson (2020), Sextortion: Corruption and Gender-Based Violence, EBA Report 2020:06, the Expert Group for Aid Studies (EBA), Sweden, Sextortion: Corruption and Gender-Based Violence | EBA.
- European Court of Auditors (2022), EU-stöd för rättsstaten på västra Balkan: grundläggande problem kvarstår trots ansträngningar, Särskild rapport 01/2022, Special Report 01/2022: EU support for the rule of law in the Western Balkans (europa.eu).
- Mason, P. (2021), Reassessing donor performance in anti-corruption: Pathways to more effective practice, U4 Issue 2021:1, U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Center, Chr. Michelsen Institute, reassessing-donor-performance-in-anti-corruption.pdf (u4.no).
- Mungiu-Pippidi, A. (2017), Seven Steps to Evidence-Based Anti-corruption: A Roadmap, EBA Rapport 2017:10, Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys (EBA), Sverige, Seven Steps to Evidence-Based Anti-corruption: A Roadmap | EBA
- Poate, D. och Vaillant, C. (2011), Joint Evaluation of Support to Anti-Corruption Efforts 2002-2009, Report 6/2011 – Synthesis, joint-evaluation-of-support-to-anti-corruption-efforts-2002-2009.pdf (norad.no)
- Poate, D., Harnett, P., Ahmed, I., Vega, M. och Velasquez, J. L. (2011), Joint Evaluation of Support to Anti-Corruption Efforts: Nicaragua Country Report, Norad Report 6/2011 – Study, joint-evaluation-of-support-to-anti-corruption-efforts-nicaragua-country-report.pdf (norad.no).
- Poate, D., Vaillant, C., Ahmed, I., Mansfield, D., Hoque, M. och Khan, M. R. (2011), Joint Evaluation of Support to Anti-Corruption Efforts: Bangladesh Country Report, Norad Report 6/2011 – Study, joint-evaluation-of-support-to-anti-corruption-efforts-bangladesh-country-report.pdf (norad.no).
- Regeringskansliet (2021), Ett utvecklat arbete mot korruption i den offentliga förvaltningen: Handlingsplan mot korruption 2021–2023, handlingsplan-mot-korruption-20212023.pdf (regeringen.se).
- Regeringskansliet (2019), "Demokratisatsningen tar form", Demokratisatsningen tar form - Regeringen.se.
- Ronceraj, M. och Sergejeff, K. (2020) Pushing on a string or pulling threads together? Lessons learned for anti-corruption efforts by European donors, ECDPM discussion paper No. 279, Pushing on a string or pulling threads together? Lessons learned for anti-corruption efforts by European donors – ECDPM.
- Rothstein, B., och Tannenbergh, M. (2015), Making Development Work: The Quality of Government Approach, EBA Rapport 2015:07, Expertgruppen för biståndsanalys (EBA), Sverige, Making Development Work: The Quality of Government Approach | EBA
- Sida (2019a) Guidance for Sidas work with corruption as a development obstacle 2019, Sida.

Sida (2019b). Årsrapport 2018: Sidas hantering av korruptionsmisstankar, Sidas hantering av korruptionsmisstankar 2018.

Sida (2020b). Årsrapport 2019: Sidas hantering av misstankar om korruption och oegentligheter i biståndet.

Sida (2020a), Action Plan for preventing and mitigating corruption 2020-2023, Sida.

Sida (2021), Corruption as a development obstacle: Guidance for Sida's work, Sida.

Sida (2022), Sidas årsredovisning 2021.

Sveriges Regering (2016), Regeringens skrivelse 2016/17:60 Policyramverk för svenskt utvecklingssamarbete och humanitärt bistånd, policyramverk-for-svenskt-utvecklingssamarbete-och-humanitart-bistand.pdf (regeringen.se).

Vaillant, C., Buch Christensen, M., Pyman, M., Sundet, G., och Smed, L. (2020), Evaluation of Norway's Anti-Corruption Efforts as part of its Development Policy and Assistance, Norad Evaluation Department Report 5/2020, Norad, report-5-2020-evaluation-of-norway-anti-corruption-efforts-as-part-of-its-development-policy-and-assistance-main-report.pdf (norad.no)

Appendix 1 – Assessment criteria

Criteria	1. Quality of proposal in terms of design, methods, and plan for implementation. (Weight: 50 per cent)	2. Experiences and qualifications of team members in the areas of interest. (Weight: 40 per cent)	3. Cost. (Weight: 10 per cent)
Scale	<p>Criterion 1 and 2 are graded on a scale of 0–5 where: 5=Extraordinary or exceeds all expectation; 4=Very good; 3=Good; 2=Fair, reasonable, in line with what can be expected; 1=Sub-standard; 0=Not applicable/not possible to assess. Sub-criteria are assessed in falling importance according to number but are not graded numerically.</p> <p>Each criterion is finally weighted (0.50*Criterion 1+ 0,40*Criterion 2 + 0,10*Criterion 3) to obtain a total grade in the interval [0, 5].</p>		Continuous grade [0,5] as a share of the lowest bid offer, where the lowest bid is graded 5.
Specifications <i>(numbered in order of importance)</i>	<p>1. Does the study design, i.e. suggested methodological approach and plan for implementation, make it possible to fulfill the study's purpose?*</p> <p>2. Have the approach and method(s) been described in a specific and transparent manner?</p> <p>3. Have important or pertinent limitations with the method been described and discussed clearly?</p> <p>4. Will the study design enable conclusions that can be expected to form the basis of use, learning, and reflection among the study's target groups?</p> <p>5. Does the proposal have a thorough and realistic workplan and timeline?</p> <p>* An overall assessment that the evaluation is feasible to implement and that it can be implemented without any ethical breaches occurring is presupposed. While such an appraisal is required, it is not included as a separate sub-criterion.</p>	<p>The team participants' experience of:*</p> <p>1) Evaluation or research in areas related to the topic, i.e. corruption and anti-corruption; anti-corruption policy and practice in development cooperation; political institutions and governance; democracy and democratisation;</p> <p>2) Advanced evaluation or research methodology;</p> <p>3) Development cooperation, especially related to democratisation and anti-corruption;</p> <p>3) Quality of previous evaluations/studies conducted by team members (based on studies attached to the proposal);</p> <p>4) Academic merits of the team members;</p> <p>5) The team members' engagement in the evaluation as specified in the proposal's work and time plan and as shares of proposed budget</p> <p>* Sufficient language skills in relation to the needs of the assignment are required to be shown and are therefore not specified as a separate sub-criterion.</p>	Total price in SEK (VAT excl.)