

## The Global Integrity Anti-Corruption Evidence Programme (GI-ACE)

The Global Integrity Anti-Corruption Evidence Programme (GI-ACE) supports 14 research partners around the world in generating actionable evidence that policy makers, practitioners, and advocates can use to design and implement more effective anti-corruption programmes. Each research team is led by a principal investigator and falls under one, or more, themes around which the programme is built.

### Rationale for the programme

It is increasingly recognised that most of the established, top-down technical and regulatory approaches to tackling corruption implemented over recent decades have a very poor record of success ([DFID 2015](#)). In response, there is a growing number of calls ([Heywood 2018](#)) for more flexible and imaginative interventions that take account of the complexity of how corruption operates in practice and of the importance of understanding contextual factors (see also, Global Integrity 2016 on “[Doing Anti-Corruption differently](#)”), as well as new investments in research to inform the design and implementation of such interventions. To inform practitioners’ efforts to deliver on the desired outcomes, such research must be operationally relevant, problem-driven, rigorous and actionable.

### Three Anti-Corruption Themes

#### Addressing the international legal & financial architecture supporting corruption

The first theme explores the link between high-level corruption and the enabling international architecture that supports illicit financial flows and the role of professional intermediaries such as agents, accountants and lawyers facilitating purchases of property and luxury goods, exploitation of tax regimes, and the use of offshore facilities.

[Dan Haberly](#) (University of Sussex) explores the effects of moves to create greater transparency in offshore secrecy jurisdictions to understand how they contribute to financial reform efforts. [Jacqueline Harvey](#) (Northumbria University) focuses on how to meet the challenges of developing systems to increase transparency and trace beneficial ownership in Nigeria. [John Heathershaw](#) (University of Exeter) assesses the effectiveness of the international Anti-Money Laundering regime, focusing on countering the use of shell companies in six jurisdictions in Africa and Asia. [Thorsten Chmura](#) (Nottingham Trent University) runs an experimental economics project that looks at the interrelationship between the international anti-corruption legal architecture and local social norms and beliefs. Finally, [Liz Dávid-Barrett](#) (University of Sussex) explores the regulatory

---

framework of donor recipient countries and their interaction with donor regulations, looking to extend their innovative analysis of ‘red flag’ risks revealed by the [big data analysis of procurement](#).

### **Promoting integrity & systems of integrity management**

Integrity is more than simply an absence of corruption. There is a need to understand better how integrity can be positively identified and promoted in both the public and the private sectors, so as to build effective models of integrity management – formal frameworks that ensure stakeholders proactively engage in ethical behaviour whilst also complying with legal norms.

[Mark Buntaine](#) (University of California, Santa Barbara) runs field experiments to explore how civic expectations may be realigned to counteract corruption, focusing on western Uganda. [Jacqueline Klopp](#) (Columbia University) uses randomized controlled trials to explore the functioning of [Sauti](#) (a mobile platform) in assisting traders to address corruption on the Kenya-Uganda border. [Vanessa Watson](#) (University of Cape Town) explores the link between urban planning and corruption, focusing on how to support the promotion of professional integrity as an anti-corruption strategy in Zambia and South Africa. [Jan Meyer-Sahling](#) (University of Nottingham) uses randomized controlled trials to develop his work on [civil service management practices](#) focusing on ethics training in Nepal and Bangladesh.

### **Corruption at sub national and sectoral level**

Studies of corruption and anti-corruption have generally focused on nation states as their unit of analysis. While this work has been valuable in identifying broad patterns, it can mask variation in corruption at the sub-national level and between different sectors.

[Gerhard Anders](#) (University of Edinburgh) leads a comparative study of law enforcement and the prosecution of high-level corruption in Nigeria, Tanzania and Malawi, looking at the effectiveness of particular legal tools. [Claudia Baez Camargo](#) (Basel Institute of Governance) works with colleagues to develop an experimental approach to test behavioural interventions in the Tanzanian health sector, looking to harness social networks through ‘governance clubs’. [Amrita Dhillon](#) (King’s College London) explores different auditing mechanisms as tools to ensure effective public service delivery in Indian states. [Ryan Jablonski](#) (London School of Economics) leads a team that evaluates different mechanisms, including the use of innovative technology, to reduce drug theft in Malawi.

To engage and to learn more about the programme, please email [johannes.tonn@globalintegrity.org](mailto:johannes.tonn@globalintegrity.org) and [paul.heywood@globalintegrity.org](mailto:paul.heywood@globalintegrity.org)