

**Workshop for Anti-Corruption Agencies of Kosovo/1244, FYR Macedonia, Montenegro and Turkey:
Country-owned assessments in support of national anti-corruption strategies**

Oslo, 27-29 October 2009

A. Objectives of the workshop

This workshop, held on 27-29 October by the [Global Programme on Democratic Governance Assessments](#) (Oslo Governance Centre) in collaboration with the Regional Centre in Bratislava, was organized in response to a growing demand and interest on the part of national anti-corruption agencies (ACAs) in strengthening their monitoring capacities.

In addition to tracking progress in the implementation of national anti-corruption strategies, there is an opportunity for ACAs to play a more active role in the reporting processes related to the **implementation of UNCAC** and to the **EU accession process** (the political criteria for EU accession include anti-corruption).

More specifically, the workshop aimed at:

- ***Increasing awareness of existing corruption and integrity assessment tools***, distinguishing their focus (i.e. methods for assessing the incidence of corruption, the impact of corruption, and the effectiveness of anti-corruption mechanisms), considering different data collection methods and information sources (data sources on de jure provisions vs. de facto implementation), and appreciating various modalities of engagement with other state and non-state actors in conducting such research;
- ***Strengthening ACA's capacities to manage the processes related to corruption monitoring***, with emphasis on the principles of national ownership, inclusive and participative consultations, focus on pro-poor and gender sensitive dimensions of integrity, and use of assessment results by policymakers in the design and implementation of reforms;
- ***Exploring the opportunity offered by the UNCAC and its 'self-assessment checklist'*** to undertake a more comprehensive and evidence-based diagnosis in areas of particular concern to a country (incl. an introduction to relevant tools matching individual UNCAC provisions under Chapter 2 on Preventive Measures);
- ***Exposing the delegations to corruption prevention, investigation and monitoring practices in Norway***, through exposure to the work of the Office of the Auditor General of Norway and to the anti-corruption project of Norad.



Four national ACAs participated in the workshop:

1. The Kosovo Anti-Corruption Agency (KACA)
2. The State Commission for the Prevention of Corruption (SCPC) of FYR Macedonia
3. The Directorate for Anti-Corruption Initiative (DACI) of Montenegro
4. The Prime Minister's Inspection Board of Turkey

Oslo, 27-29 October 2009

B. Key points made during presentations & discussions

- 1. ACAs could play a useful role in educating the media, policymakers and the public about global corruption indicators and rankings, what they *really* measure, their methodological limitations, and their relevance to the *national* context.**

Global composite indicators on corruption/governance that rank countries and track changes over time are useful advocacy tools for ‘naming and shaming’ the governments seen to be the worst corruption offenders. However, such indicators with similar sounding ‘labels’ are in fact assessing very different concepts. It is therefore important to ‘dig underneath’ by asking: What are the underlying questions or component indicators that have gone into generating the index score? Who were the respondents? How many sources (i.e. various surveys making up the index) were available for your country, compared to other countries? Were the sources used last year the same as the ones used this year? As part of their awareness-raising functions, ACAs see an important role for themselves in disseminating such analysis at the time of the release of popular international rankings.

- 2. Measuring ‘*resistance to corruption*’ (instead of assessing incidence/perception of corruption) by collecting *objective* data on anti-corruption mechanisms has proven to be an effective way to secure the political buy-in of government stakeholders in establishing an anti-corruption monitoring system**

The ‘risk-based’ assessment approach piloted at the municipal level in [Macedonia](#) (in the areas of procurement, public financial management and urban planning) generated high interest amongst participating agencies. Several agencies indicated that they would like to develop similar monitoring systems, adapted to their national context. The Macedonian methodology maps corruption risks along a service delivery chain, identifies corresponding anti-corruption mechanisms (to counter the identified risks), and selects indicators to monitor the effectiveness of such mechanisms, which are in turn quantified using very specific scoring criteria.

- 3. ACAs would like to learn more about the extensive range of assessment tools which already exist. With some adjustments, these ‘ready-made’ tools could save much time and resources to ACAs and other national institutions involved in corruption research & monitoring work.**

Many existing corruption assessment methodologies can provide templates for a research design and even indicators and data sources: there is no point in ‘reinventing the wheel’! A brief overview of such tools was provided during the workshop (e.g. survey-based tools for measuring corruption in the public and private sectors, diagnostic assessment tools for the justice system, for monitoring transparency in political party finance, or in the budget process, etc.) A suggestion was made to hold a regional training (for ACAs and concerned national partners) specifically aimed at explaining how to use these tools and how to customize them to national settings.

**Workshop for Anti-Corruption Agencies of Kosovo/1244, FYR Macedonia, Montenegro and Turkey:
Country-owned assessments in support of national anti-corruption strategies**

Oslo, 27-29 October 2009

- 4. Seeing the potential of the UNCAC 'self-assessment checklist' as an opportunity to institutionalize a more comprehensive and evidence-based diagnosis of corruption and to strengthen partnerships with other data collecting institutions, ACAs indicated that they would like to play a more active role in the UNCAC reporting process.**

The majority of ACAs are not actively involved in the UNCAC self-assessment process (which requires State Parties to report back on their efforts to implement the Convention by completing a 'self-assessment checklist'). The process of filling out the checklist is often led by the executive branch (often by the Ministry of Justice) with limited consultation with other state and/or non-state actors. The information-gathering process is rarely inclusive of the wide range of existing data sources, and gathers mainly *de jure* information (e.g. changes in laws, establishment of new institutions, etc.), with little information provided on the *de facto* implementation of such laws. Nonetheless, the UNCAC self-assessment checklist presents genuine opportunities. If conducted in a thorough and inclusive manner, the mere process of gathering information to respond to the checklist can serve as a first step towards the development of systematic anti-corruption monitoring processes. Some of the participating ACAs indicated that they would engage with their national focal point for the UNCAC to explore such possibilities.

- 5. There is a need for national institutions (especially ACAs) to take ownership of the anti-corruption reform agenda under the EU accession process, instead of letting it be driven by the so-called 'progress reports' produced periodically by the EC.**

While the progress reports produced by the EC focus mainly on legislative reforms and the establishment of new institutions, such 'quick fixes' may not be sustainable. Experience in the region has shown that anti-corruption efforts that shortcut existing institutions and/or that have an excessive legalistic focus may be counterproductive. In other words, "Better slower sustainable progress than temporary fixes and quick results that don't stick." The progress reports should not derail attention from the implementation of a long-term anti-corruption strategy with a strong prevention focus. This requires more in-depth research to unveil patterns of informality and *actual* practice, and to monitor *impact* of reforms; ACAs have an important role to play in generating and disseminating such knowledge.

**Workshop for Anti-Corruption Agencies of Kosovo/1244, FYR Macedonia, Montenegro and Turkey:
Country-owned assessments in support of national anti-corruption strategies**

Oslo, 27-29 October 2009

C. Next steps

	Proposed follow-up activities, with support from UNDP country office, Regional Bratislava Centre, and Oslo Governance Centre
Kosovo Anti-Corruption Agency (KACA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently finalizing legislation in 3 areas: conflict of interest, assets of senior officials, and the national anti-corruption agency. Also revising existing legislation related to the criminal court. • Upcoming conference to be held in Montenegro (24-25 November) will allow for regional experience-sharing on the implementation of such laws (agencies from the three other participating countries in the Oslo workshop are invited and all three already have legislation in these areas) • One outcome of this conference will be to establish a regional network of ACAs to increase experience-sharing amongst ACAs across the region • Need to increase KACA's capacity for using corruption assessment tools (KACA has the mandate to collect information on the incidence, drivers and trends in corruption)
State Commission for the Prevention of Corruption (SCPC) of FYR Macedonia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While having adequate competencies, continued international cooperation in the form of financial assistance is needed by SCPC to be able to carry out its planned activities • Apply the assessment approach piloted under the RTA methodology to other sectors (e.g. judiciary, construction, etc.) • In-depth training on existing corruption/integrity assessment tools in selected sectors – particular interest in the CRINIS tool for monitoring political party financing • Invite all relevant institutions to discuss the UNCAC reporting process (in FYR Macedonia and perhaps explore the possibility of increasing the range of actors and data sources contributing to this process) • Interested in assessment methods for monitoring corruption in the private sector • Invited Turkey (currently finalizing its anti-corruption strategy) for cross-country learning • Hosting a conference in February on conflict of interest and asset declaration
Directorate for Anti-Corruption Initiative (DACI) of Montenegro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in-house capacity for conducting sectoral research on corruption (currently outsourced): While field work / data collection would continue to be outsourced, DACI would like to take a more active role in the design of assessment methodologies, in data analysis of results, and in the communication of results • Sensitize policymakers, the media and the wider public to the distinct measurement focus of various international ranking indicators on governance & corruption which attract media attention (CPI, Global Integrity Index, etc.); improve their 'correct' understanding (in the national context) and potential misuses of such rankings and indicator scores

**Workshop for Anti-Corruption Agencies of Kosovo/1244, FYR Macedonia, Montenegro and Turkey:
Country-owned assessments in support of national anti-corruption strategies**

Oslo, 27-29 October 2009

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop an 'integrity assessment tool' to monitor 'corruption risks' at the local level (similar to the RTA methodology developed in Macedonia)• In-depth training on existing corruption/integrity assessment tools
Prime Minister's Inspection Board of Turkey	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop a communication strategy to raise awareness of Turkey's newly developed anti-corruption strategy, and of the mandate of the Prime Minister's Inspection Board• Conduct a capacity assessment of the Prime Minister's Inspection Board to develop a capacity development strategy• Consider the development of an 'integrity assessment tool' to monitor 'corruption risks' at the local level (similar to the RTA methodology developed in Macedonia)• Partner with Turkey's National Statistical Office which has expressed interest in developing a national index on corruption (drawing from surveys conducted by local governments and from data collected by NGOs)