

**DIRECTION DE LA GOUVERNANCE PUBLIQUE ET DU DEVELOPPEMENT TERRITORIAL  
PUBLIC GOVERNANCE AND TERRITORIAL DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORATE  
COMITE DE LA GOUVERNANCE PUBLIQUE  
PUBLIC GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

**FICHES DE DONNÉES PAR PAYS  
COUNTRY FACTSHEETS**

**Symposium : Comment évaluer les mesures visant à promouvoir l'intégrité  
et à prévenir la corruption dans le service public  
Symposium on How to Assess Measures for Promoting Integrity  
and Preventing Corruption in the Public Service**

**9-10 septembre 2004  
9-10 September 2004**

*Ces fiches de données ont été préparées par les pays participants afin de donner des informations sur les aspects clés des leurs initiatives en matière d'évaluation afin de favoriser les discussions.*

*These country factsheets were prepared by participating countries to provide information on key aspects of their assessment initiatives in order to support the discussions.*

For further information, please contact / Pour de plus amples informations, veuillez prendre contact avec Janos Bertok, Tel: +33 1 45 93 57; email: [janos.bertok@oecd.org](mailto:janos.bertok@oecd.org)

**JT00168727**



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

AUSTRALIA .....	3
BRAZIL .....	7
CZECH REPUBLIC .....	9
HUNGARY.....	12
ITALY.....	13
NORWAY.....	14
POLAND .....	15
SLOVENIA.....	17
SPAIN / ESPAGNE .....	20
TURKEY .....	21
UNITED STATES .....	24
CENTER FOR PUBLIC INTEGRITY .....	28

## AUSTRALIA

### Organisation: Australian Public Service Commission

#### General context:

Values in Agencies Project – investigated how a sample of Australian Public Service (APS) agencies were integrating the APS Values and Code of Conduct into their systems and procedures, and their effectiveness in ensuring that APS employees understand and apply the Values and Code of Conduct.

	<b>Initiative</b>
<p>1. WHY assess integrity measures?</p> <p><b>Aims</b> of the assessment</p>	<p>The overarching aim was to help maintain public trust and confidence in a professional Australian Public Service.</p> <p>The Public Service Commissioner has responsibilities under section 41(a) and (b) of the <i>Public Service Act 1999</i> to evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent to which Agencies incorporate and uphold the APS Values; and</li> <li>• The adequacy of systems and procedures in Agencies for ensuring compliance with the Code of Conduct.</li> </ul> <p>The assessment was designed to evaluate the extent to which the APS Values and Code of Conduct were being embedded into agencies, and to share good practice by producing a guide for APS-wide use. It was the first targeted, issues-based evaluation project conducted by the APS Commission as part of an increased focus on evaluation and quality assurance.</p>
<p>2. WHAT has been assessed?</p> <p><b>Subjects</b></p>	<p>The <i>Public Service Act 1999</i> (PS Act) gives legislative effect to the Australian Government’s public service employment framework based on a clearly defined set of shared Values and a Code of Conduct for all APS employees in the context of devolution and flexibility balanced by increased accountability.</p> <p>The PS Act also requires Agency Heads to promote and uphold the APS Values and gives them responsibility for putting in place systems and procedures necessary for maintaining the APS Values and the Code.</p> <p>The assessment identified the extent to which six APS agencies had integrated the APS Values and Code of Conduct into their culture, systems and procedures and their effectiveness in ensuring that APS employees understood and applied the APS Values and the Code.</p> <p>At the Australian Public Service Commissioner’s invitation, six agencies agreed to participate on the project. These agencies were selected as being a representative sample of the APS, ranging in function, size and location.</p>

<p>3. WHEN? <b>Timeframe</b></p>	<p>The studies of the six agencies was carried out in the latter half of 2002 and early 2003. The resulting good practice guide was released in August 2003.</p>
<p>4. By WHOM?</p>	<p>The project was commissioned by the Australian Public Service Commissioner. The research was undertaken by a project team of staff within the APS Commission, under the guidance of a reference group (consisting of the Heads of the six participating agencies) which advised the Commissioner on the parameters of the study, methodology and the content of the proposed good practice guide.</p>
<p>5. HOW to assess? <b>Methodology and Procedures</b></p>	<p>The project team undertook a review of the literature on Australian and international values-based management, including evaluating the embedding of values. The Team also reviewed a range of core documents provided by the six agencies, such as corporate plans, annual reports, industrial agreements, and certain policies.</p> <p>Agencies were then asked a series of structured questions (through interviews with senior staff) about the APS Values and the Code of Conduct to identify the approach taken by each agency to embedding the Values and the Code and to make an assessment of possible strengths and weaknesses. The project team also interviewed the Agency Heads of five of the six agencies. Depending on the responses to the structured questions additional policies, instructions or documents such as client and staff surveys were examined.</p> <p>Following analysis of this information from agencies, qualitative research was conducted in the form of focus groups with a sample of staff to test the effectiveness of the six agencies' strategies, policies, systems and guidance. In addition, a sample of senior executive staff from each agency was personally interviewed. Where an agency had a significant regional presence, interviews and focus groups were conducted in a sample of regional offices.</p> <p>To assist the qualitative phase, the fifteen APS Values were grouped into four broad headings based on the key relationships and behaviours they affect. (see <a href="http://www.apsc.gov.au/values/executivesummary.htm">www.apsc.gov.au/values/executivesummary.htm</a>)</p>
<p>6. IMPACT? <b>How was assessment used?</b></p>	<p>The study concluded that a strategic and integrated approach is required to promote and maintain a values-based culture within an organisation. To assist agencies with this task, the Commission developed 'The APS Values Framework' and accompanying checklist to be used by Agency Heads and senior executives as a tool for explaining the Values to employees and for assessing performance and identifying areas where more emphasis and attention is required. (see <a href="http://www.apsc.gov.au/values/framework.htm">www.apsc.gov.au/values/framework.htm</a>)</p> <p>The APS Values Framework is described in detail in the APS Commission management guide for senior staff, <i>Embedding the APS Values</i>. This publication is illustrated with case studies from the six APS agencies, and forms part of a suite of publications, including new guidelines on official conduct, released in August 2003. All publications are available at the Commission's website: <a href="http://www.apsc.gov.au">www.apsc.gov.au</a></p>

<p>7. LESSONS learned and FUTURE PLANS</p>	<p><b>LESSONS LEARNED</b></p> <p>(i) Effectively implemented, a values-based framework can provide the flexibility needed for public service agencies to implement their different business tasks and respond quickly to changing circumstances without compromising public confidence in the standards of conduct of public servants.</p> <p>A strong professional ethos is essential to good public administration. Once established such an ethos can be maintained without detailed rules which can restrict flexibility, response times and creativity. The clear articulation of the APS Values and Code of Conduct in legislation provides a sound framework for preserving the professionalism of public servants, with the Commission providing assurance to Parliament and the public that the APS is performing effectively and consistently with the Values through transparent evaluation measures.</p> <p>(ii) Effective embedding of values into public service agencies requires an integrated approach and active promotion of values in a practical way.</p> <p>Agency Heads and senior executives are required to promote and uphold the Values and are bound by the Code of Conduct. The Commission has worked in close consultation with agencies to provide guidance and practical tools on embedding values in their organisations. It is based on the experience of APS agencies and international evidence about values-based management. It provides a simple way of explaining the Values in terms relationships and behaviours, sets out how the Values can be promoted, managed and assured and argues that this should be done in an integrated way in agencies, whatever their particular business responsibilities.</p> <p>(iii) Leadership is essential to the success of reform and continued confidence in the professionalism of the public service.</p> <p>The most effective way of undermining values is for senior managers to silently contradict them through their personal behaviour. The most effective way of building the Values into organisational culture is by both making them explicit and explicitly putting them into practice. This means APS leaders must raise awareness of and role model the Values. In addition to the senior management guide on embedding values, the Commission has provided agencies with a model for leadership capability building which explicitly recognises the values-based management approach, while meeting agencies' needs for senior management of their businesses.</p> <p>(iv) The public service needs to be agile, flexible and innovative, but also resilient, if it is to continue to perform its functions effectively.</p> <p>Australia's recent reform experience has recognised that the rapid pace of technological advance and its ensuing social, political and economic impacts have created an environment of unprecedented complexity and fluidity. To help the public service to position itself to be responsive to the immediate agendas of government and the public, and to look to the future benefit of society to ensure that governments</p>
--	---

	<p>can also address longer-term issues, the Commission has pursued strengthened evaluation measures to provide the Government, Parliament and the public with assurance that the APS is performing effectively and consistently with the APS Values. (It has also worked closely with agencies to guide and support them in key areas such as workforce planning, performance management and HR capability development to ensure that the APS has the capability to continue delivering into the future.)</p> <p>(v) Innovation and improved performance in a devolved system depends upon a firm accountability regime where the various management systems are continually refined to provide a ‘clear line of sight’ and where there is a coherent integrity base.</p> <p>Every management reform initiative needs a ‘clear line of sight’ back to the business outcomes to be achieved. Each also needs to be firmly based on the APS Values which articulate the role of the APS as an apolitical, efficient and effective institution in our democratic system of Government.</p> <p><b>FUTURE PLANS</b></p> <p>As a result of the findings of the Values in Agencies project, the APS Commission is designing a learning and development kit to assist agencies to guide employees in workplace discussion of values and ethics. The kit will be released in the first half of 2005.</p> <p>In addition, the Commission has developed a program of targeted specific-issues evaluations. For example, the program for 2004-05 includes the release of good practice guide resulting from an evaluation of agency management of suspected breaches of the Code of Conduct, and the release of a paper-based evaluation of agency workplace diversity programs.</p> <p>The Commission will continue to publish annually a report on the State of the Service which, as well as a survey of agencies, included for the first time in 2002-2003 an on-line survey of APS employees from agencies with more than 100 employees. The Report covers a range of issues, including matters relating to the embedding of the APS Values and the Code.</p>
--	--

## BRAZIL

### Organisation: Brazilian Commission on Public Ethics

#### General context:

The main assessment initiative is about the management of ethics in the agencies of the Federal Executive branch (based mainly on the OECD's Ethics Infrastructure and on the National Quality Award Criteria of Management), described in item c. The assessment of susceptibility of agencies to ethics deviation is another initiative.

	<b>Initiatives No. 1. &amp; No. 2.</b>
1. WHY assess integrity measures? <b>Aims</b> of the assessment	The aims of assessment are finding out whether objectives were reached, adjusting policy and practice, documenting experiences and reacting to specific situations. The objective is to know if the agencies are implementing the management of ethics programs.
2. WHAT has been assessed? <b>Subjects</b>	The <b>subject</b> of assessment are: risk factors, vulnerable areas; implementation of legal instruments, codes of conduct, administrative procedures; programme and performance evaluation. All the agencies at the Federal Executive branch are involved (154 agencies participated).
3. WHEN? The <b>timeframe</b>	The assessment of the management of ethics is conducted ex-post. It happens approximately every six months, since 2001. It is not compulsory. Five cycles of assessment were done.
4. By WHOM?	The key actors who conducted the assessment are government organisations (internal evaluation unit).
5. HOW to assess? <b>Methodology</b> and <b>procedures</b>	<p>The development of the methodology is done by a Committee of experts, employees of the agencies and stakeholders (internal and external), that analyse alternative methods.</p> <p>The criteria and indicators were defined based mainly on the OECD's Ethics Infrastructure and on the National Quality Award Criteria of Management, for example on awareness familiarity with relevant rules, ethics programme and available counselling. The data are objective (statistics) and subjective data. The assessment is done by the agencies, with different information and tools to collect the data.</p>

<p>6. IMPACT How was assessment used?</p>	<p>The results of assessment were used by the Commission and agencies to improve the implementation of the ethics management, producing follow-up measures (procedures to adjust policy and practice). The aggregated data is communicated to all agencies and is available in the website of the Commission in order to give transparency.</p>
<p>7. LESSONS learned and FUTURE PLANS</p>	<p>The agencies with good practices were identified. A future plan for the assessment initiative is to start visiting the agencies in 2005 in order to verify the management of ethics programs.  The second assessment of susceptibility of agencies to ethics deviation will be done in 2004.</p>

The website of Commission is [www.presidencia.gov.br/etica](http://www.presidencia.gov.br/etica) (information is in Portuguese and some in English).



**CZECH REPUBLIC**

**The Czech Republic presents the assessment of measures for promoting integrity and preventing corruption within the Czech Office for Surveying, Mapping and Cadastre.**

<p>1. WHY assess integrity measures? <b>Aims</b> of the assessment</p>	<p>The objective of the respective measures is to eliminate the potential corruptive environment within the Czech Office for Surveying, Mapping and Cadastre, especially according to the so called “speed up” process.</p>
<p>2. WHAT has been assessed? <b>Subjects</b></p>	<p>The speed at which Land Registries enter in new records is considered to be the area showing the highest risk of corruption within the Czech Office for Surveying, Mapping and Cadastre. This issue concerns mainly those Land Registries where there are problems in observing the maximum permitted period of three months (Capital Prague and nearby districts).</p> <p>The term within which the competent Land Registry makes its decision is not decisive for a factual outcome of such a decision and it does not affect any legal consequences of such a record since the Land Registry examines the submitted documents as of the date on which they were submitted. Thus legal effects are backdated and are being valid as of the date on which the documents proposing the registration of a new owner were delivered to the Land Registry.</p> <p>Consequently, a bribe which is offered to accelerate records or to make preferential records cannot affect the final factual results, and such corruption may be motivated especially by the urgent need of clients to implement an intended real estate transaction as soon as possible. This means that processing of the request within the shortest possible term, which should be provided to all clients in an ideal situation, becomes a subject of corruption and the only advantage the relevant client gains. As a result fundamental measures preventing corruption are directed at all Land Registries, not only towards observing the determined terms but also towards their gradual shortening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Implementation of selected tools, such as legal instruments, codes of conduct, administrative procedures; and practices (e.g. recruitment, training and counselling);</li> </ul> <p>1. Norms, describing the development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The Reports on corruption in the Czech republic (for each particular year) and on meeting the schedule of measures adopted by the government programme for fight against corruption.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The Resolution No. 895 of 10<sup>th</sup> September 2003 the Proposal for Systematic Measures to Prevent Corruption within Land Registries.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> In December 2003 <i>the Agreement on Cooperation between the Ministry of the Interior and the Czech Office for Surveying, and Mapping and Cadastre</i> was signed. The contracting parties declared their will to intensify mutual cooperation in meeting tasks in investigating criminal offences, misdemeanours and other administrative infractions against the legal order in the field of surveying and maintaining the land register. The proposal of actual agreements focuses on the coordination of mutual cooperation in exchanging information, lodging reports on the</li> </ul>

	<p>commission of a crime, drawing up legislative, standard establishing and training documents, methodological procedures, as well as on cooperation at the regional level and cooperation with media, and in facilitating mutual contacts.</p> <p>2. Organisational measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Internal regulation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Personal changes</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Training of staff</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Code of ethics</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> New information system - There is a possibility for each citizen to check the state of his/her record on the web site (<a href="http://nahliznidokn.cuzk.cz/">http://nahliznidokn.cuzk.cz/</a>)</li> </ul> <p>Programme and performance evaluation (e.g. prevention programmes);</p> <p>Measures are designed as steps that can not be bypassed by the individual official.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Impact of integrity measures on organisational culture, values and behaviour (research of behaviour of public servants, changes in values of the public service).</li> </ul> <p>The internal culture of the Czech Office for Surveying, Mapping and Cadastre is now established as a transparent system, accessible and controllable by every single citizen (access to the system is free of charge).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The level (central or sub-national) and types of agencies involved; The size of the sample (organisations and persons) surveyed in the assessment.</li> </ul> <p>The scope of the approved measures was performance of overall system.</p>
<p>3. WHEN? The <b>timeframe</b></p>	<p>The Resolution No. 473 of 19 May 2003 the Report on corruption in the Czech republic in the year 2003 and on meeting the schedule of measures adopted by the government programme for fight against corruption imposed upon the head of the Czech Office for Surveying, Mapping and Cadastre a task to submit to the Government a proposal for systematic measures to prevent corruption within Land Registries.</p> <p>The Government approved by its Resolution No. 895 of 10 September 2003 the <i>Proposal for Systematic Measures to Prevent Corruption within Land Registries</i>. These measures are evaluated and supplemented every three months. The effectiveness of newly adopted measures is examined after 1 month.</p> <p>Overall assessment is done once a year in the framework of the Report on corruption in the Czech Republic (for each particular year) and on meeting the schedule of measures adopted by the government programme for fight against corruption.</p>

4. By WHOM?	<p>The assessment is done by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The Inspectorates of the Czech Office for Surveying, Mapping and Cadastre</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The Police of the Czech Republic</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Independent agencies</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Citizens (public awareness)</li> </ul>
5. HOW to assess? <b>Methodology and procedures</b>	<p>There are two types of assessment used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> self-assessment - based on the data collected by the Inspectorates of the Czech Office for Surveying, Mapping and Cadastre and official criminal statistics and findings of the authorities acting in criminal procedures (very few cases);</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> independent-assessment - there are sociological researches assigned to the independent agencies</li> </ul>
6. IMPACT How was assessment used?	<p>Outcomes of assessment are always reflected into the adjustment of original measures. This enables the reaching of the set goal (to prevent corruption).</p> <p>One of the sociological researches for example pointed out the fact that it was necessary to intensify public awareness of the activity and procedures used by the Land Registers.</p> <p>The results of assessment of the above mentioned measures could be used as a model for other problematic procedures in the Czech republic where the waiting for act of authorities is significant aspect.</p>
7. LESSONS learned and FUTURE PLANS	<p>The applied measures contributed to the reducing of corruption but did not solve the long waiting terms. This fact could be still considered as a possible source of corruption. For this reason it is appropriate to focus on solving it. Therefore, as a future plan, it would be interesting to monitor the system of Land Registers abroad, to collect and exchange information about their measures and outcomes.</p>

For further information, please consult the web site at:

<http://www.cuzk.cz/Dokument.aspx?TYPPRAC=CUZK&PRARESKOD=0&MENUID=10218&AKCE=DOC:20-ENG1>

The following documents are available on request:

1. Governmental programme 1999
2. Report on corruption in the year 2000
3. Report on corruption in the year 2001
4. Report on corruption in the year 2002
5. Report on corruption in the year 2003

## HUNGARY

**Organisation:** The Trade Union of Hungarian Civil Servants and Public Servants and the Ministry of Interior conducted a common survey on the ethical value orientation of civil servants, in 2002.

**General context:**

Results of the survey give us noteworthy information on the ethical status of the Hungarian civil servants that has been built in the drafts of Civil Service Code of Ethics.

	<b>Initiatives No. 1. &amp; No. 2.</b>
1. WHY assess integrity measures? <b>Aims</b> of the assessment	Since several theoretical studies and lectures held at professional conferences have addressed the issue of civil servants' ethics but we have had no empirical experiences as yet on what the civil servants themselves think, what ethical values they profess as their own and how they see the role of ethics and law in improving the ethical standards of public administration.
2. WHAT has been assessed? <b>Subjects</b>	e.g.: people's trust towards each other; how the legal rules protect civil servants against internal and external contestableness; what nature of the rules should characterise the ethical code of civil servants; ranking the values and principles of civil service; what is corruption; etc.
3. WHEN? <b>The timeframe</b>	It was arranged in 2002.
4. By WHOM?	The Trade Union of Hungarian Civil Servants and Public Servants and Ministry of Interior
5. HOW to assess? <b>Methodology and procedures</b>	The survey was settled by questionnaire. 309 returned questionnaires proved to be processible. The distribution of respondents according to the type of employer cannot be considered as representative. The rate of respondents from central public administration and cities is higher.
6. IMPACT How was assessment <b>used</b> ?	A national expert conference was held in the theme of ethics. Results help finalise the Civil Service Code of Ethics.
7. LESSONS learned and <b>FUTURE PLANS</b>	The survey has confirmed the necessity for creating an ethical code. The civil servants are open to the ethical issues. The improvement of the moral and ethical situation in public administration is highly dependent on the increase of trust. At macro level a precondition of this is to create foreseeability of the legislative and other conditions of the civil servant profession and the stability of the civil service career.

## ITALY

No organisation with the specific task of assessing measures for promoting integrity and preventing corruption in the public service has yet been instituted in Italy.

Law No.3 of 2003 instituted the “High Commissioner for preventing and opposing corruption and other forms of illegitimacy within the public administration” (*Alto Commissario per la prevenzione e il contrasto della corruzione e delle altre forme di illecito all’interno della pubblica amministrazione*) in conformity with the provisions of the International Convention against Corruption recently adopted by the United Nations.

This body – which enjoys inspective, cognitive and informative powers that integrate those already possessed by other control and inspection bodies both within and outside the public administrations – is also charged with performing functions of assessing measures for promoting integrity and preventing corruption in the public service and evaluating the adequacy of the instruments that the existing order provides for this purpose.

The instrument envisaged by law for rendering these assessment functions effective is the report that the High Commissioner is required to submit at half-yearly intervals to the Prime Minister, who in his turn is required each year to inform the Presidents of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies of the contents of these reports; the Prime Minister’s report constitutes a summary of the assessment activities and the occasion for suggesting solutions, identifying or correcting the instruments and procedures currently in use and proposing modifications of the regulatory framework and the ethical codes, not least in relation to the continuous evolution of this criminal phenomenology.

## NORWAY

**Organisation: Ministry of Labour and Government Administration.**

**General context:**

Assessment ex ante and proposals for improvements on the basis of OECD's recommendation on "principles for managing ethics in the public service"

	<b>Initiatives No. 1. &amp; No. 2.</b>
1. WHY assess integrity measures? <b>Aims</b> of the assessment	The purpose of the assessment was to find out to which extent there is a gap between the conditions in Norway and the twelve principles in OECD's recommendation
2. WHAT has been assessed? <b>Subjects</b>	How the Norwegian ethics infrastructure stands in relation to the OECD's recommendation
3. WHEN? The <b>timeframe</b>	2001/2002
4. By WHOM?	Kai Dramer on commission from the Ministry of Labour and Government Administration
5. HOW to assess? <b>Methodology</b> and <b>procedures</b>	Gap-analysis, based on 1) an overview of the existing rules and regulations relating to civil service ethics, including local codes of conduct, 2) interviews and 3) seminars etc.
6. IMPACT How was assessment <b>used</b> ?	The results of the assessment have been used in our preparation of ethical guidelines for the public service, and also in our work with conflict of interests measures and post employment restrictions. The Ministry has also proposed regulations for whistleblowing and protections of the whistleblowers
7. LESSONS learned and <b>FUTURE PLANS</b>	We have potentials to improve the professional socialisation in this area, and this will be planned in connection with the publication of the ethical guidelines for the civil service

## POLAND

**Organisation: Supreme Chamber of Control, Public Procurement Office, European Commission, GRECO , World Bank – Office in Warsaw, Transparency International – Poland, Open Society Institute, Anti-Corruption Program of Stefan Batory Foundation (ONG).**

**General context:**

It was parliamentarians and the public opinion that were the inspiration for the Supreme Chamber of Control (NIK) to undertake audit research and analyses more concentrated on the problem of corruption. Beginning from year 2000 the NIK publishes annual reports on the topic of Threat of Corruption in the Light of the NIK's Audit Research where it points to the areas threatened by corruption and to corruption-generating mechanisms that were recognized in the process of the audits carried out. Since October 2000 methodology for the research of areas threatened by corruption has been incorporated into particular audits, the methodology allows for the assessment of public institutions from the perspective of corruption threat, i.e. do corruption-generating mechanisms arise in their activities

	<b>Initiatives No. 1. &amp; No. 2.</b>
1. WHY assess integrity measures? <b>Aims</b> of the assessment	The main aim of the NIK assessments is a better understanding of the corruption phenomenon in Poland, pointing to corruption mechanisms that have to be eliminated and the assessment of the public institutions' results in this regard.
2. WHAT has been assessed? <b>Subjects</b>	The subject of the assessment from the perspective of threat of corruption, formulated as a result of the assessment of the Supreme Chamber of Control, are the activities of the government and self-government administration and government entities that use public funds, e.g. by carrying out undertakings assigned by the government or by carrying public procurement tasks for the state.
3. WHEN? The <b>timeframe</b>	The first report of the NIK in the year 2000 covered the results of the audits carried out from year 1995 – the last one covered audits carried out in 2003 and it presents the analyses of the verifications and results gathered through the audits carried out in the last eight years. During the last four years the analyses were carried out and published on a regular basis.
4. By WHOM?	The basis for the reports are the verifications and the results of audits carried out by NIK auditors in the whole country. In principle one auditor takes care of the editing of the reports, the auditor specializes in the field but the reports are subject to opinions institution-wide (internally) and are subject to peer review.

<p>5. HOW to assess? <b>Methodology and procedures</b></p>	<p>From October 2000 methodology for the research of areas threatened by corruption has been incorporated into particular audits, the methodology allows for the assessment of public institutions from the perspective of corruption threat. This means that uniform methodological tools are used in a regular, systematic manner, in various regions of the country with respect to various audit subjects. Within the audit program a special set of questions is prepared for the auditor. Answers to the questions allow for formulating an assessment whether corruption mechanism exists within the audited activity of the public institution.</p>
<p>6. IMPACT How was assessment used?</p>	<p>The NIK reports pertaining to the threat of corruption are periodically forwarded to the Sejm (a chamber of the Polish parliament) and public opinion. Their publication has in a way initiated a wide public discussion, in particular in the mass media. NIK clearly shows in which institutions the threat of corruption arises and points to corruption mechanisms that should be eliminated from their activities. The role of the NIK is to present a diagnosis but it is up to the given institution to react to the NIK requests. If the institution does not react on its own in due time, it happens that it is forced to react by hounding press articles that discuss the NIK audit. Also the members of parliament more often pay attention to corruption mechanisms identified by the NIK, which is reflected in the regulations being drafted.</p>
<p>7. LESSONS learned and FUTURE PLANS</p>	<p>NIK will steadily be carrying out audits of public institution activities that will be aimed at the assessment from the perspective of corruption threat. The audited institutions will be getting used to this type of audit: they will aim at putting their activities in order, eliminate discrepancies that make up corruption mechanisms and which might be the basis for negative assessment by the NIK. Also, certain follow-up audits are carried out and the results are compared and analyzed. As a result of these analyses anticorruption conclusions are drawn and corruption-generating mechanisms are pointed out – those assessed in the past and those newly identified.</p>

Relevant Web site: [www.nik.gov.pl](http://www.nik.gov.pl)

- Threat of corruption in light of audit tests of the Supreme Chamber of Control, carried out in 2003, March 2004 (volume IV).
- Threat of corruption in light of audit tests of the Supreme Chamber of Control, carried out in 2002, March 2003 (tom III).
- State of realization of the most important anticorruption conclusions of the Supreme Chamber of Control, April 2002.
- Methodology pointer on audit of areas threatened by corruption October 2001.
- Threat of corruption in light of audit tests of the Supreme Chamber of Control, May 2001 (volume II)
- Threat of corruption in light of audit tests of the Supreme Chamber of Control, March 2000 (volume I).



## SLOVENIA

**Organisation: The assessment has been carried out within Office for the Prevention of Corruption of the Republic of Slovenia, within District State Prosecution Service in Krsko (in cooperation with Supreme State Prosecution Service) and is ongoing project within Joint Services of the Government. Projects were launched in a form of “Integrity Plans”.**

**General context:**

An integrity plan assists in promoting efficiency and quality of work therefore it should become the “property” of every individual in the organization. With an integrity plan a thorough and general review of the organization is gained. It identifies areas of risk that exist in the process of work. The preparing of an integrity plan is focused on the organisation itself. It has strongly preventive impact but should not intent to cover every possible situation that may arise in the future.

	<b>Initiatives No. 1. &amp; No. 2.</b>
<p>1. WHY assess integrity measures?</p> <p><b>Aims</b> of the assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to ensure the legal, ethical and professional quality of work,</li> <li>- to detect vulnerable activities and areas prone to corruption,</li> <li>- to identify risks and to take steps to minimize them,</li> <li>- to prevent unwanted behaviour that might lead to corruption,</li> <li>- to adjust process of work to higher quality standards,</li> <li>- to promote integrity and incorruptibility of the (especially) public service as a common good,</li> <li>- to promote transparency within an organisation itself,</li> <li>- to contribute to the confidence that members of an organisation have in one another,</li> <li>- to promote discussion regarding integrity,</li> <li>- to strengthen (internal – organisational) resistance against fraud and corruption;</li> </ul>
<p>2. WHAT has been assessed?</p> <p><b>Subjects</b></p>	<p>Projects were launched in a form of self-assessment procedure. There were several areas that have been assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- national and internal (organizational) legal framework,</li> <li>- perception of corruption risks and vulnerable actions in the light of the organisation and its function, especially its corruption prevention tools/strategies,</li> <li>- vulnerable activities related to the internal tasks (such as the handling of information, money, goods and services) or to external tasks (such as receiving or disbursing funds, contracting out, licensing or granting, enforcement),</li> <li>- revising resistance promoted by general regulations and procedures - their presence, appropriate content, the familiarity with them among the staff, and their application;</li> <li>- The size of the sample varied – the smallest was 7 persons and the biggest cca 86 persons. Whole organisations were surveyed;</li> <li>-</li> </ul>

<p>3. WHEN? The <b>timeframe</b></p>	<p>The assessment is ex ante planned and launched as a project. Review is done after certain amount of time (e.g. every two years) or if it is necessary (problems, new tasks, renewed working process etc.)</p> <p>All projects were launched as pilot projects on optional basis. Integrity plans became obligatory for public sector (national bodies and local community bodies) at the end of January 2004, when Prevention of Corruption Act (Official Gazette RS, No. 2/04) entered into force.</p>
<p>4. By WHOM?</p>	<p>Within the framework of the Matra Pre-accession Projects Programme Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs funded a project in Slovenia with the title “Fight against corruption”. A core aspect of the whole project was awareness raising among civil servants and influencing the organizational culture. The pilot “Integrity Plans” project was carried out through consulting, workshops and coaching by the Dutch consultancy firm in cooperation with Office for the Prevention of Corruption (OPC) and within the OPC.</p> <p>In second and third pilot project OPC as governmental body acted as an objective outside counterpart and consultant. Second pilot project was launched within District State Prosecution Service and in cooperation with Supreme State Prosecution Service. The last, still ongoing project is being launched within Governmental Joint Services.</p> <p>The basis for all those projects was a need and a wish for improvements. According to the Prevention of Corruption Act the basis to prepare “Integrity Plans” is not optional anymore.</p>
<p>5. HOW to assess? <b>Methodology</b> and <b>procedures</b></p>	<p>Methodology was tailored to Slovene situation and needs of the specific organization as much as possible. All the material has been designed in such a way that invites suggestions and further adaptations.</p> <p>The precondition was to train and adapt people to work as “consultants” to their own and other institutions.</p> <p>Assessment started with defining the boundaries of ethical behaviour on national level. The legal framework and the concept of national anti-corruption strategy (and even more important – its implementation) is a precondition for proper functioning of the public sector in any nation (embodiment of the internal resistance against fraud and corruption).</p> <p>After reviewing rules and procedures it was necessary to collect data on informal culture within organization. This was done by interviewing personnel and administering the questionnaires.</p> <p>When <i>status quo</i> was established it was possible to propose changes in order to improve integrity and quality of work as well as to prevent possible unwanted actions.</p> <p>The next stage in cyclical dealing with improving integrity was (and is) implementation of proposed changes.</p>

<p>6. IMPACT</p> <p>How was assessment used?</p>	<p>All results of the assessments were presented and communicated with staff and management. In order to promote transparency this information needs to be available to any staff member who wants it. Results of the self-assessment are of the internal nature on the other hand. Some improvements were accepted and realized, some will be carried out in near future (according to priorities settled). Since “Integrity Plan” can not be drawn up and finished, there still is room for improvements. Improving integrity must be done on a continuous basis – at regular intervals or when breaches of integrity are detected.</p> <p>Main focus was on improving efficiency and effectiveness on the organized way of including all possible aspects of work – even those which did not seem applicable to the particular situation within the organization at first glance, but used to serve as a reminder. Since the organization’s policies and practices are conducive to promoting ethical conduct, the special attention was dedicated to issues like the recruitment and promotion of personnel, the disbursement of funds, procurement of goods and services etc.</p> <p>Regular assessment in a form of integrity plans became obligatory because of the impact of successful pilot projects and because of the necessity for permanent quality improvements.</p>
<p>7. LESSONS learned and FUTURE PLANS</p>	<p>During those projects it was found out that awareness of vulnerable areas could be improved with broader and regular discussion, dilemma training and some concrete actions. The quality of work needs constant and planned follow up. Main precondition for successful assessment is gaining trust. This is also one of the results of these projects. Other objectives are changing non acceptable behaviour to acceptable behaviour by educating, training, coaching and leading by example and thus changing culture. It always takes time to change culture.</p> <p>Future plans are related to improve technical possibilities for implementing integrity plans. There is a need to interweave “integrity” into the system (e.g.: to promote discussion regarding integrity issues into yearly on the job interview) and present new institute on a positive way to minimize resistance. Special attention should be devoted to “Integrity Plans” as legal obligation since this institute must not become external driven burden with no real impact.</p>

For more details, please do not hesitate to contact:

Office for the Prevention of Corruption, Trzaska street 19a, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

By e-mail: [nina.radulovic@gov.si](mailto:nina.radulovic@gov.si) or by phone +386 1/478 84 83 or +386 1/478 84 73

Information regarding Matra Pre-accession Projects Programme is available on the web site: [www.senter.nl/preaccession](http://www.senter.nl/preaccession)

## ESPAGNE

**Les réponses au questionnaire partent de l'expérience dans l'Agence Tributaire. Le but est d'étudier les répercussions des indicateurs d'intégrité dans la nouvelle Agence Étatique pour l'évaluation de la qualité des services et des politiques publiques.**

1.-POURQUOI évaluer les mesures en faveur de l'intégrité ?

- a. **Pour améliorer L'infrastructure étique dans une organisation complexe comme l'Agence Tributaire ;**
- b. **Pour incorporer les valeurs publiques aux processus de formation.**

Buts de l'évaluation.

**Élaboration d'une brochure sur un code professionnel d'éthique pour l'Agence Tributaire.**

2.- SUR QUOI ont porté les évaluations ?

- a. **D'après les risques d'intégrité évalués par l'organisation ;**
- b. **D'après l'analyse de la pratique des comportements irréguliers constatés.**

### Objets

3.-QUAND ?

Le calendrier: **1998 –2003.**

4.- Par QUI ?

**Service interne d'audit de l'Agence Tributaire.**

5.- COMMENT organiser l'évaluation ?

**Méthodologie et procédures**

- a. **Panel d'experts ;**
- b. **Atelier des valeurs et de l'éthique publiques ;**
- c. **Carte des risques.**

6.- IMPACT

Comment l'évaluation a t'elle été utilisée ?

**Élaboration d'un code de conduite professionnelle de l'organisation. Proposition au groupe de travail international des administrations tributaires pour l'élaboration d'un code cadre.**

7.- ENSEIGNEMENTS tirés et PROJETS POUR L'AVENIR

- a. **Projet du Statut de la Fonction Publique ;**
- b. **Indicateurs d'intégrité pour l'évaluation des politiques publiques ;**
- c. **Incorporation des indicateurs institutionnels d'intégrité dans la nouvelle Agence Étatique pour l'évaluation de la qualité des services et des politiques publiques.**

## TURKEY

**Organisation:** Studies were carried out by a Steering Committee and a Working Group. Steering Committee was composed of the representatives of Prime Ministry Inspection Board, Undersecretariat of the Treasury, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of the Interior and Financial Crimes Investigation Board (MASAK) of the Ministry of Finance and the Working Group to assist the Steering committee was formed by the approval of the Prime Ministry in February 2001.

### General context:

A series of study were conducted to determine whether the public administrative procedures reflect the principles of transparency, good governance and accountability and whether existing legal provisions and implementation programmes were adequate to prevent corruption or not. After the assessment of the results of those studies, a range of proposals have been issued and scheduled within the “Increasing Transparency in Turkey and Enhancing Good Governance in Public Sector Action Plan”.

	<b>Initiatives No. 1. &amp; No. 2.</b>
<p>1. WHY assess integrity measures?</p> <p><b>Aims</b> of the assessment</p>	<p>Aims of the assessment were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determine whether existing legal regulations and measures taken are enough or not,</li> <li>• Establish whether bureaucratic procedures and applications cause corruption or not,</li> <li>• Prepare suggestions in order to improve people oriented government management</li> <li>• Determine whether the distribution of duties between central and local authorities is effective or not,</li> <li>• Find the reasons of the lack of confidence towards public and political system.</li> </ul>
<p>2.WHAT has been assessed?</p> <p><b>Subjects</b></p>	<p>Legislation, practices and measures were assessed under the topics of political system, judicial system, public administration, civil society and competitive private sector. Some examples are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public officer, administrative structure and legislation regarding corruption.</li> <li>• Administrative procedures and applications</li> <li>• Household corruption perceptions</li> <li>• Experiences of public bodies on well management and corruption.</li> <li>• Legislation processes</li> <li>• Transparency of administration</li> <li>• Health sector applications.</li> <li>• Distribution of duties between central and local authorities</li> </ul>

<p>3. WHEN? The <b>timeframe</b></p>	<p>Evaluation studies had began in February 2001, and finished in January 2002.</p>
<p>4. By WHOM?</p>	<p>Assessment initiatives were carried out by the Steering Committee and Working Group which were established based on the approval of the Prime Ministry in February 2001. Steering Committee was composed of the representatives of the Prime Ministry Inspection Board, Undersecretariat of the Treasury, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of the Interior and Financial Crimes Investigation Board (MASAK) of the Ministry of Finance. Steering Committee and Working Group were consisted of 25 senior officials and experts.</p>
<p>5. HOW to assess? <b>Methodology and procedures</b></p>	<p>Basic components of the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The results of a public opinion survey undertaken by a nongovernmental organization (TESEV the Turkey Economic and Social Studies Foundation),</li> <li>• The report prepared by an academician to analyze corruption in Turkey and to ascertain its roots, costs and consequences,</li> <li>• Suggestions concerning good governance and the fight against corruption collected from all public institutions on subjects within their field of operation. (Based on Prime Ministerial Circular No: 2001/38 dated July 9, 2001),</li> <li>• A workshop to benefit from the international experience of the World Bank, along with the contributions and opinions of approximately 30 experts from public bodies,</li> <li>• Meetings with representatives of professional organizations, members of the print and broadcast media, civil organizations, representatives of small-to-medium-sized businesses, and educational staff and directors of public institutions,</li> </ul> <p>The results of the international conference held in September 2001 on Promoting Good Governance and Anti-Corruption in Turkey.</p>
<p>6. IMPACT How was assessment <b>used</b>?</p>	<p>Assessments were supported by governments. Steering Committee developed solution proposals based on assessment results. Assessment and solution proposals were published on “Increasing Transparency in Turkey and Enhancing Good Governance in Public Sector- Action Plan” and Action Plan was adopted by the Cabinet. Studies regarding all of the subjects that took place in the Action Plan were started, most of these have already been completed. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A series of laws passed on the following issues: harmonization to OECD Bribery Convention, reorganization the relationships between public institutions and public foundations, associations, arrangement rights to access to official information, providing transparency at public accounts and expenditure, strengthening local authorities and rearrangement public administrative structure.</li> </ul> <p>There is an ongoing project which aims to establish a data base at MASAK, and there are ongoing projects at health, justice and many other fields.</p>

<p>7. LESSONS learned and FUTURE PLANS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Senior officials and experts from various different areas came together and the study was adopted and supported as the anti-corruption strategy of country. As a result of these, the “Action Plan” was prepared successfully.</li><li>• The permanent central authority which will provide the necessary coordination at realizing the priorities of Action Plan wasn’t determined. As a result of this some problems arose in practice. It is thought that MASAK will be designated as this central authority and take duties on preventive measures in order to improve the fight against corruption. When it realizes, the assessments will be better done.</li></ul>
--	---

**UNITED STATES**

**Organisation: U.S. Office of Government Ethics**

**General context:**

As part of its oversight responsibilities, OGE is conducting its Employee Ethics Survey as one of several methods of assessing the effectiveness of executive branch agency ethics programs. The Employee Ethics Survey uses a number of key measurement dimensions to assess executive branch agency ethics programs including program awareness, employee perception of program effectiveness, and ethical culture indicators. Survey results are being used to provide OGE’s program review teams with pre-review (i.e., pre-audit) information which may be used to adjust the scope of individual agency ethics program reviews.

	<b>Initiatives No. 1. &amp; No. 2.</b>
<p>1. WHY assess integrity measures? <b>Aims</b> of the assessment</p>	<p>The Office of Government Ethics (OGE) exercises leadership in the executive branch to prevent conflicts of interest on the part of Government employees, and to resolve those conflicts of interests that do occur. In partnership with executive branch agencies and departments, OGE fosters high ethical standards for employees and strengthens the public’s confidence that the Government’s business is conducted with impartiality and integrity.</p> <p>As part of its oversight responsibilities, OGE is conducting its Employee Ethics Survey as one of several methods of assessing the effectiveness of executive branch agency ethics programs. Survey results are being used to provide OGE’s program review teams with pre-review (i.e., pre-audit) information which may be used to adjust the scope of individual agency ethics program reviews.</p>
<p>2. WHAT has been assessed? <b>Subjects</b></p>	<p>The Employee Ethics Survey uses a number of key measurement dimensions to assess executive branch agency ethics programs including program awareness, employee perception of program effectiveness, and ethical culture indicators.</p> <p>Program Awareness is an important measure because one of the primary ethics program objectives is to promote awareness of ethics issues and to encourage employees to seek advice when faced with ethics questions. This measure assesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• familiarity with the rules of ethical conduct and</li> <li>• awareness of ethics officials in the agency.</li> </ul> <p>The Program Effectiveness measure provides an overall assessment of the value perceived by employees with respect to the executive branch ethics program at their agency. This measure assesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the usefulness of the rules of ethical conduct in guiding decisions and conduct;</li> <li>• the helpfulness of resources consulted when ethics issues arise;</li> <li>• reasons for not seeking advice and, if advice was sought, for not seeking advice from ethics officials;</li> <li>• the helpfulness of resources consulted when financial disclosure reporting questions arise;</li> <li>• reasons for not seeking help in completing a financial disclosure report, if help was needed;</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the frequency of employee ethics education and training;</li> <li>• the usefulness of education and training in making employees aware of ethics issues and in guiding decisions and conduct in connection with their work;</li> <li>• familiarity with specific ethics rules; and</li> <li>• the effectiveness of ethics education and training methods and materials.</li> </ul> <p>The Ethical Climate measure examines the effect of the agency=s ethics program, in part, by assessing employee perceptions of several desirable ethical culture factors and behavior outcomes. The culture factors are characteristics of an organization that guide employee thought and action. Each of the outcomes is a desired result of an ethics program and evidence of a strong ethical culture. The Ethical Climate questions are not linked to specific ethics program elements (e.g., ethics training, advice and counseling, etc.). The Ethical Climate questions assess employees= perceptions that within their agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supervisors pay attention to ethics, (culture)</li> <li>• leadership pays attention to ethics, (culture)</li> <li>• there is consistency between ethics rules and agency practices, (culture)</li> <li>• there is open discussion by supervisors about ethics issues, (culture)</li> <li>• there is follow-up on reports of ethics concerns, (culture)</li> <li>• unethical behavior is punished, (culture)</li> <li>• employees are treated fairly, (culture)</li> <li>• employees are aware of ethical issues when they arise, (outcome)</li> <li>• employees seek ethics advice when needed, (outcome) and</li> <li>• ethics violations are reported when they occur. (outcome)</li> </ul> <p>The Ethical Climate measure was based on an existing assessment tool, developed by a private sector consulting firm and a team of academic researchers in the field of business ethics and organizational behavior to measure ethical culture in private sector corporations. The assessment tool examines the impact of an organization=s ethics program, in part, by assessing employee perceptions of several desirable ethical culture factors and behavior outcomes. In 2000, the consulting firm customized the assessment tool for use by OGE in its executive branch employee ethics survey. OGE used an abbreviated version of this measure for the current survey.</p> <p>The Employee Ethics Survey is administered during the pre-review planning stage of selected agency ethics program reviews. The survey is administered several months prior to the planned start of selected program reviews to allow time for collecting and analyzing survey responses. Because of limited resources, the survey will not be conducted prior to every program review. Survey results, along with other information developed by the review team, are used to determine the scope and focus of the program review.</p> <p>The survey population at each agency selected for review includes all executive branch employees who work for the selected agency.</p>
--	--

<p>3. WHEN? <b>The timeframe</b></p>	<p>Prior to 2000, OGE primarily relied on conducting standardized compliance reviews of executive branch agency ethics programs to monitor whether those programs were properly administered. While these program reviews were very important in measuring agency program compliance, they did not measure the effectiveness of ethics programs in achieving their intended outcomes (e.g., employee awareness of ethics issues and ethics program resources and employee willingness to seek ethics advice when needed). Therefore, OGE decided to survey executive branch agency employees to determine if the ethics programs in their agencies were achieving the desired results. In 2000, OGE conducted its first executive branch-wide ethics survey to assess agency ethics program effectiveness and ethical culture from an employee perspective.</p> <p>In November 2003, OGE began conducting the current Employee Ethics Survey, which is based in part on the 2000 survey. The current survey differs from the previous one in several ways, including that (1) it is being administered at a limited number of agencies every year during the pre-review planning stage of selected agency ethics program reviews, rather than as a one-time Government-wide survey; and (2) all employees in each agency selected for review are included in the survey population, rather than sampling employees Government-wide. Completion of the survey is voluntary and survey responses are anonymous. Contractors who work for Government agencies are not included in the survey population.</p> <p>Between November 2003 and August 2004, the survey has been conducted at nine executive branch agencies. It is expected that the survey will be conducted at approximately 10-12 agencies per year.</p>
<p>4. By WHOM?</p>	<p>OGE is conducting the Employee Ethics Survey as part of its oversight responsibilities.</p> <p>OGE developed the survey and analysis methodology and has contracted with Raosoft, Inc. to host the web-based survey. OGE analyzes the survey results and writes the survey report for each agency.</p>
<p>5. HOW to assess? <b>Methodology and procedures</b></p>	<p>Timeframe of survey administration: The survey is administered during the pre-review planning stage of selected agency ethics program reviews. The survey is administered several months prior to the planned start of selected program reviews to allow time for collecting and analyzing survey responses. Due to limited resources, the survey will not be conducted prior to every program review. Survey census: At this time, all employees are being surveyed at each selected agency.</p> <p>Topics in the Survey include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive branch rules of ethical conduct</li> <li>• Agency ethics program resources</li> <li>• Agency ethics education and training</li> <li>• Agency ethical culture (e.g., employee awareness of ethics issues when they arise and employee willingness to seek advice when needed)</li> </ul> <p>Time needed to complete the survey: The survey takes about 15-20 minutes to complete, depending on the number of questions an employee is asked to answer. (The survey contains 80 questions; however, all employees do not have to response to all questions.) For example, financial disclosure report filers are</p>

	<p>asked to answer more questions than non-filers.</p> <p>Methods of survey distribution: Employees are sent an e-mail from the contractor inviting them to complete the survey. The e-mail includes a link that provides access to the on-line survey. The survey is located on our contractor=s web server.</p> <p>Employees who do not have a computer and web access (or cannot use them) are provided with a paper version of the survey to complete and return to OGE.</p> <p>Agency assistance: OGE requires the Designated Agency Ethics Official (DAEO) of each selected agency to provide an electronic file of the e-mail work addresses of all agency employees. OGE requests that the DAEO of each selected agency send an e-mail notification to agency employees (1) alerting them that our contractor will be sending them an invitation to take the employee ethics survey and (2) requesting that they participate in the survey.</p> <p>Voluntary employee participation/confidentiality of results: Completion of the survey is voluntary and survey responses are anonymous. Individual responses are kept strictly confidential and results are only reported for groups of individuals at an agency (e.g., public financial disclosure report filers or employees who have received ethics training).</p>
<p>6. IMPACT</p> <p>How was assessment <b>used</b>?</p>	<p>Within OGE, survey results are being used, along with other information gathered during OGE’s pre-review planning, as input to the deliberative process to determine the scope and focus of each program review and to make OGE staffing decisions for the program review.</p> <p>A summary report of the survey results, along with a compendium of the results for every survey question, is provided to each agency DAEO during the ethics program review. As with our program review reports, OGE does not make the survey results public.</p> <p>Since the survey process is relatively new, OGE does not have extensive feedback as to how the results are being used within the agencies surveyed.</p>
<p>7. LESSONS learned and FUTURE PLANS</p>	<p>OGE plans to issue a year-end report on the survey results.</p> <p>OGE plans to conduct the survey at approximately 10-12 agencies over the next year.</p>

**CENTER FOR PUBLIC INTEGRITY**

**The Global Access Project, Center for Public Integrity, Washington DC**  
[www.publicintegrity.org/ga](http://www.publicintegrity.org/ga)

The Center for Public Integrity is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that does investigative reporting and research on public policy issues in the United States and around the world.

**General context:**

During 2003 Global Access looked at various laws, institutions and mechanisms that the anti-corruption literature suggests limits abuses of power. We compiled 25 in-depth country reports on the state of corruption and public integrity around the world using in-country investigative journalists, social scientists and peer review panels. From the data we generated the Public Integrity Index (based on 292 Integrity Indicators) that assesses the existence, effectiveness and access to information, citizens require for holding their government accountable.

	<b>Initiatives No. 1. &amp; No. 2.</b>
<p>1. WHY assess integrity measures?  <b>Aims</b> of the assessment</p>	<p>Recognising that it is impossible to determine with any real accuracy the exact extent of corruption and that perception based surveys have yielded limited guidance to policy reformers, the aim of the assessment was to establish baseline data on the existence, effectiveness and accessibility of anti-corruption mechanisms i.e. laws and institutions that the governance literature suggests promotes public integrity and prevents abuses of power. Each Integrity Scorecard allows one to pinpoint the strengths and weaknesses of a country’s public integrity system and on this basis suggest policies for concrete intervention and reform.</p>
<p>2. WHAT has been assessed?  <b>Subjects</b></p>	<p>Global Access looks at the national governance framework of anti-corruption mechanisms for a non-representative sample of 25 countries (Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, the Philippines, Portugal, Russia, South Africa, Turkey, Ukraine, the United States, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe) selected for their economic, geographic and political diversity. The assessment tool is comprised of six main categories and 21 sub-categories. The six main categories are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Civil Society, Public Information and the Media;</li> <li>2. Electoral and Political Processes;</li> <li>3. Branches of Government;</li> <li>4. Civil Service and Public Administration;</li> <li>5. Oversight and Regulatory Mechanisms;</li> <li>6. Anti-corruption and Rule of Law</li> </ol> <p>The indicators for each of the categories capture the <i>de jure</i> as well as <i>de facto</i> reality of the existence and effectiveness of the various laws and institutions by asking <i>in law</i> and <i>in practice</i> questions. Effectiveness of various anti-corruption measures is assessed by a number of sub-indicators including staffing, budget, independence and reporting requirements.</p>

<p>3. WHEN? The <b>timeframe</b></p>	<p>Global Access went into the field with the final set of indicators for a three month period from late June 2003. All copy, collected electronically, came in from the field October through December 2003 and was peer-reviewed, fact-checked and libel-reviewed by March 2004. The 700 000+ word online report was released at the National Press Club in Washington DC on 29 April 2004. In order to create a time series for the data, the aim is to update the information annually and thus update the original 25 countries and add an additional 25 in the coming year (2005). Expansion of the project is wholly dependent on raising additional funds.</p>
<p>4. By WHOM?</p>	<p>The Center for Public Integrity is an independent non-profit non-partisan organisation that does not accept government, business or union contributions. The Center does not engage in advocacy nor does it ask permission to conduct the assessments. Coordinated electronically from Washington, the Center contracts individually with in-country professional social scientists, investigative journalists and peer reviewers, to produce material for the Global Integrity Report. The selection of the lead social scientist follows an intensive and targeted recruitment process based on a unique database constructed by the Center for Public Integrity of contact information on individuals and organizations working in the governance field (over 3500 contacts). The contact database, compiled from bibliographies, conference attendance records, internet websites and personal contacts is continually updated. A similar process is undertaken in recruiting Country Readers for the peer review panels, on average 5 per country although in future rollouts we hope to expand this critical group. These experts are required to review and comment critically on both the journalist and social scientist's reports as well as individual indicator scores, comments and references. In total almost 200 people – over 150 individuals in the field and a management, research, editorial, data, website, fact-checking and libel-review team in Washington DC – were responsible for compiling the 2004 Global Integrity Report.</p>
<p>5. HOW to assess? <b>Methodology and procedures</b></p>	<p>Global Access combines qualitative and quantitative methodologies in an accessible web-based format to generate transparent and credible information that assesses both the de jure as well as de facto existence and effectiveness of public integrity systems that the governance literature assumes plays a crucial if not causal role in preventing corruption. Information underlying the Public Integrity Index relies on an expert assessment methodology, undertaken for cost as well as content reasons. An independent in-country lead social scientist with a track record of substantive research in the governance and corruption field is contracted for a three month period to collect credible information for the 292 Integrity Indicators. This information is posted electronically to the Global Access team in Washington via a secure data entry website and regular feedback is given to social scientists in the field to ensure consistency of approach and interpretation of the indicators.</p> <p>The specially devised research tool - the Integrity Indicators – took several years to refine and draws on a number of key research instruments in the governance field (including Transparency International's National Integrity System). Each indicator score is supported by comments and references in the form of interviews conducted or websites and public documents consulted to gather the information. In future rollouts an indicator codebook is envisioned to provide even greater guidance to social scientists in terms of allocating scores,</p>

	<p>particularly for the subjective “in practice” indicators that assess effectiveness of various mechanisms.</p> <p>An original 3000 word essay by the social scientist - the Integrity Assessment - accompanies the full set of indicators and provides a summary of key points to emerge from the six main public integrity categories.</p> <p>Investigative journalists mostly drawn from the Center’s other international project, the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ) are contracted to produce a Corruption Notebook, a 2000 word essay on the culture of corruption in each country.</p> <p>Expert Country Readers are contracted to review the draft country reports and post critical comments (without direct attribution) to the website. This allows for frank and unbiased feedback. Peer review comments are posted on the website to promote maximum transparency and dialogue on the perspectives offered by the social scientists and journalists, and play an important role in fact checking, final score allocation as well as providing depth to the reports. The Center for Public Integrity is responsible for generating the final scores which rely on several review processes incorporating interpretation, peer review, indicator evaluation and inter-coder reliability. For the full methodology see the website (<a href="http://www.publicintegrity.org/ga">www.publicintegrity.org/ga</a>)</p>
<p><b>6. IMPACT</b></p> <p><b>How was assessment used?</b></p>	<p>The Center for Public Integrity’s mission is to provide public information to citizens that they can use to hold their government and public officials accountable. The Center does not engage in advocacy around particular policy positions however values such as openness, transparency and accountability, all which underpin the work of the Center. Knowledge is power and information from various elements of the Global Integrity Report is being used by a range of actors as a tool for dialogue, pressure and reform, confirmed by a voluntary feedback survey undertaken with country team members (n=86). This found that the report was being used in the following way: Research (77%); Advocacy (72%); Policy (65%) and Public Information (62%), In the first month following the release of the report the story was carried in 19 countries with over 120 press hits which continue to this day. The project communications strategy included sending a press pack to ambassadors from countries forming part of the Public Integrity Index and positive feedback on the report was received from a number of embassies. In addition to media coverage, since the release of the report in April 2004 the methodology and main findings have been presented at conferences in Atlanta, Chicago, Panama City, now Paris and at the Barcelona Forum (in September). The project has also been presented to a number of influential forums including the International Anti-Corruption Forum at the Brookings Institution, Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS) at the University of Maryland and the Government Accountability Office, Washington DC. Various publications and journals in the governance field will publish the Global Access methodology in the coming months and in the September/October edition of Foreign Policy magazine the Center’s website featured as a “best pick of the web”.</p> <p>In some countries, for example South Africa, there was widespread pickup of the report despite not have a formal in-country communications and release plan. This was partly due to the informal networking undertaken by the lead social scientist within media, civil society and government circles pre the public release. In terms of policy impact, the Minister for Public Service and Administration, Geraldine Fraser-Moloketi mentioned the Center for Public</p>

	<p>Integrity in her budget vote address as well as calling a media briefing to discuss the findings where she noted the report was useful in that it did not merely point out the perceived extent of corruption in government, but rather what the government was doing to fight corruption. In this regard the indicators continue to fuel civil society’s calls in South Africa for tightening laws around political party finances, post public sector employment and greater enforcement of financial disclosure and conflict of interest regulations in the wake of the infamous “arms deal”.</p>
<p>7. LESSONS learned and FUTURE PLANS</p>	<p>Transparency is a major strength of the Global Access approach. Whereas one may not necessarily agree with the final index scores it is possible to access the full data set of original questions, answers, score methodology and processes that generated them, something often lacking in other assessment exercises. It should be noted that the final Integrity Indicators as well as elements of the Country Report namely the Country Facts, Corruption Timeline, Corruption Notebook, Integrity Assessment and Integrity Scorecard, developed over the course of the project. To this extent a blueprint has been established which will be easier to replicate in future rollouts of the project. Shortly after the release of the report a user feedback survey was conducted among the country teams which elicited a number of ways in which the research exercise might be improved. In early July 2004 the Center hosted a day long workshop with 45 delegates including a number of international team members to discuss The Global Integrity Report: Findings, Feedback and Future. In late July 2004 we held an internal “post-mortem” with the Global Access management team in Washington to determine how we could improve the methodology. Key lessons learned from these various critical reviews include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More explicit information as to how the various components of the country reports relate to each other</li> <li>• Greater interaction between the social scientists and investigative journalists on the team</li> <li>• More time require by the lead social scientist to conduct the fieldwork</li> <li>• Clearer instructions to the journalists as well as fewer words for the editors to edit</li> <li>• Clearer formulation of the indicators for the social scientists including the provision of an indicator codebook</li> <li>• Additional peer reviewers to give greater credibility to the final scores</li> <li>• More interaction with the country teams pre public release of the Public Integrity Index</li> <li>• An in-country communications strategy to ensure greater media coverage and awareness of the report</li> <li>• Exploring the viability of a hard copy version of the full report, particularly in countries with poor internet access.</li> </ul> <p>We now have a far greater sense of the scope and depth of the assessment exercise, as well as the timing involved in conducting field work, peer review, editing, score finalization, fact checking and libel review processes. To this extent we believe it will be easier to recruit country team members for the 50 country study (25 updated reports and 25 new countries) as the Global Access website will allow potential team members to see the various components of the report. In selecting the next group of countries we aim to be more strategic and welcome suggestions as to which countries to include.</p>