

## CORRUPTION RISK-ASSESSMENT CARDS

### MUNICIPALITY OF LARISSA

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b>		
Application of the regulation for the operation of the new Municipal Cemetery (burials)		
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b>		
1) Influence on the determination of the place within the space of the cemetery – attempt to select a grave in good condition		
2) Exploitation of the fragile emotional state of the families in order to gain additional amounts not provided for (this can also take place by the funeral providers on the pretext that this is a demand by the municipal employees – the amounts then will be withheld by the funeral providers)		
3) Interference at the priority list of burials		
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>		
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>	
<del>1</del> 1) 5      2) 4      3) 3	<del>1</del> 1) 3      2) 3      3) 3	
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b>	<del>1</del> 1) 15	2) 12      3) 9
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b>		
-		
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b>		
Selection of the place without control or accountability		
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b>		
1) Publication of the list of the available spaces		
2) Publication of burials carried out		
3) Updating of the operational regulation according to the guidelines set by the legislation. An update of the legislation governing in general the municipal cemeteries is required – there is a need to determine the subject areas that have to be examined by the regulations		
4) Rotation of the personnel		
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk:</b>		
Cross –check of electronic data in regards to compliance with the procedures		

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b> Application of the regulation for the operation of the new Municipal Cemetery (exhumations)	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b> Circumvention of the procedures for exhumation	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  2	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  4
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b>  8	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b> 1) Lack of space – necessity to empty out graves 2) Publication of the list of ex officio exhumations within the area of the cemetery	
<b>Factor that increase risk: ---</b>	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b> A wider publication of the list of the ex officio exhumations	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk:</b> Annual report of exhumations (forecasts, planning, implementation, justification of the deviations etc.)	

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b> Control and functioning of farmer's markets	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b> Collection of fee - Calculation of fee - Irregular granting of permits	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  3	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  5
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b>  15	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b> Monthly payment – electronic systems – demarcation of spots/places	
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b> Long-term contact among the same people/ friendly relationship	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b> Monthly, electronic payment/ Accurate demarcation	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk:</b> Data base for every trader	

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b> Building approval and permit (and justified refusal to grant permit)	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b> 1) Issuance of illegal permit 2) Pressure for faster processing 3) Overlooking minor issues	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale)</b> 1) 2 - improbable 2) 4 – common 3) 2 - improbable	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b> 1) 4 –important (for the Directorate for Urban Planning, not across the Municipality) 2) 2 –not important 3) 2 –not important/ fixable
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b> 1) $2 \times 4 = 8$ 2) $4 \times 2 = 8$ 3) $2 \times 2 = 4$	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b> 1) Assignment of major building permits to 2 employees – this is specifically applied to our directorate - segregation of the audit stages (as one employee controls the work of the 2) Electronic platform – access and monitoring of the progress of audit (though not absolute) by citizens, engineers, heads of the municipal units – the recent (2011) simplification of the procedure by reducing time of the procedure from 9 months to 2 months 3) a. For those who have legitimate interest (competitive firms, neighbors etc.), there is the possibility of appeal to superior administrative authorities and criminal courts – many times there is an abuse of this right due to negative prejudices b. Recent legislation of concerning settlement of illegal constructions are helpful to build a more honest/decent relationship between citizens and the urban planning authorities	
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b> 1) Legal complexity/fragmentation and “loopholes” 2) Lack of data (e.g. finalisation of the land register, forest maps etc.)	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b> 1) Sample checks e.g. on a 5% random sample 2) Informing citizens about the rational of the urban planning legislation	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk:</b> Sample checks	

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b> Controlling stationary - itinerant trade	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b> Functioning even after loss of permission / functioning at another, non allowed area	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  3	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  5
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b>  15	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b> Immediate intervention – effectiveness – more personnel at the audit procedure	
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b> Heavier fine (because it is not paid)	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b> Frequent rotation - possibility of direct action – publicity (display) of the permit - organisational measures within the Municipality	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk: ---</b>	

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b> Permit to operate health-regulated establishments	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b> 1) Ambiguity – gaps in legislation 2) Political Pressure	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  1) 3      2) 2	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  1) 5      2) 5
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b>  1) 3x5=15      2) 2x5=10	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b> 1) Auditing mechanisms of independent and various services 2) Clarity of the legislation 3) Complaints in electronic format with automatic notification to the auditing mechanisms	
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b> 1) Lack of interest of the personnel in complying properly with the legislation 2) Same people/personnel, at the same subject areas for many years	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b> a) Proper assignment of personnel to such positions b) Frequent rotation of personnel in the different departments within the Municipality	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk:</b> Frequent audits to personnel actions carried out by the Heads – Directors as well as by independent auditing mechanisms	

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b> Inspections of unauthorized buildings	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b> 1) The necessary audit does not take place 2) Audit takes place only in certain occasions (targeted) 3) The results of the audit are not being published	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b> 1) 2      2) 1      3) 2	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b> 1) 4      2) 5      3) 4
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b> 1) $2 \times 4 = 8$ 2) $1 \times 5 = 5$ 3) $2 \times 4 = 8$	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b> - Complaints should always be submitted in writing, by named persons and receive a file number - An audit team should always comprise 2 or even 3 persons and every case should be discussed with the Head - The results of the audit should always be announced to both the defendant and the complainant	
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b> - Frequent changes on the relevant legislation (ambiguity and limitation of experience) - Intervention of the political leadership	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b> - Knowledge of the legislation as thoroughly as possible - Frequent rotation of the personnel of the department	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk:</b> Control by the head of the department	

**MUNICIPALITY OF SKYROS**

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b> Acceptance of land concession to obtain plot size and shape suitability certificate	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b> False statement	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  2	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  4
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b>  8	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b> Decision is made by a collective body	
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b> Ease of individuals to proceed with their own planning	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b> Planning of agglomerations	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk: --</b>	

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b> Burial Permit - Use of Municipal Cemeteries	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b> Illegal private enrichment / Loss of revenue for the Municipality	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  3	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  2
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b>  6	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b> Responsibility allocated to more than one employee regarding the compliance to the regulation	
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b> Absence of audit	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b> Transparency of the Municipal Cemeteries Regulation	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk: --</b>	

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b>	
Permit to connect a building to the municipal water supply network	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b>	
Ineffective implementation of the regulation of water supply	
Arbitrary selection of order of priority to comply to the requests	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>
4	3
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b>	
12	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b>	
Responsibility allocated to more than one employee regarding the compliance to the regulation	
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b>	
Decisions made by single member bodies	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b>	
Electronic monitoring of the implementation of regulation	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk: --</b>	

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b>	
Permit to operate health-regulated establishments	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b>	
Selectively not applying audit on the operation of health-regulated establishments	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>
1	4
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b>	
4	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b>	
Wide/general audit, not based on sample	
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b>	
The "exploitation" of the legislated time of response to an ascertained violation	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b>	
Development of an information system that will connect the authorities sharing competencies concerning this area (urban planning, healthcare sector, fire department, Financial Services, Municipality, etc.)	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk: --</b>	

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b> Permit to use parts of beaches	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b> Overlook the arbitrary squatting of the area or the exceedance of permitted limits	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  5	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  1
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b>  5	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b> Shared responsibility of different services, for example the Municipality, the Real Estate Agency and the Coast Guard	
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b> The "exploitation" of the legislated time of response to an ascertained violation	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b> Installation of visible delimitation marks	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk: --</b>	

<b>Corruption risk assessment for a process (service):</b> Permit to use public areas	
<b>Description of corruption risks:</b> Overlook the arbitrary squatting of an area or the exceedance of permitted limits	
<b>Outcome of corruption risk assessment:</b>	
<b>Likelihood of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  5	<b>Effects of materialisation of a corruption risk (according to the adopted scale):</b>  1
<b>Total score for assessed corruption risk (likelihood x assessment of effects)</b>  5	
<b>Factors that reduce risk:</b> Transparency as regards the areas that have been granted with permit (position and size)	
<b>Factor that increase risk:</b> Pressure to elected representatives by interested entrepreneurs	
<b>Proposed preventive measures:</b> Audits, installation of visible delimitation marks	
<b>Way of monitoring corruption risk: --</b>	



