



Participation of Civil Society in Fighting Corruption in Eastern Europe

Anti-Corruption Policies Development and Monitoring

UKRAINIAN INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

08.11.2011

www.uipp.org.ua

Who We Are

Coalition of CSOs from EaP and EU countries:

- Ukrainian Institute for Public Policy (**Ukraine**)
- All-Ukrainian NGO “Ukrainian special board for the fight against corruption and organized crime” (**Ukraine**)
- Institute for Public Affairs (**Poland**)
- Oživení (**Czech Republic**)
- Centre for Analysis and Prevention Corruption of the Republic of Moldova (**Moldova**)
- Georgian Young Lawyers Association (**Georgia**)
- National Centre for Legislative Research (**Armenia**)

Supported by the **Transition Promotion Program of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic**

www.uipp.org.ua

What Our Project is About

Our Goal:

- to share best practices of national anticorruption policies public monitoring in our countries

Main tasks of the project are to examine:

- the role and potential of NGOs in the process of development and implementation of anti-corruption strategies
- best examples of interaction between CSOs and the government in improving policy in this sphere



Today's task:

- share experience on how governments and NGOs cooperate in our countries while implementing anti-corruption policies
- suggest best practices for using CSOs potential in anti-corruption policy development and implementation

Preliminary Assessment: Poland

Two different approaches to CSOs participation in anti-strategy **development** were used (none is adequate):

- work in the international-donor-driven working group (2001)
- standard consultation procedures by the government: publication of the draft, collection of the feedback and report on final results (2011)

CSOs activities during the strategy **implementation**:

- involvement of CSOs experts as external consultants to the government coordinating body (2005 – 2009)
- external monitoring of the strategy implementation (2002 – 2009)

CSOs concerns about the strategies **content** (2011):

- good progress in terms of policy ownership, coherence of the strategy, indicators used
- proper links of strategy with state budget is still lacking; coordination mechanisms are questionable

Preliminary Assessment: Czech Republic

CSOs participation in anti-strategy **development & implementation:**

- participation in the Advisory Board created by the Minister of Interior (later - Advisory Committee of the Governmental Committee for Battling Corruption)
- establishment of advisory groups for CSOs participation is a regular approach of the Czech government, however degree of commitment varies from case to case

Strategy **content:**

- there are specific 11 priority tasks within the strategy
- each of the tasks is given deadline and indicators of fulfillment
- 2011 – 2012 strategy envisages research and assessments that will become a background for 2013 – 14 strategy

Preliminary Assessment: Ukraine

CSOs participation in **anti-corruption strategy development**:

- Government Agent on Anti-Corruption Policy: cooperation in the framework of the Civic Council & CSOs Consortium
- National Anti-Corruption Committee (NAC): head of the one CSO was included as a member, formal consultation mechanism

CSOs concerns on **strategy content**:

- all specific details are left to the state program: budget, success indicators, deadlines, responsible bodies, specific tasks etc.
- state program is a responsibility of the Government (MJ?), will be developed under tight deadline
- 15 broadly defined directions for strategy implementation: priorities for the upcoming year are not clear

Prospects for CSOs participation in **strategy implementation**:

- Civic Council of NAC: its composition, scope of responsibilities and capacities are still an open question

Preliminary Assessment: Georgia

Formal mechanisms of consultations with CSOs are in place:

- January 2005 – Working Group for Development of National Anti-Corruption Strategy. CSOs representatives participated
- December 2008 - Inter-Agency Coordination Council for the Fight Against Corruption was founded. It works with CSOs recommendations and requests

Progress in anti-corruption policies implementation is evident:

- Positive reviews of GRECO, other international organizations, improvement in TI, WB and other indicators

CSOs feel their cooperation with the government could be more effective:

- drafts are given for consultations for inadequate period of time
- cooperation occurs mainly when there is a push from international organizations
- CSOs initiatives need to be backed up by international organizations to be considered by the government

Preliminary Assessment: Moldova

Strategy **development**:

- draft strategy was published on the web-page + feedback was collected
- consultations with international development projects, independent experts & NGOs took place

Strategy **implementation**:

- 5 representatives of the Alliance against corruption participate in Monitoring Group
- Monitoring Group is responsible for: review of the data provided by the public bodies, approval of the quarterly and annual monitoring reports, development of assessment reports

Strategy **content**:

- measurable indicators of success make monitoring an easier exercise

Preliminary Findings: Armenia

Strategy **development** (2009 – 2012):

- influenced by the of international partners (development of the strategy and action plan supported by OSCE Office in Yerevan)
- previous work of the CSOs was utilized (corruption perception surveys etc.)
- formal consultation mechanisms were used

Strategy **monitoring** (2009 – 2012):

- Anti-Corruption Strategy Implementation Monitoring Commission: consist of representatives of parliamentary factions, NGOs and public bodies
- Commission is an advisory organ, lacks financial resources, and human capacities, which prevents it from being an effective monitoring tool

General Impressions

- prevailing context: donors driven and donors pushed strategies. Position of governments differs (except Czech Republic)
- international organizations are still seen as a proxy for CSOs participation in strategy development; CSOs potential is bigger in case of policy monitoring
- formal procedures for CSOs participation in policy development exist almost in every country, however they tend to be formal and thus not encouraging cooperation and trust
- more inclusive procedures of the policy development are welcomed by CSOs
- second generation of anti-corruption strategies in the region tend to be of higher quality and react on donors/CSOs criticism concerning need of priorities, indicators of success, deadlines etc.
- government political will is what differentiates practice of CSOs involvement from simulation of inclusiveness

Good Practices

Policy development:

- attraction of external (NGO) experts at the early stages of document development – ensures quality, trust and further cooperation (Czech case),
- use of the external monitoring results and conclusions on previous policy during the development of the current one

Policy monitoring & implementation:

- attraction of external experts as consultants to the coordinating government bodies (Polish case)
- involvement of external experts to the advisory/monitoring group (scope of capacities and responsibilities is important)
- Results of the CSOs work and monitoring are used in a subsequent rounds of policy development

Necessary content of anti-corruption strategies:

- need for limited number of clear priorities,
- need for clear connection with government budget,
- measurable indicators of success & timetable for delivery of outputs are needed,
- commitment to review the strategy regularly and use results of external monitoring



Thank You !

Ivan Presniakov
Ukrainian Institute for Public Policy

Ivan.Presniakov@uipp.org.ua
www.uipp.org.ua

08.11.2011

www.uipp.org.ua