



ACN

**Anti-Corruption Network
for Eastern Europe and Central Asia**

Anti-Corruption Division
Directorate for Financial and Enterprise Affairs
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
2, rue André-Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France
Phone: +33 (0)1 45 24 13 19, Fax: +33 (0)1 44 30 63 07
E-mail: anti-corruption.contact@oecd.org
Website: www.oecd.org/corruption/acn

Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan

Methodology for the 4th monitoring round

The Methodology for the 4th monitoring round under the Istanbul Action Plan was endorsed by the Steering Group at its 20th meeting on 22 April 2016.

Taking into account the need to strengthen the methodology further, the Steering Group during its meeting in September 2017 adopted the attached amendments.

For more information, please contact Mrs. Olga Savran, ACN Manager, at olga.savran@oecd.org.

Contents

- Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan 3
- Objectives and principles of the fourth round of monitoring..... 4
- Main stages of the fourth round of monitoring 6
 - Schedule..... 6
 - Selection of the sector for the in-depth evaluation 8
 - Establishing the monitoring team..... 9
 - Questionnaire and issues paper 10
 - On-site visit 11
 - Drafting monitoring reports 17
 - Structure..... 17
 - Ratings 18
 - Drafting of the report..... 19
 - Plenary meetings 19
 - Adoption of the reports 21
 - Follow-up 21
 - Publication of the reports and press releases..... 21
 - Official letter..... 21
 - Return mission..... 21
 - Progress updates 22
- Annex 1: Manual for monitoring experts (extract) 25
 - Selection of monitoring experts 25
 - Main tasks of the monitoring experts..... 26
 - Practical information for monitoring experts 29
- Annex 2: Practical Guide: how to conduct monitoring by civil society (extract) 30
 - Alternative monitoring 30
 - NGO organisation for the monitoring..... 31
- Annex 3: Information Resources 33

Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan

The Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan is a programme of peer reviews which targets nine ACN countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan.¹ Other ACN and OECD countries, international organisations and non-governmental partners take part in the implementation of the Istanbul Action Plan as experts and donors. The implementation of the Istanbul Action Plan up to date has involved the following stages:

1. *Review of legal and institutional frameworks for fighting corruption.* Istanbul Action Plan countries prepared self-assessment reports on the basis of standard Guidelines, drawn up by the Secretariat. Groups of experts from ACN countries reviewed these self-assessment reports (without on-site visits) and developed recommendations, covering three main areas: (1) anti-corruption policies and institutions, (2) criminalisation of corruption and law-enforcement, and (3) preventive measures in public service. ACN plenary meetings discussed and adopted country assessment reports and recommendations based on consensus. Reviews were completed during 2003-2005.²
2. *First round of monitoring.* The first round monitoring was based on answers to individual Monitoring Questionnaires prepared by the Secretariat for each country. Groups of experts from ACN countries reviewed these answers and visited the countries to collect additional information. On the basis of the answers to the questionnaire and information gathered during the on-site visits, the experts developed draft monitoring reports, which included assessments of progress and compliance ratings ranging from fully, largely to partially or not implemented. The draft monitoring reports were presented for the discussion and adoption at plenary meetings. The first round of monitoring was completed during 2005-2007. The summary report about the first round of monitoring was published in 2008.³
3. *Second round of monitoring.* The second round of monitoring revisited the level of countries' compliance with recommendations given at the initial country review, but included three new elements: (1) it involved the Standard Monitoring Questionnaire based mainly on the UNCAC standards; (2) the monitoring reports based on desk review of questionnaires and on-site visits included updated compliance ratings for the previous recommendations as well as new recommendations; (3) upon the completion of the monitoring, the Secretariat organised return missions to the monitored countries to present the reports to the public officials, civil society and international partners in order to promote the implementation of the recommendations. The

¹ Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Russia,¹ Tajikistan and Ukraine joined this initiative at the ACN General Meeting in 2003 in Istanbul, Turkey. Kyrgyzstan joined the Action Plan in 2003 and Kazakhstan in 2004. Uzbekistan joined the Action Plan in 2010 and Mongolia in 2012.

² Except the reviews of Uzbekistan and Mongolia that took place respectively in 2010 and 2014, based on the standard questionnaire developed for the second round of monitoring.

³ OECD (2008), *The Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan. Progress and Challenges*, OECD, Paris, <http://www.oecd.org/corruption/acn/42740427.pdf>.

second round of monitoring was completed during 2009-2012.⁴ The summary report about the second round of monitoring was published in 2013.⁵

4. *Third round of monitoring.* The third round of monitoring aimed to promote compliance of the participating countries with the international anti-corruption standards and good practices with the focus on practical implementation of anti-corruption measures and recommendations adopted in the second round. It involved country-specific questionnaires, on-site visits, adoption of reports with compliance ratings, new or updated recommendations and return missions. The third round was completed during 2013-2015.⁶ The summary report about the third round of monitoring is forthcoming in 2016.
5. *Regular updates.* After the adoption of the country reports, the Istanbul Action Plan countries prepared their updates about measures taken to implement the recommendations and presented them for discussion at each plenary meeting to ensure follow-up. During the third round of monitoring the methodology of progress updates was revised to include the assessment of updates by peers and their adoption by the plenary meetings including the ratings indicating progress or lack of progress in implementing the recommendations.

Country reports are discussed and adopted at the ACN plenary meetings. All country monitoring reports and progress updates, as well as summary reports prepared by the Secretariat are published on the ACN website.⁷

Objectives and principles of the fourth round of monitoring

According to the ACN Work Programme for 2016-2019, the aim of the 4th round of monitoring under the Istanbul Action Plan is to assess progress in implementing the recommendations of the previous monitoring round ***with the focus on enforcement and practical implementation as well as the impact of the anti-corruption measures.***

Thus, during the 4th round a stronger emphasis will be put on tracking and analysing the implementation and enforcement, as well as effectiveness of anti-corruption measures. The monitoring will include one novelty: ***an in-depth examination of a specific sector with high risk of corruption.***

More specifically, the 4th round of monitoring will focus on the following issues: (1) in-depth analysis of actions taken to implement key recommendations from the previous monitoring round and reasons

⁴ Uzbekistan underwent joint first and second round of monitoring in 2012 and third round in 2015.

⁵ OECD (2013), *Anti-Corruption Reforms in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Progress and Challenges, 2009-2013*, OECD, Paris, <http://www.oecd.org/corruption/acn/istanbulactionplan/anti-corruption-reforms-eastern-europe-central-asia-2013.htm>.

⁶ Mongolia underwent joint first and second round of monitoring in 2015; it will undergo a joint third and fourth round of monitoring under this Work Programme.

⁷ <http://www.oecd.org/corruption/acn/anti-corruptionnetworkcountrymonitoringreports.htm>.

behind the success or failure to implement them,⁸ (2) analysis of the implementation of anti-corruption policy and prevention measures and their effectiveness, with the focus on practical actions and their impact, and (3) analysis of the law-enforcement actions with the focus on cases and law-enforcement statistics. In-depth evaluation of a selected sector will examine the practical application of anti-corruption policy, prevention and enforcement measures in this sector.

The guiding principles for the 4th monitoring round will remain unchanged since the previous rounds and will include the following:

Comprehensive approach – the 4th round will cover all three areas of anti-corruption efforts, namely anti-corruption policy, criminalisation and prevention of corruption. Continuation of the comprehensive approach will provide additional value to the UNCAC and GRECO examinations and will provide useful inputs for policy makers on the ground. Review of a selected sector will show how the comprehensive set of anti-corruption measures is applied in practice in one selected area.

Peer review methodology – the monitoring will be conducted as an intergovernmental peer review process, where experts nominated by ACN countries review each other. Experts from IAP countries will be systematically involved in the monitoring of other countries participating in this initiative, together with experts from other ACN and OECD countries to ensure transfer of experience; representatives of international organisations can also take part in the monitoring.

Transparent monitoring process will remain an important feature of Istanbul Anti-Corruption Action Plan. Monitoring reports undergo open discussions during the plenary meeting involving all ACN country delegates, non-governmental and international partners. All reports are published on ACN website, National Coordinators are invited to translate, disseminate and publish reports on the governmental official websites in the countries.

Participation of the non-governmental sector will continue to be promoted, including contributions from the civil society and business organisations to the preparation of the monitoring report, participation in the on-site visits and in the plenary meetings. Alternative or “shadow” reports from non-governmental partners will be further solicited and taken into account in the country assessments.

Equal treatment and consensus-based decision-making – as in the previous monitoring rounds, the assessment and recommendations will be developed in a manner to ensure equal treatment of all countries, applying same rules and procedures. The assessment and recommendations will be adopted on the basis of consensus, whereby countries undergoing the monitoring are included in the decision-making and the reports are adopted with their agreement.

Co-ordination with other international organisations will continue to be an important part of the Istanbul Action Plan process, in order to ensure that assessments and recommendations adopted in

⁸ To focus the 4th monitoring round on implementation and enforcement, the scope of monitoring will be streamlined to focus on the recommendations coming from the summary report "Fighting Corruption in Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Achievements and Challenges, 2013-2015", and to avoid duplication with other monitoring processes the implementation of the recommendations on public financial control and audit and the political party financing will not be assessed by this round.

different international frameworks reinforce each other and resources of the monitored country and of the monitoring experts are used effectively. This co-ordination should aim at avoiding unnecessary duplication of work by the international organisations and by the monitored countries, for example, by coordination of calendars and conducting joint evaluations when possible. The ACN Secretariat will ensure regular coordination with the Council of Europe GRECO and the UNODC. Co-ordination will also be promoted with the representatives of international organisations operating in the Istanbul Action Plan countries to reinforce efforts to support the implementation of the recommendations on the ground.

Main stages of the fourth round of monitoring

Schedule

According to the ACN Work Programme for 2016-2019, monitoring plenary meetings will be organised every 10 months. Two monitoring reports will be presented for adoption at each meeting (at one meeting, three reports will need to be adopted due to uneven number of countries participating in the Istanbul Action Plan). Countries will be invited to present their progress updates for assessment at each monitoring meeting. As a part of the 4th round of monitoring, one monitoring report and 3 progress updates will be adopted for each Istanbul Action Plan country. The provisional schedule of monitoring is provided below.

Provisional schedule of the fourth round of monitoring

Monitoring meeting	Monitoring reports	Progress updates
September 2016	Azerbaijan Georgia	Armenia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan
June 2017	Tajikistan Armenia * Kazakhstan	Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan
March 2018	Kyrgyzstan Ukraine*	Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan
December 2018	Mongolia Uzbekistan	Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Ukraine

* On the request from Ukraine, the monitoring of Armenia and Ukraine were swapped.

To start preparations for each country review, the Secretariat will develop a schedule of the 4th round for each country on the basis of the model schedule provided below. The Secretariat will propose via e-mail such schedule to the National Coordinator, including the deadline for submitting answers to the questionnaire, dates of the on-site visit and of the plenary meeting, and the proposal regarding the possible sector for in-depth evaluation. The final schedule will be agreed between the Secretariat and the National Coordinator. If necessary, on the request from the National Coordinator, the Secretariat

may send an official letter to the Government of the respective country to request high level support to conduct the 4th round of monitoring.

To support a more effective implementation of the ACN Work Programme for 2016-2019 and to help the National Coordinators in implementing their functions, countries will be encouraged to create coordination mechanisms or procedure that will involve responsible officials from public institutions responsible for anti-corruption policy, prevention, investigation and prosecution of corruption, business integrity, public procurement, civil service reform and other relevant areas covered by this programme and not in the exclusive competence of National Coordinator. Such mechanisms or procedures would be particularly important to help the National Coordinator in organising the monitoring activities, including the responses to the questionnaire, the on-site visit, review and negotiation of the draft, ensuring the implementation of recommendations and submitting progress updates.

Model country monitoring schedule

Action	Responsibility	Deadline
Preparation starts		4 months before visit
Establishing the schedule	Secretariat, National Coordinator	4 months before the visit
Establishing the monitoring team	ACN Secretariat in consultations with the ACN countries	4 months before the visit
Selecting the sector for in-depth evaluation	Secretariat in consultation with the National Coordinator and non-governmental partners	4 months before the visit
Sending questionnaire to the country	Secretariat and Monitoring team	3.5 months before the visit
Sending questionnaire to civil society, business associations and international partners and invitation to provide "shadow report"	Secretariat and Monitoring team	3.5 months before the visit
Submission of answers to the questionnaire by the National Coordinator, civil society, business associations and international partners	National Coordinator based on inputs from public institutions; civil society, business associations and international partners	6 weeks before the visit
Sending additional questions to the Government, if necessary	Secretariat	5 weeks before the visit
Submission of answers to the additional questions	National Coordinator	4 weeks before the visit
Preparation of the Issues Paper	Secretariat	2 weeks before the visit
Preparation of the agenda of the on-site visit (meetings with public institutions)	Secretariat in consultation with the National coordinator	2 weeks before the visit
Preparation of panels with civil society, business and international partners	Secretariat in coordination with non-governmental partners	2 weeks before the visit
On-site visit (4-5 days)		3 months before plenary

Compiling the list of additional information	Monitoring team	1 week after the visit
Submission of additional information requested by the Monitoring team	National coordinator	2 weeks after the visit
Drafting of the report and sending it to the National Coordinator and non-governmental partners for comments	Monitoring team and Secretariat	1 month before the plenary meeting
Translation of the draft report into English or Russian	Secretariat	1 month before the plenary meeting
Submitting comments to the draft report	National coordinator and other partners	2 weeks before the plenary meeting
Finalising the draft report and distributing it to participants of plenary meeting	Monitoring team and Secretariat	1 week before the plenary meeting
Adoption of the report at a plenary meeting (2 days)		
Publishing the report and the press release	Secretariat	1 month after the plenary meeting
Letter to Prime Minister/President/Speaker of Parliament of the monitored country with the report attached	Secretariat	1 month after the plenary meeting
Translation of the report into the national language and its publication on the governmental website	National Coordinator	2 month after the plenary meeting
Return mission	National Coordinator, Secretariat and member of the Monitoring Team	2 months after the adoption of the report

Selection of the sector for the in-depth evaluation

According to the ACN Work Programme for 2016-2019, the monitoring will include an in-depth examination of one sector that represents a high risk of corruption, such as education, health, tax, construction, or other. The sector will be selected for each country through a consultations process with the government, civil society, business and international partners to ensure its relevance and ability of the country to organise the in-depth examination in this sector. Where possible the selection of the sector will be based on available risk assessment studies. The in-depth examination will assess practical application of anti-corruption measures in the selected sector. It will review the implementation of measures foreseen in the national and/or sectorial anti-corruption strategy and action plan and their impact on the level of corruption in the sector; implementation of the full spectrum of preventive measures as well as the law-enforcement efforts and sanctions applied for corruption-related crimes committed in the sector.

In practical terms, at the outset of the monitoring round, the National Coordinator will be invited to propose possible sectors for the in-depth evaluation, and to explain why these sectors are proposed. The Secretariat will also invite the NGOs, the business delegates as well as the international partners to provide their own proposals on the possible sectors and to explain why these sectors are proposed. On the basis of these submissions the Secretariat will make a choice aiming to select the sector that received the highest support from all stakeholders and that has the high potential to implement

sectoral anti-corruption reforms. In order to assess the sector, the Secretariat in cooperation with the monitoring team will prepare a special part of the questionnaire that will focus on this sector. Special panels dedicated to the selected sector will also be organised during the on-site visit. The findings will be reflected in a special section of the monitoring report.

Establishing the monitoring team

For the monitoring of each country under the Istanbul Action Plan, the OECD/ACN Secretariat establishes a monitoring team of experts. For this purpose, the Secretariat approaches individual experts, who were recommended by the ACN National Coordinators or by other ACN partners (e.g. other OECD divisions, other international organisations and partners), or who's qualification and suitability to perform this work are known to the Secretariat through previous working experience. The Secretariat will inform National Coordinators of the monitored country as well as from the countries of the monitoring experts about the final compositions of the teams. The monitoring experts should have good working experience in one or several of the areas covered by the monitoring, including the sector selected for in-depth evaluation, should be familiar with relevant international standards and good practice, and should be able to work in multi-cultural groups, be able to speak and write in English and/or Russian (monitoring can be conducted in English or in Russian, depending on the choice of the country and the language skills of the team; only one working language will be selected for each country and bi-lingual monitoring will be avoided).

Monitoring teams for each country will be assembled with the view to ensure a balance of expertise and country representation. The Secretariat will seek to ensure that IAP countries are strongly represented in the monitoring teams, and that representatives from other ACN and OECD countries, who are not monitored by the IAP, but by other groups such as GRECO and OECD Working Group on Bribery, are also represented to ensure the transfer of experience between countries at different levels of anti-corruption efforts.

Monitoring experts will 1) contribute to the development of the monitoring questionnaire, 2) review answers to the monitoring questionnaire from the government and non-governmental partners, raise additional questions, if appropriate, review answers to additional questions, carry out additional research, study any publicly available relevant information⁹ and study the issues paper prepared by the Secretariat, 3) visit the country and take part in panel discussions with local authorities, NGOs, experts, academia and foreign missions, chair the panels on themes assigned to them, organise additional individual meetings and interviews with various stakeholders and use other approaches if necessary to gather information necessary for monitoring and evaluation, 4) contribute to the drafting of the relevant sections of the monitoring report, review comments provided to the draft report, and contribute to the finalization of draft report, 5) present the draft report and actively participate in the debate during the plenary meeting, 6) contribute to the finalization of the report, together with the Secretariat, on the basis of plenary and bi-lateral discussions during the meeting.

⁹ Any publicly available information on the evaluated country's activities within the scope of the monitoring can be examined by the expert, including official government data, reports by international organisations, academia, media or NGOs.

Monitoring experts will also be invited to take part in the follow-up to the reports: one of the experts who covered the most critical issues and recommendations will be invited to take part in the return mission to present the report back in the country. All monitoring experts will also be invited to contribute to the evaluation of the progress updates, and take part in the adoption of the assessments of progress updates if they are present at the next plenary meetings.

One of the experts on the team, or one of the representatives of the Secretariat, will act as team leader. The team leader will coordinate the distribution of themes among the experts; will chair the introductory and the closing plenary sessions and the debriefings for experts during the on-site, as well as the bilateral consultations during the plenary meeting.

Manual for monitoring experts, provided as the annex to the Methodology, presents detailed guidance about the selection process, specific tasks as well as practical information for experts.

Questionnaire and issues paper

Individual monitoring questionnaires will be developed by the Secretariat in consultations with the monitoring teams for each country. Monitoring questionnaire will include the following elements: (1) analysis of the anti-corruption policy, such as the strategy and action plans, and of the measures that were taken to implement this policy, including documents demonstrating the impact of the implementation of the policy on the level of corruption, such as the results of surveys and other indicators and measurements of effectiveness, (2) analysis of the measures taken by the government to prevent corruption in the public administration and in the private sector, such as measures to ensure integrity in the civil service, in public procurement, judiciary and the private sector, and access to public information, as well as relevant documents demonstrating the results of these measures and their impact, (3) description of measures taken by the government to establish and to enforce criminal responsibility for corruption, with the focus on specific cases, such as cases involving legal persons, foreign bribery, MLA and high level officials; law-enforcement statistics, including data about opened, prosecuted and adjudicated cases and sanctions; and information about the law-enforcement capacity, including human, financial and other resources dedicated to fighting corruption, and (4) analysis of the anti-corruption policy, preventive and enforcement actions in the sector selected for the in-depth evaluation, including the impact of these measures on the level of corruption in the sector.

National Coordinators will ensure that all information necessary for the monitoring is provided to the monitoring team. To this end, they will liaise with all relevant state bodies and collect from them information necessary to fill out the questionnaire; they will compile answers to the questionnaire and submit them to the Secretariat. Information provided in the answers to the monitoring questionnaire should cover the time period since the adoption of the previous round monitoring report for each country. Answers to the questionnaire should be provided in *electronic form suitable for editing*, e.g. as a Word Document. Answers and documents can be submitted in English or in Russian.

The Secretariat will also share the questionnaire with civil society and business organisations, as well as international partners inviting them to provide inputs, by answering all or some parts of the

questionnaire or preparing “shadow” reports on progress made in implementing the recommendations of the previous round of monitoring. An extract from the Practical Guide “How to conduct monitoring by civil society” that was prepared by the Secretariat for the non-governmental partners is attached as an annex to the Methodology to describe main elements of the “shadow” monitoring.

The Monitoring team together with the Secretariat will review the information provided by the evaluated country as well as by the non-governmental partners. If necessary, they may raise additional questions and request answers or additional information from the country before the on-site visit.

On the basis of the available information, the Secretariat will prepare a preliminary assessment in the form of an *issues paper* in order to help the monitoring team to prepare for the on-site visit. This preliminary assessment will aim to determine which issues have been sufficiently addressed in the answers, covering all elements in the recommendation, including the description of measures taken and their implementation as well as the achieved results, and which issues require further research and discussion during the on-site visit. This issues paper will be circulated by the Secretariat to the monitoring team prior to the on-site visit. The Secretariat may also share with the National Coordinator which issues were identified in the issues paper as those requiring further research and discussion during the on-site visit, as well as specific questions that need to be addressed.

On-site visit

The Monitoring team will conduct an on-site visit to the country and will hold meetings with public authorities, civil society, business and representatives of the international community in order to collect and verify information necessary to prepare the monitoring report. The duration of the on-site visit will be up to 5 working days.

The Secretariat will prepare the draft agenda of the on-site visit based on the model agenda provided below. The Secretariat will invite the National Coordinator to invite all necessary state organisations to take part in the respective thematic panels. List of thematic panels, their order and duration may be adjusted taking into account specific country’s recommendations. Some thematic session can be organised in parallel, where examiners may split by themes to allow them to have a more in-depth examination, while other session can be joined by all examiners. If necessary, the Monitoring team and Secretariat may also request additional meetings during the on-site visit. This may be particularly necessary for the in-depth examination of the selected sector, where it may be possible to organise individual meetings with different sector representatives. The National Coordinator will provide meeting rooms (1 meeting room if there are no parallel sessions, and 2 if there are parallel sessions), where panels with representatives of state bodies will take place. If necessary, the National Coordinator will also be invited to provide interpretation.

The Secretariat will be responsible for the organisation of the special panels with representatives of non-governmental organisations, business and international partners engaged in anti-corruption and good governance activities in the country. The National Coordinator may suggest to the Secretariat to

invite particular NGOs experts, academia, business or foreign partners to these sessions. However, government officials will be invited to abstain from participation in these meetings.

During or after the on-site visit, the Monitoring team and the Secretariat may request additional information and documents to be supplied by the National Coordinator.

Model Agenda for the On-Site Visit

Day 1		
	<i>Arrival of the monitoring team</i>	
	<i>Preparatory meeting for the monitoring team</i>	
Day 2		
Morning	<p>Panel 1. Anti-Corruption Policy and Institutions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key anti-corruption reforms 2. Anti-corruption policy documents, their monitoring and impact 3. Raising public awareness and education 4. Corruption prevention and coordination institutions 	<p>Invited institutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Coordinator Administration of the President Prime Minister's Office Parliament Body responsible for policy coordination Representative of the sector selected for in-depth evaluation Other relevant state bodies, including in sectors with high risk of corruption Academia
	<p>Panel 2: In-depth evaluation of the selected sector (Panels 1 and 2 can be parallel)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anti-corruption policy for the sector 2. Measures to prevent corruption in the sector: civil service integrity, integrity among political officials, public procurement, internal audit, access to information, business integrity measures 3. Enforcement of anti-corruption legislation in the sector 4. Impact of anti-corruption reforms in the sector 	<p>Invited institutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political leadership and management of the sector Internal control and/or audit unit HR or other body responsible for integrity Procurement unit Unit dealing with complaints and access to information Unit dealing with regulatory simplification Other representatives of the sector
Afternoon	<p>Special panel with civil society (sessions with non-governmental partners can also be organised before the panels with the governments)</p> <p>Issues for discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public participation in anti-corruption policy 2. Challenges in fighting corruption 3. Information on the selected sector 	<p>Invited organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TI local chapters, other civil society groups, such as NGOs, lawyers associations, consumers associations, freedom of information associations Media, investigative journalists University professors, academics and researchers NGOs that work with the selected sector
	<p>Special panel with business representatives</p> <p>Issues for discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Experience of companies related to corruption 2. Participation in the policy dialogue 3. Business integrity 	<p>Invited organisations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business associations Private and state owned companies, SMEs and MNE Foreign investors, audit and legal companies

	4. Business experience in the selected sector	Representatives of the private companies and business association that work in the selected sector
Evening	<i>Debriefing for the monitoring team</i>	
Day 3		
Morning	<p>Panel 3. Criminal legislation on corruption and its application in practice</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bribery and other corruption offences, their application 2. Liability of legal persons, foreign bribery 3. Sanctions and confiscation 4. Immunities, defences, statute of limitations 5. Other criminal law issues <p>Invited institutions: Ministry of Justice General Prosecutor's Office Police/Ministry of Interior Parliament Specialised anti-corruption bodies Courts</p>	<p>Panel 4. Integrity in civil service</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk-based integrity policy 2. Role of leadership in promoting integrity 3. Professional civil service, merit based recruitment, transparent remuneration 4. Conflict of interest, asset declarations, codes of ethics 5. Reporting of corruption and whistleblowers protection 6. Impact of integrity policies <p>Invited institutions: Public Service Body Public Service Academy Specialised anti-corruption bodies (responsible for prevention) Selected sector representatives Other relevant state bodies, including in sectors with high risk of corruption</p>
Afternoon	<p>Panel 5. Pre-trial investigation, prosecution and adjudication of corruption</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Responsible law-enforcement bodies and their capacity, specialised bodies 2. Detection, investigative procedures and tools, access to financial information, time limits 3. Prosecutorial discretion 4. Results in investigation and prosecution of corruption 5. Results in adjudicating corruption cases 6. International co-operation and MLA 7. Internal investigative units <p>Invited institutions Courts General Prosecutor's Office Police/investigation agencies/Ministry of Interior Specialised anti-corruption bodies with law enforcement powers FIUs and/or financial police MLA authorities</p>	<p>Panel 6. Integrity in public procurement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scope of the Public Procurement Law (PPL), exemptions 2. Single-source and other simplified procedures 3. E-procurement 4. Transparency of public procurement 5. Review procedure and oversight body 6. Debarment 7. Professionalism and of conflicts of interests in public procurement 8. Procurement of SOEs 9. Impact, procurement statistics, surveys and studies <p>Invited institutions Central public procurement body Procurement units/experts from individual agencies (e.g. health, education, public works) Investigators and prosecutors dealing with cases of corruption in public procurement</p>

		Body(ies) responsible for complaints and oversight Selected sector representative Supreme audit institution
Evening	<i>Debriefing for the monitoring team and Secretariat</i>	
Day 4		
Morning	<p>Panel 7. Business integrity</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Risk-based business integrity policy 2. Anti-corruption measures in state-owned enterprises and SMEs 3. Simplification of business regulations and public service provisions 4. Corporate disclosure, role of boards and audit committees 5. Channels to report corruption, independent review, e.g. business ombudsmen 6. Promoting company compliance programmes and role of business associations 7. Promoting collective actions 8. Impact, surveys and studies <p>Invited institutions Specialised anti-corruption body Ministry of Justice Ministry of Economy (relevant department/s) and other relevant regulatory bodies)</p>	<p>Panel 8. Accountability and transparency of public administration</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to information law, scope and limitations 2. Non-restrictive defamation laws (if covered by previous recommendations) 3. Transparency initiatives (open data regulation, budgetary transparency, access to important public registers, participation in international transparency initiatives, like EITI, CoST, OGP) <p>Invited institutions National Coordinator Ombudsman Ministry of Justice Parliament Institution responsible for regulatory reform/business environment Selected sector representatives</p>
	<p>Special panel with international community Issues for discussion: Assistance and cooperation programmes on corruption and good governance Invited institutions: Bi-lateral aid agencies Economic and trade attaches International organisations and IFIs International foundations and internationally funded programmes</p>	
Afternoon	<p>Panel 9. Integrity of political public officials</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Types of officials, including MPs, government/national level and local level 2. Ethics rules, enforcement agency, sanctions, statistics 3. Conflict of interests - special rules, enforcement agency, sanctions, statistics 4. Other restrictions (gifts, incompatibility, post-employment, other) 5. Asset and interests disclosure 6. Remuneration 7. Availability of advice and guidance on request, written guidelines, training 	<p>Panel 10. Integrity in the judiciary and public prosecution service</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institutional, operational and financial independence 2. Merit-based recruitment and promotion, grounds for dismissal 3. Ethics rules, conflict of interests, other restrictions, asset disclosure 4. Training, advice and guidance on request, written guidelines 5. Fair and transparent remuneration 6. Complaints against judges and prosecutors, disciplinary proceedings 7. Other issues with integrity

	8. Regulation of lobbying 9. Impact Invited institutions Central election commission Parliament Government chancellery or President's Administration Bodies responsible for ethics of political officials Parliamentary ethics commissions 10. Other government representative responsible for this issue	8. Impact of integrity policies, trust and perception of corruption Invited institutions Judges Judicial/Prosecutorial Council Court Administration School of Judges Ethics and disciplinary boards Ministry of Justice Prosecution Service Parliament
Evening	<i>Debriefing for the monitoring team</i>	
	<i>Dinner hosted by the evaluated country (optional, only one dinner invitation from the government can be accepted by the monitoring team)</i>	
Day 5		
Morning	Panel 11. In-depth evaluation of the selected sector Additional meeting to clarify outstanding issues, possibly visits to the relevant ministry or entity in the sector	
Afternoon	Additional meetings (in necessary)	
	<i>Debriefing for the monitoring team</i>	
	Closing meeting with the national coordinator and other relevant representatives to brief about initial findings and next steps	
	<i>Departure of the monitoring team</i>	

Drafting monitoring reports

Structure

The monitoring reports will contain assessment of compliance with the recommendations adopted during the previous round of monitoring and new recommendations for further action. For each recommendation, reports will include the following elements: (1) description of *policy, legislative and institutional measures* taken to implement the recommendation, description of *actions taken to enforce these measures in practice and the results* of these enforcement measures; (2) assessment of the achieved level of implementation of the recommendation, including progress and remaining gaps, and a compliance rating, and (3) new recommendation, when appropriate, such as for the sector that was subject to the in-depth evaluation or when the most part of the previous recommendation is no longer valid.

The report may also include description of other significant anti-corruption measures taken by the government outside the scope of the previous recommendations; however it will not contain assessment or rating of such measures whereas it may be followed by recommendation when necessary.

Model outline of the 4th round of monitoring report

Executive summary

Introduction and monitoring process

CHAPTER 1. ANTI-CORRUPTION POLICY

- 1.1. Key anti-corruption reforms and trends in corruption
- 1.2. Impact of anti-corruption policy implementation
- 1.3. Public awareness and education in anti-corruption
- 1.4. Corruption prevention and coordination institutions

CHAPTER 2. PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION

- 2.1. Integrity in the civil service
- 2.2. Integrity of political public officials
- 2.3. Integrity in the judiciary and public prosecution service
- 2.4. Accountability and transparency in the public sector
- 2.5. Integrity in public procurement
- 2.6. Business integrity

CHAPTER 3. ENFORCEMENT OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR CORRUPTION

- 3.1. Criminal law against corruption
- 3.2. Procedures for investigation and prosecution of corruption offences
- 3.3. Anti-corruption criminal justice bodies
- 3.4. Enforcement of corruption offences

CHAPTER 4. PREVENTION AND PROSECUTION OF CORRUPTION IN A SELECTED SECTOR

- 4.1. Sectoral anti-corruption policy and bodies

4.2. Prevention measures

4.3. Enforcement and results/impact

For each country, country specific monitoring questionnaires will be prepared by the Secretariat and will include specific and technical questions that will guide the countries in collecting information and data for responses, and will help the monitoring teams to focus their assessment on the implementation efforts.

Ratings

Compliance ratings include:

- fully compliant,
- largely compliant,
- partially compliant and
- not compliant.

Concerning the recommendations that require adoption of documents, a country can be fully compliant only if all aspects of the recommendation are met. For instance, if the recommendation required that the country introduces new legislative provisions or develops a new programme or methodology full compliance would require that a legal act was adopted and entered into force one month before the plenary meeting and that the act includes all recommended provisions. The country will be considered largely or partially compliant if the enacted regulations address most or some aspects of recommendation. If the draft act includes all or some of the recommended provisions, but it is in planning or preparatory stages or was adopted later than [above term], this can be reflected in the text of the report, but will not affect the ratings, thus, the country will be considered not compliant with the recommendation.

Concerning the recommendations that require to implement certain measures in practice, the country can be considered fully compliant only if it can provide comprehensive information, including reports and statistics where applicable, which demonstrates the variety of practical steps and measures that were taken to implement the recommendation and if it can demonstrate how these measures led to resolution of the problem or concrete improvements made. For instance, if the recommendation required that the country provided ethics training to its public officials, the country will need to provide detailed information about the ethics training provided in practice, including the number and categories of public officials trained, the substance of the training (e.g. training agenda, lists of participants and trainers, hand-out materials, evaluation) and the impact of the training on the public officials, such as results of surveys and other studies that demonstrate positive change in ethics behaviour and attitudes of the public officials. If the implementation of the measure led to significant or partial resolution of the problem, the country can be rated as largely or partially compliant.

If the recommendation required that the country *considered* implementing a certain measure, full compliance would require that the country demonstrates that it assessed on the official level the feasibility to introduce the required measure (through policy paper, public discussion, etc.) and an official grounded decision was taken to introduce it or not. The importance and complexity of different measures should be taken into account when assigning the compliance ratings.

No ratings will be provided for the section dedicated to the in-depth evaluation of a selected sector, since it will be the first time that recommendations will be provided for this sector.

Rating	Explanation
Fully compliant	All elements of the recommendation were implemented by the country.
Largely compliant	Most elements of the recommendation (more than one half) were fully implemented and only few elements were not implemented.
Partially compliant	Some of the elements of the recommendation (less than one half) were implemented, but most of them remain unimplemented.
Not compliant	None of the elements of the recommendation were implemented.

Drafting of the report

After the on-site visit monitoring experts will be invited to prepare written inputs for the sections of the draft report assigned to them. They can use all available information for the drafting, including the answers to the questionnaire, issues paper, information received during the on-site visit, shadow reports by the non-governmental partners and any other additional information available to them, including through independent research. References will need to be provided for all sources used in the report.

The Secretariat will collect these inputs from the monitoring experts and on this basis prepare the draft report. The monitoring experts will be invited to review the draft report. The draft report will be sent to the monitored country, the civil society, business and international partners for comments. The monitored country and the partners will be invited to provide comments and suggestions in “track changes” mode. The monitoring experts will review the comments, and will advise the Secretariat how to revise the draft report, which comments can be accepted and which not. The Secretariat on the basis of the inputs from the experts will finalise the draft, and will distribute it to the delegates of the plenary meeting. It is the responsibility of the Secretariat to ensure the consistency of the draft report with the IAP monitoring practice where possible, as well as to make sure that the findings are based on the relevant international standards and best practices and are clearly within the scope of anti-corruption area.

Cut-off period

Only written information provided no later than one month before the plenary meeting will be taken into account for the compliance ratings. Written information that was submitted after the deadline and that requires additional analysis and verification by the monitoring team may only be reflected in the text of the report but will not affect the ratings. Exception to this rule is the obvious situations,

where there is no need for further analysis or validation of the new information provided after the deadline and the reported measure clearly implements recommendation or its specific element. The cut-off period should be observed by the countries, and if necessary enforced by the Secretariat.

Plenary meetings

Draft reports will be presented for the discussion and adoption to the ACN plenary meeting. The discussion and adoption will include the following stages: (1) bi-lateral preparatory meetings between the monitoring experts, Secretariat and the monitored country in order to review outstanding issues and identify possible solutions, (2) and plenary readings to review outstanding issues and to adopt the reports. Representatives of the country's civil society may attend bilateral meetings.

Model agenda of bilateral consultations and plenary readings of the monitoring reports

Session	Description
First bi-lateral consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the procedure for bi-lateral consultations and plenary; • Discussion of the outstanding issues of the first two chapters of the report with the focus on written comments from the government that were not accepted by the monitoring team; • Preparation of the new version of the report, including the newly agreed changes and outstanding issues for the presentation at the plenary meeting in track change mode.
First part of the plenary reading *	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief introduction of the monitoring process by the head of the delegation of the reviewed country and by the leader of the monitoring team; • Presentation of the two first chapters of the draft report by the monitoring experts, including changes that were introduced during the first bi-lateral consultation and outstanding issues; • Presentation by the delegation of the monitored country of their views on the two first chapters of the report draft report, including any areas of disagreement; • Presentation of views of the civil society and international partners (when available); • Plenary discussion of the outstanding issues, adoption of the first part of the report including the ratings and the new recommendations; representatives of countries that were involved in the previous round of monitoring of the examined country will be invited to start the discussion, followed by all other countries present at the plenary.
Second bi-lateral consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of the outstanding issues of the last two chapters of the report with the focus on written comments from the government that were not accepted by the monitoring team; • Preparation of the new version of the report, including the newly agreed changes and outstanding issues for the presentation at the plenary meeting in track change mode.
Second plenary reading *	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of the two last chapters of the draft report by the monitoring experts, including changes that were introduced during the first bi-lateral consultation and outstanding issues; • Presentation by the delegation of the monitored country of their views on the two last chapters of the report draft report, including any areas of disagreement; • Presentation of views of the civil society and international partners (when available); • Plenary discussion of the outstanding issues, adoption of the second part of the report including the ratings and the new recommendations.

* The change in the methodology will require that less time is allocated for the first reading and more time is allocated for the second reading.

Adoption of the reports

The reports will be adopted by the plenary meeting on the basis of consensus and using the principle of equal treatment.

If the monitoring team cannot reach conclusions regarding a specific chapter of a report due to insufficient information or cooperation provided by the country, it can advise the plenary to adopt the report with a reservation on this specific chapter and to postpone the adoption of this chapter to the next plenary meeting.

The decision to postpone the adoption of a chapter can be taken by the plenary on the advice by the monitoring team.

Follow-up

Publication of the reports and press releases

Monitoring report adopted by the plenary meeting will be considered final. After linguistic editing and corrections, that will be done by the Secretariat in consultations with the monitored countries, the reports will be published on the ACN web site, in English and in Russian. The Secretariat will be responsible for the preparation of the press release on each of the monitoring reports.

The National Coordinators are encouraged to translate, publish the report, as soon as possible, on a governmental website(s) and disseminate to each responsible authority and take steps to promote implementation of the recommendations continuously.

Official letter

The Secretariat will send an official letter with a copy of the monitoring report to the Prime Minister/President/Parliament and the National Coordinator of each monitored country, and will invite them to further disseminate the report, and to ensure the implementation of recommendations.

Return mission

A one-day return mission to the monitored country will be organised within 2 months after the adoption and publication of the report to present the monitoring round report and discuss priorities for future action. Return mission will include (1) a conference with relevant public institutions, NGOs, business, experts, academia and international partners, (2) a press conference, (3) a bilateral meeting with the National Coordinator and/or officials of relevant state bodies and (4) consultations with international partners, if appropriate. The organisation of the joint meeting, press conference and the bi-lateral meeting will be the responsibility of the National Coordinator; the Secretariat will be responsible for the organisation of consultation with international partners.

Based on the request from countries, return missions can be extended to include also technical seminars to explain some of the key recommendations to the public and non-governmental counterparts in order to promote their implementation. National coordinators will also be encouraged to liaise with the Secretariat any time they need a consultation or clarification about any specific recommendation.

Model agenda of the return mission

Session	Description
Joint meeting for public institutions, non-governmental, business and international partners	The objective of the joint meeting, which can take form of a conference, is to present the report adopted by the ACN and to discuss how the new recommendations can be implemented by the country, including actions by the state bodies, non-governmental organisations and international partners, and how information about these actions can be provided to the continued monitoring by the ACN. State bodies responsible for the implementation of the recommendations, representatives of the civil society, business and international partners will be invited to the conference. Various sessions of the conference will be structured around the sections of the report and will envisage discussion time after each section to allow for a meaningful participation of all participants.
Press conference	The press conference will provide an opportunity for the National Coordinator and for the representative of the ACN to present the report to the broader public through mass media channels in order to raise public awareness.
Consultation with international partners	The objective of this meeting is to discuss how donor agencies and representatives of international organisations engaged in anti-corruption projects in the country can support the implementation of the recommendations through their activities.
Bi-lateral meeting with the National coordinator	The meeting of the ACN representatives with the National Coordinator and other key anti-corruption officials will provide an opportunity to discuss technical issues related to the monitoring and participation of the country in other ACN activities.
Technical seminar	On the request from the country, a technical seminar can be organised back-to-back with the return mission to discuss with the national counterparts any specific issues covered by the report and the recommendations in order to promote the implementation.

Progress updates

After adoption of the monitoring report, the evaluated country will present, at each subsequent ACN plenary meeting, its progress updates. These updates should include brief summary of measures taken to implement recommendations, and may also cover other major anti-corruption developments. The Secretariat will prepare a form for progress updates for each country based on the country recommendations and will send them to the countries in advance of each plenary meeting, but not later than two months before the meeting. The countries will be required to provide information on implementation measures that were taken for each of the recommendations, and to provide supporting documents, such as legal and other official acts, implementation reports, statistical data

and other relevant information in annexes to the progress update. The total size of the progress update should not exceed 15 pages, excluding annexes.

Written versions of the updates should be provided by the National Coordinators to the Secretariat not later than two weeks before the plenary meeting in English or Russian. Progress reports provided after the deadline will not be taken into account. If the progress update is provided after this deadline, the Steering Group will consider this as a failure of the country to provide the report, will not assess such reports and will reflect this in the Summary Record of the meeting.

In preparation for the plenary meeting Secretariat will liaise with experts who participated in the monitoring, delegates from their countries or organisations replacing them at the plenary meeting, or other delegates who will attend the plenary and who specialise in particular areas that need to be assessed, and will invite them to study the update in advance of the meeting and to prepare an assessment of progress. With the assistance from the Secretariat, they will be invited to identify if any progress has been achieved in the implementation of each individual recommendation since the adoption of the recommendations or since the previous progress update, whichever applicable.

“Significant progress” for the purposes of the assessment will mean that important practical measures were taken by the country to adequately address many elements of the recommendations (more than a half). This can involve the adoption and/or enforcement of an important law. "Progress" would mean that some practical measures were taken towards the implementation of the recommendations. For example, drafts of laws that have been at least approved by the government and submitted to the parliament would constitute "progress" for the assessment of progress updates. “Lack of progress” will mean that no such actions were taken.

Recommendations, that appear to be fully addressed can be closed for the progress update procedure and further evaluated only as a part of the monitoring procedure. Assessment of measures taken by the country in the progress report does not prejudice and bind future monitoring report. The monitoring report may differ in its assessment of the measure compared with the progress report.

Experts may wish to prepare a written version of their assessment in advance of the meeting; however, it is not mandatory.

Civil society groups, business and other partners will be invited to contribute to the discussion of the progress updates. More specifically, civil society groups and other partners that took part in the monitoring of a country will be invited to provide their assessment of progress and to report about their own inputs to the implementation of recommendations. For that purpose, the Secretariat will send to them one month before the plenary the same form for progress update that would be developed for the government, and they will be invited to provide their responses two weeks before the plenary. The inputs from the civil society and other partners will be taken into account in preparation and discussion of the assessment.

A brief bi-lateral consultation will be organised before the plenary where the reviewed country, the monitoring experts and non-governmental partners will discuss the progress update and prepare a

preliminary assessment and ratings to be presented for the plenary. While the consultation will aim to reach a consensus, there may be outstanding issues, which will be presented for the consideration of the plenary.

During the plenary meeting, experts and the Secretariat will present their assessment indicating the recommendations where progress is observed, and recommendations where no progress is observed. The evaluated country may provide reactions to the experts' assessment. After that the plenary will be invited to discuss the progress update and to endorse the assessment.

Model agenda of bilateral consultation and plenary discussion of progress updates

Session	Description
Bi-lateral consultations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The participants will discuss the progress update recommendation by recommendation; the Secretariat will take notes of the discussion.
Plenary discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• One of the monitoring experts will briefly present the preliminary assessment, focusing on the key areas where significant progress or no progress were reported, and highlighting the outstanding issues• The head of the delegation of the reviewed country will present the position of the country on the highlighted outstanding issues• The plenary will discuss both presentations and will discuss the outstanding issue with the view to adopt the ratings by consensus

The Secretariat will prepare a summary record of the discussion, including the reflection of progress, which will be added to the written progress updates prepared by the countries with the short assessment of progress. After the plenary discussion, the progress updates will be published on the ACN website.

Exceptional follow-up

If between the monitoring meetings, the OECD/ACN Secretariat becomes aware of measures taken by IAP countries that contradict international anti-corruption legislative standards, undermine the functioning of anti-corruption institutions, other measures that prevent the functioning of the key anti-corruption or integrity tools, such as systems of asset declarations, freedom of information, independence of law-enforcement, and other issues covered by the IAP recommendations that may have a detrimental effect on the anti-corruption reforms, the Secretariat in consultations with the IAP chair can take the following actions:

1. A high-level letter from the OECD/ACN raising the concern and proposing possible solutions.
2. A high-level mission from the OECD/ACN to discuss the non-compliance situation and to develop a solution with high level counterparts from the concerned country.
3. If a solution can not be reached, a public statement to be released to the media to express the OECD/ACN position on the non-compliance situation.

Annex 1: Manual for monitoring experts (extract)¹⁰

The monitoring experts are strongly advised to familiarise themselves with the methodology and relevant material before the on-site. The role of experts is very important throughout the monitoring process: it is the monitoring experts, who assess the country, justify ratings and develop new recommendations. The Secretariat plays only supporting role of compiling the opinions of the experts, communicating with the monitored country, ensuring that equal treatment and observance of international standards, as well as making sure that the style of the report is coherent. Experts must be available for all stages of the monitoring, including preparatory work, on-site visit, drafting and the plenary meeting according to the established schedule. They may also be invited to take part in the return mission and in the follow-up evaluations of the progress updates.

Selection of monitoring experts

For the monitoring of each country under the Istanbul Action Plan, the OECD/ACN Secretariat establishes a monitoring team of experts. For this purpose, the Secretariat approaches individual experts, who were recommended by the ACN National Coordinators or by other ACN partners (e.g. other OECD divisions, other international organisations and partners), or who are known to the Secretariat through other activities, such as thematic studies or law-enforcement network. When looking for the potential experts, the Secretariat pays attention to the following factors:

- Position: to ensure the peer review principle, experts from state institutions are invited; in exceptional cases experts from intergovernmental, non-governmental or business organisations, academics and independent experts can be invited if there is a specific need in their qualification and expertise; experts do not represent their countries/institutions but act in their personal capacity;
- Professional expertise: to make sure that all the topics of the monitoring report are covered;
- Skills: knowledge of English and/or Russian, as monitoring is conducted in one of these languages, drafting skills, monitoring skills;
- Country involvement: to ensure that all IAP countries have a chance to take part in the monitoring, and that other ACN countries have a balanced representation as well, and
- Availability for the monitoring work: that expert is willing and able to dedicate time to the monitoring.

The Secretariat contacts the identified expert to seek confirmation of his/her participation and to agree which sections of the monitoring report is to be covered by the expert. The monitoring schedule is finalised in consultation with the monitoring team.

Upon request of the expert the Secretariat prepares an official letter addressed to the expert's institution to facilitate expert's participation in the monitoring process, including the follow-up

¹⁰ Full text of the manual for monitoring experts is available at <http://www.oecd.org/corruption/acn/istanbulactionplan/>

progress updates. The Secretariat will update the National Coordinators about participation of experts from their countries in the monitoring.

Main tasks of the monitoring experts

A monitoring expert has the following responsibilities during the monitoring process:

- Preparatory stage: commenting on the draft questionnaire, submission of additional questions and commenting on the on-site visit agenda; studying of the Issues Paper and conducting independent desk research;
- On-site visit: chairing panels with the government officials on topics the expert is responsible for, and contributing to discussions in other panels; taking part in debriefing meetings of the monitoring team;
- Drafting the report: providing input for the text of the draft report, including assessment of the implementation of previous recommendations and their ratings, and drafting new recommendations; reviewing draft report prepared by the Secretariat;
- Plenary meeting: presenting, negotiating and finalising of the report with the support from the Secretariat; participation in the bilateral and plenary sessions;
- Follow-up: depending on expert's availability and importance of certain recommendations, one of the experts will be invited to take part in the return mission to present the adopted report in the country; experts will also be invited to contribute to the assessment of regular progress updates, which is scheduled to take part once per year during 2016-2019, and the evaluation of the ACN, including questionnaires right after the monitoring, and contribution to the external evaluation which will take place at the end of the Work Programme period.

Model schedule of tasks of monitoring experts

Action	Tasks of monitoring experts	Deadline
PREPARATORY STAGE		
Establishing the monitoring team	Commit to the monitoring; contribute to establishing the schedule and distributing the topics among the experts.	4 months before the visit
Preparing the monitoring questionnaire	Contribute to development of the parts of the monitoring questionnaire covered by the expert.	4 months before the visit
Review of responses to the questionnaire	Review answers to the questionnaire on topics covered by the expert and propose additional questions or request additional information if needed. Review the answers to the additional questions.	1 month before the visit
Additional research	Carry out additional research based on any publicly available information, including official governmental data, reports by international organisations, academia, media or NGOs; propose issues requiring discussion/clarification during the on-site visit	3 weeks before the visit
Review of the Issues paper	Read the issues paper prepared by the Secretariat that includes a preliminary assessment of implementation of recommendations and questions to be raised during thematic panels during the on-site.	several days before the visit
Preparation of the on-site agenda	Review draft agenda of the on-site visit and suggest any additional public institutions to be invited to the meetings.	2 weeks before the visit
ON-SITE VISIT UP TO 5 DAYS		
Preparatory meeting	During the preparatory meeting of the monitoring team at the beginning of the on-site, discuss the preliminary assessment and main issues to be covered in each session.	
Thematic panels	Each expert will chair the sessions with state authorities that fall under his or her responsibility. Experts will contribute to the discussions during other panels with the officials, as well as with the civil society, business sector, and international organisations.	3 months before the plenary meeting
Concluding meeting	Present the preliminary assessment, formulate main findings and propose the compliance ratings for sections of the report that the expert is responsible for.	
List of additional information	Make a list of additional information and documents that should be requested from the country after the on-site visit.	
DRAFTING OF THE REPORT		
First draft	Contribute to the drafting of the relevant sections of the first draft of the monitoring report, including by providing: (1) text or bullet points with the assessment of implementation of the recommendations and additional relevant information/comments; (2) compliance ratings on the previous recommendations; and (3) new recommendations (if needed).	1.5 month before the plenary meeting

Action	Tasks of monitoring experts	Deadline
Second draft	Review the comments to the first draft received from the country, and contribute to the preparation of the second draft, which will be sent to the participants of the plenary meeting. Review relevant chapters and inform the Secretariat which changes should be accepted and which not.	1 week after receiving the comments on the draft report
PLENARY MEETING UP TO 3 DAYS		
Bi-lateral consultations	In a bilateral meeting with the monitored country: (1) discuss changes in the monitoring report proposed by the country; (2) agree on the accepted changes; and (3) identify the outstanding issues where no agreement was reached for the presentation at the plenary meeting.	
Plenary readings	Present the parts of the draft monitoring report covered by the expert, including changes that were introduced during the bi-lateral consultations, and outstanding issues. Note the arguments of the delegation of the monitored country, views of the civil society and plenary discussion, and propose changes to the text of the assessment report, including the assessment, the ratings and the new recommendations, to ensure the adoption of the report based on consensus.	
FOLLOW-UP		
Return mission 1 day	The Secretariat and one monitoring expert visit the country to present the monitoring report and discuss how the new recommendations can be implemented during: (1) a joint meeting for public institutions, non-governmental, business and international partners, (2) a press conference, (3) consultation with international partners.	2 months after the adoption of the report
Progress updates	Contribute to the assessment of the progress updates, if possible. If the expert participates in the plenary meeting, he or she will study the progress update prepared by the country and other available information, will discuss the assessment with the country in the bilateral preparatory meeting. One of the experts from the preparatory meeting will be selected as the rapporteur to present the assessment to the plenary session. If expert does not participate in the meeting, he or she will be invited to assist the delegate from his or her country attending the meeting to prepare for the assessment. To this end, the expert can prepare a written version of his/her assessment in advance of the meeting and share it with his/her country delegate representing country at the plenary meeting and with the Secretariat.	Every ACN plenary meeting, approximately twice per year
Evaluation of the ACN	Contribute to the internal and external evaluation of the implementation of the ACN Work Programme by filling out evaluation questionnaires prepared by the Secretariat, and responding to the external evaluator.	Approximately half a year after the monitoring

Practical information for monitoring experts

If the expert invited by the ACN Secretariat to take part in the monitoring needs an **official letter** to his or her employer, he or she is invited to inform the Secretariat about it.

The OECD covers the **costs** of the experts related to their participation in the on-site visit and in the ACN plenary meeting in Paris and return mission, including the economy class roundtrip air tickets to the country under monitoring and to Paris and standard per diems, from which expert pays for his/her hotel accommodation, meals and other local expenditures during both missions, unless some costs are pre-paid by the host country or by the Secretariat. The remuneration for the monitoring-related work of the expert in the form of fees or any other form is not foreseen by the OECD. When possible, the ACN countries are encouraged to contribute to co-funding the ACN work by covering some of the expenses of the monitoring experts from their countries.

All costs such as hotel accommodation, visas, meals and other incidental expenses, except air travel costs, should be advanced by the monitoring expert - as much as possible - and will be refunded by the OECD after the mission, upon reception of the original receipts, such as the hotel invoice. In the exceptional cases, if agreed with the Secretariat in advance, prepayment of the lump sum of all expenses can be provided during the on-site visit. Hotel and air travel are arranged by the OECD Secretariat for the monitoring team; for convenience of holding joint briefings and for host country usually providing local transport, the members of the monitoring team normally all stay at the same hotel.

Whenever the visa is required for the monitoring expert for his/her visit to the country undergoing the monitoring or to France for the participation in the ACN Plenary Meeting, arranging the visa is the responsibility of each monitoring expert. The monitoring experts are recommended to check the information of the Foreign Affairs Ministry of their country before the country visit and plenary meeting and inform the Secretariat if they need visa. The Secretariat can provide a visa support letter if needed.

Annex 2: Practical Guide: how to conduct monitoring by civil society (extract)¹¹

Alternative monitoring

Alternative monitoring is a parallel independent participation of representatives of the non-governmental sector in all stages of IAP monitoring, which is envisaged by the methodology.

According to the IAP Monitoring methodology, *civil society* includes a wide set of representatives of the non-governmental sector: for example, NGOs, lawyers associations, consumers associations, freedom of information associations, business associations, journalists, scientists, universities, researchers and other civil society actors.

Representatives of the non-governmental sector are invited to participate in all stages of IAP monitoring. The key contribution is to complete the questionnaire, in parallel with the Government, during the initial phase of the monitoring. Civil society is also invited to attend a special session during the on-site visit as well as the ACN plenary meeting, where the monitoring report is being discussed and approved. Further, civil society can contribute to the regular progress reports.

Why alternative monitoring is important?

The results of the monitoring show that alternative monitoring is a very precious instrument, is unique for IAP and should be strengthened further. Alternative monitoring provides for a second alternative opinion and non-governmental source of information, and therefore it allows to secure objectives and legality of IAP monitoring reports. Public participation in the monitoring also ensures transparency of the monitoring process.

It is also important that by participating in IAP monitoring in the form of recommendations, which are given to the country in the course of monitoring, representatives of the non-governmental sector get not only a potential direction for their activities, but also a tool of influence on the country's government. By using these recommendations they can demand to initiate and implement the particular measures for development of the anti-corruption system in the country and securing of its effectiveness. Alternative monitoring can also be viewed as another opportunity for the joint work of the government and non-governmental sectors by joint giving of recommendations presented to the country within the framework of IAP monitoring.

¹¹ Full version of the practical guide for NGOs is available <http://www.oecd.org/corruption/acn/ACN-Civil-Society-Monitoring-Practical-Guide-ENG.pdf>

NGO organisation for the monitoring

Shadow monitoring is a complex process and, given the scope of the IAP, involves work on a scale that a single organization can rarely handle. Proper planning, division of responsibilities and collaboration between different civil society organisations are therefore particularly important.

Selecting the focus

The three focus areas of the IAP comprise a number of sub-topics. It is unlikely that any single organization will have sufficient capacity and knowledge to conduct shadow monitoring in all of these areas and on all sub-topics. Organizations will therefore need to decide on which particular issues they want their parallel monitoring to focus. Two questions are worth considering here:

- a) **Relative significance of an issue** in the context of anti-corruption reforms in the country
- b) The monitoring organization's **relative knowledge of a given issue** compared to others

It might be the case that, while a particular issue is an important part of the general anti-corruption policy, an organization involved in shadow monitoring has very limited knowledge and experience in the relevant area. It is also possible that an area where the organization is particularly competent is not very significant in terms of the wider anti-corruption policy. It is hence important to find the right balance and pick the areas that are important and where the organization(s) can realistically expect to deliver high-quality assessment.

Identification of key actors

Considering the above, it is advisable and often even necessary to divide the work that shadow monitoring involves between a number of CSOs. Most countries have multiple CSOs that each focus on specific issues and areas in their routine work. While there might be some overlapping between the focus areas of different CSOs, each one of them is likely to have its own area (or areas) of expertise and, jointly, they are more likely to be able to cover the majority (or even all) of the topics of the Istanbul Action Plan.

Conducting a joint project involving multiple CSOs is a challenge by itself. A collective effort to conduct shadow monitoring will, most likely, require one or a few organizations to take the lead (at least at the initial stage) and do some initial planning, including identification of potential participants and their respective areas of expertise. CSOs that focus primarily on corruption and anti-corruption policies (and are therefore more likely to have a good knowledge of the relevant international mechanisms, including the Istanbul Action Plan) are usually in the best position to conduct this initial work and they can subsequently reach out to other organizations that can contribute to different parts of a shadow monitoring report through their expertise in particular areas.

Collaboration

Once all the participant organizations are selected and commit to make contributions to shadow monitoring, it is necessary to have a working procedure in place. There are different options for this, including (but not limited to) the following:

- a) All participant CSOs writing shadow reports of their own (focusing on their respective areas of expertise) and sending them to the Secretariat separately
- b) All participant CSOs writing on their respective areas of expertise, with a designated CSO or an editor then putting these parts into a single report to be sent to the Secretariat
- c) A single CSO undertaking to prepare the reports, soliciting inputs from other CSOs and/or independent experts

All of these approaches have advantages and disadvantages. Coordinating the writing of a report between multiple organizations can be very challenging but, on the other hand, a report produced through such an effort is likely to be broader in scope and offer a more comprehensive assessment of the situation. Endorsement by multiple CSOs will also increase the legitimacy and the impact of a shadow assessment.

If several organizations decide to collaborate on a joint report, it is important to start by drawing up a proper plan with clear a division of responsibilities and realistic deadlines.

Representation at plenary meeting

A representative of the civil society is invited by the ACN Secretariat to the plenary meeting where the monitoring report of the country is being reviewed and adopted. The meeting is open to other civil society organisations too.

The chosen representative can be from the designated or single CSO if scenarios (b) or (c) described above have been selected. In a scenario (a) it can be a representative of the CSO that covered most topics, or, for example, a representative of the CSO that covered areas which are most controversial or contagious in the draft report.

One month prior to the plenary meeting the draft monitoring report is circulated for comments, including to the non-governmental sector representatives.

It is important to note that the CSO participation is not limited to one person. If additional funds are found by the CSO community independently, any number of representatives can participate in the meeting and discussions of the report. This has been done on several occasions by various countries and donor community in the countries, in general, is very receptive to supporting such undertaking. Therefore, the CSOs are encouraged to seek additional support for their participation in the exercise at this stage.

Annex 3: Information Resources

International standards and good practices

- United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC): <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/>
- OECD Anti-bribery convention and Working Group on Bribery <http://www.oecd.org/daf/anti-bribery/oecdantibriberyconvention.htm>
- Council of Europe conventions and other relevant standards: http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/documents/instruments_en.asp
- International standards and good practices on anti-corruption and integrity: <http://www.oecd.org/cleangovbiz/>

Country evaluation reports

- OECD Country reports: <http://www.oecd.org/daf/anti-bribery/countryreportsontheimplementationoftheoecdanti-briberyconvention.htm>
- IAP reports: <http://www.oecd.org/corruption/acn/istanbulactionplancountryreports.htm>
- UNCAC Country reports: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/country-profile/index.html>
- Council of Europe GRECO evaluation reports: http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/default_en.asp http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/monitoring/greco/evaluations/index_en.asp
- SIGMA country reports: <http://www.sigmaweb.org/ouexpertise/#d.en.259002>
- Civil society review reports: <http://www.uncaccoalition.org/uncac-review/cso-review-reports>

Selected other resources

- “Anti-corruption Reforms in Eastern Europe and Central Asia: Progress and Challenges, 2009-2013, Fighting Corruption in Eastern Europe and Central Asia”, OECD (2013) English and Russian, <http://www.oecd.org/corruption/acn/library/>
- “Specialised Anti-Corruption Institutions - Review of models”, OECD (2013) English and Russian, <http://www.oecd.org/corruption/acn/library/>
- “Corruption: Glossary of International Criminal Standards”, OECD (2008), [English](#) and Russian
- “Study on Asset Declarations for Public Officials”, OECD (2011), [English](#) and Russian
- UNODC UNCAC Legal Library: <http://www.track.unodc.org/Pages/home.aspx>
- SIGMA publications: <http://www.sigmaweb.org/publications>
- Doing Business Reports <http://www.doingbusiness.org/>
- EBRD Transition Report: <http://www.ebrd.com/pages/research/publications/flagships/transition.shtml>
- Transparency International: <http://www.transparency.org/>, <http://gateway.transparency.org/tools>; <http://gateway.transparency.org/guides>, <http://www.transparency.org/whatwedo/nis>
- Freedom House: <http://freedomhouse.org/report-types/>
- Open Government Partnership: <http://www.opengovpartnership.org/about>
- «Fighting Corruption: What Role for Civil Society? The Experience of the OECD»: <http://www.oecd.org/daf/anti-bribery/anti-briberyconvention/19567549.pdf>

- TRACK Portal of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (collection of materials on corruption): <http://www.track.unodc.org/Pages/home.aspx>
- Publications and methodological materials on combatting corruption: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption/publications.html>
- Reference document prepared by the Secretariat of the Confederation of the State-Members of the UNCAC “Methodologies, including evidence-based approaches, for assessing areas of special vulnerability to corruption in the public and private sectors”, Vienna, 13-15 December 2010: <http://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/UNCAC/WorkingGroups/workinggroup4/2010-December-13-15/V1056919r.pdf>
- «Methodology for Assessing the Capacities of Anti-Corruption Agencies to Perform Preventive Functions», UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre, December 2009: http://europeandcis.undp.org/uploads/public1/files/Methodology_for_Assessing_the_Capacities_of_Anti_Corruption_Agencies_to_Perform_Preventive_Functions.pdf
- «Practitioners' Guide to Capacity Assessment of Anti-Corruption Agencies», UNDP, 2011: http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Democratic%20Governance/IP/Practitioners_guide-Capacity%20Assessment%20of%20ACAs.pdf
- Web-site of the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ): http://www.coe.int/T/dghl/cooperation/cepej/default_en.asp
- The evaluation report on the judicial systems of the European countries for 2012: http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/cooperation/cepej/evaluation/2012/Rapport_en.pdf
- Web-site of the global network of civil society organizations to promoting the UN Convention Against Corruption: <http://www.uncaccoalition.org/>, <http://www.uncaccoalition.org/uncac-review/uncac-review-mechanism>, <http://www.uncaccoalition.org/learn-more/resources/viewcategory/4-uncac-review-tools-for-civil-society>, <http://www.uncaccoalition.org/uncac-review/cso-review-reports>.
- «How to monitor and evaluate anti-corruption agencies: Guidelines for agencies, donors, and evaluators», Jesper Johnsen, Hannes Hechler, Luís De Sousa, Harald Mathisen (team leader), U4 Anticorruption resource center, U4 Issue, September 2011, No 8: <http://www.cmi.no/publications/file/4171-how-to-monitor-and-evaluate-anti-corruption.pdf>.
- Anticorruption Assessment Handbook. Final Report. USAID, February 28, 2009: http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnadp270.pdf.
- Jesper Johnsen, Hannes Hechler, Luís De Sousa and Harald Mathisen, *How to monitor and evaluate anti-corruption agencies: Guidelines for agencies, donors, and evaluators*, <http://www.u4.no/publications/how-to-monitor-and-evaluate-anti-corruption-agencies-guidelines-for-agencies-donors-and-evaluators-2/>
- United Nations General Assembly Resolution 59(1), 14 December 1946, <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/033/10/IMG/NR003310.pdf?OpenElement>;
- United Nations General Assembly Resolution 217 A (III), 10 December 1948, <http://www.un.org/cyberschoolbus/humanrights/resources/universal.asp>;
- General Comment No. 34 on Article 19 (Freedom of opinion and expression), July 2011, <http://www.article19.org/resources.php/resource/2420/en/general-comment-no.34:-article-19:-freedoms-of-opinion-and-expression>;
- UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, adopted at Aarhus, Denmark, on 25 June 1998, <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/pp/documents/cep43e.pdf>;
- Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to seek and receive information, the media in countries of transition and in elections, the impact of new information technologies, national security, and women and freedom of expression, UN Doc. E/CN.4/1998/40, 28

January 1998, para. 11:

<http://www.unhcr.ch/Huridocda/Huridoca.nsf/0/7599319f02ece82dc12566080045b296?Opendocument>;

- International Budget Partnership, Open Budget Survey:
<http://internationalbudget.org/what-we-do/open-budget-survey/>.