

PRIORITY CHECKLISTS  
STANDARDS AND INSTRUMENTS  
TOOLS GUIDES MANUALS  
GOOD PRACTICES  
REVIEW MECHANISMS  
MEASURING EFFECTIVENESS

**CleanGovBiz**  
Integrity in practice

## Civil society empowerment

April 2013 (DRAFT)

The CleanGovBiz Initiative supports governments, business and civil society in their efforts to build integrity and fight corruption. The initiative draws together existing instruments, reinforces their implementation, improves co-ordination among relevant players and monitors progress towards integrity.

The CleanGovBiz toolkit provides guidance on how corruption can best be tackled in different policy areas and offers access to relevant standards and instruments.

[www.cleangovbiz.org](http://www.cleangovbiz.org)



DRAFT

This work is published on the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Organisation or of the governments of its member countries.

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

© OECD 2013

OECD freely authorises the use of this material for non-commercial purposes. Requests for commercial use or translation of this material should be submitted to [contact@cleangovbiz.org](mailto:contact@cleangovbiz.org).

## Civil society empowerment

### Introduction

Civil society has a key role to play in fighting corruption, from monitoring public services, denouncing bribery to raising awareness of all economic and political actors. Since most cases of corruption involve public officials and private companies, civil society as an independent actor representing the interests of the general public is uniquely positioned to denounce and expose corruption cases and put pressure for reform. Governments therefore have to take measures to enable and strengthen civil society participation and civil society has to be aware of its role and make use of its potential leverage.

### Aim of the questionnaire

The following questionnaire aims at identifying potential impediments to an effective and positive contribution of civil society to promote integrity and fight against corruption.

An effective participation of the civil society in the fight against corruption depends on three key factors (i) the existence of a legal framework that enables Civil Society Organizations' (CSOs) participation without political and legal restrictions (ii) the willingness of the state to engage constructively with the civil society and (iii) the effective engagement of CSOs in the fight against corruption.

### Recipients of the questionnaire

This questionnaire should be addressed to:

- CSOs that are specialized in anti-corruption issues
- Other key CSOs (trade unions, academic institutions, professional associations, etc.)
- Political parties and policy institutions
- Government anti-corruption bodies

## Priority Checklist

### Is there an enabling environment for an effective role for CSOs?

1. Are there legal provisions that aim at **respecting and protecting the freedom of citizens and CSOs** to seek, receive and publish information regarding corruption? If so, are those provisions clear and unambiguous?
2. Are CSOs **independent**? If so, how is this independence sustainably ensured? Do CSOs have sufficient **capacity** to play an effective role in the fight against corruption?

### II – Is the state developing a constructive cooperation with CSOs?

3. Are citizens and CSOs **informed** about the government's anti-corruption work and bodies, their role, agenda and actions? Is that information easily accessible notably on the internet?
4. Are citizens and CSOs **consulted** during the policy-making process?
5. Are citizens and CSOs **actively participating** in the decision-making processes? Do citizens have the right to propose new legislation? Are they participating in working groups?

### Is civil society playing a strong and effective role?

6. Are CSOs **raising awareness** against corruption? Are they **monitoring** the actions and decisions of governments in potential risk areas? Are they also **exposing** corruption cases and criticizing corrupt officials and institutions?
7. Are CSOs actively **promoting civil society's participation** and **building coalitions** with key stakeholders in order to influence the public policy debate? Are they **lobbying** and **proposing alternatives** for new institutional devices and solutions to prevent or penalise corruption?
8. Are CSOs **responsible role models** of the changes they wish to implement (transparency, reporting, accountability, etc.)?

## Implementation guidance

### I - Is there an enabling environment for an effective role for CSOs?

The following questions aim at understanding if citizens and CSOs are free and able to have a positive contribution to fighting corruption and promoting integrity. The engagement of civil society will depend on the leverage and pressure that government can exert on citizen and CSOs. The constraints and hurdles that the state can impose on the civil society can have multiple origins ranging from excessive bureaucracy to unfair and unjustified laws that translate into penal and pecuniary sanctions.

1. Are there legal provisions that aim at **respecting and protecting the freedom of citizens and CSOs** to seek, receive and publish information regarding corruption? If so, are those provisions clear and unambiguous? *Please provide a reference to any legal provisions, regulations or policies that support your answer*

A flourishing civil society depends on the freedom and commitment of individuals pursuing their own chosen ends. The law defines and influences the role of those individuals as well as CSOs. It is then implicit that an enabling legal environment enhances civil society while a restrictive one will endanger it.

Along fundamental individual rights such as freedom of speech and the right to petition the government, individuals need to be able to organise themselves around common grounds, obtain a legal identity for informal groups and become CSOs. A crucial part of an enabling legal environment for CSOs involves arrangements to incorporate and thus acquire formal “legal personality”.

Incorporation grants “legal personality” status to CSOs and protects the principals of such organizations from personal liability for the affairs of the organizations. It also allows the organizations to enter into contracts, incur debt, sue and be sued, and engage in other transactions in the name of the organization without putting the personal assets of their trustees, directors, or officers at risk. On the other hand, obtaining a legal status is often accompanied by some form of registration and regulation by the state.

### **Governing principles towards an enabling environment for civil society**

A number of crucial principles should govern the design and execution of CSO's incorporation and registration procedures. Most important among these principals are the following:

- Legal provisions allowing CSOs to incorporate should be made easily available and criteria must be clear and unambiguous and not be unduly restrictive;
- The right to associate and to form CSOs carries with it the right of these organizations to the fundamental rights that apply to natural persons, such as the rights of freedom of speech and association, and the right to petition the government;
- Governments may choose, as a condition of incorporation, to register CSOs. Such registration can help clarify the status of these organizations and bolster public confidence in them. Any such registration provisions should adhere to the following guidelines, however:
  - Registration should be conducted by independent authorities;
  - Registration procedures should be uniform;
  - Procedures and criteria for registration should be publicly available, clear, and straightforward; fees should not be prohibitive;
  - Any denial of registration must be subject to court review;
  - Registered organizations may be required to present by-laws specifying the governance structure of the organization;
  - Governmental authorities should maintain a record of registered organizations.

Public authorities may legitimately mandate transparency by requiring regular reports from registered CSOs. Several principles should apply to the design of such public reporting requirements, however:

- Reporting requirements should serve valid public purposes, not be unduly burdensome;
- Government should establish procedures for receiving and storing required reports from CSOs;
- Coordinating bodies, such as NGO Councils, should be encouraged to assist organizations in meeting public registration and reporting requirements.

*Source: "Towards an Enabling Legal Environment for Civil Society", Statement of the 16<sup>th</sup> annual John Hopkins International Fellows in Philanthropy Conference, Nairobi*

2. Are CSOs **independent**? If so, how is this independence sustainably ensured? And do CSOs have sufficient **capacity** to play an effective role in the fight against corruption?

*Please provide a reference to any legal provision that supports/guarantees the independence of CSOs from the state and elements/programs that aim at building their capacity in the fight against corruption field.*

The credibility of the message conveyed by CSOs depends on two major factors: (i) their independence from the state and (ii) their capacity to fight corruption and promote common interests.

CSOs' ability to be vocal and to expose corruption cases is clearly linked to their **independence from government**. CSOs that rely heavily on public financing and civil servants for their operations can be subject to pressures from the state. Thus, CSOs should be encouraged to become structurally and financially independent from the state.

CSO's potential in contributing to development and fighting against corruption has often been challenged by **capacity constraints** in terms of HR and finances. Those constraints have a direct impact on CSO's aptitude to mobilize resources and to become independent. CSOs should encourage the participation of its members in training programs and seminars that strengthen not only their knowledge on corruption fighting and their interaction with other key stakeholders (notably government and donors) but also their management and financial skills.

The **sustainability** of CSO's activities and the effectiveness of their anti-corruption efforts will also depend on their ability to put in place solid internal mechanisms. In order to ensure that sustainability, CSOs should (i) have appropriate governance structures, (ii) adopt high professional and ethical standards for staff members and management and (ii) develop transparent accountability and reporting systems both towards donors and the communities they are serving.

### **UNODC's capacity building activities to fight against corruption**

The United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) recognizes the role of civil society in combating corruption under its Article 13, by calling on governments to increase transparency, improve public access to information, as well as to promote public contribution to government decision-making processes.

UNODC bolsters the capacity and engagement of civil society, especially from developing countries, by delivering training to CSOs on UNCAC and its review mechanism. UNODC also supports CSO engagement in intergovernmental meetings and provides the necessary tools for them to work constructively with their governments and the private sector on UNCAC implementation.

#### ***Building the capacity of Civil Society in the Arab Spring countries***

On 12 May 2012, 40 representatives from 25 officially registered Egyptian non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and nine Tunisian NGOs gathered to attend a four-day workshop organized by UNODC, in cooperation with the Egyptian government's Information and Decision Support Centre (IDSC), Egypt's Social Contract Centre and Transparency International.

The overall objective of the workshop was to build the capacities of civil society organizations with regards to United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) and its Review Mechanism. UNCAC, to which both Egypt and Tunisia are signatories, encourages states to involve civil society in the fight against corruption. The workshop aimed also at enhancing the relationship between civil society organizations (CSOs) and the Egyptian government in order to establish an effective and cooperative relationship through which CSOs provide the government with suggestions and recommendations to better comply with UNCAC and to better combat corruption in the country.

*Source: UNODC*

**Example of an initiative that aims at reinforcing CSO's capacity and independence: The case of the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF)**

The Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF) was established in 2000 with the goal of helping citizens to fight corruption and meet citizen demand for good governance.

The PTF considers that civil society has an important role to play in the development of anti-corruption and good governance programs, and it can play this role more effectively if it is independent, financially, from government or direct bilateral or multilateral funding. Through technical and financial support, PTF empowers Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) to play an effective role in the design, implementation and monitoring of anti-corruption activities.

PTF supports projects that give voice to civil society, demonstrate the value of constructive partnerships between government and civil society, and result in capacity building through action learning.

The PTF model is based on volunteer senior governance advisers. The advisers are generally retired from various development institutions, NGOs and Government Agencies. PTF recognizes that for civil society to play a key role in holding governments accountable to their public, CSOs must be financially independent both from government and from other powerful vested interests, including major donors.

PTF awards small grants (\$25,000 – \$40,000) for CSOs that develop results-oriented and time-bound (typically 12-18 months) projects. PTF will only support projects that (1) will have a direct and sustainable impact on reducing corruption, (2) as far as possible have a measurable and sustainable outcome and (3) involve direct interaction with public agencies. PTF views that Anti-corruption campaigns work best when targeting an environment of corruption rather than the wrong doings of individual public actors.

PTF's advisers work with CSO grantees on project design and grant management as well as providing general coaching and mentoring. Adviser support throughout a project's lifecycle helps to build strong bonds with grantees and often times allows for the continuation of successful endeavours, ushering in additional project phases and bolstering the CSO's impact.

*Source: The Partnership for Transparency Fund*

## II - Is the state developing a constructive cooperation with CSOs?

Strengthening the relationship between the state and its citizens in relation to anti-corruption issues will allow (i) to improve the quality of policies by integrating different points of view (ii) to meet the challenges deriving from fast changing public trends (iii) to respond to calls for greater government transparency and accountability and (iv) to strengthen public trust in the government and its actions.

3. Are citizens and CSOs **informed** about the government's anti-corruption work and bodies, their role, agenda and actions? Is that information easily accessible, notably on the internet?

Access to information requires sound legislation, clear institutional mechanisms for its application, independent oversight institutions and effective judiciary for enforcement. Finally, it requires citizens' to know and understand their rights and to be willing and able to act upon them.

Today, democratic governments are increasingly under-pressure from citizens to open decision making processes to scrutiny of voters. The general trend is towards sharing information and communicating with general public. Moreover, internet and social networks are increasing citizens' demand and access to information that enable them to judge governments based on their performance.

The level of information available as well as the level of details communicated by the authorities will allow CSOs to collect the information, monitor and finally judge government's actions in relationship with their anti-corruption policy.

### **What is an open government according to the OECD?**

In the past, the OECD has defined an open government from a threefold perspective: (i) transparency, in other words being exposed to public scrutiny; (ii) accessibility to anyone, anytime, anywhere; and (iii) responsiveness to new ideas and demands.

Today the notion of an open government has received increased attention thanks to the growing role of social networks (within and outside government) and the extensive use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) in society.

These factors have shifted attention from the institutions and rules to the very same practice and impact of an open government. The idea being now that the source of public value is rooted in individual and society choices, expectations, and interests, and that public value cannot be generated by government alone (e.g. the preservation of the environment requires individual behavioural change). Therefore, today, open government is about how government can work with society and individuals to co-create public value.

Source: OECD Principles for Open and Inclusive Policy Making (2010).

\* All country reviews are available online at [www.oecd.org/daf/nocorruption/convention](http://www.oecd.org/daf/nocorruption/convention).

### **Example of CSOs participation to promoting integrity:**

#### **The case of the Public Information Disclosure Act in Indonesia**

In Indonesia, the Public Information Disclosure Act that entered into effect in 2010 specifically encourages civil society's participation during the policy-making process.

The act aims at: (i) securing the right of the citizens to know the plan to make public policies, public policy programs, and the process to make public decisions, as well as the reason of making a public decision; (ii) encouraging the participation of the society in the process of making a public policy; (iii) increasing the active role of the people in making public policies and to manage the Public Agencies properly; (iv) materializing good governance, i.e., transparent, effective and efficient, accountable and responsible; (v) knowing the rationale of a public policy that affects the life of the people; (vi) enhancing the information management and service at Public Agency circles, so as to produce good quality information service.

Source: *Anti-corruption Resource centre*

4. Are citizens and CSOs **consulted** during the policy – making process?  
*Please provide a reference for public consultations with CSOs (if any).*

Consultations have been recognized as an essential element of policy-making in many developed and more recently emerging countries. The opportunities for citizens to provide feedback on policy proposals were once rare. Today, consultations are on the rise as they are increasingly accepted as valuable means of improving the quality of public policy while strengthening its legitimacy. During consultation, it is governments who define the issues, set the questions and manage the process while citizens are invited to contribute their views and opinions. Several OECD countries have long-standing institutional arrangements for consultation (e.g. tripartite forums of government, business and labour). Many have established permanent or ad hoc advisory bodies and commissions that include CSOs.

**Example of public consultation:**

**Promoting transparency and fighting corruption in Procurement in India**

The “National Consultation on Transparency and Anti-Corruption Measures in Procurement” was concluded in April 2012, in New Delhi, India. It was organized by the Global Compact Network India in partnership with the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the consultation provided an opportunity for stakeholders to discuss ways to enhance transparency and strengthen anti-corruption measures in the procurement process.

The consultation was attended by high-level representatives from the Central Vigilance Commission, Comptroller and Auditor General’s Office; the Chief Vigilance Commissioner of Public Sector Units; industry associations; private companies; and civil society organizations.

Over the course of two days, participants discussed issues ranging from procurement guidelines, industry-wide efforts, integrity pacts and whistle blower mechanisms to the UN Convention against Corruption and civil society’s engagement in public-private partnerships. Industry-wide efforts on transparency and procurement were highlighted by speakers from the Confederation of Indian Industries; the Federation of Indian Chamber of Commerce and Industry Transparency; and the UN Global Compact. Key issues

highlighted during the procurement consultation will be summarised shortly.

The National Consultation is part of the UN Global Compact and the Global Compact Network India's joint project on anti-corruption collective action. Supported by the Siemens Integrity Initiative, the initiative is one of five collective action projects launched by the UN Global Compact in December 2010, in which it joined forces with Local Networks and strategic partners to develop anti-corruption collective action projects in the emerging markets of Brazil, Egypt, Nigeria, India and South Africa.

*Source: UN Global Compact*

5. Are citizens and CSOs **actively participating** in the decision-making processes? Do the citizens have the right to propose new legislation? Are they participating in working groups?

Active participation recognizes the capacity of citizens to discuss and generate policy options independently. It requires government to share agenda-setting and to ensure that policy proposals generated jointly will be taken into account in reaching a final decision.

The number of OECD countries that include citizens in formal policy making processes is still limited. An active and formal participation of citizens was mostly implemented in the form of Participatory Budgeting (PB) exercises (see box below) notably in federal countries and local governments. Whereas, in developing countries, governments often show reluctance to actively/formally include citizens and CSOs in policy making processes.

***Example of active participation of Citizens and CSOs in policy-making:  
The case of Participatory budgeting and Brazil***

Participatory Budgeting (PB) aims to involve citizens in deciding how a defined portion of public resources will be allocated. It attempts to ensure that public spending is consistent with citizens' needs and priorities.

PB is a process through which the residents of an area, be it a neighbourhood, village, city or local authority area, directly participate in the allocation of a portion of the local government budget or the budget of a specific government sector such as for e.g. maternal health, public transport etc. or an agency like for e.g. a school, health centre etc. PB enables citizens to get informed about available public resources, engage in prioritizing the needs of their locality collectively, propose projects, investments and services and allocate resources in a democratic and transparent way.

CSOs can support PB in multiple ways through, for example, helping to access, analyse and disseminate budget information; conducting research to assess citizen needs and preferences, helping citizens to organise, training and educating citizens with regard to participatory budgeting and budgetary issues in general and, facilitating communication and relations between citizens and government authorities.

A study conducted in Brazil (Zamboni, 2007), tends to demonstrate that on average, counties where PB policies have been implemented are better managed and have recorded fewer irregularities (including corruption and embezzlement cases) than similar counties without PB, when considering the overall number of irregularities and their seriousness.

*Source: CIVICUS (PG Exchange), Yves Zamboni (2007) "Participatory Budgeting and Local Governance: An Evidence-Based Evaluation of Participatory Budgeting Experiences in Brazil"*

### III – Is civil society playing a strong and effective role?

6. Are CSOs **raising awareness** against corruption? Are they **monitoring** the actions and decisions of governments in potential risk areas? Are they also **exposing** corruption cases and criticizing corrupt officials and institutions?

*Please share an example of this.*

CSOs have a key role in **raising awareness** and educating citizens about the ill effects of corruption. Educating citizens about the nature and the negative impact of corruption will allow them to recognize and denounce corruption when it occurs. CSOs can then offer citizens the opportunity to convey their messages to a larger audience. CSOs can also conduct regular surveys on corruption, service delivery and diagnostic delivery in order to inform citizens about trends in public services and highlight specific cases of misconduct or corruption.

There is also a growing recognition for the role played by CSOs in **monitoring** governmental decision and implementing anti-corruption programs. CSOs can monitor and measure progress towards the implementation of commitment of the governments in policy areas including: privatization plans, procurement reforms, allocation of housing, public expenditure tracking, election monitoring and legal reforms. They have the mandate to hold government accountable and demand access to information held by government institutions.

Finally, CSOs have also proved to be instrumental in **exposing** cases of corruption, fraud or maladministration, at the national as well as international levels.

**Example of participation of civil Society in monitoring activities:****Anti-corruption strategy in Mozambique**

**Mozambique's Anti-Corruption Strategy (ACS)** for 2006/2010 represents an example of striving to involve various sectors of society in improving public service delivery and fighting against corruption.

The ACS has been designed by an Inter-ministerial Commission on Public Sector Reform as an integral part of the overall public sector reform strategy, whose primary objective is to improve service delivery to citizens. The public reform strategy is built around five major components, including rationalisation of public service delivery structures, human resource development policy, management of public policy processes, financial management; and good governance and the fight against corruption. The ACS identifies seven major objectives, ranging from rationalisation of administrative procedures, improvement of efficiency and quality of the justice system, strengthening the public financial system to promoting the participation of civil society in the fight against corruption.

For each objective, the ACS details results and specific indicators consistent with the other components of the overall public sector reform. A Technical Commission composed of representatives of the executive, the judiciary, the legislature, civil society and the business sector is in charge of monitoring the strategy with two consultative bodies, the National Anti-Corruption forum and the Provincial forum.

*Source: Anti-corruption Resource centre*

7. Are CSOs actively **promoting civil society's participation** and **building coalitions** with key stakeholders in order to influence the public policy debate? Are they **lobbying** and **proposing alternatives** for new institutional devices and solutions to prevent or penalise corruption?

*Please provide an example of this.*

Fighting Corruption and institutional reform cannot be achieved by single players in a sustainable way. CSOs have an important role not only in raising the awareness of the general public about corruption but also in promoting its participation and in coordinating their efforts with key stakeholders. CSOs have an important role in advocacy and awareness rising, with the view to educating the

public and building constituencies backing anticorruption reforms. CSOs working on corruption related issues can also coordinate their efforts and build stronger coalitions around issues of common interests, for goals that can be better achieved through greater numbers. Such coalitions may gain a coordinating and representative function in national and international forums.

Through seminars, conferences, and workshops, CSOs can influence new legislation that will aid corruption control or to lobby for new institutional devices to prevent or penalize corruption. Advocacy for legal and judicial reform, freedom of information, business deregulation, privatization, and procurement reform are common themes of civil society interventions. Finally, CSOs can also play a key role by promoting international best practices to prevent and combat bribery and liaise with businesses and business association to adopt ethical codes of conduct that prohibit bribery.

**Example of Coalition building:**

**the case of the Extractive Industry Transparency Initiative (EITI)**

EITI, was launched in 2002 to promote transparency and accountability in the extractive industries. For this purpose, it sets a global standard for oil, gas and mining companies to publish the tax and royalty payments they make and for host governments to disclose the revenues they receive.

EITI builds on a coalition of governments, companies, CSOs and international organizations that are involved at all stages of the EITI implementation process. Its coalition approach is also reflected by its governance structure, with an executive board composed of members of supporting governments, civil society and companies. Around 50 of the world's largest oil, gas and mining companies support and actively participate in the EITI. CSOs participate in the EITI directly and through the Publish What You Pay campaign, which is supported by over 300 NGOs worldwide.

EITI has a flexible mechanism in place to monitor and reconcile the reported revenues and payment at country level. The process is overseen by a local multi-stakeholder group composed of participants from the government, companies and national civil society. In Asia and the Pacific for example, Timor-Leste has been one of the first three countries – together with Azerbaijan and Liberia - to become an EITI Compliant country, while Mongolia has achieved EITI Candidate status (ADB/OECD, 2009).

*Source: Anti-corruption Resource centre*

**Example of CSOs proposing policies to promote integrity:****The Case of Transparency International France** (*Example to be developed*)

- In December 2010, Transparency International France provided policy recommendations regarding the regulation of conflict of interests for public officials.
- Since then, TI has been actively lobbying to push for reforms in the area and to promote integrity in France.
- Recent scandals in French politics provided a renewed impetus for TI to push for more reform in this area.

*Source: Transparency International (December 2010), « Prévenir les conflits d'intérêts dans la vie publique française »*

8. Are CSOs **responsible role models** of the changes they wish to implement (transparency, reporting and accountability)?

CSOs need to be exemplary in their behavior on a daily basis. They must have an active role in fighting corruption inside their own organization and be beyond reproach. CSOs must be transparent in their operations and open to external scrutiny. Such transparency can be achieved voluntarily by CSOs through regular reporting and communication with various stakeholders including the authorities, media and the general public.

CSOs' failure as role models of integrity and good governance can have negative impacts as it can (i) endanger its role as a watchdog and discredit its actions not only towards the authorities but most importantly towards the general public, (ii) deteriorate the voice and to reduce the audience of corruption fighting organizations and citizens, (iii) endanger whistle blowing mechanisms and (iv) finally it may jeopardize the sustainability of their activities and dry up fund supply and technical assistance from international donors.

**Example of NGO accountability and transparency initiatives:****The INGO Accountability Charter**

The International Non-Governmental (INGO) Accountability Charter was launched in 2006 by eleven leading international NGOs (including Amnesty International, CARE, ActionAid, CIVICUS, Greenpeace, OXFAM, and Transparency International) as a voluntary self-regulating initiative that defines common values, policies and practices. It is considered one of the strongest initiatives in terms of assurance mechanism (Obrecht, Hammer and Laybourn 2012).

The INGO Accountability Charter is a statement of principles that promote transparency and accountability both internally and externally through a number of provisions that cover issues such as respect of human rights, political and financial independence, responsible advocacy, participatory and effective programmes, non-discrimination, transparency in reporting activities, accuracy of information, good governance, professional and ethical fundraising. Signatory NGOs commit themselves to gradually apply the Charter's provisions to all their programmes, conduct annual independent fiscal audits and submit annual compliance reports, which are reviewed by an independent panel whose assessment is made publicly available.

For additional information, see:

<http://www.ingoaccountabilitycharter.org/about-the-charter/>

*Source: Anti-corruption Resource centre*

## INSTRUMENTS AND STANDARDS

UN Convention Against Corruption, Article 13

<http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/>

## TOOLS, GUIDANCE, MANUALS

The Corruption Fighters' Tool Kit from TI: a compendium of practical civil society anti-corruption experiences described in concrete and accessible language

[www.transparency.org/tools/e\\_toolkit](http://www.transparency.org/tools/e_toolkit)

UNODC Anti-Corruption Tool Kit

[www.unodc.org/pdf/crime/toolkit/f1tof7.pdf](http://www.unodc.org/pdf/crime/toolkit/f1tof7.pdf)

Further Transparency International Tools and Initiatives

[www.transparency.org/tools](http://www.transparency.org/tools)

U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre: (several publications)

UNCAC and the participation of NGOs in the fight against corruption

[www.u4.no/helpdesk/helpdesk/query.cfm?id=162](http://www.u4.no/helpdesk/helpdesk/query.cfm?id=162)

World Bank on civil society in Anticorruption:

[go.worldbank.org/NULF579BT0](http://go.worldbank.org/NULF579BT0)

OECD Public Management Policy Brief: Engaging Citizens in Policy-making: Information, consultation and Public participation

[www.oecd.org/governance/public-innovation/2384040.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/governance/public-innovation/2384040.pdf)

*OECD Principles for Open and Inclusive Policy Making (2010)*

[www.oecd.org/gov/46560128.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/gov/46560128.pdf)

OECD Focus on Citizens: Public Engagement for Better Policy and Services

[www.oecd.org/fr/gov/focusoncitizenspublicengagementforbetterpolicyandservices.htm](http://www.oecd.org/fr/gov/focusoncitizenspublicengagementforbetterpolicyandservices.htm)

UNPAN – Citizen engagement to enhance accountability and prevent corruption in the provision of public services in OECD countries – by Beatriz Sanz Corella

[unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UN-DPADM/UNPAN047621.pdf](http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UN-DPADM/UNPAN047621.pdf)

## REVIEWS, CASE STUDIES

The Experience of Civil Society as an Anticorruption Actor in East Central Europe (Romanian Academic Society and Hertie School of Governance)

[www.againstcorruption.eu/uploads/rapoarte\\_finale\\_PDF/The-Experience-of-Civil-Society-as-an-Anticorruption-Actor-in-East-Central-Europe.pdf](http://www.againstcorruption.eu/uploads/rapoarte_finale_PDF/The-Experience-of-Civil-Society-as-an-Anticorruption-Actor-in-East-Central-Europe.pdf)

OECD/AfDB (2012), "Stocktaking of Business Integrity and Anti-Bribery Legislation, Policies and Practices in Twenty African Countries

[www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/stocktaking-of-business-integrity-and-anti-bribery-legislation-policies-and-practices-in-twenty-african-countries\\_9789264169586-en;jsessionid=42pig8a49m91.x-oecd-live-01](http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/stocktaking-of-business-integrity-and-anti-bribery-legislation-policies-and-practices-in-twenty-african-countries_9789264169586-en;jsessionid=42pig8a49m91.x-oecd-live-01)

*Yves Zamboni (2007) "Participatory Budgeting and Local Governance: An Evidence-Based Evaluation of Participatory Budgeting Experiences in Brazil"*

<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRANETSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/Zamboni.pdf>

*RAPID Case Study by Dimitrova (2005) and [www.anticorruption.bg](http://www.anticorruption.bg)*

*Barker, A: Co-production of local service. LARCI (2010)*

*McNeil and Muvumba, 2006*

[www.cleangovbiz.org](http://www.cleangovbiz.org)

