

Annex 3 – NIS Indicators and Foundations

1. Legislature

A representative deliberative assembly with the power to adopt laws – e.g. parliament or congress. In parliamentary systems of government, the legislature is formally supreme and appoints the executive. In presidential systems of government, the legislature is considered a power branch that is equal to, and independent of, the executive. If some or all members of the legislature are appointed rather than elected, questions should be inserted to enquire about the transparency of the selection process.

Capacity

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place that provide the legislature with adequate financial, human and infrastructure resources to effectively carry out its duties?
Guiding questions	What are the legal provisions re: resource allocation for the legislature? Does the legislature determine its own budget or is it up to the discretion of another institution?
Minimum score (1)	No such provisions exist.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of resources and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are provisions in place to ensure that the legislature receives adequate resources to effectively carry out its duties.
Additional data sources	Survey of legislative staff & legislators.
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.1.2
Indicator name	Resources (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the legislature have adequate resources to carry out its duties in practice?
Guiding questions	Resources include financial, infrastructure and staff. Items to consider are whether journals are published regularly and on time, house resources are adequate (clerks, research, library), committee resources are adequate (facilities, clerks, research), legislators' resources are adequate (office, staff, equipment, travel, salary, constituency budget), training is adequate.
Minimum score (1)	The existing financial, human and infrastructural resources of the legislature are minimal and fully insufficient to effectively carry out its duties.
Mid-point score (3)	The legislature has some resources. However, significant resource gaps lead to a certain degree of ineffectiveness in carrying out its duties.
Maximum score (5)	The legislature has an adequate resource base to effectively carry out its duties.
Additional data sources	Survey of senior legislative staff. Annual allocation from the state budget (including comparison to previous years).
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent is the legislature independent and free from subordination to external actors by law?
Guiding questions	Can the legislature be dismissed? If yes, under which circumstances? Can the legislature recall itself outside normal session if circumstances so require? Does the legislature control its own agenda? Does it control the appointment/election of the Speaker and the appointments to committees? Can the legislature determine its own timetable? Can the legislature appoint its own technical staff? Do the police require special permission to enter the legislature?
Minimum score (1)	There are no laws which seek to ensure the independence of the legislature.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of legislative independence and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive laws seeking to ensure the independence of the legislature.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.1.4
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the legislature free from subordination to external actors in practice?
Guiding questions	To what extent is the legislature able to practice its rights and carry out its responsibilities as described under 1.1.3? Are there examples of attempted interference by the government or judiciary in the activities of the legislature? How many bills passed by the legislature originate from it rather than from the executive? Are there examples of the legislature passing bills against the explicit will of the executive? Are there examples of the speaker or individual legislators accusing the executive of undue interference? Have these cases been addressed adequately?
Minimum score (1)	Other actors regularly and severely interfere with the activities of the legislature with consequences for the behaviour of the legislature.
Mid-point score (3)	Other actors occasionally interfere with the activities of the legislature. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of the legislature.
Maximum score (5)	The legislature operates freely from any interference by other actors, particularly the executive
Additional data sources	Statements of other actors/pillars/institutions leaders, media monitoring, reports of specific think tanks/NGOs concerned about governance and systems of checks & balances, etc.
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the public can obtain relevant and timely information on the activities and decision-making processes of the legislature?
Guiding questions	How open and accessible to the media and the public are the proceedings of the legislature and its committees required to be by law? Do all voting records have to be made public? Are the agendas of legislative sessions and committee hearings required to be published ahead of time? How free from restrictions are journalists in reporting on the legislature and the activities of its members? Does the law require verbatim records of floor sessions to be recorded? Can TV companies broadcast parliamentary sessions free of charge? Does the law allow members of the public access and attendance at legislative sessions? Is the legislature required to receive citizens and respond to their queries? Is the legislature required to produce and publicize reports about its activities? Are draft bills discussed by the legislature required to be made public? Are legislators' asset disclosures required to be made public?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions to ensure that the public can access the parliament and obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the legislature, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of the legislature and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive provisions are in place to ensure that the public can access the parliament and obtain information on the organisation and functioning of the legislature, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent can the public obtain relevant and timely information on the activities and decision-making processes of the legislature in practice?
Guiding questions	How effective is parliament in informing the public about its work, through a variety of channels? How easy is it for the media and the public to obtain information on the activities of the legislature and its committees in practice? Can TV companies broadcast legislative sessions free of charge? Are all bills published before being debated? Are the agendas of legislative sessions and committee hearings published ahead of time? Is the legislature budget published in full? Are verbatim records of floor sessions recorded? Are reports to parliament on government performance published and debated? Are Hansard/Journals for House and committees published and available? Are all voting records available in due course? Are individual budgets and balance reports on expenditures published? Are legislators' asset disclosures made public? Can members of the public access and attend parliamentary sessions in practice? Does the legislature respond to citizens' queries?
Minimum score (1)	The public is in general not able to access the parliament and obtain any relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the legislature, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While the public can access the parliament and obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the legislature, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made, it is usually a difficult, cumbersome and/or lengthy process.
Maximum score (5)	The public is able to readily access the parliament and obtain relevant information on all aspects related to the organisation and functioning of the legislature, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	Anonymous survey of legislators; standing committee that works on immunities, validations, ethics, discipline, inquiries/investigations, etc. NGOs
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the legislature has to report on and be answerable for its actions?
Guiding questions	Is there a constitutional review system of legislative activities? Are there provisions for public consultation on relevant issues? Are there mechanisms to handle complaints against decisions/actions by the legislature or its individual members? Are there provisions regarding the extent of immunity of members of the legislature?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place to ensure that the legislature has to report and be answerable for its actions.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of legislative accountability and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Extensive provisions are in place to ensure that the legislature has to report and be answerable for its actions.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent do the legislature and its members report on and answer for their actions in practice?
Guiding questions	To what extent are provisions on public consultation being followed in practice? Does the legislature support public oversight by proactively providing information? Does the legislature report regularly with appropriate justifications to the relevant state bodies and public? To what extent are complaints mechanisms applied effectively?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place/existing provisions are not effective at all in ensuring that members of the legislature have to report and be answerable for their actions in practice.
Mid-point score (3)	While members of the legislature have to report and be answerable for certain actions of theirs, the existing provisions are only partially effective/applied in practice.
Maximum score (5)	Existing provisions are effective in ensuring that members of the legislature have to report and be answerable for their actions in practice.
Additional data sources	Anonymous survey of legislators; the official journal and/or legislative database, activity reports from the oversight institutions, reports from the information service of the legislature, publications from the oversight institutions and/or the same information service of the legislature, records of courts, prosecution offices, anti-corruption agencies and/or various types of ethical or disciplinary bodies, reports from think tanks/NGOs, opinion polls and media monitoring
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity mechanisms (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there mechanisms in place to ensure the integrity of members of the legislature?
Guiding questions	Are there codes of conduct for legislators? Are the legislature or independent bodies required to deal with the legislature ethics? Are there rules on gifts and hospitality for legislators? Are there post-employment restrictions for legislators? Are legislators required to record and/or disclose contact with lobbyists? Are there conflicts of interest policies for legislators? Are legislators required to fill out and publicize asset declarations?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions in place to ensure the integrity of members of the legislature.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of legislators and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive provisions in place to ensure the integrity of members of the legislature.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity mechanisms (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of legislators ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	Are codes of conduct enforced effectively? Are these bodies effective in ensuring ethical behaviour by legislators? Are the rules on gifts and hospitality effectively enforced? Have legislators been found to be in violation of the code of conduct or other ethical standards? If yes, what sanctions were levied against them? Are post-employment restrictions enforced effectively? Do legislators record and/or disclose contact with lobbyists in practice? Are conflicts of interest policies enforced effectively? Are legislators' asset declarations published and scrutinized?
Minimum score (1)	There is a complete absence of actions which would aim to ensure the integrity of legislators, such that misbehaviour goes mostly unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	There is a piecemeal and reactive approach to ensuring the integrity of legislators, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	There is a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of legislators, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of legislative staff on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	Anonymous survey of legislators; official journal and/or legislative database, activity reports from advisory and disciplinary bodies, activity reports from political groups/caucuses, statements from political party leaders and/or disciplinary committees, special registers of assets and interests declarations, registers of gifts & hospitality disclosures, reports from whistleblower protection bodies, registers of lobby meetings, regular activity reports from standing committees and individual legislators, database of legislative initiatives, minutes of committee meetings, statements in committee/plenary meetings, reports from specialized oversight bodies/agencies, reports from think tanks/NGOs, reflections in the media
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.3.1
Indicator name	Executive Oversight (law & practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the legislature provide effective oversight of the executive?
Guiding questions	Does the legislature have the power to set up committees of inquiry? What is the scope of authority of these committees in investigating alleged executive misbehaviour? Does the legislature have the power to influence and scrutinize the national budget, through all its stages? Does the legislature have the power to scrutinize appointments to executive posts, and hold their occupants to account? Does the legislature have the power to impeach or censure officials of the executive branch, or express no-confidence in the government? What is the role of the legislature in the appointment process for the ombudsman, head of the supreme audit institution, electoral management body? Does the law include political control mechanisms via the legislature to monitor public contracting by the executive? How effective are specialist committees in carrying out their oversight function? Is the legislature's power to set up committees of inquiry effectively enforced? How effective have these committees proven to be? Is the legislature's power to influence and scrutinize the national budget, through all its stages, effectively enforced? How effectively can the legislature scrutinize appointments to executive posts, and hold their occupants to account? To what extent does the legislature have mechanisms to obtain information from the executive branch sufficient to exercise its oversight function in a meaningful way? Is the legislature's power to impeach or censure officials of the executive branch, or express no-confidence in the government effectively enforced? Is the legislature able to play a role in the appointment process for the ombudsman, head of the supreme audit institution, electoral management body?
Minimum score (1)	The legislature is rather inactive and entirely ineffective in providing oversight of the executive.
Mid-point score (3)	While the legislature is somewhat active in seeking to hold the executive to account, the effectiveness of its actions is limited (e.g. due to limited competencies and/or failure to implement existing provisions).
Maximum score (5)	The legislature provides effective oversight of the executive and holds members of the executive to account.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LEGISLATURE
Indicator number	1.3.2
Indicator name	Legal reforms (law and practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the legislature prioritise anti-corruption and governance as a concern in the country?
Guiding questions	What legislation in the field of anti-corruption has been passed by the legislature in recent years? To what extent has the legislature passed legal reforms that strengthen the integrity, transparency and accountability of the country's governance system? What is the quality of this legislation? What international legal instruments have been passed/ratified?
Minimum score (1)	The legislature does not pay attention to the promotion of public accountability and the fight against corruption.
Mid-point score (3)	While there are a number of legal reforms to counter corruption and promote integrity, they are piecemeal efforts, which are considered largely ineffective in achieving their goals.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive, concrete and effective legal reforms to counter corruption and promote integrity have been enacted by the legislature.
Additional data sources	Statements of other actors/pillars/institutions leaders, media monitoring, reports of specific think tanks/NGOs, accountability reports submitted by other institutions (especially anti-corruption agencies) to the legislature, etc.
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

2. Executive

The Executive is the supreme decision-making body of the state. For the purposes of the NIS assessment, it comprises the top two tiers of government in the country. For example, the prime minister and other government ministers, or the president and cabinet. The researcher is requested to describe in detail which ministries/agencies/offices were included as part of the Executive in the NIS country report.

Capacity

Pillar	EXECUTIVE
Indicator number	2.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (Practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the executive have adequate resources to effectively carry out its duties?
Guiding questions	Does the executive have the appropriate human resources at its disposal? Technical resources? Financial resources?
Minimum score (1)	The existing financial, human and infrastructural resources of the executive are minimal and fully insufficient to effectively carry out its duties.
Mid-point score (3)	The executive has some resources. However, significant resource gaps lead to a certain degree of ineffectiveness in carrying out its duties.
Maximum score (5)	The executive has a fully adequate resource base to carry out its duties.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	EXECUTIVE
Indicator number	2.1.2
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent is the executive independent by law?
Guiding questions	Are there any provisions which restrict the independence of the executive in its decision-making and allow encroachment of other branches of government?
Minimum score (1)	There are no laws which seek to ensure the independence of the executive.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of independence of the executive and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive laws seeking to ensure the independence of the executive.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	EXECUTIVE
Indicator number	2.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the executive independent in practice?
Guiding questions	Are there examples of other actors (e.g. military, legislature) unduly interfering with the activities and decisions of the executive?
Minimum score (1)	Other actors regularly and severely interfere in the activities and decisions of the executive.
Mid-point score	Other actors occasionally interfere with the activities and decisions of the executive. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of the executive.
Maximum score (5)	The executive operates freely from any interference by other actors.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	EXECUTIVE
Indicator number	2.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there regulations in place to ensure transparency in relevant activities of the executive?
Guiding questions	Are the activities of the executive required to be recorded in a government information system? If yes, what does it cover? Are cabinet meeting minutes required to be made publicly available? Must the government budget be made public? Does the law require assets of executive branch officials to be disclosed? Who has the legal power to enforce disclosure? Does the law require assets of executive branch officials to be disclosed? Who has legal power to enforce disclosure?
Minimum score (1)	There are no regulations which allow the public to obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the executive, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of the executive and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive regulations are in place which allow the public to obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the executive, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	EXECUTIVE
Indicator number	2.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there transparency in relevant activities of the executive in practice?
Guiding questions	To what extent does the government information system work in practice? Is the government budget made public? Are cabinet meeting minutes made public? Are assets disclosed in practice? Are they made public? In past year, how often has the government rejected a Freedom of Information Act-based request? Does the government systematically translate procedures and regulations in plain language to ensure that average citizens understand them?
Minimum score (1)	The public is not able to obtain any relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the executive, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made. The government is not active at all in disseminating information on its activities.
Mid-point score	While the public can obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the executive, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made, it is usually a difficult, cumbersome and/or lengthy process.
Maximum score (5)	The public is able to readily obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the executive, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made. The government proactively disseminates key information on its activities to the entire citizenry and particularly to those groups, which are most affected by the respective activities.
Additional data sources	field tests
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	EXECUTIVE
Indicator number	2.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that members of the executive have to report and be answerable for their actions?
Guiding questions	What laws/rules govern oversight of the executive? Do the reporting requirements of the executive ensure that it is answerable for its actions? Are members of the executive obliged by law to give reasons for their decisions? Is the executive obliged to consult with the public and/or special groups? Can members of the executive be held accountable for wrongdoing?
Minimum score (1)	There are no checks and balances with regard to the activities of the executive.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of executive accountability and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive legal checks and balances are in place. Regular reporting on relevant executive activities to other state bodies is required.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	EXECUTIVE
Indicator number	2.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there effective oversight of executive activities in practice?
Guiding questions	To what extent are oversight rules effectively implemented in practice? Does the government report on its activities as required by law? Is the executive audited and the results presented to the legislature? Is there any interference and intimidation while the office of the Auditor General is completing the audit? Is the executive audited on an annual basis? Are the requirements for public consultations followed in practice? Are sanctions/prosecution mechanisms re: members of the executive effective?
Minimum score (1)	No oversight of the executive of any consequence take places.
Mid-point score (3)	While members of the executive have to report and be answerable for certain actions of theirs, the existing provisions are only partially effective/applied in practice.
Maximum score (5)	There is effective oversight of the executive, such as regular and robust reporting with justification of decisions. The checks and balances provisions for oversight by e.g. the legislature and the judiciary are effectively implemented.
Additional data sources	WB IDA Transparency, Accountability in public sector
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	EXECUTIVE
Indicator number	2.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there mechanisms in place to ensure the integrity of members of the executive?
Guiding questions	Are there codes of conduct for members of the executive? Do codes of conduct include anti-corruption provisions? Are there rules on conflict of interest? Rules on gifts & hospitality? Restrictions on post-ministerial employment? Restrictions on "revolving door" appointments? Are there comprehensive provisions on whistleblower protection?
Minimum score (1)	There are no regulations in place to ensure the integrity of members of the executive.
Mid-point-score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of members of the executive and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive regulations in place to ensure the integrity of members of the executive. Examples are a code of conduct, rules regarding conflicts of interest, rules on gifts and hospitality and post-employment restrictions.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	EXECUTIVE
Indicator number	2.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of members of the executive ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	Are the existing codes and rules applied and enforced effectively? In the past year, how many examples of conflict of interest cases were there implicating a member of the executive? To what extent is the symptom of the "revolving door" (i.e. executive officials moving back and forth between big business and government positions) a concern? Are existing provisions on whistleblower protection effective in practice?
Minimum score (1)	There is a complete absence of actions which would aim to ensure the integrity of members of the executive, such that misbehaviour goes mostly unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	There is a piecemeal and reactive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the executive, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	There is a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the executive, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of staff on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	EXECUTIVE
Indicator number	2.3.1
Indicator name	Public Sector Management (law and practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the executive committed to and engaged in developing a well-governed public sector?
Guiding questions	Does the executive have the appropriate mechanisms and bodies to effectively supervise and manage the work of the civil service? Do ministers/DGs provide effective supervision over their respective staff? Does the executive provide incentives for the public sector to conduct its activities in a transparent, accountable and inclusive way, e.g. via transparency awards, financial incentives, monitoring systems/scorecards?
Minimum score (1)	The executive is inactive and unsuccessful in developing a public sector which is governed by high levels of transparency, accountability, integrity and inclusiveness.
Mid-point score (3)	The executive is somewhat active, but rather unsuccessful in developing a public sector which is governed by high levels of transparency, accountability, integrity and inclusiveness.
Maximum score (5)	The executive is very active and successful in developing a public sector which is governed by high levels of transparency, accountability, integrity and inclusiveness.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	EXECUTIVE
Indicator number	2.3.2
Indicator name	Legal system (law and practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the executive prioritise public accountability and the fight against corruption as a concern in the country?
Guiding questions	What legal and administrative reforms in the field of anti-corruption and accountability have been drafted by the executive? What public announcements by relevant ministers and/or the head of state have been made regarding the fight against corruption?
Minimum score (1)	The executive does not pay attention to the promotion of public accountability and the fight against corruption.
Mid-point score (3)	While there are a number of reforms, initiated and promoted by the executive, to counter corruption and promote integrity, they are piecemeal efforts, which are considered largely ineffective in achieving their goals.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive, concrete and proactive steps are taken by the executive to promote public accountability and the fight against corruption.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

3. Judiciary

The judiciary includes judges, magistrates and other adjudicators from the national (not international) judicial system.

Capacity

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there laws seeking to ensure appropriate tenure policies, salaries and working conditions of the judiciary?
Guiding questions	What are the legal regulations governing judicial salaries? Are there provisions against income reduction of judges? What is the process for determining salaries of the judiciary (by superior judges, constitution, law)? Is there a mechanism securing salary adjustment with regard to inflation? Does the system provide for security of tenure to prevent judges being threatened with arbitrary termination of their contract? What is the process for appointing and removing judges? Can judges be appointed on ad hoc basis? If so, are their working conditions the same as permanent judges? According to the law, how should the judiciary's budget be apportioned? Is the judiciary legally entitled to participate in this process? Is the judiciary required by law to be apportioned a minimum percentage of the general budget?
Minimum score (1)	There are no laws which seek to ensure appropriate judicial salaries, working conditions and tenure policies.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of resources and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive laws seeking to ensure appropriate judicial salaries, working conditions and tenure policies.
Additional data sources	Global Integrity, Voigt judicial independence, Interviews with senior judiciary and judges.
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.1.2
Indicator name	Resources (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the judiciary have adequate levels of financial resources, staffing, and infrastructure to operate effectively in practice?
Guiding questions	Is the budget of the judiciary sufficient for it to perform its duties? How is the judiciary's budget apportioned? Who apportions it? Is the judiciary apportioned a minimum percentage of the general budget? In practice, how are salaries determined (by superior judges, constitution, law)? Are salary levels for judges and prosecutors adequate or are they so low that there are strong economic reasons for resorting to corruption? Are salaries for judges roughly commensurate with salaries for practising lawyers? Is there generally an adequate number of clerks, library resources and modern computer equipment for judges? Is there stability of human resources? Do staff members have training opportunities? Is there sufficient training to enhance a judge's knowledge of the law, judicial skills including court and case management, judgment writing and conflicts of interest?
Minimum score (1)	The existing financial, human and infrastructural resources of the judiciary are minimal and fully insufficient to effectively carry out its duties.
Mid-point score	The judiciary has some resources. However, significant resource gaps lead to a certain degree of ineffectiveness in carrying out its duties.
Maximum score (5)	The judiciary has an adequate resource base to effectively carry out its duties.
Additional data sources	Global Integrity, Voigt judicial independence, Interviews with judges and court users
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent is the judiciary independent by law?
Guiding questions	Is the highest court anchored in the constitution? Is its independence guaranteed in the constitution? How difficult is it to amend the constitution regarding its specifications on the highest court? What is the process for appointing judges? Are judicial appointments made by professionals or politicians? Is there an independent Judicial Services Commission or a similar body with constitutional protection for the appointment and removal of judges? If so, how is this Commission/body appointed? To what extent are members of the judiciary and the legal profession involved in appointing judges? Do appointments have to be based by law on clear professional criteria? Are they appointed for life? Does the system provide for security of tenure to prevent judges being threatened with arbitrary termination of their contract? What is the process for removing judges? Are judges permitted membership of political parties or any political activity? Can judges form professional associations? Are there regulations protecting judges from undue influence? To what extent is there room for participation of civil society in appointment proceedings (e.g. public hearings)?
Minimum score (1)	There are no laws which seek to ensure the independence of the judiciary.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of judicial independence and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive laws seeking to ensure the independence of the judiciary.
Additional data sources	BTI 3.2, Global Integrity, Voigt judicial independence Reports from local and international civil society Reports from UN Special human rights mechanisms (such as the Special rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers).
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.1.4
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the judiciary operate without interference from the government or other actors?
Guiding questions	Are judges appointed based on a clear professional criteria? How common is it for judges to be removed from their position before the end of their term? How credible are the justifications used for removing judges from their positions before the end of their term? Do judges get transferred or demoted due to the content of their decisions? Has the legal foundation for the highest court remained stable over time or been subject to frequent changes? Are there any examples of political interference in judicial proceedings? Do judges attend political gatherings or participate in any other political events? How common is it for judges to be members of political parties, either before or after being appointed? How common is it for judges to fund/campaign for political parties? Is the independent Judicial Services Commission effective? Is there an effective professional association of judges? Are the regulations protecting judges from undue influence effectively enforced?
Minimum score (1)	Other actors regularly and severely interfere with the activities and decision-making of the judiciary.
Mid-point score (3)	Other actors occasionally interfere with the activities of the judiciary. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of the judiciary.
Maximum score (5)	The judiciary operates freely from any interference by other actors.
Additional data sources	BTI 3.2, Global Integrity, Voigt judicial independence Reports from local and international civil society Reports from UN Special human rights mechanisms (such as the Special rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers).
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the public can obtain relevant information on the activities and decision-making processes of the judiciary?
Guiding questions	Are judges required to disclose their assets and make them available to a Judicial Appointments Commission or another appropriate body? Is the judiciary required to provide information on laws, judgements, judicial statistics, court hearing records/transcripts, membership of relevant organisations, and other relevant activities to the public in a timely manner? Are public hearings/proceedings generally required by law? Is the Judicial Services Commission required to provide information on its activities and decisions to public in a timely manner? Is the information on appointing, moving and removal of judges required to be made public?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions which allow the public to obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the judiciary, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist to allow the public to obtain relevant information of the organisation and functioning of the judiciary, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of the judiciary and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive provisions are in place which allow the public to obtain information on the organisation and functioning of the judiciary, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the public have access to judicial information and activities in practice?
Guiding questions	Does the judiciary publish regular reports on its activities, spending and governance? Does the Judicial Services Commission publish regular reports on these topics? Are these reports comprehensive? How are these reports publicized/distributed? Is there reliable access to information on court procedures, judgments, judicial statistics, court hearing records/transcripts, etc.? Is the public entitled to information on the number of cases disposed of annually? To what extent can citizens and civil society access this information? Does the prosecution generally conduct judicial proceedings in public? Can citizens obtain information on appointing, moving and removal of judges easily? Is there a comprehensive website on the judiciary?
Minimum score (1)	The public is not able to obtain any relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the judiciary, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While the public can obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the judiciary, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made, it is usually a difficult, cumbersome and/or lengthy process.
Maximum score (5)	The public is able to readily obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the judiciary, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	Field test
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the judiciary has to report and be answerable for its actions?
Guiding questions	Are judges required by law to give reasons for their decisions? If so, what are the consequences if they do not do so? Is there an independent body investigating complaints against judges? Does immunity apply to corruption and other criminal offences? Is there a formal complaints procedure? Are complainants protected by law? Can a judge be publicly censured/reprimanded, fined, suspended and removed?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place to ensure that judges have to report and be answerable for their actions.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of judicial accountability and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Extensive provisions are in place to ensure that judges have to report and be answerable for their actions.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent do members of the judiciary have to report and be answerable for their actions in practice?
Guiding questions	Do judges provide reasons for their decisions in practice that can readily be understood by court users? Are any sanctions imposed if they fail to provide reasons for their decisions? How effective and independent is the body in investigating complaints and imposing sanctions? Are complainants effectively protected in practice and provided with acceptable remedies?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place/existing provisions are not enforced at all.
Mid-point score (3)	While members of the judiciary have to report and be answerable for certain actions of theirs, the existing provisions are only partially effective/applied in practice.
Maximum score (5)	Existing provisions are enforced/applied effectively.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity mechanism (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there mechanisms in place to ensure the integrity of members of the judiciary?
Guiding questions	Are judges required to disclose their assets and make them available to a Judicial Appointments Commission or another appropriate body? How comprehensive is the Code of Conduct, if it exists? Are there regulations preventing judges from receiving reimbursements, compensation and honoraria in connection with privately sponsored trips? Are there regulations governing conflicts of interest for the judiciary? Are there regulations governing gifts and hospitality for the judiciary? Can citizens challenge the impartiality of a judge if s/he fails to step down from a case? Are there restrictions for judges entering the private or public sector after leaving the government?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions in place to ensure the integrity of members of the judiciary.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of members of the judiciary and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive provisions in place to ensure the integrity of members of the judiciary. Examples are a code of conduct, rules regarding conflicts of interest, rules on gifts and hospitality and post-employment restrictions.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity mechanism (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of members of the judiciary ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	Do judges disclose their assets in practice? Are their asset declarations scrutinized? Are breaches sanctioned? How effectively applied is the code of conduct? Who ensures compliance with the code of conduct? Are breaches investigated and sanctioned? In practice, how effective are the regulations restricting post-government private sector employment for judges? How long before a judge can take up publicly funded work? In practice, how effective are the regulations restricting gifts and hospitality? In practice, are citizens able to challenge the impartiality of a judge if s/he fails to step down from a case?
Minimum score (1)	There is a complete absence of actions which would aim to ensure the integrity of members of the judiciary, such that misbehaviour goes mostly unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	There is a piecemeal and reactive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the judiciary, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	There is a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the judiciary, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of staff on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.3.1
Indicator name	Executive oversight (law and practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the judiciary provide effective oversight of the executive?
Guiding questions	Do courts have the jurisdiction to review the actions of the executive? If so, how routine and how extensive is it? How effective is it in practice? Are judgements that overturn decisions by the executive implemented?
Minimum score (1)	The judiciary is rather inactive and entirely ineffective in providing oversight of the executive.
Mid-point score (3)	While the judiciary is somewhat active in seeking to oversee the actions of the executive, the effectiveness of its actions is limited (e.g. due to limited competencies and/or failure to implement existing provisions).
Maximum score (5)	The judiciary is effective in providing oversight of the executive.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	JUDICIARY
Indicator number	3.3.2
Indicator name	Corruption Prosecution (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the judiciary committed to fighting corruption through prosecution and other activities?
Guiding questions	To what extent is the judiciary committed to sanctioning corruption? How effective is it in this task? Does it provide separate statistics on corruption prosecutions? If yes, how comprehensive are these statistics? Is the judiciary involved in suggesting anti-corruption measures/reforms to the government based on its experience and expertise?
Minimum score (1)	The judiciary is inactive in the fight against corruption and it is unsuccessful in seeking to penalize offenders in corruption-related cases.
Mid-point score (3)	While the judiciary does seek to penalize offenders in corruption-related cases, its efforts are limited and often unsuccessful. It is largely reactive in its contribution to the fight against corruption and does usually not suggest any anti-corruption reforms.
Maximum score (5)	The judiciary is proactive in suggesting anti-corruption reforms and is generally very active and successful in penalizing offenders in corruption-related cases.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

4. Public Sector

Administrative bodies that deliver goods and services by and for the government. Public sector employees assist the government in formulating policies, carrying out decisions and administering public services. Includes all public institutions (apart from those included in the NIS as separate pillars) and civil service.

Capacity

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (Practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the public sector have adequate resources to effectively carry out its duties?
Guiding questions	Are actual funds for the public sector in line with requirements? Is the overall wage bill for the public sector sustainable? Are wages in the public sector adequate to sustain an appropriate standard of living according to the level of the country's economy? Do pay and benefit levels attract or deter talented people from entering the civil service? Are public services being delivered effectively?
Minimum score (1)	The existing financial, human and infrastructural resources of the public sector are minimal and fully insufficient to effectively carry out its duties.
Mid-point score (3)	The public sector has some resources. However, significant resource gaps lead to a certain degree of ineffectiveness in carrying out its duties.
Maximum score (5)	The public sector has an adequate financial, infrastructural and human resource base to effectively carry out its duties.
Additional data sources	WB IDA Quality of Public Administration
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.1.2
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent is the independence of the public sector safeguarded by law?
Guiding questions	Are there regulations which prevent undue political interference in the appointment and promotion of public sector employees? Are there regulations regarding professional impartiality of public sector employees? Is there an institution dedicated to protect public sector employees against arbitrary dismissals or political interference? Is parliamentary lobbying for the inclusion/exclusion of publicly procured projects in plans, programmes and budgets regulated in law?
Minimum score (1)	There are no laws which seek to ensure the independence of the public sector.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of independence of the public sector and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive laws seeking to ensure the independence of the public sector.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the public sector free from external interference in its activities?
Guiding questions	To what extent are public sector employees exchanged after a change in government? Are the recruitment and promotion regulations effective in preventing political interference (e.g. are selection committees able to work without political interference)? What are the regulations re: political activities of existing public sector employees (e.g. party membership, expression of political views)? If there is a dedicated institution to safeguard the public sector from political interference, how effective is it in its work?
Minimum score (1)	Other actors regularly and severely interfere in the activities of the public sector .
Mid-point score (3)	Other actors occasionally interfere with the activities of the public sector. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of the public sector.
Maximum score (5)	The public sector operates freely from any interference by other actors.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure transparency in financial, human resource and information management of the public sector?
Guiding questions	Is the disclosure of declaration of personal assets, income, financial interests etc required in public sector agencies? How often? How are they verified? Which laws and regulations pertain to public information management? Are there regulations regarding how records in the public sector are managed and made public? Are there regulations regarding how records pertaining to public procurement ¹ are managed? What rules govern appointments? Is it required in law that vacancies are advertised publicly to ensure fair and open competition?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions which allow the public to obtain relevant information on the activities of the public sector, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of the public sector and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive provisions are in place which allow the public to obtain information on relevant activities of the public sector, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

¹ Public Procurement refers to the whole process from needs assessment to contract execution and closure.

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent are the provisions on transparency in financial, human resource and information management in the public sector effectively implemented?
Guiding questions	Do citizens have reasonable access to information on public sector activities and the records that public sector entities keep on them? Does disclosure of personal assets, income, financial interests of public sector employees occur in practice? ? Is information on public procurement timely and comprehensive enough, and available in practice? In practice, are vacancies advertised publicly to ensure fair and open competition?
Minimum score (1)	The public is not able to obtain any relevant information on the activities of the public sector, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While the public can obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the public sector, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made, it is usually a difficult, cumbersome and/or lengthy process.
Maximum score (5)	The public is able to readily obtain relevant information on the activities of the public sector, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	field tests, WB IDA transparency, Accountability in public sector
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that public sector employees have to report and be answerable for their actions?
Guiding questions	Is there any official policy on whistle-blowing or exposing wrongdoing? What are the procedures for handling complaints? Are there provisions for whistle-blowing on misconduct and management of complaints in public procurement procedures? To what extent can public sector employees be charged with extortion, bribery, corruption, abuse of privileged state information? What other oversight mechanisms are in place (e.g. legal, administrative and inspection oversight)? What mechanisms for citizen complaints/redress are in place? What audit mechanisms are in place? Are public sector agencies required to report to the legislature?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place to ensure that public sector employees have to report and be answerable for their actions.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of accountability of public sector employees and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Extensive provisions are in place which ensure that public sector employees have to report and be answerable for their actions.
Additional data sources	UN Public Administration Country Profiles
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent do public sector employees have to report and be answerable for their actions in practice?
Guiding questions	Are existing state oversight mechanisms effective? Are whistle-blowing policies and complaints mechanisms for public procurement from public sector employees effective in practice? How often are public sector employees reported of wrongdoing? To what extent are public sector employees charged with/convicted of offenses? Are there cases of public sector employees being held accountable for malpractice and what type of disciplinary procedures were taken as a result of this? Do bodies which are responsible for the control of activities related to public procurement provide effective oversight in practice? Are existing mechanisms for citizen complaints/redress effective?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place/existing provisions are not effective at all in ensuring that public sector employees have to report and be answerable for their actions in practice.
Mid-point score (3)	While public sector employees have to report and be answerable for certain actions of theirs, the existing provisions are only partially effective/applied in practice.
Maximum score (5)	Existing provisions are effective in ensuring that public sector employees have to report and be answerable for their actions in practice.
Additional data sources	WB IDA transparency, Accountability in public sector
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity Mechanisms (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure the integrity of public sector employees?
Guiding questions	Are there codes of conduct, rules regarding conflicts of interest, rules on gifts and hospitality, post-employment restrictions, unauthorized use of official property/facilities, work outside the public sector, use of official information, use of official travel, employment of family members? Is bribery of/by public sector employees considered an offense in law? When it comes to public procurement, do bidding/ contracting documents contain special anti-corruption clauses?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions in place to ensure the integrity of civil servants.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of civil servants and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive provisions in place to ensure the integrity of civil servants.
Additional data sources	UN Public Administration Country Profiles
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity Mechanisms (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of civil servants ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	Are these codes and rules enforced effectively? Are there training programmes for employees on their content? Are public sector core values regularly communicated? Are they included in employment contracts? Are they widely known by public sector employees? When it comes to public procurement, are anti-corruption clauses in bidding documents generally enforced?
Minimum score (1)	There is a complete absence of actions which would aim to ensure the integrity of public sector employees, such that misbehaviour goes mostly unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	There is a piecemeal and reactive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of public sector employees, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	There is a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of public sector employees, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of staff on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.3.1
Indicator name	Public Education (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the public sector inform and educate the public on its role in fighting corruption?
Guiding questions	Are there specific programmes run by the public sector to educate the public on corruption and how to curb it? How much prominence do these programmes have? How successful are they? Is there high-level support for these programmes? Does an average citizen know where and how to complain about corrupt practices?
Minimum score (1)	The public sector does not educate the public on corruption and on citizens' roles in fighting corruption.
Mid-point score (3)	While the public sector is somewhat active in educating the public on corruption and on citizens' roles in fighting it, its efforts are generally limited, reactive piecemeal and/or considered to be ineffective.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive, concrete and proactive steps are taken by the public sector to educate the public on corruption and on citizens' roles in fighting corruption.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.3.2
Indicator name	Cooperate with public institutions, CSOs and private agencies in preventing/ addressing corruption (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the public sector work with public watchdog agencies, business and civil society on anti-corruption initiatives?
Guiding questions	Are there examples where public sector agencies cooperated with other agencies within the state and/or with CSOs and business on anti-corruption initiatives? Who initiated them? How willing/interested were public sector bodies to cooperate on these initiatives? How successful were they?
Minimum score (1)	The public sector does not engage other stakeholders on working on anti-corruption initiatives.
Mid-point score (3)	While the public sector does cooperate with other stakeholders on anti-corruption initiatives, its role is generally reactive and these initiatives are given neither much prominence nor support by high-level public sector officials.
Maximum score (5)	The public sector is a leading force in multi-stakeholder anti-corruption initiatives. These initiatives enjoy high prominence and full support of high-level officials within the public sector.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	PUBLIC SECTOR
Indicator number	4.3.3
Indicator name	Reduce Corruption Risks by Safeguarding Integrity in Public Procurement
Scoring question	To what extent is there an effective framework in place to safeguard integrity in public procurement procedures, including meaningful sanctions for improper conduct by both suppliers and public officials, and review and complaint mechanisms?
Guiding questions	Does the law require open bidding as a general rule? To what extent does this happen in practice? Are exceptions to open bidding regulated by the law and kept to a minimum? To what extent does the law provide rules to ensure objectivity in the contractor selection process? How well do these rules work in practice? Does the law provide for the use of standard bidding documents? Are these used in practice? Does the law establish which bodies are responsible for the control of activities related to public procurement? Does the law require that these bodies be independent? Are there procedures for supervision of contract implementation? Are these enforced in practice? Is there a central procurement agency? If so, to what extent is it adequately resourced (personnel and funding)? Is it independent from procuring agents/bodies? Does the law require those involved in different stages of public contracting to have special qualifications, related to their tasks? Is this the case in practice? Does the law regulate that staff in charge of offering evaluations must be different from those responsible for the elaboration of the terms of reference/bidding documents? Does the law require that both of the above-mentioned types of staff are different from those undertaking any control activities? Does the law require clarifications and amendments during the bidding process to be shared among all bidders? Does this take place in practice? Are procurement award decisions made public? Does the procurement law require the maintenance of registers and statistics on contracts (irrespective of the contracting method)? Are these registers kept in practice? Is there a procedure to request a review of procurement decisions? Does it operate in practice? Does the law consider civil or social control mechanisms to monitor the control processes of public contracting? Are there administrative sanctions (eg. Prohibition to hold public office) for criminal offences against the public administration in connection with public procurement? Are these sanctions enforced in practice?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place to ensure that the public sector performs its public procurement responsibilities in a lawful and ethical manner.
Mid-point score (3)	While some provisions are in place with regard to procurement, they are piecemeal and/or largely disregarded in practice.
Maximum score (5)	Extensive provisions are in place to ensure that the public sector performs its public procurement responsibilities in a lawful and ethical manner.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

5. Law Enforcement Agencies

Agencies which enforce the laws of one or more governments, or that actively and directly assist in the enforcement of laws, e.g. police and public prosecutors and other law enforcement agencies.

Capacity

Pillar	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
Indicator number	5.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent do law enforcement agencies have adequate levels of financial resources, staffing, and infrastructure to operate effectively in practice?
Guiding questions	How adequate are salaries to attract qualified and committed staff? How adequate is the computer equipment? Have there been complaints regarding budget cuts? Is there a special police unit dedicated to investigating corruption-related offences?
Minimum score (1)	The existing financial, human and infrastructural resources of law enforcement agencies are minimal and fully insufficient to effectively carry out their duties.
Mid-point score (3)	Law enforcement agencies have some resources. However, significant resource gaps lead to a certain degree of ineffectiveness in carrying out their duties.
Maximum score (5)	The law enforcement agencies have an adequate resource base to effectively carry out their duties.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
Indicator number	5.1.2
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are law enforcement agencies independent by law?
Guiding questions	Are there rules stipulating that appointments should be made on the basis of clear professional criteria? Are there laws preventing any political interference in the activities of law enforcement agencies? Can prosecutors be instructed not to prosecute in a specific case by another authority? Is there a prosecutorial career, based on objective criteria? How are prosecutors promoted?
Minimum score (1)	There are no laws which seek to ensure the independence of law enforcement agencies.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of the independence of law enforcement agencies and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive laws seeking to ensure the independence of law enforcement agencies.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
Indicator number	5.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent are law enforcement agencies independent in practice?
Guiding questions	In practice, are appointments made on the basis of clear professional criteria? Are there examples of political interference in ongoing investigations? Can prosecutors work without intimidation, hindrance, harassment, improper interference or unjustified exposure to civil, penal or other liability? If not, are these cases properly investigated and those allegedly responsible brought to justice?
Minimum score (1)	Other actors regularly and severely interfere in the activities of law enforcement agencies.
Mid-point score (3)	Other actors occasionally interfere with the activities of law enforcement agencies. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of law enforcement agencies.
Maximum score (5)	Law enforcement agencies operate freely from any interference by other actors.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
Indicator number	5.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the public can access the relevant information on law enforcement agency activities?
Guiding questions	Does the law require assets of law enforcement officials to be disclosed regularly? What aspects of law enforcement work are required to be publicly disclosed? Are there any special provisions for victims of crimes to access their case files?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions which allow the public to obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the law enforcement agencies on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of law enforcement agencies and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive provisions are in place which allow the public to obtain information on the organisation and functioning of the law enforcement agencies, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
Indicator number	5.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there transparency in the activities and decision-making processes of law enforcement agencies in practice?
Guiding questions	Are assets disclosed in practice? Is disclosure of work which is specified by law taking place in practice?
Minimum score (1)	The public is not able to obtain any relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the law enforcement agencies, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While the public can obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of law enforcement agencies, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made, it is usually a difficult, cumbersome and/or lengthy process.
Maximum score (5)	The public is able to readily obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the law enforcement agencies, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	field tests
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
Indicator number	5.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that law enforcement agencies have to report and be answerable for their actions?
Guiding questions	Are prosecutors required to give reasons to relevant stakeholders regarding their decision to prosecute or not (when it falls within their discretion)? Can victims of certain crimes access the justice system to ensure prosecution? In law, is there an independent mechanism for citizens to complain about misconduct in police action? In law, is there an agency/entity to investigate and prosecute corruption committed by law enforcement officials? In law, are law enforcement officials immune from criminal proceedings?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place to ensure that law enforcement agencies have to report and be answerable for their actions.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of accountability of law enforcement agencies and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Extensive provisions are in place to ensure that law enforcement agencies have to report and be answerable for their actions.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
Indicator number	5.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent do law enforcement agencies have to report and be answerable for their actions in practice?
Guiding questions	Does the public prosecution office account periodically and publicly for its activities as a whole and in particular the way in which its priorities are carried out? Do prosecutors in practice give reasons to relevant stakeholders regarding their decision to prosecute or not? Can these decisions be legally challenged? In practice, does the independent law enforcement complaint reporting mechanism respond to citizen's complaints within a reasonable time period? In practice, does an independent agency initiate investigations into allegations of corruption by law enforcement officials? In practice, are law enforcement officials immune from criminal proceedings?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place/existing provisions are not enforced at all.
Mid-point score (3)	While law enforcement agencies have to report and be answerable for certain actions of theirs, the existing provisions are only partially effective/applied in practice.
Maximum score (5)	Existing provisions are enforced/applied effectively.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
Indicator number	5.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity Mechanisms (law)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of law enforcement agencies ensured by law?
Guiding questions	Is there are a code of conduct for the police? For prosecutors? Are there rules on conflict of interest for police officers? For prosecutors? Are there rules on gifts and hospitality? Are there post-employment restrictions? Are there corresponding legal provisions for holding accountable those law enforcement officials who have not accurately declared their assets and property?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions in place to ensure the integrity of members of the law enforcement agencies.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of members of law enforcement agencies and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive provisions in place to ensure the integrity of members of the law enforcement agencies.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
Indicator number	5.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity Mechanisms (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of members of law enforcement agencies ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	Are existing rules on conflict of interest usually adhered to? Are existing codes of conduct usually adhered to? How effective and independent are disciplinary mechanisms? Are there training programmes for employees on their content?
Minimum score (1)	There is a complete absence of actions which would aim to ensure the integrity of members of the law enforcement agencies, such that misbehaviour goes mostly unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	There is a piecemeal and reactive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the law enforcement agencies, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	There is a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the law enforcement agencies, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of staff on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES
Indicator number	5.3.1
Indicator name	Corruption prosecution (law and practice)
Scoring question	To what extent do law enforcement agencies detect and investigate corruption cases in the country?
Guiding questions	Do police and prosecutors have legal powers to apply proper investigative techniques in detecting corruption cases? Are the powers of police and prosecutors with regard to corruption cases adequate (e.g. search warrants, arrest, access to personal information)? How many cases of prosecuting corruption-related charges have been undertaken during the last 12 months? How many of them have resulted in charges?
Minimum score (1)	In general, law enforcement agencies do not detect and investigate corruption cases.
Mid-point score (3)	While law enforcement agencies do investigate corruption cases, their work is generally reactive, focused only on a small number of cases and rarely results in charges and successful convictions.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive, concrete and proactive steps are taken by the law enforcement agencies to promote public accountability and the fight against corruption. They regularly and successfully detect and investigate corruption cases.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

6. Electoral Management Body

The body responsible for administering elections and responsible for honestly and impartially implementing the procedures specified in the electoral legal framework. In some cases, it is also responsible for drafting electoral regulations.

Capacity

Pillar	ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT BODY
Indicator number	6.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the electoral management body (EMB) have adequate resources to achieve its goals in practice?
Guiding questions	Does the EMB receive a budget in a timely manner from the state sufficient for it to perform its duties for each electoral event and the running of institute? Are there regular increases in financial resources from the state? Does the EMB have the necessary human resources and operational structures (administrative, financial and technical) to manage the electoral process? Does the EMB have sufficient facilities to conduct its work (offices, transport, communications)? Are EMB staff permanent? Is the EMB committed to professional development initiatives? Does the EMB have a systematized archive and institutional memory? Do EMB members have appropriate academic qualifications and sufficient previous work experience? Is there equality of opportunity for women and ethnic/minority groups? Adequate career development and training opportunities for permanent staff?
Minimum score (1)	No electoral management body exists OR the existing financial, human and infrastructural resources of the electoral management body are minimal and fully insufficient to effectively carry out its duties.
Mid-point score (3)	The electoral management body has some resources. However, significant resource gaps lead to a certain degree of ineffectiveness in carrying out its duties.
Maximum score (5)	The electoral management body has an adequate resource base to meet its goals. Resources include financial, infrastructure and staff as well as organisational and staff development.
Additional data sources	Global electoral budget; cost per voter; % of donor support; audit reports; UNDP CORE Cost of Elections; breakdown of operational costs vs. institutional costs;
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT BODY
Indicator number	6.1.2
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent is the electoral management body independent by law?
Guiding questions	What is the legal status of the EMB as an institution? Is the EMB anchored in the constitution? Does the legal framework require and enable the EMB to operate in an impartial and transparent manner? What is the management structure of the EMB? Is there a clear division of powers between the commission (policy makers) and the secretariat (administration)? Is there a system in place to ensure that recruitment is based on clear professional non-discriminatory criteria? Who appoints/elects the head and staff? How can staff, particularly the director, be dismissed? Are they protected by law from removal without relevant justifications?
Minimum score (1)	There are no laws which seek to ensure the independence of the electoral management body.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of the independence of the electoral management body and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive laws seeking to ensure the independence of the electoral management body .
Additional data sources	Constitution; electoral legislation; appointment and recruitment procedures; EMB organisational chart
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT BODY
Indicator number	6.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the electoral management body function independently practice?
Guiding questions	Does the EMB have the confidence of government and citizens? Has there been any history of interference by the government in the affairs of the EMB? Is the EMB perceived to be independent, impartial, accountable and efficient? Can the EMB operate in a professional and non-partisan manner? Are there any examples of political interference in EMB's activities? How common is it for the senior EMB staff to be removed from their position before the end of their term?
Minimum score (1)	Other actors regularly and severely interfere in the activities of the electoral management body.
Mid-point score (3)	Other actors occasionally interfere with the activities of the electoral management body. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of the electoral management body.
Maximum score (5)	The electoral management body operates freely from other actors and its activities are non-partisan, i.e. they demonstrate no signs of bias. The government or other actors never interfere in electoral management body activities.
Additional data sources	International and domestic observer reports; complaints from political parties; voter attitude surveys; independent media reports
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT BODY
Indicator number	6.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the public can obtain relevant information on the activities and decision-making processes of the EMB?
Guiding questions	To what extent is relevant information produced by the EMB (e.g. election results, dates, polling stations) required to be made public? What aspects of party funding and operations are required to be made public by the EMB, if any?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions which allow the public to obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the electoral management body on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of the EMB and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive provisions are in place which allow the public to obtain information on the organisation and functioning of the electoral management body, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	official reports, record of official decisions (dates, procedural changes, results); media reports
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT BODY
Indicator number	6.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent are reports and decisions of the electoral management body made public in practice?
Guiding questions	To what extent is the required information actually made public? Are regular press conferences held/statements made? Is the schedule of operations made public in advance (registration dates/party registration/election day, etc)? Does the EMB have an accessible public website with events, facts, decisions and data? Does the EMB have a call centre for queries?
Minimum score (1)	The public is not able to obtain any relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the electoral management body, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While the public can obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the EMB, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made, it is usually a difficult, cumbersome and/or lengthy process.
Maximum score (5)	The public is able to readily obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the electoral management body, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	record of official decisions (dates, procedural changes, results); minutes of executive meetings; media reports; web and print sources; field tests
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT BODY
Indicator number	6.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the EMB has to report and be answerable for its actions?
Guiding questions	Does the legal framework adequately define the EMB's relationships with external stakeholders? Does the legal framework allow timely and enforceable review of an EMB decision? Is the EMB required to file reports? How comprehensive are they required to be? Are these reports required to be publicly available? Do political parties and candidates have the legal means of redress for electoral irregularities? Is there a legal requirement for internal auditing and/or independent/external auditing of expenditure? When is the EMB required to present the financial report to the state? How are discrepancies accounted for?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place to ensure that the EMB has to report and be answerable for its actions.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of the accountability of the EMB and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Extensive provisions are in place to ensure that the EMB has to report and be answerable for its actions.
Additional data sources	official reports, procurement procedures and decisions; independent audits; donor budget records and audits (if applicable)
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT BODY
Indicator number	6.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the EMB have to report and be answerable for its actions in practice?
Guiding questions	Does the head of the EMB have to account for the activities of its staff in practice? Does the EMB file the required reports? Are they adequate in quality and scope to ensure proper oversight? Are they made publicly available? Do political parties and candidates have means of redress for electoral irregularities in practice through a dispute resolution mechanism? How effectively are disputes resolved? Does the EMB have regular meetings with parties, the media and observers to answer queries on delays/decisions/disputes?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place/existing provisions are not enforced at all.
Mid-point score (3)	While members of the EMB have to report and be answerable for certain actions of theirs, the existing provisions are only partially effective/applied in practice.
Maximum score (5)	Existing provisions are enforced/applied effectively.
Additional data sources	Record of complaints/grievances; Record of stakeholder meetings and press conferences; Records of procurement and contracts awarded. Post-election review and audit.
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT BODY
Indicator number	6.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there mechanisms in place to ensure the integrity of the electoral management body?
Guiding questions	Is there a code of conduct? How comprehensive is it? Does it cover conflict of interest rules? Rules on gifts and hospitality? Post-employment restrictions? The EMB's commitment to maintaining the integrity of all electoral processes? Its support for the principle of political non-partisanship? A commitment to the provision of quality service to voters and other stakeholders?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions in place to ensure the integrity of members of the electoral management body.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of members of the EMB and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive provisions in place to ensure the integrity of members of the electoral management body. Examples are a code of conduct, rules regarding conflicts of interest, rules on gifts and hospitality, and post-employment restrictions.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT BODY
Indicator number	6.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of the electoral management body ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	Is the code of conduct applied/enforced effectively? Do staff sign a contract, declaration or swear an oath to uphold the guiding principles of independence, impartiality, integrity, transparency, efficiency, professionalism and service-mindedness in conducting their duties? How transparent is the EMB in exposing breaches, irregular or corrupt practices within its staff which may cause loss of credibility and public embarrassment? Is there a hearing or investigation process? Are there any precedents of staff suspension or dismissals?
Minimum score (1)	There is a complete absence of actions which would aim to ensure the integrity of members of the EMB, such that misbehaviour goes mostly unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	There is a piecemeal and reactive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the EMB, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	There is a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the EMB, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of staff on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	Terms and conditions of contracts; staff rules and codes; number of oversight staff and resources.
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT BODY
Indicator number	6.3.1
Indicator name	Campaign regulation (law and practice)
Scoring question	Does the electoral management body effectively regulate candidate and political party finance?
Guiding questions	What are the competencies of the EMB in this regard? What laws have been passed? How extensive are they? Is it just registration? Media allocation? Regulating funding and disclosure provisions? Auditing?
Minimum score (1)	The EMB is inactive and unsuccessful in regulating candidate and political finance.
Mid-point score (3)	While the EMB does seek to regulate candidate and political finance, its approach is largely reactive and its success is limited (due to limited competencies and/or failures in implementing existing provisions).
Maximum score (5)	The EMB is very active and successful in regulating candidate and political finance.
Additional data sources	Political party disclosure reports; media monitoring reports; audits
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ELECTORAL MANAGEMENT BODY
Indicator number	6.3.2
Indicator name	Election Administration (law and practice)
Scoring question	Does the EMB effectively oversee and administer free and fair elections and ensure the integrity of the electoral process?
Guiding questions	Is the EMB able to ensure that all eligible voters (including first time voters, women, minorities, habitants in remote/security areas) can register to vote and know where to vote? Do voters (and parties) have an opportunity to check their names are registered correctly? Are a considerable number of voters who come to the polling station unable to vote for any reason (on wrong register/lack of time/materials/security)? Does the EMB run/oversee voter education programs? Are sensitive electoral materials (ballots, seals, tally sheets) tamper-proof and accounted for? Is the EMB able to account for and aggregate results accurately and efficiently and objectively validate election results? Are observers and parties allowed access to observe all stages from polling to counting to result aggregation?
Minimum score (1)	The EMB is inactive and unsuccessful in ensuring free and fair elections.
Mid-point score (3)	While the EMB is somewhat active in seeking to ensure free and fair elections, its success is limited (due to limited competencies and/or failures in implementing existing provisions).
Maximum score (5)	The EMB is very active and successful in ensuring free and fair elections.
Additional data sources	Demographic statistics; previous electoral registers; voter awareness surveys; average no of voters per polling station; voter turnout %; parallel vote tabulation by CSOs/parties; Observer reports;
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

7. Ombudsman

An independent body to which citizens can make complaints about maladministration. In countries in which there are lower-level offices of the ombudsman, it is advised to focus on the national-level ombudsman institution, while readily available information for subnational ombudsman offices should be drawn upon as well.

Capacity

Pillar	OMBUDSMAN
Indicator number	7.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does an ombudsman or its equivalent have adequate resources to achieve its goals in practice?
Guiding questions	Is the budget of the ombudsman sufficient for it to perform its duties? Are real funding levels maintained? Stability of human resources? Do staff members have appropriate skills and experience? Adequate career development and training opportunities? Does the ombudsman have compulsory powers to acquire relevant information?
Minimum score (1)	No ombudsman exists OR the existing financial, human, legal and infrastructural resources of the ombudsman are minimal and fully insufficient to effectively carry out its duties.
Mid-point score (3)	The ombudsman has some resources. However, significant resource gaps lead to a certain degree of ineffectiveness in carrying out its duties.
Maximum score (5)	The ombudsman has an adequate financial, human, legal and infrastructural resource base to meet its goals.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	OMBUDSMAN
Indicator number	7.1.2
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent is the ombudsman independent by law?
Guiding questions	What is the legal status of the ombudsman (organic legal document vs. administrative fiat)? Is the ombudsman an independent institution or subsumed under a certain government body (e.g. ministry)? Is recruitment required to be based on clear professional criteria? Is the head of the institution appointed by qualified parliamentary majority or a body which is not subject to the ombudsman's jurisdiction? Does the law provide legal restrictions on political and other activities of the ombudsman, aiming to ensure his independence and neutrality? Does the ombudsman have fixed term of office by law (i.e. exceeding year or more the term of legislative body or body appointing him) and can he be reappointed? Is the ombudsman's salary comparable to salaries of high-level officials (MPs, government officials, judges of higher courts)? Does the Ombudsman have enough power over staff's appointments and removals)? How can staff, particularly the ombudsman, be dismissed? Are they protected by law from removal without relevant justifications? Are there any legal provisions on the ombudsman's immunity from prosecutions resulting from his normal discharge of his duties? Are the ombudsman's activities subject to judicial review by the courts? Can the ombudsman appeal to courts to reinforce the powers granted by law?
Minimum score (1)	There are no laws which seek to ensure the independence of the ombudsman.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of the independence of the ombudsman and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive laws seeking to ensure the independence of the ombudsman.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	OMBUDSMAN
Indicator number	7.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the ombudsman independent in practice?
Guiding questions	Can the ombudsman operate in a professional and non-partisan manner? Are there any examples of political influence on the appointment of ombudsman staff or examples of political interference in ombudsman's activities? Are there any cases of the ombudsman's political engagement or conducting other activities, restricted by law, or holding positions which might compromise independence? How common is it for the ombudsman to be reappointed? How common is it for the ombudsman (or senior staff) to be removed from their position before the end of their term without relevant justifications (or on political reasons)? Can complaints be filed without fear of retaliation?
Minimum score (1)	Other actors regularly and severely interfere in the activities of the ombudsman OR the ombudsman is engaged on regular basis in political or other activities which undermine his independence and political neutrality
Mid-point score (3)	Other actors occasionally interfere with the activities of the ombudsman. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of the ombudsman.
Maximum score (5)	The ombudsman operates freely from any interference by other actors, particularly the executive and/or the ruling party, and is not engaged in any political or other activities which may compromise his independence and political neutrality
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	OMBUDSMAN
Indicator number	7.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the public can obtain relevant information on the activities and decision-making processes of the ombudsman?
Guiding questions	For which cases is the ombudsman required by law to maintain confidentiality? What kind of information on his activities (i.e. findings, recommendations, reports, budget) is the ombudsman required to make publicly available, taking into account reasonable confidentiality considerations? Are there any deadlines on making such information publicly available? Is the ombudsman (senior staff of ombudsman's office) required to declare his/her assets publicly and to what extent? What are the regulations pertaining to the involvement of the public in the activities of the ombudsman (e.g. public council, advice committee, public consultations) taking into account reasonable confidentiality?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions which allow the public to obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the ombudsman on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of the ombudsman and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive provisions are in place which allow the public to obtain information on the organisation and functioning of the ombudsman, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	OMBUDSMAN
Indicator number	7.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there transparency in the activities and decision-making processes of the ombudsman in practice?
Guiding questions	What kind of information on the Ombudsman’s activities is actually made publicly available by the ombudsman? Does the information provide adequate details on the work performed (e.g. average time taken to finalise complaints, proportion of complaints to the office that were investigated)? Are there any cases of violation of time requirements for making such information publicly available? Does the ombudsman have his own website? Does ombudsman make publicly available on his website all information required by law to be publicly available? Does the ombudsman involve the public (independent experts, NGOs representatives etc.) in his activities in practice? What are the main forms of such involvement? Are they effective? Does the ombudsman declare his assets in practice, to what extent? Is this declaration made publicly available?
Minimum score (1)	The public is not able to obtain any relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the ombudsman, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While the public can obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the ombudsman, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made, it is usually a difficult, cumbersome and/or lengthy process.
Maximum score (5)	The public is able to readily obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the ombudsman, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	field tests
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	OMBUDSMAN
Indicator number	7.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the ombudsman has to report and be answerable for its actions?
Guiding questions	To whom is the ombudsman accountable for the activities of his staff? What kind of information on ombudsman's activities must be submitted to the body, to whom ombudsman is accountable, must this information be debated (discussed) be this body? Are there any time provisions on submission of this information? Must this information be publicly available Are its activities subject to judicial review by the courts? Is s/he required to file reports? Are these reports required to be publicly available? Are there provisions for whistleblowing by ombudsman staff on misconduct?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place to ensure that the ombudsman has to report and be answerable for its actions.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of accountability of the ombudsman and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Extensive provisions are in place to ensure that the ombudsman has to report and be answerable for its actions.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	OMBUDSMAN
Indicator number	7.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the ombudsman have to report and be answerable for its actions in practice?
Guiding questions	Does the ombudsman have to account for the activities of its staff in practice? What kind of information does the ombudsman file (submit to the body, to whom he is accountable), in practice? Is this information submitted in proper time? Is this information debated in practice? Are they made publicly available? Is the whistleblowing policy effective? Is the judicial review mechanism, if it exists, effective?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place/existing provisions are not enforced at all.
Mid-point score (3)	While the ombudsman has to report and be answerable for certain actions of his, the existing provisions are only partially effective/applied in practice.
Maximum score (5)	Existing provisions are enforced/applied effectively.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	OMBUDSMAN
Indicator number	7.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity Mechanisms (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure the integrity of the ombudsman?
Guiding questions	Is there a code of conduct or any other rules aiming to ensure the integrity of the ombudsman? What issues and to what extent does it cover? Does it cover conflict of interest rules? Rules on gifts? Restrictions on political engagement? Asset declarations? Confidentiality of communication unless given permission? Obligation to hold all communications with all those seeking assistance?)
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions (e.g. codes of ethics) in place to ensure the integrity of ombudsman.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of the ombudsman and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive provisions in place to ensure the integrity of the ombudsman. By law the ombudsman is neutral, unaligned and impartial.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	OMBUDSMAN
Indicator number	7.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity Mechanisms (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of the ombudsman ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	Is the code of conduct applied/enforced effectively? Is misconduct appropriately sanctioned? Are staff training on integrity issues?
Minimum score (1)	There is a complete absence of actions which would aim to ensure the integrity of the ombudsman, such that misbehaviour goes mostly unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	There is a piecemeal and reactive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the ombudsman, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	There is a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the ombudsman, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of staff on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	OMBUDSMAN
Indicator number	7.3.1
Indicator name	Investigation (law and practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the ombudsman active and effective in dealing with complaints from the public?
Guiding questions	How simple is the procedure of lodging complaints to the ombudsman in practice? How many complaints have been received and investigated? Are there examples of proactive investigation by the ombudsman? What is the public perception of the ombudsman? Is there an outreach programme in place to make the ombudsman's services better known to the public?
Minimum score (1)	The ombudsman is inactive and unsuccessful in dealing with complaints from the public.
Mid-point score (3)	While the ombudsman does seek to deal with complaints from the public, its approach is largely reactive and its success limited (due to limited competencies and/or failures in implementing existing provisions).
Maximum score (5)	The ombudsman is generally very active and successful in dealing with complaints from the public.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	OMBUDSMAN
Indicator number	7.3.2
Indicator name	Promoting good practice (law and practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the ombudsman active and effective in raising awareness within government and the public about standards of ethical behaviour?
Guiding questions	What governmental agencies are under the ombudsman office's jurisdiction by law and in practice? How common is it for the ombudsman to consult before criticising an agency or person and to allow the criticised to reply? Are there examples of public campaigns or campaigns for government officials? Are there examples of the ombudsman making recommendations to government on such issues? Is the ombudsman active in publishing findings, recommendations, reports on complaints, materials on the principles of good administration and effective complaint handling? Does the ombudsman monitor implementation of his findings and recommendations?
Minimum score (1)	The ombudsman is inactive and unsuccessful in raising awareness within government and the public about standards of ethical behaviour.
Mid-point score (3)	While the ombudsman does seek to raise awareness within the government and public awareness about standards of ethical behaviour, its efforts are generally limited, reactive, piecemeal and/or considered to be ineffective.
Maximum score (5)	The ombudsman is generally very active and successful in raising awareness within government and the public about standards of ethical behaviour.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

8. Supreme Audit Institution

The agency responsible for auditing government income and expenditure – e.g. auditor general or *cours de comptes*. The Supreme Audit Institution acts as a watchdog over financial integrity and the credibility of reported information, as well as auditing performance.

Capacity

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the audit institution have adequate resources to achieve its goals in practice?
Guiding questions	Is the budget of the SAI sufficient for it to perform its duties? Does the SAI control and manage its own resources? Are there regular increases in financial resources? If the SAI deems resources to be insufficient, can it apply to the legislature directly for the necessary financial means? Is there stability of human resources? Do staff members have an adequate academic background and sufficient previous work experience? Do they have adequate career development and training opportunities?
Minimum score (1)	No audit institution exists OR the existing financial, human and infrastructural resources of the audit institution are minimal and fully insufficient to effectively carry out its duties.
Mid-point score (3)	The audit institution has some resources. However, significant resource gaps lead to a certain degree of ineffectiveness in carrying out its duties.
Maximum score (5)	The audit institution has an adequate resource base to meet its goals. Resources include financial, infrastructure and staff.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.1.2
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent is there formal operational independence of the audit institution?
Guiding questions	What is the formal legal status of the SAI? Is it anchored in the constitution? Is the SAI an independent institution? Are the relations between the SAI and the legislature laid down in the Constitution? Is there any state body which by law can influence the SAI's agenda? Can the SAI carry out its audits in accordance with a self-determined programme and methods? Is recruitment to the SAI required to be based on clear professional criteria? Is the independence of the SAI members guaranteed by the Constitution? Is the director of the SAI appointed in the way that ensures his/her independence? Does the law provide restrictions on political and other activities of the director/members of SAI, aiming to ensure his/her independence and neutrality? Are the director and staff protected by law from removal without relevant justifications? Is the tenure of the director/members of the SAI and staff fixed by law? Is the tenure long enough to exclude political influence? Can the director be re-elected/reappointed? Are the director/members of the SAI/staff immune from prosecutions resulting from their normal discharge of their duties?
Minimum score (1)	There are no laws which seek to ensure the independence of the supreme audit institution.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of independence of the supreme audit institution and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive laws seeking to ensure the independence of the supreme audit institution.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the audit institution free from external interference in the performance of its work in practice?
Guiding questions	Can the SAI operate in a professional and non-partisan manner? Are there any examples of political influence on director's/members'/staff appointment or examples of political interference in the SAI's activities? Are there any cases of director'/members'/staff's political engagement or conducting other activities, restricted by law, or holding positions which might compromise the SAI's independence? How common is it for the director/members to be reappointed? How common is it for the senior SAI staff to be removed from their position before the end of their term without relevant justifications (or for political reasons)?
Minimum score (1)	Other actors regularly and severely interfere in the activities of the SAI and/or the director/members/staff are engaged on regular basis in political or other activities which undermine their independence and political neutrality.
Mid-point score (3)	Other actors occasionally interfere with the activities of the SAI. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of the SAI.
Maximum score (5)	The audit institution operates freely from other actors and its activities are non-partisan, i.e. they demonstrate no signs of bias. Operating freely means that the government or other actors never interfere in audit institution activities.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the public can obtain relevant information on the relevant activities and decisions by the SAI?
Guiding questions	What kind of information on its activities is the SAI required to make publicly available? Are there any deadlines on making such information publicly available? What kind of documents (reports on audits, opinions on draft laws and state budget etc.) must be prepared by the SAI? What kind of documents must be submitted to the legislature? Must these documents be debated by the legislature?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions which allow the MPs and the public to obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the audit institution, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of the SAI and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive provisions are in place which allow MPs and the public to obtain information on the organisation and functioning of the audit institution, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there transparency in the activities and decisions of the audit institution in practice?
Guiding questions	What kind of information is actually made public? Is this information made public in proper time? Does the information provide adequate details on the SAI's activities? What kind of required documents are prepared by the SAI in practice? Are the required documents always submitted to the legislature? Are they always debated? How easy is it for the public to get access to the information on SAI and its activities (audits, SAI's internal organisation, methods of audit, staff and financial capacity, budget, reports etc.)? Is there a SAI website? How up-to-date is it? Does the SAI make publicly available on its website all information required by law to be publicly available?
Minimum score (1)	The public and MPs are not able to obtain any relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the SAI, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While the public and MPs can obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the SAI, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made, it is usually a difficult, cumbersome and/or lengthy process.
Maximum score (5)	MPs and the public are able to readily obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the SAI, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	Field tests
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the SAI has to report and be answerable for its actions?
Guiding questions	Is the SAI required by law to provide a comprehensive report on SAI activities to the parliament or other responsible public body at least once a year? Are there any legal requirements to the content of this report? Is there any deadline for submission of the annual report to the legislature? Is it required to have its financial management audited itself? Is this audit independent? Must the results of audit of the SAI's finances be submitted to the parliament (or other authorised body) with a comprehensive report on the SAI's activities?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place to ensure that the SAI has to report and be answerable for its actions.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of the accountability of the SAI and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Extensive provisions are in place to ensure that the SAI has to report and be answerable for its actions.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the SAI have to report and be answerable for its actions in practice?
Guiding questions	To what extent does the SAI provide a comprehensive annual report on its work? Do independent annual financial audits of SAI finances take place? Are the audit results submitted to the parliament in practice?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place/existing provisions are not enforced at all.
Mid-point score (3)	While the SAI has to report and be answerable for certain actions of theirs, the existing provisions are only partially effective/applied in practice.
Maximum score (5)	Existing provisions are enforced/applied effectively.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity mechanisms (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there mechanisms in place to ensure the integrity of the audit institution?
Guiding questions	Is there a code of conduct or other rules aiming to ensure the integrity of the SAI? What issues and to what extent do(es) it (they) cover? In particular, does it cover conflict of interest rules? Rules on gifts and hospitality? Post-employment restrictions? Does it espouse values of independence, impartiality and objectivity?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions (e.g. codes of ethics) in place to ensure the integrity of officials of the SAI.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of officials of the SAI and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive provisions in place to ensure the integrity of officials of the SAI. Examples are a code of conduct, rules regarding conflicts of interest, rules on gifts and hospitality, and post-employment restrictions.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity mechanisms (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of the audit institution ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	Is the code of conduct applied/enforced effectively? In cases of misconduct, are appropriate sanctions applied? Are staff at the SAI given training on integrity issues?
Minimum score (1)	There is a complete absence of actions which would aim to ensure the integrity of members of the SAI, such that misbehaviour goes mostly unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	There is a piecemeal and reactive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the SAI, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	There is a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the SAI, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of staff on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.3.1
Indicator name	Effective financial audits
Scoring question	To what extent does the audit institution provide effective audits of public expenditure?
Guiding questions	Is it common for the SAI to examine the effectiveness of internal audit within government departments? Is it common for the SAI to carry out not only audits of <i>legality and regularity</i> of financial management and accounting, but also performance audits? Are reports on audit findings comprehensive? Are the audits regular? Up to date? Presented to the legislature or other authorised public body?
Minimum score (1)	Public expenditures are never audited.
Mid-point score (3)	While the SAI is somewhat active in auditing public expenditure, its effectiveness is limited (due to limited competencies and/or failures to effectively implement existing provisions).
Maximum score (5)	The audit institution has the full authority to oversee all public financial operations and always reports the results of the audit to the legislature or another public body.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.3.2
Indicator name	Detecting and sanctioning misbehaviour
Scoring question	Does the audit institution detect and investigate misbehaviour of public officeholders?
Guiding questions	Does the audit institution have adequate mechanisms to identify misbehaviour (access to all records relating to financial management, power to request necessary information etc.)? Does it have the authority to investigate misbehaviour? Does it have the political power, clout and independence to identify responsibilities of officeholders? Does it (or other government agencies) clearly define the sanctions applicable? Is the sanction generally applied?
Minimum score (1)	The SAI does not detect misbehaviour and does not investigate or apply sanctions for misbehaviour (and no other government agency does either).
Mid-point score (3)	The SAI's track record in detecting, investigating and sanctioning misbehaviour is mixed (either due to limited competencies and/or failure to effectively implement existing provisions).
Maximum score (5)	Misbehaviour of public officeholders is detected and investigated by the SAI. The SAI or another government agency clearly defines sanction, which is generally applied.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	SUPREME AUDIT INSTITUTION
Indicator number	8.3.3
Indicator name	Improving financial management
Scoring question	To what extent is the SAI effective in improving the financial management of government?
Guiding questions	How much focus does the SAI put on making comprehensive, well-grounded and realistic recommendations? How aggressively does it follow up on them? Is there a review mechanism to assess whether government has implemented the SAI recommendations? Is there evidence on whether governments act upon SAI reports?
Minimum score (1)	The SAI does generally not make recommendations on how to improve financial management in its audits.
Mid-point score (3)	Recommendations by the SAI on how to improve financial management are sometimes included, sometimes not. When included, they are not always comprehensive, well-grounded and realistic and there is no follow-up on implementation.
Maximum score (5)	The SAI makes comprehensive, well-grounded and realistic recommendations on how to improve financial management and engages government in an effective follow-up to ensure their implementation.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

9. Anti-Corruption Agencies

An anti-corruption agency is a specialized, statutory and independent public body of a durable nature, with a specific mission to fight corruption (and reduce the opportunity structures propitious for its occurrence in society) through preventive and/or repressive measures.

Capacity

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place that provide the ACA with adequate resources to effectively carry out its duties?
Guiding questions	Does the ACA have a budget of its own? Can the ACA propose its own budget to government/legislature? Is there a formal guarantee of fiscal stability over time? Is there an objective indicator for determining budgetary changes (e.g. performance-based or problem-based)? Is there leeway for the ACA to acquire further funding, e.g. from its work on confiscating assets?
Minimum score (1)	No such provisions exist.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of resources and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are provisions in place to ensure that the ACA receives adequate financial, human and infrastructural resources to effectively carry out its duties.
Additional data sources	Anorage-Net (anorage-net.org/index.jsp)
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.1.2
Indicator name	Resources (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the ACA have adequate resources to achieve its goals in practice?
Guiding questions	Is the budget of the ACA sufficient for it to perform effectively? Are there regular increases in financial resources? Stability of human resources? Adequate academic background and sufficient previous work experience of staff members? Is there an ethics screening during recruitment procedures? Will candidates have to complete an initial/specialised training course in order to become new staff members? Is the Head official politically appointed or is it recruited by open competition? Is there a public audition – parliamentary – of a short list of candidates prior to the appointment of the Head official? Are there adequate career development and training opportunities?
Minimum score (1)	The existing financial, human and infrastructural resources of the ACA are minimal and fully insufficient to effectively carry out its duties.
Mid-point score	The ACA has some resources. However, significant resource gaps lead to a certain degree of ineffectiveness in carrying out its duties.
Maximum score (5)	The ACA has an adequate resource base to effectively carry out its duties.
Additional data sources	Ancorage-Net
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent is the ACA independent by law?
Guiding questions	What is the legal status of the ACA? Is the ACA an independent statutory body or subsumed under a certain government body (e.g. ministry)? Are there mechanisms to protect the ACA from political interference in carrying out its mandate? Is recruitment of staff based on clear professional criteria? How long does the director's tenure last? How can staff, particularly the director, be dismissed? Are they protected by law from removal without relevant justifications?
Minimum score (1)	There are no laws which seek to ensure the independence of the ACA.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of the independence of the anti-corruption agencies and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive laws seeking to ensure the independence of the ACA.
Additional data sources	Ancorage-Net
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.1.4
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the ACA independent in practice?
Guiding questions	Can the ACA operate in a professional and non-partisan manner? Is the ACA seen as being politically impartial? Are there any examples of political interference in ACA activities? How common is it for ACA staff to be removed from their position before the end of their term? In practice, what is the relationship between the ACA and other law-enforcement agencies? How independent are they in terms of investigative powers?
Minimum score (1)	Other actors regularly and severely interfere in the activities of the ACA.
Mid-point score (3)	Other actors occasionally interfere with the activities of the ACA. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of the ACA.
Maximum score (5)	The ACA operates freely from any interference by other actors, particularly the executive and/or the ruling party.
Additional data sources	Analysis of ACA cases
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the public can obtain relevant information on the activities and decision-making processes of the ACA?
Guiding questions	Is the ACA required to make information on its activities publicly available, taking into account reasonable confidentiality considerations?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions which allow the public to obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the ACA, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of the ACA and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive provisions are in place which allow the public to obtain information on the organisation and functioning of the ACA, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	Ancorage-Net
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there transparency in the activities and decision-making processes of ACA in practice?
Guiding questions	Does the ACA make information on its activities publicly available? Is information presented in a clear way and with a useful level of detail? Is information published online and/or in print?
Minimum score (1)	The public is not able to obtain any relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the ACA, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Mid-point score (3)	While the public can obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of anti-corruption agencies, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made, it is usually a difficult, cumbersome and/or lengthy process.
Maximum score (5)	The public is able to readily obtain relevant information on the organisation and functioning of the ACA, on decisions that concern them and how these decisions were made.
Additional data sources	field tests
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure that the ACA has to report and be answerable for its actions?
Guiding questions	To whom is the ACA accountable (legislature, executive, others)? Is the ACA required to file annual reports? Are these reports required to be publicly available? Is the ACA required to file reports on their investigations? Are there provisions for whistleblowing on misconduct? Is the ACA required to have an independent audit carried out? Can the public file complaints against the ACA? Are there judicial review mechanisms for the ACA's work? Are there citizen oversight committees?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place to ensure that the ACA has to report and be answerable for its actions.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of the accountability of ACA and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Extensive provisions are in place to ensure that the ACA has to report and be answerable for its actions.
Additional data sources	official reports, procurement procedures and decisions; independent audits, Anorage-Net
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the ACA have to report and be answerable for its actions in practice?
Guiding questions	Does the head of the ACA have to account for the activities of its staff in practice? Does ACA file the required reports? Are they made publicly available, online and/or in print? Are the reports clearly presented and with an appropriate level of detail? Is the whistleblowing policy effective? Can complaints be filed without fear of retaliation? Are the citizen oversight committees, if they exist, effective? Is the judicial review mechanism, if it exists, effective?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place/existing provisions are not enforced at all.
Mid-point score (3)	While the ACA has to report and be answerable for certain of its actions, the existing provisions are only partially effective/applied in practice.
Maximum score (5)	Existing provisions are enforced/applied effectively.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity Mechanisms (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there mechanisms in place to ensure the integrity of members of the ACA(s)?
Guiding questions	Is there a code of conduct? How comprehensive is it? Does it cover asset declarations and conflict of interest rules? Rules on gifts and hospitality? Post-employment restrictions? Is there a standard practice of integrity screening during ACA recruitments?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions in place to ensure the integrity of members of the ACA.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of members of the ACA and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive provisions in place to ensure the integrity of members of the ACA. Examples are a code of conduct, rules regarding conflicts of interest, rules on gifts and hospitality, and post-employment restrictions.
Additional data sources	Ancorage-Net
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity Mechanisms (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of members of the ACA(s) ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	Is the code of conduct applied/enforced effectively? In cases of misconduct, are appropriate sanctions applied? Are staff at the ACA given regular training on integrity issues?
Minimum score (1)	There is a complete absence of actions which would aim to ensure the integrity of members of the ACA, such that misbehaviour goes mostly unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	There is a piecemeal and reactive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the ACA, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	There is a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of members of the ACA, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of staff on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	The ACA is generally very active and successful in its preventive anti-corruption work.
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.3.1
Indicator name	Prevention (law and practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the ACA engage in preventive activities regarding fighting corruption?
Guiding questions	Does the ACA have any competences in this regard? If yes, what are they? Can the agency recommend legislative reforms? Is the ACA tasked to coordinate anti-corruption activities? If so, how effective is it? Does the agency have research capabilities (research unit, staff assigned to do research only, commission research, etc.)? What studies/reports re: anti-corruption did the ACA produce? Does the ACA receive and respond to anti-corruption advice requests from the public and/or other government agencies? Are there examples of ACA making submissions to parliamentary and govt bodies working on anti-corruption issues?
Minimum score (1)	The ACA is inactive and unsuccessful in preventive anti-corruption activities.
Mid-point score (3)	The ACA is somewhat active in preventative anti-corruption activities, but its efforts are generally unsuccessful and it has not been successful bringing about legislative or policy change.
Maximum score (5)	The ACA is generally very active and has been successful in its preventive anti-corruption activities, such as achieving major legislative reform and influencing policy change.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.3.2
Indicator name	Education (law and practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the ACA engage in educational activities regarding fighting corruption?
Guiding questions	Does the ACA have any competences in this regard? Does the ACA actively seek to educate the public on fighting corruption, e.g. via public fora? Does the ACA work with civil society? Does the ACA assess the impact of its educational activities?
Minimum score (1)	The ACA is inactive and unsuccessful in educating the public on corruption and how to fight it.
Mid-point score (3)	While the ACA is somewhat active in educating the public on corruption and on how to fight it, its efforts are generally limited, reactive, piecemeal and/or considered to be ineffective.
Maximum score (5)	The ACA is generally very active and successful in educating the public on corruption and how fight it.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES
Indicator number	9.3.3
Indicator name	Investigation (law and practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the ACA engage in investigation regarding alleged corruption?
Guiding questions	<p>Does the ACA have any competences in this regard? If so, are these well-defined and clearly distinguished from competencies of other law enforcement agencies? In practice, has the ACA conducted investigations into corruption of high ranking officials from the ruling party/administration?</p> <p>In practice what is the balance between pro-activity (is the agency in monitoring and preventing corruption?) and reactivity (or merely responding to complaints?) in the work of the ACA? How many investigations were begun and completed in the past year? How many of them were identified by ACA's own initiative? How many investigations resulted in successful prosecutions? Has the number of successfully prosecuted cases increased or decreased over time?</p>
Minimum score (1)	The ACA is inactive and unsuccessful in investigating corruption-related cases.
Mid-point score (3)	The ACA's track record in detecting, investigating and sanctioning misbehaviour is mixed (either due to limited competencies and/or failure to effectively implement existing provisions).
Maximum score (5)	The ACA is generally very active and successful in investigating corruption-related cases.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

10. Political Parties

A political party is a political organisation that seeks to attain political power within a government, usually by participating in electoral campaigns.

Capacity

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (law)
Scoring question	To what extent does the legal framework provide a conducive environment for the formation and operations of political parties?
Guiding questions	What is the legal process of establishing parties? What are the legal restrictions on party ideology? Are there laws on freedom of association? Is there a special law on political parties? Are political parties banned by law? Are political parties and their role mentioned in the country's constitution? Is there a minimum number of founders required to set up parties? What other legal requirements do have to be met to set up a party? What are the legal provisions available for political parties to appeal against de-registration, rejected registration etc.? What restrictions exist on political party activities, such as campaigning and internal democratic decision-making?
Minimum score (1)	The legal framework pertaining to the existence and operations of political parties is highly restrictive.
Mid-point score (3)	While the legal framework permits the establishment and operation of political parties, a large number of legal requirements must be met to establish a party and/or restrictions on party activities hamper their work.
Maximum score (5)	The legal framework pertaining to the existence and operations of political parties is very conducive.
Additional data sources	Interviews with political party representatives
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent do the financial resources available to political parties allow for effective political competition?
Guiding questions	What is the financial status of opposition parties, small and new parties? Is there sustainability and diversity of funding sources for political parties? What is the balance between private and public funding of political parties?
Minimum score (1)	Effective political competition within the party system is absent due to lack of adequate funding and/or heavily biased funding against new, small or opposition parties which receive no significant resources at all.
Mid-point score (3)	While small and/or opposition parties can draw on some financial resources, these are considerably lower than the resources of the larger and/or ruling party. Political competition among parties is biased towards the largest and/or ruling party.
Maximum score (5)	All parties have adequate funding, reflecting their socio-political weight in society, allowing for effective political competition
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.1.2
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there legal safeguards to prevent unwarranted external interference in the activities of political parties?
Guiding questions	What is the relevant legislation regarding state monitoring/investigation/dissolution of political party operations? How easy it is for state authorities to order the banning of a specific political party? What are the legal powers of state authorities for surveillance of political parties? Is government oversight reasonably designed and limited to protect legitimate public interests? Are there regulations allowing for mandatory state attendance of political party meetings?
Minimum score (1)	No legal safeguards exist to prevent unwarranted external interference in the activities of political parties.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of the independence of political parties and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive legal safeguards to prevent unwarranted external interference in the activities of political parties exist.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent are political parties free from unwarranted external interference in their activities in practice?
Guiding questions	Are there examples of the state dissolving and/or prohibiting political parties? Of state attempts in this regard? Are there examples of other state interference in the activities of political parties? Are there examples of harassment and attacks on opposition parties by state authorities or actors linked to the state/governing party? Are all political parties treated equally by authorities? How common is the detention or arrest of political party members because of their work? When attacks on political party members occur, does the state usually engage in a proper and impartial investigation?
Minimum score (1)	The state and/or other external actors regularly and severely interfere in the activities of political parties.
Mid-point score (3)	The state and/or other external actors occasionally interfere with the activities of political parties. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of political parties.
Maximum score (5)	Political parties operate freely and are subject only to reasonable oversight linked to clear and legitimate public interests.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there regulations in place that require parties to make their financial information publicly available?
Guiding questions	What are the regulations governing financial accounting of political parties? What are the regulations on disclosure of campaigning money, public subsidies etc.?
Minimum score (1)	No such regulations exist.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of political parties and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive regulations on the accounting requirements for political parties.
Additional data sources	CRINIS
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent do political parties make their financial information publicly available?
Guiding questions	How readily can the public obtain relevant financial information from political parties?
Minimum score (1)	In general, political parties do not make their financial information publicly available.
	In general, while it is possible to obtain relevant financial information from political parties, it is usually a difficult, cumbersome and/or lengthy process.
Maximum score (5)	In general, political parties make their financial information available in a timely and comprehensive manner.
Additional data sources	Field tests, CRINIS
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions governing financial oversight of political parties?
Guiding questions	How extensive are these regulations in terms of electoral and non-electoral accounting? What types of finances need to be accounted for? What legal loopholes exist? What is the frequency? Is there a standard format?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions which mandate political parties to maintain records on their finances and report on them publicly.
	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of the financial reporting and accounting of political parties and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive provisions which mandate political parties to maintain records of their finances and report on them.
Additional data sources	CRINIS
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there effective financial oversight of political parties in practice?
Guiding questions	Do parties submit financial reports? How accurate and reliable are they?
Minimum score (1)	In general, no reporting on party financing to a designated state agency takes place.
Mid-point score (3)	In general, parties provide partial, low-quality and/or late reports on their financing sources.
Maximum score (5)	In general, political parties provide regular and robust reports on their finances to a state agency.
Additional data sources	CRINIS
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there organisational regulations regarding the internal democratic governance of the main political parties?
Guiding questions	What are the regulations on the election of party leadership? Selection of candidates? Decision-making processes regarding party platforms?
Minimum score (1)	Almost none of the major parties has any of these regulations in place.
Mid-point score (3)	The majority of the major political parties lack these provisions and/or existing provisions do not cover all aspects of internal democratic governance.
Maximum score (5)	In general, all major parties have in place comprehensive regulations on their internal democratic governance.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there effective internal democratic governance of political parties in practice?
Guiding questions	How are party leadership and candidates selected in practice? How are the policies of political parties determined in practice?
Minimum score (1)	None of the major political parties elects its leadership, candidates for public office nor determines their policies through democratic means.
Mid-point score (3)	The majority of major political parties does not follow provisions for internal democratic governance comprehensively.
Maximum score (5)	In general, all major political parties follow democratic procedures for their leadership and candidate selection and policy-making processes.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.3.1
Indicator name	Interest aggregation and representation (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent do political parties aggregate and represent relevant social interests in the political sphere?
Guiding questions	Are there specific interest groups who dominate certain political parties? Are there other clientelistic relationships between individuals/narrow groups and certain political parties? What is the legitimacy of political parties among the population? How strong is the linkage between political parties and civil society?
Minimum score (1)	In general, political parties are based on clientelism and narrow interests. Many relevant social interests do not find a voice in the party system.
Mid-point score (3)	While the political party system is effective in aggregating and representing many of the social interests present in the country, there are significant social groups which are excluded from representation by the major political parties. A number of major political parties are based on clientelism and narrow interests.
Maximum score (5)	In general, political parties are able to aggregate and represent the entire range of relevant social interests in the political sphere.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	POLITICAL PARTIES
Indicator number	10.3.2
Indicator name	Anti-corruption commitment (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent do political parties give due attention to public accountability and the fight against corruption?
Guiding questions	Are these issues mentioned in party manifestos and electoral commitments? Are they given prominence in speeches by party leaders?
Minimum score (1)	In general, political parties do not pay attention to the promotion of public accountability and the fight against corruption.
Mid-point score (3)	While there are a number of reforms, initiated and promoted by political parties, to counter corruption and promote integrity, they are piecemeal efforts, which are considered largely ineffective in achieving their goals.
Maximum score (5)	In general, political parties give significant attention to public accountability and the fight against corruption
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

11. Media

The tools used to store and deliver information to reach a large audience, in some cases the national population. The most common examples are newspapers, television, radio and the internet. While media can include all forms of information, that most relevant to the NIS is news media.

Capacity

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (law)
Scoring question	To what extent does the legal framework provide an environment conducive to a diverse independent media?
Guiding questions	Are there any restrictions to set up broadcast media entities? If a broadcast media license is necessary, can a negative decision be appealed? Does broadcasting legislation provide for a conducive environment for public, commercial and community broadcasting? Is media diversity promoted through adequate competition regulation/legislation? Is the entry into the journalistic profession unrestricted by law? Are there any restrictions to set up print media entities? If a print media license is necessary, can a negative decision be appealed?
Minimum score (1)	The legal framework pertaining to the existence and operations of independent media is highly restrictive.
Mid-point score (3)	While the legal framework permits the establishment and operation of media entities, a large number of legal requirements must be met to establish a media entity and/or restrictions on media activities hamper their work.
Maximum score (5)	The legal framework pertaining to the existence and operations of independent media is very conducive.
Additional data sources	Global index data: FH survey details, regional index data: Southern Africa: Media Institute for Southern Africa; Eurasia, Middle East, Africa: IREX Media Sustainability Index; non-index reports: UN special rapporteur on freedom of expression; OSCE representative on freedom of the media, OAS special rapporteur on freedom of expression, RSF global index
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.1.2
Indicator name	Resources (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there a diverse independent media providing a variety of perspectives?
Guiding questions	Are there different media organizations (print, broadcast, internet) in and outside the capital? Do they represent the entire political spectrum? Do they reflect a broad spectrum of social interests and groups? Are they affordable? Do they have adequate financial resources to be efficient? Do journalists have adequate qualifications?
Minimum score (1)	Media in the country is highly monopolized. Many important social and political interests do not find a voice in the media landscape of the country.
Mid-point score (3)	While there is a plurality of media sources (in terms of type, ideology, ownership), they do not cover the entire political and social spectrum.
Maximum score (5)	There is a plurality of media sources covering the entire political and social spectrum.
Additional data sources	Global index data: FH survey details, regional index data: Southern Africa: Media Institute for Southern Africa; Eurasia, Middle East, Africa: IREX Media Sustainability Index; non-index reports: UN special rapporteur on freedom of expression; OSCE representative on freedom of the media, OAS special rapporteur on freedom of expression, RSF global index
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there legal safeguards to prevent unwarranted external interference in the activities of the media?
Guiding questions	Is there a law protecting freedom of expression? Is there a law on editorial independence? Is there a law on access to information? Are there libel laws? Are private or community media permitted to exist regardless of format (i.e., print, broadcast, Internet, etc.)? Is censorship illegal? Are journalists permitted to withhold their sources by law? Is licensing of broadcast media apolitical? Does licensing deal with technical aspects of broadcasting only or does it also regulate the content (types of broadcasted programs)? Are there any rules allowing the government to control information disseminated by media at any time?
Minimum score (1)	No legal safeguards exist to prevent unwarranted external interference in the media.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of media independence and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive legal safeguards to prevent unwarranted external interference in the media exist.
Additional data sources	Global index data: FH survey details, regional index data: Southern Africa: Media Institute for Southern Africa; Eurasia, Middle East, Africa: IREX Media Sustainability Index; non-index reports: UN special rapporteur on freedom of expression; OSCE representative on freedom of the media, OAS special rapporteur on freedom of expression, RSF global index
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.1.4
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the media free from unwarranted external interference in its work in practice?
Guiding questions	Do government regulators or professional oversight boards operate independently of state interference? How widespread is censorship? How widespread is self-censorship? Can journalists assert their right to freedom of expression without fear? Is the law on freedom of expression effectively enforced? To what extent are journalists harassed while covering the news? To what extent is intimidation of journalists common? Are crimes that threaten media freedom generally prosecuted? To what extent are journalists agendas/editorial stances set by the government of a particular party? Is access to official or unofficial media sources generally controlled? Does the state try to control the media through allocation of advertising or subsidies? Are there any examples of political influence on media? Are media licenses issued through clear and transparent process?
Minimum score (1)	Other actors, particularly the state, regularly and severely interfere in the activities of the media.
Mid-point score (3)	The state and/or other external actors occasionally interfere with the activities of the media. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of media.
Maximum score (5)	The media is free from any unwarranted external interference.
Additional data sources	Global index data: FH survey details, regional index data: Southern Africa: Media Institute for Southern Africa; Eurasia, Middle East, Africa: IREX Media Sustainability Index; non-index reports: UN special rapporteur on freedom of expression; OSCE representative on freedom of the media, OAS special rapporteur on freedom of expression, RSF global index
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions to ensure transparency in the activities of the media?
Guiding questions	Are print media and broadcast companies required to disclose their ownership? Does the media generally have clear rules on disclosure of information relating to internal staff, reporting and editorial policies?
Minimum score (1)	In general, there are no legal provisions or individual rules and codes of media outlets which seek to establish transparency with regard to relevant media activities.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of the media and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	In general, the legal provisions and individual rules and codes of media outlets seek to establish full transparency with regard to relevant media activities.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there transparency in the media in practice?
Guiding questions	Do print and broadcast media generally disclose their ownership? Does the media generally make information on its internal staff, reporting and editing policies publicly available?
Minimum score (1)	In general, media outlets do not disclose relevant information on their activities.
Mid-point score (3)	While media outlets usually disclose relevant information on their activities, it is often partial and/or outdated information.
Maximum score (5)	In general, media outlets provide full and effective disclosure of relevant information on their activities.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there legal provisions to ensure that media outlets are answerable for their activities?
Guiding questions	Are there government regulators or professional oversight bodies, such as a press council? What is their mandate? To what extent do individual media outlets have ombudsmen? Do media usually have forums (in person or on the web), blogs, chats with reporters and editors or other ways for the public to interact with the people who collect and disseminate the news? Are there mechanisms for an individual or an agency subject to media criticism to reply and inform the public of his/its opinion on the given issue? Is media required to correct erroneous information in a timely manner? If yes, does the correction have to be made in a manner that it is easily noticeable?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place to ensure the accountability of media employees.
Mid-point activities (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of the accountability of the media for their activities and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive mechanisms are in place.
Additional data sources	http://www.media-accountability.org
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent can media outlets be held accountable in practice?
Guiding questions	Do government regulators or professional oversight boards, such as press councils, operate effectively? Do media usually grant a right of reply without prompting from outside agents? How widely used/effective are forums set up by the media to receive feedback from the public? Does the media correct erroneous information as necessary and in a timely manner?
Minimum score (1)	In general, media outlets do not have to answer for their activities to stakeholders.
Mid-point score (3)	While some media outlets have effective accountability mechanisms in place, there is no effective sector-wide accountability system for the media sector.
Maximum score (5)	In general, media outlets have to answer for their activities to stakeholders. There are sector-wide accountability mechanisms, which work effectively.
Additional data sources	National government data on established regulatory bodies , http://www.media-accountability.org
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity mechanisms (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions in place to ensure the integrity of media employees?
Guiding questions	Is there a sector-wide code of ethics? What is its scope? How common are individual codes of ethics? How common are ethics committees within individual media outlets?
Minimum score (1)	No provisions are in place to ensure the integrity of media employees.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of media employees and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive mechanisms are in place.
Additional data sources	FH and IREX MSI reports, contacts with IFJ headquarters and regional offices, http://www.media-accountability.org
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity mechanisms (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of media employees ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	How widely do journalists follow a code of conduct (established through professional norms by the media outlet itself and not, for example, by the Ministry of Communication)? How common is it for journalists to receive independent instruction on ethics (e.g. provided by professional associations, academic institutions)? Is there a professional organisation defending journalists and governing media ethics? How widely do journalists/editors follow procedures when gifts/hospitality are offered? Do journalists rely on multiple sources? Do they seek out and report on both sides of an issue?
Minimum score (1)	There is a complete absence of actions which would aim to ensure the integrity of media employees, such that misbehaviour goes mostly unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	There is a piecemeal and reactive approach to ensuring the integrity of media employees, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	There is a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of media employees, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of staff on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	FH and IREX MSI reports, contacts with IFJ headquarters and regional offices.
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.3.1
Indicator name	Investigate and expose cases of corruption practice
Scoring question	To what extent is the media active and successful in investigating and exposing cases of corruption?
Guiding questions	Is investigate journalism a key part of the media's work in the country? How many investigative journalists or/and programs are there? Are there high profile cases of corruption investigations by journalists? Are there specific media outlets which focus on investigative journalism?
Minimum score (1)	In general, the task of investigating and exposing individual cases of corruption is neglected by the media.
Mid-point score (3)	While the media is somewhat active in investigating corruption cases, their work is generally focused only on a small number of cases and rarely results in charges and successful convictions.
Maximum score (5)	In general, the media is very active and successful in investigating and exposing individual cases of corruption.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.3.2
Indicator name	Inform public on corruption and its impact (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the media active and successful in informing the public on corruption and its impact on the country?
Guiding questions	Are there specific programmes run by the media to educate the public on corruption and how to curb it? How much prominence do these programmes have? How successful are they? Is there high-level support for these programmes?
Minimum score (1)	In general, the task of informing the public on corruption and its impact is neglected by the media.
Mid-point score (3)	While media outlets pay some attention to informing the public on corruption and its impact, reports are often limited, biased and/or of poor quality.
Maximum score (5)	In general, the media is very active and successful in informing the public on corruption and its impact.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	MEDIA
Indicator number	11.3.3
Indicator name	Inform public on governance issues (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the media active and successful in informing the public on the activities of the government and other governance actors?
Guiding questions	How important is reporting on government/governance activities? How objective is media reporting on these topics? How comprehensive is it? Can the public easily obtain an unbiased account of regular government activities through media?
Minimum score (1)	In general, the task of informing the public on the regular activities of the government and other governance institutions is neglected by the media.
Mid-point score (3)	While media outlets pay some attention to informing the public on governance issues, reports are often limited, biased and/or of poor quality.
Maximum score (5)	In general, the media is very active and successful in keeping the public informed on regular activities of the government and other governance institutions.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

12. Civil Society

The arena outside of the family, the state and the business sector that is created by individual and collective action, organisations and institutions to advance shared interests.

Capacity

Pillar	CIVIL SOCIETY
Indicator number	12.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (law)
Scoring question	To what extent does the legal framework provide an environment conducive to civil society?
Guiding questions	Is there a right to associate? How simple, quick, and inexpensive is the procedure of registering CSOs? Are unregistered CSOs prohibited? To what extent are CSOs free to engage in advocacy/criticize government? How favourable is the tax system to CSOs? How narrow/broad is the range of CSOs that are eligible for tax exemptions, if any? How significant are these exemptions?
Minimum score (1)	The legal framework pertaining to the existence and operations of CSOs is highly restrictive.
Mid-point (3)	While the legal framework permits the establishment and operation of CSOs, a large number of legal requirements must be met to establish a CSO and/or restrictions on CSO activities hamper their work.
Maximum score (5)	The legal framework pertaining to the existence and operations of CSOs is very conducive.
Additional data sources	GII, CIVICUS CSI 2.5.2, ICNL reports, USAID NGO Sustainability Index, Freedom House
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	CIVIL SOCIETY
Indicator number	12.1.2
Indicator name	Resources (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent do CSOs have adequate financial and human resources to function and operate effectively?
Guiding questions	How common is it for CSOs to rely on a single grant and/or be dependent on a single donor? To what extent can CSOs rely on local funding sources? In general, how diverse are individual CSO funding sources? How strong is the volunteer and membership base of CSOs overall? To what extent are CSOs able to attract skilled professionals as staff? Do revenues from services, products, or rent from assets supplement the income of CSOs?
Minimum score (1)	In general, most CSOs suffer from a serious financial and human resource problem threatening their survival.
Mid-point score (3)	In general, most CSOs tend to have some resources. However, significant resource gaps lead to a certain degree of ineffectiveness in carrying out their duties and/or threaten their sustainability.
Maximum score (5)	In general, most CSOs have a sustainable and diverse funding and support base.
Additional data sources	CIVICUS CSI
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	CIVIL SOCIETY
Indicator number	12.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there legal safeguards to prevent unwarranted external interference in the activities of CSOs?
Guiding questions	Are citizens allowed to form and get engaged in groups promoting good governance and anti-corruption, regardless of political ideology, religion or objectives? Are the permissible grounds for state interference in CSOs limited to issues of national security, public order, public health/morals and protection of rights of others and clearly limited to necessary and proportionate means to pursue legitimate government interests? Are there regulations stipulating state membership on CSO boards? Are there regulations allowing for mandatory state attendance of CSO meetings? Does the right to privacy extend to CSOs? Is government oversight reasonably designed and limited to protect legitimate public interests?
Minimum score (1)	No legal safeguards exist to prevent unwarranted external interference in the activities of CSOs.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of CSO independence and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive legal safeguards to prevent unwarranted external interference in the activities of CSOs exist.
Additional data sources	CIVICUS CSI
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	CIVIL SOCIETY
Indicator number	12.1.4
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent can civil society exist and function without undue external interference?
Guiding questions	To what extent are CSOs free to operate without undue government interference? Are there examples of government manipulating CSOs to advance its interests? Are there examples of state officials intimidating, harassing or attacking civil society actors? How common is the detention or arrest of civil society actors because of their work? When attacks on civil society actors occur, does the state usually engage in a proper and impartial investigation?
Minimum score (1)	The state and/or other external actors regularly and severely interfere in the activities of CSOs.
Mid-point score (3)	The state and/or other external actors occasionally interfere with the activities of CSOs. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of CSOs.
Maximum score (5)	CSOs operate freely and are subject only to reasonable oversight linked to clear and legitimate public interests.
Additional data sources	CIVICUS CSI 2.6.1; Freedom House, Academic studies, Donor reports; ICNL reports, USAID NGO Sustainability Index
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	CIVIL SOCIETY
Indicator number	12.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there transparency in CSOs?
Guiding questions	Do CSOs provide an annual report? Do they make their financial statements publicly available? Do they make the composition of their board publicly available?
Minimum score (1)	In general, CSOs do not make relevant information on their activities publicly available.
Minimum score (3)	While CSOs usually disclose relevant information on their activities, it is often partial and/or outdated information.
Maximum score (5)	In general, CSOs make relevant information on their activities publicly available.
Additional data sources	CIVICUS CSI
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	CIVIL SOCIETY
Indicator number	12.2.2
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent are CSOs answerable to their constituencies?
Guiding questions	In general, to what extent are CSO boards and/or members effective in providing oversight of organizational activities?
Minimum score (1)	In general, CSO management does not have to answer about its decisions to board and membership.
Mid-point score (3)	In general, CSO boards and members are only partially effective in providing oversight of CSO management decisions. Breaches of oversight rules by CSO management are not uncommon.
Maximum score (5)	In general, membership and boards exert strong supervision of management decisions.
Additional data sources	CIVICUS CSI
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	CIVIL SOCIETY
Indicator number	12.2.3
Indicator name	Integrity (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there mechanisms in place to ensure the integrity of CSOs?
Guiding questions	Are there efforts among CSOs to self-regulate? Is there a sectorwide code of conduct?
Minimum score (1)	There are no efforts among civil society actors to self-regulate.
Mid-point (3)	While a number of integrity initiatives exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of CSOs and/or contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There is a fully-developed self-regulatory framework which seeks to establish accountable behaviour on parts of CSOs.
Additional data sources	CIVICUS CSI 1.4.3, Guidestar reports
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	CIVIL SOCIETY
Indicator number	12.2.4
Indicator name	Integrity (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of CSOs ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	How effective and enforceable are existing self-regulatory mechanisms? Is adherence to the code of conduct monitored and assessed?
Minimum score (1)	In general, CSOs are inactive in ensuring the integrity of their staff and board, so that misbehaviour mostly goes unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	In general, CSOs have a piecemeal and reactive approach to ensuring the integrity of their staff and board, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	In general, CSOs have a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of their staff and board, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of staff and board on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	Studies on CSOs; CSO publications/newsletters; Written CSO Codes of Conduct; Donor reports, CIVICUS CSI 1.4.3, Guidestar reports
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	CIVIL SOCIETY
Indicator number	12.3.1
Indicator name	Hold government accountable
Scoring question	To what extent is civil society active and successful in holding government accountable for its actions?
Guiding questions	How strongly developed is civil society's public watchdog role? What are examples of high-profile and successful activities in this regard? How widespread are civil society advocacy campaigns, public education, public engagements etc with regard to anti-corruption? How common are instances where government has taken positive action following CSO advocacy?
Minimum score (1)	In general, CSOs are inactive and unsuccessful in holding government to account for its actions.
Mid-point score (3)	While CSOs are somewhat active in seeking to hold the government to account, the effectiveness of their actions is limited (e.g. due to limited competencies and/or resources).
Maximum score (5)	In general, CSOs are very active and successful in holding government to account for its actions.
Additional data sources	CIVICUS CSI 3.2.3 & 4.2
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	CIVIL SOCIETY
Indicator number	12.3.2
Indicator name	Policy reform
Scoring question	To what extent is civil society actively engaged in policy reform initiatives on anti-corruption?
Guiding questions	How much input does civil society provide to ongoing anti-corruption reform discussions? How much does civil society seek to initiate anti-corruption reforms?
Minimum score (1)	In general, civil society is inactive and unsuccessful in engaging with government on anti-corruption policies.
Mid-point score (3)	While CSOs do cooperate with other stakeholders on anti-corruption reform initiatives, their role is generally reactive and these initiatives are given neither much prominence nor support by their leadership.
Maximum score (5)	In general, civil society is very active in engaging with government on anti-corruption policies.
Additional data sources	
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

13. Business

Please evaluate only private sector enterprises. If the economy is dominated by state-owned enterprises, please adapt these questions to state-owned companies and evaluate as a separate pillar.

Capacity

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.1.1
Indicator name	Resources (law)
Scoring question	To what extent does the legal framework offer an enabling environment for the formation and operations of individual businesses?
Guiding questions	How conducive are the laws governing the formation, operation, insolvency and winding up of businesses? How many steps are involved in starting a business? How detailed is each step? To what extent are (intellectual) property rights protected by law? To what extent is the enforcement of contracts protected by law? Is there a complaint mechanism if a business licence is refused?
Minimum score (1)	The laws pertaining to the start, operation and closing down of individual businesses are extremely cumbersome, unreasonable and/or unclear.
Mid-point (3)	The laws pertaining to the start, operation and closing down of individual businesses contain a number of problems regarding unclear, unreasonable and/or complicated provisions.
Maximum score (5)	The laws pertaining to the start, operation and closing down of individual businesses are clear, straightforward and easy to apply and include only reasonable requirements for applicants.
Additional data sources	Heritage Foundation, WB Doing Business Law Library, Global Competitiveness Report
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.1.2
Indicator name	Resources (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent are individual businesses able in practice to form and operate effectively?
Guiding questions	How difficult/easy is it in practice to register a business? How many days does it take on average? How costly is the process of registering a business? Are laws concerning the formation, operation, insolvency and winding up of businesses effectively enforced? Is the complaints mechanism working effectively? Are property rights protected effectively in practice?
Minimum score (1)	In general, to start, operate and close a business is extremely costly in terms of time and money involved.
Mid-point (3)	In general, to start, operate and close a business involves a moderate investment in terms of time and money.
Maximum score (5)	In general, to start, operate, and close down a business is very straightforward and does not involve significant time or financial resources.
Additional data sources	Heritage Foundation, WB Doing Business, Global Competitiveness Report
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.1.3
Indicator name	Independence (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there legal safeguards to prevent unwarranted external interference in activities of private businesses?
Guiding questions	To what extent does the legal system provide a role for public officials in terms of the start-up and operation of private businesses? What are the complaints mechanisms for businesses to seek redress in case of undue external interference? Are there regulations which allow businesses to seek compensation in case of undue state interference?
Minimum score (1)	No legal safeguards exist to prevent unwarranted external interference in the activities of private businesses.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects of the independence of private business and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Comprehensive legal safeguards to prevent unwarranted external interference in the activities of private businesses exist.
Additional data sources	Heritage Foundation
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.1.4
Indicator name	Independence (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the business sector free from unwarranted external interference in its work in practice?
Guiding questions	Are there examples of government abusing office to exploit the private sector? Passing of laws/regulations favourable to the government (or special interests favoured by those in government) but unfavourable to private business? Abuse of state power to gain access to private sector assets or resources? Undue authority over the economy that subverts the rule of law? How difficult is it for a business to complain or file a law suit against the behaviour of the public administration or a civil servant? What is the ownership structure of the business sector? How widely spread is it – to what extent is it controlled by the state and/or by oligarchs?
Minimum score (1)	The state and/or other external actors regularly and severely interfere with the operations of the business sector.
Mid-point score (3)	The state and/or other external actors occasionally interfere with the activities of the business sector. These instances of interference are usually non-severe, such as threatening verbal attacks, without significant consequences for the behaviour of businesses.
Maximum score (5)	There is no unwarranted external interference in the operations of the business sector.
Additional data sources	Heritage Foundation, GII, WEF EOS 2008 Q3.04 & Q3.10
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Governance

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.2.1
Indicator name	Transparency (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there provisions to ensure transparency in the activities of the business sector?
Guiding questions	How weak/stringent are financial auditing and reporting standards? Does the state or stock exchange require an independent audit by an external auditor or not? Are there statutory codes of conduct that accountants must observe – in particular, are accountants required to adhere to International Financial Reporting Standards? Are there annual banking inspections?
Minimum score (1)	No such provisions/rules exist.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the transparency of business activities and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	There are comprehensive disclosure rules for business activities, in particular for financial records.
Additional data sources	WEF GCR 2008 1.16 Financial Auditing/Reporting Standards, Kurtzman Opacity index
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.2.2
Indicator name	Transparency (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there transparency in the business sector in practice?
Guiding questions	Is general data on registered companies (names of directors, contact details, annual reports etc) available to the public? How effectively applied are financial auditing and reporting standards? Is there third-party verification of financial records? Is information on the ownership structure of businesses publicly available? Do large corporations report on corporate responsibility and sustainability? What do companies disclose in relation to countering corruption? To what extent are these disclosures available to the public?
Minimum score (1)	In general, businesses do not make either their financial accounts or reports on activities publicly available.
Mid-point score (3)	While businesses usually disclose relevant information on their activities, it is often partial and/or outdated information.
Maximum score (5)	In general, businesses make their financial accounts publicly available.
Additional data sources	field tests
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.2.3
Indicator name	Accountability (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there rules and laws governing oversight of the business sector and governing corporate governance of individual companies?
Guiding questions	How comprehensive are corporate governance provisions in the law? To whom must businesses sector report, in law? To shareholders? The Board? Is there an appropriately funded and professionally staffed financial regulator overseeing companies? Is there a stock market oversight body?
Minimum score (1)	There are no provisions for oversight of businesses in the respective laws.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of laws/provisions exist to govern oversight of the business sector, they do not cover all aspects of accountability of businesses and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Legal provisions for appropriate oversight of corporate governance are established, including rules on how companies should be governed, formation of companies, roles of the board, management and owners, insolvency, and dissolution.
Additional data sources	Stock Exchange, WEF GCR Q8.14
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.2.4
Indicator name	Accountability (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is there effective corporate governance in companies in practice?
Guiding questions	To what extent are existing corporate governance provisions applied in practice? To what extent are oversight bodies effective in practice?
Minimum score (1)	In general, corporate management does not have to answer about its decisions to board and shareholders.
Mid-point score (3)	In general, investors and boards are only partially effective in providing oversight of corporate management decisions. Breaches of oversight rules by corporate management are not uncommon.
Maximum score (5)	In general, investors and boards exert strong supervision of management decisions. Corporate governance provisions are always followed.
Additional data sources	WEF GCR 2008 Q8.14 Corporate governance
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.2.5
Indicator name	Integrity mechanisms (law)
Scoring question	To what extent are there mechanisms in place to ensure the integrity of all those acting in the business sector?
Guiding questions	Are there sector-wide codes of conduct? Do any businesses or sectors have mandatory anti-corruption codes? How comprehensive are they? Do they cover individual behaviour? Do these provisions extend to Boards? Conflict of interest? Bribery and corruption? Good commercial practices? Gifts and entertainment policies? Whistleblowing? Does the law require bidders for public contracts to have ethics programmes (e.g. anti-corruption agreements, business principles) in place and the corresponding compliance mechanisms? Are corporate codes of conduct and other aspects of corporate responsibility rare/nonexistent OR frequent? Do large corporations generally have professional chief compliance officers?
Minimum score (1)	No mechanisms are in place to ensure the integrity of those acting in the business sector.
Mid-point score (3)	While a number of regulations/provisions exist, they do not cover all aspects related to the integrity of business actors and/or some provisions contain loopholes.
Maximum score (5)	Appropriate mechanisms and procedures are established for the correct, honourable and proper performance of the activities of businesses and the prevention of misconduct, and for the promotion of the use of good commercial practices among businesses.
Additional data sources	WEF GCR
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.2.6
Indicator name	Integrity mechanisms (practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the integrity of those working in the business sector ensured in practice?
Guiding questions	Are existing codes applied/enforced effectively? How common is bribery by businesses in the country? Are chief compliance officers generally effective and empowered in their work? Are whistleblowing policies applied effectively? Have many companies signed integrity pacts? To what extent is there a general concern for integrity within and from outside the private sector? Is it common for companies to train employees on issues of integrity?
Minimum score (1)	In general, there is a complete absence of business actions which aim to ensure the integrity of those working for them, such that misbehaviour goes mostly unsanctioned.
Mid-point score (3)	In general, there is a piecemeal and reactive approach by businesses to ensuring the integrity of those working for them, including only some of the following elements: enforcement of existing rules, inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour and training of staff on integrity issues.
Maximum score (5)	In general, businesses have a comprehensive approach to ensuring the integrity of those working for them, comprising effective enforcement of existing rules, proactive inquiries into alleged misbehaviour, sanctioning of misbehaviour, as well as regular training of staff/board on integrity issues.
Additional data sources	WEF GCR 2008 1.15 Ethical behaviour of firms, BPI
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Role

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.3.1²
Indicator name	AC policy engagement (law & practice)
Scoring question	To what extent is the business sector active in engaging the domestic government on anti-corruption?
Guiding questions	What is on the agenda when large business associations and chamber of commerce meet the government? Are there examples of business associations publicly calling on the government to fight corruption? Have many companies subscribed to the UN Global Compact?
Minimum score (1)	In general, the issue of anti-corruption is absent from the business sector's agenda of engagement with government.
Mid-point score (3)	In general, while anti-corruption features on the business sector's agenda of engagement with the government, it is generally not a priority. Only rarely are there public statements by senior business people calling on government to do more to fight corruption.
Maximum score (5)	In general, anti-corruption is a cornerstone of the business sector's agenda of engagement with government
Additional data sources	websites/annual reports of business associations/chamber of commerce http://www.unglobalcompact.org/
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

² It is advised to only use this indicator in country contexts, where corruption has been identified as a key problem for the country.

Pillar	BUSINESS
Indicator number	13.3.2
Indicator name	Support for/engagement with civil society (law & practice)
Scoring question	To what extent does the business sector engage with/provide support to civil society on its task of combating corruption?
Guiding questions	Are there examples of joint business-civil society initiatives on combating corruption? Are there examples of businesses providing financial support to civil society initiatives seeking to combat corruption?
Minimum score (1)	In general, the business sector does not engage with or provide support to civil society in its task of combating corruption.
Mid-point score (3)	While the business sector occasionally cooperates with CSOs on anti-corruption reform initiatives, its role is generally reactive, symbolic and/or it rarely provides financial support to help further initiatives.
Maximum score (5)	In general, the business sector is actively engaged with civil society and provides significant support to civil society initiatives seeking to combat corruption.
Additional data sources	websites/annual reports of business associations/chamber of commerce, interviews with AC CSOs
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Foundations

Name	Political-Institutional Foundations
Scoring question	To what extent are the political institutions in the country supportive to an effective national integrity system?
Guiding questions	To what extent is there free and fair political competition for government offices among political parties and individuals? To what extent are civil rights guaranteed and protected, and to what extent can citizens seek redress for violations of these rights? How strongly entrenched is the rule of law? How far is the elected government able to influence or control those matters that are important to the lives of its people? To what extent are democratic institutions accepted or supported by the relevant actors?
Minimum score (1)	In general, the political institutions are extremely weak, civil and political rights of citizens are frequently violated and/or absent.
Mid-point score (3)	While there is a certain protection of civil and political rights of citizens in law and the basics of a democratic political process are guaranteed, violations of these rights and processes are frequent so that democracy is far from consolidated.
Maximum score (5)	In general, democracy is consolidated and stable, all main political institutions function effectively, and the political and civil rights of citizens are assured.
Data sources	Freedom House (http://www.freedomhouse.org/), International IDEA (http://www.idea.int/), Bertelsmann Transformation Index (http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/28.0.html?&L=1), World Bank Governance Indicators (http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp), Amnesty International (http://www.amnesty.org/), Human Rights Watch (http://www.hrw.org/), International Crisis Group (http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?), Cingranelli-Richards (CIRI) Human Rights Data (http://ciri.binghamton.edu/); Polity (http://www.polity.org.za/); Fund for Peace “Failed States Index” (http://www.fundforpeace.org/); IADB (Inter-American Development Bank) DataGov – Governance Indicators Database (http://www.iadb.org/datagov/index.html); Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (http://www.umich.edu/~cses/); OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights – Elections (http://www.osce.org/odihr/)
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Name	Socio-political Foundations
Scoring question	To what extent are the relationships among social groups and between social groups and the political system in the country supportive to an effective national integrity system?
Guiding questions	How deep are class, religious, ethnic, linguistic or other divisions within the population? How serious are social, ethnic, religious or other conflicts? To what extent are minority rights protected within the country? To what extent is there a stable, moderate, socially rooted party system to articulate and aggregate societal interests? To what extent is there a network of cooperative associations or interest groups to mediate between society and the political system? How strong and vibrant is civil society? How strong are patron-client relationships in society? How exclusive is the political elite?
Minimum score (1)	In general, the country is characterized by deep social conflicts, a weak civil society, ineffective party system and a closed political elite.
Mid-point score (3)	While there are some divisions/conflicts among social groups, civil society and political parties/actors are mostly able to overcome them in the political sphere. However, a number of deep conflicts which are not successfully integrated into the political sphere exist.
Maximum score (5)	In general, the country lacks significant social conflicts and divisions and has a rather vibrant civil society and an open and inclusive political culture.
Additional data sources	International IDEA (http://www.idea.int/), Bertelsmann Transformation Index (http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/28.0.html?&L=1), CIVICUS Civil Society index (http://www.civicus.org/csi), International Crisis Group (http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?), Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (http://www.sipri.org/), Prio Armed Conflict Database (http://www.prio.no/CSCW/Research-and-Publications/), Minority Rights Group International (www.minorityrights.org).
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	

Recommendations	
Name	Socio-economic foundations
Scoring question	To what extent is the socio-economic situation of the country supportive to an effective national integrity system?
Guiding questions	How rich/poor is the country overall? How is wealth divided among the population? To what extent are significant parts of the population excluded from society due to poverty? How effectively are the basic necessities of life guaranteed, including adequate food, shelter and clean water and access to primary health care? To what extent do social safety nets exist to compensate for poverty and other risks such as old age, illness, unemployment or disability? How well-developed is the country's infrastructure? How well does the country's overall economy perform? How strong and sustainable is the country's business sector?
Minimum score (1)	In general, the country is characterized by widespread poverty and/or high levels of social inequality. Social safety nets are absent and the country's economy and business sector are underdeveloped.
Mid-point score (3)	Significant poverty and/or social inequality exist. The country has a moderately developed social safety net, which however has important gaps in coverage. Its economy and business sector are rather instable.
Maximum score (5)	In general, the country is rather rich without major social inequalities. Social safety nets for the poor exist and are generally effective. The country's economy and business sector have proven to be very sustainable.
Data sources	World Development Report (www.worldbank.org/wdr/), Human Development Report (http://hdr.undp.org/en/), World Economic Forum (http://www.weforum.org/en/index.htm), Bertelsmann Transformation Index (http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/28.0.html?&L=1), Social Watch (http://www.socialwatch.org/en/portada.htm), Heritage Foundation (http://www.heritage.org/), <i>Country reports</i> to the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (http://www.ohchr.org), ELDIS (www.eldis.org), UN Millennium Development Goals (http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/), WHO (http://www.who.int/en/), UNU-Wider World Income Inequality Database (http://www.wider.unu.edu/research/Database/en_GB/database/), European Quality of Life Survey (http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/qualityoflife/eqls/2003/eqlsfindings.htm); World Bank. World Development Indicators (www.worldbank.org/data/wdi2003/index.htm), OECD Society at a Glance (http://www.oecd.org/document/24/0,3343,en_2649_34637_2671576_1_1_1_00.html); UNICEF Index of Child Wellbeing (www.unicef.org/media/files/ChildPovertyReport.pdf)
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	

Name	Socio-cultural foundations
Scoring question	To what extent are the prevailing ethics, norms and values in society supportive to an effective national integrity system?
Guiding questions	To what extent do people generally trust each other? To what extent are citizens public-minded/apathetic? To what extent is personal integrity espoused as an ethical norm by citizens?
Minimum score (1)	Society is characterized by widespread mistrust, public apathy and lack of support for norms of integrity and ethical conduct. Almost nobody in society seeks to change the prevailing norms.
Mid-point score (3)	Society is characterized by average levels of trust, public-mindedness and support for norms of integrity and ethical conduct. While mistrust, public apathy and lack of personal integrity is not uncommon, it is being challenged in the public.
Maximum score (5)	Society is characterized by high levels of interpersonal trust, public-mindedness and support for norms of integrity and ethical conduct. The majority of the population strongly condemns public apathy and unethical behaviour.
Data sources	World Values Survey (www.worldvaluessurvey.org/), Latinobarometro (www.latinobarometro.org/), AsiaBarometer Survey (www.asianbarometer.org/), Global Barometer (www.globalbarometer.net/), Pew Trust Surveys (http://people-press.org/), Eurobarometer (http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/index_en.htm), CIVICUS Civil Society Index (http://www.civicus.org/csi), Social Capital Gateway (http://www.socialcapitalgateway.org/), European Values Study (http://www.europeanvaluesstudy.eu/), European Social Survey (http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/).
Score	
Text	
Comment	
Evidence	
Causes	
Recommendations	