



Greece-OECD Project:
Technical Support on Anti-Corruption

Technical Guidelines on Capacity Self-Assessments



This document is prepared by OECD for the General Secretariat Against Corruption (GSAC) in Greece. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

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

About the OECD

The OECD is a forum in which governments compare and exchange policy experiences, identify good practices in light of emerging challenges, and promote decisions and recommendation to produce better policies for better lives. The OECD's mission is to promote policies that improve the economic and social well-being of people around the world. For further information, please see www.oecd.org.

About the Greece-OECD Project

The Greek government is prioritising the fight against corruption and bribery and, with the assistance of the European institutions, is committed to taking immediate action. Under the responsibility of the General Secretariat Against Corruption, Greece's National Anti-Corruption Action Plan (NACAP) identifies key areas of reform and provides for a detailed action plan towards strengthening integrity and fighting corruption and bribery. The OECD, together with Greece and the European Commission, has developed support activities for implementing the NACAP. This project is scheduled for completion in 2018 and is co-funded by the European Commission and Greece. For further information, please see [the project webpage](#).



ΓΕΝΙΚΗ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΙΑ ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ
ΚΑΤΑΠΟΛΕΜΗΣΗ ΤΗΣ ΔΙΑΦΘΟΡΑΣ

Table of contents

Introduction	5
Purpose of capacity self-assessment tools	6
Use of capacity self-assessment tools	7
Tool 1: Line Minister and State Agency Corruption Prevention Self-Assessment Reviews	9
Tool 2: Inter-Organisational Review Methodology for Joint Mapping	12
Tool 3: Organisational Capacity Self-Assessment Tool	17
Resources.....	24

Introduction

Strong institutional arrangements are crucial for co-ordinating integrity and the fight against corruption in the public sector. To this end, the General Secretariat against Corruption (GSAC) has been established as the institution responsible for co-ordinating the efforts to fight corruption in Greece. In order to support GSAC in fulfilling its mandate, the Greece OECD Technical Assistance Project on Anti-Corruption has an outcome area with the objective of strengthening the annual monitoring, assessment and update of the strategic anti-corruption action plan, including the assessment of the quality and the impact of the programmes and activities of GSAC's programmes and activities.

This outcome involves four activities:

1. Technical support on anti-corruption indicators and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms of the Anti-Corruption Action Plan.
2. Strengthening the organisational capacity of GSAC.
3. Enhancing institutional relations in the field of anti-corruption.
4. Building co-operation and information-sharing among relevant public bodies when detecting, investigating and prosecuting corruption and bribery.

The technical guidelines on capacity self-assessments presented in this report fall under the second activity: strengthening the organisational capacity of GSAC. This involves identifying GSAC's needs for capacity development and creating an action plan to address these needs.

The internal technical workshop "Methodology for Institutional, Organisational and Individual Capacity Development" held at GSAC's headquarters on 30 November 2016 was part of this support. OECD presented GSAC with different assessment models such as High-Performance Organisational Assessment Models; ISO Family of Quality Assessment Models; and OECD Member Country Assessment Models.

The workshop brought together GSAC's leadership as well as heads of relevant departments to assess their institutional, organisational and individual capacity development. It concluded with an open consultation on key questions such as GSAC's organisational objectives and type of organisational assessments that would best fit GSAC's needs.

It is important to note that at that time, GSAC determined that it did not require OECD experts to carry out an assessment but instead would carry out a self-assessment, using tools adapted to the Greek context by the OECD team. Two capacity self-assessment tools were presented for discussion to GSAC in an internal capacity building workshop held in Athens on 22-23 May 2017, and a third tool was developed based on the workshop feedback and outcomes.

Purpose of capacity self-assessment tools

The tools contained here have been developed for GSAC to conduct capacity self-assessments. These will support GSAC in diagnosing and identifying priorities and potential actions for organisational improvement by assessing critical elements, and identifying areas that need strengthening or further development.

If used correctly, they will help GSAC's management in creating a capacity-building development plan, based on self-assessed needs. The use of these tools are also an opportunity to enable organisational learning, foster team sharing, and encourage reflective self-assessment within GSAC.

It is important to notice that, recognising that organisational improvement is a process, the use of these tools should translate into a concrete action plan to provide GSAC with a clear organisational development roadmap to address the identified needs.

Use of capacity self-assessment tools

These tools may be adapted as needed to GSAC's changing environment and can be repeated periodically (for example, on an annual basis) to monitor the effectiveness of previous actions, evaluate progress in capacity improvement, and identify new areas in need of strengthening.

Checklist for planning a capacity self- assessment

1. Preparation

- Review the mandate, scope of functions performed and outline the main capacity issues that need to be assessed.
- Select the tool or tools to be used, in consideration of human and financial resources.
- Mobilise internal and external stakeholders and ensure political support and buy-in.

2. Clarification of objectives and expectations

- Clarify intentions of those promoting the assessment, within GSAC.
- Who wants the assessment?
- What are the related short-, medium- and long-term objectives?
- How will the results of the assessment be used?
- Secure agreement to provide all the necessary data.
- Obtain a commitment that the identified needs will be addressed.
- Review the expertise, time, funds available, and clarify the scale and scope.

3. Identification and engagement of stakeholders

- Identify all relevant stakeholders.
- State institutions.
- Civil society.
- Private sector.
- Other.

- Agree on terms of stakeholder input.

4. Determining data collection and analysis approach

- Identify the types of data needed for evaluating the range of capacity issues.
- Correlate available data sources against data needs.
- Review feasibility of generating needed data.
- Compile an overview of qualitative and quantitative data that will be collected or generated, and review data analysis requirements.

5. Defining how the assessment will be conducted

- Define the assessment team.
- Determine participants.
- Decide on location.
- Define in detail the following:
 - Steps/tasks of the assessment and their sequence.
 - Human and financial resources needed for each step/task.
 - Persons responsible for each step/task.
 - Timeline for each step/task.
 - Plan how the results will be used.

One of the main benefits of conducting an organisational capacity self-assessment is that it promotes ownership and reduces organisational resistance. Institutions can tailor the assessment methodology to their concrete needs using their own available internal knowledge and data. Furthermore, being familiar with the specificities of organisational operations can yield results that are more relevant and practical.

However, self-assessment may be affected by the subjectivity of those in charge within the institution under scrutiny. Their own views, beliefs and feelings about their competences might alter the objectivity of the assessment results. Experience shows that many public institutions find it challenging to objectively identify areas of improvement within their own operational procedures and practices. They may also be resistant to publishing or underestimate certain findings that do not present their organisation positively and/or overstate other that do. There is thus the danger that organisational strengths and weaknesses are not properly identified, or if they are, they are not objectively assessed. Therefore for a capacity self-assessment exercise to be successful institutions need to honestly open to critical self-reflection and learning.

Another challenge is that the institution conducting the self-assessment may not have the technical knowledge, capacity or resources to conduct proper research. To address this challenge, the institution may conduct a joint assessment, combining internal and external expertise, such as consultants. While this approach requires good planning and sufficient resources, it can serve to strengthen the impartiality of the assessment while

also diminishing organisational resistance and ensuring ownership of the results. An alternative is to use standard self-assessment framework which is applied internally. To this end, examples of self-assessment tools are provided here.

Tool 1: Line Minister and State Agency Corruption Prevention Self-Assessment Reviews

This is a tool for GSAC to ask for a ministry's self-assessment relating to compliance with the National Anti-Corruption Strategy and Action Plan in terms of the prevention component of UNCAC (Article II).

Self-assessment and the GSAC role

The objective is the establishment of a process to institutionalise the question of ownership within the public sector for delivery of the NACS within the UNCAC framework where line ministries and state agencies provide information on compliance or intended reforms to address non-compliance.

The process facilitates the management, co-ordination and monitoring the anti-corruption approach by allowing the GSAC to:

- undertake analysis of trends of causes and consequences of corruption and thus an objective assessment of risks
- undertake the collection and collation of adequate information or statistical data concerning how far line ministries and public sector agencies comply with the UNCAC framework through the NACS
- oversee systematic analysis by sectors of risk factors
- develop a better knowledge of the vulnerable sectors and develop relevant policies and practices for better prevention and detection of corruption
- receive reports from line ministries and public sector agencies on progress to addressing risks in terms of compliance with the UNCAC framework through the NACS
- maintain a database of, and disseminating information, that may facilitate the work of the sectors in preventing, detecting and investigating alleged corrupt activity
- monitor and report on the progress of the implementation of the NACS by reviewing responsibilities and requirements for action plans line ministries and public sector agencies, and monitoring performance delivery
- reporting to the legislature on the progress of the implementation of the NACS.

The starting point is to gain an understanding of line ministry and public agencies' approaches to the prevention of corruption and delivery of the NACS. This is achieved by self-assessments using the attached questionnaire followed by GSAC reviews focusing on:

- a gap analysis of compliance with the UNCAC framework through the NACS

- variations in practice between line ministry and public agencies across selected areas
- assessment and dissemination of risk and good practice.

QUESTIONNAIRE: MAPPING UNCAC AND NACS TOWARD PUBLIC SECTOR LINE MINISTRY AND STATE AGENCY SELF ASSESSMENT									
UNCAC Chapter II, (Article 5–14)				NACS REQUIREMENTS REFLECTING UNCAC ARTICLE	MINISTRY RESPONSE: DO YOU COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENT – YES/NO	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE; LAW, POLICY, PROCEDURE	WHAT ARE THE MAIN RISKS IN TERMS OF (a) COMPLIANCE AND (b) PROPOSED REFORMS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE	WHAT STEPS ARE BEING TAKEN TO ADDRESS (a) AND (b)	
Article	Mandatory [shall, in accordance with the fundamental principles of its legal system]	Optional [shall endeavour; shall consider; shall promote]	Potential Mandatory [shall, where appropriate and in accordance with the fundamental principles of its legal system, endeavour]						
5: Prevention	5(1) Development, implementation, maintenance of co-ordinated anti-corruption policies 5(4) Collaboration of States Parties with each other and international/regional organisations	5(2) Establish and promote effective anti-corruption practices 5(3) Periodic evaluation of legal instruments and administration measures							
7: Public sector		7(2) Prescribing criteria for candidature for and election to public office 7(3) Transparency in funding for candidates/political parties	7(1) Establishing systems for civil servants 7(4) Transparency in general and prevention of conflicts of interests						
8: Codes of Conduct	8(1) Promotion of integrity, honesty, and responsibility among public officials	8(6)(O) Disciplinary measures for public officials	8(2) Codes/Standards of Conduct 8(3) Note relevant initiatives of regional, interregional, multilateral organisations 8(4) Reporting of corruption 8(5) Reporting of outside activities, employment, investments, assets, etc.						
9: Procurement and Management of Public Finances	9(1) Systems of procurement 9(2) Management of public finances		9(3) Integrity of accounting records						
10: Public Reporting			10 Transparency in public administration						

Tool 2: Inter-Organisational Review Methodology for Joint Mapping

This is a tool for GSAC to take forward the development of an action plan aimed at enhancing institutional co-ordination. The mapping exercise looks for groupings or potential groupings of institutions with co-ordination, and explores any facilitators or inhibitors to this.

Connectedness: Managing, joining-up and monitoring the sectors through joint mapping

Within each sector or ministry the potential for connectedness, co-operation, information-sharing and communication should exist in terms of the prevention, detection, investigation, and prosecution of corruption and related offences. There are, as noted in the Joint Mapping Brief, obvious areas of connecting, co-ordinating and communicating between sectors and agencies and ministries, to promote inter-organisational activity. This should be achieved by a formalised regular intra-sector and inter-sector approach to co-ordinating activities, discuss cross-cutting issues, share information, joint intra- and inter-sector working, and so on.

In order to achieve this it should be done by both activity and by sector, since it may be assumed that agencies and ministries within sectors will have as many, if not more, reasons to promote joint working.

Purpose: Mapping the landscape and reviewing the potential for reform

In order to understand how far organisations currently work together, what are the facilitators and inhibitors to joint working, a review should be undertaken to:

- *Confirm the current landscape:* Reviewing the actual and potential co-ordination and interaction of organisations and mechanisms to achieve an effective anti-corruption approach in its organisational and inter-organisational dimensions.
- *Evaluate a joined-up approach:* Considering how far the identified organisations, envisage their anti-corruption work would be enhanced through joined-up action (and how far the anti-corruption work of others may be enhanced through joined-up action).
- *Assess the context:* Consider the impact that the legal, organisational culture and political context may have on the effective implementation of an effective joined-up corruption approach.

This would then allow the GSAC to take a lead role as co-ordinator and facilitator to joint working in terms of:

- *Change:* Proposing the parameters – structural, cultural, strategic and operational - for increased co-ordination and co-operation in anti-corruption work.
- *Ownership:* Considering measures and procedures that could ensure that organisations and stakeholders are fully engaged in the processes toward an inter-organisational approach to combating corruption.

Review questions are presented in the following table.

INFORMATION TYPE		RESPONDENT	RESPONSE	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
CORRUPTION				
	What are the main risks/threats of corruption involving your organisation?			
	What is the perceived extent of shared or potentially-shared pool of corruption types, or corruption causes, from the perspective of your organisation?			
	Which organisations have you contacted or collaborated with as part of anti-corruption case-work or initiatives?			
	What proportion of your collaborations with other organisations on individual cases or initiatives involves working with more than one other organisation?			
	Are you a member of any forums or committees outside your organisation where the issue of inter-organisational corruption or co-operative arrangements are discussed?			
WORKING TOGETHER: MAIN EXISTING ISSUES				
	What are the strengths and weaknesses of information, or technical expertise, or resources of your organisation in terms of co-ordination and co-operation?			
	What are the strengths and weaknesses of any existing or potential inter-organisational policy, legal and operational environments?			
	What is the level of, and reasons for, existing inter-organisational co-operation/absence of inter-organisational co-operation?			
	What are the facilitators for you to pursue co-ordination and co-operation (including:			

14 – USE OF CAPACITY SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOLS

	enhanced performance, complementary strategies, a wider range of investigation options and sanctions, cost-effectiveness, greater potential for prevention, shared expertise and resources)?			
	What are the inhibitors for you to pursue co-ordination and co-operation (including: organisational objectives, performance measurement, perceived asymmetry of relationship, political context, resourcing implications)?			
WORKING TOGETHER: OPERATING CONTEXT				
	Which laws most help your work?			
	Which laws most hinder your work?			
	Which databases of other organisations do you have automatic access to?			
	Which databases of other organisations do you wish to have automatic access to?			
	Organisations with whom you have to work?			
	Organisations that have to work with you?			
	Organisations from which you receive most support?			
	Organisations to which you give most support?			
	Those organisations from which you require most support?			
	Those organisations from which you require most support?			
	Those other organisations to which you perceive that you provide most help?			
	Those other organisations whom you would like			

	to work with?			
	Those other organisations whom you would like to share information with?			
	What is the effectiveness of, or hindrance by, those organisations that monitor or inspect your work?			
	What are the overlaps or conflicts in terms of operational jurisdiction and activity, resource allocation, dealing with complaints/allegations?			
	Where are the potential frictions between organisations?			
	Are there any known areas of good practice policy transfer across organisations or means for examining the scope for cross-organisational synergy that organisations have identified?			
	What does each organisation envisage you will require from each other organisation to enhance your anticorruption work?			
	What does each organisation envisage you will provide to each other organisation to enhance that organisation's anti-corruption work?			
	Are there any formal ground rules or protocols /SLAs/MLAs for co-ordination and co-operation?			
	Are there any formal ground rules or protocols /SLAs/MLAs for sharing information?			
	What are the overlaps or conflicts in terms of legislative context			
	What are the overlaps or conflicts in terms of policy development?			
	What are the overlaps or conflicts in terms of policy development?			

16 – USE OF CAPACITY SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOLS

	What means exist to assess the impact of government policy and/or intended legislation on those levels and patterns of corruption which are the responsibility of your organisation?			
	What organisational means are in place to share best practice, training, etc.?			
	Are you participating in any action against corruption involving co-operation with other organisations where you provide information and / or resources but get little or no information or resources in return?			
	Are there any areas (including those in which joint action is currently advocated or practised) you can think of where joint action to tackle corruption is not appropriate or not practical given (a) current resources, (b) even if some more resources were forthcoming; and (c) if there were efforts to resolve any issues identified above?			
	What organisational activities are compromised or potentially compromised by issues/weaknesses elsewhere in terms of government policy or the delivery of public services?			
	What wider aspects of society or culture facilitate or inhibit the joined-up or joint detection, investigation, prosecution and prevention of corruption?			
	OTHER			

Tool 3: Organisational Capacity Self-Assessment Tool

This tool is to assist GSAC in assessing the critical elements for effective organisational management, and identifying those areas that may need strengthening or further development.

ORGANISATIONAL CAPACITY SELF-ASSESSMENT	
PART I Enabling Environment Objectives: Review the set of interrelated conditions – such as social, organisational, and political– that impact on the capacity of GSAC’s development as an anti-corruption actor in Greece.	
Social context	Sample questions: 1. In what areas is political will strongest to fight corruption in Greece, and why? 2. What types of corruption that most affect Greek citizens? 3. What actions would most help reduce corruption, that GSAC could influence? 4. What have been the biggest changes to the types and patterns of corruption over the past 10 years in Greece, and why?
Institutional arrangements and co-ordination mechanisms	Sample questions: 1. Who are main institutions with whom GSAC works most frequently? (Focus on a few, e.g. three.) 2. Who are the three institutions with whom GSAC has limited or no work relations, but where improved relations would be useful? 3. When does GSAC reach out to these stakeholders and how often (give some examples)? Are stakeholders actively involved in GSAC’s initiatives? 4. How does GSAC seek stakeholder views? Does GSAC have clear channels of communication (v.gr. through focal points, periodical meetings, etc.) that stakeholders can use to raise issues? Describe the communication channels. Can you describe some examples in which stakeholders used these communication channels and what were the results? 5. Does GSAC consistently collect baseline data from key anti-corruption stakeholders? What are the main constraints to collecting data from them? What could be the solutions? 6. Does GSAC share studies, plans, and evaluations with key stakeholders? How, and how often? 7. What are GSAC’s strengths in stakeholder involvement? How does GSAC plan to build on stakeholder involvement in the future (e.g. informal meetings, training, sharing information, potential networks etc.)? 8. What are GSAC’s weaknesses in stakeholder involvement? How can it improve stakeholder involvement, and in what specific areas (e.g. revision of action plan, co-ordination, etc.)? 9. Do there exist active and functioning interagency co-ordination committees or structures composed of representatives from the executive, judiciary, legislature, and civil servants in key departments (such as customs, procurements, revenue collection and law enforcement and from local governments)? 10. To what extent does GSAC engage with them, and what benefits are there to them for GSAC to be involved? 11. Do they also include members from civil society such as business representatives, civil society and academia? 12. Do they have sufficient power, resource and capacity?

<p>Accountability</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does GSAC report to the Ministry of Justice, Transparency, and Human Rights (i.e. in writing/verbally)? How often? 2. Who reviews GSAC's activities and how in-depth is this review? 3. Do GSAC's staff members have clearly-defined work procedures and routines for reporting to superiors, either on a periodic basis (e.g. weekly staff meeting) or on particular decisions or activities? 4. How often is GSAC audited by an external audit body?
<p>PART II Governance and Legal Structure Objectives: Review GSAC's vision and mission statements, organisational structure and succession planning</p>	
<p>Vision and mission Objectives: Assess the clarity of GSAC's statements of its purpose and values and how they have been shared and applied</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe in a few sentences GSAC's vision and mission. 2. Are the current vision and mission statements written? If so, are they periodically reviewed? When were they last changed? 3. To what extent do GSAC's staff feel the vision and mission remain relevant? 4. How are the vision and mission statements included in staff orientation? 5. How are the vision and mission statements included in public communication materials? 6. Are the vision and mission statements consistently used to guide priorities and actions?
<p>Organisational structure Objectives: Assess whether the organisational structure is appropriate</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a documented organisational chart or structure within GSCAC? 2. Is the organisational structure appropriate for current GSAC's priorities? 3. Does it support clear direction for staff? 4. Is the organisational structure updated as needed? When was it last revised? 5. Are GSAC's departmental or functional responsibilities and lines of authority clear and appropriate?
<p>Succession planning Objectives: Assess the organisation's ability to continue smooth operations and program management in the event of a loss or change in leadership.</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could GSAC continue existing activities without the current leadership? 2. Could other current managers take on the leadership role without major transitional problems? 3. Are changes in the leadership expected over the next two years?
<p>PART III Financial Management and Internal Control Systems Objectives: Review the financial management systems, financial controls, financial documentation, financial statements and financial reporting, audit experience, and cost-sharing capacity.</p>	
<p>Budgeting Objectives: Assess the ability to budget and plan financial resources</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a comprehensive annual master budget? Is it realistic and well documented? 2. If there is no annual master budget, is there a core cost budget for administrative costs? 3. How does GSAC budget and plan for core costs? 4. Does the budget process involve program and financial staff in a participatory and transparent manner? 5. Are project budgets realistic, clear, and well documented without external assistance? 6. What is the overall decision-making and budget allocation structure of GSAC?

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. What is GSAC’s annual budget? 8. Who funds GSAC? 9. Is there any legal protection to the level of funding? 10. Are the funds paid on time? 11. What is the budget estimate process and how are decisions made over competing requests for funding? 12. What is the expenditure of GASC by division? 13. What is the overall staff cost? 14. What activities absorb most funds? 15. What is the process for proposing and agreeing on division budgets?
<p>Audit Objective: Assess whether GSAC undergoes routine audits and has a system for addressing audit findings.</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does GSAC have an internal audit system? If so, describe it. If not, how does it assess and manage risks? 2. Have the organisation’s financial statements or procedures been audited or reviewed by a third party within the last two years? If so, when? 3. Is GSAC legally required to have an external audit? 4. Within the past two years, has GSAC received a qualified opinion, adverse opinion, disclaimer of opinion, or deficiency in an audit? If so, when? Why? 5. How does GSAC ensure it responds audit findings and recommendations?
<p>PART IV Administration Objectives: Review the operational policies, procedures, and systems, as well as management and the degree of management and staff understanding and compliance with these policies, procedures, and systems.</p>	
<p>Operating policies, procedures, and systems Objectives: Assess the soundness of operating policies and procedures and the degree of staff understanding and compliance</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe GSAC’s operating policies and procedures in the following areas: Management of office supplies, phones, communication systems, equipment, consultants and staff, client support and confidentiality, and safety and security. 2. Are operating policies and procedures written and regularly updated? When were they revised last? 3. Are there areas where the policies and procedures need to be clarified or expanded? 4. Are the operating policies and procedures consistently followed? Are there any areas where greater consistency is needed in following policies and procedures?
<p>Information technology Objectives: Assess the soundness of IT policies and procedures and systems and staff compliance.</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are IT systems adequate for the current staff size, including expected growth over the next year? 2. Are IT systems networked? Are IT systems backed up? 3. What risks are there to the IT system (e.g. unreliable electricity, malware and viruses)? 4. Do IT staff and users have the skills to use the systems effectively? What additional IT skills are needed or wanted? Is training available on IT equipment use, software, and security?
<p>PART V Human Resources Objectives: Review GSAC’s systems for recruiting qualified staff, structuring staff positions, and developing and updating job descriptions to ensure that roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, understood, and relevant.</p>	

<p>Adequacy of staffing and job descriptions Objectives: Review GSAC’s systems for recruiting qualified staff, structuring staff positions, and developing and updating job descriptions to ensure that roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, understood, and relevant.</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are there written policies on job descriptions and delegations of authority that are complete and appropriate? When were they last reviewed? 2. Do job descriptions include position titles and clearly specify roles and responsibilities, required qualifications and skills, and reporting? 3. Are the policies consistently applied? 4. Do all staff have written job descriptions, delegations of authority, and re-assignments that are up to date? 5. Have the needed management, technical, and finance positions been established? 6. Are all key management, technical, and finance positions currently filled by people with the appropriate qualifications and skills?
<p>Recruitment and retention Objectives: Assess GSAC’s systems for recruiting and retaining staff</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How does GSAC recruit new staff? 2. Is there a human resource division within GSAC? 3. What does GSAC do to retain existing staff? 4. Is the recruitment and hiring process open and transparent? How are positions announced or advertised? 5. Who is involved in screening applications and interviewing and selecting candidates? 6. How satisfied are staff with the organisation and their positions? 7. Are staff professional development needs regularly identified? What training and staff development opportunities are available? Are these opportunities relevant, appropriately designed, and well used? 8. Is there a GSAC training strategy? 9. Who trains new staff? 10. Who provides specialist training? 11. Is any joint training undertaken? 12. Are the training programmes linked to the strategy or action plans, and if so, how?
<p>Staff profile</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many staff are currently working for GSAC? 2. What technical capacities are GSAC’s current staff strengths? 3. What technical capacities are currently missing among GSAC staff? 4. Based on current staff strengths, what priorities will GSAC focus on?
<p>PART VI Organisational Management Objectives: Assess GSAC’s ability to do effective strategic planning, use annual work plans, manage change; generate and share knowledge and develop linkages; and foster effective internal communications and decision making.</p>	
<p>Strategic planning Objectives: Assess GSAC’s ability to review its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats; the external environment and competition; and stakeholder needs in preparing and using an effective strategic plan.</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How is the GSAC’s annual strategy agreed? 2. What are GSAC main priorities for the next 12 months? 3. Does GSAC have a good, written strategic plan based on its priorities? What time period does it cover? 4. How did you develop the strategic plan? Is the strategic plan based on a comprehensive review of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats; and realistic resource requirements and availability? 5. How often does the leadership meet to discuss strategic planning? 6. Is the strategic plan clear and specific on priorities, measurable objectives, and targets?

	<p>7. Is the strategic plan regularly reviewed?</p> <p>8. Is the strategic plan consistently used in guiding management decisions and operational planning?</p> <p>9. What types of performance indicators are included in the strategic plan?</p> <p>10. Is there an annual review of the strategy and action plans in terms of performance?</p>
Leadership	<p>Sample questions:</p> <p>1. How GSAC’s leadership style could be defined? Is there more of a “task focus” or “relationship focus” and how does that affect internal & external communications?</p> <p>2. Does the leadership teamwork as a “team” or a collection of individuals – how does that impact interpersonal relationships and trust within GSAC?</p> <p>3. What is senior management’s protection against dismissal?</p> <p>4. Are members of GSAC protected when undertaking official duties?</p> <p>5. How does the protection or lack of protection affect GSAC’s effectiveness and what can be done to address this?</p>
<p>Monitoring and evaluation</p> <p>Objectives: Review GSAC’s ability to carry out regular, internal monitoring of activities and outputs.</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <p>1. Describe how GSAC monitors its work and results.</p> <p>2. Does GSAC have adequate policies and procedures for the organisation to have a good sense of how it is doing and what it is accomplishing?</p> <p>3. Does GSAC consistently set realistic targets and quantitative and qualitative performance indicators?</p> <p>4. Do staff have sufficient expertise in baseline data collection and monitoring?</p> <p>5. Are project monitoring data consistently timely and reliable? Are gaps between performance and targets adequately analyzed?</p> <p>6. Are monitoring data used to design effective remediation measures?</p> <p>7. Have lessons learned from monitoring been incorporated into the design of subsequent projects?</p> <p>8. Does GSAC have Manuals for core functions?</p> <p>9. What are the work and workload progress review procedures?</p> <p>10. Who reviews progress? What records are kept?</p> <p>11. How are the activities of the anti-corruption agency being evaluated?</p>
<p>Annual work plans</p> <p>Objectives: Assess the organisation’s ability to prepare, follow, and monitor annual work plans containing goals, measurable objectives, strategies, timelines, and responsibilities</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <p>1. Are annual work plans based on GSAC’s strategic plan?</p> <p>2. Describe how GSAC produces annual work plans. Who is involved in developing annual work plans? Are they timely? Are they modified as needed?</p> <p>3. Do annual work plans contain clear and specific goals, activities, timelines, responsibilities, or performance indicators and targets?</p> <p>4. Are the work plans linked to GSAC’s budget?</p> <p>5. How are annual work plans used (e.g. management decisions, operational planning, monitoring and evaluation)? How often are work plans monitored?</p> <p>6. What are GSAC’s management processes for overseeing operational activities, notably in terms of work allocation and progress, staffing levels, budget expenditures and performance?</p> <p>7. What performance measures are used at the institutional and sub-institutional level and staff levels? Are they publically available?</p>

	<p>8. How are they reviewed, and by whom and how often?</p> <p>9. What are the consequences of failure to meet the targets?</p> <p>10. For each function, what are the procedures involved and volume of activity?</p>
<p>Change management</p> <p>Objectives: Assess GSAC’s ability to respond to change in the internal and external environment</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <p>1. Have major changes in leadership, staffing, budgets, government policies, and donor funding occurred in the last 2 years? How did GSAC respond to these changes?</p> <p>2. Has GSAC demonstrated a good capacity to identify and adapt to changes in the internal and external environment? Give examples.</p> <p>3. How does GSAC’s leadership team deal with risk, and how does that impact decision-making and direction to seize opportunities?</p> <p>4. Is there an ability to develop creative solutions to problems or opportunities?</p> <p>5. Has GSAC experienced major setbacks, problems, or delays in response to internal or external changes? What happened and why?</p>
<p>Knowledge management</p> <p>Objectives: Assess GSAC’s ability to identify good practices and lessons learned, develop linkages with other anti-corruption stakeholders and networks to improve the enabling environment, plan sector strategies and approaches, and share knowledge internally and externally</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <p>1. How does GSAC identify good practices in the field of anti-corruption and public integrity? What are the most important sources of learning?</p> <p>2. Does GSAC have a regular internal process for sharing and thinking about good practices and lessons learned? If so, how often is this done?</p> <p>3. Is the organisation an active member of any formal networks with other Greek stakeholders active in anti-corruption and public integrity stakeholders? If so, which ones? Do they also cover civil society, academia and the private sector? What role does the organisation play in these networks?</p> <p>4. Does GSAC participate in discussions with other Greek anti-corruption stakeholders on approaches, lessons learned, and good practices? If so, how often? Have these discussions been mutually beneficial? Why or why not?</p> <p>5. How often does GSAC present its approaches and results at external events?</p>
<p>Record keeping</p>	<p>1. Does GSAC have clear rules for the management of records and files?</p> <p>2. Does the anti-corruption agency operate a LAN, databases, analysis software and other software?</p> <p>3. Are these available on request, by a business case process, or on an ad hoc basis?</p> <p>4. Are individual decisions recorded and filed according to clear rules and for a clearly defined and binding minimum period?</p> <p>5. Who has access to these files, who is authorised to amend them or review them?</p> <p>6. What degree of freedom of information exists with respect to GSAC’s files and documentation, both in terms of which decisions/files/documents are made public automatically (and how), and which ones are available on request? To what extent is such access guaranteed in practice?</p>
<p>Internal communications and decision making (within GSAC)</p> <p>Objectives: Assess the effectiveness of GSAC’s internal communications within and across departments or functions and the decision-making process</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <p>1. Are there good two-way communications between GSAC’s management and staff? Give examples of good and bad communications.</p> <p>2. Are there regular structured ways to exchange ideas, discuss problems or opportunities, address administrative or technical issues, and provide staff input? If so, how often? If not, is this needed?</p> <p>3. How good are communications within GSAC’s departments or functions? How good are communications across departments or functions?</p>

	4. Are staff consistently involved in decision-making on major issues? Do they feel free to raise challenging issues? Do staff initiate discussions with management?
<p>External communications Objectives: Assess the effectiveness of GSAC’s external communications (media, the general public, government, , and civil society organisations)</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who are the key external audiences for GSAC? How does GSAC communicate with them? 2. How are external communication messages determined? What types of communication have been most effective? What types of communication have been least effective? 3. Does GSAC have an effective strategy for external communications? When was it revised last? 4. Does GSAC pre-test external communication messages and materials? 5. Does GSAC have templates or a style guide for the website and publications? 6 How, how often and through what media GSAC communicates externally? 7. Are citizens involved in the management of the anti-corruption agency? 8. Are there any management committees dealing with education, prevention, investigation, awareness involving citizens? 9. Does GSAC relies on traditional media or is willing to try new channels (v.gr. social media)? If yes, give some examples.
<p>Anti-corruption advocacy and influence Objectives: Assess the strategies and effectiveness of the organisation’s work on advocacy of policies and issues</p>	<p>Sample questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has GSAC carried out significant activities in public integrity and anti-corruption advocacy over the past two years? How often? Discuss examples of the types of activities. 2. How effective is GSAC as an advocate? Give examples. 3. Has GSAC developed alliances with other stakeholders for advocacy? Explain how. 4. Has GSAC influenced the formulation or implementation of government policies at the national or local level? Explain how. 5. Has GSAC influenced the general public’s views? Explain how.

Resources

UNDP Capacity Assessment of Anti-corruption Agencies

USAID Organizational Capacity Assessment (OCA)

oecd.org/corruption

