



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL MIGRATION and HOME AFFAIRS

MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONTACT POINTS ON CORRUPTION

Brussels, 6 February 2015

1. Opening by *Matthias Ruete, HOME Director-General*:

- The Commission wishes to better involve Member States in the preparations for the next EU Anti-Corruption Report, while minimising administrative burden.
- Contributions from national authorities are welcome, on a voluntary basis. While the Commission retains full responsibility for the report. Member States ownership is essential.
- The priority is to deliver a quality second report, with added value for all concerned. Publication is envisaged in 2016; an exact date has not yet been set. Quality should not be taken hostage of a set deadline. Duplication with other processes should be avoided.
- A corruption-free public administration is vital for the business environment; is a priority in the Europe 2020 Agenda for growth and jobs and in the European Semester of economic governance.
- The anti-corruption experience sharing programme is launched.

2. Second EU Anti-Corruption Report: Methodology and Member State consultation

████████████████████ and ██████████, *Organised Crime Unit, DG HOME*:

- An overview of the recent activities was presented as well as the prospects for follow-up.
- This included comments on a possible EU institutions chapter and information regarding upcoming relevant event at the European Parliament and at the EESC.
- Information was also briefly provided on the intention of having in the second report more horizontal chapters, in particular on public procurement and EU funds, healthcare sector and beneficial ownership.
- Information is needed from the Member States on the implementation of the first report's recommendations. Member State contributions so far have been uneven.

- Information was provided on the European Semester of economic governance and explanation provided on the reason to also include transparency and anti-corruption policies. This should benefit all in particular the authorities in charge of corruption. Info was also provided on country visits in this context, which have been particularly useful.
- In addition to perception and experience surveys, the report will include criminal statistics situated in context, without comparison across countries.
- National authorities were asked for data on a shortlist of indicators via the [Expert group](#) on policy needs for data on crime. Three Member States have responded; the others are expected to do so by the end of February 2015.

Member State delegates:

- Member States welcomed their **early involvement** in the preparation of the report, and links with the growth strategy () and public administration (). **Best practice** needs to be shared ().
- emphasized the need for minimal administrative burden, equal treatment, and coherence. Readers will **compare** countries, even if the report does not. and called for **transparency, ownership, equal treatment and coordination**. A website and timetable would provide clarity. would welcome **updates** from the Commission about issues on its radar.
- Unofficial information **sources** must be supplemented by official ones (). Unofficial sources should remain but be clearly cited (). Recommendations stemming from the Commission's own sources need to be fully **reasoned** and justified ().
- requested a minimum checklist for MS input, whereas for the UK an extensive **questionnaire** would be burdensome. and called for **written guidelines**.
- doubts the usefulness of gathering **criminal statistics** and using **perception data**. However, and noted that perception data complement the picture, reflect public opinion and show what statistics cannot. suggested that data be checked. noted that little data are available on some MS and called for EU-funded independent studies on under-researched countries.
- also complained about **unreliable sources** and **inaccurate data** in the first report, and called for the next report to start afresh. complained about links being made to the European Semester and criticized the way the topic was discussed in that context during the country visit in January.
- The and consider that MS should comment on draft recommendations. and are concerned by the **deadline** to provide written comments on draft country chapters. Coordination takes time.
- and did not receive the **request for statistics**. Contact points should be in copy.
- and : The report should contain a 29th chapter evaluating the **EU institutions**.

Commission response to Member State comments:

- The Commission underlined again the main messages of the Director-General: the importance of anti-corruption policies for **economic recovery** and proper functioning of **public administration**; the fact that this is an exercise which is in the **interest of all**, starting with the Member States themselves. It is in their interest to provide the Commission with all information on the steps being taken in order to build their own (positive) case.
- The Commission uses a variety of **sources** including local research correspondents, existing reports, and fact-finding contacts with national authorities. The European Semester exercise also contributes and encourages political will to fight corruption. It also helps identifying those priorities, which will afterwards be eligible for European Structural and Investment Funds.
- **Statistics** have limitations but help paint the overall picture. Experience and perception data will remain, complemented by other available statistics. Reputable unofficial sources will continue to be used, clearly identified in the text.
- While minimising administrative burden, the Commission invites MS **contributions**, which will help ensure equal treatment. In the first report, only minor errors have been brought to the Commission's attention. While the recommendations are justified, the Commission is available to provide further detail where necessary.
- Council [conclusions](#) and other feedback pointed to the need to assess the **EU institutions** and the Commission is examining ways to include an evaluation in the next report.

3. Panel on Transparency: A tool to prevent and fight corruption. Presentations and Q&A (PowerPoint presentation available):

- [REDACTED], *Secretariat-General*
- [REDACTED] *Transparency International EU Liaison Office*
- [REDACTED] *Expert Forum Romania*

4. Anti-Corruption Experience Sharing Programme: Objectives and selection of topics

[REDACTED] *DG HOME:*

The programme will include 4 to 5 workshops per year, over an initial period of 2 years. One-day workshops will focus on specific examples (positive and negative) and solutions, thus supporting MS in implementing strategies. Experts from the private sector, international organisations and civil society will also participate. A report on each workshop will be published. The first workshop is envisaged in Budapest in late April 2015.

The Commission will finance the workshops and select topics and experts based on challenges identified in the first EU Anti-Corruption Report. Member States are welcome to express interest

in particular topics listed (please see annex), or propose others and suggest experts.

Member State delegates:

The programme could share not only good practice but also lessons learnt from measures that failed (■). ■ would be happy to host a workshop, others asked for time to react in writing. The Commission asked them to do so by 13 March 2015.

5. Operational conclusions by the Commission:

- **Cooperation** with national contact points is essential to get the facts right, based on transparency, coherence, equal treatment, without unnecessary administrative burden.
- **Consultations** on *early* draft country chapters will take place by end-2015. The exact timing will be announced in due course.
- The Commission will share an *advanced* draft country chapter (in PDF format) for **fact-checking** in 2016, and invite written comments within 10 working days. The Commission is also open to bilateral meetings if necessary.
- The Commission retains responsibility for the content of the report. The conclusions and **recommendations** are not subject to prior consultation.
- Contact points are asked to provide timely information and involve other national authorities, which may be copied in correspondence with the Commission. An **update**, in a free format, would be appreciated by 29 May 2015 on the follow-up to "future steps" at the end of each country chapter.

Potential topics for the experience sharing programme (non-exhaustive list)

Corruption and public procurement

- internal and external control mechanisms and risk management tools at contracting authorities;
- corruption risk assessment and tailor-made strategies for regional and local administrations;
- procurement training for local government;
- tools to prevent and detect corruption in public procurement at national and local level;
- measures to enhance transparency of ownership for companies participating in public tenders;

Integrity and transparency in public administration and elected bodies

- preventive measures and integrity programmes in the civil service;
- monitoring of declarations of assets and interests by elected and appointed officials;
- internal control tools to assess the application of ethical frameworks;
- parliamentary codes of ethics including oversight mechanisms and sanctions;

- disciplinary regimes for public servants;

Sectors at risk

- risk assessment tools for urban planning decisions;
- corruption risk management in interactions between the pharmaceutical industry and the public healthcare sector;
- targeted strategies against informal payments in healthcare;

Corruption in the private and public sector

- revolving door policies.
- tools against foreign bribery including raising awareness among small and medium-sized enterprises;
- mechanisms for prevention of corruption in state-owned and state-controlled companies;

Law enforcement and anti-corruption agencies

- whistleblower protection and raising awareness in the public and private sectors;
- tools to speed up criminal proceedings to avoid expiry of corruption cases;
- developing transparent integrity criteria and procedures for appointing magistrates and evaluating their performance;
- systems for random assignment of cases in courts;
- models for guaranteeing the independence of anti-corruption bodies

Confirmed external participants at the Meeting of National Contact Points on Corruption				
	Country	Name	Surname	Function
1	AT			FEDERAL MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR
2	AT			BUNDESMINISTERIUM FÜR JUSTIZ
3	BE			BUREAU VOOR AMBTELIJKE ETHIEK EN DEONTOLOGIE
4	BE			FOD JUSTITIE, DIRECTORAAT- GENERAAL WETGEVING,
5	BG			MINISTRY OF INTERIOR
6	BG			STATE AGENCY FOR NATIONAL SECURITY
7	BG			CENTER FOR PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION
8	CY			CY PERMANENT REPRESENTATION
9	CZ			OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT
10	CZ			OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT
11	CZ			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE, HEAD OF THE

				INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION
12	CZ			MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, SECURITY POLICY DEPARTMENT
14	DE			FEDERAL FOREIGN OFFICE, DESK OFFICER
15	DE			DE PERMANENT REPRESENTATION
16	DE			FEDERAL MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR, GERMANY
17	DK			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
18	DK			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
19	EE			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
20	EE			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
21	EE			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
22	EL			NATIONAL ANTI-CORRUPTION COORDINATOR
23	EL			NATIONAL ANTI-CORRUPTION COORDINATOR
24	EL			NATIONAL ANTI-CORRUPTION COORDINATOR
25	ES			MINISTRY OF INTERIOR
26	ES			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
27	ES			MINISTRY OF PRESIDENCY/LEGAL ADVISER
28	FI			MINISTERIAL ADVISER, MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR/POLICE DEPARTMENT
29	FI			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE/MINISTERIAL ADVISER
30	FI			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE / DEPUTY HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL POLICY
31	FR			HEAD OF THE FRENCH CENTRAL SERVICE FOR THE PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION
32	FR			SECÉTAIRE GÉNÉRALE ADJOINTE - SGAE
33	FR			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
34	HR			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
35	HR			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
36	HR			MINISTRY OF INTERIOR
37	HU			MINISTRY OF INTERIOR, DEPARTMENT OF EUROPEAN COOPERATION

38	HU			HU PERMANENT REPRESENTATION
39	HU			NATIONAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION CORRUPTION AND ECONOMIC CRIME DEPARTMENT
40	HU			NATIONAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE, CORRUPTION PREVENTION DEPARTMENT
41	IE			DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC EXPENDITURE AND REFORM
42	IE			DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND EQUALITY
43	IT			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
44	IT			ITALIAN NATIONAL ANTICORRUPTION AUTHORITY
45	IT			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
46	LT			SPECIAL INVESTIGATION SERVICE
47	LT			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
48	LT			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
49	LU			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE/ ATTACHE DE GOUVERNEMENT
50	LV			CORRUPTION PREVENTION AND COMBATING BUREAU
51	LV			CORRUPTION PREVENTION AND COMBATING BUREAU
52	LV			CORRUPTION PREVENTION AND COMBATING BUREAU
53	MT			OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
54	MT			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
55	NL			MINISTRY OF SECURITY AND JUSTICE
56	NL			MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR AND KINGDOM RELATIONS
57	PL			MINISTRY OF INTERIOR
58	PL			CENTRAL ANTICORRUPTION BUREAU
59	PL			CENTRAL ANTICORRUPTION BUREAU
60	PT			DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR JUSTICE POLICY – MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
61	PT			DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR JUSTICE POLICY – MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
62	RO			MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
63	RO			NATIONAL ANTICORRUPTION DIRECTORATE (DNA)
64	RO			NATIONAL INTEGRITY AGENCY

66	SE	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SE PERMANENT REPRESENTATION
67	SI	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	POLICE, CRIMINAL POLICE DIRECTORATE
68	SI	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
69	SI	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MINISTRY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
70	SK	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SPECIAL PROSECUTORS OFFICE
71	SK	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	NATIONAL CRIME AGENCY
72	SK	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MINISTRY OF JUSTICE
74	UK	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	CABINET OFFICE
75	UK	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	HOME OFFICE
76	UK	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	UK PERMANENT REPRESENTATION
79	UK	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	HOME OFFICE
80	UK	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	UK PERMANENT REPRESENTATION

Participants not representing Member States

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	EXPERT FORUM [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]