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Title: A National Integrity System Assessment of Georgia

Summary:
This paper reports on a project examining the National Integrity System of Georgia in the Caucasus (GNISA). The research utilised methodology developed for the earlier national integrity study of Australia, adapted for Georgia. The research involved 83 interviews with key institutions in Georgia, supported by focus groups and workshops. The findings report on the capacity, coherence and consequences of Georgia's existing integrity system. The findings presented a summary of 26 recommendations to the Georgian Government to enhance integrity reform in the country and made suggestions regarding implementation strategies to achieve these reforms. While the paper presents a national governmental focus in a developing country, the research methodology, findings and recommendations will also be of interest to public sector policy analysts, public sector managers and consultants working in this area of management.
ABSTRACT
This paper reports on a two-year project examining the National Integrity System of Georgia in the Caucasus (GNISA). The GNISA research project used methodology developed for the earlier national integrity study of Australia and adapted this for Georgia. The research involved conducting 83 interviews with key institutions in Georgia, supported by a range of focus groups and workshops. The findings report on the capacity, coherence and consequences of Georgia's existing integrity system. The findings present a summary of 26 recommendations to the Georgian Government to enhance integrity reform in the country and make suggestions regarding implementation strategies to achieve these reforms. Within the context of a growing interest in areas such as public integrity, public sector ethics, social responsibility and sustainability, this research identifies and highlights an important contribution to new knowledge, as well as explaining the methods to achieve similar outcomes in other contexts.

INTRODUCTION
Australia, like many other countries, has experienced its own breakdowns in public integrity especially in two states (Queensland and Western Australia) through the period immediately prior to the 1990s, culminating in the alarming revelations of two major inquiries: the 1989 ‘Fitzgerald Inquiry’ in Queensland (Fitzgerald 1989) and the 1991 ‘WA Inc’ Royal Commission in Western Australia (Kennedy 1992; Shacklock 1994). These yielded dramatic outcomes, resulting in the ousting of the then Queensland Government and the gaoling of the Police Commissioner in that state (Fitzgerald 1992; Preston 1994, 1995, 1997; Preston, Sampford & Connors 2002; Sampford, Preston & Bois 1998, and in Western Australia the ousting of the Government and the eventual gaoling of both the Premier and Deputy Premier of that state (Shacklock 1994).

NATIONAL INTEGRITY SYSTEMS EXPLAINED
A National Integrity System (NIS) has been described as: “the institutions, laws, procedures, practices and attitudes that encourage and support integrity in the exercise of power in any given society. Thus Integrity Systems function to ensure that power is exercised in a manner that is true to the values, purposes and duties for which that power is entrusted to, or held by, institutions and individual office-holders.”(Brown et al 2005). The foundation Managing Director of Transparency International (TI), Jeremy Pope, first used the term ‘National Integrity System’ and represented it diagrammatically with his now widely recognised “Greek Temple” (Figure 1). Since the early 2000s considerable NIS work has been carried out by both TI and, at a more in-depth level by IEGL, using its National Integrity System Assessment (NISA) methodology. This paper will first summarise the development of NISA and outline the Georgian context for the study. It will then describe how the methodology was used in Georgia for the GNISA project. The conclusion highlights the future for research such as this.

[Figure 1 here]
Researchers and practitioners generally agree that the achievement and maintenance of a society which can be said to have integrity-based governance, depends upon three essential elements. These are a legislative base (including a properly functioning judiciary and legal practices), a well designed and appropriate set of effective and well-
supported public institutions (agencies) and a sound system to establish and embed ethical values and standards (Sampford and Wood 1992). These essential elements embrace all sectors of society: public, private and civil and all need to be operating effectively on the basis that no one law or government agency can be expected to achieve overall integrity reform (Pope 2000; Sampford 1994).

The pillars of the “Greek Temple” represent a system which, when operating effectively, ensures that the three key societal objectives of sustainable development, the rule of law and quality of life for all citizens can be established and sustained. Pope’s metaphor for governance reform also conveys the message that if the necessary pillars do not operate effectively there is a risk of the Temple developing a significant lean, which can put at risk these key societal benefits, since might be said to balance precariously. A worst case scenario might be that in a so-called ‘failed state’, the roof of this Temple has tumbled to the ground such that the above benefits do not exist and that a massive and carefully prioritised effort is needed to establish public integrity and to strengthen the pillars. The research agenda in pursuing these ideas began in the 1990s and in 2001 Transparency International (TI) began to carry out what came to be known as ‘NIS country studies’ (Doig 2003; Doig and McIvor 2003; Doig and McIvor 2008; Doig and McIvor 1999; Doig and Moran 2002). These studies compared what existed in a country with an ideal set of integrity institutions that might be found in a functioning Western democracy. TI has carried out more than 70 such studies since 2001 (Transparency International) and other similar studies followed, for example ten country studies by the Open Society Institute (EUMAP 2002).

Concurrently, research was being conducted in Australia by Griffith University’s Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance (KCELJAG), in partnership with TI (Australia), together with affiliated researchers. This work expanded TI’s NIS methodology to provide a more complete picture of integrity system assessment and was funded by the Australian Research Council with supplementary funding from TI (Australia) and the Office of the Public Service in Queensland. This expanded approach became known as the National Integrity Systems Assessments (NISA) methodology.

Later, other more complex models emerged from the NISA research, culminating in Sampford’s model which saw integrity systems as a “Bird’s Nest” (Sampford, Smith & Brown 2005 see Figure 2). This analogy allowed for the mapping of three forms of relationships between the different institutional components of an integrity system: constitutional, policy and operational. The bird’s nest analogy stressed the cumulative relationships of an integrity system operating to protect and promote public integrity. A “single twig” can be very weak, whereas when the twigs are strategically interwoven (as in a bird’s nest) the strength of the nest far exceeds the sum of its individual twigs.

[Figure 2 here]
The NISA methodology was then tested and refined in the Australian setting over a five year period from 2000 to 2005. A major study across four Australian jurisdictions (Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and the Federal sphere), resulted in a report on Australia’s own integrity system which presented 21 recommendations for reforms to the Australian integrity system (Brown et al 2005). Since then, further work has occurred to extend the impact of integrity building mechanisms in the Australian setting (Shacklock 2004; Shacklock et al 2008; Shacklock and Lewis 2007).
THE NISA METHODOLOGY
The NISA methodology is designed to examine in detail the components and existing relationships that constitute a country’s public integrity system. As indicated previously in this paper, the NISA differs significantly from the methodology of the NIS country studies undertaken primarily by TI. The ways in which societies achieve integrity are likely to differ and as a result, the NISA methodology recognises that the achievement of integrity may not always be entirely based upon the same set of institutions operating in Western integrity systems. Effective institutional arrangements for a particular society will depend upon cultural and societal structures as well as fundamental values and traditions. The recognition of differences between countries does not suggest the abandonment of basic principles, values or human rights, but rather, emphasises that a check list approach, using a Western model or template, is insufficient as a tool to assess and map integrity systems.

As a result, the NISA methodology is designed to examine the integrity institutions and mechanisms that already exist in the country under study, ascertain which institutions and relationships are working effectively and efficiently and also determine those that are not (Brown et al 2005; Shacklock et al 2007) The resulting outcome may be that the institutions that fit the needs of one society may not be appropriate for another society and that the mix of integrity institutions that make up the systems may differ.

The integrity institutions within a given country are ‘mapped’, described and assessed to determine their effectiveness. An “integrity institution” for NISA study purposes includes any organisation or entity which can, does, or has the potential to contribute to the achievement, enhancement and maintenance of public integrity and the reduction of abuses of power, unethical conduct or corruption. In order to achieve this, the NISA methodology is designed to examine the existence of integrity institutions together with their capacity to fulfill their identified role effectively, as well as the interrelationships that exist between such institutions within the society. The interrelationships and interconnectedness that exist among institutions, involving both systemic and non-systemic interactions, are central to the coherence or otherwise of the system (Brown et al 2005; Shacklock et al 2007). In particular, the analysis seeks to discover factors such as missing integrity functions, overlapping roles, mutual support mechanisms between institutions and conflicts in order to identify and map the way in which a given integrity system functions. The factors that impact upon the coherence of an integrity system are best determined by posing a range of focused questions which examine the operational interactions between institutions. Finally, NISA seeks to measure the consequences of the ways in which the integrity institutions operate by determining the success or otherwise of the system in delivering effective integrity measures appropriate for the country under study. Combined, the elements of a NISA study enable the formulation of recommendations in relation to strengthening and reinforcing the best elements of the existing National Integrity System and for the removal of those elements which are counter-productive to the integrity goals.

The three Cs of Integrity Systems: Capacity, Coherence and Consequences
NISA’s methodology examines a country’s existing national integrity system, not only to see whether the expected key institutions are present, but also to assess whether
collectively its elements work in unison to deliver effective governance. NISA focuses on the three measures of capacity, coherence and consequences (or impacts) in a given country (Brown et al 2005; Shacklock et al 2007). Capacity answers the question of whether the institutions have the necessary resources (financial, human etc.) to fulfil their stated role; together with the legal foundation to exercise power, and initiate sanctions, which are both elements of integrity that emanate from political will (including freedom from political interference). Coherence assesses how well the various integrity institutions work together supportively and cooperatively to achieve maximum support and coordination. This measure also seeks to identify gaps and/or overlaps in their various jurisdictions in dealing with corruption and other abuses of power. A final focus on Consequences examines the outcomes of the existing system in terms of its effectiveness in delivering integrity, including the level of public awareness, satisfaction and trust in the country’s overall integrity system (Brown et al. 2005, Brown and Head 2008).

THE GEORGIA NISA PROJECT

Integrity reform in developing countries has been ongoing for many years, designed to bring about stronger public ethics regimes with the necessary monitoring and enforcement agencies and processes in place. According to the literature, this needs to move from a compliance-based approach towards an integrity-driven approach, where reforms are based upon shared societal values which yield a set of widely endorsed standards upon which such reforms can be based and which are aspirational in focus, not merely punitive (Stevulak and Brown 2011). See also Roberts 2009 for a discussion of the rise of compliance based ethics and the implications for organizational ethics.

In order to put this project in context a brief overview follows covering Georgia's geography, history and cultural perspectives.

Historical and Cultural Background
Georgia is situated in the Caucasus region, between Europe and Asia and has borders with Russia, Turkey, Armenia, Azerbaijan and the Black Sea. Georgia has a population of approximately 4.7 million with some 98% of Georgians identifying with the Georgian Orthodox Church as their religious faith. Following independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, the expected improvements did not eventuate. The first decade of independence, during the time of President Shevardnadze, was a time of significant civil unrest. When the societal demands for reform were left unmet, social upheaval occurred in the early 2000s culminating in what became known as the “Rose Revolution” in November 2003. This was a peaceful revolt without bloodshed, but overthrew the Shevardnadze regime and resulted in the now independent Georgia and the government still headed by Mikheil Saakashvili. While it is beyond the scope of this paper, Mitchell (2009) gives a detailed coverage of Georgia since the recent conflicts in the region. The more recent impacts of corruption in Georgia have also been detailed by Kukhianidze (2009), Corso (2011) and Kupatadze (2011).
Impetus for the GNISA Project

Following the above political events and the development of democratic reform in Georgia, the GNISA project originated from discussions between the Open Society Georgia Foundation (OSGF) and Mr Jeremy Pope, a principle of 'Tiri', a London NGO which focuses its efforts on integrity building projects. Tiri then joined with IEGL (Griffith University) to conduct the project. Funding was provided by Open Society Institute (Soros Foundation) through its Georgian arm, the Open Society Georgia Foundation (OSGF). Three Georgian NGOs were selected to be local partners of GNISA, these being the Caucasus Institute for Peace, Development and Democracy (CIPDD), the Georgian Young Lawyers Association (GYLA) and Transparency International (Georgia). Tentative interview teams were established and two draft questionnaires were developed, during the initial 2 week period. One questionnaire was designed for interviews with representatives from core government institutions from the Executive, Parliamentary and Judicial arms of government. The other questionnaire was for those external to the national government sector which included a wide variety of civil society entities such as NGOs, the Media, the Church and Local Government.

GNISA Project Goals:

Specifically the goals of this project were as follows:

- To map and evaluate Georgia's integrity system, its institutions and practices, in order to identify strengths and weaknesses and to recommend further reforms required.
- To assess the existing institutions against a standard set of 'good practice' measures, by analysing the reasons that institutions had been established, their mandates and how effectively they were performing.
- To identify conflicts of interest, especially where there may be institutions with responsibilities for seemingly contradictory functions, duplication of roles or gaps. As part of this the study would attempt to assess institutional performance in interactions with other parts of the integrity system.
- To provide data and recommendations that would assist the relatively new Georgian leadership in its reform agenda, at the same time suggesting ways in which international institutions and donors might be able to better assisting in these reform processes.

While this GNISA project was a finite and specifically targeted activity as regards its funding, it was seen as ideal if the process could be repeated in 3 to 5 years, in order to provide a re-assessment and an evaluation of progress and an ongoing incentive for integrity reform.

GNISA METHODS

GNISA used a series of eight sequential steps following the NISA model:

1. Initial desk research identified the integrity institutions currently existing in Georgia, and documented current legislation, regulations and codes which apply and the values under which they operated.
2. Establishment of a research team bringing together academics and practitioner experts (including local representatives) to develop the research agenda.

3. Preliminary Mapping of the Integrity System occurred via a workshop including researchers, in-country experts, officials from key integrity agencies and non-government agency representatives. This group developed an operational plan including milestones and task allocations. Preliminary mapping identified the institutions and mechanisms that constitute the integrity system classifying them as either Core Institutions (such as anti-corruption commissions, governance councils, and parliamentary committees); Distributed Institutions (such as public sector agencies with portfolio responsibilities or private sector bodies with responsibility for specific aspects of the integrity system); Contextual Institutions (such as regulatory bodies, political organisations or NGOs with the potential to influence integrity issues); or Key “extra-institutional” Elements, which might influence the development of an effective integrity system, such as social entities that help to instil values, through education, religion or tradition (Shacklock et al 2007). This mapping process described the roles that the institutions play (or should play) and their likely interactions and interrelationships with other elements of the integrity system.

4. Development of a research plan and designing and testing the research instrument(s) involved deciding which entities should be interviewed and adapting earlier NISA questionnaires to ensure their appropriateness for Georgia. Pre-testing was done via pilot interviews, involving local team members and lead researchers. Two questionnaires were designed, one for internal government institutions and another for those external to government. The questionnaires were extensive containing 29 and 27 potential questions respectively, divided into sections and included probing questions.

5. In-depth face-to-face interviews were conducted, using teams of two interviewers. Altogether 83 interviews were conducted as shown in Table 1 below. The “Special Others” group refers to those institutions which sit outside other categories for example, The Ombudman’s Office and the Civil Service Commission. The complete list is available from the authors or from the formal GNISA report (Shacklock et al., 2007). Interviews lasted a minimum of one hour and were almost all conducted in private settings at the work premises of the interviewees, the exceptions being a few conducted at the Open Society Georgia Institute’s premises. Interviews were conducted in the Georgian language and/or in English and transcripts were produced and translated into English to enable all researchers to consider and assess the issues.

[Table 1 here]

6. Data analysis and work-shopping followed, to identify the ways in which the various elements of the system interrelate, the gaps or overlaps between them, and the extent to which the institutions operated truly as a system. Data analysis was a thematic analysis (Creswell 2003) of the transcripts to identify dominant issues. 26 interviews were initially analysed by IEGL researchers to determine the quality of responses and to suggest variations to the process. Three focus groups were organised to test and expand upon the initial findings, one of which focused on Local Government issues. In the Local
Government group, in particular, a number of the recommendations regarding that sector emanated from the focus group process.

7. Mapping the system involved the development of a “display” of the integrity system as it appeared in its entirety, to highlight the system’s strengths and weaknesses and the system’s likely capacity, coherence and consequences. This stage also examined possible high risk areas and potential threats to the integrity system, for fraud or corruption. Following the preliminary analysis of the 83 interviews and focus group data, a findings and recommendations workshop was held involving both Georgian and international stakeholders, to synthesise the findings and draft the recommendations.

8. Reporting and recommendations followed to the Georgian Government. The Report contained 26 overall recommendations on how the Georgian integrity system might be enhanced through strengthening institutions, improving institutional co-operation, collaboration and oversight, or the development of new institutions. These recommendations were supported by suggestions for implementation.

LIMITATIONS
While the project was originally seen as taking a year this proved to be highly ambitious and unrealistic in practice and it eventually took about 2 years to complete the work. This was largely due to the difficulty in getting very senior, yet critically important interviewees to the interview table. These difficulties were exacerbated by the unavoidable need to change team members and reduce the team numbers in Georgia in unexpected ways during the process. As a result, the findings and recommendations did not include analysis of institutional reforms that took place after 2007.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
The findings and recommendations are given in substantial detail in the official report submitted to the Georgian Government (Shacklock et al 2007). These are necessarily heavily summarised below, in the interest of brevity for this paper. The following summarises the strengths and weaknesses found under the three Cs mentioned earlier.

**Capacity:** The existing strengths and opportunities were seen as: the system of financial accountability and implementation of related standards, the increased role of law enforcement agencies, financial and human resources in core investigation agencies, technical infrastructure and improvements to working environment conditions in the public sector, the accumulation of expertise and knowledge in civil society and the readiness of donors and international organizations to assist in reform processes. The challenges requiring future action included: greater parliamentary leadership and integrity, whistleblower protection, civic education, and awareness of rights and electoral integrity and the development of political parties.

Recommendations focussing on the capacity of institutions and the overall system were directed at improved distribution of resources in accordance with actual institutional need; improved knowledge sharing and cooperation among institutions and between institutions, international organisations/institutions and NGOs, enhanced by an
easily accessible database; education reform to improve the qualifications and skills of public officials; improved legislative basis for institutional operations and prescribed roles and functions across the NIS to achieve uniform procedures and process; and enhanced powers for oversight bodies to enable them to monitor the implementation of recommendations.

**Coherence:** The existing strengths and opportunities were seen as: the growing acceptance of mutual accountability of ministers, ministerial advisors and the public service and relations between core and distributed integrity institutions. The challenges requiring future actions included: policy and operational coordination between core integrity agencies, parliamentary leadership and integrity, parliamentary oversight committees, business sector regulatory coordination and structural problems within civil society organizations.

Recommendations relating to coherence generally focussed on improved cooperation in relation to public relations, development and implementation; increased interaction with local government sectors and stronger partnership between NGOs and tertiary education institutions to promote civic values more widely; cooperation between the judiciary and court-related institutions and NGOs and the media to increase efficiency and public awareness; improved oversight by improving ‘checks and balance’ mechanisms, stronger oversight of the executive by a dedicated unit, improved parliamentary oversight of law enforcement agencies, mutual institutional controls to balance punitive and preventative anticorruption policies; and more broadly, enhanced internal and external control mechanisms for the public sector.

**Consequences:** The existing strengths and opportunities were seen as: the use of centralised controlling tools to monitor effectiveness, a strong commitment of the leadership to combating corruption, effective Executive oversight institutions, activity and efficiency performance measures and a high level of social trust in governmental policies. The challenges requiring future actions included: the development of greater trust in the leadership itself, the problem of fragmented and uncoordinated data gathering, limited cooperation with NGOs, over-centralisation of authority in some areas and weak public relations policies.

Recommendations that relate to consequences centred on the use of education and anticorruption prevention measures as longer term solutions to the problem of corruption in Georgia. Transparent and appropriate polices and procedures for promotion within the public sector need to be widely adopted. Public awareness of the rule of law, the problem of corruption and the promotion of civic values are essential for the strengthening of Georgia’s NIS. Clearly defined legislative frameworks are required as are common approaches to reform in the governance system.

As part of the recommendations, GNISA researchers provided suggestions regarding ways in which the recommendations might be progressed. These suggestions included ensuring that every institution consider the report and respond to its recommendations as well as publishing lists of organisations with which they should cooperate. It was also suggested that institutions should designate specific officials to
take responsibility for driving the reform process. Other suggestions included seeking additional support for reforms from international and donor organizations through financial and or technical assistance, and also emphasized the importance of the Government providing the moral leadership to support the reform process. A further suggestion was the establishment of a permanent ‘Governance Reform Commission’ (GRC) whose composition would put it beyond party politics, to be supported by a permanent secretariat, which would assist the GRC to propose alternatives, canvas experts and popular feedback and draft reports for legislative consideration. It was suggested that the GRC should also take a “helicopter view” of the overall coherence of the system and the way that the different reforms interact with each other.

The above represents only a brief summary of this project and its outcomes. For a more complete coverage of this research, interested parties are referred to the complete final report of the GNISA project which explains in detail the background to this project, its methodology and findings (Shacklock et al 2007).

CONCLUSION

The paper describes the further development and use of the NISA methodology to assess national integrity systems. In this way, the paper has made an important contribution to the literature on integrity systems, public integrity and anti-corruption. This can potentially assist other countries, including Australia and its neighbours, in replicating such assessments of their own integrity systems, nationally and at the state level. Within the context of a growing interest in areas such as public integrity, public sector ethics, social responsibility and sustainability, this research identifies and highlights an important contribution to new knowledge, as well as explaining the methods to achieve similar outcomes in other contexts.

The GINSA study has positive implications for Australia in a number of ways. Firstly, the methodology used was developed and refined in Australia, enhancing Australia’s reputation as a leader in the integrity and capacity building assessment arena. It is also in Australia’s interests to encourage and assist developing countries wherever they may be, with which it may have relationships through trade or other international involvements, in order to enhance their integrity systems and thus be better equipped to function as equal partners on the global stage.

While the paper presents a national governmental focus in a developing country, the research methodology, findings and recommendations will also be of interest to public sector policy analysts, public sector managers and consultants working in this area of management in any region. The detailed structured interview frameworks will be of particular interest to researchers and analysts. These are available as appendices to the full report (Shacklock et al 2007)

Georgia is arguably still in a post-revolutionary phase of its development and as such is still somewhat volatile. Since this research was carried out, the country has faced serious disputes with its large and powerful neighbour, Russia, over border and territorial issues.
However, as the research revealed, there has been progress on some fronts, for example in the area of anti-corruption measures. Despite the ongoing and long-standing difficulties Georgia has with some of its neighbours, the Georgian Government seems to be committed to enhancing the country's standing in the region and internationally, particularly in relation to its European neighbours. This sets a positive context for potential integrity system reform and it is hoped that the GNISA research and the recommendations and suggestions will be revisited as soon as possible and that a number of the recommendations will gradually be progressed.
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FIGURES AND TABLE

Figure 1: Transparency International’s NIS Greek Temple (from Pope 2000)
The supported societal goals shown are: Sustainable Development, Rule Of law and Quality of Life.

The 11 pillars shown are the Legislature, Executive, Judiciary, Auditor General, Ombudsman, Watchdog Agencies, Public Service, Media, Civil Society, Private Sector and International Actors.
Figure 2: Integrity System – Bird’s Nest Analogy (from Sampford et al 2005)

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions interviewed during the GNISA Project</th>
<th>Number of Interviews conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Institutions</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-government organisations (NGOs)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International and Donor Institutions:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary and Court Related Institutions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Institutions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Others</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>