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Attachment 1

Agenda
ANTICORRP 2nd Consortium meeting
Berlin, 21-24th October, 2014

TUESDAY, Oct 21st

14:00 – 19:00  Arrival and hotel check-in
19:00  Dinner

WEDNESDAY, Oct 22nd

09:00 – 09:30  General Assembly: Opening remarks by Monika Bauhr and Alina Mungiu-Pippidi
09:30 – 10:30  General Assembly: WP13 Management – Update on scientific and financial issues, as well as important changes to the Grant Agreement by QOG
10:30 – 11:00  Coffee break
11:00 – 13.00  General Assembly: WP12 Dissemination – Update on dissemination plan and website by HERTIE
13.00 – 14:00  Lunch
14:00 – 15:45  General Assembly: WP12 Dissemination – Planning upcoming books, journal special issues, policy reports, national and international dissemination events by HERTIE

14:45-15:00  Short break
15:00 -17.00  Work Package Leaders’ meeting
17:00 – 17:30  Coffee break
17:30 – 18:30  Steering Committee meeting
20:00  Dinner

THURSDAY, Oct 23rd

08:30 – 10:15  Parallel Work Package Meetings: WP2, WP4, WP6, WP8
10:15 – 10:30  Coffee break
10:30 – 12:00  Parallel Work Package Meetings: WP2, WP4, WP6, WP8
12:00 – 13:00  
Lunch

13:00 – 14:45  
Parallel Work Package Meetings: WP9, WP10, WP11

14:45 – 15:00  
Coffee break

15:00 – 16:30  
Parallel Work Package Meetings: WP9, WP10, WP11

16:30 – 17:15  
General Assembly: Pillar III presents WP6, WP9 – each WP leader presents WP’s work within this pillar

17:15 – 18:45  
General Assembly: Roundtable discussion with Advisory Board members

20:00  
Dinner

FRIDAY, Oct 24th

09:00 – 10:00  
General Assembly: Pillar I presents WP1, WP 2 and WP 4 – each WP leader presents WP’s work within this pillar

10:00 – 11:00  
General Assembly: Pillar II presents WP5, WP7, WP11 – each WP leader presents WP’s work within this pillar

11:00 – 11:30  
Coffee break

11:30 – 12:15  
General Assembly: Pillar IV presents WP3, WP 8 and WP 10 – each WP leader presents WP’s work within this pillar

12:15 – 13:00  
General Assembly: concluding remarks
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Agenda for WP leader meeting

Monika Bauhr

Purpose: The purpose of the meeting is:

• To strengthen communication between WP leaders, in order to facilitate the achievement of common goals.

• To encourage all WP leaders to take a greater part in the collective work of the program and form opinions on how to improve and develop their work.

• To generate ideas on how to improve the programs scientific and other output.

• To identify where opinions on desired outputs and outcomes diverge and decide where coordination is needed and where not.

Format: The meeting, although short is important because WP leaders hold a key position in the program and have both strong scientific and dissemination responsibilities. The idea is to have this discussion internally within the SC at the SC meeting in Paris, and that the WP leader meeting should primarily be devoted to listening to WP leaders that are not part of the SC. It would be good if as many SC members as possible are present at the meeting to listen to the discussion. The SC conclusions from this meeting will be discussed at the SC meeting in Berlin the day after.

Topics to discuss can include:

• What are the most important outputs of the program?

• What are the most desired outcomes of the program?

• What are the most important/critical factors to achieve these goals?

• How can findings of the different WPs be contrasted?

• How can WP leaders facilitate that deliverables are used for scientific publications?

• How can scientific communication within the program be facilitated?

PLEASE FEEL FREE TO ADD FURTHER TOPICS
Attachment 3

Bi annual monitoring of the project

WP’s summary Work progress and achievements during the period from 1st September 2013 - May 30, 2014

WP1  1 Social, legal, anthropological and political approaches to theory of corruption

The WP as a whole was presented at an internal workshop in Berlin, while part of the WP was presented at a conference in Sweden.

2013 August – QoG Internal Conference, Gottskär (19th- 21st August)
- Presented first draft of Bo Rothstein and Aiysha Varraich’s report “The Concept of Corruption” at the internal conference of the QoG Institute.

2013 November – Workshop meeting, Hertie, Berlin (28th November)
- Purpose: To share all the work done so far by all participants and exchange feedback. All of WP1 participants presented penultimate contributions, receiving feedback and suggestions for improvement.
- Set date for revised versions to be submitted to WP leader as January 15th 2014.

2013 December – feedback from Michael Johnston (advisory board member)
- Sent Rothstein and Varraich “Concept of Corruption” to Michael Johnston (advisory board member). Received detailed feedback on various aspects of the contribution

2014 January – streamlined and synthesized contributions from all WP1 participants into one deliverable as draft for submission to advisory board. Received feedback from Susan Rose-Ackerman regarding quality control and suggestions for improvement/general feedback.

2014 February – Revised versions of WP1 contributions collated and synthesized into one document. Executive summary prepared, highlighting results and policy relevance of WP1.
- Submitted WP1 deliverable to steering committee and EU Commission
- Feedback from Commission: Deliverable holistically approved but asked to write a more extensive introduction

2014 June – Revised and will be submitted in June with enhanced executive summary – including an introduction. Conclusion reached by WP leader that edited volume from the various contributions not possible to the varied length, scope and focus of the different contributions.
WP 2 History of corruption in comparative perspective

WP2 held a workshop in Amsterdam in October 2013. On 3-4 October 2013 WP2 (History of Anticorruption) held its first workshop. It was attended by all regular members, and all of them presented on their ongoing and/or projected studies. Presentations were followed by discussion and feedback, and the final discussion was dedicated to thinking about the conference and final deliverable, which is a collection of case studies in the history of anticorruption. We agreed to communicate in the near future about common themes and research questions that may help guide the work and shape the conference. We also decided on which lacunae we should focus in filling in the conference rooster of speakers.

In part as a consequence of the papers presented there, we have rethought the ways in which WP members could contribute to the final deliverable, an edited volume/s on the history of anticorruption from antiquity to modernity.

Since the PhD student Sanne Deckwitz left the WP earlier that year, we adjusted our plans on the basis of the available budget and hired another postdoc, Ronald Kroeze, who has now formally joined the team.

With Ronald on board, plans for the final conference (the basis of the final deliverable) are shaping up. I hope to present the final lineup in Berlin come October.

In terms of geographic coverage of the WP:

- Medieval Iberia and England: A. Vitoria
- Medieval Islamic Caliphate: M. van Berkel
- Late-medieval/Renaissance Italy: G. Geltner
- Early Modern Romania: A. Ovidu
- Modern Sweden: A. Bagenholm
- Modern Denmark: M. Frisk Jensen
- Modern Germany: R. Kroeze
- Modern Netherlands: J. Kennedy
Please bear in mind that this coverage will be significantly expanded through the conference and edited volume/s to include Ancient Greece and Rome, medieval France, Tudor England, Ottoman Empire, Modern U.S, Italy, and Greece.

**WP 3 Corruption and governance improvement in global and continental perspectives**

Work progress and achievements during the period from 1st September 2013 - May 30, 2014

Hertie School of Governance (WP leader: WP3, WP8)

WP3

WP3 had a workshop in Hamburg on 25-27 October 2013. It was hosted by GIGA for a first round of discussion of contemporary global ‘achievers’ – countries which have managed to reach control of corruption in recent decades: Poland (HERTIE); Georgia (UCL); South Korea, Taiwan, Uruguay, Chile, Costa-Rica, Rwanda, Botswana, Qatar, (GIGA); Bulgaria (CSD); Estonia, Latvia (PROVIDUS); and Croatia (PSD). In addition countries like Tunisia and Egypt were discussed, but the work on them will be continued and finalized in the WP8 at a later stage.

The decision was made to continue with 7 process-tracing cases that will be conducted in the following countries: Georgia (UCL); South Korea, Taiwan, Uruguay, Chile, Costa-Rica (GIGA, HERTIE); Estonia (PROVIDUS, HERTIE).

WP 3 deliverable D3:2 “Background paper and regional comparison on selected countries” has been submitted to the Commission in the end of February 2014. It has been accepted by the Commission and is now available on the www.anticorrp.eu. It includes background reports on 13 countries and 5 regional reports. The only report that is still not submitted is the one on Croatia. We are still waiting for the final version from PSD.

WP3 deliverable milestone MS2 “Quantitative report on causes of performance and stagnation in the global fight against corruption” has been submitted to the Commission in the end of March 2014. It has been accepted by the Commission and is now available on the www.anticorrp.eu.

Currently the work is going on Volume 2 of the Anticorruption Report (Budrich), which will consist in part of a few country background reports as well as short version of the milestone report. We plan to have it published in September.

Field work and interviews in process-tracing countries are in progress. Alina Mungiu-Pippidi has already traveled to Chile and Uruguay and conducted interviews there. The deadline for process-tracing cases will be moved to month 39 (initially month 36) as there is more time required to finalize them.
To June 2014, WP4 has undertaken ethnographic research in all the countries object of our research (see below) except for Japan. The case of Japan will be dealt separately through a contrastive specialized literature analysis on corruption, reforms, and perception, as well as of those cultural values that relates to the topic. Survey research in Japan will be accomplished in June-July 2014.

Ethnographic research conducted in all countries has so far consisted of two main sections:

1. Questionnaire survey research
2. Interviews and/or focus groups with local experts, practitioners, activists and politicians

It is unfortunately too early for providing a summary of results because the very big amount of data (about 870 surveys including all countries) is under analysis for data elaboration to be submitted in D4.1, the first WP4 deliverable, coming up very soon at the end of next month. Data analyzed will include a comparative dataset on 8 countries on the following topics:

**SECTION 1**

**Performance of local governments and public organizations**

Data on:

- Experience with institutions
- Problems in the community
- Ability to obtain services from institutions
- Problem resolution methods
- Practices against good governance
- Means to express dissatisfaction

**SECTION 2**

**Trust and confidence in public institutions**

- Trust levels
- Who helps in the well-being of the community
- How public sector officials should behave...
SECTION 3

Social Norms

- Importance of norms-customs
- Statements on gift-giving
- Statements on personal relations
- Integrity scenarios

SECTION 4

Values

- Self-identification with values

Countries under investigation and regions

Italy (2 regions: Lombardy, Monza and Apulia, Lecce) researched by: Davide Torsello, Giulia Pezzi

Hungary (Budapest district), Davide Torsello

Bosnia (Sarajevo), Zaira Lofranco

Russia (4 regions), UCL team

Turkey (2 regions), Muhittin Acar

Kosovo (Pristina), IKS team

Tanzania (2 regions), Claudia Baez

Mexico (2 regions), Claudia Baez

Japan, Davide Torsello

Meetings held at WP4

Florence, at Consortium Meeting
Berlin, at Consortium Meeting

Planned internal meeting: June 12-14, Bergamo
Deviations from Annex 1

None

Future Plans

After submitting the deliverable, the WP4 partners will work separately to develop one single and original aspect of integrity/corruption for each of the countries through an ethnographic perspective. This will lead to the final output of the package, which will be the ethnographic study of corruption in the 9 countries of investigation in the form of an edited volume publication. I have already established contacts with Palgrave which declared interested to consider this publication.

Comments

Muhittin Acar has transferred his time from WP2 to our WP.

I would like to receive information from the work progress of all other WPs, I think it is crucial that we share this info as soon as it gets ready, outside of possible publications, which, as we all know, need time to be finalized.

We plan to arrange a meeting with WP2 in Berlin, where we shall have our internal meeting as well.

WP 5 Pan-European survey on quality of government and corruption at national and regional level

WP leader: Nicholas Charron, QoG

Progress update

- During the 2013-2014 year (to date) our pan-European survey was written, launched and data was received for the survey in late April 2013.
- Since September 2013, the survey data was used to build a second round of the European Quality of Government Index (EQI) for 206 European regions and 28 EU countries plus Turkey and Serbia. The survey sampled at the regional level (NUTS 1 or NUTS 2), with 400+ respondents per region. The total number of respondents was roughly 85,000.
- Due to the expanded sample compared with the 2010 EQI round, the previous round was retrospectively updated and both years are now available for use.
- The data has been sent to the QoG Institute’s homepage to be made freely available in Excel format.
- A sensitivity test of the 2013 data has been done, the results of which can be found in a forthcoming article, presenting the data (Charron, Dijkstra and Lapuente, forthcoming)

- A book chapter has been written (Charron, 2013a) and published in ANTICORP’s first annual report on corruption on the national level summary of the results of the survey.
- A Working paper presenting the regional results of the survey was published on the QoG Institute’s homepage (Charron, 2013b).
Four other research papers are currently in progress using parts of the survey data from this work package. Nicholas Charron and Bo Rothstein have one paper currently under review at the *European Journal of Political Research* and one other in progress, both deal with institutional quality and generalized trust in Europe. Andreas Bågenholm and Nicholas Charron will have one paper on corruption voting in European democracies under review at *Comparative Political Studies*. Nicholas Charron has a paper under review at *World Development* comparing corruption perceptions and experiences in Europe.

- No deviations from the plan have been made at this time from Annex I.
- No formal meetings have been held. We will not need a formal extra space in Berlin in October, 2014.
- Future plans are to disseminate both the individual and regional level data, combined with that from 2010 and work on further publications

Countries included in WP5’s survey:

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Rep., Denmark, Germany, Greece, France, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Serbia (with Kosovo), Turkey, Ukraine (6 regions including Crimea) United Kingdom.

- Additional countries included in the EQI measures (national level data only):
  
  Cyprus, Malta, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Luxembourg

References to published/forthcoming works:


WP 6 Media and corruption

Official starting date of WP6: September 1, 2013 Actually we had already started working before that date but unfortunately, as you know, Gallup Europe has abandoned the project and we were forced to reschedule and reorganize the entire WP.

This is the new plan that was decided in accordance with project coordinator: the computerized content analysis that was supposed to be carried out by Gallup will be replaced by a human assisted content analysis on a small sample of newspapers in: Italy, France, United Kingdom, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Latvia (each national team will work as to its own country, Unipg will take care of the study in Italy, France, United Kingdom). This study will go deeper in the content and the structure of the coverage than the computer assisted content analysis. This analysis will be carried out by the national teams involved on WP6 thanks to part of the money (20.000 Euro each team, 30.000 Unipg) that was supposed to be allotted to Gallup. This change will cause a delay in our deliverables of a couple of months. Amendments to the contract are necessary accordingly.

Where we stand.
April 25 - 26 we had a new meeting in Bratislava in which all the teams agreed on the proposed plan adding to the plan also a computerized content analysis to be carried out before the human assisted content analysis. A schedule of the agreed deadlines is attached.

As to the qualitative analysis to be carried out within WP6 everything goes as planned.

As we started our WP just eight months ago and as an important changes occurred no result is available so far.

A new meeting of WP6 is schedule next October in Berlin on occasion of the general meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Partners involved</th>
<th>Research phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 May 2014</td>
<td>All partners</td>
<td>CACA, HACA</td>
<td>Each partner sends to UNIPG information about their final choices on the corpus (which newspaper to be analysed). A table to fill in with information is provided by UNIPG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Agency/Role</td>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 2014</td>
<td>All partners</td>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>Each partner sends to UNIPG the definitive list of cases they will work on. In the final report, each partner will motivate the choice of national cases taking into account Andrej's observations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of May 2014</td>
<td>Istvan and Ioana</td>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>The working group sends to other partners a typology of the roles of journalists in relation to corruption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 June 2014</td>
<td>All partners</td>
<td>CACA, HACA</td>
<td>Each partner will send to UNIPG approximately 100 articles (extracted from their corpus and including at least one of the keywords within the headlines or the texts). UNIPG will run a test based on this material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 July 2014</td>
<td>All partners</td>
<td>CACA, HACA</td>
<td>Each partner will send to UNIPG all the news articles (in .doc, .docx or .txt format) extracted from their corpus of newspapers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of September 2014</td>
<td>Alessio, Istvan, Pavol and Agnes</td>
<td>HACA</td>
<td>The group working on HACA codebook sends to partners the finalised codebook and instructions for coders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>UNIPG</td>
<td>HACA</td>
<td>UNIPG sends to the other partners some examples of British articles analysed following the agreed codebook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>All partners</td>
<td>HACA</td>
<td>A reliability test will be run in each country. Two different coders per country will code a sample of news articles (approximately 100 articles per country). Decisions about the way to code articles and on how to go on will be taken in Berlin on the bases of the reliability test results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 October 2014</td>
<td>UNIPG</td>
<td>CACA</td>
<td>UNIPG will send to the WP6 partners the results of the CACA. Partner will interpret the results, which will be discussed during the Berlin meeting (22-24 October 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WP 7 Individual values and motivations to engage against corruption

WP coordinator: TI, briefing prepared by Dieter Zinnbauer, May 30, 2014

WP7 started in month 19 with a first subset of activities focused on a stocktake exercise of social accountability tools. Work is still ongoing. Given that a recent batch of synthesis reports on social accountability interventions in the governance areas has been published it was decided to complement the existing materials by focussing the stocktake on a) pulling in evidence from social accountability interventions in neighbouring fields such as urban planning and local environmental sustainability initiatives and b) put more emphasis on evidence about the socio-economic and sociocultural profiles of participants as well as evidence on the sustainability of specific initiatives.

Preparations for the citizen survey (month 25): consultations on survey design have taken place and negotiations for a joint survey with EBRD are underway, which might greatly leverage the available funds for this purpose and make it possible to expand the number of survey countries.

Preparations for other activity streams are underway. Participating TI chapters for the focus groups, action research and 360 accountability assessments have been selected and include BiH, Azerbaijan, Portugal, Romania, UK, Montenegro, Lithuania, Macedonia.

No further deviations from ANNEX 1 are currently envisaged other than the amendments re. participating chapters, which had been discussed with the Commission at the proposal design stage and is included already as additional clause in the description of work.

Some minor adjustments in terms of re-assigning some costs between the "staffing" and "other categories" might have to be applied for and take place in the future, but this is only going to be an issue for future reporting periods.

We have consulted with WP and other consortia members that had expressed interest on the citizen survey design, but have not held a full WP meeting.

Re. country coverage: no comprehensive country reports as such are foreseen for this workpackage. Case studies on different aspects of social accountability will take place in the countries listed above and will inform a synthesis report. Country coverage of the survey will depend on the outcome of the negotiations with EBRD.
WP8 Corruption, assistance and development

WP8 started its work in March 2014 with a meeting in Berlin. For deliverable D8.1 it was decided to organize a survey of EU-funded projects for infrastructure, looking at different time intervals in Hungary (BCE); Croatia (PSD); Romania (SAR); Turkey (HAT); Bulgaria (CSD); Germany (HERTIE) and Ukraine (UCL).

For D8.2 WP8 will document and test the association between governance improvement and EU funds for development, with a focus on the new governance facility, in the case of ENP countries by quantitative means (HERTIE) and in-depth case studies. Case selection is guided by the variation in the extent of anticorruption conditionality and covers: Bosnia-Herzegovina (PSD); Kosovo (IKS); Bulgaria (CSD); Ukraine (UCL); Tunisia, Egypt, Ghana, Tanzania (GIGA).

Future plans include: data visualization of procurement risk on Hungary and several workshops: on Institutions in public procurement for the infrastructure sector (Slovakia, Romania, Turkey, and Hungary) and links between EU funds and good governance (Bulgaria, Greece). Next WP8 meeting will take place in October 2014.

WP 9, Organized crime and impact on vulnerable groups

The WP9 recently started in March 2014. The EUI, as leading institution, has launched the activities in collaboration with CSD. In the previous meetings in Goteborg and Florence, all the partners agreed in creating two research teams within the WP, having two different focus of research: the first one about the link between organized crime and corruption (EUI); the second one about the link between corruption and human trafficking (CSD). The first online meeting of the WP will be held in the first week of June, but there have already been some meetings between the two leading institutions (EUI and CSD) to coordinate their activities and to plan research and deadlines for the WP deliverables. Moreover, the EUI has already started working on the analytical framework that will be used in the first deliverable (Integrated report on organized crime and corruption), together with the methodology for data collection (a codebook will be distributed to all partners in June 2014). During the Berlin conference in October 2014, the WP9 will organize a workshop to present and discuss the early drafts of country reports of the Integrated report, in order to submit it to the European Commission by the end of February 2015.

Below, you can find the research plan of the two WP9 research teams, and a table with the list of deliverables, descriptions, deadlines, and country study/institution.
**ANTICORRP WP 9 Activities (lead by EUI)**

**Research plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Implementation Period</th>
<th>Responsible Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D9.1 Integrated Report on Organized crime and Corruption</td>
<td>May – July 2014</td>
<td>EUI (methodology, literature review), CSD (contribution to methodology), BCE (contribution to methodology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Methodology (Codebook and questionnaire)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.1 Integrated Report on Organized crime and Corruption</td>
<td>June - September 2014</td>
<td>Cross-national analysis: EUI (data collection and analysis), BCE (contribution to data collection and analysis) Case studies: EUI (Italy), CSD (Bulgaria), BCE (Hungary), IKS (Kosovo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Data collection (press and judicial evidence about cases in each country)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Data collection of statistics about corruption and organized crime in Europe/4 countries (Eurobarometer);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.1 Integrated Report on Organized crime and Corruption</td>
<td>September 2014 - February 2015</td>
<td>EUI (Introduction; Italy), CSD (Bulgaria), BCE (Hungary), IKS (Kosovo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Case studies report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.2 Policy paper with recommendations</td>
<td>March - September 2015</td>
<td>EUI (Italy), CSD (Bulgaria), BCE (Hungary, Belgium), IKS (Kosovo), UCL ? (Russia and Ukraine), PSD (Germany/Italy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Review of countries’ legislation about both anticorruption policies in relation with organized crime, and anti-trafficking policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.2 Policy paper with recommendations</td>
<td>September 2015 - February 2016</td>
<td>EUI (Introduction, Italy), CSD (Introduction, Bulgaria), BCE (Hungary), IKS (Kosovo), UCL ? (Russia and Ukraine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phases of the research (May 2014 – February 2015):
- Carrying out a literature review of research examining the link between organized crime and corruption;
- Elaborating relevant instrument for data collection – codebook for data collection;
- Collecting empirical data about cases of criminal-political nexus either in the political market or in public contracting (involving EU funds);
- Analysis of the actors involved, the resources they exchange and the mechanisms of interaction;
- Assessing the variety of criminal organizations operating in the country;
- Measurement and evaluation of the link between corruption and organized crime by using statistics on crime and surveys (Eurobarometer; crimes statistics when available);
- Presentation of the early drafts of the reports on October 2014 during the ANTICORRP General conference in Berlin;
- Summarising the findings in four country case study reports.

D9.2 Policy paper with recommendations

Phases of the research (March 2015 – February 2016):
- Policy review and evaluation of the legislation against the link between corruption and organized crime in public contracting in 4 countries (under EUI supervision);
- Policy review and evaluation of the legislation against human trafficking and corruption (under CSD supervision);
- Summarising the findings in a policy paper with recommendation

Issues to discuss: Whether to ask UCL to help us for a report on Russia and Ukraine;
**ANTICORRP WP 9 Activities (lead by CSD)**

**Research plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Activity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Implementation Period</strong></th>
<th><strong>Responsible Institution</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D9.3 (a) Methodology and literature review (incl. IDI Guide)</td>
<td>May - mid-October 2014</td>
<td>CSD (methodology, literature review), EUI (contribution to methodology), BCE (contribution to methodology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.3 (b) Case studies - field work (x 15 interviews with stakeholders in each country)</td>
<td>October 2014 - January 2015</td>
<td>CSD (Bulgaria), BCE (Belgium), PSD (Germany/Italy), IKS (Kosovo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.3 (c) Case study reports (x 4)</td>
<td>January - June 2015</td>
<td>CSD (Bulgaria), BCE (Belgium), PSD (Germany/Italy), IKS (Kosovo), EUI (quality review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.4 Analytical report of interview findings</td>
<td>January - September 2015</td>
<td>CSD (desk research and analysis), PSD (desk research), IKS (desk research), EUI (quality review)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **D9.3 (a-c) Four case studies and case study reports (Bulgaria, Kosovo, Germany/Italy, Belgium)**

**Phases of the research (May 2014 – June 2015):**

- Carrying out a literature review of research examining the links between corruption and human trafficking;
- Identifying the stakeholders involved in the human trafficking process (victims, traffickers, institutions and NGO’s);
- Elaborating relevant instrument for data collection – In-depth interview guides;
- Collecting information from the stakeholders representatives’ (victims of trafficking (or social workers who represent them) and law enforcement officers – police and judiciary, local authorities) through relevant instruments (in-depth interviews).
- Summarising the findings in four country case study reports.

- **D9.4 Analytical report of interview findings**

**Phases of the research (January – September 2015):**
- Conducting of desk research (estimating the volume of the target audience – number of victims and people involved in the trafficking schemes; ascertaining whether the process of human trafficking is regulated by the law; identifying cases of law enforcement);
- Assessing the stakeholders opinion – analysis of the field work;
- Summarising the findings in an analytical report (how the process of trafficking is related to corrupt practices and schemes through comparison of the case countries)

Issues to discuss: Whether to replace Germany with Italy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Nature/ Diss. level</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D9.1</td>
<td>EUI</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Integrated report</td>
<td>28.02.2015</td>
<td>To analyse the interaction of organised crime and political corruption in different activities, such as (a) the privatisation of local public services; (b) public contracting sector (c) management and control of EU funds (mechanism of interrelation, actors and strategies of infiltration).</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>EUI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>CSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>IKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraina</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.2</td>
<td>EUI (with BCE)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Policy paper with recommendations</td>
<td>29.02.2016</td>
<td>To evaluate legislation against organised crime's infiltration in public works market (implementation and reform). To provide policy recommendations about possibilities of reform and feasibility in other EU member states, EU accession countries and neighbouring states.</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>EUI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>CSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>IKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.3</td>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Four case study reports</td>
<td>29.02.2016</td>
<td>To identify the stakeholders in the human trafficking process (victims, traffickers and institutions) and to collect information from their representatives through relevant instruments (in-depth interviews). To summarise the findings in four country case study reports.</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>CSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>CSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany/Italy</td>
<td>PSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>IKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.4</td>
<td>CSD (with PSD)</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Analytical report of interview findings</td>
<td>29.02.2016</td>
<td>To summarise and compare the findings from the four case studies. To see how the process of trafficking is related to corrupt practices and schemes through analysis of the similarities and the differences between the case countries.</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>CSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>CSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>PSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>IKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.5</td>
<td>EUI</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>International Conference in Brussels to present the results of the work package findings</td>
<td>29.02.2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WP 10 Monitoring anticorruption legislation and enforcement in Europe

- Work progress and achievements during the period from 1st September 2013 - May 30, 2014: Work in progress: Ongoing preparations for the first deliverable of WP10, deliverable WP10.1, due in October 2014 (preparation of a detailed outline for deliverable WP10.1 by the WP leaders; exchange of views and opinions with WP partners, specifically those included in the drafting of the report, concerning the outline; allocation of sections to authors; drafting)

- Highlight any results so far N/A (as mentioned above our first WP10 deliverable is due later in 2014)

- Has there been any deviations from Annex I N/A (Deviations from Annex I as regards the allocation of tasks among WP10 partners have already been communicated to you in the context of the preparations for the amendment of the Grant Agreement)

- Meetings held within the WP, purpose and summary from the meetings N/A (All our WP10 meetings take place in the context of the project’s consortium meetings)

- Future plans within the WP Work is carried out in accordance to the GA.

  - Notify also us of eventual concerns and problems within the WP. N/A

- What countries does this WP cover. In the frame of WP10, we are dealing with EU28 through cross-country analysis. There is no allocation of precise countries to individual authors.

WP 11 Work progress report for WP11: Building accountability: transparency, civil society and administrative responses

During the period 1 September 2013 and 30 May 2014, WP11 participants have initiated research efforts, met to discuss joint and complementary individual project work, and arranged an planned conference involvement.

In September, several WP11 members showcased on-going work relevant at a session at the European Consortium for Political Research Annual Meeting in Bordeaux. Participating members included Alice Mattoni, Heather Marquette, Claudia Baez Camargo and Marcia Grimes, with Monika Bauhr acting as chair and Alina Mungiu-Pipidi as discussant. The session, entitled “The institutional conditionants of non-state actors' efforts to enhance good government” was well-attended.

As indicated under the first point in the original “Description of work and role of partners,” the Quality of Government Institute together with partners at University College London organized a workshop for all partners involved in WP11 to develop tools for empirical analyses and to agree upon
a common approach. The workshop took place 18-19 November 2013 in London and all participant institutions were represented. Participants presented papers, eleven in all, which delineated their planned research approach, conceptualization of key terms, and in particular measurement. Based on these contributions, the workshop ended with a general discussion aimed at specifying ways forward, both analytical as well as organizational.

A second undertaking is the launch of the Quality of Government expert survey. Public administration experts in 196 countries have been contacted and asked to report on specific organizational aspects related to accountability within the public sector in their country. The survey is a follow-up of a previous study, which will considerably add to the analytical power of the study of accountability and transparency, as it allows for both country comparative analyses but also changes within countries over time. The data from the survey will become available in the coming months, and once cleaned, will be the basis for the first deliverable.

Finally, the partners submitted a successful bid to arrange a session at the ECPR Joint Sessions in 2015, to be held 29 March - 2 April at the University of Warsaw. The session, entitled “The intricacies of accountability: horizontal, vertical and diagonal mechanisms to combat corruption” will both offer an opportunity for WP11 participants to meet and discuss findings with one another, but more importantly also to disseminate the results of the WP, and to widen the research network.

Finally, we have to date not encountered any problems within the work package and have not had to make any deviations from Annex I.

Summary of all WP’s country covered so far:

WP 1 none

WP 2

- Medieval Iberia and England,
- Medieval Islamic Caliphate
- Late-medieval/Renaissance Italy
- Early Modern Romania
- Modern Sweden
- Modern Denmark
- Modern Germany
- Modern Netherlands
Please bear in mind that this coverage will be significantly expanded through the conference and edited volume/s to include Ancient Greece and Rome, medieval France, Tudor England, Ottoman Empire, Modern U.S, Italy, and Greece.

**WP 3**

- Poland
- Georgia
- South Korea
- Taiwan
- Uruguay
- Chile, Costa-Rica
- Rwanda, Botswana
- Qatar, (GIGA)
- Bulgaria
- Estonia
- Latvia
- Croatia
- In addition countries like Tunisia and Egypt were discussed, but the work on them will be continued and finalized in the WP8 at a later stage.

**WP 4**

**Countries under investigation and regions**

- Italy (2 regions: Lombardy, Monza and Apulia, Lecce)
- Hungary (Budapest district)
- Bosnia (Sarajevo)
- Russia (4 regions)
- Turkey (2 regions)
- Kosovo (Pristina)
- Tanzania (2 regions)
- Mexico (2 regions)
- Japan

**WP 5:**

- Austria,
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Czech Rep
- Denmark
- Germany
- Greece,
- France,
- Finland
- Hungary
- Ireland
- Italy
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovakia
- Spain
- Sweden
- Serbia (with Kosovo)
- Turkey
- Ukraine (6 regions including Crimea)
- United Kingdom.
- Additional countries included in the EQI measures (national level data only):
  - Cyprus
  - Malta
  - Latvia
  - Lithuania
  - Estonia
  - Luxembourg

**WP6:**

- Italy
- France
- United Kingdom
- Hungary
- Romania
- Slovakia
- Latvia

**WP 7:**

- BiH
- Azerbaijan
- Portugal
- Romania
Country coverage: no comprehensive country reports as such are foreseen for this workpackage. Case studies on different aspects of social accountability will take place in the countries listed above and will inform a synthesis report. Country coverage of the survey will depend on the outcome of the negotiations with EBRD.

WP8:

- Hungary
- Croatia
- Romania
- Turkey
- Bulgaria
- Germany
- Ukraine
- Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Kosovo
- Tunisia
- Egypt
- Ghana
- Tanzania

Future plans include: data visualization of procurement risk on Hungary and several workshops: on Institutions in public procurement for the infrastructure sector (Slovakia, Romania, Turkey, and Hungary) and links between EU funds and good governance (Bulgaria, Greece). Next WP8 meeting will take place in October 2014.

WP9:

- Italy
- Hungary
- Bulgaria
- Kosovo
- Russia
- Ukraine
- Belgium
- Germany
WP 10

In the frame of WP10, we are dealing with EU28 through cross-country analysis. There is no allocation of precise countries to individual authors.

WP11

Conducts a global expert survey