



Integrity, Transparency and Accountability
in the Defence and Related Security Sector

Reference Curriculum



Good governance and Building Integrity in the defence and related security sector

NATO Building Integrity Education and Training Discipline



Good governance and Building Integrity in the defence and related security sector

NATO Building Integrity Education and Training Discipline

Foreword

“The supreme quality for leadership is unquestionably integrity. Without it, no real success is possible, no matter whether it is on a section gang, a football field, in an army, or in an office.”

Dwight D. Eisenhower



At NATO, we are taking forward the legacy of the first Supreme Allied Commander Europe, bringing integrity to the core of our business.

Building Integrity is our approach to addressing the risk of corruption in the defence sector and its negative impact on defence budgets, public trust and operational effectiveness. We recognise that corruption and security are interlinked and that lack of good governance in the defence sector is a security challenge.

We are determined to enhance integrity as a distinct academic discipline within NATO. Since 2012, with the adoption of the NATO Building Integrity Education and Training Plan by the North Atlantic Council, we have been working to strengthen integrity within defence institutions through education.

Strengthening integrity and good governance is a challenging task with no ready-made solutions. It requires political commitment, strong leadership, a long-term perspective and the right mix of tools and good practices to incentivise change and foster sustainable reforms. Education is key to success. Education is a vector for sustaining reforms and promoting a culture of integrity as well as for developing new capabilities.

To attain this vision, we have developed this Reference Curriculum with the support of a multi-national working group of subject matter experts led by NATO BI staff. It is intended as a guide for nations, Allies and partner countries, who are engaged in implementing good governance reforms and revising their own national curricula to incorporate BI themes, or developing new courses to meet national BI requirements.

I would like to express appreciation to all members of the working group who contributed to the development of this guide. Resources for the development of this guide were provided by the NATO Building Integrity Trust Fund and the US Office of the Secretary of Defence.

The NATO staff look forward to continuing to work with partners and national authorities to enhance BI education and training and to share best practices.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Manza'.

Dr. John Manza
Assistant Secretary General
Operations

About this Reference Curriculum

Recognizing the impact of poor governance and corruption as a security risk and the importance of incorporating BI principles into existing education and training activities this Reference Curriculum is intended as a guide to assist both NATO Allies and partners in enhancing education and training and mainstreaming BI. It is part of NATO's ongoing commitment to defence institution building and strengthening transparency, accountability and integrity in the defence and related security sectors.

The Curriculum is not intended to be an exhaustive guide to all possible good governance and anti-corruption learning objectives and reference materials. The aim is to provide BI specific material that can be embedded into existing courses, providing a series of flexible options that can be tailored to meet national requirements. The learning objectives have been designed for civilian and military staff officers up to Head of Section (military audience of OF2-OF5) with an intermediate level of knowledge. On the advice of the 1325 team at NATO HQ, gender has been incorporated into the proposed modules. BI is a cross cutting issue and institutions are encouraged to make use of subject matter experts (hereinafter, SMEs) drawn from national and

international administrations, civil society and the private sector.

The Curriculum is organised into four main chapters including learning objectives, study questions and references. The four chapters are:

- *Understanding Corruption as a Security Risk and Importance of Building Integrity*
- *Building Integrity and Public Administration*
- *Building Integrity in Management and Delivery of Defence and Security*
- *Building Integrity in Operations and Defence Engagement*

This Reference Curriculum has been developed by a NATO IS led BI Working Group of SMEs from Allied and partner nations, it complements similar NATO Reference Curricula developed through the Defence Education Enhancement Programme. It should be viewed as a first step in mainstreaming BI into NATO and national education and training systems. Nations are encouraged to provide feedback and national experiences including case studies to further enhance this reference curriculum. For ease of reference it also includes key reference documents.

Additional chapters will be developed based on identified needs or requirements.

NATO Building Integrity Policy

1. NATO member states form a unique community of common values, committed to the principles of individual liberty, democracy, human rights and the rule of law. They all stand united in a common cause: to ensure that the Alliance remains an unparalleled community of freedom, peace, security, and shared values. Dialogue and cooperation with partner nations, in line with the principles enshrined in the Basic Document of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), can make a concrete contribution to enhancing international security and to defending the values on which the Alliance is based.
2. Allies reaffirm their conviction that transparent and accountable defence institutions under democratic control are fundamental to stability in the Euro-Atlantic area and essential for international security cooperation. They also recognise that corruption and poor governance are security challenges as they undermine democracy, the rule of law and economic development, erode public trust in defence institutions and have a negative impact on operational effectiveness.
3. The NATO Building Integrity policy, described in this document, draws upon experience gained through the implementation of the Building Integrity Programme launched in 2007 by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. The NATO Building Integrity Programme is part of NATO's commitment to strengthen integrity, transparency and accountability in the defence and related security sector. Integrity is the link between behaviour and principles. In institutional terms, integrity is directly linked to good governance. Reinforcing an institution's integrity is a question of institutionalising the principles that we want the institution to stand for, as well as a question of socialising these norms and values among its personnel.
4. The NATO Building Integrity programme of activities is open to NATO Allies, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, Mediterranean Dialogue, Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, Partners across the globe and Colombia. Requests from other countries are reviewed by NATO on a case-by-case basis. It promotes good practices and provides participating countries with tailored expertise and support to make defence and security institutions more effective and efficient.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

5. The NATO Building Integrity policy is guided by the following principles:
 - 5.1. Building Integrity is a key element of Alliance activities. The importance of implementing measures to improve integrity building, anti-corruption and good governance applies to NATO, Allies and partners alike. Allies and partners are committed to support and promote the principles and implementation

of integrity, transparency and accountability in accordance with international norms and practices established for the defence and related security sector.

- 5.2. Effective and transparent national procedures need to be in place to assess corruption-related security risks and defence requirements, and to develop and maintain efficient and interoperable defence capabilities corresponding to these requirements and international commitments.
- 5.3. Building Integrity should be an integral part of NATO work and activities internally and should be taken forward as part of the Institutional Adaptation. The International Staff, International Military Staff, Military Commands and Agencies should continue to make efforts to build integrity, transparency and accountability and promote good governance within their structures.

OVERARCHING AIM

6. Building Integrity and the development of effective, transparent and accountable defence institutions which are responsive to unpredictable security challenges, including those of a hybrid nature, contribute significantly to the Alliance's mission to safeguard the freedom and security of its members.
7. Recognising the cross-cutting nature of Building Integrity, and depending on the respective responsibilities of NATO, Allies and partners, the policy aims to:

NATO

- 7.1. Integrate Building Integrity within the context of NATO's wider policy objectives and the implementation of the Alliance's core tasks.
- 7.2. Provide a synchronised and structured approach to make Building Integrity conceptually robust and operational across NATO's political and military lines of activity.
- 7.3. Align efforts with other international organisations, as appropriate.

ALLIES AND PARTNERS

- 7.4. Continue to develop and update, on a voluntary basis, national related building integrity policies, doctrines and training.
- 7.5. Reaffirm nations' intentions to, on a voluntary basis, share lessons learned and best practices within the auspices of the NATO Building Integrity Programme and its activities.
- 7.6. Promote local ownership and enhance institutional and individual capacity building.

CORE TASKS

8. Elements of Building Integrity, to include the concepts of integrity, transparency and accountability, should be utilised to improve the management of defence resources and capability development. These elements should be incorporated in the fulfilment of the NATO's core tasks.

COLLECTIVE DEFENCE

- 8.1. Collective defence depends on effective and efficient defence institutions and should be based on the principles of integrity, transparency and accountability, maximising the value of money to further build defence capabilities and ensure better resourced Armed Forces. Building Integrity should continue to be strengthened in national defence and related security sector in order to ensure their resilience especially against corruption.

CRISIS MANAGEMENT

- 8.2. NATO has a unique and robust set of political and military capabilities to address a wide spectrum of crises. In the context of an ongoing operation, capacity building activities are conducted in parallel with an ongoing crisis management response. Taking into account that corruption erodes public trust in government, affects economic development, and perpetuates conflicts, Building Integrity could have a preventive effect. Building Integrity should be considered in all stages of NATO-led operations and missions.

COOPERATIVE SECURITY

- 8.3. The wide network of relations between NATO and partner countries and organisations provides a particular impetus for NATO Building Integrity. In line with NATO's Partnership policy, NATO and its partners continue to work together and where possible increase cooperation within and across the various partnerships formats, to promote the implementation of Building Integrity principles, share lessons learned and good practices.

MULTIDIMENSIONAL PERSPECTIVES

9. Mainstreaming Building Integrity in NATO's core tasks is complementary to national efforts. Building Integrity activities must be flexible and tailor-made.
10. NATO Building Integrity focus is on corruption prevention in the defence and related security sector, and is complementary to efforts by other international actors. In the context of bilateral, regional and multilateral programmes of cooperation, the Building Integrity policy should align with these efforts and the coordination among the various engaged actors should be strengthened as appropriate, and in line with the Comprehensive Approach Action Plan.
11. NATO is committed to ensure that all military and civilian personnel in defence and related security

sector of nations participating in the Building Integrity Programme are aware of consequences of corruption and that leaders have the necessary awareness and knowledge to create an organisational culture of integrity, transparency and accountability. The NATO Building Integrity Education and Training Plan agreed by the North Atlantic Council in 2012 is designed to mainstream Building Integrity into NATO's Education and Training activities with regard to current and future operations and institutional enhancement in support of national initiatives to this end. This Plan supports national efforts already in place towards strengthening national individual and institutional capacity building as well as enhancing the interoperability of their forces through education and training.

12. The Building Integrity policy continues to support NATO's priorities on the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution 1325, and related resolutions, on Women, Peace and Security. Therefore, the gender perspective will continue to be mainstreamed into the NATO Building Integrity tools and programme of activities including education and training.
13. NATO Building Integrity is in line with the NATO Partnership policy. It will continue to strengthen the synergies with partnership tools such as the Planning and Review Process (PARP), the Defence Education Enhancement Programme (DEEP) and the Professional Development Programme (PDP). NATO Building Integrity will also continue to contribute to the Defence and Related Security Capacity Building Initiative (DCBI) and the Partnership Interoperability Initiative (PII).
14. A network of Implementing Partners drawn from NATO countries and partners also contributes to the NATO Building Integrity Programme. They will continue to provide expertise, host events, and conduct research and analysis.
15. NATO, Allies and partners should ensure that Building Integrity principles are included in their respective public diplomacy strategies and activities. Defence and security leaders benefit from a thorough strategy of communication to further promote and support reforms aimed at strengthening good governance.
16. Civil society and media are essential in ensuring integrity, transparency and accountability. They also have a key role in raising awareness of corruption and mismanagement of resources. NATO Building Integrity expands outreach and cooperation.

IMPLEMENTATION AND WAY AHEAD

17. Following the endorsement by the NATO Heads of State and Government at the Warsaw Summit, the NATO Building Integrity policy is supported by an Action Plan. Development, implementation and review of the Building Integrity Action Plan would be led by the PASP-led Building Integrity Task Force reflecting the joint combined efforts of the International Staff and NATO Military Authorities. The North Atlantic Council will be updated on an annual basis on the implementation of the NATO Building Integrity policy.

Table of Contents

I. UNDERSTANDING CORRUPTION AS A SECURITY RISK AND THE IMPORTANCE OF BUILDING INTEGRITY

Block One: Understanding Corruption

Module 1.1.1: Corruption as a Security Risk.....	10
Module 1.1.2: Corruption in Defence and Security: Facilitating Factors and Impact	11
Module 1.1.3: Comprehensive Assessment of Corruption Risks.....	12
Module 1.1.4: Legal Frameworks	13

Block Two: Integrity, Ethics and Culture

Module 1.2.1: Ethics.....	14
Module 1.2.2: Cultural Dimension of Integrity Building.....	16

II. GOOD GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Block One: Principles of Good Governance

Module 2.1.1: Representation	19
Module 2.1.2: Human Rights	20
Module 2.1.3: Gender	20
Module 2.1.4: Transparency.....	21
Module 2.1.5: Accountability	22
Module 2.1.6: Checks and Balances.....	22
Module 2.1.7: Rule of Law	23
Module 2.1.8: Impartiality.....	23
Module 2.1.9: Reliability and Predictability.....	24
Module 2.1.10: Strategic approach to Building Integrity	24

Block Two: Functioning of Public Institutions

Module 2.2.1: Executive branch	25
Module 2.2.2: Legislative branch.....	26
Module 2.2.3: Judiciary branch.....	26

Block Three: Checks and Balances

Module 2.3.1: Civil-Military Relations	27
Module 2.3.2: Parliamentary oversight of integrity in defence sector	28
Module 2.3.3: Judiciary control of integrity in defence sector	28
Module 2.3.4: Media	29
Module 2.3.5: Civil Society Organisations	29
Module 2.3.6: Specialised Anti-corruption Bodies (including international organizations	30

III. BUILDING INTEGRITY IN MANAGEMENT AND DELIVERY

Block One: Human Resources Management

Module 3.1.1: Human Resources Strategy	34
--	----

Module 3.1.2: Decision-Making in Human Resources	35
Module 3.1.3: Ethical Conduct of Officials and Whistle-Blower Protection.....	35
Module 3.1.4: Gender	36

Block Two: Finances and Acquisition

Module 3.2.1: Defence Planning, Budgeting and Financial Management.....	37
Module 3.2.2: Transparency and corruption risks in acquisition	37

Block Three: Mainstreaming BI

Module 3.3.1: Integrity of decision-making.....	39
Module 3.3.2: Internal Checks and Balances	39
Module 3.3.3: Designing and Managing BI programmes	40

IV. OPERATIONS & DEFENCE ENGAGEMENT

Block One: Building Integrity in Military Operations

Module 4.1.1: Types and Pathways of Corruption Affecting Military Operations	44
Module 4.1.2: Corruption Risks and Mission Success	45
Module 4.1.3: Addressing Corruption through the NATO Planning Process	45
Module 4.1.4: Standard Operating Procedures: Techniques, Practices and Processes Limiting Risks of Corruption within the Military Mission.....	46
Module 4.1.5: Techniques, Practices and Processes for Countering Corruption during Operations.....	46
Module 4.1.6: Corruption Risks in Mission Sustainment.....	47
Module 4.1.7: Countering Corruption through the Comprehensive Approach	47
Module 4.1.8: Leadership and Effective Decision-Making	48
Module 4.1.9: Development of Indigenous Military Security and Police Forces.....	48
Module 4.1.10: Assessing and Monitoring Anti- and Counter-Corruption Interventions in Military Operations	49

Block Two: Defence Engagement and Capacity Building

Module 4.2.1: Corruption Risks in Defence Engagement, Security Force Assistance, Stability Policing and Defence and Related Security Capacity Building.....	50
Module 4.2.2: Corruption pathways and corruption risk assessment in host nation defence integrity building	51
Module 4.2.3: Mitigating corruption risks in defence engagement: building integrity, building capacity.....	51
Module 4.2.4: Mitigating corruption risks in defence engagement: working with external partners.....	52
Module 4.2.5: Best practices in building sustainable oversight, anti-corruption and internal control structures	52



1

**Understanding corruption as
a security risk and the importance
of building integrity**

Theme Description

This theme introduces students to the concept of corruption as a security risk, how it affects the defence and security sectors, and the link between corruption and conflict. It also covers methods of evaluating corruption risks, legal frameworks, ethics and the role of organisational cultures in preventing or facilitating corruption.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- Understand and explain corruption as a security risk;
- Understand and explain corruption phenomena and what impact corruption can make on defence and security institutions;
- Identify and analyse sources and the circumstances facilitating corruption in defence and security institutions;
- Identify and evaluate corruption risks in defence and security institutions;
- Analyse effective legal frameworks related to corruption in view of existing international norms and good practices;
- Explain individual and organisational behaviour which facilitates or inhibits corruption, and understand how behaviour is shaped by ethical and cultural influences, including gender.

TOPIC LIST

BLOCK ONE: UNDERSTANDING CORRUPTION

Module 1.1.1: Corruption as a Security Risk

Module 1.1.2: Corruption in Defence and Security: Facilitating Factors and Impact

Module 1.1.3: Comprehensive Assessment of Corruption Risks

Module 1.1.4: Legal Frameworks

BLOCK TWO: INTEGRITY, ETHICS AND CULTURE

Module 1.2.1: Ethics

Module 1.2.2: Cultural Dimensions of Integrity Building

BLOCK ONE: UNDERSTANDING CORRUPTION AS A SECURITY RISK

Block description

The aim of this block is to discuss the concept and meaning of corruption, the possible sources and impact of corruption including helping students to understand corruption and poor governance are security challenges, they undermine democracy, the rule of law and economic development, erode public trust in defence institutions and have a negative impact on operational effectiveness.

Defence and security institutions are expected to react quickly and decisively to crisis situations, and to meet urgent requirements that, as a rule, involve sensitive information and have an operational imperative. Limited transparency of some activities, pressure to act, combined with discretionary powers can under certain circumstances contribute to corruption.

The block also covers legal frameworks and teaches methods of identifying and assessing the risks of corruption. The block is best introduced by an expert who has theoretical and legal knowledge as well as experience in the defence and security sector. The students should be provided with the relevant international legal acts and conventions from the UN, Council of Europe, OECD and OSCE.

Block Learning Objectives

Upon successful completion of the block, students will be:

- Able to understand the links between corruption and conflict, and the impact of corruption on international security;
- Introduced to the concepts and methodology necessary to understand corruption;
- Introduced to the concepts and methodology of corruption risk assessment;
- Introduced to the international legal framework concerned with identifying and preventing corruption, in order to enable them to understand and analyse national and institutional legislation.

Issues for consideration

- What are the common accepted definitions of corruption used by relevant international and national institutions?
- What are the academic definitions of corruption in the theoretical sense?
- What are the links between corruption and violent extremism?
- What are the links between corruption, conflict and illegal activities such as human trafficking and trade in conflict resources?
- What are the best practises/methods for assessing the impact of corruption and reducing the risk of corruption?
- What are the specific modes of corruption in different defence spheres, such as procurement, finances, personnel, peacekeeping operations, etc.?
- What are the risk factors that could promote corruption in defence institutions?

- How can we assess the corruption risks for defence institutions?
- What are the linkages between corruption and gender?
- What are the main pieces of international legislation related to corruption in defence?
- What common aspects enable or limit the effectiveness of national legislation in practice?
- How can national legislation be adjusted to match the international legal framework?
- How can countries undertake comparative analysis on corruption-related mechanisms and legislation?

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures by expert practitioners, and case studies. Case studies could include comparing and contrasting the coverage of international legal frameworks;
- Students will be assessed by their knowledge and understanding of corruption concept and risks which can be assessed during their case study discussions.

References

- Alex Cobham, *Corrupting Perceptions: Why Transparency International's flagship corruption index falls short*, Foreign Policy, 2013. <http://foreignpolicy.com/2013/07/22/corrupting-perceptions/>
- Centre for Integrity in the Defence Sector, *Criteria for good governance in the defence sector International standards and principles*, 2015. <http://cids.no/wp-content/uploads/pdf/7215-Criteria-for-Good-Governance-in-the-Defence-Sector-k6.pdf>
- Mitchell A. Seligson, *The impact of corruption on regime legitimacy: A comparative study of four Latin American countries*, *The Journal of Politics* 64.02, 2002:408-433.
- Gabriella R. Montinola, Robert W. Jackman, *Sources of corruption: a cross-country study*, *British Journal of Political Science* 32.01, 2002:147-170.
- NATO, *Building Integrity Self-Assessment Questionnaire and Peer Review Process A Diagnostic Tool for National Defence Establishments*, 2015. http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2015_03/20150309_150309-bi-saq-en.pdf
- NORAD, *Contextual Choices in Fighting Corruption: Lessons Learned*, 2011. http://evalueringsportalen.no/evaluating/contextual-choices-in-fighting-corruption-lessons-learned/Report_4_2011_web.pdf/@inline
- OECD, *Consequences of Corruption at the Sector Level and Implications for Economic Growth and Development*, March 2015. <http://www.oecd.org/publications/consequences-of-corruption-at-the-sector-level-and-implications-for-economic-growth-and-development-9789264230781-en.htm>
- Paul Collier, *The Bottom Billion: Why the poorest countries are failing and what can be done about it*, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Lawrence Lessig, *Institutional Corruption Defined*, *Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics*, Vol. 41, No. 3, 2013.
- Staffan Andersson, Paul N. Heywood, *The Politics of Perception: Use and Abuse of Transparency International's Approach to Measuring Corruption*. *Political Studies* 57(4), 2009.
- Transparency International, *Building integrity and reducing corruption in defence & security: 20 practical reforms*, 2011. https://www.dropbox.com/s/iuob15qfey32ihj/2011-02_Handbook_IntegrityReducingCorruption.pdf
- Transparency International, *Corruption Perceptions Index*. <http://www.transparency.org/research/cpi/overview>
- Transparency International, *Global Corruption Barometer*. <http://www.transparency.org/research/gcb/overview>
- Transparency International, *Government Defence Anticorruption Index 2015*. <http://government.defenceindex.org>
- Vikas Anand, Blake E. Ashforth, and Mahendra Joshi, *Business as usual: The acceptance and perpetuation of corruption in organizations*, *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 18, No. 2, 2004.
- UK Department for International Development, *Why corruption matters: understanding causes, effects and how to address them. Evidence paper on corruption*, January 2015.
- U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre, *International Good Practice in Anti-Corruption Legislation*. U4 Expert Answer. <http://www.u4.no/publications/international-good-practice-in-anti-corruption-legislation/>
- World Bank, *World Development Report, Conflict, Security and Development*, 2011.
- http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWDRS/Resources/WDR2011_Full_Text.pdf

Module 1.1.1: Corruption as Security Risk

Module Description

This module introduces theoretical definitions and concepts of corruption in general, with focus on the security sector. The module describes potential drivers of corruption and the relationship between corruption and conflict.

Module Learning Objectives

Upon successful completion of the module students will be able to:

- Compare and explain definitions of the term “corruption” and “good governance”;
- Identify drivers and facilitating factors of corruption in the defence and security sector;
- Understand the impact of corruption on peacebuilding;
- Understand how corrupt activities such as trafficking are used to fund conflict;
- Understand the concept and analyse cases of “state capture”;
- Understand how corruption and conflict feed on each other (interrelate), and link these issues to the role of security and defence institutions.

Issues for Consideration

- What are the various definitions of corruption and good governance?
- What are the consequences of corruption in defence on the level of defence capability, operational effectiveness, and the performance of defence organisations?
- What are the drivers and enablers of corruption in defence and security institutions?
- What are the links between corrupt practices in defence and security and governance?
- What are the conditions that make security and defence organisations prone to corruption? What links exist between corruption and conflict?

Learning Methodology

- Lecture;
- Group discussion of case studies;
- Students will be assessed on the basis of their activity in the discussions and the presentation of case study analyses.

References

- Alina Mungiu-Pippidi, *The Quest for Good Governance: How Societies Develop Control of Corruption*, Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Alix J. Boucher, *Mapping and Fighting Corruption in War-torn States*, Henry L. Stimson Centre, 2007.
- Cheyanne Church, *Thought Piece: Peacebuilding and Corruption: How many they collide?*, *The Nexus: Corruption, Conflict and Peacebuilding Colloquium*, The Fletcher School, 2007.
- Daniel Jordan Smith, *A Culture of Corruption: Everyday Deception and Popular Discontent in Nigeria*, Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Emil Bolongaita, *Controlling Corruption in Post-conflict Countries*, Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, 2005.
- Institute for Economics and Peace, *Peace and Corruption: Lowering Corruption, a Transformative Factor for Peace*, 2015.
- Jessica C. Teets, Erica Chenoweth, *To bribe or to bomb; do corruption and terrorism go together?*, in Robert I. Rotberg, *Corruption, Global Security and World Order*, Brookings Institution Press, 2009.
- Kimberly Thachuk, *Corruption and International Security*, SAIS Review, Vol. 25, no. 1, 2005.
- Louise I. Shelley, *Dirty Entanglements: Corruption, Crime and Terrorism*, Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Louise I. Shelly, *The Unholy Trinity: Transnational Crime, Corruption and Terrorism*, *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, no. 2, 2005:101-111.
- Phil Williams, *Criminals, Militias and Insurgents: Organized Crime in Iraq*, US Army Strategic Studies Institute, 2009.
<http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubid=930>
- Philippe Le Billon, *Corruption Peace? Peacebuilding and Post-conflict Corruption*, *International Peacekeeping*, no. 3, 2008:344-361.
- Robert I. Rotberg, *How Corruption Compromises World Peace and Stability* in Robert I. Rotberg, *Corruption, Global Security and World Order*, Brookings Institution Press, 2009.
- Sarah Chayes and the Working Group on International Security. *Corruption: The Unrecognized Threat to International Security*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Washington D.C., June 2014. http://carnegieendowment.org/files/corruption_and_security.pdf.
- Sarah Chayes and the Fragility Study Group, *Corruption and State Fragility*, Policy Brief No. 1, 2016.
- Sarah Chayes, *Thieves of State. Why Corruption threatens Global Security*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2015.
- Susan Rose-Ackerman, *Corruption and Government*, *International Peacekeeping*, no. 3, 2008:328-343
- UK Department for International Development, *Why corruption matters: understanding causes, effects and how to address them. Evidence paper on corruption*, 2015.
- UNESCAP, *What is good governance?*, 2013.
www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf
- Victoria K. Holt and Alix J. Boucher, *Framing the issue: UN Responses to corruption and Criminal Networks in post-conflict settings*, *International Peacekeeping*, no. 3, 2008:20-32.
- Walter A. Kemp, *The Business of Ethnic Conflict*, *Security Dialogue* 35, 2004:43-59.
- World Bank, *World Development Report 2011. Conflict, Security and Development*. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWDRS/Resources/WDR2011_Full_Text.pdf.

Module 1.1.2: Corruption in Defence and Security: Facilitating Factors and Impact

Module Description

This module explores further the concepts of corruption and the impacts on the defence and security sector. The module describes potential drivers of corruption and factors that enable corrupt behaviour, examining cases from different countries and cultures. The module further discusses likely consequences of corruption on the functioning of defence institutions, as well as the broader impact on their legitimacy and national integrity.

Module Learning Objectives

Upon successful completion of the module students will be able to:

- Review the specific role of defence and security institutions and role in promoting transparency, accountability and integrity;
- Understand the effects of corruption on defence capabilities, readiness, operations, and morale of military and security personnel;
- Understand how corruption reduces the legitimacy and the trust of society in the defence and security institutions.

Issues for Consideration

- What is the impact of corruption on the individual, the institution, the population and the state?
- How does corruption impact the morale of the troops and their consequent performance?
- How does corruption influence public trust in the armed forces, and what are the consequences?
- What are the links between corrupt practices in defence and security and governance?
- How do discretion and the lack of competitiveness, oversight, transparency, and accountability for results increase corruption risks?
- How do corruption risks and effects differ depending on gender?
- How do secrecy, urgency, and concern for promotion of local defence industries facilitate corruption?
- How does lack of professional civil and military cadre of management expertise, historical experience and security environment contribute to corruption in security and defence organisations?

Learning Methodology

- Lecture;
- Group discussion of case studies;
- Students will be assessed on the basis of their activity in the discussions and the presentation of case study analyses.

References

- Eurasia Daily Monitor, *Black Holes, Vanishing Roubles and Corruption in the Russian Military*, Eurasia Daily Monitor, Issue 7, 2010.
http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_

[ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=37150](https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-2444)

- Joel S. Hellman, Geraint Jones and Daniel Kaufmann, *Seize the State, Seize the Day: State Capture, Corruption, and Influence in Transition*, Policy Research Working Papers, World Bank, 2000. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-2444>.
- Mark Sedra, *Towards Second Generation Security Sector Reform in Mark Sedra, The Future of Security Sector Reform*, The Centre for International Governance Innovation, 2010:102-116. https://www.cigionline.org/sites/default/files/the_future_of_security_sector_reform.pdf
- Nathaniel Heller, *Defining and Measuring Corruption: Where Have we Come From, Where Are We Now, and What Matters for the Future* in Robert I. Rotberg, *Corruption, Global Security and World Order*, Brookings Institution Press, 2009.
- Richard Kleinfeld and the Fragility Study Group, *Fragility and Security Sector Reform*, 2016.
- Todor Tagarev, *The Corruption Curse in Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Todor Tagarev, Defence: A Compendium of Best Practices*, Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2010:3-12.
<http://defenceintegrity.eu/en/publication/corruption-curse>.
- World Bank, *World Development Report 2011, Conflict, Security and Development*. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWDRS/Resources/WDR2011_Full_Text.pdf

Module 1.1.3: Comprehensive Assessment of Corruption Risks

Module Description

The likelihood of acts of corruption and their impact differ among countries and security sector organisations, and evolve with time. As a consequence, each organisation defines the corruption challenges in a distinct way, and prioritises its efforts accordingly. The “state of the art” developments in this field show that a strong approach to addressing the challenges of corruption involves a risk mitigation framework, in which key integrity building measures aim to comprehensively reduce major corruption risks. The prerequisite for implementation of such risk mitigation framework is the rigorous review and comprehensive mapping of corruption risks for each organisation.

This module demonstrates the application of risk mapping methods in defence and security organisations that allows efficient allocation of limited organisational resources, permits tailored international assistance and encourages local ownership. At the conclusion of the module the students will be able to identify and select measures for assessing progress of integrity building programmes.

Module Learning Objectives

Upon successful completion of the module students will be able to:

- Understand the place of risk mapping in the design of BI programmes;
- Implement advanced risk mapping methods and techniques;
- Understand the strengths and limitations of perception and risk-based approaches;
- Understand the utility of benchmarking in assessing corruption risks in defence and security sectors;
- Appreciate the need for systematic collection and sharing of risk mapping data, and in particular data and evidence on corruption in defence and security organisations.

Issues for consideration

- What different risk-management frameworks exist for decision-making on resource allocation?
- What are the various approaches and methods to corruption risk mapping?
- How can we measure the likelihood and impact of corruption?
- What are the limitations of risk management frameworks and mitigation strategies?
- What is industry best practice in risk assessment and risk management?

Learning Methodology

- Lecture;
- Corruption risk mapping exercise (e.g. mapping risks in a selected functional area);
- Students will be assessed on the basis of their activity in the discussions and the presentation of their risk mapping results.

References

- Alex Cobham, *Corrupting Perceptions: Why Transparency International's flagship corruption index falls short*, Foreign Policy, 22 July 2013. <http://foreignpolicy.com/2013/07/22/corrupting-perceptions/>
- *Exercise materials from the DCAF/SEDM BI capacity building series.*
- ISO 31000 - Risk management.
- ISO 31000:2009, Risk management – Principles and guidelines.
- ISO/IEC 31010, Risk management – Risk assessment techniques.
- John Flaherty, *Role of Internal Auditors in the Anti-Corruption Battle*, The 8th International Anti-Corruption Conference. <http://www.8iacc.org/papers/jflaherty.html>
- NATO, *Building Integrity Self-Assessment Questionnaire and Peer Review Process A Diagnostic Tool for National Defence Establishments*, 2015. http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2015_03/20150309_150309-bi-saq-en.pdf
- Staffan Andersson and Paul N. Heywood, *The Politics of Perception: Use and Abuse of Transparency International's Approach to Measuring Corruption*, Political Studies 57(4), December 2009.
- Transparency International, *Government Defence Anticorruption Index*, 2015. <http://government.defenceindex.org>

Module 1.1.4: Legal Frameworks

Module Description

Corruption is widely recognised as a breach of law, but national legislative frameworks differ widely in defining corruption, and in the scope and measures envisioned to address acts of corruption. The module will examine the strengths and limitations of different approaches in creating an effective legal environment for tackling corruption. The module also introduces the international legislation related to corruption, including the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) and the Council of Europe's conventions, and examples of national anti-corruption regulations. Students will have the opportunity to compare national norms with international good practice, and identify gaps and implementation challenges.

Module Learning Objectives

Upon successful completion of the module students will be able to:

- Understand the requirements for implementation of the existing national legal framework in their organisation;
- Discuss the rationale for legally defining the concept of “integrity”;
- Describe and explain legal definitions of corruption;
- Compare strengths and limitations of different national legislative counter-corruption frameworks in reducing corruption;
- Analyse legal provisions for bodies with investigative or enforcement powers;
- Analyse relevant functional legislation, such as on procurement, military and civil service conduct, finance management, or resource utilisation;
- Understand the legal significance and utility of codes of conduct;
- Understand the requirements and approaches implemented in international counter-corruption norms, with focus on the UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC);
- Be aware of other relevant international/regional legislation such as on anti-money laundering, asset seizure and organised crime;
- Be aware of dedicated international bodies such as the Financial Action Task Force (FATF).

Issues for consideration

- What are the key legal definitions of corruption and their main elements?
- What gaps exist in these definitions?
- How to complement preventive and punitive measures against corruption?
- How do criminal and civil law differ, and complement each other, in regard to corruption?
- What special investigation techniques are applicable in identifying and investigating cases of corruption?
- What are the differences between “freezing,” “seizure,” and “confiscation” of assets acquired as a result of corruption?
- Are current legal measures sufficient to effectively protect witnesses, experts, victims, and reporting persons/whistle-blowers?

- Are special powers necessary to investigate and prosecute corrupt officials and intermediaries?
- What forms of corruption occur beyond the public sector and how do they impact the defence and security sector?

Learning Methodology

- Lecture;
- Group discussion of case studies;
- Students will be assessed on the basis of their activity in the discussions and the presentation of case study analyses.

References

- *Corruption Laws: A non-lawyers' guide to laws and offences in the UK relating to corrupt behaviour*, Transparency International-UK, 2016.
<http://www.transparency.org.uk/publications/corruption-laws-a-non-lawyers-guide-to-laws-and-offences-in-the-uk-relating-to-corrupt-behaviour/>
- *Council of Europe Conventions*.
 - *Criminal Law Convention on Corruption* (ETS No. 173).
 - *Civil Law Convention on Corruption* (ETS No. 174).
 - *Additional Protocol to the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption* (ETS No. 191).
 - *Recommendation of the GRECO Council of Ministers* (No. R (2000) 10) *on codes of conduct for public officials, including a Model code of conduct for public officials*.
 - *Model code of conduct for public officials*.
- *Francisco Cardona, Tackling conflicts of interest in the public sector, Guides to Good Governance. no 2, Centre for Integrity in the Defence Sector, 2015.*
<http://cids.no/wp-content/uploads/pdf/cids/7250-DSS-Tackling-conflicts-Skjerm.pdf>
- *OECD Convention, Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International.*
<http://www.oecd.org/corruption/oecdantibriberyconvention.htm>
- *The Bribery Act 2010.*
<http://www.transparency.org.uk/our-work/business-integrity/bribery-act/>
- *Todor Tagarev, Regulatory Frameworks in Todor Tagarev, Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Defence: A Compendium of Best Practices, Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2010:172-192.*
<http://defenceintegrity.eu/en/publication/regulatory-frameworks>.
- *United Nations Convention Against Corruption, Background on the United Nations Convention Against Corruption.*
<https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/treaties/CAC/>
- *U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre, International Good Practice in Anti-Corruption Legislation*
<http://www.u4.no/publications/international-good-practice-in-anti-corruption-legislation/>

BLOCK TWO: UNDERSTANDING INTEGRITY, ETHICS AND IMPACT OF CULTURE

Block description

This block examines the role of ethics and the concept of Building Integrity in public administration. It aims to provide the students with a deeper understanding of their own individual decision-making with account of moral and societal norms, peer pressure, and organizational culture generally. The block features problem analysis and moral reasoning in the context of government service in the national defence and security sectors. It begins from the distinction between ethics and the law, considering case studies that present ethical issues about which the law is silent, and continues with a survey of those classical forms of moral reasoning (such as utilitarianism and the ethics of duty) that address and help resolve ethical problems. It compares free market conceptions of profit-making with the activities of acquisition and contracting in government and public service, and examine proposals for designing institutions and procedures that provide accountability, oversight and transparency, and so inhibit the onset of corruption in the public sector.

Block Learning Objectives:

- Understand the role and importance of ethics in the administration of the defence and security sector;
- Apply understanding of ethics to case studies of integrity challenges;
- Explain how organisational culture can affect an organisation's resilience or susceptibility when faced with corruption;
- Analyse an organisation's culture to identify areas which may promote vulnerabilities to corruption.

Issues for consideration

- Why are ethics important in the defence and security sector, and how do they assist with the resolution of moral dilemmas that arise in organisational settings?
- How do individuals resist pressure in corrupt organisational culture?
- How can organisations promote ethical behaviour?
- How are organisational cultures formed, and how can they be changed?
- How do different national and organisational cultures develop varying understandings of corruption, and how does this affect defence capacity building?

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures by expert practitioners, and case studies. Case studies could include comparing and contrasting the coverage of international legal frameworks;
- Students will be assessed by their knowledge and understanding of corruption concept and risks which can be assessed during their case study discussions.

Module 1.2.1: Ethics

Module Description

This module provides the students with a deeper understanding of their own individual decision-making (e.g. whether or not to become involved in corrupt activities, motivated by loyalty, fear, or greed), taking into account of moral and societal norms, peer pressure, and organizational culture generally, as well as the strengths and limits of codes of ethics. It features problem analysis and moral reasoning in the context of government service in the national defence and security sectors, focusing on acquisition of capital assets, management of public programmes, and decisions on recruitment and promotion.

Module Learning Objectives

Based on the lectures, study of recommended reading materials, discussions, and case-study analysis, the students will be able to:

- Appreciate the distinction between ethics and the law as 'governance concepts';
- Explain the content and the evolution of the concepts of internal and external integrity in organizational systems and their individual staff members;
- Distinguish correctly between moral dilemmas (as ambiguities in discerning the correct or best national strategy) and tests of character or integrity (in which individuals break the law, defy regulation, and knowingly engage in fraud, corruption, nepotism and abuse of power);
- Apply the "case study" method with regards to issues of integrity throughout the national security system.

Issues for consideration

- What are ethics and what are basic ethical values in security and defence organizations?
- What are the critical reasoning, assessment, and resolution skills required to address moral dilemmas as analytical problems?
- What are the impacts on individual choice and decision-making within institutional and organizational settings (sometimes characterized by peer pressure and corrupt activities)?
- How do classical "moral theories of the right and the good" shape the "strategic thinking" about the ultimate ends of individual or corporate action, and the most appropriate means of attaining those ends? (especially in situations in which prevailing applicable law provides no meaningful guidance)
- What guidance do Aristotle's theory of moral character and Kant's moral principles provide in elaborating counter-corruption strategies?
- What shapes resilience ("moral courage") of individuals confronted with group pressure and corrupt customary practices, permitting such individuals' strength to resist these everyday tendencies to corruption?
- What are the mechanisms security and defence organizations can use for promoting ethical behaviour?

Learning Methodology

- Lecture;
- Group discussion of case studies;
- Students will be assessed on the basis of their activity in the discussions and the presentation of case study analyses.

References

- Alain Fogue-Tedom, *Effective Democratization and the Development of Moral Competencies in the Armed Forces of African States* in Jr. George R. Lucas, *Routledge Handbook of Military Ethics*, Routledge Publishers, Ch. 10, 2015.
- George Lucas, *Military Ethics: What Everyone Needs to Know*, Oxford University Press: Ch. 5., 2015.
- George Lucas, Rick Rubel, *Case Studies in Military Ethics*, Pearson, 3 Ed., 2012.
- Husbandry Provisioning Scandal in U.S. Navy. <http://archive.defensenews.com/article/20131121/DEFREG02/311210016/Another-US-Navy-Officer-Implicated-Bribery-Scandal-Sacked>.
- Patricia J. Cook, *Problem Analysis and Ethical Dilemmas (PAED)*, Pearson, 2010.
- Philip M. Nichols, *The Psychic Costs of Violating Corruption Laws*, *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law*, 45, 2012.
- Major General Robert Latiff, *Ethical Issues in Defense Systems Acquisition* in Jr. George R. Lucas, *Routledge Handbook of Military Ethics*, Routledge Publishers, Ch. 20, 2015.
- Stephen Coleman, *Military Ethics*, Oxford OUP, 2012.
- U.S. Department of Defence, *Encyclopaedia of Ethical Failure: Department of Defense, Office of Gen Counsel, Standards of Conduct Office*, 2014.
http://www.dod.mil/dodgc/defense_ethics/dod_oge/eef_complete.pdf

Module 1.2.2: Cultural Dimension of Integrity Building

Module Description

Individual behaviour is shaped by perceptions, attitudes, traditions, organisational practices and social norms. This module will introduce the students the concepts of organisational culture, the roots and features of organisational culture in defence and security organisations and its linkages to corruption. Students will analyse external factors affecting formation of organisational cultures and how they reduce or increase corruption risks. The students will be given practical examples and cases of how organisational culture facilitates corruption in defence and security organisations in different countries. They will analyse case studies in order to understand relationship of culture and corruption in defence and security organisations. The goal is to provide understanding of the impact organisational culture has on facilitating or preventing corruption in defence and security organisations.

Module Learning Objectives

Based on the lectures, study of recommended reading materials, discussions, and case-study analysis, the students will be able to:

- Understand the concepts of organizational culture;
- Understand how culture shapes individual and group behaviour and may facilitate or prevent corruption;
- Identify the features (values, perceptions, attitudes, norms) of organizational culture and analyse how they are linked to corruption in the practices of defence and security organisations;
- Analyse the influence of external factors (legacy, history, national culture, traditions, etc.) on organizational culture;
- Understand the role of personalities/leaders, and their sources of power, in the formation of organisational culture from the perspective of corruption risks;
- Identify what threats to integrity may penetrate into the national security policy-making process and practice from corruption in national and international social systems;
- Understand the relationship between national/organizational cultural features and the 5P model (philosophy, policy, programmes, processes, practices) in terms of integrity building;
- Understand the dichotomy between psychological contracts and formal contracts and the integrity dilemmas it generates.

Issues for consideration

- What are the general features and definitions of culture/organizational culture?
- How is organizational culture formed, and what are the factors affecting its formation?
- How the understanding of corruption can differ among countries or societies?
- What is the impact of the cultural environment on the prevention or encouragement of corruption - could it serve as a "reasonable excuse" for corrupt behaviour?
- How does corruption affect organizational culture?

- How do varying different organisational cultures deal with the issues around gender and corruption?
- How are organizational cultures affected by historical developments of nation building and defence institution building?
- What are the cultural specifics of defence and security organizations?
- How do cultures change? What are the timeframes, and what characterises resistance to change?

Learning Methodology

- Lecture;
- Group discussion of case studies;
- Students will be assessed on the basis of their activity in the discussions and the presentation of case study analyses.

References

- Alison Taylor, *What impact does organizational culture have on corruption?*
<http://www.ethic-intelligence.com/experts/8879-relationship-organisational-culture-corruption/>
- David Gebler, *The 3 Power Values: How Commitment, Integrity, and Transparency Clear the Roadblocks to Performance*, Jossey-Bass, 2012.
- Ed Voerman, Fons Trompenaars, *Servant Leadership Across Cultures*, Infinite Ideas, 2009.
- Geert Hofstede, Gert Jan Hofstede, Michael Minkov, *Cultures and Organizations, Software of the Mind*, 3 Ed., McGraw-Hill, 2010.
- George Lucas, *Military Ethics: What Everyone Needs to Know*, Oxford University Press: Ch. 5, 2015.
- George Lucas, Rick Rubel, *Case Studies in Military Ethics*, 3rd Edition, Pearson, 2012.
- Lawrence Lessig, "Institutional Corruption" Defined, *Journal of Law, Medicine and Ethics*, 41, no. 3, 2013:553-555.
- Nickolay Slatinski, *Cultural Awareness in Implementing Integrity Building Programmes* in Todor Tagarev, *Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Defence: A Compendium of Best Practices*, Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2012:312-322.
- Paul Gibbons, *The Science of Successful Organizational Change: How Leaders Set Strategy, Change Behavior, and Create an Agile Culture*, Pearson Business, 2015.
- Robert E. Quinn, Kim S. Cameron, *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture: Based on the Competing Values Framework*, Jossey-Bass, 3 Ed., 2011.
- Stephen Coleman, *Military Ethics*, Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Vikas Anand, Blake E. Ashforth, Mahendra Joshi, *Business as usual: The acceptance and perpetuation of corruption in organizations*, *Academy of Management Executive*, 18, no. 2, 2004.
- The Hofstede Centre, *Country comparison*.
<https://geert-hofstede.com/countries.html>

2

Good governance and public administration

Theme Description

This theme provides students with an understanding of the concept of good governance, and its importance in public administrations. It covers the major principles of good governance, the functioning of public institutions and the various checks and balances which exist to provide monitoring and oversight of the defence and related security sector.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- Understand the idea of good governance in public administration, as well as importance of applying legal and ethical standards the defence and related security sectors;
- Identify key principles of good governance and forms of their possible implementation in modern defence institutions;
- Discuss how high levels of integrity in the defence sector enables society to achieve and maintain sustainable democracy;
- Understand the functioning of public institutions based on the concept of separated powers and analyse the appropriate role of defence establishments within it;
- Define the system of checks and balances in the contemporary defence sector and its key elements;
- Discuss the nature of relations between civil and military institutions and their interdependence;
- Identify how high or low level of integrity in the security and defence sectors can influence their work and the rule of law within a society;
- Understanding of gender as related to good governance and public administration.

REFERENCES

- Centre for Integrity in the Defence Sector, Guides to Good Governance.
http://cids.no/?page_id=4596

TOPIC LIST

BLOCK ONE: PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

Module 2.1.1: Representation

Module 2.1.2: Human Rights

Module 2.1.3: Gender

Module 2.1.4: Transparency

Module 2.1.5: Accountability

Module 2.1.6: Checks and Balances

Module 2.1.7: Rule of Law

Module 2.1.8: Impartiality

Module 2.1.9: Reliability and Predictability

Module 2.1.10: Strategic approach to Building Integrity

BLOCK TWO: FUNCTIONING OF PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Module 2.2.1: Executive branch

Module 2.2.2: Legislative branch

Module 2.2.3: Judiciary branch

BLOCK THREE: CHECKS AND BALANCES

Module 2.3.1: Civil-Military Relations

Module 2.3.2: Parliamentary oversight of integrity in defence sector

Module 2.3.3: Judiciary control of integrity in defence sector

Module 2.3.4: Media

Module 2.3.5: Civil Society Organisations

Module 2.3.6: Specialised Anti-corruption Bodies (including international organizations)

BLOCK ONE: PRINCIPLES OF GOOD GOVERNANCE

Block Description

Good governance is based on separation of powers of the parliament, executive, and judicial branches of government. The separation of powers should provide an effective system of checks and balances that curtails and arbitrary or unilateral exercise of power by any one branch of government. Together with impartial, reliable and predictable public administration under rule of law, good governance creates an environment where defence establishments are instilled with culture of integrity that rejects corruption.

Block learning objectives

- Recognize the significance of establishing and maintaining good governance in defence institutions, focusing on the rule of law, accountability, representation and integrity;
- Understand the key features of a government that structurally promote good governance and public administration;
- Understand the characteristics and behaviours within governance and administrative structures that impact operations of defence establishments and their organizational environment;
- Understand the interrelationships among branches of government to appreciate how these affect the defence sector and help define the proper role of defence establishments in civil-military relations;
- Recognize key competencies required for effective governance and administration (including transparency, accountability, and respect for human rights);
- Understand how good governance and public administration are preconditions to reduce the risk of corruption and foster a culture of integrity for defence establishments.

Issues for consideration

- What are the key concepts related to the principles of good governance?
- How do you demonstrate the importance of good governance and good administration in a democracy?
- Are the participants able to address the links between good governance and BI in defence?

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

Module 2.1.1: Representation

Module Description

Democracies are built on the principle of representation expressed in free, competitive and fair elections. The executive branch of government (to which the defence system belongs) performs the mandate given by the parliament and is controlled through a system of parliamentary oversight which should be built in accordance with legal and ethical norms. Through this module, employees of defence establishments will learn about the political concept of representation, based on principles of integrity and its influence on defence management in a democracy.

Module Learning Objectives

- Define the concept of representation in modern political thought and its influence on defence management;
- Present the most important forms of representation in political life and modern society and their influence on defence sector;
- Discuss how schemes for the financing of political parties can distort representative democracy;
- Discuss how and why the influence of political parties can undermine defence capabilities and public trust in armed forces and security forces.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Irwin Shapiro, Susan Stokes, Elisabeth Wood, Alexander Kirshner, *Political Representation*, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
<https://www.princeton.edu/~ppettit/papers/2010/Varieties%20of%20Public%20Representation.pdf>
- M.J.C. Vile, *Constitutionalism and the Separation of Powers*, Indianapolis, Liberty Fund, 2 Ed., 1998.
- Nadia Urbinati, *Representative Democracy, Principles and Genealogy*, University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Module 2.1.2: Human Rights

Module Description

According to the UN, human rights are rights inherent to all human beings, whatever their nationality, place of residence, sex, national or ethnic origin, color, religion, language, or any other status. Human beings are all equally entitled to human rights without discrimination. These rights are all interrelated, interdependent and indivisible. Universal human rights are often expressed and guaranteed by law, in the forms of treaties, customary international law, general principles and other sources of international law. International human rights law lays down the obligations of Governments to act in certain ways or to refrain from certain acts, in order to promote and protect human rights and the fundamental freedoms of individuals or groups. Obligation to respect human rights is not only legal, but also should be observed as a moral norm, thus making treatment of human rights as an issue of integrity. Modern systems of defence and security are legally obliged to respect and protect human rights (i.e. life and physical integrity, prevention of torture, dignity of human beings, independent justice, freedom of expression, conscience and religion and so forth). This module will consider how, due to the specific nature of the defence sector, the necessity to protect national security and to operate in armed conflicts or emergency situations, defence personnel may be faced with serious challenges which will require proper education and training to protect human rights in an effective way.

Module Learning Objectives

- Present the evolution of human rights in a historical perspective;
- Introduce the main legal instruments and ethical norms regulating issues of human rights in the modern world, including legislation and codes relevant for military;
- Analyze the impact of human rights and humanitarian law on modern defence systems;
- Provide standards of behavior for uniformed and armed forces (including civil defence personnel) in dealing with human right issues or human rights violations.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Council of Europe, *Democratic and Effective Oversight of National Security Services*, Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, 2015.
- Inderjit Singh, *The United Nations Human Rights Regime: An Analysis*, *International Journal Of Multidisciplinary Approach & Studies*, 3(1), 2016: 195-204.

Module 2.1.3: Gender

Module Description

Gender equality is a concept based on the idea of achieving legal and social equality between men and women in law and in society, providing them equal opportunities in all spheres of social life, especially in the workplace. During the last three decades, gender issues have been the focus of study within international relations theory, particularly within the field of security and defence studies. Moreover, lately there has been increased focus is on “mainstreaming gender” into military operations (UNSCR 1325). The module considers importance and influence of integrity within the concept of gender equality and specifically how it applies to the military environment.

Module Learning Objectives

- Introduce the historical development of the gender equality concept;
- Present and discuss the key legal documents regulating gender issues on international, regional and national level;
- Analyze the level of gender equality achieved in modern defence systems with special focus on the country in which the module is being applied.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Consortium of Gender, Security and Human Rights, *Syllabus Collection*. <http://genderandsecurity.org/projects-resources/syllabus-collection>
- Nordic Centre for Gender, *Whose Security*, 2015. <http://www.forsvarsmakten.se/siteassets/english/swedint/engelska/swedint/nordic-centre-for-gender-in-military-operations/whose-security-2015-low-resolution.pdf>
- Nordic Centre for Gender, *UN resolutions on gender*. <http://www.forsvarsmakten.se/siteassets/english/swedint/engelska/swedint/nordic-centre-for-gender-in-military-operations/un-resolutions.pdf>
- UN Women, *Gender and Security Training Manual*, 2012. https://trainingcentre.unwomen.org/pluginfile.php/2484/mod_resource/content/1/Gender%20and%20Security%20training%20manual%20eng.pdf

Module 2.1.4: Transparency

Module Description

Transparency is instrumental in fostering democracy and the accountability of public officials. It is also a management method in the public administration, which implies information disclosure, clarity and accuracy based on legal frameworks, and is supported by developed systems of control and oversight. It is one of the main pillars of a culture of integrity and anti-corruption. Transparency applies to all sectors from planning and decision making to the expenditure of funds to the implementation and performance of systems. In addition, it spans from the strategic to the operational level. Within modern defence systems, it is often hard to strike the right balance between the necessity to apply standards of transparency, which exist in other branches of public administration, and to protect sensitive information that may be important for national security or defence. The purpose of this module is to improve awareness about the strong connections between transparency, democracy and anti-corruption policies.

Module Learning Objectives

- Explain the fundamental principles of transparency in modern public administrations and present the historical development of the concept;
- Present the key legislation regulating standards of transparency on international and national level;
- Perform a comparative analysis of transparency standards achieved in modern defence systems, at global, regional and national level;
- Reflect on the limits to transparency and define their legitimacy;
- Consider broad transparency-enhancing policies, including the protection of good-faith whistle-blowers.

Learning methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Amanda L. Jacobsen A, *National Security and the Right to Information in Europe*, University of Copenhagen, Centre for Advance Security Theory, 2013.
- Council of Europe, *The Protection of Whistle-blowers: A study on the feasibility of a legal instrument on the protection of employees who make disclosures in the public interest*, CDCJFIN, 2012.
[http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/cdcj/Whistleblowers/CDCJ\(2012\)9F_Final.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/cdcj/Whistleblowers/CDCJ(2012)9F_Final.pdf)
- Council of Europe, *Recommendation CM/Rec (2014)7 of the Committee of Ministers to member States on the protection of whistle-blowers*.
[https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=CM/c\(2014\)7&Language=lanEnglish&Site=CM&BackColorInternet=DBD CF2&BackColorIntranet=FDC864&BackColorLogged=FDC864](https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=CM/c(2014)7&Language=lanEnglish&Site=CM&BackColorInternet=DBD CF2&BackColorIntranet=FDC864&BackColorLogged=FDC864)
- Francisco Cardona, *Access to Information and Limits to Public Transparency*, Guide to Good Governance 4,

Centre for Integrity in the Defence Sector, Norwegian Ministry of Defence, 2016.

- Lawrence Friedman, Victor Hansen, Secrecy, Transparency and National Security, *William Mitchell Law Review*, Vol. 38:5, 2012:1610-1628.
- OECD, *The Right to Open Public Administrations in Europe: Emerging Legal Standards*, Sigma Papers, No. 46, OECD Publishing, 2010.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5km4g0zfqt27-en>
- Robert G. Vaughn, *The Successes and Failures of Whistle-blower Laws*, Elgar Publishing, 2012.
- Tarlach McGonagle, Yvonne Donders, *The United Nations and Freedom of Expression and Information: Critical Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- *The Global Principles on National Security and the Right to Information (Tshwane Principles)*, Open Society Foundation, 12 June 2013.
- Transparency International, *Whistleblowing in Europe: Legal Protections for Whistle-blowers in the EU*, 2013.
http://issuu.com/transparencyinternational/docs/2013_whistleblowingineurope_en

Module 2.1.5: Accountability

Module Description

A modern administration is obliged to account for its activities, accept responsibilities for them, and disclose the results of its work in a transparent manner, also responsibly managing entrusted financial resources, material assets and property. This module will explore how defence systems can fully implement legal standards of accountability and encourage discussion on different approaches to transparency and accountability.

Module Learning Objectives

- Explain basic principles of accountability and the historical development of that concept and standards;
- Present most important legislation on international, regional and national level regulating standards of accountability;
- Analyze the level of accountability achieved in modern defence systems with special focus on the country in which the module is being applied. Identify examples of good practice;
- Reflect on the conflict of interest policies that would better enhance accountability and transparency of those operating within the defence sector;
- Understand the basics of establishing accountability for performance in the defence sector;
- Understand integrity issues related to accountability tools employed in the security and defence area.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Amanda Sinclair, *The Chameleon of Accountability: Forms and Discourses*, Accounting, Organization and Society, 1995:219-237.
- Antonio B. Cendon, *Accountability and Public Administration: Concepts, Dimensions, Developments in Openness and Transparency in Governance: Challenges and Opportunities*, NISPACE and IEPA, 1999.
- Francisco Cardona, *Guide to Good Governance No 2: Tackling Conflicts of Interest in the Public Sector*, Centre for Integrity in the Defence Sector, Norwegian Ministry of Defence, 2015.
- Melvin Dubnick, *Clarifying accountability: an ethical theory framework*, in C. Sampford, N. Preston, *Public Sector Ethics*, Routledge, 68-81, 1998.
- OECD, *Conflict of Interest Policies and Practices in Nine EU Member States: A Comparative Review*, Sigma Papers, No. 36, OECD Publishing, 2007.
- OECD, *Managing Conflict of Interest in the Public Service: OECD Guidelines and Overview*, OECD publishing, 2003.
- OECD, *Managing Conflict of Interest in the Public Service: OECD Guidelines and Overview*, OECD publishing, 2003.
- OECD Policy Brief, *Public Sector Modernising Accountability and Control*, OECD Observer, 2005.
- Richard Mulgan, *Accountability: an Ever-expanding Concept?*, *Public Administration*, No 3, 2000:555-573.

Module 2.1.6: Checks and Balances

Module Description

Checks and balances are a set of mechanisms to reduce mistakes or improper behavior while enhancing accountability. It is based on sharing power, responsibilities and information in order to build an environment in which no single person or institution can have absolute control over decisions. Power concentration is perceived as a major corruption risk factor, while the system of countervailing powers and transparency is considered to promote democratic checks on corruption and unethical behavior. The most important mechanisms of checks and balances system are: parliamentary oversight, anti-corruption policies, specialized anti-corruption bodies, arrangements for handling conflicts of interest, arrangements for transparency/freedom of access to information, arrangements for external and internal audit, inspection arrangements and ombudsman institutions. The module will consider how checks and balances apply to defence establishments by looking at the concept, legislation and different systems.

Module Learning Objectives

- Present the definition of a checks and balances system and describe the historical development of that concept;
- Present most important legislation on international, regional and national level regulating standards of checks and balances;
- Analyse systems of checks and balances currently functioning in defence sectors, identifying their strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Daniel Lederman, Norman Loayza, Norman, Rodrigo Soares, *Accountability and Corruption: Institutions Matter*, Economics and Politics, Vol. 17, Issue 1, 2005.
- James Alt, David Lassen, *Political And Judicial Checks on Corruption: Evidence from American State Governments*, Economics and Politics, Vol. 20, Issue 1, 2007.

Module 2.1.7: Rule of Law

Module Description

Although administrative law will differ from one national system to another, a common definition of administrative law is the set of principles and rules applying to the organization and management of public administration and the relations between administration and citizens. The module will outline how rule of law principles such as legality, providing reasons for administrative decisions, access to information, accountability, and the right to be heard must be integral in public service delivery, including defence establishments.

Module Learning Objectives

- Explain the definition and concept of the rule of law and how it is a key component in a functioning public administration;
- Understand how the rule of law is codified and practiced in different countries, organisations and defence establishments.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Rachel Kleinfeld, *Advancing the Rule of Law Abroad: Next Generation Reform*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2012.
- Richard Sannerholm, Shane Quinn, Andrea Rabus, *Responsive and Responsible: Politically Smart Rule of Law Reform in Conflict and Fragile States*, Folke Bernadotte Academy, 2016.
www.fba.se
- Tom Bingham, *The Rule of Law*, Allen Lane, Penguin Books, 2010.

Module 2.1.8: Impartiality

Module Description

The principle of impartiality requires that public administrative bodies should act in an impartial way and pursue only the public interest, abstaining from taking into account other interests. In practice, impartiality often requires public servants to refrain from opinions, positions or actions that demonstrate a bias towards or against a particular cause or course of action, including the defence of government policies. A politically impartial public service supports the government of whichever political party the electorate chooses and refuses to comply with illegal instructions or ethically dubious orders. The module considers how impartiality is important to public administrations with particular emphasis on defence establishments.

Module Learning Objectives

- Explain how impartiality is a crucial component of a well-functioning public administration system;
- By drawing on examples, explain the concept of impartiality and how it is relevant to the defence sector.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Brian Head, Alexander Jonathan Brown, Carmel Connors, *Promoting Integrity: Evaluating and Improving Public Institutions*, Ashgate, 2008.
- Jan Teorell, *The Impact of Quality of Government as Impartiality: Theory and Evidence*, QoG Working Paper Series, 2009:25.
http://qog.pol.gu.se/digitalAssets/1350/1350721_2009_25_teorell.pdf

Module 2.1.9: Reliability and Predictability

Module Description

Predictability is important to the way the administrative apparatus operates. A number of administrative legal principles and mechanisms work to encourage the reliability and predictability of public administration's actions and decisions. All the institutions of administrative law – delegated legislation, decision making process, remedies, legal control, the ombudsman – are in place because they enhance predictability or the capacity of the citizens to form stable expectations about how their matters are to be dealt with.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the concept of reliability and predictability and how it is connected to the concept of rule of law;
- Understand how the rule of law is not necessarily at odds with administrative discretion;
- Understand how the principle of proportionality acts in favor of reliability and predictability.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Stephanie Lindquist, Frank Cross, Stability, Predictability and the Rule of Law: State Decisions as Reciprocity Norm, University of Texas School of Law, 2008. <https://law.utexas.edu/conferences/measuring/The%20Papers/Rule%20of%20Law%20Conference.crosslindquist.pdf>

Module 2.1.10: Strategic Approach to Building Integrity

Module Description

A strategic approach to building integrity requires enhanced ethics among public sector personnel, as well as increased transparency and accountability. In order to demotivate potential perpetrators, it is important to reduce perceived rewards of corrupt behavior (reducing marginal benefits) and increase marginal costs for individuals who might be considering engagement in such activities.

The need for a comprehensive program to ensure integrity necessitates the identification of components/functions which must be established to make a system capable of building integrity. Such elements should include: cultural differences within and between countries, components of ethics/standards (especially in the military), control mechanisms at different levels of an institution (which serve as early warning of possible misconduct), the varying amounts of control required at each level, an ability to undertake prevention, an ability to undertake detection, and an ability to undertake prosecution and remediation should corrupt activities be detected (integrity, transparency, accountability).

The purpose of this module is to increase the level of awareness regarding the importance of the strategic approach and educate defence personnel to the extent that they are capable of implementing it in practice.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the idea of a strategic approach to building integrity within the defence sector;
- Identify and analyze components/functions of a strategic approach to build integrity in the defence sector;
- Identify examples of good and bad practices within systems approaches implemented to build integrity in defence sector (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges).

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Ingrid Busterud, Stefanie O./ Nijssen, *Integrity Action Plan – A Handbook for Practitioners in Defence Establishments*, Centre for Integrity in the Defence Sector and Transparency International UK Defence and Security Programme, 2014.
- Mark Pyman, Anne-Christine Wegener, *Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Defence: 20 Practical Reforms*, Transparency International Defence and Security Programme, 2011.
- Susan Pond, Mark Pyman, *Integrity Self-Assessment Process: A Diagnostic Tool for National Defence Establishments*, Transparency International, 2009.
- Todor Tagarev, *Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Defence: A Compendium of Best Practices*, NATO/DCAF, 2010.
- Valeri Ratchev, *Civilianisation of the Defence Ministry: A Functional Approach to a Modern Defence Institution*, DCAF, 2011.

BLOCK TWO: FUNCTIONING OF PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Block Description

Public institutions have an important function in any program to build integrity. The goal of this block is to impart the knowledge necessary to comprehend the division of power as related to integrity and good governance and to provide an analytical presentation of the acknowledged international definitions of the respective roles of government institutions and how they interact. Each of the three branches of government will be considered in detail.

Block Learning Objectives

- Understand the duties and responsibilities of the parliamentary executive and judicial branches;
- Explain how the democratic civilian control of the armed and security forces is part of the good governance process;
- Understand how division of power with good governance and public administration provide a framework for integrity in defence establishments.

Issues for Consideration

- How can different roles and responsibilities lead to conflicting interests?
- How can political affiliation and political roles influence the composition of the various branches?

References

- SMEs will work with host country to select appropriate references for each mini-module or lecture/session.

Module 2.2.1: Executive Branch

Module Description

The division of power into different branches of government is central to the idea of the separation of powers. The executive branch is the part of the government that has authority and responsibility for the daily administration of the state, executing or enforcing the law. The executive also issues regulations and sets high ethical standards for government departments and commands the armed forces. The integrity of processes, institutions, policies and stakeholders (especially key officials) has to be guaranteed in this branch of government.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the duties, responsibilities, legal and ethical norms of the executive branch;
- Explain how the executive branch is responsible for the public administration system;
- Understand the role of the executive concerning the armed forces and the notion of civilian control of the armed and security forces, in the context of integrity standards and policies.

Learning methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Joel Aberbach, Mark Peterson, *The Executive Branch*, Oxford University Press, 2005.

Module 2.2.2: Legislative Branch

Module Description

The legislature is the law-making body that has the power to enact, amend, and repeal public policy. Legislatures observe and steer governing actions and usually have exclusive authority to amend the budget or budgets involved in the process. The defence sector is a challenging area for effective oversight where parliamentarians must balance their responsibility to demand accountability with the need for a degree of secrecy. However, the legislative process in defense should as much as possible resemble the one in the civilian sphere. Parliaments must also ensure that defence establishments act in the interests of the state and in a manner defined by its constitution and policies, providing legality, legitimacy and integrity of their work.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the duties, responsibilities, and legal and ethical norms of the legislative branch;
- Understand the role of the legislature in management, control and accountability of defence sector and national security matters;
- Explain how parliamentarians decide the appropriate balance between public accountability and secrecy for the defence and security sector and uphold the principle of a civilian administered military, while maintaining high legal and ethical standards.

Learning methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Karre Strom, *Rules, reasons and routines: Legislative roles in parliamentary democracies*, *The Journal of Legislative Studies* 3, Issue 1, 1997.
- Thomas Saalfeld, Wolfgang Muller, *Roles in legislative studies: A theoretical introduction*, *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, 3, Issue 1.

Module 2.2.3: Judiciary Branch

Module Description

The judiciary is the system of prosecution and courts that interprets and applies the law. The judiciary also provides a mechanism for the resolution of disputes and controls the legality of administrative acts. Under the doctrine of the separation of powers, the judiciary generally does not make law or enforce law, but rather interprets law and applies it to the facts of each case. Some states have separate bodies of law that govern the conduct of members of their armed forces, often using distinct judicial arrangements to enforce those laws. An independent and efficient judiciary has to provide accountability and legal responsibility of public institutions and officials, including the defence establishment. Just and efficient sanctioning of highest officials found in illegal and unethical activities is crucial for public trust in public and defence institutions.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the functions of the judiciary branch with a specific focus on integrity in defence;
- Explain how the judiciary should handle a complaint procedure based on high legal and ethical standards within the armed forces;
- Understand the role of the administrative justice system for ensuring the rule of law and integrity in the performance of the executive and public administration, focusing especially on the military.

Learning methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Fabio Padovano, Grazia Sgarra, Fiorino, N. *Judicial Branch, Checks and Balances and Political Accountability*, *Constitutional Political Economy*, 2003:14-47.

BLOCK THREE: CHECKS AND BALANCES

Block Description

Checks and balances are critical to building systems that encourage integrity. This block examines civil-military relations, parliamentary oversight, judiciary control, the role of media, and the relationships with civil society organisations and specialized anti-corruption bodies as potential means of ensuring the existence of checks and balances. Examining these issues allows greater understanding of their impact on integrity in the defence sector.

Block Learning Objectives

- Understand how parliamentary and judiciary oversight applies in the defence sector;
- Understand the relationships and roles of the civil society and media as institutional factors that can be used to promote integrity;
- Explain how specialized anti-corruption bodies undertake initiatives and collaborate with defence establishments to build integrity.

Issues for Consideration

- What problems does your country face working with civil society and media related to checks and balances and anti-corruption?
- What are the most important levers used by parliament as oversight for the defence sector?
- What is the relationship in your country between the civil society and the military?
- How does the media influence political participation and public debate on corruption and governance matters within the defence and security sector?

Learning Methodology

- The learning methodology will entail six modules, each tackling one oversight mechanism.

Module 2.3.1: Civil-Military Relations

Module Description

This module describes the relationship between civil society as a whole and the military organization or organizations established to protect it, and how this relationship can be used to aid in the process of building integrity. More narrowly, it describes the relationship between the civil authority of a given society and its military authorities in matters related to building integrity.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the concept of civil-military relations and cooperation in building integrity;
- Understand the mechanisms which underpin civil-military relations in area of BI;
- Understand civil-military relations theory as applied to mature democratic states in the context of building integrity.

Learning methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State, The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*, Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Thomas C. Bruneau, Florina Cristiana Matei, *The Routledge Handbook of Civil-Military Relations*, Routledge, 2013.

Module 2.3.2: Parliamentary Oversight of Integrity in Defence Sector

Module Description

Parliamentary action impacts integrity in the defence sector through the budget process, through the oversight mechanisms of spending, and by requiring accountability from the defence sector for its implementation of programs authorized by the legislature.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the interaction between the legislative and defence sector as programs are proposed and funded;
- Understand various means through which the parliament exercises oversight of the defence sector, including; reports to legislative committees on defence program spending status and effectiveness, referrals of issues to Inspectors Generals or audit offices for detailed review, promotion of continuing debate on funded program implementation;
- Understand the importance of this branch of government, and its interaction with executive branch to define and direct the defence mission.

Learning methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Ceranic J, *Parliamentary Oversight of the Defence Sector*, in Alexandra Rabrenovic, *Legal Mechanisms for Prevention of Corruption in Southeast Europe with Special Focus on the Defence Sector*, Institute of Comparative Law, 2013.
- Hans Born, Philippe Fluri, Anders Johnson, *Parliamentary Oversight of the Security Sector: Principles Mechanisms and Practices*, Handbook for Parliamentarians, Nr. 5, Inter-Parliamentary Union and Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, 2002.
- Hans Born, Philippe Fluri, Simon Lunn, *Oversight and Guidance: The Relevance of Parliamentary Oversight for the Security Sector*, DCAF, 2010
- Katarina Djokic, Vladimir Erceg, *Parliamentary Oversight and Integrity Building in Security Institutions*, BCSP, 2014.
- Simon Lunn S, *The Democratic Control of Armed Forces in Principle and Practice*, DCAF working paper, 2002.
- Willem F. van Eekelen, *Democratic Control of Armed Forces*, DCAF, No. 2, 2002.

Module 2.3.3: Judiciary Control of Integrity in Defence Sector

Module Description

The judicial branch of government ensures that the operations of defence sector programs, if challenged in court, adhere to applicable laws and regulations, including integrity standards. The judiciary is responsible for deciding whether cases brought involving defence sector personnel indicate violations of law have been committed and to impose sanctions, if the defendant is found guilty.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the judicial steps in accepting and processing complaints;
- Understand the judicial branch's interpretation of legal standards, based on laws, regulations and case precedents, which apply to the conduct of personnel within the defence sector;
- Understand the relationship between the judicial case decisions and subsequent actions concerning the same or similar issues taken in response by the legislative and/or executive branches.

Learning methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- John McDaniel, *The Availability and Scope of Judicial Review of Discretionary Military Administrative Decisions*, *Military Legal Review*, Vol. 89, 1985.
- Gerri Rubin, *United Kingdom Military Law: Autonomy, Civilianisation, Juridification*, *The Modern Law Review*, Vol. 65, No. 1, 2002.

Module 2.3.4: Media

Module Description

Media organizations are generally assumed to play an important role in democracies, but their impact and effectiveness vary from state to state. An example of this is how countries with a higher degree of media freedom show higher levels of political participation and less corruption. The media can play an important oversight role in the defence sector and can be instrumental when it comes to exposing corruption.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the relationship between media and good governance;
- Describe the relationship between media decisions and the influence of state, political and commercial entities in process of building integrity in the defence sector;
- Discuss how and why the media is an important actor within the context of building integrity in the defence sector?

Learning methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Peters, B., *The media's role: covering or covering up corruption?*, *Global Corruption Report*, Ch. 6, *Transparency International*, 2003.
- Rafael Di Tella, Ignacio Franceschelli, *Government Advertising and Media Coverage of Corruption Scandals*, *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 3(4), 2011.

Module 2.3.5: Civil Society Organisations

Module Description

Civil society is described by the UN as the “third sector” of society, along with government and business. It comprises civil society organizations and non-governmental organizations. It is increasingly accepted that real progress in tackling developmental deficits can only be made by building the institutions for good governance (e.g. legal and fiscal systems) and by ensuring genuine civil society participation. Building integrity is a part of good governance as a wider concept which is essential for ensuring accountable work by public institutions, including defence establishments. Civil society organisations may give a substantial contribution to the creation of more transparent and accountable work in public and defence institutions, including protection of ethical standards and the constant improvement of integrity.

Module Learning Objectives

- Explain how civil society actors have an important contribution to make in the governance of the security and defence sector;
- Explain how civil society organization can help ensure that high legal and ethical standards are being implemented and constantly improved within public institutions (including defence).

Learning methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative in Asia and the Pacific, *The role of civil society in curbing corruption in public procurement in Fighting Bribery in Public Procurement in Asia and the Pacific*, Ch. 6, 2008.
- Alina Mungiu-Pippidi., *The Experience of Civil Society as an Anti-Corruption Actor in East Central Europe*, *Civil Society Against Corruption*, 2014.

Module 2.3.6: Specialised Anti-Corruption Forces

Module Description

The establishment of specialised anti-corruption bodies (ACBs) has widely been considered to be one of the most important initiatives to effectively tackle corruption both in the entire public sector and in defence establishments. However, experience has shown that the effectiveness of anti-corruption agencies has varied greatly from country to country. Lessons learned show that capable anti-corruption agencies need to be well-resourced, headed by strong leadership with visible integrity and commitment, and situated amongst a network of state and non-state actors who work together to implement anti-corruption interventions. On the other hand, weaker anti-corruption agencies have often been undermined by weak political will, manifested in limited resources and staff capacity.

Module Learning Objectives

- Identify key anti-corruption bodies (through a risk assessment process) in the defence sector and understand how they can be used to help prevent corruption;
- Explain why some anti-corruption bodies are successful while others are not;
- Consider and describe specific environments for successful functioning of anti-corruption bodies within the armed forces and defence establishments;
- Identify available tools and resources for efficient anti-corruption bodies in defence systems.

Learning methodology

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Francisco Cardona, *Anti-Corruption Policies and Agencies, Guide to Good Governance 3*, Centre for Integrity in the Defence Sector, Norwegian Ministry of Defence, 2015.
- Eser Albin, Kubiciel Michael, *Institutions against Corruption: A Comparative Study of the National Anti-corruption Strategies Reflected*, GRECO's First Evaluation Round, 2004.
- Matic M, *Specialised Anti-Corruption Agencies in Alexandra Rabrenovic A., Legal Mechanisms for Prevention of Corruption in Southeast Europe with Special Focus on the Defence Sector*, Institute of Comparative Law, 2013.
- OECD, *Specialised Anticorruption Institutions – Review of Models*, OECD publishing, 2008.
- UNDP, *Practitioners' Guide: Capacity Assessment of Anti-Corruption Agencies*, UNDP publishing, 2011.



3

**Building integrity
in management and delivery**

Theme description

This theme provides students with an understanding of the main corruption risks in the management and delivery processes in the defence and security sectors. It covers human resources, financial management and budgeting, acquisition and procurement, integrity of decision making processes, and the development of integrity plans.

THEME LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- Explain the role of HR resources management in reducing corruption risks, including the effects of gender;
- Explain the role of defence planning, budgeting and financial management processes in reducing corruption risks;
- Explain, evaluate and reduce corruption risks in acquisition and procurement;
- Explain the role of integrity in the decision making process and in reducing risks of corruption;
- Explain the role of internal checks and balances in addressing corruption;
- Discuss how to design and manage national BI programmes.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- Who are the main stakeholders in the development of BI in the defence sector?
- What are the main issues that an integrity plan must cover?
- How can nations monitor and assess the implementation of their integrity plan?
- How can nations incorporate BI into their education and training programmes?

LEARNING METHODOLOGY

Group work, discussions, lecture, situational analysis, solution of practical tasks, interview, lessons learned, train the trainers.

TOPIC LIST

BLOCK ONE: HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Module 3.1.1: Human Resources Strategy

Module 3.1.2: Decision-Making in Human Resources

Module 3.1.3: Ethical Conduct of Officials and Whistle-Blower Protection

Module 3.1.4: Gender

BLOCK TWO: FINANCES AND ACQUISITION

Module 3.2.1: Defence Planning, Budgeting and Financial Management

Module 3.2.2: Transparency and corruption risks in acquisition

BLOCK THREE: MAINSTREAMING BI

Module 3.3.1: Integrity of decision-making

Module 3.3.2: Internal Checks and Balances

Module 3.3.3: Designing and Managing BI programmes

BLOCK ONE: HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Block Description

This block provides an introduction to the legal and regulatory frameworks, principles and standards underlying functional human resource management models and that regulate modern and efficient HRM systems in the public sector, including military and security forces. These principles and standards provide public servants with protection from abuse of political power or other positions of authority. This can cover explicit tools and methods such as occupational standards that need to be in place to guide both manager behavior in relation to subordinated human resource, as well as HR professionals' behavior, codes of conduct, ethics, retention tools and techniques, etc.; and implicit methods such as which behaviors are deemed acceptable and necessary for career development, and what is required of managers to be equitable and fair in allowing subordinates to develop professionally and personally.

Block Learning Objectives

- Human Resources Strategy: Upon successful completion of the module students will be able to: conduct rational functional analyses; define objective organizational requirements; implement strategic human resources planning, including a strong reward system that can resist pressure; and develop systems for the protection of the rights of the civilian personnel, and occupational standards for managers and HR professionals from a resource based view;
- Human Resource decision making: Upon successful completion of the module students will be able to: understand transparency in human resource management processes focusing on risks and root causes of issues in each HRM component (e.g. using key risk indicators); develop fair and transparent HR decision making processes; and determine required institutional preconditions, including conflict of interests;
- Ethics and conduct of officials, and whistle-blower protection: Upon successful completion of the module students will be able to: define the HRM role in setting requirements for ethics and moral conduct, whistle-blower protection and illegal incident report procedure; discuss the impact of special military rules and protection measures; understand how to regulate ethics and conduct through HRM mechanisms;
- Gender: Upon successful completion of the module students will be able to: describe gender related risks in HRM process; discuss and assess methods of prevention and institutional response mechanisms to these issues.

Issues for Consideration

- What are the basic rules, roles and regulations of human resources management?
- What are the main corruption risks in the area and what types of key indicators we can use to detect their presence and scope?
- How can we ensure a balanced, transparent approach to achieve effective human resources management?
- What education is needed to develop human resource

experts and managers' knowledge in the field of HR?

- How can the code of conduct and ethics approach help human resources management in reducing risks of corruption? Which are the key ethical rules in staff management of defence and security sectors that can be used?
- How can we set up a whistle-blowers protection system?
- How does integrity/corruption in human resources help/hinder other building integrity initiatives?

Learning Methodology

- The learning methodology will entail four modules, each tackling one principle and/or standard relating to improved transparency, accountability and integrity in Human Resources management. Group work, discussions, lecture, situational analysis, solution of practical tasks, interview, lessons learned.

Module 3.1.1: Human Resources Strategy

Module Description

This module provides a basic understanding of how to analyse the functions of human resource systems at various levels. In addition, it will provide an understanding of the necessary requirements to develop a strong merit/reward system through educational courses in order to protect the rights of personnel.

Module Learning Objectives

- Conduct rational functional analyses of the HR system;
- Define organizational requirements from a two-fold perspective: manpower-personnel balance, and competence requirements for HR professionals and (senior) managers;
- Understand strategic HR planning including creation of a strong merit/reward system that can resist pressure, in terms of securing organization demand-supply balance and individual work-life equilibrium with a view to maintaining system and personal integrity;
- Identify integrity related gaps triggered by HR planning at outcome level: workforce patterns (e.g. balance of military and civilian employees); organization structure and development (e.g. force size and structure, degree of centralization, use of subcontracting); recruitment and selection (e.g. mix of skills and experience needed, main sources of applicants, methods to attract suitable candidates, recruitment freezes); workforce diversity (e.g. equal opportunities, diversity training); pay and reward (mix of financial-non-financial rewards); performance management (e.g. type of performance appraisal, performance related to reward); Retention (e.g. family friendly policies, employee development, work conditions); Training and development (induction/orientation programs, training programs, development reviews, education); Employment relations (communication, grievance and disciplinary procedures); Release (e.g. natural wastage, outplacement support, redundancy programs);
- Understand the need of an integrative and integrity-based multi-system approach to career management, compensation and retirement;
- Understand the protection of the rights of the personnel.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Albert A. Robbert, Brent R. Keltner, Kenneth J. Reynolds, Mark D. Spranca, Beth A. Benjamin, *Differentiation in Military Human Resource Management*, RAND, 1997.
- Anthony Hartle, *Moral issues in military decision making*, University Press of Kansas, 1989.
- Carol Gill, *Use of Hard and Soft Models of HRM to illustrate the gap between Rhetoric and Reality in Workforce*, No. WP 99/13, 1999.
- California State Department Of Finance, *Strategic*

Planning Guidelines, 1998. <https://www.calhr.ca.gov/Documents/wfp-department-of-finance-strategic-planning-guidelines.pdf>

- Elliot Turiel, *The development of Social Knowledge: Morality and Convention*, Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Harry Thie, *A Future Officer Career Management System: An Objectives-based Design*, Rand, 2001.
- Harry J. Thie, Roland J. Yardley, Margaret C. Harrell, Kevin Brancato, *Alignment of Department of Defense Manpower, Resources, and Personnel Systems*, RAND, 2007.
- Lawrence M. Hinman, *Ethics: A pluralistic approach to moral theory*. Ft Worth: Harcourt Brace & Co., 2004.
- Michael Armstrong, *Strategic Human Resource Management: A guide to action*, Kogan Page, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- NATO HRM Framework. [http://ftp.rta.nato.int/public//PubFullText/RTO/TR/RTO-TR-SAS-059///\\$TR-SAS-059-Report.pdf](http://ftp.rta.nato.int/public//PubFullText/RTO/TR/RTO-TR-SAS-059///$TR-SAS-059-Report.pdf)
- Wayne Brockbank, David Ulrich, Mike Ulrich, Jon Younger, *HR from the Outside In Six Competencies for the Future of Human Resources*, McGraw-Hill, 2012. <http://mams.rmit.edu.au/d4lhtsmk45c.pdf>

Module 3.1.2: Decision-Making in Human Resources

Module Description:

This module provides an understanding of the approaches human resources professionals can use to make their decision-making process transparent.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the need for transparency in HR processes, focusing on risks facing the implementation of transparency and the root causes of these risks in each HRM component (e.g. using key risk indicators);
- Understand the importance of decision-making skills, based on the principles of good governance;
- Develop fair and transparent HR decision making processes;
- Determine required institutional preconditions, including conflict of interests.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Andras Hugi, *Prevention and combating corruption: for conducting the training course in the educational establishments of the Border Guard and Customs agencies*, OSCE, EUBAM, 2013. <http://www.antykorupcja.gov.pl/download/4/13971/entionandCombatingCorruptionManualMoldawiaNACC.pdf>
- Kirsten Edwards, Dr. Martin Edwards, *Predictive HR Analytics*, Kogan Page, 2016.
- Patricia Ward Biederman, James O'Toole, Daniel Goleman, Warren Bennis, *Transparency: How Leaders Create a Culture of Candor*, Jossey-Bass, 2008.

Module 3.1.3: Ethical Conduct of Officials and Whistle-Blower Protection

Module Description

This module will provide students with the knowledge necessary to develop an HR system based on best practices in ethics and moral conduct. In addition, it will introduce the concepts of whistle-blower protection and the safe management of information.

Module Learning Objectives

- Define the HRM role in defining requirements for ethical and moral conduct, whistle-blower protection, and illegal event reporting procedures;
- Discuss the impact of special military rules and protection measures;
- Highlight the importance of consultative procedures, information access, efficiency criteria and public accountability in HRM;
- Understand how to regulate ethics and conduct through HRM mechanisms.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- OECD, *Protecting Whistleblowers: Encouraging Reporting*, 2012. <http://www.oecd.org/cleangovbiz/toolkit/50042935.pdf>

Module 3.1.4: Gender

Module Description

This module will provide students with an awareness of gender-related corruption risks in the HRM process.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand and describe gender-related risks in HRM processes;
- Discuss and assess methods of prevention and mitigation, and institutional response mechanisms to these issues.

Learning methodology/Assessment

- Teaching delivery will include lectures, case studies, plenary and group discussion, reflective journaling and practical exercises.

References

- Kirsten Edwards, Martin Edwards, *Predictive HR Analytics*, Kogan Page, 2016.
- Max Muller, *The Manager's Guide to HR*, 2nd Edition, AMACOM, 2013.
- NATO ACT Gender Training Package.
<http://www.act.nato.int/gender-training-documents>
- Transparency International, *Gender, Inequality and Corruption – What are the linkages?*, 2004.
http://files.transparency.org/content/download/1067/9235/file/2014_Policybrief1_GenderEqualityCorruption_EN.pdf

BLOCK TWO: FINANCES AND ACQUISITION

Block Description

This block introduces students to the main aspects of defence financial management and acquisition, and highlights the importance of these areas in the prevention of corruption. Finance and procurement are two of the areas most vulnerable to corruption, and a strong understanding of the main corruption risks and the methods of countering them is vital.

Block Learning Objectives

- Understand the defence strategy and operational budgeting process;
- Understand the budget process and financial corruption risks;
- Explain how to maximize transparency and minimize corruption risks in defence financial management
- Define and estimate acquisition corruption risks and their management throughout the procurement cycle (selection risks, bidding risks, contract risks, performance risks);
- Understand and explain conflict of interest, offsets, public-private partnerships and whole life costs and their relationship with corruption risks.

Issues for Consideration

- What the benefits and corruption risks of programme budgeting are?
- How can Ministries of Defence prioritize requirements and allocate resources accordingly?
- What are the major corruption risks in acquisition?
- How can life-cycle costing help prevent corruption?
- How do you balance efficiency and transparency in the acquisition cycle?

Learning Methodology

- Group work, discussions, lecture, situational analysis, solution of practical tasks, interview, lessons learned.

Module 3.2.1: Defence Planning, Budgeting and Financial Management

Module Description

This module covers the development of defence policy and strategy, as well as planning, budgeting and resources management, which are some of the main areas requiring improved transparency, accountability, effectiveness, and efficiency in Ministries of Defence. The module will also cover an understanding of gaps and avoiding risks.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the budget process and financial corruption risks;
- Understand the defence funding model, particularly the importance of avoiding gaps between strategic defence planning and operational budgeting;
- Discuss means and ways to introduce transparency into the defence decision making process;
- Understand the risks in the entire defence budget PPBE (planning, programming, budgeting and execution) cycle beyond just budgetary concerns;
- Understand corruptions risks and the transparency measures that can be taken to counter them in budgeting.

Issues for Consideration

- What are the major components of a programme budgeting system?
- What are the benefits of using a programme budget?
- What is the impact of the planning and budgeting process to the resources?
- How can MoDs identify defence priorities and align them with defence resources?
- What are the consequences of corruption in financial management in defence systems?

Learning Methodology

- Group work, discussions, lecture, situational analysis, solution of practical tasks, interview, lessons learned.

References

- Anderson, Douglas J. and Eubanks, Gina, *Leveraging COSO across the three lines of defense*, The Institute of Internal Auditor, 2005.
<http://www.coso.org/documents/COSO-2015-3LOD-PDF.pdf>
- CIDS, *Integrity Action Plan - a handbook for practitioners in defence establishments*, 2014.
http://cids.no/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Integrity-Action-Plan-handbook_web.pdf
- DCAF, *Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Defence: A Compendium of Best Practices*, 2010.
http://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_topics/20120607_BI_Compendium_EN.pdf
- Transparency International – *Defence and Security Programme, The Transparency of National Defence Budgets*, 2011.

Module 3.2.2: Transparency and corruption risks in acquisition

Module Description

This module will enable students to understand the main elements of acquisition (procurement, contracting, cost analysis, development of life cycle cost models, PPP (private public partnership)), the corruption risks involved in the acquisition process, and the mechanisms to prevent or reduce them. In addition to listing the major corruption risks, students will be able to estimate the level of corruption risk for various scenarios and settings.

Module Learning Objectives

- Define and estimate acquisition corruption risks and their management (selection risks, bidding risks, contract risks, performance risks);
- Evaluate the selection risks (including setting system requirements, gaps between strategic and operation planning, minimum requirements, amounts of goods to be procured);
- Evaluate bidding risks (including risk between low cost and benefits, life cycle cost, abuse of single sources and noncompetitive processes, collusion of bidders and price-fixing, realism of cost compared to quality, collusion between private suppliers, overuse of the “secret” designation, not ensuring the full transparency of the beneficiary);
- Evaluate contract risks (including paying inflated prices, use of subcontractors without full cost disclosure, lack of knowledge about performance capability of providers such as lists of good and bad providers, incomplete or confused contracts leading to supplemental costs);
- Evaluate performance risks (including quality of work, timeliness of work, quantity of work, the lack of control when suppliers are violating the contract in any of these ways, the completeness of the contract in regards to underperformance);
- Evaluate conflict of interest as a cross-cutting issue;
- List and describe different methods for reducing corruption risks in acquisition;
- Explain the issues arising with discretionary powers;
- Define and estimate offset corruption risks;
- Evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of private public partnership;
- Conduct a cost-benefit analysis.

Issues for Consideration

- How best to define acquisition needs in relation to defence priorities?
- What are the major acquisition methods?
- What are the corruption risks and consequences in the area?
- What are the benefits of implementing life-cycle costing?
- How do you transparently compare system effectiveness and system cost-effectiveness in the acquisition cycle?
- How do you compare acquisition plans with your strategic planning and capabilities requirements?

Learning Methodology

Group work, discussions, lecture, situational analysis, solution of practical tasks, interview, lessons learned.

References

- DCAF, *Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Defence: A Compendium of Best Practices*, 2010. http://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_topics/20120607_BI_Compendium_EN.pdf
- Transparency International UK, *Anti-bribery due diligence for transactions*, 2012. https://www.transparency-france.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/2012_-Anti_Bribery_Due_Diligence_for_Transactions.pdf
- Transparency International UK, *Defence spending: how to reduce corruption risks*, 2014. http://www.transparency.org/news/feature/defence_spending_how_to_reduce_corruption_risks

BLOCK THREE: MAINSTREAMING BI

Block Description

This block focuses on integrating BI into an organization – making it part of all decision-making processes, internal systems of checks and balances, and designing and managing national BI programmes.

Block Learning Objectives

- Understand decision-making processes and evaluate how they can be vulnerable to corruption;
- Apply knowledge of how decision-making processes can be improved to reduce corruption risks;
- Understand the roles of internal control measures, including audit and the inspector general, and how they reduce corruption risks;
- Understand the BI Self-Assessment Questionnaire and Peer Review process;
- Develop an outline integrity action plan and put it into practice with assistance from NATO BI.

Issues for Consideration

- What are examples of effective and ineffective decision making methodologies?
- How can we effectively monitor and evaluate the results of different decision-making methodologies?
- What are the features of effective auditing and control systems, and how can these systems maintain their effectiveness in constantly changing environments?
- What are the main lessons from countries which have previously gone through the SAQ / Peer Review process?
- How can countries most effectively use the process to improve the governance and resilience of their defence and security sectors?

Learning Methodology

- Group work, discussions, lecture, situational analysis, solution of practical tasks, interview, lessons learned.

Module 3.3.1: Integrity of Decision-Making

Module Description

This module aims to provide an understanding of the methodology of decision-making processes and how corruption risks can arise during the process. Students will also learn how to develop measures to address corruption risks, and undertake process analysis and improvement.

Module Learning Objectives

- Explain national decision-making methodologies;
- Be able to evaluate the corruption risks in the decision-making process (risk mapping);
- Develop an effective risk management methodology;
- Develop specific national measures to reduce the corruption risks;
- Create a monitoring system for the decision-making process.

Issues for Consideration

- What are examples of decision-making methodology?
- Can we compare and contrast the decision-making methodologies of different countries?
- What are the corruption risks and consequences in the decision-making process?
- What are the benefits of implementing a risk management methodology?
- How can we develop and evaluate specific measures for each country to reduce corruption risks?
- What are the benefits of implementing a monitoring system for decision-making processes?

Learning Methodology

- Group work, discussions, lecture, situational analysis, solution of practical tasks, interview, lessons learned.

References

- DCAF, *Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Defence: A Compendium of Best Practices*, 2010. http://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_topics/20120607_BI_Compendium_EN.pdf
- OECD, *Integrity in Public Procurement: good practice from A to Z*, 2007. <http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/38588964.pdf>
- Transparency International UK, *Defence spending: how to reduce corruption risks*, 2014. http://www.transparency.org/news/feature/defence_spending_how_to_reduce_corruption_risks

Module 3.3.2: Internal Checks and Balances

Module Description

This module focuses on providing students with an understanding of what the most effective methods of internal control and audit are, and what measures are required for transparency and risk reduction.

Module Learning Objectives

- Explain the roles of internal control measures in defence institutions;
- Explain why having separated powers and levels of authorizations reduces corruption risks;
- Explain why having separated decision-making among multiple departments reduces corruption risks;
- Formulate criteria and corruption risk indicators for internal control and audit systems and procedures for initiating reviews;
- Explain the role of internal audit in addressing corruption;
- Explain the role of Inspector General and ex-ante evaluation in mitigation of corruption.

Issues for Consideration

- What are the roles of internal audit and controls in mitigating corruption risks?
- Who are the main stakeholders in establishing internal checks and balances?
- What are the main requirements for effective internal audit and control?
- In a constantly evolving environment, what is the best way to maintain effective internal checks and balances?
- What is the correct balance between monitoring activities to prevent corruption and the requirement for efficient operations?

Learning Methodology

Group work, discussions, lecture, situational analysis, solution of practical tasks, interview, lessons learned.

References

- DCAF, *Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Defence: A Compendium of Best Practices*, 2010. http://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_topics/20120607_BI_Compendium_EN.pdf
- Henderson, William T, *Anti-corruption internal audits – a crucial element of anti-corruption compliance*, Ernst and Young, 2010. [http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/EY-FIDS-Anti-corruption-internal-audits/\\$FILE/EY-FIDS-Anti-corruption-internal-audits.pdf](http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/EY-FIDS-Anti-corruption-internal-audits/$FILE/EY-FIDS-Anti-corruption-internal-audits.pdf)
- Protiviti Inc, *Guide to internal audit*, 2009. http://www.protiviti.com/en-US/Documents/Resource-Guides/Guide_to_Internal_Audit.pdf
- The Institute of Internal Auditors, *The audit committee: internal audit oversight*. https://na.theiia.org/about-ia/PublicDocuments/08775_QUALITY-AC_BROCHURE_1_FINAL.pdf

Module 3.3.3: Designing and Managing BI programmes

Module Description

This module introduces students to the entire NATO process for Building Integrity. It covers the Self-Assessment Questionnaire, the Peer Review process, designing the integrity action plan and implementing a continuous process of improvement.

Module Learning Objectives

- Complete the Self-Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) and define the next steps;
- Understand the purpose and process of the Peer Review visit;
- Develop an integrity action plan appropriate for the country;
- Understand the options for the implementation assistance from NATO BI, including trainings, tailored workshops, seminars, and provision of SMEs;
- Understand the importance of the iterative cycle in assessing progress.

Issues for Consideration

- Who are the main stakeholders in the development of BI in the defence sector, and how can they be persuaded of the need to join the programme?
- How can you ensure an accurate and honest response to the self-assessment questionnaire?
- What steps are necessary to ensure the peer review is acceptable to the country?
- How can nations incorporate education and training into a building integrity action plan?

Learning Methodology

- Group work, discussions, lecture, situational analysis, solution of practical tasks, interview, lessons learned, train the trainers.

References

- CIDS, *Integrity Action Plan - a handbook for practitioners in defence establishments*, 2014.
http://cids.no/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Integrity-Action-Plan-handbook_web.pdf
- DCAF, *Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Defence: A Compendium of Best Practices*, 2010.
http://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_topics/20120607_BI_Compendium_EN.pdf
- Transparency International UK, *Defence spending: how to reduce corruption risks*, 2014.
http://www.transparency.org/news/feature/defence_spending_how_to_reduce_corruption_risks



4

Operations and defence engagement

Theme description

This theme focuses on the impact of corruption and weak governance on military operations and defence engagement. It explains the relevance of BI principles to overseas operations and defence engagement as well as the necessity to include BI as part of the mission. It will enable participants to understand the significance of preventing and tackling corruption in operations and defence capacity building, and to mainstream BI aspects in their own work. It will combine the focus on tackling risks related to area of operations (AOR) with mitigating corruption risks among mission troops.

THEME LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- Understand corruption risks and challenges in all phases of military operation;
- Understand and identify the impact of corruption on tactical, operational and strategic levels (including bribery; nepotism; vertically integrated corruption; criminal patronage networks; and state capture);
- Identify and understand corruption indicators and warnings. Understand the utility and limitations of corruption measuring tools;
- Understand ways in which mission actions can interact with the AOR environment to entrench or mitigate corruption;
- Identify and understand corruption risks, pathways, manifestations, and challenges it poses to defence capacity building;
- Identify and apply preparatory actions and in-theatre ways to mitigate corruption risks in operations and defence capacity building;
- Identify other actors involved prior and during military operations and defence capacity building, and understand their role in handling corruption at different levels of governance;
- Understand effective decision-making, based on the risk and possible impact on corruption for achieving mission success;
- Apply techniques, practices and processes that can be used to mitigate corruption risks in operations and defence capacity building;
- Understand the role of Building Integrity in Defence Capacity Building.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

- How can the mission assess the risk that corruption poses to mission goals and success?
- How can different manifestations and pathways of corruption be diagnosed (including the way corruption is intertwined with criminal patronage networks, exploitation of natural resources, foreign aid etc.)?
- In what ways can mission activities exacerbate corruption issues in AOR? How can these be mitigated?
- How does corruption influence the efficiency and legitimacy of host nation government institutions, including defence and security forces?
- How can mission staff best prepare to tackle corruption issues?

- How do the different manifestations of corruption affect Defence Capacity Building programs?
- What is the role of integrity building in Defence Capacity Building and defence engagement?

LEARNING METHODOLOGY

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

BLOCK ONE: BUILDING INTEGRITY IN MILITARY OPERATIONS

Module 4.1.1: Types and Pathways of Corruption Affecting Military Operations

Module 4.1.2: Corruption Risks and Mission Success

Module 4.1.3: Addressing Corruption through the NATO Planning Process

Module 4.1.4: Standard Operating Procedures: Techniques, Practices and Processes Limiting Risks of Corruption within the Military Mission

Module 4.1.5: Techniques, Practices and Processes for Countering Corruption during Operations

Module 4.1.6: Corruption Risks in Mission Sustainment

Module 4.1.7: Countering Corruption through the Comprehensive Approach

Module 4.1.8: Leadership and Effective Decision-Making

Module 4.1.9: Development of Indigenous Military Security and Police Forces

Module 4.1.10: Assessing and Monitoring Anti-and Counter-Corruption Interventions in Military Operations

BLOCK TWO: DEFENCE ENGAGEMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Module 4.2.1: Corruption Risks in Defence Engagement, Security Force Assistance, Stability Policing and Defence and Related Security Capacity Building

Module 4.2.2: Corruption pathways and corruption risk assessment in host nation defence capacity building

Module 4.2.3: Mitigating corruption risks in defence engagement: building integrity, building capacity

Module 4.2.4: Mitigating corruption risks in defence engagement: working with external partners

Module 4.2.5: Best practices in building sustainable Oversight, Anti-corruption and Internal Control structures

BLOCK ONE: BUILDING INTEGRITY IN MILITARY OPERATIONS

Block Description

This block is designed to create, foster and advance understanding of building integrity in military operations. It focuses on the risks that corruption can pose to military operations, aiming to equip participants with the understanding of different types of risks and the ways in which they affect the goals of military missions, including provision of security, provision of basic services, and stabilisation of governing structures. It introduces the 'do no harm' principle, showing the various ways in which mission activities could inadvertently exacerbate corruption. Finally, it tackles the impact of corruption on the efficacy and legitimacy of the mission itself.

The goal is to educate selected military and police officers in practices and processes that enable them to understand and counter the various types of corruption that undermine mission success in military operations on the tactical, operational and strategic levels. The block also aims to facilitate cooperation with relevant SMEs by including a module in the NATO planning process, aimed at SMEs augmenting NATO forces.

Block Learning Objectives

- Understand corruption risks and challenges in all phases of military operations;
 - Understand and identify corruption pathways, manifestations, and impact on tactical, operational and strategic levels (including bribery; nepotism; vertically integrated corruption; criminal patronage networks; and state capture);
 - Identify and understand corruption indicators and warnings;
 - Understand the utility of corruption measuring tools.
- Understand ways in which mission actions can interact with the AOR environment to entrench corruption (including mission sustainment);
- Identify and understand techniques, practices and processes that can be used to mitigate corruption risks, including mission preparation and in-theatre activities;
- Identify other actors involved during military operations and their role in preventing corruption;
- Understand effective decision-making with a focus on integrity building for achieving mission success.

Issues for Consideration

- How can the mission assess the risks that corruption poses to mission goals and success?
- How can different manifestations and pathways of corruption be diagnosed?
- In what ways can mission activities exacerbate corruption issues in AOR? How can these be mitigated?
- How does corruption influence government institutions, including defence forces?

Learning Methodology

- Teaching in this block is based on ten modules. Each module will comprise introductory lectures by practitioners/researchers, followed by analysis of case studies and a short written assignment. The written assignment could also be completed prior to the module, to allow participants time to engage with the reading material.

Module 4.1.1: Types and Pathways of Corruption Affecting Military Operations

Module Description

Students will understand the various types of corruption and negative behaviours that can undermine military operations and post/conflict reconstruction efforts.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the link between corruption and conflict;
- Identify and understand corruption risks within the mission;
- Identify and understand types and forms of corruption (bribery; nepotism; vertically integrated corruption; criminal patronage networks; state capture) as well as specific corruption risks and pathways in the Area of Operations (including exploitation of natural resources, foreign aid, etc.) and their impact on mission success;
- Understand ways in which corruption undermines safety, security and trust of troops, the local population and other stakeholders in mission area.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- Joint Analysis and Lessons Learned Centre, Counter- and Anti-Corruption. *Theory and Practice from NATO Operations*, NATO, 2013. http://www.jallc.nato.int/products/docs/jallc_report_corruption_releasable.pdf
- Joint and Coalition Operation Analysis, Operationalizing Counter/Anti-Corruption Study, 2014. http://nust.edu.pk/INSTITUTIONS/Schools/NIPCONS/nipcons-institutions/CIPS/Download%20Section/JCOA%20CAC%20Final%20Report_U.pdf
- SIGAR, *Corruption in Conflict: Lessons Learned from the US Experience in Afghanistan*, 2016. <https://www.sigar.mil/pdf/LessonsLearned/SIGAR-16-58-LL.pdf>
- Transparency International Defence and Security, *Corruption – Lessons from the International Mission in Afghanistan*, 2015. https://www.transparency.org/files/content/pressrelease/2015_Corruption_Lessons_From_Afghanistan_EN.pdf
- Transparency International Defence and Security, *Corruption – Lessons from the International Mission in Afghanistan*, 2015. https://www.transparency.org/files/content/pressrelease/2015_Corruption_Lessons_From_Afghanistan_EN.pdf
- Transparency International Defence and Security, *Corruption and Peacekeeping. Strengthening Peacekeeping and the United Nations*, 2013. http://ti-defence.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/2013-10_-Corruption-PK-report.pdf
- UK Department for International Development, *Why Corruption Matters: Understanding Causes, Effects and how to Address Them, Evidence Paper on Corruption*. Ch. 1, 4.8, 2015.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/406346/corruption-evidence-paper-why-corruption-matters.pdf

Module 4.1.2: Corruption Risks and Mission Success

Module Description

This module allows participants to delve into a more detailed analysis of corruption risks on the tactical level and possible impact on operational and strategic levels. It traces the impact of corruption on three goals of stabilisation missions: provision of security, provision of basic services, and stabilisation of the host government, showing how different types of corruption can influence particular military mission activities. Finally, the module addresses how the mission itself can exacerbate corruption, and how social norms and practices can facilitate or limit corruption.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand corruption risks as an element of the comprehensive situational assessment;
- Identify societal norms and practices supporting and/or challenging corruption;
- Understand the impact of corruption on the efficiency and legitimacy of indigenous military security and police forces;
- Understand the factors which can lead to the reluctance of missions to address corruption;
- Understand the ways in which missions can influence/exacerbate corrupt practices in AOR (including through contracting);
- Recognize importance of practical preventive approaches in anti-corruption;
- Understand current best practice in anti-corruption measures on military operations.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- Anand Gopal, *No Good Men among the Living: America, the Taliban, and the War through Afghan Eyes*, American Empire Project, 2014.
- Christine Cheng, Dominik Zaum, *Key Themes in Peacebuilding and Corruption*, Special Issue of *International Peacekeeping Journal*, 2008.
- COMISAF Initial Assessment, 2009. <http://sclr.stabilisationunit.gov.uk/top-10-reads/thematic/counterinsurgency/13-isaf-commander-s-initial-assessment?path=counterinsurgency>
- Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, *Extortion and Corruption Along the U.S. Supply Chain in Afghanistan*, 2010.
- Marie Cheene, *Lessons Learned in Fighting Corruption in Post-Conflict Countries*, U4, 2012. <http://www.u4.no/publications/lessons-learned-in-fighting-corruption-in-post-conflict-countries/>
- Transparency International Defence and Security, *Corruption and Peacekeeping. Strengthening Peacekeeping and the United Nations*, 2013. http://ti-defence.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/2013-10_-Corruption-PK-report.pdf

Module 4.1.3: Addressing Corruption through Planning: the NATO Planning Process

Module Description

Students will be introduced to the NATO Operations Planning Process (OPP) and the way mission-relevant corruption issues should be linked and considered through the different phases of the OPP. This course is aimed at BI SMEs who will be working in operational environments.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the challenges related to planning anti- and counter-corruption efforts in military operations;
- Understand the contribution of the military to the NATO Crisis Management Process;
- Understand the different types of military operations planning;
- Understand the different phases of the NATO OPP, the interactions between different planning levels and how military operations planning at different levels interact with each other;
- Identify the way corruption relates to the different phases of the NATO OPP, from situational awareness to transition;
- Understand how corruption-related issues should be integrated in the different products throughout of the NATO OPP;
- Understand the challenges related to planning counter-corruption efforts in military operations;
- Understand how to set objectives for counter/ anti- and counter-corruption initiatives in operations.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- *Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive v2*, 2013
- MC 133/4, *NATO's Operations Planning*, 2016 (classified)
- *NATO BI-SC Operations Assessment Handbook*, 2015
- *NATO Crisis Response System Manual*, 2016 (classified)

Module 4.1.4: Standard Operating Procedures: Techniques, Practices and Processes Limiting Risks of Corruption within the Military Mission

Module Description

Audiences will become familiar with various techniques, best practices and processes that can be put in place to mitigate the risk of corruption and maintain integrity within a mission. The focus will be on Standard Operational Procedures and types of (national) personnel and financial regulations preventing corruption within the mission. This course is aimed at those staff working within the planning process.

Module Learning Objectives

- Ensure a common view of corruption risks in the (pre-) deployment contracting phase;
- Understand the importance of mission and unit cohesion and working comprehensively together;
- Identify and understand measures which can mitigate personnel corruption risks;
- Understand corruption risks through the full range of mission sustainment activities;
- Understand role of Inspector General Office in armed forces;
- Identify and understand examples of national anti-corruption laws and policy particularly pertinent to operational environments;
- Understand the importance of the situational assessment, relating to corruption levels within the Mission Area and local practices.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- *National and NATO SOPs and doctrine.*
- *NATO CIMIC Centre of Excellence, Good Governance Makes Sense – A Way to Improve Your Mission, 2012.* http://www.cimic-coe.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/internet_Handboek-Good-Governance-CCOE.pdf

Module 4.1.5: Techniques, Practices and Processes for Countering Corruption during Operations

Module Description

Students will study various techniques, best practices and processes that can be put in place to counteract corruption risks in AOR and mitigate their impact on mission objectives.

Module Learning Objectives

- Identify counter-corruption preparatory actions (such as threat assessment, intelligence, personnel management, screening of contractors, training, civil-military interaction, strategic communications, legal issues);
- Identify and understand the impact of mission contracting (including engagement with private security companies) on operations;
- Understand guidance and best practices of counter-corruption practices from different sources;
- Understand the challenges of dealing with corrupt actors;
- Use situational assessment to gain knowledge of existing corruption networks in theatre.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- *Joint and Coalition Operation Analysis, Operationalizing Counter/Anti-Corruption Study, 2014.* http://nust.edu.pk/INSTITUTIONS/Schools/NIPCONS/nipcons-institutions/CIPS/Download%20Section/JCOA%20CAC%20Final%20Report_U.pdf
- *Marie Cheene, Lessons Learned in Fighting Corruption in Post-Conflict Countries, U4, 2012.* <http://www.u4.no/publications/lessons-learned-in-fighting-corruption-in-post-conflict-countries/>
- *SIGAR, Corruption in Conflict: Lessons Learned from the US Experience in Afghanistan, 2016.* <https://www.sigar.mil/pdf/LessonsLearned/SIGAR-16-58-LL.pdf>
- *Transparency International Defence and Security, Corruption Threats & International Missions: Practical guidance for leaders, 2014.* https://issuu.com/tidefence/docs/corruption_threats_international_

Module 4.1.6: Mission Sustainment

Module Description

Students will be able to identify and understand corruption risks in the sustainment of operations and be aware of techniques and practices that can be put into place to mitigate the risk of corruption and maintain integrity within a mission area.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the impact of corruption in the sustainment chain on mission success;
- Understand the span of sustainment activities from deployment to redeployment;
- Understand the risks of corruption in sustainment operations;
- Understand the risks inherent in national and multinational strategic support networks;
- Understand the risks inherent in operational support networks;
- Understand the involvement and scope of contractors and local employed individuals in sustainment; including beneficial ownership and sub-contractual relationships;
- Identify and apply effective risk mitigation strategies in sustainment operations.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- AJP 4 Logistics.
- AJP4.4 Allied Joint Movement and Transportation Doctrine.
- AJP 4-5 Allied Joint Host Nation Support.
- AJP 4-6 Joint Logistics Support Group.
- AJP 4-9 Modes of Multinational Logistics Support.
- AJP 4-10 Medical Support.
- AJP 4-11 Asset Visibility.
- NATO Logistics Handbook.

Module 4.1.7: Countering Corruption through the Comprehensive Approach

Module Description

Students will familiarise themselves with the various stakeholders involved in mission area and the role they can play in mitigating corruption risks.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the NATO Comprehensive Approach and the requirement of cooperation and coordination at all levels in anti- and counter-corruption activities;
- Understand mandates, roles, strengths and decision-making autonomy of other stakeholders in mission area;
- Understand and apply anti-corruption guidance, including those issued by NATO, UN, OSCE and host nations;
- Understand the demands and benefits of working with Non-NATO Entities (NNEs) to obtain unity of efforts within a Comprehensive Approach and implement BI activities;
- Understand corruption risks associated with humanitarian crises;
- Identify anti-corruption measures used by other stakeholders in the mission area.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- Christopher Schnaubelt, *Towards a Comprehensive Approach: Integrating Civilian and Military Concepts of Strategy*, NATO Defence College, 2011. <http://www.ndc.nato.int/download/downloads.php?icode=272>
- Independent Commission for Aid Impact, *DFID's Approach to Anti-Corruption and Its Impact on the Poor*, 2010. <http://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/DFIDs-Approach-to-Anti-Corruption-and-its-Impact-on-the-Poor-FINAL.pdf>
- Transparency International, *Preventing Corruption in Humanitarian Operations*, 2014. http://files.transparency.org/content/download/1899/12606/file/2014_Humanitarian_Handbook_EN.pdf
- UK Department for International Development, *DFID's Anti-Corruption Strategy for Nigeria*, 2013. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/213915/anti-corruption-strategy-ng.pdf

Module 4.1.8: Leadership and Effective Decision-Making

Module Description

Students will analyse the role of leadership within the mission and what effective decision-making processes mean for preventing and addressing corruption in support of achieving mission objectives.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the importance of the Commander building a culture of integrity within the Force;
- Understand the importance of addressing corruption risks through all phases of the decision-making process;
- Understand the importance of leadership with respect to personnel and assets management;
- Understand the challenges and significance of reconciling varying stakeholder interests, priorities, and ethical approaches when addressing corruption;
- Understand commanders' role in setting objectives for anti- and counter-corruption initiatives during military operations;
- Understand commanders' role in mitigating the increase of corruption in the AOR during operations.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- Robert L. Taylor and William E. Rosenbach. *Military Leadership: In Pursuit of Excellence*. Boulder, Westview Press, 2008.
- SIGAR, *Corruption in Conflict: Lessons Learned from the US Experience in Afghanistan*, 2016.
<https://www.sigar.mil/pdf/LessonsLearned/SIGAR-16-58-LL.pdf>
- United States Army Combined Arms Centre, *Operational Leadership Experiences Project (OLE)*.
<http://usacac.army.mil/organizations/cace/csi/ole>

Module 4.1.9: Development of Host Nation Military Security and Police Forces

Module Description

Students will analyse ways to integrate anti- and counter-corruption measures in developing Host Nation (HN) military security and police forces in (post) conflict areas.

Learning Objectives

- Understand the concept and process of developing HN military and police forces;
- Understand risks of corruption within the HN military and police forces;
- Understand the influence that defence and security capacity building initiatives can have on corruption risks and practices within HN military and police forces;
- Identify ways to develop HN military and police forces' own capabilities to address corruption within their institutions and in the execution of their missions;
- Identify ways to integrate Building Integrity into development of HN military and police forces.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- AJP - 3.16, *Allied Joint Doctrine for Security Force Assistance*, 2016.
- AJP - 3.22, *Allied Joint Doctrine for Stability Policing*, 2015.
- Hans Born, Albrecht Schnabel, *Security Sector Reform in Challenging Environments*, DCAF, 2009.
<http://www.dcaf.ch/Publications/Security-Sector-Reform-in-Challenging-Environments>
- Mark Sedra, *An Uncertain Future for Afghanistan's Security Sector*, *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development*, 3(1), 2014.
- Mark Sedra, *Diagnosing the Failings of Security Sector Reform in Afghanistan* in *Afghanistan in the Balance: Counterinsurgency, Comprehensive Approach, and Political Order*, Hans-Georg Ehrhart, Sven Gareis, Charles Pentland, McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008.
- NATO Security Forces Assistance Concept, 2013.
- NATO SOF Military Assistance Handbook (1st Study draft), 2014.
- *Resolute Support Security Force Assistance Guide*, 2015.
- Transparency International Defence and Security Programme, *Security Assistance, Corruption and Fragile Environments: Exploring the Case of Mali*, 2015.
<http://ti-defence.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/150818-150817-Security-assistance-corruption-and-fragile-environments-Exploring-the-case-of-Mali-2001-2012.pdf>
<http://www.stabilityjournal.org/articles/10.5334/sta.ei/>

Module 4.1.10: Assessing Anti- and Counter- Corruption Interventions in Military Operations

Module Description

Students will be introduced to methodologies to assess anti-corruption interventions during military operations.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the NATO Operations Assessment Process;
- Understand how to integrate assessment of the impact of corruption in the overall operations assessment process;
- Understand the challenges in collecting data and assessing corruption levels and the success or failure of counter corruption efforts in military operations;
- Identify ways to develop Measures of Effectiveness and Measures of Performance to assess counter corruption interventions;
- Understand how to develop recommendations to mitigate increases of corruption in the AOR during operations.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- Centre for Army Lessons Learned, *Assessments and Measures of Effectiveness in Stability Operations Handbook*, 2011.
http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/call/call_10-41.htm
- Derick Brinkerhoff, *Assessing Political Will for Counter Corruption Efforts: an analytic framework*, *Public Administration and Development*, Vol 20, 2000.
- Daniel Kaufmann, Aart Kraay, Massimo Mastruzzi, *Measuring Corruption: Myths and Realities*, World Bank Group, 2006.
- DCAF, *Building Integrity and Reducing Corruption in Defence: A Compendium of Best Practices*: http://www.nato.int/nato_static/assets/pdf/pdf_topics/20120607_BI_Compendium_EN.pdf
- Francisco J. Urra, *Assessing Corruption An analytical review of Corruption measurement and its problems: Perception, Error and Utility*, Georgetown University, 2007.
- Jesper Johnsen, *How to monitor and evaluate anti-corruption agencies: Guidelines for agencies, donors, and evaluators*; U4 Issue 8, Bergen Institute, 2011.
- Jonathan Schroden, *Why Operations Assessments Fail. It's Not Just the Metrics*, *Naval War College Review* 64(4), 2011.
<https://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/6ed0e5cd-621f-44c3-b40d-913cad7e8c48/Why-Operations-Assessments-Fail-It-s-Not-Just-the.aspx>
- NATO BI-SC Operations Assessment Handbook, 2015.

BLOCK TWO: DEFENCE ENGAGEMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Block Description

This block is designed to foster and advance understanding of integrity in Defence Engagement (DE), Security Force Assistance (SFA), Stability Policing (SP) and Defence and Related Security Capacity Building (DCB). It aims to identify the risk that corruption can pose to the success of defence engagement and capacity building programmes; outline specific corruption risks and pathways; analyse the impact of capacity building and defence engagement programmes on corrupt networks and practices; and offer best practices in mitigating corruption risks and addressing corrupt practices as and when feasible. The goal is to contribute to a more sustainable engagement and capacity building approach.

The block is aimed at those designing, implementing and monitoring DE, SFA, SP and DCB programmes, including BI SMEs involved in these activities.

Block Learning Objectives

- Understand the objectives of Defence Engagement (DE), Security Force Assistance (SFA), Stability Policing (SP) and Defence and Related Security Capacity Building (DCB);
- Understand and analyse corruption risks and the challenges it poses to DE, SFA, SP and DCB;
- Understand the interplay between corrupt agents/officials and DE, SFA, SP and DCB programmes;
- Identify corruption pathways, manifestations, and impact on the recipient security forces (including the impact of bribery, nepotism, and vertically integrated corruption);
- Identify sources of information on corruption issues;
- Understand the role Building Integrity plays in defence engagement and capacity building, and be able to incorporate it into activity planning;
- Apply anti- and counter-corruption measures in programme design and implementation;
- Understand the contribution of robust defence sector oversight to defence capacity building;
- Understand the role external actors can play in capacity and integrity building, and mitigating corruption risks;
- Understand the importance of performance monitoring and impact evaluation

Issues for Consideration

- How does corruption affect Defence Engagement, Security Force Assistance, Stability Policing and Defence and Related Security Capacity Building programs?
- How can different manifestations, pathways and effects of corruption be diagnosed (including bribery; nepotism; influence trading; etc.)?
- What are the ways to mitigate corruption risks and how should individuals address corrupt practices?
- What role can third-party organizations (including international organisations and civil society

organisations) when conducting DE/SFA/DCB activities with regard to BI?

- What is the importance of defence sector oversight for defence capacity building?
- What is the importance of monitoring and impact assessment important? How can it help address corruption risks?

Learning Methodology

The course will be delivered through five modules. Each module will comprise introductory lectures by practitioners/researchers, followed by analysis of case studies and a short written assignment. The written assignment could also be completed prior to the module, to allow participants time to engage with the reading material.

Module 4.2.1: Corruption Risks in Defence Engagement, Security Force Assistance, Stability Policing and Defence and Related Security Capacity Building

Module Description

This module introduces participants to the aims of defence engagement, security force assistance, and capacity building, and introduces the principles of effective DE, SFA and DCB. It proceeds to discuss the relationship between corruption and DE/SFA/DCB: the ways in which corruption can affect the effectiveness of programmes, as well as the risk of programmes inadvertently entrenching corrupt practices.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the goals of DE/SFA/DCB programmes and the conditions under which DE and/or SFA/DCB activities may be desirable;
- Identify the key elements of effective DE and SFA/DCB (needs assessment, identification of shared interests and objectives, design/implementation of appropriate activities, partnering with third parties where feasible, integrated performance monitoring and impact assessment) and understand how DE/SFA/DCB activities can inadvertently entrench corrupt practices;
- Understand the pathways through which particular types of corruption (including bribery; nepotism; criminal patronage networks; state capture; corruption in personnel and supply chain management) can affect defence engagement and capacity building (for example through diverted resources, training participation as a reward to inappropriate personnel, and lack of host country support at key levels);

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- Hans Born, Albrecht Schnabel, *Security Sector Reform in Challenging Environments*, DCAF, 2009.
http://www.dcaf.ch/content/download/35748/526713/file/YEARBOOK_2009.pdf
- OECD, *Handbook on Security System Reform: Supporting Security and Justice*, 2008.
http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/the-oecd-dac-handbook-on-security-system-reform_9789264027862-en
- Sarah Chayes and the Working Group on International Security, *Corruption: The Unrecognized Threat to International Security*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, June 2014. http://carnegieendowment.org/files/corruption_and_security.pdf
- Transparency & Accountability Initiative, *Open Government Guide, Security Sector*. <http://www.opengovguide.com/topics/security-sector/>
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime Corruption and Economic Crime Branch, *Partnering in Anti-Corruption Knowledge (PACK): A Guidance Note for Development Partners*, 2013.

Module 4.2.2: Assessing and Mitigating Corruption Risks in Defence Engagement, Security Force Assistance and Defence Capacity Building

Module Description

The purpose of the module is to enable participants to assess the type and severity of corruption risks which can affect DE/SFA/DCB programmes; to familiarise them with sources which can provide corruption-related indicators and warnings; and to introduce best practice in mitigating corruption risks.

Module Learning Objectives

- Identify indicators of the presence and severity of corruption (for example, documented cases of government corruption; governance indicators; strength of legislative and punitive measures);
- Apply the knowledge of indicators in assessing the relevance of corruption risks to the programmes being planned;
- Understand best practice in mitigating corruption risks;
- Identify anti-corruption resources (including external expertise) that can assist in planning and programming DE and DCB activities.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- Andrew Lebovich, *Mali's Bad Trip. Field notes from the West African Drug Trade*. *Foreign Policy*, 2013. <http://foreignpolicy.com/2013/03/15/malis-bad-trip/>, 2015.
- Jeffrey Meiser, *Dilemma of an African Soldier. War on the Rocks*, 2015. <http://warontherocks.com/2015/01/the-dilemma-of-an-african-soldier/?singlepage=1>.
- Mark Sedra, *An Uncertain Future for Afghanistan's Security Sector*, *International Journal of Security and Development*, 3(1), 2014. <http://www.stabilityjournal.org/articles/10.5334/sta.ei/>
- Mark Sedra, *Diagnosing the Failings of Security Sector Reform in Afghanistan* in Hans-Georg Ehrhart, Sven Gareis, Charles Pentland, *Afghanistan in the Balance: Counterinsurgency, Comprehensive Approach, and Political Order*, McGill-Queen's University Press, 2012.
- Transparency International *Defence and Security (2015), Security Assistance, Corruption and Fragile Environments: Exploring the case of Mali, 2001-2012*. <http://ti-defence.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/150817-Security-assistance-corruption-and-fragile-environments-Exploring-the-case-of-Mali-2001-2012.pdf>

Module 4.2.3: Building Integrity, Building Capacity: Implementing BI Programmes within Security Force Assistance and Defence Capacity Building

Module Description

This module focuses on the implementation of BI/anti-corruption programmes as elements of DE/SFA/DCB. It enables participants to understand the range of available tools and ways to implement an anti-corruption programme, and introduces the potential role of external partners (including parliaments and civil society), in mitigating corruption risks and building integrity and sustainability. It is aimed at BI SMEs participating in DE/SFA/DCB programmes; it could also be useful, however, to those wishing to understand the design of the BI programmes and the role they can play in DE/SFA/DCB.

Module Learning Objectives

- Apply Building Integrity measures, tailoring them to specific contexts;
- Understand the contribution of external actors to building integrity and defence capacity building.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- Federation of American Scientists, *International Military Education and Training*. http://fas.org/asmp/campaigns/training/IMET2.html#_ftn38,
- OECD, *Handbook on Security System Reform: Supporting Security and Justice*, 2008. http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/the-oecd-dac-handbook-on-security-system-reform_9789264027862-en
- OECD, *Security System Reform: What Have We Learned?*, 2009. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/docs/44391867.pdf>
- Paul, Christopher, Colin P. Clarke, Beth Grill, Stephanie Young, Jennifer D. P. Moroney, Joe Hogler and Christine Leah, *What Works Best When Building Partner Capacity and Under What Circumstances?* RAND Corporation, 2013. <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG1253z1.html>.

Module 4.2.4: Monitoring and Evaluation of Defence Engagement, Security Force Assistance and Capacity Building

Module Description

This module focuses on the importance of performance monitoring and impact evaluation in DE, SFA and DCB programmes and explains ways of monitoring the levels and impact of corruption on programme success.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the difference between measures of performance and measures of effectiveness;
- Understand the importance of including monitoring activities in initial DE/SFA/DCB planning and funding;
- Identify ways of monitoring the levels and impact of corruption on programme success;
- Explain how the results of performance and effectiveness monitoring can be used to adjust DE/SFA/DCB activities and/or objectives, particularly with regard to corruption risks.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- Federation of American Scientists, *End-Use Monitoring of Defence Articles and Services. Government-to-Government Services*, 2005.
<http://fas.org/asmp/resources/govern/109th/EUM05.pdf>
- Jennifer Moroney, Aidan Kirby Winn, Jeffrey Engstrom, Joe Hogler, Thomas-Durell Young and Michelle Spencer, *Assessing the Effectiveness of the International Counter proliferation Program*, RAND, 2011.
http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR981.html.
- Jennifer Moroney, Joe Hogler, with Benjamin Bahney, Kim Cragin, David R. Howell, Charlotte Lynch, and Rebecca Zimmerman, *Building Partner Capacity to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction*, RAND Corporation, 2011.
<http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG783.html>
- Jennifer Moroney, Joe Hogler, Jefferson P. Marquis, Christopher Paul, John E. Peters, and Beth Grill, *Developing an Assessment Framework for U.S. Air Force Building Partnerships Programs*, RAND Corporation, 2011.
<http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG868.html>

Module 4.2.5: Best practices in building sustainable oversight, anti-corruption and internal control structures

Module Description

This module focuses on the importance of anchoring long term capacity and ownership for sustainable oversight, anti-corruption and internal control structures, and explains ways of approaching this.

Module Learning Objectives

- Understand the role and workings of the different national oversight structures (ministerial, governmental, and parliamentary);
- Identify ways of empowering these institutions, while preserving their independence and impartiality;
- Explain how cooperation with national oversight structures can strengthen impact of military operations.

Learning Methodology

- Teaching delivery will include a training package of lectures, case studies, group discussion and practical in-class exercises.

References

- Cole Eden, Kerstin Eppert & Katrin Kinzelbach. *Public Oversight of the Security Sector. DCAF Handbooks series.*
<http://www.dcaf.ch/Publications/Public-Oversight-of-the-Security-Sector>
- OECD DAC Handbook, *Security System Reform Supporting Security and Justice: Supporting Security and Justice.* OECD Publishing.
<http://www.oecd.org/dac>
- Rick Stapenhurst, *Legislative Oversight and Budgeting: A World Perspective*, World Bank Publications, 2008.
- William McDermott, Gilad Efra, *Social Media Guide for Ombuds Institutions for the Armed Forces*, DCAF, 2016.
<http://www.dcaf.ch>

Appendix 1

The audio-visual resource material is recommended to stimulate dialogue and explore real life situations which may confront students in the course of executing their professional duties. The material is drawn from a private sector source but will have application to the public sector. This includes short stories presented by actors aimed at highlighting challenges of embedding transparency, accountability and integrity in personnel systems and the importance of having clear practices in accordance with domestic and international laws, codes of conduct and good practices.

CD NR1.

Content: Interview with Richard Bistrong, who spent over a decade as an International Sales Vice-President, bribed foreign officials, covertly cooperated with international law enforcement, and went to prison.

- Why happened and what are the factors to consider in this experience?
- Was the experience avoidable and how it influenced the individual?
- Are there similar examples in your country?

CD. 2. 3. 4

Content: The stories presented focus on the role of auditors in the private companies and the behaviour of public officials leading to irregular and illegal actions.



















- What did the public officers wrong?
- Are active and passive corruption the same, how should be treated?
- Is “vetting” for the “third parties” part of your country rules and regulations?

CD NR 4.

Content: The story in the video presents the process of evaluating the business situation from all aspects before making a decision (Due Diligence).

- How domestic legal framework changes effect private sector and open ways to malpractice.
- Who is doing wrong in this story?
- Public-private dialogue and partnership on BI.

Building Integrity Reference – Project team

Working Group Leader	Neil Best	NATO HQ	
Working Group Co-leader	Mark Huber	US Defence Governance and Management Team	
COUNTRY	NAME	INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	LTC Osmo Hasic	Peace Support Operations Training Centre	
Bulgaria	Prof. Todor Tagarev	Geneva Centre for Democratic Control of Armed Forces	
Canada	Dr David Emelifeonwu	Canadian Defence Academy / Royal Military College of Canada	
Republic of North Macedonia	Afrdita Volina	Ministry of Defence of the Republic of North Macedonia	
Republic of North Macedonia	LTC Marijo Jurishikj	Army of the Republic of North Macedonia	
Georgia	David Gunashvili	Georgian Ministry of Defence	
Georgia	Maka Petriashvili	Georgian Ministry of Defence	
Georgia	Vasil Garsevanishvili	Georgian Ministry of Defence	
Italy	COL Antonio Genovese	Anti-corruption and Transparency Support Office Italian Joint Military Staff	
Italy	LTC Marco Rizzo	Budget and Financial Central Department Italian Ministry of Defence	
Italy	MAJ Filippo Tancon Lutteri	NATO Stability Policing Centre of Excellence	
Moldova	MAJ Ion Rotaru	Army of the Republic of Moldova	
Montenegro	Sanela Djozagic	Montenegrin Ministry of Defence	
Montenegro	Vanja Vukovic	Montenegrin Ministry of Defence	
Norway	COL Terje Haaverstad	Centre for Integrity in the Defence Sector	
Serbia	CDR Stanko Lekic	Republic of Serbia, Ministry of Defence, Defence Policy Sector, Strategic Planning Department	

Serbia	Milan S. Milutinovic	Republic of Serbia, Ministry of Defence, Defence Policy Sector, Directorate of European Integration and Project Management	
Ukraine	LTC Stanislav Filippov	State Border Guard Service of Ukraine	
Ukraine	COL Yuriy Pryzglei	Building Integrity Training and Education Center, Ivan Chernyakhovsky National Defense University	
Ukraine	COL Olena Holota	Building Integrity Training and Education Center, Ivan Chernyakhovsky National Defense University	
United Kingdom	LTC Dave Allen	Defence Academy of the United Kingdom	
United States	Dr Anke Richter	Naval Postgraduate School	
United States	Dr Joe Hogler	RAND Corporation	
United States	Timothy Schultz	International Forum on Business Ethical Conduct	
NATO	F/SGT Louise McLoughlin	Joint Force Command Naples	
NATO	LTC Massimo Morretti	Joint Force Command Naples	
NATO	LTC Francesco Pellegrino	Joint Force Command Naples	
NATO	Kim Vetting	Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe	
NATO	Valentin Poponete	Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe	
Civil society Organization	Gavin Raymond	Transparency International UK Defence and Security Programme	
Civil society Organization	Karolina MacLachlan	Transparency International UK Defence and Security Programme	

Notes

[illegible]

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.



Further information

For further information, please contact the following:

Ms. Bénédicte Borel

Programme Coordinator

Building Integrity Programme

Defence Institution and Capacity Building Directorate

Operations Division

NATO HQ

Email: borel.benedicte@hq.nato.int

For further information on the NATO Building Integrity Programme, please see the following:

Website: <https://buildingintegrity.hq.nato.int/>

LinkedIn: NATO Building Integrity

Email: building-integrity@hq.nato.int