Good Governance and Fighting Corruption Workshop
Idlib, Syria 3 – 6 April 2017

In collaboration with:
Background

After more than 6 years of armed conflict, governance in Syria has almost completely collapsed. What remains is mostly driven by the needs of war rather than the needs of the population. Basic services such as food, electricity, shelter and heating, as well as security and justice, are managed and delivered throughout the country by a patchwork of different de-facto local authorities. Consequently, the governance systems and mechanisms which emerge from this patchwork are varied and operate out of sync with each other, leaving the civilian population exposed to the daily challenges of the conflict.

In areas outside the control of the Government of Syria, the governance vacuum is filled by a multitude of actors, both armed and civilian. Conditions for good governance vary area by area and are dependent on the presence of civil society, the level of civil activism, and the attitude and role of armed groups. Nonetheless, a developed culture of consultation between local councils and governing bodies on the one hand and local communities on the other is lacking. While this is certainly a legacy from the period prior to 2011, the conflict has only worsened conditions. Now more than ever, those in executive positions frequently believe they possess the authority to do as they want, yet they often lack the tools, knowledge and intention to provide good governance. Accountability of those in governance positions is usually vague and remains largely unimplemented and there is an absence of formal accountability systems for the population.

Situated in the northwest of Syria, Idlib has been a major flashpoint throughout the duration of the conflict and the events that preceded it. In the early phase of the war, as the uprising descended into armed conflict, Idlib became the focus of several military operations carried out both by governmental and armed opposition forces attempting to gain the control of the city. In March 2015, following a successful offensive against the Syrian regime forces, Jaish al-Fatah (JAF) wrested control of Idlib and have governed the province since. While relatively sophisticated services were maintained, particularly considering the challenging circumstances, the civilian population remained wary of the military control over administrative matters as both corruption and favouritism negatively influenced the city’s management. In response to continued mismanagement, the citizens of Idlib began to demand greater control over the selection of the city’s governing bodies. Reaching a head in the last months of 2016, the protests eventually forced JAF to concede to the public’s demands and in January 2017, free elections to form a completely civilian governing entity were arranged.

In light of these events, No Peace Without Justice (NPWJ) in cooperation with Jusoor - Training Centre organised a four-day workshop on “Good Governance and Fighting Corruption”. Held in Idlib between 3-6 April 2017, its aim was to build knowledge and increase awareness on the basics of good governance and on the tools and mechanisms that could make governance processes more effective and efficient. The workshop targeted the members of Idlib Local Council and local civil society activists.
Structure of the training course

Prior to the workshop, the organisers conducted a survey among members of the Local Council and civil society activists in the city of Idlib. The survey was aimed at identifying the level of understanding among participants on good governance, local administration, service management and decision-making mechanisms. The survey shaped the preparation and definition of the goals and objectives of the “Good Governance and Fighting Corruption” training, and helped NPWJ and Jusoor - Training Centre to tailor the activity according to the needs of the beneficiaries (see Annex I for a detailed analysis of the survey and its results).

The training took place in Idlib City over four days. It was deliberately designed as an interactive exercise in order to maximise participants’ engagement and provide practical and realistic information tailored to the needs of the participants in a captivating manner. Following an introduction and general overview of the workshop, each day focused on specific aspects of good governance: day 1 focused on decentralised administration and local councils; day 2 tackled issues related to good governance and local administration; day 3 was dedicated to discussing the role of social participation and the importance of transparency in local government; and day 4 was dedicated to addressing corruption issues and local governance (see Annex II for the agenda of the training course).

NPWJ designed the workshop with the express intention of helping participants understand their own strengths and weaknesses, so that they could better develop the skills and best practices that they genuinely need. All the training material used during the training course was made available to the participants at the end of the training.

Trainer’s biography

Mehdi Salem

Born in 1989, married and the father of two children, and the holder of a Bachelor Diploma of Veterinary Science, Mr Salem is a certified and experienced trainer. Previously a member of the Hama Province Council, he is currently a relations officer for the charitable organisation al-Ikhlas. Mr Salem obtained a Diploma in Conflict and Negotiation Management from George Mason University and a certification as a trainer and coach in emotional intelligence from the American Institute of Professional Studies. He is a professional trainer in the Royal Canadian Academy of Management Science and an accredited trainer in the Local Administration Councils Unit (LACU) in the field of negotiation and good governance. He has proven experience working in Syria, having conducted numerous training courses on negotiation and good governance organised by the LACU and Jusoor - Training Centre for members of local councils in Hama and Idlib as well as to civil society activists.

Participants

The workshop was attended by 22 participants, 14 of whom are members of the Idlib Local Council, 3 members of the Idlib House, 1 from the free Aleppo Police Department and 3 from
Rakeen. Additional participants included Alaa Abed from NPWJ and Areej from Jusoor - Training Centre who attended via Skype. A third of the participants were women.

**Day One – 3 April 2017**

**Introduction**

The training opened with a welcoming of the participants and an explanation of the purposes of the workshop, outlining its structure and objectives. In turn, participants introduced themselves and their work, described how they expected to benefit from the training and shared opinions on why they were elected to the Local Council. Experience and trust were identified as fundamental elements that got them to their current positions.

Following the initial personal introductions, the training began with the introduction of the concept of local governance and the role that local councils are expected to fulfil. The “ideal type” for a local council, its abilities and responsibilities were presented. A local council, it was explained, should have a clearly defined mandate established between itself and the people it governs, granting the council authority over a defined territory and access to resources. Its goals are to provide services, encourage local development and empower citizens with a sense of ownership and oversight for the community in which they belong. The ideal council will work with its subsidiary governing bodies/departments to pass and enforce policies consistent with its mandate. Likewise, it will ensure the provision of necessary public services. To this end, its activities must be accurately accounted for in a clear and independent budget.

The essence of effective governance is transparent, logical and realistic planning for the establishment of smooth, sustainable operating procedures. If more services are needed, then the needs must be properly established, funds must be allocated, its implementation must be fully considered and its existence must be communicated to the constituency. Local governing bodies are also expected to be a beacon encapsulating and reflecting the values of a society, ensuring social harmony and protection.

After introducing the text-book definition of an effective local council, the trainers took a step back and explained how “ideal types” rarely exist. Though helpful as a reference, all contexts are different and local governance must be appropriate for the environment in which it exists. To this end, participants were invited to engage in a brainstorming session to discuss the major obstacles for governance in Idlib so that priorities and roles might be properly established. Consensus settled on the lack of available financial resources and the difficulty of establishing legitimacy in a conflict setting.

**The local council: definition, roles and functions**

Continuing with the theme of understanding local realities, participants were asked to write down their own definition of local councils that best suit the context of Idlib. Once all participants had done so, the responses were attached to a flip chart and the group proceeded to engage in a brainstorming session on how to craft the most efficient and effective governance for Idlib. As
part of the same exercise, participants were then divided into 5 groups and asked to provide suggestions on the governance priorities for Idlib.

**Group 1**
- Representing the needs of the people of Idlib and ensuring accountability
- Responsible and ethical public expenditure
- Initiating and/or supporting public projects: for example, youth or public work initiatives

**Group 2**
- Ensuring the sustainability of the council, not to repeat the failures of previous governing bodies
- Reducing humanitarian needs and suffering
- Accountability

**Group 3**
- Informed decision-making based on rigorous data collection
- Fostering civil society
- Supporting and protecting the rights of women and minorities

**Group 4**
- Raising funds for the distribution of basic goods and services for the needy
- Humanitarian relief and development for the vulnerable, especially orphans and women
- Sponsoring local development projects to boost employment and the local market
- Maintaining education, in particular Rushd University

**Group 5**
- The provision of security and justice, with a focus on an established and effective civilian police force
- Sponsoring local development projects to boost employment and the local market

**The (de)centralisation of governance**

The brainstorming session was followed up by an extensive discussion on how the structure of governance can differ in terms of centralisation and what this means in effect.

The conflict in Syria has resulted in the breakdown of centralised government and led to complicated patterns of decentralised governance. Understanding the ways in which governance can be effectively devolved and how Idlib can be reincorporated into a broader governance structure in the future will be key to the sustainability of the Council. To understand this, however, the general concept had to be introduced to participants and this was done by using the United States of America as an example. It was explained how, with its separate states existing under a common federal constitution, the USA is a fine example of a federal state that is subjected to one constitution.

Decentralised administration is the distribution of administrative duties from the central government to more localised authorities. Decentralised regional authorities are thus relatively
independent but subject to the overall supervision of the central authorities under a standardised framework. This process can have a number of benefits, chiefly allowing greater flexibility and context-specific appropriateness of governance and a reduction of bureaucracy. In short, it places the loci of power and decision-making closer to the people it affects. Decentralisation also offers several concrete benefits to civil society. Primarily, it can increase governmental accountability and transparency and generate greater opportunities for collaboration with the authorities.

The second half of the sessions saw participants explaining the specific way that Idlib City Council was established. The mechanism of elections was discussed and deliberated in discussions between public committees and executive entities. The announcement was made through social and traditional media platforms. The conditions of the voter as well as the election entities were put in place, while it was explained that the Council is to rule the city of Idlib only, therefore the candidates had to be registered as citizens of Idlib. The electoral body consisted of 1,400 voters. 120 nomination requests were presented, of which 13 were rejected by the appeals committee. 25 persons were elected in a special hall that was prepared for this purpose. The whole process went smoothly, though only 850 voters could participate due to security issues and bombardments. The ballots were open from 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. The candidates or authorised persons on their behalf attended the vote counting process, which lasted to next day evening. The announcement of the results was well managed and organised.

**Good Governance**

A brainstorming session over good governance was led by the trainer, who introduced “power” as a concept practiced differently in different contexts. Corporations, international bodies, countries, local and national bodies all exercise a degree of power. Good governance is the exercise of power within an established framework of monitoring, oversight and accountability to determine the responsibilities, rights and relationships between the government and the governed. It is a system that supports justice, transparency and accountability of the organisations as well as fostering confidence and credibility within the work environment.

The trainer clarified the main elements of good governance: the availability of a clear strategy, a trusted system (an internal system that consists of accounting, accountability and rewarding) and finally the proper institutional culture (no corruption and no infringement).

Therefore, good governance is a process that enables the Council to guide the organisations in achieving their goals and visions and protecting the interests and the assets of the members and the general public. Good governance is the main element setting the balance between strategic and operational responsibilities in an organised and deliberate manner.

**Exercise:** The participants divided into groups and were asked the following questions:

1. Is the Local Council working under the principles of good governance (transparency – integrity – accounting and accountability)? Please clarify which steps and procedures should be met by the Council in this regard.

2. From your point of view, how can we enhance the practices of good governance in the Syrian local councils?
Each group wrote their own answers with an explanation of those answers. The trainer then presented the answers and discussed and identified gaps that should be a priority for the Council members. The trainer and the groups discussed potential scenarios that could occur in the absence of good governance structures, even if there were good intentions. A short instructional film on good governance followed the exercise.

The trainer then focused on the lack of good governance as a factor of organisational failure. He outlined how the following elements can undermine an organisation: lack of knowledge and training (governance); absence of financial and administrative oversight; absence of a clear form of leadership; no accountability over the local council performance; inactivity of governance’s operations; rigidity and stubbornness of old members who are in power; the misunderstanding of volunteer work and social services concepts; and the priority of private interests over the public good.

The last session of the day saw the trainer give a presentation and elaboration of “the principles and pillars” of good governance.

The Pillars of Good Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Transparency</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Effectiveness and Appropriateness</th>
<th>Legality</th>
<th>Equality and Social Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Participation**
The right of every woman and man to participate in decision-making.

**Transparency**
Openness and availability of decision-making processes and records to stakeholders. Honest and clear announcement of objectives, activities, impact and funding.

**Accountability**
Mechanisms for feedback and redress in the governing process. The implementation of tools by those who govern to answer for their activities to those they represent and affect.

**Effectiveness/ Appropriateness**
The ability of implementing projects that correspond to the expectations and interests of the governed.

**Legality**
All are subject to the rule of law, both citizens and public officials.
Equality and social integration

The right for all people to have equality of opportunity. No discrimination based on race, gender, religion, or ethnic origin and social origin.

Civil Society and Good Governance

Moving to the role of civil society, the trainer illustrated the vital role that civil society can play in strengthening and deepening democracy and good governance, by fostering political participation and mobilisation. It was explained that the relationship can at times be conflictual but it need not be antagonistic. Managing this relationship and balancing interests is itself an integral part of the governing processes.

Civil organisations can play a decisive role in many essential and critical matters as a tool to support and enhance the role of authorities in strengthening the concepts of social participation. Organisations and authorities can work together to support one another in the following ways:

1. Implementing awareness campaigns to improve cooperation and interaction between public institutions and citizens and channeling information in both directions.
2. Civil society participation with the executive and legislative authorities in their discussions over important matters, especially when drafting and amending laws, as well as making strategic decisions.
3. Working hand-in-hand on fostering the role of individuals and groups by protecting rights and freedoms of the people and denouncing violations and abuses.
4. Civil society holding authorities and individuals to account regarding transparency, accountability and legality.
5. Civil society undertaking research as background for future council activities.
6. Providing the authorities and decision-makers with the information available in these organisations, considering the ability of private establishments to possess more data when compared to public establishments.

Day Two – 4 April 2017

Day two began with a quick recap of the previous day before moving onto the day’s content.

Accountability

The module started with a description of what accountability means concretely. Accountability is a term that derives from the financial sector, hence the similarity in language between “accountability” and terms such as “accounts”, “accountancy” and “accountants”. While financial accountability is certainly important, it does not encompass the entirety of what is meant by the modern sense of accountability for actions, particularly governance matters.

Accountability means providing reasonable justification for, and evaluation of, any given behaviour. Wherever an action may have an impact, there should be accountability, be it over financial, social, moral, political or environmental matters. To be accountable, one must provide
mechanisms to be held to account by those that one’s actions affect. Three examples of mechanism types are 1) oversight and control; 2) performance improvement; and 3) respect of the law.

Accountability can guarantee the rights of citizens, enhance good governance and oblige officials to complete their duties toward all citizens while limiting corruption, misuse of power and waste of public money.

Financial accountability is a cornerstone of overall accountability and it was impressed upon Council members that bills and receipts must always be kept when possible. More importantly, there should be internal review and checks to monitor expenditure in order to fight corruption. Overall, financial accountability requires a proper devolution and division of oversight powers, so that no one can capture the process and facilitate corrupt practices.

There can be constitutional accountability through the institution of internal checks and balances in a governing structure. Whether between governing bodies at different levels of governance or within governing bodies themselves, the way in which a body is set up and the rules it must follow is paramount to accountability. These rules also ensure mechanisms for stakeholders to have redress or feedback on governance. Constitutionally, citizens, civil society and even entities such as businesses should have the right to input and evaluation of a governing body. In its most basic form, this is the ballot box, but good governance should have additional tools for accountability.

Herein is an important distinction between vertical and horizontal authority: vertical accountability indicates the abilities of voters to hold their representatives accountable; while horizontal accountability indicates that all public offices and officials are subject to accountability by another political entity so no one will be above the law.

A certain set of requirements must be available for successful accountability, like the clarity of messages and visions of the establishments to be agreed upon among the concerned people, the availability of an agreed-upon establishment strategy that is built on analysing the overall environment and the tools to reveal and distribute information.

**Translating Principles of Good Governance at the Individual Level**

Discussion moved to what practical steps the Council members could take together to build in principles of good governance into their work and mandate. Minimising bureaucracy, staffing positions based on merit and recognising competency are all important at the individual level. Council members should work together to build a sustainable, good governing body by fostering institutional abilities, encouraging creativity and innovation, supporting visionary leadership and results-based governing.

**Linking Good Governance to Local Society**

A governing body exists in a delicate balance. Its primary responsibility is to serve society yet it cannot deliver services unless it collects resources. However, it cannot collect resources unless it has popular support. Popular support, though, requires legitimacy and how does a governing body develop legitimacy? Primarily through delivering services!
How Governing Works

For this cycle to work, everyone must be honest in their duties and rely on one another. This was illustrated by a quote from Ibn Khaldun, “Kings made by soldiers, soldiers by money, money by taxes, taxes by construction, construction by justice, justice by labour efficiency, and labour efficiency by honesty of ministers”. Again, in this relationship, the importance of good governance is evident.

Though acknowledging that as an infinite regression the cycle is somewhat paradoxical, the trainer nonetheless highlighted service provision as “a good place to start in maintain the cycle of governance”.

During the practical exercise that followed, groups were asked to choose a public service under the purview of the Council and identify potential improvements and how they would incorporate public accountability into their plans. Participants divided into two groups, one representing the Council and the other representing the general public. Drinking water was chosen as the public service for the exercise. The simulation went smoothly and spontaneously through constructive discussion, the exchange of opinions and mutual respect. The experience of some participants was obvious through presenting solid and realistic ideas, therefore the session as an exercise was effective in that it was true to its real-life counterpart. After writing down all suggestions, the Trainer developed a table to gather the suggestions received by the participants (see below). A simulation dialogue was run by the trainer between citizens and the Council as the participants asked for implementation guarantee and quality control, when the Council responded with assurance of citizens’ participation and the availability of the complaints office, official website and phone number as communications platforms.

Service Provision Scenario: Improving the water supply service in Idlib city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Citizen</th>
<th>Local Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Water</td>
<td>Daily 35 litres per citizen, taking in consideration to reach highlands</td>
<td>25 litres per person according to an international study, taking in consideration to reach highlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>40000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of service</td>
<td>Assigning a committee of experts to check the water quality for</td>
<td>Assigning the health department to inspect Water and fuel quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants presented many ideas like granting water to all, ensuring fair shares, achieving social justice, building justice pillars, participation, equality of opportunities, considering all opinions, availability of laws, law sovereignty, transparency, securing human rights like the right to have services and work as well as the right to development and fighting corruption. Listening to complaints and delivering citizens’ demands were the most important points that the participants focused on. They pointed out that most of the mentioned pillars do not exist in reality, as even though there is inspection and surveillance in addition to a complaints channel, there is no mechanism to guarantee the right application. Other participants assured the possibility to ask the courts to reclaim rights as there are indeed incidents where people could reclaim their rights through that channel.

Rounding up the module on service provision and legitimacy was a discussion on the use of technology. Proper use of technology can support good governance in a number of ways. Call centres, electronic complaints platform, social media, online surveys and simple use of modern software can be employed to great effect. Be it in managing the internal affairs of the Council or providing a way of collecting and managing data from citizens, technology should be embraced.

The important points regarding social communications were highlighted, which were: establishing clear communication lines, a good understanding of society and its members, working together to identify high priority needs and activities, communicating with organisations, listening to the demands and requirements of all community’s members, indicating the municipality’s objectives and activities, explaining the time frame and work strategy and finally negotiations over society’s roles and responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>human consumption, quality of fuel and other related matters</th>
<th>Bills collection to assure the continuation of service with pumping water once a week – 500 Syrian pounds per month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Bill</td>
<td>1000 Syrian pounds every 2 months for a family of 5 members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Quality control patrols among neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Fighting misuse and waste and rationalising consumption through awareness campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backup Plan</td>
<td>Availability of emergency plan to secure 60% of the original service</td>
<td>Digging auxiliary wells; 7 wells for 7 areas as a backup with 50% of the original capacity production. Providing supporting organizations with researches and studies, securing two generators to produce 50% power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bills collection to assure the continuation of service with pumping water once a week – 500 Syrian pounds per month.
Justice and Equality in Governance and through Governance

Equality of opportunity, both inside the Council itself and through the activities it implements are of the utmost importance. Equal opportunity must be ensured for women, those with disabilities and ethnic minorities. When considering service for the community, for example, priorities must be struck on a calculation of fairness that includes severity of needs and the number able to be reached. There may be only a few hundred people with disabilities in any given area but if they are, for example, all unable to find livelihoods then their need is urgent and intervention should be considered. On the other hand, a community of thousands in some degree of need but has greater resilience can be considered a lesser priority.

The trainer explained that these kinds of judgements are not easily made when it comes to delivering services. This was illustrated by a scenario involving priority seating in a vehicle. Council member quickly saw how their own opinions influenced who they felt had the greater need. When assessing general and specific needs and priorities, all available information should be used. Research should be conducted and opinions sought.


Social Participation

Attention on the third day turned to public participation, something considered critically important in view of the limited resources available for Syrian administrative bodies. The issue of volunteer work was raised and become a central subject of the module.

Through a brainstorming session, the participants presented their ideas, emphasising: the contribution of members of society in sharing ideas; considering all opinions; participation of all members of society: and developing a sense of responsibility and a sense of belonging. They also stressed how volunteer work should be organised and divided to short periods for limited time. The trainer stressed how volunteers should be treated as regular employees to avoid turning volunteer work into disguised employment. One of the participants observed that geographical distance is among the reasons behind differences of opinions. Responding to this, the trainer underlined how critical it is to share common goals for volunteer work, while one participant stressed that mutual goals are not enough to form a unified society, rather similar traditions and culture among other things.

During the discussion over social participation, the topic of transparency was also discussed as a way to build trust and share concerns. The trainer stressed how important it is to ensure that any volunteer does their best and works hard using their personal potential, by including everybody and reinforcing the participatory aspect of constructive activities. Elections, funding, donating, ideas, volunteer work, gatherings and meetings, consultations and bonuses were among the tools to fostering participation and engagement by the volunteer workers.

The trainer conducted an exercise through which the participants had to draw a map of relationships between the Local Council and the rest of the community. This practical exercise assisted the participants in better understanding how to define practical goals and identify plans to achieve targets. The results of the exercise were written down and broadly discussed to identify the relationships between the Council and the rest of the local community (citizens, unions, local dignitaries and business as well civil society organisations), showing the critical relations between
these different social groups. The trainer then illustrated suggestions on how to overcome these difficulties and on which social groups the work of the Council should improve to come up with better relations among the various sections of the Idlib community.

**Governance planning**

The training continued by exploring the concept of governance planning and discussing the difference between management and leadership. An exercise was made over planning where the participants analysed how the internal and external environment affects decisions as well as strengths, weaknesses, chances and risks. The essence of institutional governance is the relationship between all sides of the interactive internal and external perimeter, which means the forming of relationships between the manager and the staff on one side and among the staff and others, as well as between the organisation and the public at large. During the interactive discussion, issues of the philosophy of governance and effective administration were discussed. Building trust between individuals and society is the most important argument for success of the work, and work values were key in this argument. Governance is reflected through the Council’s good planning, while the process starts from the clear and suitable construction of the Council’s work, then a whole internal process of placing people in jobs that fulfil the job requirements. All governance principles (transparency, accountability, social participation) are involved in all management processes (planning, orientation, regulation, oversight). The trainer explained these terms as follows: planning includes identifying internal and external relationships, while orientation comes after tasks’ distribution to follow up with employees to track their performance and confirm that the job is completed as well; regulation is the organisation and coordination of tasks, especially when work overlap occurs. At the end of his explanation, the trainer talked about oversight which means evaluation, correction and feedback.

**Pillars of good management and planning**

The trainer led a brainstorming session during which the participants presented many points like planning, regulation, clear procedures, team work, documentation, observation and follow up systems (reports, meetings, quantity & quality performance indications), evaluation and respect for the law and mechanisms of decision-making as well as authorisation.

The discussion then shifted to the operational plan of the Council. The trainer opened a discussion on internal procedures for establishing and achieving goals, focusing on the importance of clearly identifying the chain of command and responsibilities and how to create quantitative and qualitative indexes to measure performance and keep track of task implementation. The trainer explained the importance of analysing the current situation and specifying priorities.
Day Four– 6 April 2017

The fourth day of the training was dedicated to the issue of corruption and how to fight it. During a brainstorming session, the participants defined the concept of corruption, mentioning examples such as sabotage, profiteering and lack of integrity. The trainer then screened a small clip that tackled corruption, showing a person who noticed it everywhere and decided to find solutions to fight it. They did so by launching a campaign on 9 December, International Anti-Corruption Day, to deliver a strong message, while at the same time emphasising the reasons behind corruption: slow economy, no deterrents, lack of morality, education, absence of accountability, lack of oversight, bureaucracy and excessive legislation.

Through the brainstorming session, the trainer asked the participants to mention the types of corruption they knew, commenting on the replies and stressing how corruption can be categorised according to behaviour types, the places of corruption and the positions of corrupted people. Sometimes there will be an overlap between these factors. The types of corruption can be divided into four categories: political, financial, management and moral corruption.

The participants talked about the reasons behind corruption, comparing public money waste during the regime’s days and the revolution’s days, as well as nepotism. They also talked about the types of corruption and bribes prevailing in Idlib and how some people are still engaged in corruption today. For the participants, corruption is due to various factors such as: favouritism, ignorance, illiteracy and a lack of qualified people. The trainer identified four main reasons for corruption: educational and behavioural reasons, economic motives, political reasons and finally legal reasons.

The topic of corruption in public affairs was brought up for discussion, and the participants were excited to share their opinions and stories. They talked about the low level of integrity during the regime’s days, where the people overlooked how public money should be spent over public services and not to be wasted, sabotaged or stolen. They reminisced about the days when powerful people took advantage of their positions to fulfil their personal interests, or satisfy other individuals according to political and religious beliefs.

When the trainer asked who practices corruption, the participants answered that it could be anyone, however it’s more likely to be people in powerful positions, especially in an already corrupted environment. The participants also noted that there is a systematic corruption by the regime which causes qualified people to flee.

The trainer conducted an exercise to find the potential existence of corruption in local councils, encouraging participants to discuss and share their opinions. The participants mentioned many possibilities for corruption, like uncompleted internal systems in the Council that open the door for manipulation; any gap in the law could also be used by corrupted people; if the officials in the Council refused to listen to people’s demands and suggestions, this means corruption; and when one neighbourhood is serviced while the other is ignored it also constitutes corruption. Tenders, purchasing, salaries and wages, property, services, recruitment and appointments, are all potential areas for corruption. The participants also pointed out what they consider to be indirect corruption, which happens when someone comes late to work or appoints incompetent people, which means tasks will either be incomplete or done incorrectly.
Subsequently, the participants divided into four groups to discuss the difficulties of the Local Council in dealing with corruption cases. The first group discussed the hiring process, identifying criticisms such as secret dealings with service providers, taking advantage of high positions, ignoring abusers and disruption of the rules of procedure. The second group discussed the difficulties of the Council in achieving its goals. The third group discussed the issues of financial corruption, bribes, taking advantage of high positions and nepotism. The fourth group discussed favouritism in hiring, taking advantage of high positions, financial corruption, giving positions to relatives and friends, personal spending from project budgets, low quality materials, taking part of the resources allocated to people, ignoring people’s requests and bad legislative practices.

When the link between government and corruption was brought up in discussion, some participants believed there is none, while others said there must be a link. The trainer commented that corruption is not directly linked to work mechanisms and authorities, however democracies are less likely to be corrupted; when freedom of speech is protected, justice is intact, peaceful transfer of power is available and accountability is possible corruption is also less frequent. The participants talked about the misuse of granted authorisation to achieve personal illegal profit; this misuse can occur when a bribe is paid to someone to give a special service which is included in his job description and part of his obligation, or when the payee does something that is not within their authority, the bribe is a bad motivation to fight the practice and complete work according to the rule of law. The trainer pointed out that there are international studies that rank countries in respect to their corruption levels: Syria is listed 117 in transparency and corruption.

The trainer then clarified several types of administrative corruption, like incidental or small corruption, which is defined as personal behaviour such as embezzlement, favouritism and acquisition. The other type is regular and organised corruption, which indicates a vast network of corrupt people. Then mass corruption, which means stealing public money on a large scale, stealing public property and assets through fake deals, commissions, collusion and granting unauthorised privileges to specific people. The participants explained these types in groups. The first group talked about organised corruption, no respect for work timing, refusing duties, laziness, carelessness and revealing work secrets. The trainer explained administrative corruption from different perspectives or directions; the first direction focuses on general function and specific roles, the second direction focuses on linking economic situations to general function, the third direction focuses on public interests within authority’s practices, while the fourth direction focuses on moral behaviour. The second group discussed the issue of political corruption. The third group talked about organised corruption and bad structures that lead to putting the wrong people in the wrong positions; they also mentioned work overlap and behaviours like showing up late to work, leaving early, and working in side jobs that could affect the official job. They also mentioned a few more points like misuse of power and favouritism. Other forms were mentioned like financial corruption, which means violating the rules and written laws and manipulating the instructions and rules of financial control entities, excessive spending or stealing public money. They then talked about crimes and criminal offenses that are directly linked to misuse of power like counterfeiting, fraud and embezzlement.

Conclusions
At the end of the workshop, a survey was distributed among the participants to address and answer all questions and certificates of attendance were distributed. The expert was very positively received in the workshop and participants were engaged in the topics of discussion. The group worked well together as there was a strong desire to learn and for self-improvement. Some participants commented that they would have liked more time dedicated to the practical exercises and expressed the hope that the organisers would develop more trainings, in particular on transparency, which highlights the importance and value they placed on the workshop and its content. Other feedback from the participant’s evaluation included the desire to have had more time to analyse real cases in more detail, and to conduct actual interviews in a roleplay. A large percent of the participants said they would encourage a further expansion of women’s participation in this kind of trainings and praised the will of the organisers to ensure that women were represented.
ANNEX I ANALYSIS OF THE SURVEY AND ITS RESULTS

ELABORATION AND DEFINITION OF THE TRAINING “GOOD GOVERNANCE AND FIGHTING CORRUPTION”
Idlib, 3-6 April 2017

Prepared by: No Peace Without Justice and Jusoor Training Center in collaboration with the trainer Mehdi.

Target group: In order to prepare and define the goals and objectives of the training on “Good Governance and fighting corruption”, including its conception and elaboration of training material, a questionnaire was circulated among 26 members of the local council and civil society activists in the city of Idlib.

The questionnaire consisted of 18 questions designed to gather a range of relevant information. Preliminary questions covered participant’s personal information. The second set of questions aimed at gauging the areas of governance that participants deemed the most necessary and relevant. Additional questions were asked to measure the level of sensitivity among participants regarding the rights of minorities, the representation of women and the adherence to democratic principles

Questions and analysis

Below is the list of questions asked and an analysis of the responses received, with representative example answers provided where appropriate. This report does not include the section relating to personal information to protect the individuals interviewed.

Question 1) What do you think governance means? What does “good governance” mean to you?

Example answers:

- “Good governance of the institutions where decision is taken, power is exercised and systems of excellence and quality are established.”
- “A set of values, under which guidance and control are exercised, that are conducted by a leader, who is responsible for setting laws, guiding them and punishing those who violate them.”
- “It is the activity of the administration that is related to decisions, expectations and performance and that is rational when the decision is taken following a correct method allowing everyone to participate.”
- “It is a system of supervision and guidance at the institutional level that defines responsibilities, rights and relationships. It is rational when decisions are clear and it upholds the principle of justice and transparency.”
- “To set the mechanism of work of any institution in a legal way.”
- “The mechanism of decision-making properly corresponds to the mechanisms of the institutions, fighting corruption, transparency and linking administrations.”
- “Combating corruption through monitoring, evaluation and the development of sanctions.”
- “To link all institutions with a clear and consistent structure and avoid corruption.”
Commentary:
It was clear from the answers that most participants had already encountered the concept of good governance. Responses outlined a vision of principled governance, representative of its constituents, transparent and effective. Justice and rule of law were common themes in the responses and, additionally, several participants interpreted good governance to be synonymous with the respect of individual rights.

Question 2) What are good governance topics you would like to know about?

Example answers:
- “Linking institutions with a clear and consistent structure”
- “Building strategic plans that ensure sustainable development”
- “Ensuring accountability and transparency”
- “Giving attention to education, health, judiciary and unions”
- “Fighting corruption”
- “Community participation”
- “Better resources management”
- “Project management in the field of education”
- “Corporate governance”
- “Institutional culture and aspects of their application”

Commentary:
To this question, there was significant variation in the responses. Some participants provided long lists of topics, while others provided as few as two. Similarly, there was significant variation in how precise responses were regarding topics, with some being conceptually very vague while others were clearly defined. Nonetheless, there was a clearly identifiable desire for training on accountability, transparency and fighting corruption. Also evident was a general desire for better service and project management, along with community and stakeholder management.
Question 3) Which of the following topics do you believe are most relevant to governance? (You may select multiple options)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers:</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of answers</th>
<th>% of total participants who selected option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building partnerships and supporting local projects.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing plans for rational, controlled expenditure.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building strategic plans that ensure sustainable local development.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of relief aid.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring accountability and transparency.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving attention to education and health only.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
Controlled expenditure, sustainable local development, accountability and transparency were seen by nearly all beneficiaries as being relevant. Over half the participants expressed an interest in building partnerships to support local projects. Interestingly, less than the 10% of the respondents found the distribution of relief aid and the specific topics of health and education to be relevant. Accordingly, less attention will be given to these areas for the workshop. However, in case the low response level on these topics may indicate an incomplete understanding, these topics will still be presented in some form during the training.

Question 4) Do you think your organisation needs training in good governance? If yes, why?

Example answers:
- “In order to build the capacity of the Council members to work with a sound mechanism and to be able to plan and work with the available resources.”
- “To know the laws and standards that determine the relationship between members and ensure the quality of work.”

Commentary:
All responses were in the positive. In the event, very few beneficiaries gave detailed justifications for why this is the case, yet those that were given indicated a general sense of current professional inexperience in the topic.
Question 5) Where you currently work, do you have clear plans in place to fight corruption? If yes, please elaborate

Example answers:

Only one participant described comprehensive anti-corruption practice

- “Continuous monitoring and evaluation - Application of laws and regulations of the procedure rules governing the course of work according to legal basis - Replacing the corrupt and setting the right person - Collection of corrupt files and replacing them - Determination of responsibilities.”

Commentary:

The answers revealed that most participants do, in fact, have some form of plan in place. However, most of these plans amounted simply to informal or unwritten understandings between staff/officials, lacking clearly defined procedures. Thus, there appears to be a clear need for training in developing standardised anti-corruption mechanisms and procedures.

Question 6) Please mark the following phrases either true or false

Answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making a decision according to a participatory process that gives credibility to the results before the society.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The participatory process makes the subject very complex and slow, so it is not useful approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even very poor communities have the resources to revive themselves.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are primarily victims and/or the main beneficiaries of resources so they should not be represented in councils and decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to achieve economic growth, there must be self-sufficiency projects.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of the local council’s general policy is carried out with the participation of members of the council only and there is no need to share it with people</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:

Though the phrases presented were somewhat simplistic, they were designed to identify potential entrenched views amongst participants that could have proved problematic during the training.
The responses were generally uniform and uncontroversial, thus highly compatible with the training material developed for the training.

**Answers as percentages:**

- **Making a decision according to a participatory process that gives credibility to the results before the society**
  - True: 100%
  - False: 0%

- **The participatory process makes the subject very complex and slow, so it is not a useful approach**
  - True: 100%
  - False: 0%

- **Even very poor communities have the resource to revive themselves**
  - True: 62%
  - False: 38%

- **Women are primarily victims and/or the main beneficiaries of resources so they should not be represented in councils and decision-making.**
  - True: 100%
  - False: 0%

- **In order to achieve economic growth, there must be self-sufficiency projects.**
  - True: 100%
  - False: 0%

- **Formulation of the local council’s general policy is carried out with the participation of members of the council only and there is no need to share it with people**
  - True: 85%
  - False: 15%
Question 7) To what extent do you agree that corruption in local institutions and governing bodies is the result of lack of accountability?

Answers:

1-Strongly disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neither disagree nor agree 4-Agree 5-Strongly agree

1 11 13

Commentary:
With only one exception, responses fell between agree and strongly agree, demonstrating a strong willingness amongst the beneficiaries for systems and practices of accountability and oversight.

Question 8) To what extent do you agree that lack of transparency is one of the reasons for corruption in local institutions and councils?

Answers:

1-Strongly disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neither disagree nor agree 4-Agree 5-Strongly agree

1 11 16

Commentary:
Related to the above question, this question was designed to gauge the participants need and willingness for mechanisms of accountability which can provide transparent information to the public on their work. With nearly all answers again falling between agree and strongly agree, both need and willingness were confirmed.

Question 9) To what extent do you agree that principles of democracy are important in institutions and local councils?

Answers:

1-Strongly disagree 2-Disagree 3-Neither disagree nor agree 4-Agree 5-Strongly agree

2 12 8

Commentary:
The question was posed in order to identify the willingness of beneficiaries to incorporate representative and participatory practices in their governance. The majority of the answers again fell between agree and strongly agree. The lack of unanimity, however, justifies some focus on the topic during training.
Question 10) To what extent do you agree that accountability facilitates the work of institutions and councils and gives prompt results?

Answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-Disagree</th>
<th>3-Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>4-Agree</th>
<th>5-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
Coming as somewhat of a surprise, all beneficiaries either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. Interpreting the results in relation to question 7, it is possible that the beneficiaries believe that, while accountability prevents corruption, this does not *per se* improve effectiveness. This could indicate a tacit acceptance of corruption as a “necessary evil” in the process of governance yet this seems unlikely given prior responses, which demonstrate a widespread desire for the group to “fight corruption”. Thus, the more likely interpretation is that while they see corruption as harmful, they do not especially see a general *added value* in terms of governance when it comes to accountability. Regardless, the response is a clear indication that training needs to focus on the relationship between accountability, corruption, and effectiveness of governance.

Question 11) To what extent do you agree that sound economic planning is a central component of your governing responsibilities?

Answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-Disagree</th>
<th>3-Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>4-Agree</th>
<th>5-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
The question was designed to gauge the extent to which beneficiaries would want financial issues to be covered in the workshop. Initial assumptions were that this may not be a priority, yet most respondents approved of the statement. Accordingly, such issues will be better covered in the good governance training.
Question 12) To what extent do you agree that minority groups do not need guaranteed representation in governing structures.

Answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2-Disagree</th>
<th>3-Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>4-Agree</th>
<th>5-Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
Ascertaining the level of tolerance is important to understand the extent to which it should be a focus of the training. It also indicated potentially challenging conflicts of interest between participants themselves and between participants and the training material. All participants, however, either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the (negative) statement.

Question 13) In your current place of work, do minorities have representation?

Answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
Two thirds responded in the positive, with the remainder fairly evenly split between “no” and “I don’t know.” Despite the majority stating that they did have minority representation, additional commentary provided by the beneficiaries indicated that there was no formal “positive” system in place to ensure the representation of minorities in their workplace or the representation of minority rights / views. This was supplemented with explanations on how minorities have traditionally not been afforded such representation. Overall, the impression from these responses was that a deeper look into how minority rights and perspectives can be built into governance and governing structure for the benefit of all.

Question 14) What percentage of representation do women have in the governance process where you work? (give an estimated percentage figure)

Example answers:
- “Women don’t work because of security conditions”
- “The increase in women’s duties, especially during war as her role became limited to raising children and taking care of the house”
- “The society’s culture that do not believe in the importance of women’s work, and that consider men’s decision-making process is better”

Commentary:
In general, the estimates provided were very low, with most responses placing female participation at approximately 10% - 20%. Few responses provided estimates even close to 50%. Moreover, the additional commentary provided by respondents painted a clear picture of how, in the community,
women are still primarily expected to operate in the private, household sphere of life – at the expense of working in public life. Interpreted in relation to other responses, the responses to this question indicate both desire and need for incorporating a gender perspective into the training.

**Question 15)** On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high), to what extent does your institution need courses on good governance and anti-corruption?

**Answers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary:**
Though answers ranged from “2” to “5 agree”, the upper end of the spectrum (“4” and “5”) accounted for two thirds of responses; a clear indication of the relevance of the proposed training.

**Question 16)** On a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high), how much of a say do you believe people should have in how services are provided to them?

**Answers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary:**
Though most answers were clustered at the upper end of the spectrum (“4” and “5”), there was a significant spread. For example, “1” accounted for nearly a fifth of responses. The split indicated a mixed belief among beneficiaries in participatory governance. Accordingly, the issue will be a topic for discussion and capacity building in the workshop.

**Question 17)** What role do local councils play in good governance and in fighting corruption?

**Example answers:**
- “Councils are the bases of the government that is elected by the people and has an executive role in the management of facilities. They also have a controlling and legislative role. That is why it can fight corruption and develop the country”
- “Raising community awareness and managing its affiliated institution in accordance with scientific and legal rules and regulation, as well as regulating the resources and employing them in the proper way”
- “Put an end to job corruption through project management.”
- “Because it achieves life stability and the development of society”
- “Its role is to select competent people who serve others and who build confidence”
- “By empowering citizens and their right to participate in decision-making.”

**Commentary:**
A question to further comprehend the understanding and expectations of the beneficiaries.
Answers demonstrated that participants had a strong degree of faith that local councils could indeed play a positive, pivotal role in fighting corruption and effecting good governance.

**Question 18) What practical outcomes do you hope to achieve as a result of “good governance and fighting corruption” workshop?**

**Example answers:**
- Linking institutions and society in a participatory manner.
- Developing institution in an orderly manner and within a plan of action, good management and scientific foundations.
- Reaching goals in a timely manner.
- Increase the efficiency of work and production as well as change in methods to get better results.
- Reducing corruption.
- Self-development and refinement of information in a management manner and taking the decision, as well as sharing the others’ views.
- Projects management and selecting competent teachers at the level of education, as well as the development of work in institutions in order for graduates and experienced people to be in their right places.
- Better use of resources.
- A new vision on management, decision-making and working methods.

**Commentary:**

Related to question 17 but with a desire for more granular responses. Those given accorded well to the outcomes envisaged in the design of the workshop.
# Annex II Agenda

## First Day – Monday, April 3, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10:00 – 10:30 | Opening of workshop  
- Welcoming participants and introducing workshop objectives  
- Introductions and breaking the ice  
- Identification of participant expectations from the workshop |
| 10:30 – 12:00 | Overview of local governance  
- Explanation of local governance concept, its characteristics, and the basic pillars of its success  
- Objectives of local governance – what should local governance “do”?  
- Administrative decentralisation and effective management |
| 12:00 – 12:15 | Break |
| 12:15 – 13:30 | Roles and functions of effective local councils  
- How to structure a council  
- Exercise |
| 13:30 – 14:30 | Lunch |
| 14:30 – 16:00 | Good governance  
- Challenges of governing and how to address them effectively, fairly and transparently  
- Contributions and role of community-based organisations in good governance |
| 16:00 – 16:15 | Break |
| 16:15 – 17:00 | - Instructional video session  
- Workshop and recommendations on governance for participating organizations |

## Second Day – Tuesday, April 4, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10:00 – 10:30 | Review of day 1  
- Recap exercises |
| 10:30 12:00 | Accountability and accounting  
- Video tutorial |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 –</td>
<td>Exercises in efficiency and efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 –</td>
<td>Emergency response and relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>- Models of response and emergency service provisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 –</td>
<td>Community participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>- Involving different stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community tension management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Minority and women’s inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Day</td>
<td>- Wednesday, April 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 –</td>
<td>Community participation (continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>- Fostering participation and building good-will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Review of day 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 –</td>
<td>- Recap exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 –</td>
<td>Project and service management: community and council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>- Stakeholder mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Problem analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 –</td>
<td>Project and service management: community and council (continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>- Project and service design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 –</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15</td>
<td>- Case studies on community participation and service provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Day</td>
<td>- Thursday, April 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:30</td>
<td>Understanding corruption</td>
<td>Causes and sources of corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 12:00</td>
<td>Identifying corruption</td>
<td>Informational video, Recognising different types of corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 12:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 – 13:30</td>
<td>Fighting corruption</td>
<td>Tackling corruption in governing structures, Interactive exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30 – 14:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30 – 16:00</td>
<td>Institutionalising good practice</td>
<td>Mechanisms of oversight and transparent practices, Institutional policies for fighting corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 16:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:15 – 17:00</td>
<td>Workshop evaluation questionnaire</td>
<td>Handing out certificates of completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>