

INTEGRITY

IN ACTION

Assessment Report on the Implementation of Anti-Corruption
Measures for the Justice System, Prosecutor's Office Subsystem



Publication Title:

Integrity In Action: Assessment Report on the Implementation of Anti-Corruption Measures
for the Justice System, Prosecutor's Office Subsystem

Publisher:

Agency for the Prevention of Corruption

Author:

Marko Sošić

Design / layout:

Radna soba

Print:

3M Makarije

Circulation:

70

Location:

Podgorica, Montenegro



*The publication of this report was made possible through the generous support
of the Government of the Republic of Korea to UNDP.*

*During this activity, the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption received support
from consultants Dragana Krunić and Marko Sošić.*

Integrity In Action:

Assessment Report on the Implementation of Anti-Corruption Measures
for the Justice System, Prosecutor's Office Subsystem

June 2023

Contents

Introduction	6
Table 1. Results of the impact of the application of anti-corruption measures for the Prosecutor's Office subsystem	7
Results of compliance with anti-corruption measures by category	8
Category 1: Creating conditions for the implementation of regulations to prevent corruption	8
Criterion 1.1: Establishment of an internal corruption risk management mechanism	8
Indicator 1.1.1: Designated integrity manager	9
Indicator 1.1.2: Prepared integrity plan	9
Indicator 1.1.3: Special risk areas	9
Indicator 1.1.4: Report on the implementation of the integrity plan	9
Indicator 1.1.5 Questionnaire for assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the integrity plan	10
Criterion 1.2: Establishment of a mechanism for monitoring and controlling work processes	10
Indicators 1.2.1 and 1.2.2: Established internal audit mechanism	11
Indicator 1.2.3: Risk register	11
Indicator 1.2.4: Book of procedures	11
Criterion 1.3: Establishing mechanisms for detecting and reporting corruption	11
Indicator 1.3.1: Person responsible for receiving and handling whistleblower reports	12
Indicator 1.3.2: Procedure for handling reports	12
Category 2: Strengthening the institutional framework for preventing corruption	12
Criterion 2.1: Strengthening transparency in the work of authorities	12
Indicator 2.1.1: Published Integrity Plan	14
Indicator 2.1.2: Report on the implementation of the Integrity Plan published	14
Indicator 2.1.3: Work report published	14
Indicator 2.1.4: Published guide for access to information	14
Indicator 2.1.5: Compliance with Article 12 of the Law on Free Access to Information	14
Indicator 2.1.6: Share of "approved" requests for free access to information	15
Criterion 2.2: Taking measures to improve human resource management	15
Indicator 2.2.1: Regulation of temporary engagements	15
Indicator 2.2.2: Contracts on supplementary work	16
Indicator 2.2.3: Integrity plan and human resources management	16
Criterion 2.3: Improving the internal mechanism of ethical and professional conduct	16
Indicator 2.3.1: Ethics, integrity and anti-corruption beyond the Law on the Prevention of Corruption	17

Indicator 2.3.2: Specific laws in the Integrity Plan	17
Category 3: Strengthening ethical culture	17
Criterion 3.1: Raising awareness of managers and employees about ethics and integrity	18
Indicator 3.1.1: Training for employees	18
Indicator 3.1.2: Training and management staff	18
Criterion 3.2: Existence and application of conflict of interest rules	18
Indicator 3.2.1: Conflict of interest	19
Indicator 3.2.2: Property records	19
Criterion 3.3: Existence and application of rules on accepting gifts	19
Indicator 3.3.1: Procedure for gifts	20
Indicator 3.3.2: Internal rules and records	20
Category 4: Indicators whose fulfillment leads to the deduction of points from the government body	20
Recommendations	23
Attachment number 1. Achieved points for each authority	24
Attachment No. 2. Effects of the methodology and impact assessment	25

Introduction

Article 78 of the Law on the Prevention of Corruption (Official Gazette of Montenegro 53/2014 and 42/2017) stipulates that the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption is responsible for monitoring the adoption and implementation of Integrity Plans, providing recommendations for their improvement, and assessing their efficiency and effectiveness in accordance with the law.

The Integrity Plan is a strategic document based on a self-assessment of corruption risks, their evaluation, and the identification of appropriate preventive measures. Its objective is to enhance the quality of work, efficiency, professional standards, and ethical culture within institutions. A key aspect of this preventive mechanism is that its development also allows for the monitoring of the implementation of other anti-corruption measures.

For the purpose of assessing the implementation of anti-corruption measures, the **Methodology for Assessing the Implementation of Anti-Corruption Measures** was developed in November 2021. In its first phase, it was applied to authorities in two selected sectors: *State Administration and Other State Authorities* and *Social and Child Protection*. Through the application of this Methodology, efforts made by authorities to implement anti-corruption measures prescribed by various systemic laws were assessed, along with additional measures that, while not legally mandated, contribute to fostering a culture of resistance to corruption and other irregularities.

When developing this Methodology, the recommendations provided in the description of the methodology *Assessment of Anti-Corruption Initiatives*, conducted by the Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission of the Republic of Korea¹ were taken into account. One of the recommendations is that countries interested in adopting a similar methodology should start with a few simple criteria with quantitative indicators.

The purpose of the Methodology is to assess whether authorities are implementing anti-corruption measures, to what extent their implementation has led to change, and to encourage authorities to take a proactive approach in planning and implementing anti-corruption measures that are not legally mandated. The Methodology consists of three main categories, nine criteria, and 28 performance indicators (totalling 70.5 points) designed to determine whether authorities have established institutional mechanisms for managing corruption risks, internal control, availability of work information, professional conduct of employees, raising awareness of employees about ethics and integrity, and preventing conflicts of interest, thereby strengthening an ethical culture. The fourth category includes 10 indicators, the fulfilment of which results in a deduction of points, totalling-24, and serves as a corrective measure for the fulfilment of indicators in the first three categories.

After the first phase of the assessment, as well as the adjustment and consultative process of finalising the Methodology based on comments received at the workshop with representatives of judicial authorities, the second phase began—for the *Justice* system, subsystems *Judiciary* and *Prosecutor's Office*.

The *Prosecutor's Office* subsystem within the *Justice* system includes 18 authorities: 17 prosecutor's offices and the Prosecutorial Council. The Methodology for Assessing the Implementation of Anti-Corruption Measures was submitted to the authorities on 8 November 2022, with a deadline

¹ For more details see: **Introduction to Korea's Anti-Corruption Initiative Assessment (2016)** www1.undp.org/content/seoul_policy_center/en/home/research-and-publications/ACRC.html

for self-assessment of the fulfilment of the given criteria by 31 December 2022. Authorities were required to enter the number of points in the table next to each indicator and submit the means of verification for each indicator to the Agency.

All authorities participated in the self-assessment and submitted means of verification, based on which 18 individual reports were prepared. The structure of the individual reports follows the structure of the Methodology and, in addition to the number of points awarded (or deducted) and a description of the key findings for each indicator, they also contain recommendations for the implementation of anti-corruption measures for that authority.

On 9 May 2023, the Agency submitted individual reports to the authorities for review and potential comments. A total of 10 authorities responded and submitted additional comments and documentation, which were taken into account. In cases where the submitted arguments and attachments met the methodological requirements for changing the assessment, the evaluation was adjusted, and the report was amended in accordance with the accepted comments of the authorities.

For the purposes of verifying the indicators, the following were used:

- a) documents in electronic or printed form submitted to the Agency by government authorities,
- b) data from records kept by the Agency, and
- c) publicly available official data on the work of authorities.

The index measuring the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures across the four common categories was calculated as the percentage of the total points awarded to each authority in relation to the maximum possible score.

Table 1. Results of the impact of anti-corruption measures for the Prosecutor's Office subsystem.

	Total score	Performance	No. of recommendations
BPO Herceg Novi	54.0	76.60	6
BPO Kolašin	54.0	76.60	7
BPO Berane	51.0	72.34	8
HPO Bijelo Polje	50.5	71.63	8
Supreme State Prosecutor's Office	50.0	70.92	12
BPO Cetinje	49.5	70.21	9
BPO Bijelo Polje	48.5	68.79	7
BPO Pljevlja	48.5	68.79	10
BPO Bar	48.0	68.09	8
BPO Ulcinj	47.0	66.67	8
BPO Nikšić	44.0	62.41	10
Prosecutorial Council	44.0	62.41	10
BPO Rožaje	39.5	56.03	13
BPO Kotor	39.0	55.32	11
BPO Podgorica	37.0	52.48	11
HPO Podgorica	35.5	50.35	16
BPO Plav	33.0	46.81	12
Special State Prosecutor's Office	27.0	38.30	18

Results of compliance with anti-corruption measures by category

Category 1: Putting in Place the Assumptions for Implementing Anti-Corruption Legislation

This category received the highest rating among the three in the Methodology, with 72.3% of the total Maximum score achieved. This category assessed the application of fundamental mechanisms from the Law on the Prevention of Corruption and the Law on Management and Internal Controls in the Public Sector across three specific areas (criteria). Results ranged from exceptionally high (nearly 95% for the first criterion) to somewhat weaker in other areas, with the lack of internal audit coverage identified as a key issue.

Indicator	Maximum score	Actual score	Performance
1 - Putting in place the assumptions for implementing anti-corruption legislation	540	390.5	72.3%
1.1. Establishing an internal corruption risk management mechanism	252	238	94.4%
1.2. Establishing a mechanism for monitoring and controlling work processes	198	92	46.2%
1.3. Establishing mechanisms for detecting and reporting corruption through whistleblower reports	90	61	67.8%

Criterion 1.1: Establishing an internal corruption risk management mechanism

The highest-performing criterion among all nine in the assessment relates to key obligations under the Law on the Prevention of Corruption, including the appointment of an integrity manager, the adoption of an integrity plan, a report on its implementation, and a questionnaire for assessing its efficiency and effectiveness. The results indicate that authorities within the Prosecutor's Office subsystem have largely met these legal requirements.

Indicator	Maximum score	Actual score	Performance
1.1 Establishing an internal corruption risk management mechanism	252	238	94.4%
1.1.1 Integrity Manager designated	18	18	100.0%
1.1.2 Integrity Plan developed- 1 point			
* If the adopted Integrity Plan is entered into the application in compliance with the user manual, the authority receives an additional 1 point . If it is entered in accordance with the User Manual, the authority receives an additional 1 point .	72	67	93.1%
** If the Integrity Plan has been updated at least once in the previous two years, the authority receives an additional 1 point .			
1.1.3 The Integrity Plan, in addition to general risk areas, also contains specific risk areas.			
one speccificl risk area- 1 point	54	50	92.6%
two specific risk areas- 2 points			
three or more specific risk areas - 3 points			

1.1.4 Report on the implementation of the Integrity Plan for the previous year prepared and submitted to the Agency: in printed form- 1 point through the web-based application- 2 points	54	52	96.3%
1.1.5 A questionnaire for assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the Integrity Plan over the last two years completed and submitted to the Agency: in printed form- 1 point through the web-based application- 2 points	54	51	94.4%

Indicator 1.1.1: Integrity Manager designated

This is the only indicator in the entire assessment with 100% performance, as all authorities have designated an Integrity Manager. This confirms that this measure from the Law on the Prevention of Corruption has been fully implemented and consistently upheld.

Indicator 1.1.2: Integrity Plan developed

All authorities in the Prosecutor's Office subsystem have developed an Integrity Plan. However, the result falls short of 100% because some authorities have not updated their Integrity Plan in the past two years or have not entered it into the Agency's information system as prescribed by the user manual (Basic State Prosecutor's Offices in Plav and Ulcinj, the Special State Prosecutor's Office, and the Prosecutorial Council). As a result, the full functionality of the system for reporting and monitoring the implementation of measures from the Integrity Plan is not utilised.

Indicator 1.1.3: Specific risk areas

The first indicator assessing the content of the Integrity Plan also recorded a high performance, with **92.6% of the total points achieved**.

Almost all authorities in this subsystem have defined at least three or more specific risk areas. A smaller number have identified only two specific risk areas (Basic State Prosecutor's Offices in Podgorica, Ulcinj, and Rožaje, as well as the Prosecutorial Council).

In most cases, the identified risks are standardised, with authorities most commonly citing: management of the prosecutorial process and decision-making within their legal jurisdiction, reception and dispatch/delivery of documents, dismissal of criminal charges for reasons of expediency, postponement of criminal prosecution, and provision of data and access to information.

Indicator 1.1.4: Report on the implementation of the Integrity Plan

Almost all authorities have prepared and submitted a report on the implementation of the Integrity Plan to the Agency, resulting in a high performance rate of **96.3%**. However, some authorities did not submit their reports through the Agency's web-based application, leading to a loss of points..

Indicator 1.1.5 Questionnaire for assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the Integrity Plan

Almost all authorities required to do so completed the Questionnaire for the Assessment of the Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Integrity Plan, achieving a performance rate of **94.4%** for this indicator. The only exception is the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Plav.

Criterion 1.2: Establishing a mechanism for monitoring and controlling work processes

Performance under this indicator is significantly lower than under the previous one, reaching 46.2%, making it the weakest in the first category. While the previous criteria focused on the Law on the Prevention of Corruption, this one shifts attention to the Law on Management and Internal Controls in the Public Sector, specifically its key elements: internal audit, the Risk Register, and the Book of Procedures. Without a functional internal audit in the Prosecutor's Office, strong results in other indicators are diminished on average by this criterion.

Indicator	Maximum score	Actual score	Performance
1.2 Establishing a mechanism for monitoring and controlling work processes	198	92	46.2%
1.2.1 Internal audit performed (audit report prepared) in the previous two years:			
one- 1 point	36	0	0.0%
two or more- 2 points			
1.2.2 Percentage of internal audit recommendations implemented over the last reporting period:			
from 50% - 70% - 1 point	54	0	0.0%
from 70% - 90% - 2 points			
over 90% - 3 points			
1.2.3 Risk Register developed in accordance with Article 14 of the Law on Management and Internal Controls in the Public Sector:	18	17	94.4%
Register in place- 1 point			
*If the register has been updated within the last year, the authority receives an additional 1 point.	18	14	77.8%
**In case the valid Risk Register is published on the authority's website, the authority receives an additional 1 point.	18	17	94.4%
1.2.4 A Book of Internal Procedures has been developed in accordance with Article 50 of the Law on Management and Internal Controls in the Public Sector:	18	16	88.9%
Book of Procedures in place- 1 point			
*If the Book Of Procedures has been updated in the last year, the authority receives an additional 1 point.	18	12	66.7%
**In case the valid book of procedures is published on the authority's website, the authority receives an additional 1 point.	18	16	86.1%

Indicators 1.2.1 and 1.2.2: Internal audit in place

Due to the specific situation in which this subsystem was not covered by internal audit during the monitoring period, no points were achieved for these two indicators. In July 2022, the Government of Montenegro adopted the Rulebook amending the Rulebook on Internal Organisation and Job Classification of the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office, establishing the Internal Audit Department, which came into force on 30 July 2022. The filling of positions in the department is planned for 2023 as part of efforts to implement the recommendations from the latest audit report of the State Audit Institution on the Prosecutor's Office.² The planned internal audit unit will consist of three staff members and will be responsible for overseeing 17 prosecutor's offices and the Prosecutorial Council.

Indicator 1.2.3: Risk Register

Performance under this indicator is high, reaching 94.4%, with only one authority yet to adopt a Risk Register. All other authorities have established registers that are publicly available, and in most cases, they were adopted during the monitoring period, earning points for timeliness.

Indicator 1.2.4: Book of Procedures

The performance under this indicator is 88.9%, with almost all authorities having a **Book of Procedures** published on their websites. The majority (66%) of these authorities updated it at least once during the monitoring period.

Criterion 1.3: Establishing mechanisms for detecting and reporting corruption

The third part of this category focuses on authorities' efforts to establish an effective system for handling whistleblower reports, achieving a slightly better result than the previous criterion at 67.8%. While most authorities have designated a person to receive and process whistleblower reports, a slightly smaller number (five) have also established procedures for selecting this person.

Indicator	Maximum score	Actual score	Percentage
1.3 Establishing mechanisms for detecting and reporting corruption	90	61	67.8%
1.3.1 Designated person for receiving and acting upon whistleblower reports of threats to the public interest indicative of corruption	18	17	94.4%
1.3.2 A procedure has been developed for dealing with reports of threats to public interest indicative of corruption which ensures the protection of persons who file reports- 2 points In case the developed procedure contains the method and criteria for selecting a person to receive and act on whistleblower reports, the authority receives an additional 2 points.	72	44	61.1%

² Available at: <http://www.dri.co.me/doc/lzvještaj%20o%20finansijskoj%20reviziji%20i%20reviziji%20pravnosti%20poslovanja%20Tužilaštva%20za%202020.%20godinu.pdf>

Indicator 1.3.1: Person responsible for receiving and handling whistleblower reports

Almost all authorities have designated a **person** to receive and act on whistleblower reports of threats to the public interest indicating corruption. The only authority that has yet to make this designation is the High State Prosecutor's Office in Podgorica..

Indicator 1.3.2: Procedure for handling complaints

Most authorities have developed a procedure for handling reports of threats to the public interest indicating corruption, ensuring the protection of whistleblowers. However, a smaller number of authorities have also established a regulated method and criteria for selecting persons to receive and process such reports, including the Basic State Prosecutor's Offices in Berane, Bijelo Polje, and Ulcinj, the High State Prosecutor's Office in Bijelo Polje, and the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office.

Category 2: Strengthening the Institutional Anticorruption Framework

Category two recorded the weakest performance in the Methodology, with authorities achieving 58% of the maximum score. It covers key areas such as free access to information, human resource management, more advanced forms of institutionalising the fight against corruption, and the content of the Integrity Plan. The best results were achieved in the area of free access to information, while other areas performed poorly, particularly in improving internal mechanisms for ethical and professional conduct..

	Maximum score	Actual score	Performance
2 - Strengthening the institutional anticorruption framework	477	277	58%
2.1 Increasing transparency in the work of authorities	261	203	78%
2.2. Improvement of human resources management	108	67	62%
2.3 Improvement of the internal mechanism ensuring ethical and professional conduct	108	7	6%

Criterion 2.1: Increasing transparency of authority's work

This criterion evaluates the openness of authorities through proactive disclosure of information and responses to requests for free access to information. Authorities generally performed well in areas assessing whether key documents, such as the Integrity Plan and legally mandated disclosures about their work, have been published. However, the weakest results were recorded in assessing authorities' responsiveness to requests for free access to information. At the individual level, three authorities scored below 60% on this indicator, indicating significant transparency issues within these institutions.

Indicator	Maximum score	Actual score	Percentage
2.1 Increasing transparency of the authority's work	261	203	78%
2.1.1 Up-to-date Integrity Plan published on the authority's website- 1 point *In case the document is published in a way that it is accessible in three clicks or less from the homepage, an additional 0.5 points are awarded	27	22.5	83%
2.1.2 Published report on the implementation of the Integrity Plan for the previous year on the institution's website- 1 point *In case the document is published in a way that it is accessible in three clicks or less from the homepage, an additional 0.5 points are awarded	27	20	74%
2.1.3 Authority's Activity Report for the previous year published- 1 point *In case the document is published in a way that it is accessible in three clicks or less from the homepage, an additional 0.5 points are awarded	27	24	89%
2.1.4 Guide for Free Access to Information published. Guide published- 1 point	18	18	100%
*If the document has been updated in the last year, an additional 0.5 points are awarded	9	9	100%
**If an up-to-date guide is published in a way that it is accessible in three clicks or less from the homepage, an additional 0.5 points are awarded	9	7.5	83%
2.1.5 Complete and updated information published, in accordance with Article 12 of the Law on Free Access to Information: a) list of civil servants and state employees b) list of public officials with payroll information, including all income and benefits related to their public office c) information to which access is granted upon request	18	18	100%
	36	36	100%
	18	13	72%
*In the event that all requested data is published in a way that it is available in three clicks or less from the homepage, or the authority's page on the central website, an additional 0.5 points are awarded	9	7.5	83%
**In case certain datasets are also published on the Open Data Portal, an additional 1 point is awarded	18	0	0%
2.1.6 Approved and partially approved requests for access to information, as well as notifications of published information, as a share of the total number of requests submitted in the previous two years: a) 70 to 90% of all requests received were accepted or partially accepted or the requesting party notified that the information was already in the public domain- 1 point b) Over 90% of all requests received were accepted or partially accepted or the requesting party notified that the information was already in the public domain- 2 points	45	27.5	61%
*In the event that the authority promptly uses the information system for free access to information of the Agency for Personal Data Protection and Free Access to Information and submits evidence thereof, an additional 0.5 points are awarded			

Indicator 2.1.1: Integrity Plan published

Most authorities published an up-to-date Integrity Plan on their website, achieving a solid performance of 83% of the maximum score. However, a few authorities either failed to publish their plan or did not make the latest adopted version available (Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Podgorica and the Special State Prosecutor's Office). Several authorities also lost points because the plan was not published in an easily accessible manner, meaning it was not reachable within three clicks from the homepage.

Indicator 2.1.2: Report on the implementation of the Integrity Plan published

The situation is slightly weaker regarding the publication of reports on the implementation of the Integrity Plan, with four authorities not publishing them on their websites (Basic State Prosecutor's Offices in Nikšić, Plav, and Podgorica, as well as the Special State Prosecutor's Office). In several other authorities, the reports are not easily accessible, bringing the overall performance for this indicator to 74%.

Indicator 2.1.3: Activity Report published

With the exception of two Basic State Prosecutor's Offices, all authorities have published an annual report on their work, which is mostly easily accessible on their websites, resulting in an 89% performance for this indicator.

Indicator 2.1.4: Guide for Accessing Information published

All authorities have published a Guide for Accessing Information, either adopting or updating it during the monitoring period. However, in the case of three Basic State Prosecutor's Offices, the Guide was not published in a way that ensures easy accessibility (within three clicks from the homepage), which was the only aspect of this indicator where points were lost.

Indicator 2.1.5: Compliance with Article 12 of the Law on Free Access to Information

This indicator assessed the performance of authorities in fulfilling certain obligations under Article 12 of the Law on Free Access to Information, which mandates the proactive publication of information, including lists of employed civil servants and state employees, lists of public officials along with their salaries and other income, and information to which access was granted upon request. Given the multiple dimensions of this indicator, the overall performance of authorities was relatively high at 75.2%. The key reason for point deductions was the failure of authorities to publish data on the Open Data Portal.³ Additionally, five authorities lost points for not publishing information to which access was granted upon request. In some cases, only the received requests or requests along with their own decisions were published, but not the actual information requested. On the other hand, all authorities publish lists of employed civil servants and state employees, as well as lists of public officials with details of their salaries and other income. Furthermore, the accessibility of this information on websites was assessed as satisfactory in almost all cases, except for three authorities.

Indicator 2.1.6: Share of "approved" requests for free access to information

This indicator measures the openness of authorities in granting access to information by assessing the share of approved and partially approved requests, as well as notifications of published information, in the total number of requests submitted over the past two years. It represents the weakest-performing indicator under criterion 2.1 *Increased Transparency in the Work of Authorities*, with a score of 61%, highlighting that a significant number of access to information requests are being rejected. Although seven authorities achieved the maximum score, all others fell short, with four authorities receiving no points. However, a notable positive aspect is that many authorities provided precise records of decision-making statistics on received requests for free access to information. This was done through an extract from the information system of the Agency for Personal Data Protection and Free Access to Information, a practice not commonly observed in other monitored systems.

Criterion 2.2: Taking measures to improve human resource management

In the area of human resources management, the Methodology requires that various forms of temporary and supplementary staff engagement be more precisely regulated through internal acts of the authority and that the Integrity Plan recognises specific risks and measures related to different aspects of human resources management. The results show weaker performance compared to the previous criterion, with an overall score of 62%. The lowest performance was recorded under the indicator assessing the content of Integrity Plans concerning risks and measures related to human resources management.

Indicator	Maximum score	Actual score	Percentage
2.2. Improvement of human resource management	108.0	66.5	62%
2.2.1 The authority has adopted an internal rule/procedure with criteria and standards that more closely regulate the management, conclusion, execution, supervision and reporting of service contracts and contracts for temporary and occasional work	36	29	81%
2.2.2 The authority has adopted an internal rule/procedure with criteria and standards that more closely regulate the management, conclusion, execution, monitoring and reporting of contracts for additional work within the authority.	18	15	83%
2.2.3 The Integrity Plan includes risks and measures related to:	18	11	61%
a) planning recruitment- 1 point			
b) performance appraisal and monitoring- 1 point	18	8	44%
c) rewards and sanctions- 1 point	18	3.5	19%

Indicator 2.2.1: Regulation of temporary employment

With the exception of four authorities, all others have adopted an internal act (internal instruction) on temporary and occasional work and service contracts, which more precisely defines the management, conclusion, execution, supervision, and reporting on such contracts. Three authorities do not have the required internal acts in their entirety (Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Rožaje, Supreme State Prosecutor's Office in Podgorica, and Special State Prosecutor's Office), while the Prosecutorial Council has an internal instruction in this area, but it does not regulate service contracts.

Indicator 2.2.2: Contracts on supplementary work

The authorities achieved a performance of 83% in the indicator assessing internal procedures for additional engagement of existing employees. Three authorities in the Prosecutor's Office subsystem do not have an internal rule or procedure with criteria and standards that more precisely regulate the management, conclusion, execution, supervision, and reporting of additional work contracts (Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Rožaje, Higher State Prosecutor's Office in Podgorica, and Special State Prosecutor's Office).

Indicator 2.2.3: Integrity Plan and human resources management

This indicator recorded the weakest performance within the criterion, at 41.6%, although the three dimensions of the indicator were achieved to varying degrees. It assesses whether the Integrity Plan includes risks and measures related to specific aspects of human resources management, such as employment planning, the employment procedure, performance appraisal and monitoring, as well as rewards and sanctions. The fewest authorities have identified risks and measures in the area of rewards and sanctions, with only four (Basic State Prosecutor's Offices in Cetinje, Kolašin, Herceg Novi, and partially Rožaje) including them in their Integrity Plans. The situation is slightly better in terms of performance appraisal and monitoring, where eight authorities have defined risks and measures, while the best results were recorded in employment planning, with 11 authorities identifying risks and proposing measures in their Integrity Plans.

Criterion 2.3: Improvement of the internal mechanism ensuring ethical and professional conduct

The area with by far the weakest performance in the entire assessment, with only 6% of points achieved, sets somewhat more ambitious expectations for authorities. It evaluates their commitment to integrity, ethics, and anti-corruption beyond the formal requirements of the Law on the Prevention of Corruption, as well as whether Integrity Plans include more advanced risks and measures related to protection against discrimination in various areas.

Authorities in the Prosecutor's Office subsystem generally did not score in this area. Under the first indicator, which assesses formal structures for addressing ethics, integrity, and the fight against corruption, no authority received points. In the second indicator, which examines the content of Integrity Plans, three Basic State Prosecutor's Offices stand out for taking certain steps.

Indicator	Maximum score	Actual score	Percentage
2.3 Taking measures to improve the internal mechanism of ensuring ethical and professional conduct	108	7	6%
2.3.1 A designated employee tasked, in addition to their ordinary job description, with matters concerning ethics, integrity and anticorruption, giving advice, etc. apart from the tasks the employee is required to perform under the Law on the Prevention of Corruption (such as integrity manager, members of the Integrity Plan drafting group, person responsible for receiving and acting on whistleblower reports, etc.)	36	0	0%
in case it is an additional task for the give officer- 1 point			
in case of a sole responsibility of an officer, or a special organizational unit established to deal with these matters- 2 points			

2.3.2 The Integrity Plan includes the risks and measures governed by the following laws:	18	4	22%
a) Law prohibiting mobbing- 1 point			
b) Law on Prohibition of Discrimination- 1 point	18	3	17%
c) Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities- 1 point	18	0	0%
d) Gender Equality- 1 point	18	0	0%

Indicator 2.3.1: Ethics, integrity and anti-corruption beyond the Law on the Prevention of Corruption

No authority achieved points under this indicator, which assesses whether there are employees responsible for tasks related to ethics, integrity, and the fight against corruption beyond those mandated by the Law on the Prevention of Corruption. This includes roles such as Integrity Managers, members of the working group for developing an Integrity Plan, and persons designated to receive and act upon whistleblower reports. No points were awarded in this area, even for the umbrella or strategic bodies of the subsystem, such as the Prosecutorial Council. In several cases, authorities reported officials performing functions already prescribed by the Law on the Prevention of Corruption, but these were not accepted as a basis for scoring.

Indicator 2.3.2: References to specific laws in the Integrity Plan

This indicator assesses whether the Integrity Plan includes risks and measures related to areas covered by the Law on the Prohibition of Harassment at Work, the Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination, the Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities, and the Law on Gender Equality. Three Basic State Prosecutor's Offices (Cetinje, Herceg Novi, and Kolašin) have defined risks and measures related to workplace harassment and discrimination. Additionally, the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Pljevlja has included a measure in its Integrity Plan concerning the prohibition of mobbing: *"Designate a person for mediation in cases of harassment at work."*

Category 3: Strengthening Ethical Culture

This category recorded slightly better results than the previous one but weaker compared to the first, with authorities achieving 71% of the maximum score. The lowest performance was recorded in training on integrity, ethics, and anti-corruption, as employees—particularly management staff—do not attend such training to a sufficient extent. The management of gifts and the existence and enforcement of rules on conflict of interest were generally assessed as satisfactory in terms of the adoption and application of internal acts in this area.

Indicator	Maximum score	Actual score	Percentage
3 - Strengthening ethical culture	252	180	71%
3.1 Raising awareness of managers and employees about ethics and integrity	72	31	43%
3.2 Existence and application of conflict-of-interest rules	108	90	83%
3.3 Existence and application of rules on accepting gifts	72	59	82%

Criterion 3.1: Raising awareness of managers and employees about ethics and integrity

Ethics and integrity training for employees and public officials recorded **the weakest performance among all criteria in this area**, primarily because management personnel rarely attend such training. While the performance rate for employee participation in training stands at 47%, the overall score drops down to 39% when focusing on managers.

Indicator	Maximum score	Actual score	Percentage
3.1 Raising awareness of managers and employees about ethics and integrity	72	31	43%
3.1.1 Number of various thematic training courses related to the areas of anticorruption, ethics and integrity that employees (court and prosecutorial interns, advisors and other categories) attended in the previous two years: a) up to 2 trainings- 1 point b) more than 2 trainings- 2 points	36	17	47%
3.1.2 Number of various thematic training courses related to the areas of anticorruption, ethics and integrity that managers (presidents of courts, judges, prosecutors, deputy prosecutors, members of the Judicial or Prosecutorial Council) attended in the previous two years: a) up to 2 trainings- 1 point b) more than 2 trainings- 2 points	36	14	39%

Indicator 3.1.1: Training for employees

Employees in only five authorities did not attend any training in these areas. In nine authorities, employees participated in at least one such training, while in the remaining four, evidence was found of attendance at more than two similar training sessions during the monitoring period. The success rate for this indicator stands at 47%. In many cases, the only employees attending these trainings were Integrity Managers, with topics primarily focused on strengthening integrity, often as part of training specifically designed for Integrity Managers. Various examples of training related to the fight against corruption within the authority were also observed.

Indicator 3.1.2: Training and management staff

Compared to the previous indicator, the situation with management training is slightly worse, with a performance rate of **39%**. Management staff in eight authorities within this subsystem did not attend any training related to anti-corruption, ethics, or integrity.

Criterion 3.2: Existence and application of conflict of interest rules

The achievement rate under this criterion stands at 83%, making it the highest-rated in this area. The results indicate that authorities generally have well-defined provisions on conflict of interest tailored to the specifics of their jurisdiction, as well as a clearly defined concept of an affiliated person in their internal acts. Equally often, they have established rules for their employees regarding the performance of additional tasks outside the authority. Records from the Agency for the Prevention

of Corruption show that public officials within this subsystem were up to date in submitting reports on income and assets.

Indicator	Maximum score	Actual score	Percentage
3.2 Existence and application of conflict of interest rules	108	90	83%
3.2.1 Existence of internal rules defining conflicts of interest	18	12	67%
Created internal rule- 1 point			
*In case the internal rule also contains a definition of an affiliated person, the authority receives an additional 1 point.	18	12	67%
**In case the internal rule also contains rules for employees on performing other tasks (permitted/prohibited tasks, reporting procedure, etc.) or if there is a separate internal rule that defines this, the authority receives an additional 1 point.	18	12	67%
3.2.2 All officials employed within the authority who are subject to the income and asset declaration requirement have regularly submitted their annual declarations to the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption in a timely manner or upon assuming office, starting from January 1 of the current year.	54	54	100%

Indicator 3.2.1: Conflict of interest

Two-thirds of the observed authorities have internal rules that define conflict of interest in more detail, resulting in a score of 67% of the maximum points for this indicator. This indicates that most authorities have adopted internal rules on defining and preventing conflicts of interest for public officials and civil servants in the performance of their duties. These rules include the definition of a, affiliated person, as well as provisions on the performance of other duties, specifying permitted and impermissible activities, the reporting procedure, and related requirements. In many cases, however, these rules simply replicate provisions from the Law on the Prevention of Corruption without further elaboration or adaptation to the specific roles and competencies of the authority.

Indicator 3.2.2: Assets and Income Declarations

This indicator assesses whether all officials within the institution who are required to do so have submitted their regular annual Assets and Income Declarations or the declaration upon assuming office on time. It is the highest-scoring indicator under this criterion, with 100% of points achieved. According to the Agency's records, no proceedings were initiated for failure to submit regular annual declarations by public officials in this subsystem.

Criterion 3.3: Existence and application of rules on accepting gifts

A strong performance of 82% was achieved in this criterion, which examines the handling of gifts, record-keeping, and related procedures. Some authorities rely solely on the provisions of the Law on the Prevention of Corruption for gift management and lack an internal act that would regulate this issue in more detail. However, most authorities have adopted internal acts that govern this area, covering not only public officials but also other employees.

Indicator	Maximum score	Actual score	Percentage
3.3 Existence and application of rules on accepting gifts	72	59	82%
3.3.1 Internal rules governing the receipt of gifts and actions to be taken when receiving gifts applied to all staff in the authority are in place – 1 point *if records of gifts received are kept for all employees, the authority receives an additional 1 point	36	29	81%
3.3.2 Internal rules governing the handling of gifts received by public officials are in place – 1 point * If a record of received gifts for public officials is maintained, the authority receives an additional 1 point	36	30	83%

Indicator 3.3.1: Procedure for gifts

With a performance of 81%, this indicator assesses whether authorities have gone beyond general legal norms to regulate the receipt, handling, and recording of gifts in greater detail. A specific requirement is the recognition of risks related to gift acceptance, not only for public officials but also for other employees. Only two authorities lack internal rules, instead relying on the provisions of the Law on the Prevention of Corruption and the Rulebook on the Content and Method of Keeping Records of Gifts, which they consider sufficiently precise in defining the procedure for recording and handling reported gifts. Additionally, three other authorities, despite having internal rules, do not maintain records of gifts for all employees.

Indicator 3.3.2: Internal rules and records

With the exception of two authorities, all others have adopted an Internal Rule regulating the handling of gifts received by public officials, and only two do not maintain records of received gifts, resulting in a performance of 83% for this indicator.

Authorities without internal rules stated that they apply the provisions of the Law on the Prevention of Corruption and the Rulebook on the Content and Manner of Keeping Records of Gifts, which they consider sufficiently precise in defining the procedure for recording and handling reported gifts.

Category 4: Indicators Used for Deductible Scores

The last category consists of so-called corrective indicators, whose fulfilment results in negative points or deductions. A total of 46 points were deducted, meaning that authorities lost 5.4% of the points they had achieved in the previous three categories. Before the deduction, the total number of points was 847, slightly adjusting the overall result.

Indicator	Total points deducted	The number of authorities from which points were deducted
4.1 Final court rulings against the authorities received before 1 January of the current year	-5	2
4.2 Since 1 January of the current year, the Agency for Personal Data Protection and Free Access to Information has identified irregularities through inspection supervision (related to the creation and updating of the Guides for Accessing Information, proactive publication of information, and submission of acts and data for the Free Access to Information electronic system)	0	0
4.3 Complaints have been filed against the authorities with the Agency for Personal Data Protection and Free Access to Information since 1 January of this year due to "administrative silence".	-2	1
4.4 During the monitoring period, the Administrative Court has passed rulings against authorities on the count of "administrative silence" <i>in cases where a public law authority has failed to issue an administrative act, decide on a party's appeal, or undertake administrative activity, i.e. respond to a party's objection.</i>	0	0
4.5 SAI opinion on financial performance and regulatory compliance in case the authority has been subject to an audit by SAI in the previous five years: a) Qualified opinion: -2 points b) Adverse or disclaimer of opinion: -3 points * In case there is evidence that the authority has fulfilled the recommendations, a reduction of negative points is possible, depending on the percentage of implementation.	-27	18
4.6 Opinions of the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption, which established harm to public interest indicative of corruption, issued in the previous two years	0	0
4.7 In the past 3 years, there have been cases in which the statute of limitations for initiating and conducting disciplinary proceedings has expired.	-2	1
4.8. In the past three years, there have been cases in which the Ethics Commission has found violations of the Code of Ethics for State Prosecutors.	-4	2
4.9 In the past three years, there have been cases in which the Disciplinary Council and/or the Prosecutorial Council have determined the disciplinary liability of a judge/state prosecutor and imposed a sanction.	-2	1
4.10 In the previous year, irregularities were identified by the judicial inspection of the Ministry of Justice *In case there is evidence that the authority has since addressed the identified irregularities, a reduction of the deducted points is possible.	-4	3
Total points deducted:	-46	

By far the highest number of points were deducted from authorities due to the opinion of the State Audit Institution on financial operations and compliance with regulations—a total of 27 points, or 1.5 points for each of the 18 authorities. In 2020, the SAI published the *Report on the Financial Audit and Compliance Audit of the Prosecutor's Office for 2020*,⁴ issuing an adverse opinion on the compliance audit and a qualified opinion on the financial audit. In the meantime, the SAI has reviewed the implementation of recommendations on three occasions. In its latest report, it concluded that out of a total of 38 recommendations for the entire Prosecutor's Office, 33 were assessed as implemented, three as partially implemented, one had insufficient information for an assessment, and one was deemed inapplicable. Since a significant number of recommendations were implemented and authorities demonstrated openness in reporting on their implementation, the total number of points that could have been deducted under this indicator was reduced.

4 SAI Report is available at: <http://www.dri.co.me/doc/lzvjestaj%20o%20finansijskoj%20reviziji%20i%20reviziji%20pravilnosti%20poslovanja%20Tužilaštva%20za%202020.%20godinu.pdf>
The Report on Following on the Recommendations is available at: <http://www.dri.co.me/izvjestaj-o-realizaciji-preporuka>

According to the Methodology, points are also deducted if, in the past three years, the Ethics Commission established a violation of the Code of Ethics for State Prosecutors within an authority. This applied to the Cetinje State Prosecutor's Office and the Kotor State Prosecutor's Office, each losing two points. The only case of point deduction based on the work of the Disciplinary Council was also recorded in the Kotor State Prosecutor's Office due to a registered disciplinary offence.

Points were deducted if court rulings were issued against an authority in final and binding legal disputes during the year in which the assessment was conducted. A total of five points were deducted on this basis from two authorities. According to the Special State Prosecutor's Office, five legally concluded disputes during the reporting period were resolved against the authority. These included one case of compensation for damages, one for a violation of personal rights, two for compensation for non-pecuniary damage, and one for employment-related damages. As a result, three points were deducted from this Prosecutor's Office's score. The Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Bijelo Polje submitted two final judgments related to labour disputes. Since these disputes were initiated in 2018 under the previous management, the maximum possible deduction under this indicator was reduced, and a total of two negative points were applied.

If complaints due to "administrative silence" were filed against an authority with the Agency for Personal Data Protection and Free Access to Information from 1 January of the year in which the monitoring was conducted, points were also deducted. Under indicator 4.3, points were deducted from the Special State Prosecutor's Office due to three cases where requests for free access to information led to complaints for "administrative silence."

It is important to note that, in this category, apart from publicly available sources such as SAI reports, APC records, and annual reports of the Agency for Personal Data Protection and Free Access to Information, the assessment was based on verification materials provided by the authorities themselves. In many cases, authorities did not submit statements or evidence for this category. Therefore, the results should be interpreted with caution, as only independent verification with the relevant authorities or the systematic production of data from the indicators in category 4 can ensure complete accuracy.

Points were deducted for irregularities identified by the judicial inspection of the Ministry of Justice in the cases of the Basic State Prosecutor's Offices in Herceg Novi, Pljevlja, and Podgorica, resulting in a total deduction of four points. However, since the irregularities were subsequently addressed, the maximum possible deduction under this indicator was reduced.

Recommendations

In preparing this Report, the Agency drafted individual reports for all 18 authorities within the Prosecutor's Office subsystem. These reports contain detailed findings specific to each authority, with a total of **184** recommendations tailored to their respective needs. Rather than reiterating the recommendations already provided in the individual reports, this sectoral report offers guidance for potential systemic actions to address the issues identified.

- Authorities should place greater focus on defining specific risk areas in the next cycle of adopting Integrity Plans, ensuring they reflect the authority's jurisdiction or unique position, with a detailed elaboration of residual risks and measures for their prevention and elimination.
- A uniform practice of publishing information to which access is granted upon request should be established in accordance with the Law on Free Access to Information.
- Authorities must comply with the obligation to keep records of requests for free access to information through the information system of the Agency for Personal Data Protection and Free Access to Information. Extracts from these records should also be made publicly available to enhance transparency and prevent duplicate requests for already published information.
- If not by all authorities individually, then by the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office or the Prosecutorial Council, data on the work and results of the Prosecutor's Office should be published using open data formats on the designated portal.
- In the next cycle of adopting or updating Integrity Plans, authorities should pay particular attention to risks related to human resource management, including employment planning, the recruitment process, performance appraisal and monitoring, as well as reward and sanction mechanisms.
- Authorities should also analyse risks related to areas regulated by the Law on the Prohibition of Harassment at Work, the Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination, the Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities, and the Law on Gender Equality.
- Consideration should be given—at least at the level of the Prosecutorial Council or the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office—to systematising a dedicated organisational unit or job position responsible for anti-corruption efforts, integrity, and ethics, which would also oversee related matters within the wider prosecutorial organisation.
- Management staff should actively seek out and participate in additional training on anti-corruption, ethics, and integrity, while also ensuring such opportunities are provided for other employees, particularly in areas specific to their authority's work.

Annex 1. Achieved Scores by Authority

	1 - Assump- tions for implement- ing anticor- ruption regu- lations %	1.1 Estab- lishing an internal corruption risk man- agement mecha- nism %	1.2 Mecha- nism for monitoring and con- trolling work processes %	1.3 Establish- ing mecha- nisms for detecting and report- ing corrup- tion %	2 - Strengthen- ing the insti- tutional anticor- ruption frame- work	2.1 Strengthen- ing trans- parency in the work of authori- ties	2.2. Improve- ment of human resourc- es man- agement	2.3 Internal mecha- nism of ethical and pro- fessional conduct	3 - Strengthen- ing ethical culture	3.1 Raising aware- ness of manag- ers and em- ployees about ethics and integrity	3.2 Exis- tence and appli- cation of conflict of inter- est rules	3.3 Exis- tence and appli- cation of rules on accepting gifts	4 - Indi- cators for de- ductible scores	Total score	Self- assess- ment	Perfor- mance	Number of recom- menda- tions
BPO Herceg Novi	76.7%	100.0%	54.5%	60.0%	77.4%	86.2%	100.0%	33.3%	92.9%	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-2.5	54.0	58.5	76.60	6
BPO Kolašin	76.7%	100.0%	54.5%	60.0%	81.1%	93.1%	100.0%	33.3%	78.6%	25.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-1.5	54.0	54.5	76.60	7
BPO Berane	83.3%	100.0%	54.5%	100.0%	62.3%	93.1%	50.0%	0.0%	78.6%	25.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-1.5	51.0	53.5	72.34	8
HPO Bijelo Polje	83.3%	100.0%	54.5%	100.0%	56.6%	82.8%	50.0%	0.0%	85.7%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-1.5	50.5	51.0	71.63	8
Supreme State Prosecutor's Office	80.0%	92.9%	54.5%	100.0%	62.3%	79.3%	83.3%	0.0%	78.6%	25.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-1.5	50.0	45.5	70.92	12
BPO Cetinje	76.7%	100.0%	54.5%	60.0%	75.5%	82.8%	100.0%	33.3%	85.7%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-5.5	49.5	62.5	70.21	9
BPO Bijelo Polje	83.3%	100.0%	54.5%	100.0%	56.6%	82.8%	50.0%	0.0%	85.7%	75.0%	100.0%	75.0%	-3.5	48.5	53.0	68.79	7
BPO Pljevlja	76.7%	100.0%	54.5%	60.0%	64.2%	82.8%	66.7%	16.7%	78.6%	25.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-2.5	48.5	54.0	68.79	10
BPO Bar	76.7%	100.0%	54.5%	60.0%	58.5%	86.2%	50.0%	0.0%	78.6%	25.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-1.5	48.0	50.5	68.09	8
BPO Ulcinj	76.7%	85.7%	54.5%	100.0%	66.0%	86.2%	83.3%	0.0%	57.1%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	-1.5	47.0	54.5	66.67	8
BPO Nikšić	73.3%	100.0%	45.5%	60.0%	50.9%	72.4%	50.0%	0.0%	71.4%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	-1.5	44.0	49.5	62.41	10
Prosecutorial Council	63.3%	85.7%	36.4%	60.0%	62.3%	86.2%	66.7%	0.0%	71.4%	75.0%	50.0%	100.0%	-1.5	44.0	0.0	62.41	10
BPO Rožaje	66.7%	92.9%	36.4%	60.0%	52.8%	93.1%	8.3%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	-1.5	39.5	55.5	56.03	13
BPO Kotor	70.0%	100.0%	36.4%	60.0%	50.9%	72.4%	50.0%	0.0%	71.4%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	-5.5	39.0	41.0	55.32	11
BPO Podgorica	73.3%	92.9%	54.5%	60.0%	39.6%	44.8%	66.7%	0.0%	57.1%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%	-3.5	37.0	0.0	52.48	11
HPO Podgorica	53.3%	92.9%	27.3%	0.0%	45.3%	75.9%	16.7%	0.0%	64.3%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	-1.5	35.5	34.5	50.35	16
BPO Plav	51.7%	50.0%	50.0%	60.0%	45.3%	55.2%	66.7%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	-1.5	33.0	0.0	46.81	12
Special State Prosecutor's Office	56.7%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	35.8%	44.8%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	-6.5	27.0	28.0	38.30	18

Annex 2. Effects of the Methodology and Performance Assessment

The Methodology was presented to the authorities during a workshop with their representatives on 10 October 2022. Based on their feedback, it was revised and officially submitted on 8 November 2022, with a deadline of 31 December 2022 for authorities to conduct a self-assessment of the fulfilment of the given criteria. This involved assigning scores to each indicator in the provided table and submitting the corresponding means of verification to the Agency. Following data collection and analysis, a separate report was prepared for each of the 18 authorities, with a draft version submitted for comments and potential corrections.

On 9 May 2023, the Agency sent individual reports to the authorities for review and further feedback. A total of 10 authorities responded, submitting additional comments and documentation, which were considered. Where the submitted arguments and supporting documents met the methodological requirements for modifying the assessment, corrections were made, and the reports were updated accordingly. Throughout this process—while refining the Methodology, gathering documentation, and providing feedback—it was observed that many authorities initiated actions such as drafting internal acts, publishing information, or appointing designated personnel. In total, 106 activities were carried out. The following is a list of registered changes that resulted from engagement with the authorities during the performance assessment process:

1. BPO Bar

- ✓ In November 2022, the Risk Register was adopted and published on their website.
- ✓ In November 2022, the Internal Rule on Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Service Contracts was adopted, as well as the Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for the Engagement of Persons in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Bar on the Basis of Supplementary Work Contracts.
- ✓ In November 2022, the Internal Rules on Defining and Preventing Conflicts of Interest of Public Officials and Civil Servants in the Performance of Their Duties were adopted at the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Bar.
- ✓ In November 2022, the Internal Rule on the Content and Method of Keeping Records of Gifts was adopted, which refers to gifts received by the state prosecutor, civil servant, or state employee, and which also regulates the handling of gifts received, as well as the Rulebook on the Method of Disposing of Gifts by Public Officials.

2. BPO Berane

- ✓ The Berane BPO developed their Risk Register in November 2022, which was published on the prosecutor's office's website.
- ✓ The Book of Procedures was developed in December 2022 and published on the website.
- ✓ In December 2022, the Berane State Prosecutor's Office adopted an Internal Instruction on Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Contracts for Service, as well as an Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for the Engagement of Persons in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Berane on the Basis of Supplementary Work Contracts.

- ✓ In December 2022, the Public Prosecutor's Office in Berane adopted Internal Rules on Defining and Preventing Conflicts of Interest of Public Officials and Civil Servants in the Performance of Their Duties, which define both affiliated persons and rules on the performance of other duties.
- ✓ In November 2022, the Berane Public Prosecutor's Office adopted the Rulebook on the content and manner of keeping records of gifts, which applies only to civil servants. The Rulebook also provides for keeping records of gifts received. At the same time, the Berane Public Prosecutor's Office also adopted the Rulebook on the manner of disposing of gifts of public officials, which also regulates keeping records of gifts received.

3. BPO Bijelo Polje

- ✓ The BPO in Bijelo Polje developed the Book of Procedures in November 2022. The Risk Register and the Book of Procedures were published on the prosecutor's office's website.
- ✓ In November 2022, the Bijelo Polje State Prosecutor's Office adopted an Internal Rule on Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Service Contracts, as well as an Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for the Engagement of Persons in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Bijelo Polje on the Basis of Supplementary Work Contracts.
- ✓ In November 2022, the Bijelo Polje State Prosecutor's Office adopted Internal Rules on Defining and Preventing Conflicts of Interest of Public Officials and Civil Servants in the Performance of Their Duties in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Bijelo Polje, which also contains the definition of an affiliated person and rules for performing other duties.
- ✓ In November 2022, the Public Prosecutor's Office in Bijelo Polje adopted an Internal Rule on the content and method of keeping records of gifts relating to state prosecutors, civil servants and employees.

4. BPO Cetinje

- ✓ The Cetinje BPO adopted a Risk Register in December 2022, which was published on the institution's website. At the same time, this prosecutor's office also adopted a Book of Internal Procedures, which is also available on the prosecutor's office's website.
- ✓ In December 2022, the Cetinje Public Prosecutor's Office appointed a person to receive and process whistleblower reports.
- ✓ At the same time, the Cetinje Public Prosecutor's Office also issued Instructions on how to act upon whistleblower reports of threats to public interest indicative of corruption.
- ✓ In December 2022, the authority adopted the Internal Rule on Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Service Contracts, as well as the Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for the Engagement of Persons in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Cetinje on the Basis of Additional Work Contracts.

- ✓ In December 2022, the Cetinje Basic State Prosecutor's Office adopted Internal Rules on Defining and Preventing Conflicts of Interest of Public Officials and Civil Servants in the Performance of Their Duties in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Cetinje. These rules contain the definition of an affiliated person, as well as rules on the performance of other duties.
- ✓ The BPO in Cetinje adopted an Internal Rule on the Content and Method of Keeping Records of Gifts, which relates to gifts received by a civil servant, in December 2022. This prosecutor's office has also developed a Rulebook on the Method of Disposing of Gifts by Public Officials from December 2022.

5. BPO Herceg Novi

- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted a Risk Register, which was published on the institution's website.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted the Book of Internal Procedures.
- ✓ In December 2022, the Internal Procedure for Handling Reports, Recording Reports of Corruption and Protecting the Identity of the Person Filing a Report was adopted at the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Herceg Novi.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted the Internal Rule on Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Service Contracts, as well as the Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for the Engagement of Persons in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Herceg Novi on the Basis of Supplementary Work Contracts.
- ✓ In December 2022, the Herceg Novi Basic State Prosecutor's Office adopted an Internal Rule on the Content and Method of Keeping Records of Gifts, which refers to gifts received by a civil servant, and which provides for keeping records of gifts.
- ✓ In December 2022, an Internal Instruction on the Disposal of Gifts by Public Officials was drafted.

6. BPO Kolašin

- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted the Internal Rule on the Conclusion of Contracts for Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Service Contracts, as well as the Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for the Engagement of Persons in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Kolašin on the Basis of Supplementary Work Contracts.
- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted a Risk Register, which was published on their website.
- ✓ In November 2022, it also adopted the Book of Internal Procedures, which is available on the prosecutor's office website.
- ✓ In November 2022, the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Kolašin adopted Internal Rules on Defining and Preventing Conflicts of Interest of Public Officials and Civil Servants in Performing Their Duties at the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Kolašin.
- ✓ In November 2022, the Kolašin Public Prosecutor's Office adopted an Internal Rule on the Content and Method of Keeping Records of Gifts, which refers to gifts received by a civil servant, and which provides for keeping records of gifts. This prosecutor's office has also developed an Internal Instruction on the Method of Disposing of Gifts by Public Officials from November 2022.

7. BPO Kotor

- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted Internal Rules on Defining and Preventing Conflicts of Interest of Public Officials and Civil Servants in the Performance of Their Duties, which, in addition to conflicts of interest, also define affiliated persons, as well as rules on the performance of other duties.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted an Internal Rule on the Content and Method of Keeping Records of Gifts, which applies only to civil servants, and an Internal Instruction on the Method of Disposing of Gifts by Public Officials, which also regulates the keeping of records of gifts received.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted a Risk Register, which was published on their website.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted the Book of Internal Procedures.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted the Instructions on acting upon whistleblower reports of threat to public interest indicative of corruption, as well as the Internal Procedure for acting upon reports, recording corruption reports and protecting the identity of the person who filed the report at the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Kotor.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted an Internal Instruction on Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Contracts for Service, as well as an Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for the Engagement of Persons in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Kotor on the Basis of Supplementary Work Contracts.

8. BPO Nikšić

- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted the Book of Internal Procedures.
- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted the Instructions on acting upon whistleblower reports of endangerment of the public interest indicative of corruption.
- ✓ In December 2022, the Internal Rule on temporary and occasional jobs and work contracts was adopted
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted an Internal Rule on the detailed conditions for engaging persons in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Nikšić on the basis of supplementary work contracts.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted Internal Rules on Defining and Preventing Conflicts of Interest of Public Officials and Civil Servants in the Performance of Their Duties, which also define affiliated persons, as well as rules on the performance of other duties.
- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted the Internal Rule on the Content and Method of Keeping Records of Gifts and the Rulebook on the Method of Disposing of Gifts of Public Officials, which also regulates the keeping of records of gifts received.

9. BPO Plav

- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted the Risk Register and the Book of Internal Procedures.
- ✓ In December 2022, a person was appointed to receive and process whistleblower reports.

- ✓ In December 2022, the BPO Plav adopted Instructions on acting upon whistleblower reports of endangerment of the public interest indicative of corruption.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted the Internal Rule on the Conclusion of Contracts for Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Service Contracts, as well as the Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for the Engagement of Persons in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Plav on the Basis of Supplementary Work Contracts.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted an Internal Rule on the Content and Method of Keeping Records of Gifts, which relates to gifts received by a civil servant, and an Internal Rule on the Method of Disposing of Gifts by Public Officials.

10. BPO Pljevlja

- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted an Internal Rule on the Content and Method of Keeping Records of Gifts Relating to Civil Servants and an Internal Instruction on the Method of Disposing of Gifts by Public Officials, which also defines record keeping.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted the Risk Register and the Book of Internal Procedures.
- ✓ In December 2022, a person was appointed to receive and act upon whistleblower reports and the Instructions on Acting Upon Whistleblower Reports on Threats to the Public Interest Indicative of Corruption were adopted.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted the Internal Rule on the Conclusion of Contracts on Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Service Contracts and the Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for the Engagement of Persons in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Pljevlja on the Basis of Supplementary Work Contracts.

11. BPO Podgorica

- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted the Risk Register and the Book of Internal Procedures.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted an Internal Rule on the manner of disposing of gifts by public officials, as well as an Internal Rule on the content and manner of keeping records of gifts relating to civil servants.

12. BPO Rožaje

- ✓ In October 2022, created the Risk Register and the Book of Internal Procedures.
- ✓ In November 2022, a person was designated to receive and act upon whistleblower reports.
- ✓ In December 2022, the Instructions on acting upon whistleblower reports of endangerment of the public interest indicative of corruption were adopted.
- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted the Internal Rule on the Content and Method of Keeping Records of Gifts Relating to Civil Servants and the Rulebook on the Method of Disposing of Gifts by Public Officials.

13. BPO Ulcinj

- ✓ In November 2022, the Book of Procedures was adopted.
- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted an Internal Procedure for Handling Reports, Recording Reports of Corruption, and Protecting the Identity of the Person Submitting the Report.
- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted the Internal Rule on Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Service Contracts and the Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for the Engagement of Persons in the Basic State Prosecutor's Office in Ulcinj on the Basis of Supplementary Work Contracts.
- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted Internal Rules on Defining and Preventing Conflicts of Interest of Public Officials and Civil Servants in the Performance of Their Duties.
- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted Internal Rules on Defining and Preventing Conflicts of Interest of Public Officials and Civil Servants in the Performance of Their Duties. These internal rules also define affiliated persons, as well as rules on the performance of other duties.

14. High State Prosecutor's Office in Bijelo Polje

- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted the Book of Internal Procedures.
- ✓ In November 2022, the Internal Procedure for Handling Reports, Recording Reports of Corruption and Protecting the Identity of the Person Filing a Report was adopted at the High State Prosecutor's Office in Bijelo Polje.
- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted the Internal Rule on Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Service Contracts, as well as the Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for the Engagement of Persons in the High State Prosecutor's Office in Bijelo Polje on the Basis of Supplementary Work Contracts.
- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted Internal Rules on Defining and Preventing Conflicts of Interest of Public Officials and Civil Servants in the Performance of Their Duties at the High State Prosecutor's Office in Bijelo Polje.
- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted an Internal Rule on the Content and Method of Keeping Records of Gifts, which refers to gifts received by a state prosecutor, civil servant, or employee, and which regulates the handling of received gifts and the keeping of records of gifts.

15. Special State Prosecutor's Office

- ✓ A person to receive and act upon whistleblower reports has been designated and a procedure has been developed for acting in this area.

16. Supreme State Prosecutor's Office

- ✓ In December 2022, the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office adopted the Risk Register and the Internal Procedures Book
- ✓ In October 2022, a person was appointed to receive and process whistleblower reports.

- ✓ In December 2022, it developed Instructions on acting upon whistleblower reports of threats to the public interest that indicate the existence of corruption, which also contain the method and criteria for selecting persons to act upon whistleblower reports.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted the Internal Rule on Temporary and Occasional Jobs and Service Contract and the Internal Rule on Detailed Conditions for Engaging Persons in the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office on the Basis of Supplementary Work Contracts.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted Internal Rules defining conflicts of interest.
- ✓ In December 2022, it adopted an Internal Rule on the content and manner of keeping records of gifts received by a civil servant or employee and a separate Internal Instruction on the manner of disposing of gifts by state prosecutors in the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office.

17. Prosecutorial Council

- ✓ In November 2022, it adopted an Internal Rule on detailed conditions for performing temporary and occasional work.

