

Russia

2015 Country Summary

Recommendations

Russia's GI ranking in Band D places it in the high risk category for corruption in the defence and security sector, one of the lowest ranked among G20 nations. Russia scored B and D across all risk areas of Political, Finance, Procurement, and Personnel Risks. The highest risk area is Operations in Band F (critically high risk).

Budget Transparency and Secret Items

Budget experts have calculated that more than a half of the defence-related expenditure is classified as confidential in Russia. As a result, there is no way that defence expenses can be overseen in an effective and independent way by external bodies. Only a narrow group of individuals within parliamentary oversight bodies have access to secret items, while civil society has no visibility at all. Although most countries keep some defence-related items secret on the grounds of national security, Russia's exceptionally high overall level of secrecy undermines the national security rationale. We recommend that Russia reconsider the secrecy status of defence budget items and general defence-related information to allow greater scrutiny by Parliament and civil society organizations.

Civil Society and Government Engagement on Defence

Most defence policy decisions (e.g. sending Russian troops abroad, equipping the Armed forces) affect peoples' lives in a dramatic way and depend on taxpayer contributions. The public does therefore have the right to be included in the defence policy debates. Expert civil society organisations should be given space to conduct independent oversight and suggest recommendations to the government. To facilitate public engagement, we recommend that restrictive legislation on the NGO sector should be lifted. A foreign agent NGO law, "On undesirable organisations" currently severely impedes the activities of many independent NGOs by classifying them as "foreign agents" when they receive foreign funding. The label not only has a negative connotation, it limits the ability of NGOs to apply for foreign funding and imposes a burden of excessive reporting and accountancy which further inhibits their work.

To ensure that civil society does not fear reprisals in pursuing its anti-corruption efforts, we recommend that whistle-blowing be encouraged and protected by law and in practice. For defence sector cases, verbal and legal encouragement and protection are particularly important as the risks of a severe retaliation such as charges of state treason are likely to be highly discouraging for whistle-blowers as well as media or NGOs that pick up the information.

The government should additionally establish more dialogue between defence institutions and the public, in line with the Ministry of Defence “Plan for Combating Corruption in the Armed Forces for 2014 – 2015” as well as the “Declaration of Openness of Federal Executive Agencies.” The Ministry of Defence -- as well as other security and defence institutions -- should involve independent media, NGOs, and other experts more actively in their work. This could be done by inviting them to briefings and other events, as well as by consulting with them on specific issues.

Judicial Enforcement of Anti-Corruption Law

There should be no impunity and no selective enforcement of anti-corruption legislation. All cases of corruption in defense and security sector need to be investigated and prosecuted properly, including corruption by high-level officials. If some of the corrupt, especially high-level Ministry of Defence officials, fully or partially escape justice or punishment, this will crystallise an atmosphere of impunity for the corrupt.

Scorecard

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Political | Defence & Security Policy | Legislative Scrutiny | 1 |
| | | Defence Committee | 1 |
| | | Defence Policy Debated | 1 |
| | | CSO Engagement | 1 |
| | | International AC Instruments | 3 |
| | | Public Debate | 2 |
| | | AC Policy | 2 |
| | | AC Institutions | 2 |
| | | Public Trust | 1 |
| | | Risk Assessments | 1 |
| | Defence budgets | Acquisition Planning | 1 |
| | | Budget Transparency & Detail | 1 |
| | | Budget Scrutiny | 1 |
| | | Budget Publicly Available | 1 |
| | | Defence Income | 1 |
| | | Internal Audit | 1 |
| | | External Audit | 2 |
| | Other Political Areas | Natural Resources | 4 |
| | | Organised Crime Links | 1 |
| | | Organised Crime Policing | 2 |
| Intelligence Services Oversight | | 2 | |
| Intelligence Services Recruitment | | 1 | |
| Export Controls | | 0 | |
| Finance | Asset Disposals | Asset Disposal Controls | 2 |
| | | Asset Disposal Scrutiny | 2 |
| | Secret Budgets | Percentage Secret Spending | 1 |
| | | Legislative Access to Information | 2 |
| | | Secret Program Auditing | 2 |
| | | Off-budget Spending in Law | 1 |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | Off-budget Spending in Practice | 2 |
| | | Information Classification | 2 |
| | Links to Business | Mil. Owned Businesses Exist | 1 |
| | | Mil. Owned Business Scrutiny | 1 |
| | | Unauthorised Private Enterprise | 3 |
| Personnel | Leadership | Public Commitment | 2 |
| | | Measures for Corrupt Personnel | 2 |
| | | Whistleblowing | 0 |
| | | Special Attention to Sensitive Personnel | 2 |
| | Payroll and Recruitment | Numbers of Personnel Known | 1 |
| | | Pay Rates Openly Published | 3 |
| | | Well-established Payment System | 3 |
| | | Objective Appointments | 2 |
| | | Objective Promotions | 1 |
| | Conscription | Bribery to Avoid Compulsory Conscription | 1 |
| | | Bribery for Preferred Postings | 1 |
| | Salary Chain | Ghost Soldiers | 0 |
| | | Chains of Command and Payment | 2 |
| | Values, Standards, Other | Code of Conduct Coverage | 2 |
| | | Code of Conduct Breaches Addressed | 1 |
| | | AC Training | 2 |
| | | Prosecution Outcomes Transparent | 2 |
| Facilitation Payments | | 2 | |
| Operations | Controls in the Field | Military Doctrine | 1 |
| | | Operational Training | 1 |
| | | AC Monitoring | 1 |
| | | Controls on Contracting | 0 |
| | | Private Military Contractors | 1 |
| Procurement | Government Policy | Legislation | 2 |
| | | Transparent Procurement Cycle | 1 |
| | | Oversight Mechanisms | 2 |
| | | Purchases Disclosed | 2 |
| | | Standards Expected of Companies | 0 |
| | Capability Gap | Strategy Drives Requirements | 1 |
| | | Requirements Quantified | 1 |
| | Tendering | Open Competition v. Single-Sourcing | 1 |
| | | Tender Board Controls | 3 |
| | | Anti-Collusion Controls | 3 |
| | Contract Delivery / Support | Procurement Staff Training | 2 |
| | | Complaint Mechanisms for Firms | 3 |
| | | Sanctions for Corruption | 2 |
| | Offsets | Due Diligence | |
| | | Transparency | |
| | | Competition Regulation | |
| | Other | Controls of Agents | 0 |
| | | Transparency of Financing Packages | 1 |
| | | Subsidiaries / Sub-Contractors | 0 |
| Political Influence | | 3 | |