



Workshop 2



Workshop 2 Conclusions



The flow of information must go through an established contact person (anti-corruption official, ombudsman, external or internal, centralized or decentralized) who can be easily identified as such by public employees and citizens, and who is known to them.



Workshop 2 Conclusions



The contact person's area of responsibility may have different focuses, but it must be clearly defined: an advisory and intermediary function for the institutions and/or public employees and/or citizens that are assigned to him or her.



Workshop 2 Conclusions



Rights:

- Access to relevant paper and electronic files
- Possibility of involving investigative institutions in cases of criminal activity

Duties:

- Need for action (mediation / investigation / support /advice etc.)



Workshop 2 Conclusions



All public authorities depend on information:

- from their own investigations (risk assessment)
- from public employees
- from citizens

Problem: anonymous tips

- communicative dead-end



Workshop 2 Conclusions



Possible solution:

Web-based whistle-blower system (State Bureau of Criminal Investigation, Niedersachsen), which makes possible an anonymous dialogue between the whistle-blower and the investigating authority.



Workshop 2 Conclusions



Conclusions:

- Despite all the differences, it must be remembered that these are based on their local, national and cultural circumstances.
- A standardization of different proposed solutions is not recommended.
- Specific approaches to a solution should be worked out through the sharing of best practices.

