RESEARCH NOTES

Mongolia's Millennuim
Development Goal-9 Indicators Project Brief

Mongolia's exercise to develop Democratic Governance Indicators (DGIs) found its logical continuation in a project to develop indicators for MDG-9 for the latter's reporting mechanism. The Project was institutionally located at the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law, the locus of the previous DGIs research team. The objective of the Project was to refine previously developed DGIs to enable national stakeholders to better monitor performance in democratic governance reforms and build the capacities of the government, the national statistical office and civil society in collection, maintenance and analysis of governance related data. It was also to assist in developing an inclusive and consultative framework for the systematic assessment and monitoring of MDG-9 related goals and targets expressed in national development plans.

The outputs of the Follow-up project (DGIs, Country Information Notes (CIN) and National Plan of Action (NPA)) fed into the outputs of the MDG-9 Project and helped formulate concrete activities aimed at achieving the MDG-9 targets. Since the inauguration of the Project, the DGIs were reviewed and specific target indicators and methodologies for data gathering based on the selected indicators drafted, national consultations on DGIs and methodology with stakeholders, including the Parliament, NGOs, and the National Statistical Office (NSO) conducted, and a network of MDG-9 stakeholders established.

The most important achievement of the Project was the approval of a resolution on MDGs including indicators for MDG-9 by the Parliament in January 2008. Another important step was the testing of MDG-9 survey questions by the NSO in December 2007 in a periodic household survey

in compliance with an institutional contract between the Project and the NSO signed in May 2006.

A pilot household survey was finally conducted at the end of 2008 - early 2009 by the NSO. Other significant milestones included a national consultative meeting on MDG-9 held in March 2008, a MDG-9 website, and recommendations for government interventions in relation to MDG-9 (two roundtable discussions were with stakeholders and an implementation matrix for government programs related to MDG-9 was prepared). The project activities included numerous consultations with stakeholders in 2007-2008 and local trainings on MDG-9 indicators in three provinces of Dundgobi, Huvsgul, Dornod, and the capital city of Ulaanbaatar. In December 2008, a national wrap-up conference was held to discuss the project results with participation of all stakeholders.

The following table presents the MDG-9 indicators as approved by the Parliament of Mongolia in 2008.

Table 1. MDG-9 Indicators

Target	Indicator	Dimension of change	Data collection How Method	Data collection How Target group	Data collection When How often*	Who collects	Data analysis How Method	Data analysis How Target group	When How often	Who collects	What for
						MDG-9: Guarantee Human Rights and Strengthen Democratic Governance Targets 22-24 and Indicators as Approved by the Parliament of Mongolia in January 2008					
	Impact										
Target 22: Fully respect and uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ensure the freedom of media, and provide the public with free access to information	1. Human Development Index 1990: 0.652; 2000: 0.669; 2006: 0.691 (2004); 2015: 0.830		Statistical data	National	Annual	UNDP, based on national statistics	Statistical review Comparative analysis		Annual	UNDP	Assess progress in human development worldwide
	2. Expert evaluation of conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with international human rights treaties and conventions (percentage)		Expert evaluation	National	Biannual	National Human Rights Commission	Comparative analysis		Biannual	National Human Rights Commission	Assess progress in protection of human rights
	3. Percentage of implementation/enforcement of judicial decisions		Statistical data (agency level)	National	Biannual	Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs	Comparative analysis		Biannual	Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs	Assess progress in strengthening the rule of law
	4. Number of attorneys that provide services to poor citizens		Statistical data	National	Biannual	Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs	Comparative analysis		Biannual	Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs	Assess progress in strengthening the rule of law
	5. Public perception of political, economic, and financial independence of mass media		Household socio-economic survey data	National	Annual	National Statistical Office	Statistical review Comparative analysis		Annual	NSO	Assess freedom of media
	6. Number of state organizations that regularly place reports of their budgets and expenditures on their websites		Statistical data	National	Biannual	Ministry of Finance	Comparative analysis		Biannual	Ministry of Finance	Assess freedom of information
Target 23: Mainstream democratic principles and practices into life	7. Public perception of activities of state organizations		Household socio-economic survey data	National	Annual	NSO	Statistical review Comparative analysis		Annual	NSO	Assess accountability and transparency of the public sector and assess progress in strengthening the rule of law
	8. Number of civil society organizations that have officially participated and expressed their views in the process of developing and approving the state budget		Statistical data	National	Biannual	Ministry of Finance	Comparative analysis		Biannual	Ministry of Finance	Assess participation and responsiveness of the public sector
	9. Percentage of voters that have participated in nominating governors of soums and baghs		Statistical Data	National	Once every four years	Government Secretariat	Comparative Analysis		Once every four years	Government Secretariat	Assess participation in the electoral process, participation in local self-government
	10. Index of corruption		Public survey, specific index development methodology	National	Biannual	Anti-Corruption Agency	Comparative analysis		Biannual	Anti-Corruption Agency	Assess progress in fighting corruption
Target 24: Develop a zero-tolerance environment to corruption in all spheres of society	11. Perception of corruption in political organizations, judicial and law enforcement institutions		Expert survey	National	Biannual	Anti-Corruption Agency	Comparative analysis		Biannual	Anti-Corruption Agency	Assess progress in fighting grand corruption
	12. Public perception of corruption in public administration and public services		Household socio-economic survey data	National	Annual	NSO	Comparative analysis		Annual	NSO in cooperation with the Anti-corruption Agency	Assess progress in fighting petty corruption

Note: * Indicators that are produced on an annual basis will be collected from annual household socio-economic surveys by the NSO; all others will be produced on a bi-annual basis as required by the resolution of the Parliament.

DESCRIPTION OF MDG-9 INDICATORS

Target 22. Fully respect and uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ensure the freedom of media, and provide the public with free access to information.

1. Human Development Index

1990	2000	2006	2015
0.652	0.669	0.720 (2007)	0.830

Definition

The HDI is a summary measure of human development. It measures the average achievements in a country in three basic dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, as measured by life expectancy at birth; knowledge, as measured by the adult literacy rate (with two-thirds weight) and the combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrollment ratio (with one-third weight); a decent standard of living, as measured by GDP per capita (PPP USD).

Related Goal, Objective
Targets 22 and 23

Justification

Democracy/democratic governance serve as guarantees of implementation of human rights that are reflected in the progress in human development. The HDI (progressive realization of socio-economic rights) can be viewed as representing the effects of progress in democratic governance. The Project assumes that there is causality between governance and growth, between democratic governance and full realization of socio-economic rights especially for the poor and the marginalized.

National Organization in Charge of Measurement
The National Statistical Office (NSO)

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/ Timeframe
UNDP-specific methodology. All countries use the same methodology.	The Human Development Report group uses data and other materials collected by the UN system organizations and national statistical agencies.	The HDI is calculated on an annual basis.

Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/Measurement Limitation	References
The HDI individual indices (life expectancy, literacy, etc.) can be disaggregated by gender.	The Indicator cannot fully capture dimensions of human development. There is an indirect relationship with human rights, democracy, and democratic governance.	Human Development Reports, http://www.undp.org Mongolia Human Development Reports: 1997, 2000, 2003, 2007

2. Expert evaluation of conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with international human rights treaties and conventions (percentage)

Definition

The indicator is an expert evaluation expressed in percentage representing the compliance/conformity of Mongolia's laws and regulations (in particular those related to the exercise of human rights and immunities) with international human rights treaties and conventions that Mongolia has joined.

Related Goal, Objective
Targets 22, 23, 24

Justification

The national legislation should conform to the requirements of international treaties and conventions that Mongolia is a party to and provide for at least the minimum standards of international law. The Constitution of Mongolia envisions the same status for international treaties and conventions ratified by Mongolia as for the national legislation. It also provides for the priority of international law over Mongolia's national legislation if there is a conflict between the two.

National Organization in Charge of Measurement
The Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/ Timeframe
It is calculated on the basis of experts'assessment as percentage of conformity/non-conformity of the current national legislation with international human rights instruments. Also, on the basis of data from the judiciary, it is possible to provide the number of court cases resolved upon the principle of the priority of international law over the national legislation.	• All existing legislation • All international treaties and conventions ratified by Mongolia	The measurement is to be calculated every two years for inclusion in the national report on implementation of MDGs.

Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/Measurement Limitation	References.
There is a possibility to disaggregate the measurement with regard to international instruments on/related to women's rights.	There are no comprehensive studies on conformity/non-conformity of the current national legislation with international human rights instruments. The judicial practice of referring to international law in court is very limited. There are very few handbooks, instruction manuals, seminars and trainings on the use of international law in the practice of the judiciary and the law enforcement organizations.	• National legislation, international legal instruments • Decisions by the courts • Resolutions of the Supreme Court

3. Percentage of implementation/enforcement of judicial decisions

Definition

The percentage of implementation/ enforcement of judicial decisions is calculated by comparing the number of judicial decisions that have been implemented to the total number of judicial decisions (over a certain period of time) that needed enforcement.

Related Goal, Objective
Targets 22 and 23

Justification

The percentage of implementation /enforcement of judicial decisions is an important measurement in strengthening the rule of law, upholding social justice, and in protecting human rights and freedoms. It is also a guarantee that the rights that have been violated will be restored, the damages that have been inflicted will be repaid by those who have violated the law, and that the court decisions will be enforced speedily and effectively. Every court decision should be fully implemented. However, the implementation of court decisions in Mongolia is far from being satisfactory (30-40 percent), and the citizens still continue to suffer from bureaucratic red tape and nepotism of the organization in charge of implementing court decisions.

National Organization in Charge of Measurement
The Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/ Timeframe
The measurement will be calculated by comparing the number of judicial decisions that have been implemented to the total number of judicial decisions (over a certain period of time) that needed enforcement.	• Reports and other monitoring documents by organizations in charge implementing court decisions • The Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs will collect all the materials including monitoring reports by the Ministry and the Procurator's Office regarding the organization in charge of implementing court decisions.	The measurement will be calculated once every two years for inclusion in the National MDGs Report.

Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/Measurement Limitation	References
It is possible to disaggregate court decisions with damages of small amounts to be paid. Such decisions with small amounts of money imply that a service fee (up to 10 percent of the overall amount of damages to be transferred to the organization in charge of implementing court decisions will also be small. The Project assumes that there could be an indirect relationship with poverty/finance status of citizens to benefit from implementing court decisions with damages of small amounts.	Court decisions usually contain provisions on payment of damages. There could be difficulty in assessing realistically the implementation of provisions on payment of damages.	Reports of the Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs. Reports and other documents of organizations in charge of implementing court decisions.

4. Number of attorneys that provide services to citizens that are not able to pay for such services

Definition
The number of attorneys that provide services to citizens that are not able to pay for such services is the number of licensed attorneys that have provided legal services to citizens who are not able to pay for such services.

Related Goal, Objective
Targets 22 and 23

Justification
In Mongolia, approximately 80 percent of criminally convicted and imprisoned persons belong to the category of poor citizens, the poorest, and the unemployed. In 2005, 70.9 percent of the convicted belonged to the group of citizens that are not able to pay for legal services. The Law on Courts and the Law on Legal Defense contain provisions to the effect that "legal defense for citizens that are not able to pay for such service will covered by the state budget". However, only 12 million tugrugs are allocated annually for the above provision which is far from covering the actual expenditures.

It is important to establish a mechanism to support provision of legal defense for the abovementioned citizens at all phases of the criminal process, to improve the quality of and access to legal services. This will contribute to eliminating violation of human rights and freedoms and strengthening the rule of law in the country.

In 2006, the Government of Mongolia passed a resolution 263 on approving a national program to provide legal services to citizens that are not able to pay for such services. The program includes such components as setting up legal aid centers for the abovementioned citizens, creating conditions for provision of legal aid in the countryside, and creating positions of state attorneys.

National Organization in Charge of Measurement
The Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/ Timeframe
A total number of attorneys will be established. Then a comparison will be made between the number of citizens that are not able to pay for legal services and that have made official requests for such services and the actual number of the abovementioned citizens that have received such legal services.	Information will be collected from attorneys, other legal aid professionals, legal aid centers that are engaged in providing legal services free of charge to the abovementioned citizens on criminal issues at the national level, and criminal, administrative, and civil process issues at the local level.	The measurement will be calculated once every two years for inclusion in the National MDGs Report.

Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/Measurement Limitation	References
There is a possibility to disaggregate by gender the number of attorneys and the number of those that have received their services in relation to this indicator.	The national program to provide legal services to citizens that are not able to pay for such services is to be implemented until 2012 in two phases. Major activities include establishing legal aid centers in all aimags and districts and selecting state attorneys to work there. There is now a program to set up legal aid centers in aimags and districts. The lack of appropriate funding is the major obstacle in implementing the program fully.	• Reports by state attorneys and legal aid centers • Reports and other documents of local and regional courts • Information from the Association of Attorneys

5. Public perception of political, economic, and financial independence of mass media

Definition
The indicator is the percentage of citizens that have expressed their belief in political, economic and financial independence of mass media.

Related Goal, Objective
Targets 22, 23, and 24

<u>Justification</u>

Freedom of mass media is measured by whether the mass media is independent of political, economic, and financial influences. Dependent mass media undermines the principles of democracy and democratic governance. The DGIs study in Mongolia revealed that the existence of dependent media is expressed by subtle, "behind the curtains" means rather than by outright persecution of journalists.

<u>National Organization in Charge of Measurement</u>
The National Statistical Office (NSO)

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/ Timeframe
The measurement will be calculated on the basis of the results of a household survey containing questions on dependence/independence of mass media with a scale expressing the measure of dependence/independence (full, partial, etc.)	Data will be provided by an annual socio-economic household survey conducted by the National Statistical Office.	The NSO conducts its socio-economic household surveys on an annual basis.
Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/Measurement Limitation	References
There is a possibility to disaggregate the survey respondents according to their financial/poverty status.	Ordinary citizens may not possess full information regarding political, economic, and financial dependence/ independence of mass media.	Annual socio-economic household surveys conducted by the National Statistical Office: http://www.nso.mn

6. Number of state organizations that regularly place reports of their budgets and expenditures on their websites

<u>Definition</u>

The indicator is the number of state organizations that regularly and openly inform of their budgets and expenditures on their websites.

<u>Related Goal, Objective</u>
Targets 22, 23, and 24

<u>Justification</u>
The indicator expresses the degree of transparency and accountability

of government as well as the degree of access to information by citizens that are fundamental principles of democratic governance.

<u>National Organization in Charge of Measurement</u>
The Ministry of Finance

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/Timeframe
The measurement is the number of state organizations that regularly place their budget and expenditure reports on their websites. The number is to be compared to the total number of state organizations at the national level.	Data will be provided by the Ministry of Finance.	The measurement will be calculated once every two years for inclusion in the National MDGs Report.
Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/Measurement Limitation	References
There is no possibility for disaggregation.	Currently, there are few state organizations that inform of budgets and expenditures (Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science). Reports on websites will only be available to citizens with access to Internet. The poor, the disabled and other marginalized citizens will have limited access to these reports.	Websites of state organizations

Target 23: Mainstream democratic principles and practices into life

7. Public perception of activities of state organizations

<u>Definition</u>

The indicator is a composite index calculated on the basis of percentages of respondents that have expressed trust/distrust in state organizations and have evaluated their performance as answers to questions on different state organizations.

<u>Related Goal, Objective</u>
Targets 22, 23, and 24

Justification

The indicator expresses the degree of trust in government institutions and reflects their popular legitimacy. One of the biggest challenges to democracy and democratic governance is growing dissatisfaction and distrust of governmental institutions by citizens across various countries. The rule of law is an important measurement of democratic governance. Law enforcement organizations such as the judiciary, the procurators' office, and the police play a significant role in strengthening the rule of law.

National Organization in Charge of Measurement
The National Statistical Office (NSO)

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/Timeframe
The measurement will be calculated on the basis of the results of a household survey containing questions on trust/distrust of state organizations with a scale expressing the measure of trust/distrust (positive, medium, negative, etc.)	Data will be provided by an annual socio-economic household survey conducted by the National Statistical Office.	The NSO conducts its socio-economic household surveys on an annual basis.

Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/Measurement Limitation	References
There is a possibility to disaggregate the survey respondents according to their financial/poverty status.	There are different factors affecting the growing distrust by citizens of state organizations including a variety of socio-economic factors, the economic capacity of the state, etc. There is little possibility to develop one comprehensive measurement with respect to state organizations by formulating one "umbrella" question. Thus, a composite index is needed.	Annual socio-economic household surveys conducted by the National Statistical Office: http://www.nso.mn

8. Number of civil society organizations that have officially expressed their views in the process of developing and approving the state budget

Definition

The indicator is the number of civil society organizations that have officially expressed their views on the draft state budget to the Ministry of

Finance, the Government of Mongolia, and the State Great Hural (Parliament of Mongolia) during the formal process of developing and approving the state budget from the date the draft state budget is presented by the Ministry of Finance to the Government of Mongolia until the date the draft state budget is approved by the State Great Hural (from 15 September until 1 December).

Related Goal, Objective
Targets 22, 23, and 24

Justification

Democratic governance is based on citizen participation in decision-making. Broad participation of academia and civil society organizations in making decisions regarding the development and approval of the state budget is a reflection of degree of openness and transparency of government decision-making.

National Organization in Charge of Measurement
The Ministry of Finance

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/Timeframe
The measurement will be calculated as the number of civil society organizations that have officially expressed their views on the draft state budget to the Ministry of Finance, the Government of Mongolia, and the State Great Hural (Parliament of Mongolia) during the formal process of developing and approving the state budget from the date the draft state budget is presented by the Ministry of Finance to the Government of Mongolia until the date of the approval of the draft state budget by the State Great Hural (from 15 September to 1 December).	Data will be collected by the Ministry of Finance from its own relevant departments and as reports from the Government Secretariat and the Secretariat of the State Great Hural.	The measurement will be calculated once every two years for inclusion in the National MDGs Report. It can also be calculated annually.

Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/Measurement Limitation	References
There is a possibility to collect the number of pro-poor and pro-gender equality civil society organizations that have officially expressed their views on the draft state budget.	The indicator is more reflective of the participation process rather than the participation results.	Reports by the Ministry of Finance: http://www.mof.gov.mn

9. Percentage of voters that have participated in nominating governors of soums and baghs

Definition

The indicator is the national average of the percentage of voters that have participated in citizens' public meetings to nominate governors of soums and baghs for appointment by respective governors of higher administrative level in compliance with the Constitution of Mongolia and relevant legislation (the Law on Local Administration and Territorial Division).

Related Goal, Objective
Targets 22, 23

Justification

Effective and broad participation of citizens in local self-government is an important aspect of democratic governance. In Mongolia, the participation of citizens in forming local government institutions is relatively low. There is a wide-spread practice of holding nomination meetings with only relatives, friends, and party colleagues present. There are quorum provisions based on family representation for nomination meetings in the Law on Local Administration and Territorial Division, paragraphs 23.10, 23.11.

National Organization in Charge of Measurement
The Government Secretariat

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/Time-frame
The measurement will be calculated as the national average percentage of soum and bagh voters that have attended meetings for nominating respective governors as compared to the total number of voters in soums and baghs. There could also be a national average percentage of families represented by soum and bagh voters that have attended meetings for nominating respective governors as compared to the total number of families in soums and baghs.	Voter lists of citizens of soums and baghs compiled in preparation to local assemblies' elections, meeting minutes, and other relevant reports by Citizens' Hurals will constitute the basic source of information. Secretaries of Citizens' Hurals of all levels in aimags and the capital city will be responsible for collecting the information.	The measurement will be calculated once every four years in compliance with the electoral cycle.

Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/ Measurement Limitation	References
There is a possibility to disaggregate the percentage of voters that have participated in citizens' public meetings to nominate governors by gender.	The indicator does not reflect the dynamics of broader citizen participation in local self-government, and it is calculated only once every four years.	• Number of families is soums and baghs, voter lists • Meeting minutes, reports by Citizens' Hurals

10. Index of corruption

Definition

The index of corruption could be a quantitative expression of the following measurements: 1. Magnitude of corruption, traditional and new forms and practices of corruption, 2. Tolerance/intolerance of corruption by the public, 3. Trust/distrust of state organizations by the public from the point of view of corruption, 4. Magnitude of corruption in state organizations viewed as more corruption-prone than others such as the judiciary, the police, the customs agency, taxation offices, etc., 5. Risks of corruption in the business sector, economic cost of corruption, the magnitude of informal economy, etc.

Related Goal, Objective
Targets 22, 23, and 24

Justification

Measuring corruption is an important component in the national strategy of fighting corruption. It allows for identification of the spread of corruption across the country and across different sectors and subsectors as well as corruption "hotbeds". Regular measurements of corruption help focus on factors that encourage/discourage corruption and its different practices and help formulate effective anti-corruption policies. Paragraph 1.3, Article 18 of the Law on Anti-corruption approved by the State Great Hural in July 2006 states that among others the function of the Anti-corruption Agency is "to develop an index of corruption once every two years based on the research of the magnitude, forms, and contributing factors of corruption, and report it to the public".

National Organization in Charge of Measurement
The Anti-corruption Agency

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/ Timeframe
The methodology to develop an index of corruption will be developed separately. There is a need to conduct a number of studies. A study of international experience in measuring corruption is important in developing a methodology for Mongolia's index of corruption.	The data for the index of corruption will include quantitative and qualitative studies of corruption.	According to the Law on Anti-Corruption, the index of corruption is to be developed once every two years.

Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/ Measurement Limitation	References
Disaggregation by gender and poverty status needs to be included as a requirement in the methodology for the index of corruption.	The following issues are related to the methodology: • This area of research is new to Mongolia, and there is a lack of experience and lack of experts in the field; • Corruption is a hidden phenomenon; • Governments, as a rule, do not have sufficient motivation in collecting realistic data on corruption; • Indices of corruption, as a rule, are based on subjective assessments, perceptions by the public rather than on the practical realistic level of corruption, amount of bribes paid, amount of rent-seeking, scale of repetition, realistic economic cost of corruption.	While developing a specific methodology for the index of corruption, the following studies could be consulted: • In-house research of the Anti-corruption Agency • Transparency International (TI). Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI). Bribe Payers Index (BPI) Global Corruption Barometer (GCB). Urban Corruption Index (UCI). • World Bank Institute (WBI) Governance Indicators. • Transparency International Kenya Chapter Bribe Index Kenya. • Asia Foundation Mongolia Trends in Corruption Attitudes, 2006, 2008. • World Economic Forum (WEF). Global Competitiveness Survey. • Follow-up to ICNRD-5 Project, UNDP Mongolia/ MFA Democratic Governance Indicators: Assessing the State of Governance in Mongolia, 2006.

11. Perception of corruption in political organizations, judicial and law enforcement institutions

Definition

The indicator is a quantitative measurement/score calculated as an average of scores assigned by a pool of experts (business and financial sector experts, civil society experts) on the basis of their perception of corruption in different areas of political life and government functions such as magnitude of corruption in Mongolia politics, most corruption-prone sectors, institutional leaderships, organizations, forms and practices of corruption, socio-economic cost of corruption, etc. The indicator is a measurement of the "grand" corruption at the highest level of the Mongolian society.

Related Goal, Objective
Targets 22, 23, and 24

Justification

This indicator aims at establishing the experts' perception of corruption in political organizations, judicial and law enforcement institutions, the "grand" corruption in Mongolia. The indicator will reflect the degree of influence of financial and business sector actors on political actors, civil servants and officers of law-enforcement agencies and the judiciary. The "Trends in Corruption Attitudes" study commissioned by the Asia Foundation Mongolia in 2006 noted that action was urgently needed to combat corruption in politics and government administration and that political corruption was likely to incur the most damage to the country's economy.

National Organization in Charge of Measurement
The Anti-corruption Agency

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/Timeframe
The methodology to develop this perception indicator will be developed separately. A particular attention needs to be paid to selection of independent experts.	The source for the data for this indicator will be a perception survey by experts who will assign scores while assessing corruption. The Project assumes that experts (financial and business experts) possess more realistic information on "grand" corruption based on their personal experience and knowledge.	This indicator is to be produced once every two years for inclusion in the national MDGs report.

Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/ Measurement Limitation	References
Disaggregation by gender and poverty status needs to be included as a requirement in the methodology for this indicator.	See relevant section above on the Index of Corruption	See section J on the Index of Corruption

12. Public perception of corruption in public administration and public services

Definition

The public perception indicator will include several qualitative measurements of corruption in areas such as magnitude of corruption in public services, corruption-prone services, sectors, formal practices of corruption in public services, public attitudes to "petty" (petit, small) corruption.

Related Goal, Objective

Targets 22, 23, and 24

Justification

The most wide-spread instrument of assessing the level of corruption is the public perception survey of corruption. The Project assumes that this indicator will encapsulate the general level of corruption as well as public attitudes (tolerance/intolerance) to corruption.

National Organization in Charge of Measurement

The National Statistical Office (NSO)

Method of Calculation	Data Source, Data Collection	Measurement Replication/ Timeframe
The measurement will be calculated on the basis of the results of a household survey containing questions on "petty" corruption and public attitudes to corruption.	Data will be provided by an annual socio-economic household survey conducted by the National Statistical Office.	The NSO conducts its socio-economic household surveys on an annual basis. The methodology to develop this perception indicator was developed by NSO in cooperation with the Project.

Disaggregation by Gender & Poverty Status	Comment/ Measurement Limitation	References
There is a possibility to disaggregate the survey respondents according to their financial/poverty status.	Ordinary citizens may not possess full information regarding all aspects of "petty" corruption. The indicator is based on subjective perceptions of the public based on personal experiences along with the information provided by different mass media and other sources of information.	Annual socio-economic household surveys conducted by the National Statistical Office: http://www.nso.mn

SUMMARY BASELINE REPORT ON MDG -9
INDICATORS

This report contains a summary description of the baseline of the MDG-9 indicators at the end of 2009.

Target 22. Fully respect and uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ensure the freedom of media and provide the public with free access to information.

1. Human Development Index

1990	2000	2006	2015
0.652	0.669	0.720 (2007)	0.830

Definition

The HDI is a summary measure of human development. It measures the average achievements in a country in three basic dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, as measured by life expectancy at birth; knowledge, as measured by the adult literacy rate (with two-thirds weight) and the combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrollment ratio (with one-third weight); a decent standard of living, as measured by GDP per capita (PPP USD).

Today, the NSO announces Mongolia's HDI on an annual basis. As a comprehensive measurement of the country's human development, it also reflects the implementation process for all MDGs including MDG-9. The NSO includes the HDI in its annual statistical report. In 2007, Mongolia's HDI was 0.720.[1]

Mongolia produced its first Human Development Report in 1997 and published its forth Report in 2008. If the first report was devoted to general issues of human development, the following three reports were dedicated to specific issues of human development.

_____

[1] http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/country_fact_sheets/cty_fs_MNG.html

2. Expert evaluation of conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with international human rights treaties and conventions (percentage)

Definition

The indicator is an expert evaluation expressed in percentage representing the compliance/conformity of Mongolia's laws and regulations (in particular those related to the exercise of human rights and immunities) with international human rights treaties and conventions that Mongolia has joined.

The State Great Hural Resolution no. 13 of 31 of January 2008 obliged the National Human Rights Commission and other state bodies to elaborate MDGs indicators and methodologies, monitor and evaluate achievements on each indicator, and create and maintain special and itemized information database.

In the framework of the MDG-9, the main objective of the "Expert Evaluation on Conformity of Mongolian Laws with International Treaties and Conventions" was to elaborate expert evaluation questionnaire, evaluate those questions by experts chosen through adopted criteria and elaborate methodology for calculation and summarization of expert evaluation.

Since 1921, Mongolia has established around 3000 bilateral and around 180 multilateral treaties. According to the Constitution of Mongolia, international treaties and conventions to which Mongolia is a party shall have the same effect as national legislation. Therefore, the national legislation of a country must comply with international treaties and conventions that it has ratified or at least with minimum standards of those international treaties and convention.

In the framework of strengthening human rights, fostering democratic governance, fully respecting and upholding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, ensuring the freedom of media and providing the public with access to information, the expert evaluation of conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with international human rights treaties and conventions is presented in percentage. Elaboration of the expert evaluation questionnaire involved not only researchers working in this field but also other researchers, specialists and public comments and recommendations.

In accordance with the terms of reference, the selection of international human rights treaties and conventions to which Mongolia was party was made based upon the criteria of direct relation with the right to liberty and private safety and basic freedoms.

1. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
(Adopted by UN General Assembly Resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966 and entered into force on 23 March 1976. Mongolia signed on 05 January 1968 and ratified on 18 November 1974)
2. International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
(Adopted by UN General Assembly Resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966 and entered into force on 03 January 1976. Mongolia signed on 5 January 1968 and ratified on 18 November 1974)
3. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
(Adopted by UN General Assembly Resolution 34/180 of 18 December 1979 and entered into force on 03 September 1981. Mongolia signed on 10 July 1980 and ratified on 14 May 1981)
4. Convention on the Rights of the Child
(Adopted by UN General Assembly Resolution 44/25 of 20 November 1989 and entered into force on 02 September 1990. Mongolia signed on 26 January 1990 and ratified on 05 July 1990)
5. Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
(Adopted by UN General Assembly Resolution 39/46 of 10 December 1984 and entered into force on 26 June 1987. Mongolia ratified on 02 November 2000)
6. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
(Adopted by UN General Assembly Resolution 2106(XX) of 21 December 1965 and entered into force on 04 January 1969. Mongolia signed on 03 May1966 and ratified on 31 March 1969)

For the elaboration of the assessment questionnaire, provisions of the conventions obliging the state party and relevant provisions of Mongolian laws and regulations were selected.

The questionnaire on "Expert Evaluation of Conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with International Human Rights Treaties and

Conventions Project" prepared by the experts and specialists was evaluated by Mongolian experts.

A general evaluation was calculated through summarization of all given evaluations such as 1,2,3,4,5 that were given to provisions of the conventions directly obliging the state party and relating to human rights, and provisions of Mongolia laws and regulations that directly related to the provisions of the specific convention.

Table 1. expert evaluations numerical expression

	1. Provision of a law	2. Provision of a convention
1.	1-5 numerical expression	1-5
2.	1-5 numerical expression	1-5

The experts gave their numerical evaluation on conformity of legal provisions with the content of the provisions of treaties and conventions related to the right to liberty and private safety through the criteria of similarity by using the evaluation points between 1 and 5.

The following is the meaning of evaluation points:

1 point -Insufficient
2 points- Slightly above insufficiency
3 points- Medium
4 points- Higher than medium, but need further
5 points- Sufficient

The calculation of expert evaluation of a specific treaty or convention was conducted through utilization of the following formula:

$$K=\frac{Y1+Y2+Y3+Y4+Yn}{Y\ total}$$

K - Evaluation of conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with relevant international human rights convention or treaty.
Y1 - Evaluation given to a specific provision of the law in comparison to the provision of the treaty or convention (numerical evaluation in a single cell)
Y total – total number of cells with numerical evaluations.

The following formula was used to calculate the final evaluation of conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with international human rights treaties and conventions:

$$Y=\frac{K1+K2+K3+K4+Kn}{K\ total}$$

Y- Evaluation of conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with international human rights treaties and conventions

K1- Evaluation given to a single treaty or convention

K total –total number of conventions

By establishing the first baseline data on conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with ratified international human rights treaties and conventions, we identified the present level of conformity which will be an important tool in identifying the level to be reached in 2015.

Table 2. Expert Evaluation of Conformity of Mongolian Legislation with International Human Rights Treaties and Conventions-I

№	Conventions	Average of evaluations conducted by Mongolian experts
1.	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	3
2.	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	3.7
3.	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment	3.2
4.	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	4
5.	Convention on the Rights of Child	3
6.	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Woman	3.9
	Expert evaluation on conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with international human rights treaties and conventions	3.4

The evaluation, made by selecting laws from the national legislation based on direct relation with the right to liberty and private safety, and with abovementioned treaties and conventions, is shown in the table below.

Expert evaluation on conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with international human rights treaties and conventions received an evaluation of 3.4 points out of 5 as maximum. The conformity of the Mongolian national legislation with international human rights treaties is above "satisfactory", and this indicates that there still was a need for further review of legislation for conformity.

Nonetheless, it should be considered that the documents such as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights have the nature of gradual implementation

and, because of that, Mongolia fulfills its obligations in a step-by-step manner. Moreover, the table shows that Mongolia is implementing its obligations with regard to the elimination of racial and sexual discrimination relatively well.

However, it should be noted that the expert evaluation on conformity of Mongolian laws and regulations with international human rights treaties and conventions is an evaluation on conformity and does not evaluate their implementation.

3. Percentage of implementation/enforcement of judicial decisions

Definition

The percentage of implementation/ enforcement of judicial decisions is calculated by comparing the number of judicial decisions that have been implemented to the total number of judicial decisions (over a certain period of time) that needed enforcement.

This indicator is to be reported by the Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs.

As of 2008, the General Court Enforcement Agency performed 42.3 billion tugrugs under 13557 writs of execution out of 52.6 billion tugrugs to be performed under 19850 writs of execution leaving 10.3 billion tugrugs not performed under 6293 writs of execution. The average practical performance for court enforcement was 74.3 percent.

The practical performance of court enforcement increased as compared

to the previous years by demonstrating a 9.6 percent growth compared to 2006 and 2007.

978 writs of execution were suspended in 2008 on the grounds specified in the Court Enforcement Law. This number showed the decrease of suspended writs by 1992 writs or 67.0 percent compared to the average of the past three years. 4147 writs of execution for which legal grounds for suspension ceased to exist were re-opened in 2008, which demonstrated an increase by 2497 writs or 60.2 percent compared to the average of the past three years.

Also in 2008, 1.3 billion tugrugs were executed under 7643 writs of execution for small amount cases out of 2.3 billion tugrugs to be executed under 11278 writs of execution leaving 978.6 billion tugrugs under 3635 writs. The practical performance percentage was 63.1, which demonstrated a 5.0 percent increase compared to 2007.

4. Number of attorneys that provide services to citizens that are not able to pay for such services

> Definition
> The number of attorneys that provide services to citizens that are not able to pay for such services is the number of licensed attorneys that have provided legal services to citizens who are not able to pay for such services.

Currently, legal assistance to insolvent citizens is rendered in the following two forms:

1. Article 12.3.8 of the Law on Advocacy specifies that an advocate has a duty to help pro bono insolvent citizens twice a year. In order to implement this provision, the Association of Mongolian Advocates appoints advocates under a certain schedule. Today, there are over 1000 advocates working in Mongolia in total. In 2007, 252 advocates appointed by the Association rendered free legal assistance to 314 insolvent citizens. This number decreased in 2008 when 141 advocates helped 161 people. This fact is explained by the establishment of legal assistance centers across the country.

2. Over 29 months, from June 2004 to November 2006, pilot projects to establish Legal Assistance Centers were undertaken in Hentii aimag and Songinohairhan District with the financing from the Open Society Institute.

Implementation of these pilot projects led to conclude that establishment of such a unit would be the most suitable means to protect the rights of insolvent citizens and provide them with access to legal assistance. Also, in order not to limit legal assistance for insolvent citizens only by the advocates appointed by the Association, the Government adopted the National Program on Legal Assistance to Insolvent Citizens by its Resolution 262 in 2006. A National Council operates with local branches to supervise and organize the program implementation.

In order to implement the above program, the Ministry of Justice and Internal Affairs together with the UNDP and the Open Society Institute established legal assistance centers in Hentii and Uvurhangai aimags, and Bayangol and Bayanzurh districts of Ulaanbaatar in April 2008 and other aimags and districts in August 2008. As of today, legal assistance centers were established under local Governor's Office in 21 aimags and 8 districts of Ulaanbaatar.

Permanent staff work 8 hours daily providing free legal assistance of a Center and are paid a constant wage. As the number of the citizens requesting free legal assistance is likely to increase, it is necessary to employ advocates on a contractual basis.

Contractual advocates deal with specific cases under contracts during the high work-load times of the center and are paid according to a specific rate (adopted by Decree 69 of the Minister of Justice and Internal Affairs). In 2009, the government budget allocation for provision of advocacy services to insolvent citizens increased from 15 million tugrugs to 78 million tugrugs.

Since the establishment of legal assistance centers and commencement of their activities in 2008, 2769 people in total were rendered legal assistance. Advocacy services were rendered for 628 cases engaging 689 people, out of which 360 cases were resolved. In 101 cases, the requests for legal assistance were refused on the grounds such as financial capability, conflict of interests and jurisdiction.

The report submitted by the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs to the National Committee on Development and Innovation in May 2009 stated that there were 476 advocates that provided legal services to insolvent citizens in 2006, 417 in 2007, and 293 in 2008. However, another report on implementation of MDGs by the said Ministry in 2009 stated that there were 544 advocates that provided legal services to insolvent citizens in 2007 and 431 in 2008. The confusion in numbers reveals a lack of common methodology and reporting procedures with regard to the indicator on the number of attorneys that provide legal services to citizens who are not able to pay for such services. To refine the statistical data for this indicator, the MDG-9 Project experts made two recommendations: (1) to ensure the principle of "one advocate – one client" reporting, and (2) to include simultaneously the number of insolvent clients in the reporting data.

A recommendation that included a proposal for a data reporting matrix was formally submitted by the Project to the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs.

The past two years have witnessed such progressive steps as the establishment of legal assistance centers for insolvent citizens, increase of government financing/budget, training of specialized advocates and launching of certain projects and programs. These achievements create conditions for continuous and effective provision of advocacy services for insolvent citizens, improvement of the accessibility and impact of legal assistance to citizens as a whole and protection of human rights.

5. Public perception of political, economic, and financial independence of mass media

Definition
The indicator is the percentage of citizens that have expressed their belief in mass media, political, economic, and financial independence of mass media.

The project team and the National Statistical Office (NSO) signed a Memorandum of Understanding to include a questionnaire on the abovementioned indicator in the latter's Annual Household Socio-economic Survey and agreed in 2007 on the methodology and reporting,

and conducted a pretesting of the questionnaire in December 2007. The questionnaire was discussed and approved by the Consultative Committee under the NSO Director and was given a "green light" for the pilot and then the implementation within the framework of the Annual Household Socio-economic Survey.

The 2006 State of Democracy Assessment produced within the scope of the Follow-up to ICNRD-5 Project revealed that infringements on the freedom of the press were expressed through indirect, covert pressures brought upon journalists rather than through the use of such instruments as prosecution and other means of direct and open pressure. In 2008, the results of the Annual Household Socio-economic Survey conducted among 1872 households revealed that by and large the population viewed the mass media as dependent on political and financial interests. 20 percent

Table 3. Public Perception of Political, Economic and Financial Independence of Mass Media

	Survey questions	Responses in %						Overall assess-ment [1] (score)
		Very depen-dent	Depen-dent	Rela-tively depended	Indepen-dent	Very indepen-dent	Don't know	
1	Public percep-tion of political independence of mass media	10.5	30.9	21.7	15.8	1.1	20.0	28.9*
2	Public percep-tion of economic and financial in-dependence of mass media	8.5	29.3	21.8	13.8	1.0	25.6	28.1*
3	Can Mongolians express their views freely?	5.3	18.5	31.0	35.0	6.7	3.6	63.61*

Source: Module on Democratic Governance under the Annual Household Socio-economic Survey, NSO, 2008
*The scores were calculated by the staff of the MDG-9 Project, June 2009.

---

[2] The total score is a standard score was calculated by subtracting negative values from the positive values (the range is 1-100 scores).

of respondents gave the "don't know answer" to the question on media dependence. This showed that a large segment of the respondents did not feel knowledgeable enough to evaluate the media situation.

The overall result showed that the Mongolian citizens believed that they could express their views freely (the score was 63.6). However, the mass media independence of political, economic and financial interests was 28.9 and 28.1 scores respectively, a very low rate of media independence.

The questions regarding the degree of trust in mass media revealed that the public media instruments such as the Mongolian National Public TV (99.3 scores) and the National Public Radio (93.0 scores) had the highest trust among the respondents. Private media scored very low with the "yellow press" having the lowest degree of trust.

The average total score of the media independence of political, economic and financial interests was 28.5 percent.

Table 4. Citizens' Trust in Mass Media

		Responses in %						Trust assessment[3] (score)	
		Very unreli-able	Unreli-able	Mod-estly Reliable	Reliable	Very reliable	Don't know		
1	National Public Radio	1.5	3.9	19.4	57.7	12.3	5.3	93.0	
2	FM Radio	2.3	8.3	29.4	33.6	4.2	22.3	78.3*	
3	Mongolian Na-tional Public Television	1.2	3.5	17.4	58.2	18.7	1.0	94.3*	
4	Private Televi-sion Stations	1.5	9.4	31.3	43.2	6.1	8.5	81.9*	
5	Local Television Stations	2.0	6.4	23.6	33.8	4.5	29.8	82.1*	
6	Daily Newspa-pers	3.0	13.3	33.0	33.1	4.1	13.5	69.5*	
7	Yellow Press	10.9	30.3	27.7	12.0	1.9	17.2	25.2*	

Source: Module on Democratic Governance under the
Annual Household Socio-economic Survey, NSO, 2008
* The scores were calculated by the staff of the MDG-9 Project, June 2009

---

[3] The total score is a standard score was calculated by subtracting negative values from the positive values (the range is 1-100 scores).

The score was calculated according to a methodology described in the section "Concept Note on the MDG-9 Module in the Annual Household Socio-economic Survey".

6. Number of state organizations that regularly place reports of their budgets and expenditures on their websites

Definition
The indicator is the number of state organizations that regularly and openly inform of their budgets and expenditures on their websites.

According to the Parliament Resolution, the Ministry of Finance is now responsible for developing the above indicator. The project staff produced the base indicator in collaboration with respective experts of the Ministry of Finance.

In the first half of 2008, there were 4037 organizations funded by the state budget excluding state-owned business organizations. There were 32 general budget managers there along with 54 general budget managers including aimag and capital city governors.

The majority of the abovementioned organizations are local schools, hospitals and other social sector budgetary organizations. There are basic four budgetary organizations in one soum such as a local school, a hospital, local governor's office, and a cultural center. None of these has a functioning website. There is no detailed survey available about this. Thus, it can be assumed that at the local soum level there are no organizations that have placed statistical information on their websites. This is explained by the fact that it has been only two year that a majority of soums received a constant source of electricity whereas around 40 percent still lack a stable access to electricity sources.

The following is a performance data with regard to the indicator by 32 budgetary organizations working under general budget managers: one organization has placed its 2008 budget implementation and 2009 budget plan, 12 organizations had budget implementations of earlier years on their websites, 13 organizations had no information, and 6 organizations had no websites to refer to.

Only one of the local offices of the Ulaanbaatar City and provincial (aimag) offices had a budgetary report of the current year, 11 had budgetary reports of earlier years, 7 had no information, and 3 organizations had no websites.

Among 54 budgetary organizations under general budget managers, there were 2 organizations that have placed full reports of their budgets, 23 had reports from previous years, 20 had no reports on budgets on their websites, and 9 organizations did not have websites. All in all, there were 45 organizations at the national and local level that had websites and 9 organizations without websites. 25 organizations or 55.6 percent of organizations with websites had placed reports on their budgets.

Target 23: Mainstream democratic principles and practices into life

7. Public perception of activities of state organizations

Definition
  The indicator is a composite index calculated on the basis of percentages of respondents that have expressed trust/distrust in state organizations and have evaluated their performance as answers to questions on different state organizations.

The project team and the NSO signed a Memorandum of Understanding to include a questionnaire on the abovementioned indicator in the latter's Annual Household Socio-economic Survey and agreed in 2007 on the methodology and reporting, and conducted a pretesting of the questionnaire in December 2007. The questionnaire was discussed and approved by the Consultative Committee under the NSO Director

Table 5. Public Perception of Activities of State Organizations

№		Responses in %						Overall assessment[4] (score)*
		Very poor	Poor	Relatively Good	Good	Very good	Don't know	
1.	President	4.0	10.2	34.1	43.4	4.7	3.6	77
2.	Parliament	10.1	25.9	45.2	15.1	0.8	2.9	31

[4] The total score is a standard score was calculated by subtracting negative values from the positive values (the range is 1-100 scores).

3.	Government	6.9	18.4	39.7	28.4	1.9	4.7	55
4.	Capital /aimag Hurals (assemblies)	5.2	15.2	33.5	19.7	0.8	25.6	50
5.	District/ soum Hurals (assemblies)	7.1	17.5	35.5	21.9	1.0	17.0	48
6.	Horoo/bagh Hurals (assemblies)	10.0	17.9	32.4	22.6	1.7	15.5	47
7.	Capital/aimag Governors	4.7	13.0	34.9	29.0	2.3	16.2	64
8.	Distirict/soum Governors	6.0	15.7	35.4	28.9	2.2	11.8	59
9.	Horoo/bagh Governors	7.2	15.6	31.7	35.9	3.5	6.1	63
10.	Supreme Court	4.4	9.0	21.8	12.3	1.7	51.0	51
11.	Capital/aimag Courts	3.6	9.8	23.4	13.4	1.0	48.9	52
12.	District/soum Courts	3.6	10.8	24.5	13.4	1.1	46.7	50
13.	General Court Enforcement Agency	3.2	9.7	22.4	16.0	1.7	46.9	58
14.	Traffic Police	4.5	11.6	29.2	35.4	2.9	16.4	70
15.	Criminal Police	4.0	12.4	31.3	27.1	2.4	22.8	64
16.	Police Patrol	4.7	12.9	31.1	31.8	3.7	15.8	67
17.	Independent Authority Against Corruption	11.1	16.2	23.3	11.1	1.2	37.2	31
18.	State Specialized Inspection Agency	6.4	14.3	26.8	25.0	2.0	25.5	57
19.	National Audit Office	2.2	7.7	20.3	19.2	2.0	48.6	68
20.	Customs	5.4	11.7	23.7	17.2	1.1	40.9	52
21.	Authority of Land Affairs	11.2	16.5	28.1	17.9	1.2	25.2	41
22.	Taxation administration	3.1	8.4	25.6	35.9	3.5	23.5	78
23.	Social insurance organizations	1.2	5.2	24.5	53.2	5.9	10.1	90
24.	Social care organizations	1.3	5.7	22.4	53.7	7.5	9.3	90
25.	Public schools	1.5	6.1	30.9	47.8	6.7	7.1	88
26.	Public Health organizations	4.4	12.3	30.9	43.6	5.2	3.6	75

Source: Module on Democratic Governance under the Annual Household Socio-economic Survey, NSO, 2008
* The scores were calculated by the staff of the MDG-9 Project, June 2009

and was given a "green light" for the pilot and then the implementation within the framework of the Annual Household Socio-economic Survey. The results of the Survey were as shown in Table 3.

The survey respondents gave a higher satisfaction rate to social insurance and social care organizations (90 scores) whereas the Parliament received the lowest score of 30. The citizens believed that state democratic institutions including national and local assemblies had failed to implement their relevant functions.

Table 6. Citizens' Trust in the State Institutions

	Responses in %						Overall Assessment (score)*
	Very unreliable	Unreliable	Relatively Reliable	Reliable	Very reliable	Don't know	
Parliament of Mongolia	7.1	23.2	41.4	25.3	1.3	1.7	46.8
Government of Mongolia	4.6	15.8	39.3	34.6	2.6	3.0	64.6
President of Mongolia	4.0	10.4	31.3	45.3	6.9	2.2	78.5

Source: Module on Democratic Governance under the
Annual Household Socio-economic Survey, NSO, 2008
* The scores were calculated by the staff of the MDG-9 Project, June 2009

8. Number of civil society organizations that have officially expressed their views in the process of developing and approving the state budget

Definition
    The indicator is the number of civil society organizations that have officially expressed their views on the draft state budget to the Ministry of Finance, the Government of Mongolia, and the State Great Hural (Parliament of Mongolia) during the formal process of developing and approving the state budget from the date the draft state budget is presented by the Ministry of Finance to the Government of Mongolia until the date the draft state budget is approved by the State Great Hural (from 15 September until 1 December).

This indicator was to be produced using the data by the GoM (Ministry of

Finance), the Government Secretariat, and the Parliament Secretariat as reflected in the Parliament's respective resolution.

During the Project duration, two state budgets were approved in 2008 and 2009. During the discussion of the 2008 budget, the MDG-9 indicators were under the process of completion. However, during the discussion of the 2009 state budget, the data on the number of NGOs and citizens that had submitted proposals was not collected. The Project staff made an attempt to collect the data on their own by approaching formally both the Government Secretariat and the Parliament's Secretariat. The latter two organizations did not have processed data on the above indicator.

The interviews with relevant officials showed that many proposals were usually submitted by budgetary organizations rather than NGOs or citizens. Few organizations that were implementing some programs funded by the budget suggested a number of proposals.

The Project staff believes that a specific function /job description should be made available to formalize the collection of the indicator data by the staff at the Ministry of Finance, Government Secretariat, and the Parliament's Secretariat to ensure the implementation of the indicator.

9. Percentage of voters that have participated in nominating governors of soums and baghs

Definition
    The indicator is the national average of the percentage of voters that have participated in citizens' public meetings to nominate governors of soums and baghs for appointment by respective governors of higher administrative level in compliance with the Constitution of Mongolia and relevant legislation (the Law on Local Administration and Territorial Division).

The Project staff proposed this indicator as a measure of a direct participatory democracy by citizens at the local elections of governors of baghs, soums and horoos. The data could be collected through the Citizens' Representative Hurals.

However, in 2008, the State Great Hural amended the Law on Administrative Units and Their Management by introducing appointments of lower level governors by higher level governors of administrative units. The amendment had a disqualifying effect on the proposed indicator. Still, in March 2009, the Constitutional Court reversed the amendment of the Parliament and restored the initial legal provision of electing governors local administrative units. In the final end, the above indicator has retained its validity. In 2009, the indicator has not been substantiated by a data base.

Target 24: Develop a zero-tolerance environment to corruption in all spheres of society

10. Index of Corruption

Definition
The index of corruption could be a quantitative expression of the following measurements: 1. Magnitude of corruption, traditional and new forms and practices of corruption, 2. Tolerance/intolerance of corruption by the public, 3. Trust/distrust of state organizations by the public from the point of view of corruption, 4. Magnitude of corruption in state organizations viewed as more corruption-prone than others such as the judiciary, the police, the customs agency, taxation offices, etc., 5. Risks of corruption in the business sector, economic cost of corruption, the magnitude of informal economy, etc.

This indicator was assigned for development by the Anti-corruption Agency by both the Anti-corruption Law and the Parliament Resolution on MDGs. The Project staff initiated two roundtable discussions with relevant officials of the Anti-corruption Agency along with national stakeholders on various existing methodologies to produce a corruption index that were used by international and foreign organizations.

Along with the above, the Project with the support of the UNDP invited an international adviser to assist in the capacity-building for developing a corruption index. There are also opportunities to collaborate with such organizations as the Mongolian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Sant Maral Foundation, the Political Education Academy and

others that conducted corruption surveys over time with some regularity and were exposed to established methodologies.

The project believes that the Anti-corruption Agency that holds the primary responsibility for developing the corruption index needs to engage in a more energetic manner in this area of MDG-9 indicators. Currently, at the end of 2009, the indicator is still under development.

11. Perception of corruption in public organizations, judicial and law enforcement institutions

Definition
The indicator is a quantitative measurement/score calculated as an average of scores assigned by a pool of experts (business and financial sector experts, civil society experts) on the basis of their perception of corruption in different areas of political life and government functions such as magnitude of corruption in Mongolia politics, most corruption-prone sectors, institutional leaderships, organizations, forms and practices of corruption, socio-economic cost of corruption, etc. The indicator is a measurement of the "grand" corruption at the highest level of the Mongolian society.

The indicators on the zero tolerance of corruption in all spheres of society (Target 24) include an indicator on perception of corruption in political organizations, judicial and law enforcement institutions. The indicator is aimed at identifying the current state of corruption at the "grand" or elite level in the Mongolian society and establishing experts' perceptions of grand level corruption.

The survey targeted the State Great Hural, Citizens' Representatives Hurals of all level, Ministries, Agencies, local public organizations in provinces, National Audit Commission, judicial bodies, Public Prosecutor's Office, Department of Police and the Enforcement Agency for Judicial Decisions. The survey questionnaire covered all important areas of corruption phenomenon and included 13 questions and 87 statements. The survey kept anonymous the names of participating experts.

The selection of experts was based on the following: experience in a state

organization and a law enforcement body, experience in working against corruption or exposure to information about it, legal experience, experience in representing private sector interests before a state organization, and experience in business activities. While selecting the experts, more experts from the private sector were included. This approach was supported by partner organizations such as the Anti-Corruption Agency. Altogether there were 15 experts.

The overall mean score of the "grand" corruption in Mongolia was set at 4.09 by the experts leading to the conclusion that the corruption was very high in Mongolia's political, judicial and law enforcement bodies.

Low level of social and economic development, lack of intolerance of corruption in the society, lack of transparency and accountability, red tape, patronage and nepotism by politicians, inadequate civil service system, weak capacity of government institutions, evasion of responsibility by persons who have engaged in unlawful practices and unethical behavior, poverty and failure of law enforcement were cited by the experts as corruption factors.

The section on Reports on Specific Indicators contains a more detailed description of the expert survey on the "grand" corruption in Mongolia.

12. Public perception of corruption in public administration and public services

Definition
The public perception indicator will include several qualitative measurements of corruption in areas such as magnitude of corruption in public services, corruption-prone services, sectors, formal practices of corruption in public services, public attitudes to "petty" (petit, small) corruption.

The project team and the NSO signed a Memorandum of Understanding to include a questionnaire on the abovementioned indicator in the latter's Annual Household Socio-economic Survey and agreed in 2007 on the methodology and reporting, and conducted a pretesting of the questionnaire in December 2007. The questionnaire was discussed and approved by the Consultative Committee under the NSO Director and

was given a "green light" for the pilot and then the implementation within the framework of the Annual Household Survey. The first such survey was conducted in December 2008. The survey questions covered 22 types of public services that the Project experts and the NSO staff identified as the most in demand by the citizens. The results of the survey were as follows.

The survey revealed a relatively very low rate of observed corruption in the most popular services demanded by citizens such as medical care and documents from local governor's office.

Table 7. Public Perception of Corruption in
Public Administration and Public Services

№	Services	During the past 12 months, have you used the following services?	Did you observe corruption during the service?	Percent of the people who did not observe the corruption in public service	Ratio of numbers[5]
		Responses in %			
1	Get employment for yourself or somebody else in a state organization	19.7	38.7	61,3	0.63
2	Get a child enrolled in school	26.4	22.6	77,4	0.29
3	Get enrolled in training or retraining courses	14.6	16.1	83,9	0.19
4	Get good/better grade	10.2	35.6	64,4	0.55
5	Resolve car/traffic related issues	24.1	23.3	76,7	0.30
6	Get medical care	60.6	22.8	77,2	0.29
7	Get an official document from a bagh/ horoo local governor	49.7	6.8	93,2	0.07
8	Get exempt from army conscription	10.0	23.1	76,9	0.30
9	Get social care service	37.8	14.4	85,7	0.17
10	Get money from or coverage by aid projects/ programs	14.9	24.5	75,5	0.32
11	Get loans from bank	32.2	9.3	90,7	0.10
12	Get land permission/ ownership license	32.6	32.6	67,4	0.48

[5] Observation of corruption/ No observation of corruption ratio is within the range of 0-2.

13	Get exemption from or preferential treatment by customs office	3.1	55.2	44,8	1.23
14	Get exemption from or preferential treatment by tax office	2.6	39.6	60,4	0.66
15	Refer the case for court settlement	4.7	52.3	47,7	1.10
16	Transfer goods through the border	3.8	47.9	52,1	0.92
17	Receive passport domestic/international	19.4	13.9	86,2	0.16
18	Get a foreign visa	5.6	32.4	67,6	0.48
19	Dismissal of case by court	3.4	46.9	53,1	0.88
20	Get special license	4.0	42.7	57,3	0.74
21	Influence a state tender	2.2	56.1	43,9	1.28
22	Evaluation and registration of immovable property	11.3	21.9	78,1	0.28

Source: Module on Democratic Governance under the Annual Household Socio-economic Survey, NSO, 2008
* Assessment has been based on the survey data collection,
MDG-9 project – Phase II, June 2009

Tender submissions (1.28), customs' tax exemptions (1.23), court case referrals (1.10) had a very high corruption rate thus identifying these sectors as highly corruption-prone. For instance, only 2.2 percent of those surveyed took part in tender submissions, however more than a half of them (56.1 percent) believed that corruption had an impact on the tender results. The ratio of corruption and non-corruption was the highest (1.28) in the state tender sector.

The overall score for the public perception of corruption in public administration and public services is a relatively low score of 30.8 at the scale of 0 to 100.

The methodology of calculation of the indicator is described in the section "Concept Note on the MDG-9 Module in the Annual Household Socio-economic Survey".

This is except from the first publication of the project on 'Support in Achieving MDG 9 on Human Rights and Democratic Governance in Mongolia'.

Prepared by O.Khatanbold,
Administrative and Finance Assistant
to the MDG-9 Project, Mongolia