

## **Corruption Perceptions Index 2011**

### ***Long Methodological Brief***

Transparency International's (TI) Corruption Perceptions Index<sup>1</sup> (CPI) is an aggregate indicator that ranks countries in terms of the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among public officials and politicians. It is a composite index drawing on corruption-related data from a variety of reputable institutions.

The main reason for using an aggregated index of individual sources is that a combination of sources measuring the same phenomenon is more reliable than each source taken separately.

This document presents the data used to calculate the CPI 2011 and the methodological steps followed for its calculation.

#### **Part 1 - DATA SOURCES TO CALCULATE THE CPI**

All sources of information used to construct the CPI are produced by reputable, data-gathering, organisations. To be included in the CPI, a source must measure the overall extent of corruption (frequency and/or size of corrupt transactions) in the public sector, including civil servants, elected officials and politicians, and provide a ranking of countries, that is to say, measure perceptions of corruption in multiple countries. Also, the methodology used to assess these perceptions has to be the same for all assessed countries in order for the source to be selected for the CPI.

The number of source surveys/assessments included varies from one year to another depending on their availability at the time of calculating the index.

The CPI 2011 is calculated using data from 17 different surveys or assessments produced by 13 organisations<sup>2</sup>:

1. African Development Bank Governance Ratings 2010
2. Asian Development Bank Country Performance Assessment 2010
3. Bertelsmann Foundation Sustainable Governance Indicators
4. Bertelsmann Foundation Transformation Index
5. Economist Intelligence Unit Country Risk Assessment
6. Freedom House Nations In Transit
7. Global Insight Country Risk Ratings
8. IMD World Competitiveness Year Book 2010
9. IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook 2011
10. Political and Economic Risk Consultancy Asian Intelligence 2010
11. Political and Economic Risk Consultancy Asian Intelligence 2011
12. Political Risk Services International Country Risk Guide
13. Transparency International Bribe Payers Survey
14. World Bank - Country Performance and Institutional Assessment
15. World Economic Forum Executive Opinion Survey (EOS) 2010
16. World Economic Forum Executive Opinion Survey (EOS) 2011
17. World Justice Project Rule of Law Index

Not all sources rank all countries in the index. Because the coverage of these surveys and assessments is not identical, the number of sources from which each country's score is derived is not the same for all countries. A country must be covered by a minimum of three of the data sources TI uses for the CPI in order to be ranked in the Index.

The CPI 2011 covers 183 countries, five more than the CPI 2010. A slight change in country coverage resulted from individual sources adjusting their coverage and the addition of four new data sources

---

<sup>1</sup> The CPI method was developed for Transparency International by Johann Lambsdorff of the University of Passau.

<sup>2</sup> Please refer to Appendix 2 for more information on the organisations providing data for the CPI as well as on data collection method and timelines of data collection.

this year. These adjustments in coverage made it possible to include the Bahamas, North Korea, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines, and Suriname.

The sources used in the CPI 2011 are a mixture of business surveys, assessments by commercial risk analysts and country experts from international institutions.

For business surveys, when multiple years of the same survey are available, data for the last two years are included as both years worth of survey data were collected within the last 24 months.

For scores provided by experts, only the most recent iteration of the assessment is included. The reason is that these scores are generally peer-reviewed and therefore scores do not change abruptly. Consequently, evidence shows they are less prone to sudden fluctuations from one year to another than business surveys. Furthermore, as the last iteration of expert assessments represent the most current information about the perceptions of the prevalence of corruption in a country, including assessment from previous years would not add any information.

Data are either available in the public domain or donated to Transparency International by the source institutions for the purpose of building the index.

## **Part 2 - QUESTIONS REFLECTED IN THE CPI 2011 SCORES**

Among other issues, all sources measure perceptions of the prevalence of corruption in the public sector, generally defined as the misuse of public power for private gain. The information extracted from the sources for the purpose of building the index is limited to that specific dimension.

### **African Development Bank Governance Ratings 2010, Asian Development Bank Country Performance Assessment 2010 and World Bank Country Performance and Institutional Assessment 2010:**

Experts are asked to assess: Transparency, Accountability and Corruption in the Public Sector. "This criterion assesses the extent to which the executive can be held accountable for its use of funds and the results of its actions by the electorate and by the legislature and judiciary, and the extent to which public employees within the executive are required to account for the use of resources, administrative decisions, and results obtained. Both levels of accountability are enhanced by transparency in decision making, public audit institutions, access to relevant and timely information, and public and media scrutiny. A high degree of accountability and transparency discourages corruption, or the abuse of public office for private gain. National and sub-national governments should be appropriately weighted.

Each of three dimensions should be rated separately:

- (a) the accountability of the executive to oversight institutions and of public employees for their performance;
- (b) access of civil society to information on public affairs; and
- (c) state capture by narrow vested interests."

### **Bertelsmann Foundation Sustainable Governance Indicators**

Experts are asked to assess:

"To what extent are public officeholders prevented from abusing their position for private interests?"

Scores are given from:

- a low of 1 to 2 where 'Public officeholders can exploit their offices for private gain as they see fit without fear of legal consequences or adverse publicity'
- to a high of 9 to 10 where 'Legal, political and public integrity mechanisms effectively prevent public officeholders from abusing their positions.'

### **Bertelsmann Foundation Transformation Index**

Experts are asked to assess:

"To what extent are public officeholders who abuse their positions prosecuted or penalized?"

Assessments range from:

- a low of 1 to 2 where 'Officeholders who break the law and engage in corruption can do so without fear of legal consequences or adverse publicity.'
- to a high of 9 to 10 where 'Officeholders who break the law and engage in corruption are prosecuted rigorously under established laws and always attract adverse publicity.'

"To what extent does the government successfully contain corruption?" Assessments range from:

- from a low of 1 to 2 where 'The government fails to contain corruption, and there are no integrity mechanisms in place.'
- to a high of 9 to 10 where 'The government is successful in containing corruption, and all integrity mechanisms are in place and effective.'

### **Economist Intelligence Unit Country Risk Assessment**

Experts are asked to assess: Corruption.

Specific guiding questions include:

- Are there clear procedures and accountability governing the allocation and use of public funds?
- Are public funds misappropriated by ministers/public officials for private or party political purposes?
- Are there special funds for which there is no accountability?
- Are there general abuses of public resources?
- Is there a professional civil service or are large numbers of officials directly appointed by the government?
- Is there an independent body auditing the management of the public finances?
- Is there an independent judiciary with the power to try ministers/public officials for abuses?
- Is there a tradition of a payment of bribes to secure contracts and gain favours?

### **Freedom House Nations in Transit**

The Freedom House experts are asked to explore a range of indicative questions, including:

- Has the government implemented effective anticorruption initiatives?
- Is the government free from excessive bureaucratic regulations, registration requirements, and other controls that increase opportunities for corruption?
- Are there adequate laws requiring financial disclosure and disallowing conflict of interest?
- Does the government advertise jobs and contracts?
- Does the state enforce an effective legislative or administrative process—particularly one that is free of prejudice against one's political opponents—to prevent, investigate, and prosecute the corruption of government officials and civil servants?
- Do whistle-blowers, anti-corruption activists, investigators, and journalists enjoy legal protections that make them feel secure about reporting cases of bribery and corruption?

### **Global Insight Country Risk Ratings**

Experts are asked to assess:

Corruption, particularly as it affects operational activities for businesses. There is analytical emphasis on the economic and political drivers of the problem.

From a business perspective, corruption is a particular concern in relation to obtaining business permits and favourable policy and planning decisions. Analysts will closely assess businesses' experience of these processes.

### **IMD World Competitiveness Year Book 2010 and 2011**

Survey respondents were asked:

"Bribing and corruption: Exist or do not exist".

### **Political and Economic Risk Consultancy 2010 and 2011**

Survey respondents were asked:

"To what extent do you perceive corruption to be a problem in the following positions?"

- National-level political leaders
- City and other local-level political leaders
- Civil servants at the national level
- Civil servants at the city level

"To what extent do you perceive corruption to be a problem affecting the following institutions?"

- The police department
- The court system
- Customs
- The taxation bureau
- Government licensing bodies
- Inspection bodies
- The military

### **Political Risk Services International Country Risk Guide**

This is an assessment of corruption within the political system. The most common form of corruption met directly by businesses is financial corruption in the form of demands for special payments and bribes connected with import and export licenses, exchange controls, tax assessments, police protection, or loans. The measure is most concerned with actual or potential corruption in the form of excessive patronage, nepotism, job reservations, exchange of favours, secret party funding, and suspiciously close ties between politics and business.

### **Transparency International Bribe Payers Survey**

Survey Respondents were asked:

“In your opinion, how common is it for public officials to demand or accept bribes in this country?”

“In your opinion, how common is the misuse of public funds for private gain in this country?”

### **World Economic Forum Executive Opinion Survey (EOS) 2010 and 2011**

Survey respondents were asked:

(On a scale of 1 - 7 where 1 means very common and 7 means never)

“In your country, how common is it for firms to make undocumented extra payments or bribes connected with the following”:

- a) Imports and exports
- b) Public Utilities
- c) Annual Tax Payments
- d) Awarding of public contracts and licensing
- e) Obtaining favourable judicial decisions

(on a scale of 1 - 7 where 1 means very common and 7 means never)

“In your country, how common is diversion of public funds to companies, individuals or groups due to corruption?”

### **World Justice Project Rule of Law Index**

A total of 68 questions are asked of experts and respondents from the general population (53 and 15 targeted to each group respectively) on the extent to which government officials use public office for private gain. These questions touch on a variety of sectors within government including the public health system, regulatory agencies, the police, and the courts. Individual questions are aggregated into four sub-indices:

- Government officials in the executive branch do not use public office for private gain
- Government officials in the judicial branch do not use public office for private gain
- Government officials in the police and the military do not use public office for private gain
- Government officials in the legislature do not use public office for private gain

### **Correlation of data**

To illustrate the level of association among the different sources providing data for the CPI 2011 the table below presents the pair-wise correlation among sources<sup>3</sup>. Stars indicate that correlation is significant at the 1% level or better. As the table shows, on average assessments by different institutions tend to correlate well with each other.

---

<sup>3</sup> Correlation coefficients refer to all countries assessed by the sources.

	AFDB_ GR	ADB_ CPA	BF_ SGI	BF_ TI	EIU_ CRR	FH_ NIT	GI_ CRR	IMD_ 2010	IMD_ 2011	PERC_ 2010	PERC_ 2011	PRS_ ICRG	TI_ BPI	WB_ CPIA	WEF_ 2010	WEF_ 2011	WJP_ ROL
AFDB_GR	1																
ADB_CPA	.	1															
BF_SGI	.	.	1														
BF_TI	0.79*	0.69*	0.75	1													
EIU_CRR	0.73*	-0.14	0.87*	0.81*	1												
FH_NIT	.	0.90	0.66	0.94*	0.78*	1											
GI_CRR	0.53*	0.40	0.88*	0.77*	0.91*	0.90*	1										
IMD_2010	.	.	0.84*	0.65*	0.84*	0.59	0.85*	1									
IMD_2011	.	.	0.89*	0.63*	0.87*	0.68*	0.88*	0.96*	1								
PERC_2010	.	1.00*	0.39	0.82*	0.96*	.	0.94*	0.90*	0.94*	1							
PERC_2011	.	1.00*	0.51	0.88*	0.96*	.	0.95*	0.93*	0.97*	0.98*	1						
PRS_ICRG	0.64*	0.69	0.87*	0.64*	0.85*	0.74*	0.86*	0.85*	0.87*	0.91*	0.91*	1					
TI_BPI	0.32	.	0.55	0.79*	0.77*	0.50	0.82*	0.79*	0.79*	0.85*	0.77*	0.78*	1				
WB_CPIA	0.83*	0.80*	.	0.78*	0.81*	0.87*	0.70*	.	.	0.96	1.00	0.19	0.07	1			
WEF_2010	0.29	0.26	0.86*	0.44*	0.79*	0.53*	0.81*	0.94*	0.93*	0.93*	0.90*	0.80*	0.81*	0.31	1		
WEF_2011	0.56*	0.17	0.86*	0.62*	0.85*	0.57*	0.86*	0.96*	0.95*	0.93*	0.92*	0.85*	0.84*	0.40*	0.95*	1	
WJP_ROL	0.46	0.71	0.80*	0.80*	0.91*	0.86*	0.93*	0.94*	0.93*	0.97*	0.96*	0.89*	0.92*	0.46	0.93*	0.94*	1

### Part 3 - HOW DO WE CALCULATE THE CPI?

The calculation of the index entails the following steps:

- 3.1 Each data source is summarised to provide a single score for each country included in that source. Where more than one question is asked, the simple average across questions is calculated. Where the data source is a survey, the average across all responses is calculated for each country.
- 3.2 Because each of the sources uses its own scaling system, the data must be standardised to the 0-10 CPI scale before entering into the index. The rescaling is carried out in two steps:
- 3.3 The first step consists of standardising the scores using “matching percentiles”. This technique uses the ranks of countries reported by each individual source (but not the scores). The method allows all reported scores to be denominated in common (and thus comparable) units and within the same bounds, enabling proper aggregation remaining within the lower bound of 0 and upper bound of 10. However, while it is a useful method for combining variables that have different distributions, there is some information loss in this technique.

The implementation of the matching percentile technique proceeds as follows:

Let us label the individual survey or assessment, Source Y.

- 3.3.1 Select a master list: This master list is the pool of values going from 0 to 10 to which rankings of Source Y will be matched. As in years past the master list has been chosen based on the previous year's scores. Specifically, for the 2011 edition of the CPI, the master list is the CPI 2010.
- 3.3.2 Identify countries included in both the master list and assessed by source Y: Only information included in both is used in the standardisation. Information on countries only included either in the master list, or in source Y, is not used for the standardisation of the scores.
- 3.3.3 Rank countries according to their scores in source Y: Countries identified in the previous step are ranked according to their score in source Y, starting from the country with the lowest perceived level of corruption to the country with the highest perceived level of corruption.
- 3.3.4 For each country, the only information kept from source Y, is their position in the ranking.

- 3.3.5 Going back to the master list, scores for the common set of countries identified in step 3.3.1 are sorted from the number representing the lowest perceived level of corruption, to the number representing the highest perceived level of corruption.
- 3.3.6 The information kept from the master list is (only) scores and rankings. Scores in the master list are not linked to countries anymore but to positions in the ranking.
- 3.3.7 Scores from the master list are matched to the countries by their respective rankings. The country ranking first in source Y (lowest perceived level of corruption) gets assigned the highest score in the master list (lowest perceived level of corruption). The country ranking second in source Y (second lowest perceived level of corruption) gets assigned the second score in the master list (second lowest perceived level of corruption) and so on. For countries in Y but not included in the master list, the score is set through linear interpolation between the scores of the two neighbouring countries and taking into consideration the distance to the neighbouring scores the in the original source.
- 3.3.8 The matching-percentile technique is not designed to handle ties either on the ranking given by sources or on the scores from the master list. To solve this problem the following technique is used:
- 3.3.8.1 If two countries are ranked in the same position by source Y but the scores in the master list are different, they will both get assigned the simple average of their two scores.
- 3.3.8.2 If two countries are ranked differently by source Y but the scores in the master list are the same, both countries will get a new score calculated through an interpolation that takes into consideration the scores they receive from source Y, and the scores in both the master list, and source Y from their upper and lower neighbours (See Appendix 2 for more detailed information).
- 3.4 The second step of the rescaling process consists of applying a beta-transformation to the matched scores obtained in 3.1. The beta-transformation increases the standard deviation of these values to counter the statistical caveat by which the matching percentiles technique results in a smaller standard deviation every year. The transformation uses the *Cumulative Distribution Function* of a variable that follows a beta-distribution. The alpha and beta parameters are set such that the mean and standard deviation of the index are the same as the mean and standard deviation of the master list. In the case of the CPI 2011, we set  $\alpha=1.148$  and  $\beta=1.177^4$ .
- 3.5 The final CPI score for a country is the average of these transformed values for all sources where it appears. Only countries assessed by 3 or more sources are included in the index.

#### **Part 4 - CONFIDENCE INTERVAL**

The confidence interval indicates the reliability of the CPI score for each country by providing the range in which we have 90% confidence that a country's CPI falls between. The width of the confidence interval provides information on the level of precision of the CPI score. The narrower it is, the more precise the estimated score is.

Intervals are built for the CPI 2011 as follows: each source provides an assessment of corruption perceptions in a given country in a given year, and each source is assumed to be, on average, correctly capturing the underlying phenomenon (it provides an unbiased estimate). However, each source is a *noisy* measure of the phenomenon; otherwise they would all agree on the assessment of a given country in a given year. We can exploit the variation (disagreement) across sources to estimate how precise they are, and therefore how precise the estimate of the index is.

Each source could have provided a slightly different value, just because of random *noise*. The approach that was adopted to calculate the confidence intervals is *bootstrapping*. This method exploits the variation across sources in the evaluation of a given country to create alternative scenarios, in

---

<sup>4</sup> To find these parameters an algorithm was written for Transparency International by Piero Stanig of the London School of Economics.

which slightly different values are provided by each source for the same country.

For each country, 10,000 samples were drawn with replacement from the observed values of the individual sources. This method constructs alternative configurations of values of the individual sources, starting from the set of values that were actually observed in the data.

For example, imagine that country A is evaluated in the following way by four sources:

Source X: 7.8

Source W: 7.3

Source Y: 8.1

Source Z: 7.1

A resample for country A could be

7.8

7.8

8.1

7.3

In other words, a "reshuffling" of the standardised values can be performed, possibly recycling the same value more than once. Hence we say that we "sample with replacement": a value is picked and then "put back in the urn", so that it might be picked more than once.

On each of these samples, the index was computed. We obtained 10,000 replications of the index. The 90% confidence interval is the range in which 90% of the replications lie. In 5% of the replications, the index was lower than the lower boundary of the confidence interval we report. In 5% of the replications, the index was higher than the upper boundary of the reported confidence interval. But in 90% of the replications, the index lay in the interval we report.

### **Overconfidence of Intervals**

The properties of the method used to compute confidence intervals were assessed using MonteCarlo experiments. MonteCarlo experiments are a general approach used to assess the statistical properties of a method, by repeatedly applying the method itself to artificial data. The artificial data are generated by a known process, chosen by the analyst to be similar in nature to the process that the real data are assumed to be generated by. Then, the analyst can check whether the method gave the correct answer (which is known to the analyst, because the data is artificial).

In this specific instance, data for a hypothetical country were generated, with a known amount of noise in each of the sources. Then, the bootstrap method was applied to the artificial data and the confidence intervals were computed. We then assessed if the intervals were correctly "fishing up" the true value (again, known to the analyst because the data is artificial).

The results of the MonteCarlo experiments point to the fact that, in particular when there are very few sources for a given country, the intervals built with the method we adopted are overconfident. In other words, the intervals might overstate the precision of the index, which suggests that the confidence intervals--- especially for those countries evaluated just by three or four sources--- might not fully capture the underlying uncertainty in the value of the index.

The CPI 2011 table also displays the maximum and minimum scores given to each country in the surveys or assessments.

**Appendix 1. Matching Percentiles: Dealing with ties.**

Master list	Score by original survey/assessment	Matched score
$m_1$	$y_1$	$z_1$
$m_2$	$y_2$	$z_2$
$m_3$	$y_3$	$z_3$
$m_4$	$y_4$	$z_4$

Possible scenarios:

- (1) Standard case:  $m_1 > m_2 > m_3 > m_4$  and  $y_1 > y_2 > y_3 > y_4$ .  
Matching percentiles imply: Set  $z_i = m_i$  where  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$
- (2) Tie in scores by original survey or assessment:  $m_1 > m_2 > m_3 > m_4$  and  $y_1 > y_2 = y_3 > y_4$ .  
Matched scores set by:  $z_1 = m_1$ ,  $z_2 = z_3 = (m_2 + m_3) / 2$ ,  $z_4 = m_4$
- (3) Tie in master list:  $m_1 > m_2 = m_3 > m_4$

Matched scores set by:

$$z_1 = m_1$$

$$z_2 = ((m_1 - m_4) / (y_1 - y_4)) * (y_2 - y_4) + m_4$$

$$z_3 = ((m_1 - m_4) / (y_1 - y_4)) * (y_3 - y_4) + m_4$$

$$z_4 = m_4$$

When ties occur at the bottom or the upper tails of the master list, an extrapolation is anchored to the highest/lowest values the master list and relevant source could attain.

## **Appendix 2: Sources for the TI Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2011**

### **Corruption Perceptions Index 2011 Full Source Description**

#### **Sources included in the CPI 2011:**

- 1. African Development Bank Governance Ratings 2010**
- 2. Asian Development Bank Country Performance Assessment 2010**
- 3. Bertelsmann Foundation Sustainable Governance Indicators**
- 4. Bertelsmann Foundation Transformation Index**
- 5. Economist Intelligence Unit Country Risk Assessment**
- 6. Freedom House Nations In Transit**
- 7. Global Insight Country Risk Ratings**
- 8. IMD World Competitiveness Year Book 2010**
- 9. IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook 2011**
- 10. Political and Economic Risk Consultancy Asian Intelligence 2010**
- 11. Political and Economic Risk Consultancy Asian Intelligence 2011**
- 12. Political Risk Services International Country Risk Guide**
- 13. Transparency International Bribe Payers Survey**
- 14. World Bank - Country Performance and Institutional Assessment**
- 15. World Economic Forum Executive Opinion Survey (EOS) 2010**
- 16. World Economic Forum Executive Opinion Survey (EOS) 2011**
- 17. World Justice Project Rule of Law Index**

**1. African Development Bank Governance Ratings**  
**Code: AFDB\_GR**

**Data Provider**

The African Development Bank (AFDB) is a regional multilateral development bank, engaged in promoting the economic development and social progress of countries on the continent.

The AfDB's 2009 Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) assesses the quality of a country's institutional framework in terms of how conducive it is to fostering the effective use of development assistance. The current CPIA strives to achieve a maximum level of uniformity and consistency across all regional member countries surveyed. Also, and in order to comply with the Paris and Rome declarations on Aid Effectiveness, Harmonization and Alignment, the AfDB has modified the questionnaire and guidelines for its CPIA to be in line with those of the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, thus increasing the comparability and synergy among systems.

The CPIA is carried out by a group of country economists with vast experience in policy analysis. The knowledge of these experts is complemented with that of local contacts that provide both quantitative and qualitative insights. Peer discussions are also used to monitor the quality of the findings.

**Corruption Question(s)**

Experts are asked to assess:

Transparency, Accountability and Corruption in the Public Sector.

"This criterion assesses the extent to which the executive can be held accountable for its use of funds and the results of its actions by the electorate and by the legislature and judiciary, and the extent to which public employees within the executive are required to account for the use of resources, administrative decisions, and results obtained. Both levels of accountability are enhanced by transparency in decision making, public audit institutions, access to relevant and timely information, and public and media scrutiny. A high degree of accountability and transparency discourages corruption, or the abuse of public office for private gain. National and sub-national governments should be appropriately weighted.

Each of three dimensions should be rated separately:

- (a) the accountability of the executive to oversight institutions and of public employees for their performance;
- (b) access of civil society to information on public affairs; and
- (c) state capture by narrow vested interests."

**Scores**

The rating scale ranges from 1 (very weak for two or more years) to 6 (very strong for three or more years) and allows for half point intermediate scores (e.g.3.5).

The score is an aggregate of the three dimensions of corruption across national and sub-national government institutions in the country.

**Country Coverage**

All African Countries (53) are covered with the exception of South Sudan (inclusion scheduled for 2013).

Countries are scored in terms of their performance during the year of the rating vis-à-vis the criteria, which are included in the CPIA Manual for Drafters and updated every year. The CPIA is a three-phase process involving i) the rating of countries by country teams; ii) the review of all ratings by sector experts; and iii) the endorsement of final ratings at open discussions between country teams and reviewers

**Data availability**

The data set has been published annually since 2005.

The 2010 Governance Ratings were compiled during 2010 and published in March 2011.

The data is publicly available online in the Bank's web page,  
<http://www.afdb.org/en/documents/project-operations/country-performance-assessment-cpa/>

It is also available through a dedicated data portal: <http://cpia.afdb.org/>

## **2. Asian Development Bank Country Performance Assessment Code: ADB\_CPA**

### **Data Provider**

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) is a regional, multilateral development bank, engaged in promoting the economic development and social progress of countries in the region.

In order to determine how resources are allocated – through the Asian Development Fund (ADF) – the ADB operates a performance-based allocation (PBA) policy. Since 2006, Country Performance Assessments were reserved for developing member countries with populations of over 1 million, post-conflict countries and those deemed to be “weakly performing” (i.e. countries consistently rated in the bottom fourth or fifth quintile in recent studies). The current CPA strives to achieve a maximum level of uniformity and consistency across all regional member countries surveyed. Also, and in order to comply with the Paris and Rome declarations on Aid Effectiveness, Harmonization and Alignment, the ADB has modified the questionnaire and guidelines for its CPA to be in line with those of the World Bank and the African Development Bank, thus increasing the comparability and synergy among systems.

The ADB study was conducted by a small group of country specialists with relevant experience in analysing countries’ performance. This group is comprised of local contacts that conduct quantitative assessments and who work with staff members based at the Bank’s headquarters. Peer discussions are also used to monitor the quality of the findings.

### **Corruption Question(s)**

Experts are asked to assess:

Transparency, Accountability and Corruption in the Public Sector.

“This criterion assesses the extent to which the executive can be held accountable for its use of funds and the results of its actions by the electorate and by the legislature and judiciary, and the extent to which public employees within the executive are required to account for the use of resources, administrative decisions, and results obtained. Both levels of accountability are enhanced by transparency in decision-making, public audit institutions, access to relevant and timely information, and public and media scrutiny. A high degree of accountability and transparency discourages corruption, or the abuse of public office for private gain. National and sub-national governments should be appropriately weighted.

Each of the three dimensions should be rated separately:

- (a) the accountability of the executive to oversight institutions and of public employees for their performance;
- (b) access of civil society to information on public affairs; and
- (c) state capture by narrow vested interests.”

### **Scores**

The rating scale ranges from 1 (very weak for two or more years) to 6 (very strong for three or more years) and allows for half point intermediate scores (e.g.3.5).

The score is an aggregate of the three dimensions of corruption across national and sub-national government institutions in the country.

### **Country Coverage**

28 Asian Countries are covered

### **Data availability**

The 2010 Governance Ratings were compiled during 2010 and published in 2011.

The data is publicly available online in the Bank’s web page,  
<http://beta.adb.org/sites/default/files/country-performance-assessment-ar-2010.pdf>

### **3. Bertelsmann Foundation Sustainable Governance Indicators Code: BF\_SGI**

#### **Data Provider**

The Bertelsmann Stiftung was founded in 1977 as a private foundation. As a think tank they work toward improved education, a just and efficient economic system, a preventative healthcare system, a vibrant civil society and greater international understanding. The Bertelsmann Stiftung is independent and nonpartisan. It designs, launches and runs its own projects.

The Sustainable Governance Indicators (SGI) examine governance and policymaking in OECD member states in order to evaluate each country's need for, and ability to carry out, reform.

The indicators are calculated using quantitative data from international organisations and then supplemented by qualitative assessments from recognised country experts.

#### **Corruption Question(s)**

Experts are asked to assess:

“To what extent are public officeholders prevented from abusing their position for private interests?”

This question addresses how the state and society prevent public servants and politicians from accepting bribes by applying mechanisms to guarantee the integrity of officeholders, through: auditing of state spending; regulation of party financing; citizen and media access to information; accountability of officeholders (asset declarations, conflict of interest rules, codes of conduct); transparent public procurement systems; and effective prosecution of corruption.

Scores are given from:

- a low of 1 to 2, where 'Public officeholders can exploit their offices for private gain as they see fit without fear of legal consequences or adverse publicity'
- to a high of 9 to 10, where 'Legal, political and public integrity mechanisms effectively prevent public officeholders from abusing their positions.'

#### **Scores**

Scores are given on a scale of 1 (highest level of corruption) to 10 (lowest level of corruption).

#### **Country Coverage**

31 OECD countries were scored.

The quantitative data are compiled centrally by the SGI project team from official, publicly accessible statistics (primarily from OECD sources). The qualitative data are captured and examined by a worldwide network of around 80 respected researchers. The SGI Codebook, a detailed questionnaire, provides a clear explanation for each of the questions, so that all experts share a common understanding of the questions.

#### **Data availability**

First published in 2009, this is now a biennial publication.

The Sustainable Governance Indicators 2011 were published in 2010 and assess a two-year period from 1 May 2008 to 30 April 2010.

Data is publicly available online.

<http://www.sgi-network.org>

**4. Bertelsmann Foundation Transformation Index**  
**Code: BF\_TI**

**Data Provider**

The Bertelsmann Stiftung was founded in 1977 as a private foundation. As a think tank they work toward improved education, a just and efficient economic system, a preventative healthcare system, a vibrant civil society and greater international understanding. The Bertelsmann Stiftung is independent and nonpartisan. It designs, launches and runs its own projects.

The Transformation Index provides the framework for an exchange of good practice among agents of reform. Within this framework, the BTI publishes two rankings, the Status Index and the Management Index, both of which are based on in-depth assessments of 128 countries. The scores are based on detailed country reports which assess 52 questions divided into 17 criteria.

Assessments are provided by two experts per country. Country assessments consist of two sections: the written assessment of the state of transformation and management performance in a country (country report) and the numerical assessment of the state of transformation and management performance (country ratings). Scores are given by a country expert, which are then reviewed blind by a second country expert who also provides a second independent rating of the country.

**Corruption Question(s)**

Experts are asked to assess:

“To what extent are public officeholders who abuse their positions prosecuted or penalized?”

Assessments range from:

- a low of 1 to 2, where 'Officeholders who break the law and engage in corruption can do so without fear of legal consequences or adverse publicity.'
- to a high of 9 to 10, where 'Officeholders who break the law and engage in corruption are prosecuted rigorously under established laws and always attract adverse publicity.'

“To what extent does the government successfully contain corruption?” Assessments range from:

- from a low of 1 to 2, where 'The government fails to contain corruption, and there are no integrity mechanisms in place.'
- to a high of 9 to 10, where 'The government is successful in containing corruption, and all integrity mechanisms are in place and effective.'

**Scores**

Scores are assigned on a scale of 1-10 with 10 being the lowest level of corruption and 1 being the highest.

The score for each country is an average of the two questions.

**Country Coverage**

128 countries and territories are scored.

Country scores pass through an *intra-regional* review stage followed by an *inter-regional* review and ratings aggregation.

**Data availability**

The Transformation Index was first published in 2003, and has been published every two years since then.

The data is taken from the BTI 2012 report, which will be published in 2011 and assesses a two-year period from 1 February 2009 to 31 January 2011.

The reports are publicly available online.

<http://www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/en/bti/>

**5. Economist Intelligence Unit Country Risk Assessment**  
**Code: EIU\_CRR**

**Data Provider**

The Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) was established in 1946 as the research body for The Economist newspaper. Since then, it has grown into a global research and advisory firm that produces business intelligence for policy makers worldwide. 650 full-time and contributing analysts work in and on over 200 countries/territories.

Country Risk Ratings are designed to provide in-depth and timely analysis of the risks of financial exposure in more than 140 countries.

The EIU relies on teams of experts based primarily in London (but also in New York, Hong Kong, Beijing and Shanghai) who are supported by a global network of in-country specialists. Each country analyst covers a maximum of two or three countries/territories. The economic and political reports produced by EIU analysts are subjected to a rigorous review process before publication.

**Corruption Question(s)**

Specific guiding questions include:

- Are there clear procedures and accountability governing the allocation and use of public funds?
- Are public funds misappropriated by ministers/public officials for private or party political purposes?
- Are there special funds for which there is no accountability?
- Are there general abuses of public resources?
- Is there a professional civil service or are large numbers of officials directly appointed by the government?
- Is there an independent body auditing the management of public finances?
- Is there an independent judiciary with the power to try ministers/public officials for abuses?
- Is there a tradition of a payment of bribes to secure contracts and gain favours?

**Scores**

Scores are given as integers on a scale from 0 (very low incidence of corruption) to 4 (very high incidence of corruption).

**Country Coverage**

142 countries/territories were scored in 2011 according to the standardised guidelines provided to each analyst.

**Data availability**

Country risk assessments have been produced by the EIU since the early 1980s. Updated summaries are provided monthly for 100 countries and quarterly for the rest.

The CPI draws on the most recent data provided, in September 2011 for 142 countries/territories.

Data is available to subscribers of EIU Country Risk Ratings.

<http://www.eiu.com>

## **6. Freedom House Nations in Transit**

**Code: FH\_NIT**

### **Data Provider**

Founded in 1941, Freedom House is an independent watchdog organisation that supports the expansion of freedom around the world. Freedom House supports democratic change, monitors freedom, and advocates for democracy and human rights.

The Nations in Transit (NIT) reports measure democratisation in 29 nations and administrative areas throughout Central Europe and the Newly Independent States (NIS). The reports focus on democratic progress and setbacks. Each report focuses on the following thematic areas: national democratic governance; electoral process; civil society; independent media; local democratic governance; judicial framework and independence; and corruption.

The NIT surveys were produced by Freedom House staff and consultants. The latter were recommended by relevant authorities and are regional or country specialists. A range of sources were used in compiling the report, including: multilateral lending institutions; non-governmental organisations; and other international organisations; local newspapers and magazines; and select government data.

### **Corruption Question(s)**

The Freedom House experts are asked to explore a range of indicative questions, including:

- Has the government implemented effective anti-corruption initiatives?
- Is the government free from excessive bureaucratic regulations, registration requirements, and other controls that increase opportunities for corruption?
- Are there adequate laws requiring financial disclosure and disallowing conflict of interest?
- Does the government advertise jobs and contracts?
- Does the state enforce an effective legislative or administrative process—particularly one that is free of prejudice against one's political opponents—to prevent, investigate, and prosecute the corruption of government officials and civil servants?
- Do whistle-blowers, anti-corruption activists, investigators, and journalists enjoy legal protections that make them feel secure about reporting cases of bribery and corruption?

### **Scores**

Ratings run from 1 (lowest level of corruption) to 7 (highest level of corruption) and allow for half-point and quarter-point intermediate scores (e.g.3.25).

The score is a generalised composite measure of corruption that includes an assessment of all areas covered by the indicative questions.

### **Country Coverage**

29 countries/territories were ranked in 2011.

Country scores are reviewed at the regional level and then centrally by the Freedom House academic advisory board.

### **Data availability**

The report has been published annually since 2003.

The 2011 Nations in Transit data coverage is from 1 January through 31 December 2010.

The data is publicly available online.

<http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=17>

**7. Global Insight Country Risk Ratings**  
**Code: GI\_CRR**

**Data Provider**

Founded in 1959, IHS is a global information company employing more than 5,100 people in more than 30 countries around the world. It provides a wide range of online services covering macroeconomics, country risk and individual sector analysis.

The country risk rating system has been in operation since 1999 and provides a six-factor analysis of the risk environment in 204 countries/territories. The six factors are political, economic, legal, tax operational and security risk. The corruption risk score used in the CPI is drawn largely from the evaluation of operational risk, but also builds on the insight of the country experts in analysing the other areas of risk.

The assessments are made by over 100 in-house country specialists, who also draw on the expert opinions of in-country freelancers, clients and other contacts. The ratings reflect IHS Global Insights expert perceptions of the comparative level of the problem in each country/territory. The ratings assess the broad range of corruption, from petty bribe-paying to higher-level political corruption and the scores assigned to each country are based on a qualitative assessment of corruption in each country/territory.

**Corruption Question(s)**

Experts are asked to assess:

Corruption, particularly as it affects operational activities for businesses. There is analytical emphasis on the economic and political drivers of the problem.

From a business perspective, corruption is a particular concern in relation to obtaining business permits and favourable policy and planning decisions. Analysts will closely assess businesses' experience of these processes.

**Scores**

The ratings range from a minimum of 1.0 (minimum corruption) to 5.0 (maximum corruption) and allow for half-point intermediate scores (e.g.3.5).

**Country Coverage**

Over 200 countries/territories worldwide are scored.

Scores provided by country analysts are reviewed and benchmarked by IHS Global Insight's risk specialists at both the regional and global level.

**Data availability**

The Country Risk Rating System has been available since 1999 and is continuously maintained.

The data for the CPI 2011 was received on 9 May 2011.

Data is available to customers of IHS' Country Intelligence.

<http://www.ihs.com/products/global-insight/country-analysis/>

**8. IMD World Competitiveness Year Book 2010**  
**Code: IMD\_2010**

**Data Provider**

IMD is a world pioneer in executive education. More than a business school, IMD collaborates with individuals, teams and organisations to resolve real business issues, build capabilities and prepare for the future. Delivered from a campus on the shores of Lake Geneva in Switzerland and key locations worldwide, IMD's top-ranking programmes and services combine practical experience, thought leadership and a global mind-set. ([www.imd.org](http://www.imd.org))

The World Competitiveness Yearbook measures the competitiveness of nations and, in doing so, both ranks and examines how a nation's socio-political and economic climate affects corporate competitiveness. The study uses 331 criteria in order to obtain a multifaceted image of the competitiveness of nations, defined as following: "Competitiveness of nations is a field of economic knowledge, which analyses the facts and policies that shape the ability of a nation to create and maintain an environment that sustains more value creation for its enterprises and more prosperity for its people."

The WCY largely includes hard data but also a survey of senior business leaders who, together, reflect a cross-section of a nation's corporate community. IMD calls upon local and foreign enterprises operating in a given economy, and surveys both nationals and expatriates, so as to add an international perspective on local environments. In 2011 4,935 business executives responded. The IMD World Competitiveness Centre works in collaboration with 54 partner institutes around the world to assure the validity and relevance of data.

**Corruption Question (s)**

Survey respondents were asked:

"Bribing and corruption: Exist or do not exist".

**Scores**

Answers are given on a 1 - 6 scale which is then converted to a 0 - 10 scale where 0 is the highest level of perceived corruption and 10 is the lowest.

**Country Coverage**

58 countries/territories around the world were scored in 2010.

**Data availability**

The IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook has been published annually since 1989.

The 2010 data was gathered between January and April 2010, and published in May 2010.

Data is available to customers of IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook, package or online services.

<http://www.imd.org/wcy>

**9. IMD World Competitiveness Year Book 2011**  
**Code: IMD\_2011**

**Data Provider**

IMD is a world pioneer in executive education. More than a business school, IMD collaborates with individuals, teams and organisations to resolve real business issues, build capabilities and prepare for the future. Delivered from a campus on the shores of Lake Geneva in Switzerland and key locations worldwide, IMD's top-ranking programmes and services combine practical experience, thought leadership and a global mind-set. ([www.imd.org](http://www.imd.org))

The World Competitiveness Yearbook measures the competitiveness of nations and, in doing so, both ranks and examines how a nation's socio-political and economic climate affects corporate competitiveness. The study uses 331 criteria in order to obtain a multifaceted image of the competitiveness of nations, defined as following:

"Competitiveness of nations is a field of economic knowledge, which analyses the facts and policies that shape the ability of a nation to create and maintain an environment that sustains more value creation for its enterprises and more prosperity for its people."

The WCY largely includes hard data but also a survey of senior business leaders who, together, reflect a cross-section of a nation's corporate community. IMD calls upon local and foreign enterprises operating in a given economy, and surveys both nationals and expatriates, so as to add an international perspective on local environments. In 2011 4,935 business executives responded. The IMD World Competitiveness Centre works in collaboration with 54 partner institutes around the world to assure the validity and relevance of data.

**Corruption Question (s)**

Survey respondents were asked:

"Bribing and corruption: Exist or do not exist".

**Scores**

Answers are given on a 1 - 6 scale which is then converted to a 0 - 10 scale where 0 is the highest level of perceived corruption and 10 is the lowest.

**Country Coverage**

59 countries/territories around the world were scored in 2011.

**Data availability**

The IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook has been published annually since 1989.

The 2011 data was gathered between January and April 2011, and published in May 2011.

Data is available to customers of IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook, package or online services.

<http://www.imd.org/wcy>

**10. Political and Economic Risk Consultancy 2010**  
**Code: PERC\_2010**

**Data Provider**

The Political and Economic Risk Consultancy or PERC is a consulting firm specialising in strategic business information and analysis for companies doing business in the countries of East and Southeast Asia. As part of its services, PERC produces a range of risk reports on Asian countries, paying special attention to critical socio-political variables like corruption, intellectual property rights and risks, labour quality, and other systemic strengths and weakness of individual Asian countries/territories.

PERC publishes fortnightly newsletters, which are available to subscribers, on a number of issues. The data for the CPI was gathered from the corruption newsletter, which gathers and interprets data from an executive opinion survey of local and expatriate businesspeople.

The survey was conducted via face-to-face, telephone and online interviews. Business people were asked about both the country in which they currently work and their country of origin. 100 business executives were surveyed in each country.

**Corruption Question(s)**

Survey respondents were asked:

“To what extent do you perceive corruption to be a problem in the following positions?”

- National-level political leaders
- City and other local-level political leaders
- Civil servants at the national level
- Civil servants at the city level

“To what extent do you perceive corruption to be a problem affecting the following institutions?”

- The police department
- The court system
- Customs
- The taxation bureau
- Government licensing bodies
- Inspection bodies
- The military

**Scores**

Answers to each question were scaled from 0 (not a problem) to 10 (a serious problem).

The results of the 11 separate scores for each position and institution were averaged to give one score for each country.

**Country Coverage**

15 Asian countries/territories plus the United States were surveyed in 2010.

The same questions and survey methodology were employed in each country surveyed. Individual respondents were asked both about the country they were from and the country they currently work in.

**Data availability**

The survey dates back 20 years and is conducted annually.

The data used for the CPI 2011 was gathered in a survey carried out between December 2009 and February 2010 and published in March 2010.

The data is available to subscribers.

<http://www.asiarisk.com/>

**11. Political and Economic Risk Consultancy 2011**  
**Code: PERC\_2011**

**Data Provider**

The Political and Economic Risk Consultancy or PERC is a consulting firm specialising in strategic business information and analysis for companies doing business in the countries of East and Southeast Asia. As part of its services, PERC produces a range of risk reports on Asian countries, paying special attention to critical socio-political variables like corruption, intellectual property rights and risks, labour quality, and other systemic strengths and weakness of individual Asian countries/territories.

PERC publishes fortnightly newsletters, which are available to subscribers, on a number of issues. The data for the CPI was gathered from the corruption newsletter, which gathers and interprets data from an executive opinion survey of local and expatriate businesspeople.

The survey was conducted via face-to-face, telephone and online interviews. Business people were asked about both the country in which they currently work and their country of origin. 100 business executives were surveyed in each country.

**Corruption Question(s)**

Survey respondents were asked:

“To what extent do you perceive corruption to be a problem in the following positions?”

- National-level political leaders
- City and other local-level political leaders
- Civil servants at the national level
- Civil servants at the city level

“To what extent do you perceive corruption to be a problem affecting the following institutions?”

- The police department
- The court system
- Customs
- The taxation bureau
- Government licensing bodies
- Inspection bodies
- The military

**Scores**

Answers to each question were scaled from 0 (not a problem) to 10 (a serious problem).

The results of the 11 separate scores for each position and institution were averaged to give one score for each country.

**Country Coverage**

15 Asian countries/territories plus the United States were surveyed in 2011.

The same questions and survey methodology were employed in each country surveyed. Individual respondents were asked both about the country they were from, and the country they currently work in.

**Data availability**

The survey dates back 20 years and is conducted annually.

The data used for the CPI 2011 was gathered in a survey carried out between November 2010 and February 2011 and published in newsletter #823, published in March 2011.

The data is available to subscribers.

<http://www.asiarisk.com/>

**12. Political Risk Services International Country Risk Guide**  
**Code: PRS\_ICRG**

**Data Provider**

Based in the vicinity of Syracuse, New York, since its founding in 1979, Political Risk Services (PRS) has consistently focused on political risk analysis.

On a monthly basis since 1980, their International Country Risk Guide (ICRG) has produced political, economic, and financial risk ratings for countries/territories important to international business. The ICRG now monitors 140 countries/territories. ICRG ratings form the basis of an early warning system for opportunities and pitfalls, country-by-country.

ICRG staff collect political information and convert this to risk points on the basis of a consistent pattern of evaluation. Political risk assessments and other political information form the basis of ICRG risk ratings. It is therefore possible for the user to check through the information and data so as to assess the ratings against their own assessments, or against some other risk ratings system.

**Corruption Question(s)**

This is an assessment of corruption within the political system. The most common form of corruption met directly by businesses is financial corruption in the form of demands for special payments and bribes connected with import and export licenses, exchange controls, tax assessments, police protection, or loans. The measure is most concerned with actual or potential corruption in the form of excessive patronage, nepotism, job reservations, exchange of favours, secret party funding, and suspiciously close ties between politics and business.

**Scores**

The corruption scores are given on a scale of 0 (highest potential risk) to 6 (lowest potential risk).

**Country Coverage**

The ICRG provides ratings for 140 countries on a monthly basis.

To ensure consistency both between countries/territories and over time, points are assigned by ICRG editors on the basis of a series of pre-set questions for each risk component.

**Data availability**

The ICRG model was created in 1980 and the data is made available on a monthly basis.

The CPI data is an aggregate of quarterly assessments covering the period of September 2010 to September 2011.

Data is available to customers of the PRS International Country Risk Guide.

[www.prsgroup.com](http://www.prsgroup.com)

**13. Transparency International Bribe Payers Survey**  
**Code: TI\_BPI**

**Data Provider**

Transparency International (TI), the global civil society organisation leading the fight against corruption, brings people together in a powerful worldwide coalition to end the devastating impact of corruption on people around the world. TI's mission is to create change towards a world free of corruption.

Transparency International commissioned the tailor-made Bribe Payers Survey. This is a survey of business executives in 30 countries/territories around the world which probes perceptions of bribery and corruption both in their country of operation and by companies from other countries that they do business with.

It was conducted by the IPSOS polling group in 2011. 100 business executives from 30 different countries/territories were surveyed in 2011, through phone, face-to-face and online interviews on the subject of bribery and corruption. The sample included companies from a broad range of sectors in each country/territory, with an oversampling of large and foreign-owned companies.

**Corruption Question(s)**

Survey Respondents were asked:

“In your opinion, how common is it for public officials to demand or accept bribes in this country?”

“In your opinion, how common is the misuse of public funds for private gain in this country?”

**Scores**

For each question scores were given on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 corresponds to ‘never’ and 5 corresponds to ‘very common’.

The results of the two questions were averaged to give one score per country/territory.

**Country Coverage**

30 countries were surveyed in 2011.

The same question was asked of respondents in all countries, about bribery and corruption both at home and in the context of international business dealings.

**Data availability**

The Bribe Payers Survey was first conducted in 1999. It is expected that the survey will be repeated triennially.

The 2011 survey was conducted between April and June 2011.

Data will be made publicly available online in 2012.

[www.transparency.org](http://www.transparency.org)

**14. World Bank Country Performance and Institutional Assessment**  
**Code: WB\_CPIA**

**Data Provider**

The World Bank was established in 1944, is headquartered in Washington, D.C and has more than 10,000 employees in more than 100 offices worldwide. The World Bank is made up of two development institutions: the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and the International Development Association (IDA). The IBRD aims to reduce poverty in middle-income and creditworthy poorer countries, while IDA focuses on the world's poorest countries.

The CPIA rates all IDA-eligible countries against a set of 16 criteria grouped in four clusters: (a) economic management; (b) structural policies; (c) policies for social inclusion and equity; and (d) public sector management and institutions. The criteria are focused on balancing the capture of those factors critical to fostering growth and poverty reduction against avoiding undue burden on the assessment process.

The ratings are the product of staff judgment and do not necessarily reflect the views of the World Bank's Board of Executive Directors or the governments they represent. The Bank has prepared guidance to help staff assess country performance, by providing a definition of each criterion and a detailed description of each rating level. Bank staff assess the countries' actual performance on each of the criteria, and assign a rating. The ratings reflect a variety of indicators, observations, and judgments based on country knowledge, originating with the Bank or elsewhere, and on relevant publicly available indicators.

**Corruption Question(s)**

Experts are asked to assess:

Transparency, Accountability and Corruption in the Public Sector.

"This criterion assesses the extent to which the executive can be held accountable for its use of funds and the results of its actions by the electorate and by the legislature and judiciary, and the extent to which public employees within the executive are required to account for the use of resources, administrative decisions, and results obtained. Both levels of accountability are enhanced by transparency in decision making, public audit institutions, access to relevant and timely information, and public and media scrutiny. A high degree of accountability and transparency discourages corruption, or the abuse of public office for private gain. National and sub-national governments should be appropriately weighted.

Each of three dimensions should be rated separately:

- (a) accountability of the executive to oversight institutions and of public employees for their performance;
- (b) access of civil society to information on public affairs; and
- (c) state capture by narrow vested interests."

**Scores**

The rating scale ranges from 1 (low levels of transparency) to 6 (high levels of transparency) and allows for half-point intermediate scores (eg. 3.5). The score is an aggregate of the three dimensions of corruption across national and sub-national government institutions in the country/territory.

**Country Coverage**

77 countries were scored in the CPIA 2010.

The process of preparing the ratings involves two phases: (a) the benchmarking phase, in which a small, representative, sample of countries is rated in an intensive Bank-wide process; and (b) a second phase, in which the remaining countries are rated using the derived benchmark ratings as guideposts. The process is managed by the Bank's Operations Policy and Country Services Vice-Presidency.

**Data availability**

First released in 2005 in its current form, the CPIA is now an annual exercise.

The ratings process typically starts in the fall and is concluded in the spring of the following year. The scores disclosed in June 2011 (the 2010 CPIA exercise) cover 2010 country performance.

The data is publicly available online.

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/IDA/0,,contentMDK:21359477~menuPK:2626968~pagePK:51236175~piPK:437394~theSitePK:73154,00.html>

**15. World Economic Forum Executive Opinion Survey (EOS) 2010**  
**Code: WEF\_2010**

**Data Provider**

The World Economic Forum is an independent international organisation committed to improving the state of the world by engaging business, political, academic and other leaders of society to shape global, regional and industry agendas. Incorporated as a not-for-profit foundation in 1971, and headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland, the Forum is tied to no political, partisan or national interests.

The Executive Opinion Survey (EOS) is the World Economic Forum's annual survey of business executives. The survey has evolved over time to capture new data points essential to the Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) and other Forum indexes.

The Forum's Centre for Global Competitiveness and Performance works closely with a network of over 150 partner institutions that administer the surveying of their respective countries/territories. They are selected because of their capacity to reach out to leading business executives as well as their understanding of the national business environment and their commitment to the Forum's research on competitiveness. The Partner Institutes are, for the most part, well-respected economics departments of national universities, independent research institutes or business organisations. An average of 98 business executives per country/territory were surveyed for the EOS 2010 with an oversampling of larger firms. The surveys are conducted according to stringent guidelines which underwent a review in 2008. The sample is stratified by sector and company size.

**Corruption Question(s)**

Survey respondents were asked:

(On a scale of 1 - 7 where 1 means very common and 7 means never)

"In your country, how common is it for firms to make undocumented extra payments or bribes connected with the following":

- a) Imports and exports;
- b) Public Utilities;
- c) Annual Tax Payments;
- d) Awarding of public contracts and licensing;
- e) Obtaining favourable judicial decisions.

(on a scale of 1 - 7 where 1 means very common and 7 means never)

"In your country, how common is diversion of public funds to companies, individuals or groups due to corruption?"

**Scores**

Each question is scored by respondents on a scale of 1 - 7.

The results of parts a) to e) of the first question were aggregated into a single score. The results of the two questions were then averaged across all respondents to give a score per country/territory.

**Country Coverage**

In 2010 the survey captured the views of business executives in 139 economies.

The survey is conducted in each country/territory according to the sampling guidelines and therefore in a consistent manner across the globe during the same time of year.

**Data availability**

The World Economic Forum has conducted its annual survey for more than 30 years.

The data was gathered in a survey conducted between January and May 2010.

Some aggregated data is available in the appendix of the Global Competitiveness Report, the micro-level data is provided to TI by the World Economic Forum.

<http://www.weforum.org/>

**16. World Economic Forum Executive Opinion Survey (EOS) 2011**  
**Code: WEF\_2011**

**Data Provider**

The World Economic Forum is an independent international organisation committed to improving the state of the world by engaging business, political, academic and other leaders of society to shape global, regional and industry agendas. Incorporated as a not-for-profit foundation in 1971, and headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland, the Forum is tied to no political, partisan or national interests.

The Executive Opinion Survey (EOS) is the World Economic Forum's annual survey of business executives. The survey has evolved over time to capture new data points essential to the Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) and other Forum indexes.

The Forum's Centre for Global Competitiveness and Performance works closely with a network of over 150 partner institutions that administer the surveying of their respective countries/territories. They are selected because of their capacity to reach out to leading business executives as well as their understanding of the national business environment and their commitment to the Forum's research on competitiveness. The Partner Institutes are, for the most part, well-respected economics departments of national universities, independent research institutes or business organisations. An average of 98 business executives per country/territory were surveyed for the EOS 2011 with an oversampling of larger firms. The surveys are conducted according to stringent guidelines which underwent a review in 2008. The sample is stratified by sector and company size.

**Corruption Question(s)**

Survey respondents were asked:

(On a scale of 1 - 7 where 1 means very common and 7 means never)

"In your country, how common is it for firms to make undocumented extra payments or bribes connected with the following":

- a) Imports and exports,
- b) Public Utilities,
- c) Annual Tax Payments,
- d) Awarding of public contracts and licensing,
- e) Obtaining favourable judicial decisions.

(on a scale of 1 - 7 where 1 means very common and 7 means never)

"In your country, how common is diversion of public funds to companies, individuals or groups due to corruption?"

**Scores**

Each question is scored by respondents on a scale of 1 - 7.

The results of parts a) to e) of the first question were aggregated into a single score. The results of the two questions were then averaged across all respondents to give a score per country/territory.

**Country Coverage**

In 2011 the survey captured the views of business executives in 136 economies.

The survey is conducted in each country/territory according to the sampling guidelines and therefore in a consistent manner across the globe during the same time of year.

**Data availability**

The World Economic Forum has conducted its annual survey for more than 30 years.

The data used in the CPI 2011 was gathered in a survey carried out between January and June 2011 for 136 countries/territories.

Some aggregated data is available in the appendix of the Global Competitiveness Report. The micro-level data is provided to TI by the World Economic Forum.

<http://www.weforum.org/>

**17. World Justice Project Rule of Law Index**  
**Code: WJP\_ROL**

**Data Provider**

The World Justice Project (WJP) is an independent, non-profit organisation working to advance the rule of law for the development of communities of opportunity and equity. The WJP's multi-national, multi-disciplinary efforts are dedicated to developing practical programmes in support of the rule of law around the world. The work of the WJP is based on two complementary premises: the rule of law is the foundation for communities of opportunity and equity, and multi-disciplinary collaboration is the most effective way to advance the rule of law.

The WJP Rule of Law Index is an assessment tool designed by The World Justice Project to offer a detailed and comprehensive picture of the extent to which countries/territories adhere to the rule of law in practice. The Index provides detailed information and original data regarding a variety of dimensions of the rule of law, which enables stakeholders to assess a nation's adherence to the rule of law in practice, identify a nation's strengths and weaknesses in comparison to similarly situated countries, and track changes over time.

The Index's rankings and scores are the product of a rigorous data collection and aggregation process. Data comes from a global poll of the general public and detailed questionnaires administered to local experts. To date, over 2,000 experts and 66,000 other individuals from around the world have participated in this project.

**Corruption Question(s)**

A total of 68 questions are asked of experts and respondents from the general population (53 and 15 targeted to each group respectively) on the extent to which government officials use public office for private gain. These questions touch on a variety of sectors within government including the public health system, regulatory agencies, the police, and the courts. Individual questions are aggregated into four sub-indices:

- Government officials in the executive branch do not use public office for private gain
- Government officials in the judicial branch do not use public office for private gain
- Government officials in the police and the military do not use public office for private gain
- Government officials in the legislature do not use public office for private gain

**Scores**

Scores are given on a continuous scale between from a low of 0 to a high of 1.

**Country Coverage**

66 countries were scored in the 2011 Rule of Law index.

The Index is deliberately intended to be applied in countries with vastly differing social, cultural, economic, and political systems.

**Data availability**

The first edition was published in 2010 and the second in 2011, with slight variation in methodology and country coverage.

Data is publicly available online for the 2011 report.

<http://worldjusticeproject.org/rule-of-law-index/>