



**15th INTERNATIONAL
ANTI-CORRUPTION
CONFERENCE**

**MOBILISING PEOPLE:
CONNECTING AGENTS OF CHANGE**

**BRASÍLIA BRAZIL
7-10 NOVEMBER 2012**

Long Session Report: Global Solutions

Session Title: Challenges and innovations on local and sector specific indexes

Date & Time: 8 November 2012, 15:00-17:00

Report prepared by: Dadisai Taderera, Project Manager, Global Integrity

Experts:

Hazel Feigenblatt, Managing Director, Global Integrity

Magued Osman, CEO and Managing Director, Egyptian Centre for Public Opinion Research (Baseera)

Mark Pyman, Program Director, Defence and Security Program, Transparency International UK

Jairo Acuna, Policy Advisor, Public Administration and Anti-Corruption Reform UNDP (Vietnam)

Karen Egger, Senior Programme Manager, TI (Private Sector Team)

Moderated by: Jana Palacios

Session coordinated by: Hazel Feigenblatt, Managing Director, Global Integrity

Summary of Panellists' Contributions & Discussion Points (please be as detailed as possible)

This session focused on 5 diverse research projects, using either a local or sector specific index. The overall consensus was that each methodology has its pros and cons but indices can be strong tool for advocacy.

Transparency International's Defense and Security program developed two indices to measure corruption risk in the defense sector. The first index measured risk from the perspectives of the companies and the second from the government's perspectives, which represents the supply and demand sides of the defense sector. The purpose of the indices was not only to provide information but specifically to be used as an advocacy tool to promote transparency and accountability in the defense sector. The selection criteria for the countries in the Government Defense Integrity Index 2012 were the size of the military and 80 countries are currently being assessed and the information will be published in January. For the Defense

Companies Anti- Corruption index, 129 of the largest defense companies were selected from across the globe.

Transparency International's Private Sector Team presented the second sector specific index. The index measured transparency in corporate reporting, focusing on what corporates report publicly regarding anti corruption programmes, in country reporting and organisational transparency. This allowed the fairest evaluation of what corporates report because public information improves the company's willingness to be held accountable and it limits bias if companies were asked for information there would be an incentive to give more information in order to score more favourably. The unit of analysis were the top 100 Multinational Companies according to size from the Forbes top 200 largest companies.

Global Integrity presented a local index, the State Integrity Investigation - a collaborative study between Global Integrity, Center for Public accountability and Public Radio International. The aim of the field research was to measure the strength of state laws and practices that promote open, transparent government and prevent corruption. The study used an expert assessment method with a blind peer review process. The unit of analysis were the 50 states in the United States of America. Journalists were contracted to collect the information because they are familiar with the issues and have experience accessing key sources. The study used an evidence-based methodology to measure the risk of corruption and not the level of corruption in the 50 states. The results created a lot of debate as they produced some unexpected results. There have been some reforms in different states as a result of the study.

In Vietnam, the UNDP is measuring citizen experience of corruption. Given the context of Vietnam, this has proved to be a useful tool to complement government's self-assessments. The study was first piloted in 2009 in only 3 of the provinces. It has since been expanded to cover all 63 provinces, surveying over 13000 citizens. The units of analysis are individual citizens and their experiences of corruption, not perceptions. In cases where citizens have no experience, they were not asked to respond. For instance, if the question asks about corruption in hospitals and the respondent has not has any dealings with the hospital then they may not respond.

The Egyptian Centre conducted the final index, discussed in Egypt for Public Research before the uprisings. The index measured public opinion and experience of corruption in the different governorates, capturing the difference between the perception and experience of corruption. The rationale was that Egypt had been ranked poorly on many corruption indicators. This was to test whether these had an impact on people's opinion of government corruption and if it differed from their experience of corruption. An anthropological study was conducted initially to determine the local understandings of corruption. The results show that dimensions of corruption are localised and they vary from one governorate to another. Perceptions and exposure to corruption also varies according to level of education and location especially in terms of rural or urban.

Main Outcomes (include interesting questions from the floor)

Any research methodology has a bias. It is important for the researchers to be transparent about their methodology and data. Evidence based methodologies can produce more effective results and reduce the discretion of the researchers, therefore increasing the reliability of the data.

In the defence sector, the information from the index was very helpful for the reformers in government. They could then use it as a starting point for internal advocacy.

Sector/local indicators can be instrumental in: designing and setting priorities for interventions, assessment, accountability and program evaluation.

Recommendations, Follow-Up Actions

If indexes are detailed and sufficiently independent, they can be a key advocacy tool. The more sector specific they are or locally relevant, the better their impact. Local indexes, if sufficiently detailed, can help local authorities to prioritize and target relevant areas to fight corruption.

There is a need to continuously improve the methodology, given the learning from doing the research to incorporate feedback from the process, as well as assess what worked and what did not. In some cases, this may mean changing the research parameters to strengthen the tools. The results can expose areas for further research and more in-depth analysis to better understand the issues. This must also challenge accepted tools and priorities. For instance the defence sector index exposed that it is not the procurement aspect that is a cause for concern but the legislative process when the decisions are made with regards to what defence equipment is necessary for the country and many loopholes can be overlooked or created in that process.

Highlights (please include interesting quotes)

Rankings in an index can be a useful but can also be a distraction especially in cases where the results are surprising. People tend to be focused on the rankings and not the overall picture. In certain cases, as with the State Integrity investigation, the controversy caused by the State rankings proved to be a positive spin off in terms of the media coverage. As a result there was more attention on the research and a chance to discuss the findings and explain them to a wider audience.

In the corporate reporting project, an interesting point raised was that the advocacy was not only when the data was released but also during the process, the fact that corporates new they were understudy in some instances this influenced them to make more information regarding their anti corruption strategies publicly available. This also applied to those companies that did not form part of the study. This shows the potential that indices have as a tool to fight corruption.

Key Insights Recommended for inclusion into the IACC Declaration

If indexes are detailed and sufficiently independent, they can be a key component for advocacy. The more specific or locally relevant the index is the greater potential for impact. Local indexes, when sufficiently detailed, can help local authorities to prioritize and target relevant areas to fight corruption.

Rapporteur's name and date submitted

Dadisai Taderera