

Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2003



<http://www.transparency.org>

Transparency International Secretariat
Otto-Suhr-Allee 97-99,
10585 Berlin,
Germany
Tel: +49-30-3438 2010
Fax: +49-30-3470 3912
ti@transparency.org

About TI:

Transparency International, founded in 1993, is the leading international non-governmental organisation devoted solely to curbing corruption. TI currently has close to 90 national chapters around the world and TI's International Secretariat is in Berlin, Germany. For more information on TI, its national chapters and its work, please visit:

www.transparency.org

PRESS RELEASE

Media Contacts:

(Berlin) Sarah Tyler
Tel: +49 30 3438 2061/19, Fax: +49 30 3470 3912,
Email: press@transparency.org

(London) Jeff Lovitt/Susan Côté-Freeman
Tel: +44 207 981 0345/0347



<http://www.transparency.org>

Otto-Suhr-Allee 97-99,
10585 Berlin, Germany
Tel: +49-30-3438 2061
Fax: +49-30-3470 3912

Embargoed until 08.30 GMT, 7 October 2003

*DRAFT VERSION – DO NOT RELEASE BEFORE 7 OCTOBER
2003*

Nine out of ten developing countries urgently need practical support to fight corruption, highlights new index

The Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2003 charts levels of corruption in 133 countries. Seven out of ten countries score less than 5 out of a clean score of 10, while five out of ten developing countries score less than 3 out of 10

London, 7 October 2003 --- “Rich countries must provide practical support to developing country governments that demonstrate the political will to curb corruption. In addition, those countries starting with a high degree of corruption should not be penalised, since they are in the most urgent need of support,” said Peter Eigen, Chairman of Transparency International (TI), speaking today on the launch of the TI Corruption Perceptions Index 2003 (CPI).

“The new CPI points to high levels of corruption in many rich countries as well as poorer ones, making it imperative that developed countries enforce international conventions to curb bribery by international companies, and that private businesses fulfil their obligations under the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention, namely to stop bribing public officials around the world,” said Eigen. But, he continued, “nine out of ten developing countries score less than 5 against a clean score of 10 in the TI CPI 2003. Their governments must implement results-oriented programmes to fight corruption, but they also urgently require practical help tailored to the needs of their national anti-corruption strategies.”

For these strategies to succeed, said Eigen, “such support must go hand in hand with international backing for civil society to monitor the implementation of these strategies”. In addition, he insisted, “donor countries and international financial institutions should take a firmer line, stopping financial support to corrupt governments and blacklisting international companies caught paying bribes abroad.”

“Seven out of ten countries score less than 5 out of a clean score of 10 in the TI CPI 2003, which reflects perceived levels of corruption among politicians and public officials in 133 countries,” explained Eigen. “Five out of ten developing countries scores less than 3 out of 10, indicating a high level of corruption.” The annual CPI, published today by TI, the leading international non-governmental organisation devoted to fighting corruption worldwide, reflects the perceptions of business people, academics and risk analysts, both resident and non-resident. The statistical work was co-ordinated by Prof. Dr Johann Graf Lambsdorff at Passau University in Germany, advised by a group of international specialists.

Corruption is perceived to be pervasive in Bangladesh, Nigeria, Haiti, Paraguay, Myanmar, Tajikistan, Georgia, Cameroon, Azerbaijan, Angola, Kenya, and Indonesia, countries with a score of less than 2 in the new index. Countries with a score of higher than 9, with very low levels of perceived corruption, are rich countries, namely Finland, Iceland, Denmark, New Zealand, Singapore and Sweden.

Some changes highlighted in the CPI were identified by Peter Eigen. “On the basis of data from sources that have been consistently used for the index, improvements since last year’s index can be observed for Austria, Belgium, Colombia, France, Germany, Ireland, Malaysia, Norway, and Tunisia.

Noteworthy examples of a worsening are Argentina, Belarus, Chile, Canada, Israel, Luxembourg, Poland, USA, and Zimbabwe.”

“There are many countries, where there is now a high-level political commitment to fight corruption,” said TI Vice Chair Rosa Inés Ospina Robledo, speaking in Bogota, Colombia, today. “In such countries, international support, especially for transparency in public contracting, is essential to build solid foundations for removing corruption from government and public services. In particular, the private sector must take full responsibility for its conduct at home and abroad, and take urgent steps to stop paying bribes. To make this a reality, TI and private sector companies have worked together to develop a set of Business Principles for Countering Bribery, advocating anti-bribery training and codes of conduct within companies. TI has also implemented no-bribes Integrity Pacts in public contracting.”

“We can begin to close the rift between developing and rich countries, which was so evident at the WTO meeting in Cancún, Mexico, last month,” said Peter Eigen, “if WTO negotiations are launched on a multilateral framework agreement on Transparency in Government Procurement (TGP). For less developed countries, it is in their own interests to introduce transparency measures in public procurement because the waste of their own scarce resources is at stake. If corruption in procurement is not contained, poverty will grow.”

“Today’s CPI demonstrates that it is not only poor countries where corruption thrives,” said Laurence Cockcroft, Chairman of TI (UK), in London today. “Levels of corruption are worryingly high in European countries such as Greece and Italy, and in potentially wealthy oil-rich countries such as Nigeria, Angola, Azerbaijan, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Libya, Venezuela and Iraq.”

“To turn around this situation so that ordinary people share in the oil wealth of their country, TI is campaigning, along with other NGOs, for international oil companies to publish what they pay to governments and state oil companies. This will enable citizens and civil society organisations in countries such as Nigeria, Angola, Iraq, Indonesia and Kazakhstan to have a clearer picture of state revenues,” said Cockcroft, a member of TI’s international Board of Directors, “so that they can call their governments to account where the state budget is not used to improve scarce public resources, but instead disappears on expensive vanity projects or into the secret offshore bank accounts of politicians and public officials.”

“Political parties, the courts and the police were identified as the three areas most in need of reform in TI’s Global Corruption Barometer, a survey of the general public in 48 countries, launched in July 2003,” said Cockcroft. “This indicates a serious lack of confidence in those in authority worldwide.”

The CPI 2003, published today, is a poll of polls, reflecting the perceptions of business people, academics and risk analysts, both resident and non-resident. First launched in 1995, this year’s CPI draws on 17 surveys from 13 independent institutions. A rolling survey of polls taken between 2001 and 2003, the CPI 2003 includes only those countries that feature in at least three surveys. “It is important to emphasise that the CPI, even with 133 countries, is only a snapshot,” said Peter Eigen. “There is not sufficient data on other countries, many of which are likely to be very corrupt.”

The CPI 2003 complements TI’s Bribe Payers Index (BPI), which addresses the propensity of companies from top exporting countries to bribe in emerging markets. The BPI 2002, published on 14 May 2002, revealed high levels of bribery by firms from Russia, China, Taiwan and South Korea, closely followed by Italy, Hong Kong, Malaysia, Japan, USA and France – although many of these countries signed the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention, which outlaws bribery of foreign public officials.

“The OECD Convention came into force in 1999, but we are still awaiting the first prosecutions in the courts of the 35 signatory countries,” said Eigen. “The governments of these countries have an obligation to developing countries to investigate and prosecute the companies within their jurisdictions that are bribing. Their bribes and incentives to corrupt public officials and politicians are undermining the prospects of sustainable development in poorer countries.”

For full details of the TI CPI 2003, visit <http://www.transparency.org/cpi/index.html#cpi>

Press Contacts for the CPI 2003

Berlin: Sarah Tyler
Tel: +49 30 3438 2061/19
Email: press@transparency.org

UK: Jeff Lovitt/Susan Côté-Freeman
Tel: +44-207 981 0345

Additional technical CPI information

Prof. Dr Johann Graf Lambsdorff (TI Adviser and
director of the statistical work on the CPI)
Passau University, Germany
Tel: +49-851-509 2551
Email: jlambsd@uni-passau.de

Country rank	Country	CPI 2003 score	Surveys used	Standard deviation	High-low range
1	Finland	9.7	8	0.3	9.2 - 10.0
2	Iceland	9.6	7	0.3	9.2 - 10.0
3	Denmark	9.5	9	0.4	8.8 - 9.9
	New Zealand	9.5	8	0.2	9.2 - 9.6
5	Singapore	9.4	12	0.1	9.2 - 9.5
6	Sweden	9.3	11	0.2	8.8 - 9.6
7	Netherlands	8.9	9	0.3	8.5 - 9.3
	Australia	8.8	12	0.9	6.7 - 9.5
8	Norway	8.8	8	0.5	8.0 - 9.3
	Switzerland	8.8	9	0.8	6.9 - 9.4
	Canada	8.7	12	0.9	6.5 - 9.4
11	Luxembourg	8.7	6	0.4	8.0 - 9.2
	United Kingdom	8.7	13	0.5	7.8 - 9.2
14	Austria	8.0	9	0.7	7.3 - 9.3
	Hong Kong	8.0	11	1.1	5.6 - 9.3
16	Germany	7.7	11	1.2	4.9 - 9.2
17	Belgium	7.6	9	0.9	6.6 - 9.2
18	Ireland	7.5	9	0.7	6.5 - 8.8
	USA	7.5	13	1.2	4.9 - 9.2
20	Chile	7.4	12	0.9	5.6 - 8.8
21	Israel	7.0	10	1.2	4.7 - 8.1
	Japan	7.0	13	1.1	5.5 - 8.8
23	France	6.9	12	1.1	4.8 - 9.0
	Spain	6.9	11	0.8	5.2 - 7.8
25	Portugal	6.6	9	1.2	4.9 - 8.1
26	Oman	6.3	4	0.9	5.5 - 7.3
27	Bahrain	6.1	3	1.1	5.5 - 7.4
	Cyprus	6.1	3	1.6	4.7 - 7.8
29	Slovenia	5.9	12	1.2	4.7 - 8.8
30	Botswana	5.7	6	0.9	4.7 - 7.3
	Taiwan	5.7	13	1.0	3.6 - 7.8
32	Qatar	5.6	3	0.1	5.5 - 5.7
33	Estonia	5.5	12	0.6	4.7 - 6.6
	Uruguay	5.5	7	1.1	4.1 - 7.4
35	Italy	5.3	11	1.1	3.3 - 7.3
	Kuwait	5.3	4	1.7	3.3 - 7.4
37	Malaysia	5.2	13	1.1	3.6 - 8.0
	United Arab Emirates	5.2	3	0.5	4.6 - 5.6
39	Tunisia	4.9	6	0.7	3.6 - 5.6
40	Hungary	4.8	13	0.6	4.0 - 5.6
41	Lithuania	4.7	10	1.6	3.0 - 7.7
	Namibia	4.7	6	1.3	3.6 - 6.6
43	Cuba	4.6	3	1.0	3.6 - 5.5
	Jordan	4.6	7	1.1	3.6 - 6.5
	Trinidad and Tobago	4.6	6	1.3	3.4 - 6.9
46	Belize	4.5	3	0.9	3.6 - 5.5
	Saudi Arabia	4.5	4	2.0	2.8 - 7.4
48	Mauritius	4.4	5	0.7	3.6 - 5.5
	South Africa	4.4	12	0.6	3.6 - 5.5
	Costa Rica	4.3	8	0.7	3.5 - 5.5
50	Greece	4.3	9	0.8	3.7 - 5.6
	South Korea	4.3	12	1.0	2.0 - 5.6
53	Belarus	4.2	5	1.8	2.0 - 5.8
54	Brazil	3.9	12	0.5	3.3 - 4.7
	Bulgaria	3.9	10	0.9	2.8 - 5.7
	Czech Republic	3.9	12	0.9	2.6 - 5.6
57	Jamaica	3.8	5	0.4	3.3 - 4.3
	Latvia	3.8	7	0.4	3.4 - 4.7
	Colombia	3.7	11	0.5	2.7 - 4.4
59	Croatia	3.7	8	0.6	2.6 - 4.7
	El Salvador	3.7	7	1.5	2.0 - 6.3
	Peru	3.7	9	0.6	2.7 - 4.9
	Slovakia	3.7	11	0.7	2.9 - 4.7
64	Mexico	3.6	12	0.6	2.4 - 4.9
	Poland	3.6	14	1.1	2.4 - 5.6

Explanatory notes

A more detailed description of the CPI 2003 methodology is available at <http://www.transparency.org/cpi/index.html#cpi> or at <http://www.gwdg.de/~uwv>

CPI 2003 Score

relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by business people, academics and risk analysts, and ranges between 10 (highly clean) and 0 (highly corrupt).

Surveys Used

refers to the number of surveys that assessed a country's performance. A total of 17 surveys were used from 13 independent institutions, and at least three surveys were required for a country to be included in the CPI.

Standard Deviation

indicates differences in the values of the sources: the greater the standard deviation, the greater the differences of perceptions of a country among the sources.

High-Low Range

provides the highest and lowest values of the different sources.

Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2003

Country rank	Country	CPI 2003 score	Surveys used	Standard deviation	High-low range
66	China	3.4	13	1.0	2.0 - 5.5
	Panama	3.4	7	0.8	2.7 - 5.0
	Sri Lanka	3.4	7	0.7	2.4 - 4.4
	Syria	3.4	4	1.3	2.0 - 5.0
70	Bosnia & Herzegovina	3.3	6	0.7	2.2 - 3.9
	Dominican Republic	3.3	6	0.4	2.7 - 3.8
	Egypt	3.3	9	1.3	1.8 - 5.3
	Ghana	3.3	6	0.9	2.7 - 5.0
	Morocco	3.3	5	1.3	2.4 - 5.5
76	Thailand	3.3	13	0.9	1.4 - 4.4
76	Senegal	3.2	6	1.2	2.2 - 5.5
77	Turkey	3.1	14	0.9	1.8 - 5.4
78	Armenia	3.0	5	0.8	2.2 - 4.1
	Iran	3.0	4	1.0	1.5 - 3.6
	Lebanon	3.0	4	0.8	2.1 - 3.6
	Mali	3.0	3	1.8	1.4 - 5.0
	Palestine	3.0	3	1.2	2.0 - 4.3
83	India	2.8	14	0.4	2.1 - 3.6
	Malawi	2.8	4	1.2	2.0 - 4.4
	Romania	2.8	12	1.0	1.6 - 5.0
86	Mozambique	2.7	5	0.7	2.0 - 3.6
	Russia	2.7	16	0.8	1.4 - 4.9
88	Algeria	2.6	4	0.5	2.0 - 3.0
	Madagascar	2.6	3	1.8	1.2 - 4.7
	Nicaragua	2.6	7	0.5	2.0 - 3.3
	Yemen	2.6	4	0.7	2.0 - 3.4
92	Albania	2.5	5	0.6	1.9 - 3.2
	Argentina	2.5	12	0.5	1.6 - 3.2
	Ethiopia	2.5	5	0.8	1.5 - 3.6
	Gambia	2.5	4	0.9	1.5 - 3.6
	Pakistan	2.5	7	0.9	1.5 - 3.9
	Philippines	2.5	12	0.5	1.6 - 3.6
	Tanzania	2.5	6	0.6	2.0 - 3.3
Zambia	2.5	5	0.6	2.0 - 3.3	
100	Guatemala	2.4	8	0.6	1.5 - 3.4
	Kazakhstan	2.4	7	0.9	1.6 - 3.8
	Moldova	2.4	5	0.8	1.6 - 3.6
	Uzbekistan	2.4	6	0.5	2.0 - 3.3
	Venezuela	2.4	12	0.5	1.4 - 3.1
	Vietnam	2.4	8	0.8	1.4 - 3.6
106	Bolivia	2.3	6	0.4	1.9 - 2.9
	Honduras	2.3	7	0.6	1.4 - 3.3
	Macedonia	2.3	5	0.3	2.0 - 2.7
	Serbia & Montenegro	2.3	5	0.5	2.0 - 3.2
	Sudan	2.3	4	0.3	2.0 - 2.7
	Ukraine	2.3	10	0.6	1.6 - 3.8
	Zimbabwe	2.3	7	0.3	2.0 - 2.7
113	Congo, Republic of the	2.2	3	0.5	2.0 - 2.8
	Ecuador	2.2	8	0.3	1.8 - 2.6
	Iraq	2.2	3	1.1	1.2 - 3.4
	Sierra Leone	2.2	3	0.5	2.0 - 2.8
	Uganda	2.2	6	0.7	1.8 - 3.5
118	Cote d'Ivoire	2.1	5	0.5	1.5 - 2.7
	Kyrgyzstan	2.1	5	0.4	1.6 - 2.7
	Libya	2.1	3	0.5	1.7 - 2.7
	Papua New Guinea	2.1	3	0.6	1.5 - 2.7
122	Indonesia	1.9	13	0.5	0.7 - 2.9
	Kenya	1.9	7	0.3	1.5 - 2.4
124	Angola	1.8	3	0.3	1.4 - 2.0
	Azerbaijan	1.8	7	0.3	1.4 - 2.3
	Cameroon	1.8	5	0.2	1.4 - 2.0
	Georgia	1.8	6	0.7	0.9 - 2.8
	Tajikistan	1.8	3	0.3	1.5 - 2.0
129	Myanmar	1.6	3	0.3	1.4 - 2.0
	Paraguay	1.6	6	0.3	1.2 - 2.0
131	Haiti	1.5	5	0.6	0.7 - 2.3
132	Nigeria	1.4	9	0.4	0.9 - 2.0
133	Bangladesh	1.3	8	0.7	0.3 - 2.2

Explanatory notes

A more detailed description of the CPI 2003 methodology is available at <http://www.transparency.org/cpi/index.html#cpi> or at <http://www.gwdg.de/~uwv>

CPI 2003 Score

relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by business people, academics and risk analysts, and ranges between 10 (highly clean) and 0 (highly corrupt).

Surveys Used

refers to the number of surveys that assessed a country's performance. A total of 17 surveys were used from 13 independent institutions, and at least three surveys were required for a country to be included in the CPI.

Standard Deviation

indicates differences in the values of the sources: the greater the standard deviation, the greater the differences of perceptions of a country among the sources.

High-Low Range

provides the highest and lowest values of the different sources.

Questions & Answers on the TI Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2003

What is the Corruption Perceptions Index?

The TI Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) this year ranks 133 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 17 different polls and surveys from 13 independent institutions carried out among business people and country analysts, including surveys of residents, both local and expatriate. In 2002, the CPI included only 102 countries. The large increase in coverage relates to the fact that more valid and reputable sources have been found that can be incorporated.

For the purpose of the CPI, how is corruption defined?

The CPI focuses on corruption in the public sector and defines corruption as the abuse of public office for private gain. The surveys used in compiling the CPI tend to ask questions in line with the misuse of public power for private benefit, with a focus, for example, on bribe-taking by public officials in public procurement. The sources do not distinguish between administrative and political corruption.

Why is the Corruption Perceptions Index a valuable tool?

Because the CPI is derived from 17 different surveys that garner the perceptions of both residents and expatriates, both business people, academia and risk analysts, the index provides a snapshot of the views of decision-makers, who take key decisions on investment and trade. The CPI builds public awareness of the corruption issue, and it draws the attention of governments to the negative image of their nation that low rankings in the CPI reflect, adding another reason for them to address the problem.

What is the difference between the CPI and TI's Global Corruption Barometer (GCB)?

The CPI aims at assessing levels of corruption across countries, while the Global Corruption Barometer (see <http://www.transparency.org/surveys>) is concerned with attitudes that the general public forms vis-à-vis these levels of corruption. One question in the GCB asks respondents how significantly corruption affects their personal and family life. The resulting attitudes can vary considerably and do not necessarily correlate with levels of corruption. Respondents in some countries may be capable of living with high levels of corruption while for others even low levels of corruption provoke serious concerns.

What role is played by exporters in international criminal transactions?

On 14 May 2002, TI published the second Bribe Payers Index (BPI), which ranked exporting countries according to the propensity of companies from those countries to offer bribes abroad. The BPI is accessible on the internet at <http://www.transparency.org/surveys/index.html#bpi>. The BPI complements the CPI and underlines the point that corruption in international business transactions involves both those who take and those who give. Looking only at those who take, the CPI provides an incomplete picture.

Is it right to conclude that the country with the lowest score is the world's most corrupt country?

No. The country with the lowest score is the one perceived to be the most corrupt of those included in the index. The CPI is based on polls that are snapshots in time and reflect both opinions and experience. Furthermore, there are almost 200 sovereign nations in the world, and the CPI 2003 ranks only 133.

Why is the CPI based only on perceptions?

It is difficult to base comparative statements on the levels of corruption in different countries on hard empirical data, e.g. by comparing the number of prosecutions or court cases. Such cross-country data does not reflect actual levels of corruption; rather it highlights the quality of prosecutors, courts and/or the media in exposing corruption. The only method of compiling comparative data is therefore to build on the experience and perceptions of those who are most directly confronted with the realities of corruption.

Was there any change in the target groups polled for the CPI this year?

The robustness of the CPI findings is enhanced by the fact that residents' viewpoints are found to correlate well with those of expatriates. In the past, expatriates surveyed were often western businesspeople. The viewpoint of less developed countries seemed underrepresented. This has changed. On behalf of Transparency International, Gallup International surveyed respondents from emerging market economies, asking them to assess the performance of public servants in industrial countries. A related approach was carried out by Information International. The results from these surveys correlate well with other sources, indicating that the CPI gathers perceptions that are invariant to cultural preconditions and represent a global perspective.

What are the criteria in determining which surveys are used?

TI seeks excellent data for the CPI and, to qualify, the data has to be well documented, and it has to be sufficient to permit a judgment on its reliability. TI strives to ensure that the sources used are of the highest quality, that the survey work is performed with complete integrity and that the methodologies used to analyse findings are first-class. A more detailed description of the underlying methodology has been written for the 2003 index and is available at <http://www.transparency.org/cpi/index.html#cpi> or at www.gwdg.de/~uwvw. The methodology used is

reviewed by a Steering Committee consisting of leading international experts in the fields of corruption, econometrics and statistics. Members of the Steering Committee make suggestions for improving the CPI, but the management of TI takes the final decisions on the methodology used.

Which countries are included in the CPI 2003?

TI requires at least three sources to be available for a country before considering the database sufficiently robust for that country to be ranked in the CPI. The following countries were in the CPI 2003, but not the CPI 2002: Algeria, Armenia, Bahrain, Belize, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Congo (Republic of), Cuba, Cyprus, Gambia, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Libya, Macedonia, Mali, Mozambique, Myanmar, Oman, Palestine, Papua New Guinea, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Serbia & Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Syria, Tajikistan, United Arab Emirates and Yemen.

Countries with only two sets of data (and therefore not included) were: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Benin, Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Chad, Congo (Democratic Republic of), Dominica, Eritrea, Fiji, Gabon, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Macau, Malta, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, North Korea, Rwanda, Seychelles, Somalia and Turkmenistan.

Countries with only one set of data were: Andorra, Anguilla, Aruba, Bhutan, Brunei, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, Djibouti, East Timor, Equatorial Guinea, French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Guinea, Guyana, Laos, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Martinique, Mauritania, Neth. Antilles, Palau, Puerto Rico, Samoa, Sao Tome & Principe, St Kitts & Nevis, St Lucia, St Vincent & the Grenadines, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo and the Virgin Islands.

Is the country score a reliable measure of a country's perceived level of corruption?

In terms of perceptions of corruption, the CPI is a solid measurement tool. The reliability differs, however, between countries. Countries with a low number of sources and large differences in the values provided by the sources (indicated by a large Standard Deviation) convey less reliability as to their score and ranking.

Are old surveys used in the CPI?

The CPI is based on 2001-2003 data. Since fundamental changes in the levels of corruption in a country evolve only slowly, while public perceptions may change more swiftly and be influenced to some extent by short-term events, TI determined to base the CPI on a three-year rolling average. Hence, this year's CPI is based on survey data collected exclusively between 2001 and 2003.

Which sources have contributed to the assessment of each individual country?

A list of sources and surveys from which the CPI is derived follows at the end of the press release. A list of the sources that contributed to the assessment of each country is available on the Internet as an Excel sheet (<http://www.transparency.org/cpi/index.html#cpi> or <http://www.gwdg.de/~uwwv>). This list also provides further information on standard errors and confidence intervals for each country.

Can data from one year be compared with that from a previous year?

Comparisons to the results from previous years should be based on a country's score, not its rank. A country's rank can change simple because new countries enter the index and others drop out. A higher score is an indicator that respondents provided better ratings, while a lower score suggests that respondents revised their perception downwards. However, year-to-year comparisons of a country's score do not only result from a changing perception of a country's performance but also from a changing sample and methodology. Some sources are not updated and must be dropped, while new, reliable sources are added. With differing respondents and slightly differing methodologies, a change in a country's score may also relate to the fact that different viewpoints have been collected and different questions been asked. The index primarily provides an annual snapshot of the views of businesspeople and country analysts, with less of a focus on year-to-year trends.

Which countries' scores deteriorated most between 2002 and 2003?

Making comparisons from one year to another is problematic. However, to the extent that changes can be traced back to a change in the results from individual sources, trends can be cautiously identified. Noteworthy examples of a downward trend are Argentina, Belarus, Chile, Canada, Israel, Luxembourg, Poland, USA, and Zimbabwe. The considerable decline in their scores does not result from technical factors - actual changes in perceptions are therefore likely.

Which countries improved most compared with last year?

With the same caveats applied, on the basis of data from sources that have been consistently used for the index, improvements can be observed for Austria, Belgium, Colombia, France, Germany, Ireland, Malaysia, Norway and Tunisia..

Survey sources for the TI Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2003

Number	1		2		3	
Source	World Economic Forum					
Name	Global Competitiveness Report					
Year	2001		2002		2003	
Internet address	www.weforum.org					
Who was surveyed?	Senior business leaders; domestic and international companies					
Subject asked	Undocumented extra payments connected with import and export permits, public utilities and contracts, business licenses, tax payments or loan applications are common/not common.			Questions on left plus payments connected to favourable regulations and judicial decisions		
Number of replies	4,022		ca. 4,600		7,741	
Coverage	59 countries		76 countries		102 countries	
Number	4		5		6	
Source	Institute for Management Development, IMD, Switzerland					
Name	World Competitiveness Yearbook					
Year	2001		2002		2003	
Internet address	www.imd.ch					
Who was surveyed?	Executives in top and middle management; domestic and international companies					
Subject asked	Bribery and corruption in the public sphere			Bribery and corruption in the economy		
Number of replies	3,678		3,532		> 4,000	
Coverage	49 countries		49 countries		51 countries	
Number	7			8		
Source	Information International			World Bank		
Name	Survey of Middle Eastern Businesspeople			World Business Environment Survey		
Year	2003			2001		
Internet address	www.information-international.com			info.worldbank.org/governance/wbes/index1.html		
Who was surveyed?	Senior businesspeople from Bahrain, Lebanon, UAE			Senior managers		
Subject asked	How common are bribes, how costly are they for doing business, and how frequently are public contracts awarded to friends and relatives in neighbouring countries?			"Frequency of bribing" and "corruption as a constraint to business"		
Number of replies	382 assessments from 165 respondents			10,090		
Coverage	31 countries			79 countries ¹		
Number	9		10		11	
Source	Economist Intelligence Unit		Freedom House		World Markets Research Centre	
Name	Country Risk Service and Country Forecast		Nations in Transit		Risk Ratings	
Year	2003		2003		2002	
Internet address	www.eiu.com		www.freedomhouse.org		www.wmrc.com	
Who was surveyed?	Expert staff assessment (expatriate)		Assessment by US academic experts/FH staff		Assessment by staff	
Subject asked	Assessment of pervasiveness of corruption (misuse of public office for private or political party gain) among public officials (politicians and civil servants)		Perception of corruption in civil service, business interests of top policymakers, laws on financial disclosure and conflict of interest, and anti-corruption initiatives		Red tape and likelihood of encountering corrupt officials. This includes small-scale bribes, larger-scale kickbacks and corporate fraud	
Number of replies	Not applicable		Not applicable		Not applicable	
Coverage	139 countries		27 transition economies		186 countries	
Number	12		13		14	
Source	Columbia University (CU)		Political & Economic Risk Consultancy		PricewaterhouseCoopers	
Name	State Capacity Survey		Asian Intelligence Issue		Opacity Index	
Year	2002		2001		2001	
Internet address	US-resident country experts (policy analysts, academics and journalists)		http://www.asiarisk.com/		www.opacityindex.com/	
Who was surveyed?	Expatriate business executives		CFOs, equity analysts, bankers, PwC staff		Frequency of corruption in various contexts (e.g. obtaining import/export permits or subsidies, avoiding taxes)	
Subject asked	Severity of corruption within the state		How do you rate corruption in terms of its quality or contribution to the overall living/working environment?		Frequency of irregular "additional payments"; how is corruption for the operation and growth of your business?	
Number of replies	224		ca. 1,000		1,357	
Coverage	95 countries		14 countries		34 countries	
Number	15		16		17	
Source	A multilateral development bank		Gallup International on behalf of Transparency International		World Bank and the EBRD	
Name	Survey		Corruption Survey		Business Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey	
Year	2002		2002		2002	
Internet address	Experts within the bank were identified and multiple questionnaires (each relating to a different country) sent out to them. Roughly 40% of questionnaires were returned.		www.transparency.org/surveys/index.html#bpi		info.worldbank.org/governance/beeps2002	
Who was surveyed?	Senior businesspeople from 15 emerging market economies		Senior businesspeople		Senior businesspeople	
Subject asked	How widespread is the incidence of corruption? (Widespread; Somewhat widespread; Somewhat limited; Limited; No judgment)		"How common are bribes to politicians, senior civil servants, and judges?" and "how significant of an obstacle are the costs associated with such payments for doing business?"		Frequency of irregular "additional payments"; how is corruption for the operation and growth of your business?	
Number of replies	398		835		6,500	
Coverage	47 countries		21 countries		25 transition countries	

¹ The survey was carried out in 81 countries, but data for two countries was insufficient.