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This quiz provides enough background on the complexity regarding measuring corruption
Measuring corruption generally difficult ...

“Not everything that counts can be counted, and not everything that can be counted counts.”

– Albert Einstein

How do you measure something which differ across societies in terms of its impact, definition, perception, scope and manifestations; but needed to be measured for evidence-based policy making?
What We know from UNDP Experiences?

**UNDP ‘s Users’ Guide to Measuring Corruption in 2008**

1. Review the existing tools and methodologies for corruption measurement and assessment

2. Provide a practical guidance on the use and misuse of these tools
Are there enough tools and methodologies? Yes!

The mushrooming industry of indicators: Trying to measure perception, impact, existing gaps, integrity, enabling environment, etc.
**Enough tools and methodologies, but with major limitations**

1. **Comparison problem**: All most all tools/methodologies not suitable for cross-country comparison (see next slide)
2. Practitioners want **actionable** data, and existing global indicators are inadequate
3. **Perception-based data** are too vague to be useful for policy reform (although frequently used as advocacy tools)
4. Different tools seem to be assessing the different concepts (see the next two graphs)
5. Many tools are not **customized to country** specificities and thus are not useful and not seen as more ‘credible’ by policymakers
6. **Lack of pro-poor, gender sensitive indicators**
The Comparison Problem

Virtually all existing governance, anti-corruption, and corruption indicators are not suitable for cross-country comparisons or for tracking changes over time.

Three sets of challenges:
1. Ambiguities in definition
2. Methodology
3. Perception data
What is each index measuring, and what data sources are used?

Corruption indices for China: Variations in rankings

- **World Bank - Control of Corruption**: Corruption in the public sector (+ some indicators at household level) as perceived by “experts” + opinion polls (incl. NGO experts).
- **Transparency International - CPI**: Corruption in the public sector as perceived by “experts”.
- **Global Integrity Index**: Existence, effectiveness and citizen access to anti-corruption mechanisms, assessed by national experts.
Discrepancies in rankings

Corruption in China over time (2004-06): 2 indices, 2 stories

According to the *World Bank*, China is doing *better* in 2006 than it was in 2004.

According to TI, China is doing *worse* in 2006 than it was in 2004.

However, different scores do not mean that one index is right and the other is wrong. *Only that the 2 indices are assessing different concepts.*
So, What is UNDP’s approach on measuring and assessing corruption?
Guiding Principle 1:

UNDP doesn’t prescribe or subscribes any methodologies, but provides guidance on the use and misuse of tools and methodologies because:

a. No methodology is perfect and thus standard
b. All have advantages and disadvantages
c. Depends on the purpose of the measurement
Guiding Principle 2:

For UNDP, measuring corruption is not an end itself, but rather a means to an end (actual reform). What we measure should be helping us in implementing reform at the national level.

- In Francophone Africa, UNDP received request from the World Bank Institute to build on the diagnostics.
Guiding Principle 3:

UNDP’s focus is on country-based and nationally owned corruption measurement and assessment:

a. Results from the assessments undertaken by a country on its own initiative could feed into policy-making processes (e.g., reforms)

b. Nationally-owned process help develop national capacity on measurement and assessment
Guiding Principle 4:

The assessment/measurement should engage multi-stakeholders at the country level with:

a. Active participation of state and non-state actors to identify problems, agree on the concept, methodologies, process, etc.

b. Focus on collecting gender sensitive and pro-poor data (data disaggregation is important for evidence-based policy making)
Country-Led Assessments Can Help:

- To take stock of formal and informal corruption monitoring processes, and how they relate to the national development plan
- To build broad-based consensus on what research areas (institutions, sectors, processes) to prioritize and what indicators to use
- To institutionalize procedures for collecting, managing and analyzing data
- To identify and address gaps in capacity
- To generate public dialogue on progress in combating corruption

Hence, the need is to focus on the processes that standardizes the assessment/measurement at the country level; not too much on attempts to standardize tools and methodologies at the global level because all tools and methodologies do have advantages and disadvantages.
What kind of support is available from UNDP?

• UNDP Oslo Governance Centre: Provides support (both advisory and financial) for nationally owned assessments

• UNDP Global Programme on Anti-Corruption for Development Effectiveness:
  • Has reviewed the tools, methodologies and good practices on anti-corruption in sectors
  • Will provide support to AC agencies to conduct “Integrity assessment”.

About the Global Programme on Democratic Governance Assessments

UNDP Oslo Governance Centre
Anti-Corruption in Sectors: Methods, Tools and Good Practices!
Thank You!

For more information:
www.undp.org/governance