

Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2004



**TRANSPARENCY
INTERNATIONAL**

the coalition against corruption

<http://www.transparency.org>

Transparency International Secretariat
Otto-Suhr-Allee 97-99,
10585 Berlin,
Germany
Tel: +49-30-3438 200
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 with 90 national chapters around the world, has its International Secretariat in Berlin, Germany. For more information on TI, its national chapters and its work, please visit:

www.transparency.org

PRESS RELEASE



Media Contact:

Jeff Lovitt/Diana Rodriguez (London)
Tel: +44 207 610 1400
Mobile: + 49 162 419 6454

Sarah Tyler/Jana Kotalik (Berlin)
Tel: +49-30-3438 2019/61
Fax: +49-30-3470 3912
press@transparency.org

Additional technical information:
Prof. Dr Johann Graf Lambsdorff
Passau University, Germany
Tel: +49 851 509 2551

<http://www.transparency.org>

Otto-Suhr-Allee 97-99
10585 Berlin, Germany
Tel: +49-30-3438 2061/19
Fax: +49-30-3470 3912

Embargoed until 08.30 GMT, 20 October 2004

Corruption is rampant in 60 countries, and the public sector is plagued by bribery, says TI

Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index 2004 ranks a record 146 countries; most oil-producing nations are prone to high corruption

London, 20 October 2004 --- "Corruption in large-scale public projects is a daunting obstacle to sustainable development, and results in a major loss of public funds needed for education, healthcare and poverty alleviation, both in developed and developing countries," said Transparency International (TI) Chairman Peter Eigen today at the launch of the TI Corruption Perceptions Index 2004.

"If we hope to reach the Millennium Development Goal of halving the number of people living in extreme poverty by 2015, governments need to seriously tackle corruption in public contracting," said Eigen. TI estimates that the amount lost due to bribery in government procurement is at least US\$ 400 billion per year worldwide.

A total of 106 out of 146 countries score less than 5 against a clean score of 10, according to the new index, published today by Transparency International, the leading non-governmental organisation fighting corruption worldwide. Sixty countries score less than 3 out of 10, indicating rampant corruption. Corruption is perceived to be most acute in Bangladesh, Haiti, Nigeria, Chad, Myanmar, Azerbaijan and Paraguay, all of which have a score of less than 2.

"Corruption robs countries of their potential," said Eigen. "As the Corruption Perceptions Index 2004 shows, oil-rich Angola, Azerbaijan, Chad, Ecuador, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Kazakhstan, Libya, Nigeria, Russia, Sudan, Venezuela and Yemen all have extremely low scores. In these countries, public contracting in the oil sector is plagued by revenues vanishing into the pockets of western oil executives, middlemen and local officials."

TI urges western governments to oblige their oil companies to publish what they pay in fees, royalties and other payments to host governments and state oil companies. "Access to this vital information will minimise opportunities for hiding the payment of kickbacks to secure oil tenders, a practice that has blighted the oil industry in transition and post-war economies," said Eigen.

"The future of Iraq depends on transparency in the oil sector," added Eigen. "The urgent need to fund postwar construction heightens the importance of stringent transparency requirements in all procurement contracts," he continued. "Without strict anti-bribery measures, the reconstruction of Iraq will be wrecked by a wasteful diversion of resources to corrupt elites."

According to TI Vice Chair Rosa Inés Ospina Robledo, "across the globe, international donors and national governments must do more to ensure transparency in public procurement by introducing no-bribery clauses into all major projects." Speaking in Bogota, Colombia, today, she said: "Tough sanctions are needed against companies caught bribing, including forfeit of the contract and blacklisting from future bidding."

Tenders should include objective award criteria and public disclosure of the entire process, argues TI. Exceptions to open competitive bidding must be kept to a minimum, and explained and recorded, since limited bidding and direct contracting are particularly prone to manipulation and corruption. Public contracting must be monitored by independent oversight agencies and civil society.

“Companies from OECD countries must fulfil their obligations under the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention and stop paying bribes at home and abroad,” said Rosa Inés Ospina Robledo. “With the spread of anti-bribery legislation, corporate governance and anti-corruption compliance codes, managers have no excuse for paying bribes.”

The Corruption Perceptions Index is a poll of polls, reflecting the perceptions of business people and country analysts, both resident and non-resident. This year’s Corruption Perceptions Index draws on 18 surveys provided to Transparency International between 2002 and 2004, conducted by 12 independent institutions.

Countries with a score of higher than 9, with very low levels of perceived corruption, are predominantly rich countries, namely Finland, New Zealand, Denmark, Iceland, Singapore, Sweden and Switzerland. “But the poorest countries, most of which are in the bottom half of the index, are in greatest need of support in fighting corruption,” said Eigen.

On the basis of data from sources that were used for both the 2003 and 2004 index, since last year an increase in perceived corruption can be observed for Bahrain, Belize, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Oman, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, and Trinidad and Tobago.

On the same basis, a fall in corruption was perceived in Austria, Botswana, Czech Republic, El Salvador, France, Gambia, Germany, Jordan, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, United Arab Emirates and Uruguay.

The index includes only those countries that feature in at least three surveys. As a result, many countries – including some which could be among the most corrupt – are missing because there simply is not enough survey data available.

The statistical work on the index was coordinated by Professor Johann Graf Lambsdorff at Passau University in Germany, advised by a group of international specialists.

Full details of Transparency International’s Corruption Perceptions Index 2004 are available at: www.transparency.org/surveys/#cpi

Press Contacts for the CPI 2004

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

UK: Jeff Lovitt
Tel: +44-207 610 1400
Mobile: +49 162 419 6454

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

This table was compiled at the University of Passau on behalf of Transparency International. For information on data and methodology, please consult the frequently asked questions and the framework document at www.transparency.org/surveys/cpi or www.icgg.org

Country Rank	Country	CPI 2004 Score*	Confidence Range **	Surveys used***	Survey reference (for more details, see table of sources on page 8)																	
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
					BEEPS 2002	CU 2003	EIU 2004	FH 2004	II 2003	IMD 2002	IMD 2003	IMD 2004	MDB 2002	MIG 2004	PERC 2002	PERC 2003	PERC 2004	TiGI 2002	WMRC 2004	WEF 2002	WEF 2003	WEF 2004
1	Finland	9.7	9.5 - 9.8	9			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
2	New Zealand	9.6	9.4 - 9.6	9			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
3	Denmark	9.5	9.3 - 9.7	10		#				#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
	Iceland	9.5	9.4 - 9.7	8						#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
5	Singapore	9.3	9.2 - 9.4	13			#			#	#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#		
6	Sweden	9.2	9.1 - 9.3	11		#	#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
7	Switzerland	9.1	8.9 - 9.2	10			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
8	Norway	8.9	8.6 - 9.1	9			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
9	Australia	8.8	8.4 - 9.1	15		#	#		#	#	#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#		
10	Netherlands	8.7	8.5 - 8.9	10			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
11	United Kingdom	8.6	8.4 - 8.8	12		#	#		#	#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
12	Canada	8.5	8.1 - 8.9	12		#	#		#	#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
13	Austria	8.4	8.1 - 8.8	10			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
	Luxembourg	8.4	8.0 - 8.9	7						#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
15	Germany	8.2	8.0 - 8.5	11		#	#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
16	Hong Kong	8.0	7.1 - 8.5	13			#			#	#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#		
17	Belgium	7.5	7.1 - 8.0	10			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
	Ireland	7.5	7.2 - 7.9	10		#	#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
	USA	7.5	6.9 - 8.0	14			#		#	#	#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#		
20	Chile	7.4	7.0 - 7.8	11		#	#			#	#	#	#				#	#	#	#		
21	Barbados	7.3	6.6 - 7.6	3			#										#	#	#	#		
22	France	7.1	6.6 - 7.6	12		#	#		#	#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
	Spain	7.1	6.7 - 7.4	11		#	#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
24	Japan	6.9	6.2 - 7.4	15		#	#		#	#	#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#		
25	Malta	6.8	5.3 - 8.2	4													#	#	#	#		
26	Israel	6.4	5.6 - 7.1	10		#	#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
27	Portugal	6.3	5.8 - 6.8	9			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
28	Uruguay	6.2	5.9 - 6.7	6			#										#	#	#	#		
29	Oman	6.1	5.1 - 6.8	5		#	#		#								#	#	#	#		
	United Arab Emirates	6.1	5.1 - 7.1	5			#										#	#	#	#		
31	Botswana	6.0	5.3 - 6.8	7		#	#										#	#	#	#		
	Estonia	6.0	5.6 - 6.7	12	#	#	#	#		#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
	Slovenia	6.0	5.6 - 6.6	12	#	#	#	#		#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
34	Bahrain	5.8	5.5 - 6.2	5			#										#	#	#	#		
35	Taiwan	5.6	5.2 - 6.1	15		#	#		#	#	#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#		
36	Cyprus	5.4	5.0 - 5.8	4		#	#										#	#	#	#		
37	Jordan	5.3	4.6 - 5.9	9			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
38	Qatar	5.2	4.6 - 5.6	4			#										#	#	#	#		
39	Malaysia	5.0	4.5 - 5.6	15		#	#		#	#	#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#		
	Tunisia	5.0	4.5 - 5.6	7		#	#										#	#	#	#		
41	Costa Rica	4.9	4.2 - 5.8	8		#	#					#					#	#	#	#		
42	Hungary	4.8	4.6 - 5.0	12	#	#	#	#		#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
	Italy	4.8	4.4 - 5.1	10			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
44	Kuwait	4.6	3.8 - 5.3	5		#	#		#								#	#	#	#		
	Lithuania	4.6	4.0 - 5.4	9	#	#	#	#									#	#	#	#		
	South Africa	4.6	4.2 - 5.0	11		#	#		#	#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
47	South Korea	4.5	4.0 - 4.9	14			#			#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#		
48	Seychelles	4.4	3.7 - 5.0	3			#										#	#	#	#		
49	Greece	4.3	4.0 - 4.8	9			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
	Suriname	4.3	2.1 - 5.8	3			#										#	#	#	#		
51	Czech Republic	4.2	3.7 - 4.9	11	#		#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
	El Salvador	4.2	3.3 - 5.1	7			#				#	#					#	#	#	#		
	Trinidad and Tobago	4.2	3.6 - 5.2	6			#				#	#					#	#	#	#		
54	Bulgaria	4.1	3.7 - 4.6	10	#	#	#	#		#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
	Mauritius	4.1	3.2 - 4.8	5			#										#	#	#	#		
	Namibia	4.1	3.5 - 4.6	7		#	#										#	#	#	#		
57	Latvia	4.0	3.8 - 4.3	8	#		#										#	#	#	#		
	Slovakia	4.0	3.6 - 4.5	11	#		#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
59	Brazil	3.9	3.7 - 4.1	11		#	#			#	#	#	#				#	#	#	#		
60	Belize	3.8	3.4 - 4.1	3			#										#	#	#	#		
	Colombia	3.8	3.4 - 4.1	10			#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
62	Cuba	3.7	2.2 - 4.7	4		#	#										#	#	#	#		
	Panama	3.7	3.4 - 4.2	7		#	#										#	#	#	#		
64	Ghana	3.6	3.1 - 4.1	7		#	#				#	#					#	#	#	#		
	Mexico	3.6	3.3 - 3.8	11		#	#			#	#	#	#				#	#	#	#		
	Thailand	3.6	3.3 - 3.9	14		#	#			#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#		
67	Croatia	3.5	3.3 - 3.8	9	#		#				#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#		
	Peru	3.5	3.3 - 3.7	8		#	#				#	#					#	#	#	#		
	Poland	3.5	3.1 - 3.9	13	#	#	#	#		#	#	#	#				#	#	#	#		
	Sri Lanka	3.5	3.1 - 3.9	8		#	#			#	#	#					#	#	#	#		
71	China	3.4	3.0 - 3.8	16		#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#		
	Saudi Arabia	3.4	2.7 - 4.0	5		#	#		#								#	#	#	#		
	Syria	3.4	2.8 - 4.1	5		#	#		#								#	#	#	#		
74	Belarus	3.3	1.9 - 4.8	5	#	#	#										#	#	#	#		
	Gabon	3.3	2.1 - 3.7	3			#										#	#	#	#		
	Jamaica	3.3	2.8 - 3.7	6			#										#	#	#	#		

Country Rank	Country	CPI 2004 Score*	Confidence Range**	Surveys used***	Survey reference (for more details see table of sources)																	
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
					BEEPS 2002	CU 2003	EIU 2004	FH 2004	II 2003	IMD 2002	IMD 2003	IMD 2004	MDB 2002	MIG 2004	PERC 2002	PERC 2003	PERC 2004	TI/GI 2002	WMRC 2004	WEF 2002	WEF 2003	WEF 2004
77	Benin	3.2	2.0 - 4.3	3		#																
	Egypt	3.2	2.7 - 3.8	8		#	#		#				#	#				#	#			
	Mali	3.2	2.2 - 4.2	5		#							#					#	#			
	Morocco	3.2	2.9 - 3.5	7			#		#				#				#	#	#			
	Turkey	3.2	2.8 - 3.7	13	#	#	#		#	#	#	#	#				#	#	#			
82	Armenia	3.1	2.4 - 3.7	5	#		#						#	#				#				
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	3.1	2.7 - 3.5	7	#	#		#					#	#				#				
	Madagascar	3.1	1.8 - 4.4	4									#					#	#			
85	Mongolia	3.0	2.6 - 3.2	3		#							#					#				
	Senegal	3.0	2.5 - 3.5	6		#	#						#	#				#	#			
87	Dominican Republic	2.9	2.4 - 3.3	6			#						#					#	#			
	Iran	2.9	2.2 - 3.4	5		#	#		#				#					#	#			
	Romania	2.9	2.5 - 3.4	12	#	#	#	#		#	#	#	#				#	#	#			
90	Gambia	2.8	2.2 - 3.4	5		#												#	#			
	India	2.8	2.6 - 3.0	15		#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#			
	Malawi	2.8	2.2 - 3.7	5			#						#					#	#			
	Mozambique	2.8	2.4 - 3.1	7		#	#						#	#				#	#			
	Nepal	2.8	1.6 - 3.4	3		#							#					#				
	Russia	2.8	2.5 - 3.1	15	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#			
	Tanzania	2.8	2.4 - 3.2	7		#	#						#	#				#	#			
97	Algeria	2.7	2.3 - 3.0	6		#	#						#	#				#	#			
	Lebanon	2.7	2.1 - 3.2	5			#	#					#	#				#				
	Macedonia (FYR)	2.7	2.3 - 3.2	7	#		#	#					#					#	#			
	Nicaragua	2.7	2.5 - 3.0	7		#	#						#	#				#	#			
	Serbia and Montenegro	2.7	2.3 - 3.0	7			#	#					#	#				#	#			
102	Eritrea	2.6	1.6 - 3.4	3		#							#					#				
	Papua New Guinea	2.6	1.9 - 3.4	4		#	#						#					#				
	Philippines	2.6	2.4 - 2.9	14		#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#			
	Uganda	2.6	2.1 - 3.1	7		#	#						#	#				#	#			
	Vietnam	2.6	2.3 - 2.9	11		#	#						#	#	#	#	#	#	#			
	Zambia	2.6	2.3 - 2.9	6		#	#						#					#	#			
108	Albania	2.5	2.0 - 3.0	4	#		#						#					#				
	Argentina	2.5	2.2 - 2.8	11		#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#				#	#			
	Libya	2.5	1.9 - 3.0	4			#	#					#					#				
	Palestinian Authority	2.5	2.0 - 2.7	3			#	#					#					#				
112	Ecuador	2.4	2.3 - 2.5	7			#	#					#	#				#	#			
	Yemen	2.4	1.9 - 2.9	5		#	#	#					#	#				#	#			
114	Congo, Republic of	2.3	2.0 - 2.7	4		#	#						#					#				
	Ethiopia	2.3	1.9 - 2.9	6		#	#						#					#	#			
	Honduras	2.3	2.0 - 2.6	7		#	#						#					#	#			
	Moldova	2.3	2.0 - 2.8	5	#		#	#					#					#	#			
	Sierra Leone	2.3	2.0 - 2.7	3		#	#						#					#				
	Uzbekistan	2.3	2.1 - 2.4	6	#	#	#	#					#					#				
	Venezuela	2.3	2.2 - 2.5	11		#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#			
	Zimbabwe	2.3	1.9 - 2.7	7		#	#						#	#				#	#			
122	Bolivia	2.2	2.1 - 2.3	6			#						#					#	#			
	Guatemala	2.2	2.0 - 2.4	7		#	#						#					#	#			
	Kazakhstan	2.2	1.8 - 2.7	7	#	#	#	#					#	#				#	#			
	Kyrgyzstan	2.2	2.0 - 2.5	5	#	#	#	#					#	#				#	#			
	Niger	2.2	2.0 - 2.5	3			#						#					#				
	Sudan	2.2	2.0 - 2.3	5		#	#	#					#					#				
	Ukraine	2.2	2.0 - 2.4	10	#	#	#	#					#	#				#	#			
129	Cameroon	2.1	1.9 - 2.3	5			#						#	#				#	#			
	Iraq	2.1	1.3 - 2.8	4			#	#					#					#				
	Kenya	2.1	1.9 - 2.4	7		#	#						#	#				#	#			
	Pakistan	2.1	1.6 - 2.6	7			#	#					#	#				#	#			
133	Angola	2.0	1.7 - 2.1	5			#						#	#				#	#			
	Congo, Democratic Republic	2.0	1.5 - 2.2	3		#							#					#				
	Côte d'Ivoire	2.0	1.7 - 2.2	5		#	#						#	#				#				
	Georgia	2.0	1.6 - 2.3	7	#	#	#	#					#	#				#	#			
	Indonesia	2.0	1.7 - 2.2	14		#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#			
	Tajikistan	2.0	1.7 - 2.4	4		#		#					#					#				
	Turkmenistan	2.0	1.6 - 2.3	3			#						#					#				
140	Azerbaijan	1.9	1.8 - 2.0	7	#	#	#	#					#	#				#	#			
	Paraguay	1.9	1.7 - 2.2	7		#	#						#	#				#	#			
142	Chad	1.7	1.1 - 2.3	4			#						#					#	#			
	Myanmar	1.7	1.5 - 2.0	4		#	#						#					#	#			
144	Nigeria	1.6	1.4 - 1.8	9		#	#	#	#				#	#				#	#			
145	Bangladesh	1.5	1.1 - 1.9	8		#	#						#	#				#	#			
	Haiti	1.5	1.2 - 1.9	5		#							#					#	#			

Explanatory notes

*CPI Score relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by business people and country analysts and ranges between 10 (highly clean) and 0 (highly corrupt).

** Confidence range provides a range of possible values of the CPI score. This reflects how a country's score may vary, depending on measurement precision. Nominally, with 5 percent probability the score is above this range and with another 5 percent it is below. However, particularly when only few sources (n) are available an unbiased estimate of the mean coverage probability is lower than the nominal value of 90%.

*** Surveys used refers to the number of surveys that assessed a country's performance. 18 surveys and expert assessments were used and at least 3 were required for a country to be included in the CPI.

Frequently Asked Questions

Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2004

What is the Corruption Perceptions Index?

The TI Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 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 in expert surveys carried out by a variety of reputable institutions. It reflects the views of business people and analysts from around the world, including experts who are resident in the countries evaluated.

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 ask questions that relate to 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 or between petty and grand corruption.

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 in a country.

Is the CPI a reliable measure for decisions on aid allocation?

Some governments have begun to wonder whether it is useful to provide aid to countries perceived to be corrupt – and have sought to use corruption scores to determine which countries receive aid, and which do not.

TI does not encourage the CPI to be used in this way. Countries that are perceived as very corrupt should not be penalised for starting from a high level of corruption. They in particular need help to emerge from the corruption-poverty spiral. If a country is believed to be corrupt, but is willing to reform, this should serve as a signal to donors that investment is needed in systemic approaches to fight corruption. And if donors intend to support major development projects in corrupt countries, they should pay particular attention to corruption ‘red flags’ and make sure appropriate control processes are set up to limit graft.

Which countries are new to the CPI 2004?

The following countries are in the CPI 2004, but not the CPI 2003: Barbados, Benin, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Eritrea, Gabon, Malta, Mongolia, Nepal, Niger, Seychelles, Suriname and Turkmenistan.

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. There are almost 200 sovereign nations in the world, and the latest CPI ranks 146 of them.

Which matters more, a country’s rank or its score?

While ranking countries enables TI to build an index, a country’s score is a much more important indication of the perceived level of corruption in a country.

Can country scores in the CPI 2004 be compared with those in past CPIs?

The index primarily provides an annual snapshot of the views of business people and country analysts, with less of a focus on year-to-year trends.

If comparisons with previous years are made, they should be based only on a country’s score, not its rank. A country’s rank can change simply because new countries enter the index or 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 changes in a country’s score result not only from a changing perception of a country’s performance but also from a changing sample and methodology. Each year, some sources are not updated and must be dropped from the CPI, 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 have been asked.

Which countries' scores deteriorated most between 2003 and 2004?

Making comparisons from one year to another is problematic. However, to the extent that changes can be traced back to individual sources, while sometimes not obvious in the final overall score, trends can be cautiously identified. Noteworthy examples of a downward trend from 2003 to 2004 are Bahrain, Belize, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Oman, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, and Trinidad and Tobago. In these cases, actual changes in perceptions occurred during the last three years. In the case of the lower scores in the CPI 2004 for countries such as Belarus, Cuba, Israel, Italy, Namibia, Pakistan, Palestinian Authority and Qatar, however, the deterioration is partly due to technical factors of the CPI methodology, such as the inclusion or dropping of some surveys since last year.

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 from 2003 to 2004 for Austria, Botswana, Czech Republic, El Salvador, France, Gambia, Germany, Jordan, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, United Arab Emirates and Uruguay. In the case of the higher scores in the CPI 2004 for countries such as Cameroon, Costa Rica, Estonia, Libya, Macedonia (FYR), Madagascar, Papua New Guinea, and Serbia and Montenegro, however, the improvement is partly due to technical factors of the CPI methodology, such as the inclusion or dropping of some surveys since last year.

The CPI is ten years old. Are there any long-term trends in country scores?

To be clear, the CPI was not designed to provide for comparisons over time, since each year the surveys included in the index vary. Analysing the individual sources in the CPI that have been included over time, however, does yield some aggregate changes over time. Countries that have improved over time include Colombia, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hong Kong, Mexico and Spain; countries that have deteriorated include Argentina, Ecuador, Poland and Zimbabwe, for instance. More research on long-term trends in corruption perception levels is being carried out, and results are expected in 2005-06.

What are the sources of data for the CPI?

The CPI 2004 draws on 18 different polls and surveys from 12 independent institutions. TI strives to ensure that the sources used are of the highest quality and that the survey work is performed with complete integrity. To qualify, the data has to be well documented, and it has to be sufficient to permit a judgment on its reliability.

Since fundamental changes in the levels of corruption in a country evolve only slowly, TI opted to base the CPI on a three-year rolling average. The CPI 2004 is based on surveys provided between 2002 and 2004.

For a full list and details on questions asked, number of respondents and coverage of the 18 polls and surveys included in the CPI 2004, please see www.transparency.org/surveys/#cpi or www.icgg.org

Whose opinion is polled by these surveys?

Surveys are carried out among business people and country analysts, including surveys of residents of the countries in question. It is important to note that residents' viewpoints are found to correlate well with those of experts from abroad.

In the past, the experts surveyed in the CPI sources were often business people from northern, industrialised countries; the viewpoint of less developed countries was 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 industrialised countries. A related approach was carried out by Information International. The results from these surveys correlate well with other sources. In sum, the CPI gathers perceptions that are broadly based, not biased by cultural preconditions, and not only generated by US and European experts.

How is the index itself computed?

TI has made considerable efforts to ensure that the methodologies used to analyse the data are of the highest quality. A detailed description of the underlying methodology is available at www.transparency.org/surveys/#cpi or at www.icgg.org.

The CPI 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. The statistical work on the CPI is orchestrated at the University of Passau under the leadership of Prof. Dr. Johann Graf Lambsdorff.

Further frequently asked questions on the Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2004, together with the framework document (on the methodology), are available at www.transparency.org/surveys/#cpi

Sources for the Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2004

Number	1		2		3	
Abbreviation	BEEPS		CU		EIU	
Source	World Bank and the EBRD		Columbia University, The Center for International Earth Science Information Network		Economist Intelligence Unit	
Name	Business Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey		State Capacity Survey		Country Risk Service and Country Forecast	
Year	2002		2003		2004	
Internet address	info.worldbank.org/governance/beeps2002/		http://www.ciesin.org/		www.eiu.com	
Who was surveyed?	Senior businesspeople		US-resident country experts (policy analysts, academics and journalists)		Expert staff assessment	
Subject asked	Frequency of irregular additional payments; how problematic is corruption for business?		Severity of corruption within the state		The misuse of public office for private (or political party) gain	
Number of replies	6,500		224		Not applicable	
Coverage	25 transition countries		95 countries		142 countries	
Number	4		5			
Abbreviation	FH		II			
Source	Freedom House		Information International			
Name	Nations in Transit		Survey of Middle Eastern Businesspeople			
Year	2004		2003			
Internet address	www.freedomhouse.org/research/nattransit.htm		www.information-international.com			
Who was surveyed?	Assessment by US, regional, and in-country experts		Senior businesspeople from Bahrain, Lebanon and United Arab Emirates			
Subject asked	Extent of corruption as practised in governments, as perceived by the public and as reported in the media, as well as the implementation of anti-corruption initiatives		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?			
Number of replies	Not applicable		382 assessments from 165 respondents			
Coverage	28 countries/territories		31 countries			
Number	6		7		8	
Abbreviation			IMD			
Source			International Institute for Management Development, Lausanne, Switzerland			
Name			World Competitiveness Yearbook			
Year	2002		2003		2004	
Internet address			www.imd.ch			
Who was surveyed?			Executives in top and middle management; domestic and international companies			
Subject asked			Existence of bribery and corruption in the economy			
Number of replies	3,532		> 4,000		4,166	
Coverage	49 countries		51 countries			
Number	9		10			
Abbreviation	MDB		MIG			
Source	A multilateral development bank		Merchant International Group			
Name	Survey		Grey Area Dynamics			
Year	2002		2004			
Internet address			www.merchantinternational.com			
Who was surveyed?	Experts within the bank were identified, and multiple questionnaires (each relating to a different country) were sent out to them. Roughly 40% of the questionnaires were returned.		Expert staff and network of local correspondents			
Subject asked	How widespread is the incidence of corruption?		Corruption, ranging from bribery of government ministers to inducements payable to the "humblest clerk"			
Number of replies	398		Not applicable			
Coverage	47 countries		155 countries			
Number	11		12		13	
Abbreviation			PERC			
Source			Political & Economic Risk Consultancy			
Name			Asian Intelligence Newsletter			
Year	2002		2003		2004	
Internet address			www.asiarisk.com/			
Who was surveyed?			Expatriate business executives			
Subject asked			How bad do you consider the problem of corruption to be in the country in which you are working as well as in your home country?			
Number of replies	More than 1,000		More than 1,000		More than 1,000	
Coverage			14 countries			
Number	14		15			
Abbreviation	TI/GI		WMRC			
Source	Gallup International on behalf of Transparency International		World Markets Research Centre			
Name	Corruption survey		Risk Ratings			
Year	2002		2004			
Internet address	www.transparency.org/surveys/#bpi		www.wmrc.com			
Who was surveyed?	Senior businesspeople from 15 emerging market economies		Expert staff assessment			
Subject asked	How common are bribes to politicians, senior civil servants and judges, and how significant an obstacle to doing business are the costs associated with such payments?		The likelihood of encountering corrupt officials, ranging from petty bureaucratic corruption to grand political corruption			
Number of replies	835		Not applicable			
Coverage	21 countries		186 countries			
Number	16		17		18	
Abbreviation			WEF			
Source			World Economic Forum			
Name			Global Competitiveness Report			
Year	2002		2003		2004	
Internet address			www.weforum.org			
Who was surveyed?			Senior business leaders; domestic and international companies			
Subject asked			Undocumented extra payments connected with various government functions			
Number of replies	ca 4,600		7,741		8,700	
Coverage	76 countries		102 countries		104 countries	