

Media Contact: John Devitt
Tel: +353 86 1750 40, Email info@transparency.ie
Website: www.transparency.ie

Global perceptions show Ireland must do more to prevent corruption, says Transparency International

Dublin, October 18 2005 – Transparency International Ireland (TI Ireland) has urged the Government to commit itself to taking further action to prevent corruption both at home and abroad. The anti-corruption group has also called on Ireland to ratify the United Nations Convention on Corruption as it announced the details of this year's Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) today.

The CPI measures perceptions of business people and country analysts towards levels of corruption around the world. Ireland is placed 19th out of 159 countries with a score of 7.4 out of 10. A score close to 10 indicates that a country is perceived to be "highly clean" and the higher a country is placed on the index, the less corrupt it is believed to be. The lower the score, the more likely a country is to be believed to suffer from high levels of corruption.

While Ireland's score is relatively high in international terms, it falls well short of the scores allocated to its northern European neighbours. Iceland is perceived to be the "least corrupt country" with a score of 9.7 and is closely followed by Finland on 9.6 out of 10. The United Kingdom also scores highly with 8.6 out of 10.

Ireland's score and ranking has slipped from a high of 8.57 and 11th least corrupt country in 1995. According to John Devitt, acting chief executive of TI Ireland, the sobering decline in Ireland's international standing should provide the impetus for reform: "it could be time for the government to look again at the high cost of appeals to the Information Commissioner and lack of legal safeguards for whistleblowers. Both will have a long term effect on Ireland's global reputation".

Ireland's ratification of the United Nations Convention on Corruption which is designed to combat bribery, embezzlement and money laundering worldwide would also "be a clear signal of Ireland's commitment to fighting corruption both at home and abroad." added Mr Devitt.

TI Ireland will launch a National Integrity System study of Ireland in 2006. The NIS study will provide the first in-depth assessment of the ability of Irish laws and institutions to prevent corruption. The NIS study should also provide a clearer picture of what further reforms may be needed to prevent corruption and enhance Ireland's international reputation.

The Irish chapter of TI was launched last December. Its board includes people from the world of business, civil society and politics, including Garret FitzGerald, Tom Arnold of Concern and economist Colm McCarthy. The NGO will not investigate corruption but plans to undertake anti-corruption research and lobby government on legal and institutional reform.

TI Ireland is currently funded by membership and the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, a UK based philanthropic group which donated €60,000 for the set up of the Irish chapter of TI in 2004.

TI Ireland launched Ireland's first corruption and governance journal, TIQ Ireland, in July. TIQ Ireland, TI's Daily Corruption News, the Global Corruption Report and details of this year's and past Corruption Perceptions Indexes are available at www.transparency.ie.

Ends –

Notes including CPI tables, explanatory notes and FAQs from page 2 to 11.

Notes

Transparency International, founded in 1993, is the civil society organisation leading the fight against corruption. TI, currently with 90 national chapters around the world, has its International Secretariat in Berlin, Germany. For more information on TI Ireland visit www.transparency.ie. Further information on TI, its national chapters and its work, is available at www.transparency.org

Ireland's ranking and score on the Corruption Perceptions Index 1995 to 2005

Year	95	96	97	98	99	00	01	02	03	04	05
Ranking	11	11	12	14	15	19	18	23	18	17	19
Score	8.57	8.45	8.28	8.2	7.7	7.2	7.5	6.9	7.5	7.5	7.4
No. of Countries	41	54	52	85	99	90	91	102	133	145	159
Surveys Used	6	6	6	10	10	8	7	8	9	10	10

Surveys used in compiling Ireland's score

Columbia University asks its panel of experts to rate the severity of overall corruption within the state on the following scale: Low; Low/Modest; Modest; Modest/Severe; Severe.

Economist Intelligence Unit asks its panel of expert to assess the incidence of corruption and defines corruption as the misuse of public office for personal (or party political) financial gain. Integers between 0 (denoting a "very low" incidence of corruption) and 4 (denoting a "very high" incidence) are provided.

International Institute for Management Development, Lausanne (2003 – 2005) surveys elite businesspeople and asks them to assess whether "bribing and corruption prevail or do not prevail in the economy."

Merchant International Group asks its panel of correspondents assess levels of corruption. Corruption in their definition ranges from bribery of government ministers to inducements payable to the "humblest clerk".

The **World Economic Forum (2003 – 2005)** asks: "In your industry, how commonly would you estimate that firms make undocumented extra payments or bribes connected with:"

- 1 – exports and imports
- 2 - public utilities (e.g. telephone or electricity)
- 3 - annual tax payments
- 4 – public contracts
- 5 - loan applications
- 6 - influencing laws and policies, regulations, or decrees to favor selected business interests?
- 7 – getting favorable judicial decisions

The simple average has been determined from these questions.

World Market Research Centre provides an assessment of the likelihood of encountering corrupt officials. Corruption can range from petty bureaucratic corruption (such as the paying of bribes to low-level officials) right through to grand political corruption (such as the paying of large kick-backs in return for the awarding of contracts).

Corruption Perceptions Index 2005

Country Rank	Country/territory	2005 CPI Score*	Confidence range**	Surveys Used***
1	Iceland	9.7	9.5 - 9.7	8
2	Finland	9.6	9.5 - 9.7	9
	New Zealand	9.6	9.5 - 9.7	9
4	Denmark	9.5	9.3 - 9.6	10
5	Singapore	9.4	9.3 - 9.5	12
6	Sweden	9.2	9.0 - 9.3	10
7	Switzerland	9.1	8.9 - 9.2	9
8	Norway	8.9	8.5 - 9.1	9
9	Australia	8.8	8.4 - 9.1	13
10	Austria	8.7	8.4 - 9.0	9
11	Netherlands	8.6	8.3 - 8.9	9
	United Kingdom	8.6	8.3 - 8.8	11
13	Luxembourg	8.5	8.1 - 8.9	8
14	Canada	8.4	7.9 - 8.8	11
15	Hong Kong	8.3	7.7 - 8.7	12
16	Germany	8.2	7.9 - 8.5	10
17	USA	7.6	7.0 - 8.0	12
18	France	7.5	7.0 - 7.8	11
19	Belgium	7.4	6.9 - 7.9	9
	Ireland	7.4	6.9 - 7.9	10
21	Chile	7.3	6.8 - 7.7	10
	Japan	7.3	6.7 - 7.8	14
23	Spain	7.0	6.6 - 7.4	10
24	Barbados	6.9	5.7 - 7.3	3
25	Malta	6.6	5.4 - 7.7	5
26	Portugal	6.5	5.9 - 7.1	9
27	Estonia	6.4	6.0 - 7.0	11
28	Israel	6.3	5.7 - 6.9	10
	Oman	6.3	5.2 - 7.3	5
30	United Arab Emirates	6.2	5.3 - 7.1	6
31	Slovenia	6.1	5.7 - 6.8	11
32	Botswana	5.9	5.1 - 6.7	8
	Qatar	5.9	5.6 - 6.4	5
	Taiwan	5.9	5.4 - 6.3	14
	Uruguay	5.9	5.6 - 6.4	6
36	Bahrain	5.8	5.3 - 6.3	6
37	Cyprus	5.7	5.3 - 6.0	5
	Jordan	5.7	5.1 - 6.1	10
39	Malaysia	5.1	4.6 - 5.6	14
40	Hungary	5.0	4.7 - 5.2	11
	Italy	5.0	4.6 - 5.4	9
	South Korea	5.0	4.6 - 5.3	12
43	Tunisia	4.9	4.4 - 5.6	7
44	Lithuania	4.8	4.5 - 5.1	8
45	Kuwait	4.7	4.0 - 5.2	6
46	South Africa	4.5	4.2 - 4.8	11
47	Czech Republic	4.3	3.7 - 5.1	10
	Greece	4.3	3.9 - 4.7	9
	Namibia	4.3	3.8 - 4.9	8
	Slovakia	4.3	3.8 - 4.8	10
51	Costa Rica	4.2	3.7 - 4.7	7
	El Salvador	4.2	3.5 - 4.8	6
	Latvia	4.2	3.8 - 4.6	7
	Mauritius	4.2	3.4 - 5.0	6
55	Bulgaria	4.0	3.4 - 4.6	8
	Colombia	4.0	3.6 - 4.4	9

	Fiji	4.0	3.4 - 4.6	3
	Seychelles	4.0	3.5 - 4.2	3
59	Cuba	3.8	2.3 - 4.7	4
	Thailand	3.8	3.5 - 4.1	13
	Trinidad and Tobago	3.8	3.3 - 4.5	6
62	Belize	3.7	3.4 - 4.1	3
	Brazil	3.7	3.5 - 3.9	10
64	Jamaica	3.6	3.4 - 3.8	6
65	Ghana	3.5	3.2 - 4.0	8
	Mexico	3.5	3.3 - 3.7	10
	Panama	3.5	3.1 - 4.1	7
	Peru	3.5	3.1 - 3.8	7
	Turkey	3.5	3.1 - 4.0	11
70	Burkina Faso	3.4	2.7 - 3.9	3
	Croatia	3.4	3.2 - 3.7	7
	Egypt	3.4	3.0 - 3.9	9
	Lesotho	3.4	2.6 - 3.9	3
	Poland	3.4	3.0 - 3.9	11
	Saudi Arabia	3.4	2.7 - 4.1	5
	Syria	3.4	2.8 - 4.2	5
77	Laos	3.3	2.1 - 4.4	3
78	China	3.2	2.9 - 3.5	14
	Morocco	3.2	2.8 - 3.6	8
	Senegal	3.2	2.8 - 3.6	6

78	Sri Lanka	3.2	2.7 - 3.6	7
	Suriname	3.2	2.2 - 3.6	3
83	Lebanon	3.1	2.7 - 3.3	4
	Rwanda	3.1	2.1 - 4.1	3
85	Dominican Republic	3.0	2.5 - 3.6	6
	Mongolia	3.0	2.4 - 3.6	4
	Romania	3.0	2.6 - 3.5	11
88	Armenia	2.9	2.5 - 3.2	4
	Benin	2.9	2.1 - 4.0	5
	Bosnia and Herzegovina	2.9	2.7 - 3.1	6
	Gabon	2.9	2.1 - 3.6	4
	India	2.9	2.7 - 3.1	14
	Iran	2.9	2.3 - 3.3	5
	Mali	2.9	2.3 - 3.6	8
	Moldova	2.9	2.3 - 3.7	5
	Tanzania	2.9	2.6 - 3.1	8
	97	Algeria	2.8	2.5 - 3.3
Argentina		2.8	2.5 - 3.1	10
Madagascar		2.8	1.9 - 3.7	5
Malawi		2.8	2.3 - 3.4	7
Mozambique		2.8	2.4 - 3.1	8
Serbia and Montenegro		2.8	2.5 - 3.3	7
103	Gambia	2.7	2.3 - 3.1	7
	Macedonia	2.7	2.4 - 3.2	7
	Swaziland	2.7	2.0 - 3.1	3
	Yemen	2.7	2.4 - 3.2	5
107	Belarus	2.6	1.9 - 3.8	5
	Eritrea	2.6	1.7 - 3.5	3
	Honduras	2.6	2.2 - 3.0	7
	Kazakhstan	2.6	2.2 - 3.2	6
	Nicaragua	2.6	2.4 - 2.8	7
	Palestine	2.6	2.1 - 2.8	3
	Ukraine	2.6	2.4 - 2.8	8
	Vietnam	2.6	2.3 - 2.9	10
Zambia	2.6	2.3 - 2.9	7	

	Zimbabwe	2.6	2.1 - 3.0	7
117	Afghanistan	2.5	1.6 - 3.2	3
	Bolivia	2.5	2.3 - 2.9	6
	Ecuador	2.5	2.2 - 2.9	6
	Guatemala	2.5	2.1 - 2.8	7
	Guyana	2.5	2.0 - 2.7	3
	Libya	2.5	2.0 - 3.0	4
	Nepal	2.5	1.9 - 3.0	4
	Philippines	2.5	2.3 - 2.8	13
	Uganda	2.5	2.2 - 2.8	8
126	Albania	2.4	2.1 - 2.7	3
	Niger	2.4	2.2 - 2.6	4
	Russia	2.4	2.3 - 2.6	12
	Sierra Leone	2.4	2.1 - 2.7	3
130	Burundi	2.3	2.1 - 2.5	3
	Cambodia	2.3	1.9 - 2.5	4
	Congo, Republic	2.3	2.1 - 2.6	4
	Georgia	2.3	2.0 - 2.6	6
	Kyrgyzstan	2.3	2.1 - 2.5	5
	Papua New Guinea	2.3	1.9 - 2.6	4
	Venezuela	2.3	2.2 - 2.4	10
137	Azerbaijan	2.2	1.9 - 2.5	6
	Cameroon	2.2	2.0 - 2.5	6
	Ethiopia	2.2	2.0 - 2.5	8
	Indonesia	2.2	2.1 - 2.5	13
	Iraq	2.2	1.5 - 2.9	4
	Liberia	2.2	2.1 - 2.3	3
	Uzbekistan	2.2	2.1 - 2.4	5
144	Congo, Democratic Republic	2.1	1.8 - 2.3	4
	Kenya	2.1	1.8 - 2.4	8
	Pakistan	2.1	1.7 - 2.6	7
	Paraguay	2.1	1.9 - 2.3	7
	Somalia	2.1	1.6 - 2.2	3
	Sudan	2.1	1.9 - 2.2	5
	Tajikistan	2.1	1.9 - 2.4	5
151	Angola	2.0	1.8 - 2.1	5
152	Cote d'Ivoire	1.9	1.7 - 2.1	4
	Equatorial Guinea	1.9	1.6 - 2.1	3
	Nigeria	1.9	1.7 - 2.0	9
155	Haiti	1.8	1.5 - 2.1	4
	Myanmar	1.8	1.7 - 2.0	4
	Turkmenistan	1.8	1.7 - 2.0	4
158	Bangladesh	1.7	1.4 - 2.0	7
	Chad	1.7	1.3 - 2.1	6

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 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. 16 surveys and expert assessments were used and at least 3 were required for a country to be included in the CPI.

Transparency International commissioned Prof. Dr J. Graf Lambsdorff of the University of Passau to produce the CPI table. For information on data and methodology, please consult the frequently asked questions and the CPI methodology: www.transparency.org/surveys/#cpi or www.icgg.org

Sources for the Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2005

Number	1	2	3	4
Abbreviation	CU	EIU	FH	II
Source	Columbia University, The Center for International Earth Science Information Network	Economist Intelligence Unit	Freedom House	Information International
Name	State Capacity Survey	Country Risk Service and Country Forecast	Nations in Transit	Survey of Middle Eastern Businesspeople
Year	2003	2005	2005	2003
Internet	http://www.ciesin.org/	www.eiu.com	http://www.freedomhouse.org/research/nattransit.htm	www.information-international.com
Who was surveyed?	US-resident country experts (policy analysts, academics and journalists)	Expert staff assessment	Assessment by US, regional, and in-country experts	Senior businesspeople from Bahrain, Lebanon and UAE
Subject asked	Severity of corruption within the state	The misuse of public office for private (or political party) gain	Extent of corruption as practiced in governments, as perceived by the public and as reported in the media, as well as the implementation of anticorruption 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	224	Not applicable	Not applicable	382 assessments from 165 respondents
Coverage	95 countries	156 countries	29 countries/territories	31 countries
Number	5	6	7	8
Abbreviation	IMD			MIG
Source	International Institute for Management Development, Lausanne, Switzerland			Merchant International Group
Name	World Competitiveness Yearbook			Grey Area Dynamics
Year	2003	2004	2005	2005
Internet	www.imd.ch			www.merchantinternational.com
Who was surveyed?	Executives in top and middle management; domestic and international companies			Expert staff and network of local correspondents
Subject asked	Bribery and corruption in the economy			Corruption, ranging from bribery of government ministers to inducements payable to the "humblest clerk"
Number of replies	> 4,000	4166	Roughly 4000	Not applicable
Coverage	51 countries			155 countries
Number	9	10	11	12
Abbreviation	PERC			UNECA
Source	Political & Economic Risk Consultancy			United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
Name	Asian Intelligence Newsletter			Africa Governance Report
Year	2003	2004	2005	2005
Internet	www.asiarisk.com/			http://www.uneca.org/agr/
Who was surveyed?	Expatriate business executives			National expert survey (between 70 and 120 in each country)
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?			"Corruption Control". This includes aspects related to corruption in the legislature, judiciary, and at the executive level, as well as in tax collection. Aspects of access to justice and government services are also involved
Number of replies	More than 1,000	More than 1,000	More than 1,000	Roughly 2800

Coverage	14 countries		12 countries	28 countries
Number	13	14	15	16
Abbreviation	WEF			WMRC
Source	World Economic Forum			World Markets Research Centre
Name	Global Competitiveness Report			Risk Ratings
Year	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2005
Internet	www.weforum.org			www.wmrc.com
Who was surveyed?	Senior business leaders; domestic and international companies			Expert staff assessment
Subject asked	Undocumented extra payments or bribes connected with various government functions			The likelihood of encountering corrupt officials, ranging from petty bureaucratic corruption to grand political corruption
Number of replies	7,741	8,700	10,993	Not applicable
Coverage	102 countries	104 countries	117 countries	186 countries

Frequently Asked Questions

Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2005

1. What is the Corruption Perceptions Index?
2. For the purpose of the CPI, how is corruption defined?
3. Why is the CPI based only on perceptions?
4. Is the CPI a reliable measure of a country's perceived level of corruption?
5. Is the CPI a reliable measure for decisions on aid allocation?
6. How many countries are included in the CPI 2005?
7. Which countries are new to the CPI 2005?
8. Is it right to conclude that the country with the lowest score is the world's most corrupt country?
9. Which matters more, a country's rank or its score?
10. Can country scores in the CPI 2005 be compared to those in past CPIs?
11. Why isn't there a greater change in my country's score, given the strength (or: lack of) anti-corruption reform, or given recent exposure of corruption scandals?
12. Which countries' scores deteriorated most between 2004 and 2005?
13. Which countries' scores improved most?
14. The CPI is more than ten years old. Are there any long term trends in country scores?
15. What are the sources of data for the CPI?
16. Whose opinion is polled by these surveys?
17. Why include expert surveys, but not public opinion surveys?
18. How is the index itself computed?
19. Which countries might be included in future CPIs?

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

21. What is the difference between the CPI and TI's Bribe Payers Index (BPI)?

1. 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 locals in the countries evaluated.

2. 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.

3. Why is the CPI based only on perceptions?

It is difficult to assess the levels of corruption in different countries based 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 draw on the experience and perceptions of those who are most directly confronted with the realities of corruption in a country.

4. Is the CPI 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 evaluations provided by the sources (indicated by a wider confidence range) convey less reliability as to their score and ranking.

5. 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 can not be written off – it is particularly they who need help to emerge from the corruption-poverty spiral. If a country is believed to be corrupt, 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 countries perceived to be corrupt, they should pay particular attention to 'red flags' and make sure appropriate control processes are set up.

6. How many countries are included in the CPI?

The CPI 2005 ranks 159 countries. TI requires at least three sources to be available in order to rank a country in the CPI. In 2004, the CPI included only 146 countries. The increase in coverage relates to the fact that a new source has been included.

7. Which countries are new in the CPI 2005?

The following countries are included in the CPI 2005, but were not in the CPI 2004: Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Guyana, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Rwanda, Somalia, and Swaziland.

8. 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 where corruption is perceived to be the highest among those included in the list. Moreover, there are more than 200 sovereign nations in the world, and the latest CPI ranks 159 of them.

9. 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.

10. Can country scores in the CPI 2005 be compared to those in past CPIs?

The index primarily provides a 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 only be based 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 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.

11. Why isn't there a greater change in a particular country's score, given the strength or lack of anti-corruption reform, or recent exposure of corruption scandals?

It is difficult to improve a CPI score over a short time period. The CPI is based on data from the past three years (for more on this, see question 15 on the **sources of data**, below). This means that a change in perceptions of corruption would only emerge in the index over longer periods of time. In addition, in those cases where government and/or others have made substantial efforts to combat corruption, with demonstrable results, and where there is no improvement in a CPI score, there is the possibility that these efforts – however successful – have not been adequately communicated.

12. Which countries' scores deteriorated most between 2004 and 2005?

Making comparisons from one year to another is problematic. However, to the extent that changes can be traced back to individual sources, trends can be cautiously identified. Noteworthy examples of a downward trend from 2004 to 2005 are Barbados, Belarus, Costa Rica, Gabon, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Russia, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Trinidad & Tobago and Uruguay. In these cases, actual changes in perceptions occurred during the last three years.

13. 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 2004 to 2005 for Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Estonia, France, Guatemala, Honduras, Hong Kong, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan,

Lebanon, Moldova, Nigeria, Qatar, Slovakia, South Korea, Taiwan, Turkey, Ukraine and Yemen.

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

The CPI was not designed to provide comparisons over time, since year-to-year changes on a country's score are the result not only of changes in perceptions of a country's performance, but of changes in survey samples and methodology and alterations in the list of sources that constitute the index. Nevertheless, analysis of the CPI and its component data, conducted by Prof. Dr. Johann Graf Lambsdorff in 2005, provides initial findings related to country trends in almost 60 countries over the period 1995-2005. For further detail see J. Graf Lambsdorff, 'Determining Trends for Perceived Levels of Corruption', Passau University Discussion Paper, V-38-06, 2005.

15. What are the sources of data for the CPI?

The CPI 2005 draws on 16 different polls and surveys from 10 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 must be well documented and sufficient to permit a judgment on its reliability.

Data for the CPI has been provided to TI free of charge, on a non-disclosure basis. The institutions who provided data for the CPI 2005 are: Columbia University, Economist Intelligence Unit, Freedom House, Information International, International Institute for Management Development, Merchant International Group, Political and Economic Risk Consultancy, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, World Economic Forum and World Markets Research Centre.

For a full list and details on questions asked, number of respondents and coverage of the 16 polls and surveys included in the CPI 2005, please see the CPI methodology at <http://www.transparency.org/surveys/index.html#cpi> or <http://www.ICGG.org>

16. Whose opinion is polled by these surveys?

Surveys are carried out among business people and country analysts, including surveys of residents of countries.

It is important to note that residents' viewpoints correlate well with those of experts abroad. In the past, the experts surveyed in the CPI sources were often business people from industrialised countries; the viewpoint of less developed countries was underrepresented. This has changed over time, giving increasingly voice to respondents from emerging market economies. In sum, the CPI gathers perceptions that are broadly based, not biased by cultural preconditions, and not generated just by American and European experts.

17. Why include expert surveys, but not public opinion surveys?

The CPI used to include public opinion surveys. When these surveys dropped out of the index because they were more than three years old, TI decided to focus the CPI exclusively on expert opinion on corruption. The reason for this is that while the surveys themselves don't distinguish between types of corruption, it was felt that business experts are better qualified than the public at large to comment accurately on grand corruption. The general public is assumed to be more familiar with the burden (or absence) of petty corruption within a country.

TI is interested in public assessments of the levels of corruption – particularly as a way to benchmark progress in the fight against graft. To this end, TI has developed another tool, the Global Corruption Barometer, to evaluate public sentiment on and experience with corruption (see question 20 on the **difference between the CPI and the Global Corruption Barometer**, below).

18. How is the index itself computed?

A detailed and a short description of the underlying methodology is available at <http://www.transparency.org/surveys/index.html#cpi> or at www.ICGG.org.

TI has made considerable efforts to ensure that the methodologies used to analyse the data are of the highest quality. The CPI methodology 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.

19. Which countries might be included in future CPIs?

Countries with two sets of data are: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bermuda, Bhutan, Cayman Islands, Central African Republic, Dominica, East Timor, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Macau, Mauritania, North Korea, Puerto Rico and Togo. For all of the above countries, at least one more set of data is necessary for inclusion in the CPI.

Countries with only one set of data are: Andorra, Anguilla, Aruba, Brunei, Cape Verde, Comoros, Djibouti, French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Liechtenstein, Maldives, Martinique, Netherlands Antilles, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, St. Kitts & Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines and Virgin Islands (US). For all of the above countries, at least two more sets of data are necessary for inclusion in the CPI.

20. What is the difference between the CPI and TI's Global Corruption Barometer?

The CPI assesses the perception of levels of corruption across countries, while the Global Corruption Barometer (see <http://www.transparency.org/surveys/index.html#barometer>) is concerned with attitudes toward and experiences of corruption among the general public. Over time, the Global Corruption Barometer, which was first published in 2003, will provide an indicator of the impact of the fight against corruption within countries.

21. What is the difference between the CPI and TI's Bribe Payers Index (BPI)?

While the CPI indicates overall levels of corruption in countries, the BPI focuses on the propensity of firms in leading export countries to bribe abroad – creating the 'supply side' of corruption. The BPI underlines the point that corruption in international business transactions involves those who give as well as those who take, and the BPI is therefore a complement to the CPI. The most recent Bribe Payers Index was published in May 2002 and can be found under: <http://www.transparency.org/surveys/index.html#bpi>.

Further frequently asked questions on the Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2005, together with the CPI methodology, are available at www.transparency.org/surveys/#cpi