

Council of Europe

PACO Impact Project

Regional Activity

Belgrade

18-19 November 2005

V. Devine



Objectives

Discussion on:

- How to measure success and impact of anti-corruption agencies?
- How to measure success and impact of anti-corruption policies?

Discussing Indicators

- New area + no corpus of literature/research available to define what could be indicators of success of anti-corruption agencies
- recent comparative work on “Measuring ‘success’ in five African Anti-corruption Commissions” by A. Doig, D. Watt + R. Williams at www.u4.no
- Also “From the Ground Up – Assessing the Record of Anti-corruption Assistance in Southeastern Europe” by M. Tisné and D. Smilov at <http://cps.ceu.hu/polstud.php>

Discussing Indicators

Consensus on:

- The need to measure impact and success
- The omission to build in appropriate measurement tools into program and project design, and into new institutions (ACC)

Lack of consensus on:

- How to measure?
- What to measure (what are meaningful indicators)?

Context

- Countries have undertaken multitude of anti-corruption reforms
- Countries have established specialized anti-corruption services/bodies
- Yet, available indicators on corruption show little improvement, if any

Transparency International's CPI for the Western Balkans

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Albania	N.A.	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4
Bosnia and Herzegovina	N.A.	N.A.	3.3	3.1	2.9
Croatia	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.4
FYROM	N.A.	N.A.	2.3	2.7	2.7
Serbia and Montenegro	N.A.	N.A.	2.3	2.7	2.8
Bulgaria	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.0
Moldova	3.1	2.1	2.4	2.3	2.9
Romania	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.9	3.0
Slovenia	5.2	6.0	5.9	6.6	6.1

Freedom House Corruption Index

	The Balkans					
	1999-2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Albania	6.00	5.50	5.25	5.00	5.25	5.25
Bosnia	6.00	5.75	5.50	5.00	4.75	4.50
Bulgaria	4.75	4.75	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.00
Croatia	5.25	4.50	4.50	4.75	4.75	4.75
Macedonia	5.00	5.00	5.50	5.50	5.00	5.00
Romania	4.25	4.50	4.75	4.50	4.50	4.25
Yugoslavia	6.25	6.25	5.25	5.00	n/a	n/a
Serbia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.00	5.00
Montenegro	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.25	5.25
Kosovo	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	6.00	6.00

EBRD Transition Report 2005

[...] corruption is on the decline in most of the former communist states of Eastern Europe and Central Asia according to a survey published yesterday. But the poll carried out jointly by the EBRD and the World Bank finds that corruption has worsened in the last three years in nine states, notably in Russia, the region's largest economy. The other eight countries where corruption levels have risen are the Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Serbia, Lithuania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Kyrgyzstan. The authors surveyed the opinions of 8,000 companies in the region and compared the results with those of a similar poll in 2002. Overall, business conditions in the region have improved significantly over the past three years. Fewer companies reported problems in dealing with the courts, crime, corruption, customs and trade rules, permits, labor regulations and tax.

Source: Press clippings on the launch of the 2005 Transition Report 2005 on 14 November 2005 at http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/NEWS/0,,date:2005-11-15~menuPK:34461~pagePK:34392~piPK:64256810~theSitePK:4607_00.html#Story2

Discussing Indicators

Some important questions (in no particular order):

- Based on this data – is it possibly the case that no matter how effective anti-corruption services are, corruption will always grow quicker and there is little that can be done?
- When and based on what can we say that an Anti-corruption Agency is effective - or ineffective?
- Does an increase - or no change - in the levels of corruption indicate that the Anti-corruption Agency is not effective?
- What do indicators tell us about causes and effects?
- How do we look at corruption? As a static, passive phenomenon, or as a 'sponge', taking different forms and shapes?

Case Studies

Imagine you are an international consulting firm. The government of country X, which is concerned by its low ratings in international corruption surveys (saying that corruption has reached endemic proportions i.e. is affecting all sectors of society) and which is subject to pressure from donors to do something about corruption, is contemplating to establish an anti-corruption agency to remedy this situation. The government hires you to help them set up the agency. It provides initial funding, but future funding will be dependent upon the agency proving that every program or activity they come up with is effective in reducing corruption in some way, and that the service has a range of programs targeting all serious forms of corruption.

With the mandate and experience of your own AC Service in mind, what program goals and outcomes would you propose to the AC Service-to-be of country X in order to contribute to the overall objective of reducing corruption, and for each program, develop one or more indicators that would show whether the program was effective. Consider both direct outputs, outcomes and objectives and outputs with indirect or proxy outcomes and objectives; what strategies would you employ to capture the indirect outcomes and objectives?

Case Studies

You are being asked to develop indicators to measure the success of the recently adopted Anti-corruption Law of your country.

Think about issues that can be identified (directly and indirectly) and issues that cannot be identified that give you an idea about the impact of the law.

For those issues that can not be identified, what type of project would you put in place to capture the impact nonetheless?

Discussing Indicators

a) Output, direct (measurable) outcomes and objectives

Training of prosecutors = output → Increase of prosecutions = outcome → Strengthening legal framework to fight corruption deterring potential wrongdoing and decreasing levels of corruption (objective)

b) Output, indirect (measurable only through proxy) outcomes and objectives

Public awareness campaign = output → Raised awareness = outcome → Less tolerance of citizens vis-à-vis corruption and fewer citizens engaging in it, thereby reducing levels of corruption (objective)

Summing up

Some of the main points:

- Review how realistic the mission statement of Anti-corruption Agencies are, against resources available, organizational infrastructure, skills and capacities of staff, the scale of the problem
- Then develop performance indicators for this realistic set of tasks
- Measuring corruption – and decrease or increase – requires a long-term perspective, very specialized skills, and funding
- Build impact assessment into policy design
- Beware of simplistic approaches – need for a combination of indicators to arrive at realistic picture