

Expert Workshop on National Integrity Systems
12 IACC Guatemala City, Guatemala
November 2006

Marianne Camerer
Co-founder, International Director, Global Integrity
www.globalintegrity.org

In this panel discussion we have been asked to focus on the following:

1. Global Integrity's approach to assessing integrity, and
2. How Global Integrity's findings have been used.

Introduction

First let me start with a brief introduction to Global Integrity and our mission.

Global Integrity is a Washington, D.C.-based international nonprofit organization dedicated to the comprehensive and timely research and reporting of governance and corruption trends around the world. Global Integrity was created recognizing the international community's need for a trustworthy source of unbiased information on corruption and governance produced by an entity without partisan, ideological, or financial interest or agendas and based on a robust methodology that is accepted by the governance, development, and business communities as a reliable tool for quantitatively and qualitatively gauging government accountability and openness. Global Integrity produces the Global Integrity Index, a balanced assessment of diverse countries with more than 290 indicators of openness, governance, and anti-corruption mechanisms. Further, Global Integrity hopes to provide global citizens, including the public, the private sector, non-governmental organizations and governments, with an innovative set of accessible information tools to understand and analyze governance trends in a globalized world.

In September 2005 Global Integrity (www.globalintegrity.org) spun off as a separate international NGO from the Center for Public Integrity. Just over a year old as an organization, the idea behind Global Integrity - to devise a unique methodology, using in-country virtual teams of investigative journalists and social scientists around the world to capture, in an accessible way, through indicators that generate a scorecard, the strengths and weaknesses of national public integrity systems - has been around since 1999. In December 2001 we completed a 3 country pilot study of our methodology¹, in April 2004 we rolled out a 700 000 word online report of 25 countries², and in the coming weeks, we will

¹ 2002: Italy, Indonesia, South Africa.

² 2004: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, the Philippines, Portugal, Russia, South Africa, Turkey, Ukraine, USA, Venezuela, and Zimbabwe.

present the 2006 Global Integrity Index and country reports from 43 nations around the world.³ For a full description of the methodology see the January 2006 edition of the *Journal of Democracy*.⁴

Our mission

Next, let me talk to the mission of Global Integrity that informs our approach.

Our mission is to provide information on governance and corruption for global citizens:

“Global Integrity generates, synthesizes, and disseminates credible, comprehensive and timely information on governance and corruption around the world. As an independent information provider employing on-the-ground expertise, we produce original reporting and quantitative analysis in the global public interest regarding accountable and democratic governance. Our information is meant to serve simultaneously as a roadmap for engaged citizens, a reform checklist for policymakers, and a guide to the business climate for investors.”

Essentially, we are motivated by the desire to improve, enhance and influence both the transparency around and quality of information about corruption and governance trends that goes into making decisions that affect people’s lives.

Actors such as the World Bank, Millennium Challenge Corporation, USAID, private investors who want to know where to invest, and grassroots advocacy groups all need credible information to inform their work and in the case of citizens to actively hold their governments accountable.

³2006: [Argentina](#), Armenia, Azerbaijan, *Benin*, [Brazil](#), Bulgaria, Cambodia, *Democratic Republic of Congo*, Egypt, *Ethiopia*, Georgia, [Ghana](#), [Guatemala](#), India, [Indonesia](#), Israel, [Kenya](#), Kyrgyz Republic, Lebanon, *Liberia*, [Mexico](#), Montenegro, *Mozambique*, Nepal, [Nicaragua](#), [Nigeria](#), Pakistan, [the Philippines](#), Romania, [Russia](#), *Senegal*, Serbia, *Sierra Leone*, [South Africa](#), *Sudan*, Tajikistan, *Tanzania*, [Uganda](#), [USA](#), Viet Nam, the West Bank, Yemen, and [Zimbabwe](#).

⁴ Camerer. M, “Measuring Public Integrity.” *Journal of Democracy* Volume 1, No 17 (2006): 153–165.

1: The Global Integrity approach to assessing integrity

Sustainable Integrity = Credible Information + Functioning Systems + Engaged Citizens
--

The Global Integrity approach does not attempt to measure or assess corruption. Rather we focus on generating credible information that objectively assesses the existence and functioning of systems and institutions in a particular country that can play a role in preventing abuses of power (corruption). We also assess the extent to which citizens can access those mechanisms in order to hold their governments accountable.

The Global Integrity approach is thus to quantitatively assess the *other side* of corruption, that is, the access that citizens and businesses have to a country's government and public integrity institutions, their ability to monitor a government's behavior, and their ability to seek redress and advocate for better governance.

Using "integrity" incentives rather than a shaming "corruption" approach, the Integrity Indicators attempt, as objectively as possible (supported by a transparent scoring mechanism, references, and reader review comments) to assess the existence and effectiveness of the systems and institutions that promote public integrity.

Our in-depth diagnostic reports generate comprehensive and comprehensible information that allows stakeholders across sectors to engage in a meaningful dialogue. We thus hope to move the dialogue away from, "You're corrupt...shame on you!" to, "Let's prioritize the governance challenges in order to spend our limited resources most effectively."

Issues of corruption and governance are complex. Undoubtedly a universal problem, context matters. Understanding the political culture and context within which national integrity systems and institutions that institutionalize power in a society requires multiple sources of data, both qualitative and quantitative. By using truth tellers and knowledge workers, journalists and social scientists, to both report on and research the various dimensions of these issues, we believe we are accomplishing this goal.

2: How Global Integrity's findings have been used.

This part of the presentation is easier, if only anecdotal.

Global Integrity's mission and purpose was developed in response to the user community, namely the need for credible, comprehensive and timely data and information on governance and corruption trends around the world. We wanted to move beyond single country scores which, while very effective for naming and shaming, are simply not actionable for decision makers.

From the development aid community to policy analysts, practitioners, programmers, and political risk consultants, we have heard that all these actors are using our data. From the investment community we have reports that our data and reporting is being used for client vetting and country risk analysis.

Specifically I will refer to the way in which two influential decision-making organizations, both whom need data and information to justify their lending and aid programs and decisions to their shareholders, are using our data:

The World Bank

According to a lead economist in the public sector group, the Global Integrity data and reporting are being used for two purposes:

1. As part of the Country Policy and Institutional Assessments (CPIA) – these are internal World Bank staff assessments done on an annual basis of countries across several dimensions (16 indicators, including those on economic management, structural policies, policies for social inclusion and public sector management). CPIA ratings influence International Development Association (IDA) allocations. 75% of the countries making up the 2006 Global Integrity Report are IDA countries.
2. Potentially for programming purposes, as part of the actionable indicators specified in the new anti-corruption strategy - i.e. devising programming and loans around the new emphasis on indicators that are actionable. The World Bank in their recent *Global Monitoring Report* refers to our methodology as, “an example of ‘good practice’ methodology for governance indicators...because each measure is specifically defined, it provides ‘actionable’ information for governance reform. The specific [Global Integrity] indicators cover the range of the checks and balances constellation...”⁵

⁵ Global Monitoring Report 2006: Millennium development goals: strengthening mutual accountability, aid, trade and governance.

Millennium Challenge Corporation

The Millennium Challenge Corporation is also excited about our data in terms of informing the work which they do.

Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) a United States government corporation designed to work with some of the poorest countries in the world, is based on the principle that aid is most effective when it reinforces good governance, economic freedom, and investments in people that promote economic growth and elimination of extreme poverty (www.mcc.gov)

In October 2006 Global Integrity participated in two roundtables in Washington, DC at which the MCC was present. One was hosted by the MCC to discuss the indicators used in their 2007 assessments and at the second roundtable a representative from the MCC was a discussant on the Global Integrity Index.

According to the MCC development policy officer on the panel the 2004 Global Integrity reports are being used extensively by the MCC. They are seen as "a fantastic diagnostic tool", one that "yields comparable diagnostics across countries that translate into specific policy decisions." In particular, with regard to the MCC's threshold program, we have been told that Global Integrity data and assessment are included as part of senior MCC executives' briefing books on negotiating trips. We have heard that GI data was used to design Ukraine's threshold program using our Integrity Indicators dealing with conflicts of interest regulations and enforcement.

Conclusion

The Global Integrity approach to quantifying integrity is thus:

- Accessible – the indicators are comprehensible and actionable, using information that is relatively easy to obtain, whether it be the existence of a law, the extent to which it is implemented or enforced, and other data that supports the score.
- Timely and Cost-effective – using smart technology and the internet to interact with our virtual network of independent social scientists and investigative journalists, it takes approximately 3 – 6 months to produce a country report (10-12 weeks of on-the-ground research (raw data gathering + peer review) followed by several weeks of preparation at GI HQ. Depending on how the overhead is calculated, the cost is between US\$15,000 - US\$40,000 per country.
- Repeatable – 15 of the 25 original countries are being repeated in 2006, so we hope to already see some trends at the category level, with the aim to expand the country sample significantly as resources become available.

This may mean not doing every country each year, but having a rolling bi-annual sample that continues to expand country coverage.

- Innovative - With this year's development of a "codebook" to accompany the indicators and anchor the scoring, and our continued commitment as a learning organization, it seems there is little doubt that what we do is unique and adds value to existing governance approaches.

The Global Monitoring Report 2006 notes: "it remains to be seen, though, whether the GII will receive the sustainable financing and broad legitimacy necessary for it to become a widely used part of the arsenal of governance indicators."⁶ All indications are that it will.

Sustainable integrity in our view requires credible information, functioning systems and an engaged citizenry. Global Integrity's mission and reports work to support this desirable goal.

⁶ Global Monitoring Report 2006: Millennium development goals: strengthening mutual accountability, aid, trade and governance.