

Combating corruption in infrastructure services: A tool-kit

M.Sohail and S. Cavill

Contents

Glossary

About this series

Section 1: **UNDERSTANDING CORRUPTION**

Section 2: **DESIGNING AN ANTI-CORRUPTION PLAN**

Tools for users

TOOL 1: Supporting Civil Society Initiatives

TOOL 2: Working with the Media to Detect and Prevent Corruption

TOOL 3: Training Communities as Monitor

TOOL 4: Partnerships between Government and Civil Society

TOOL 5: Brining in Donor Anti-Corruption Mechanisms

TOOL 6: Tracking of Public Funds and Expenditure

TOOL 7: Monitoring and Measuring the Nature and Extent of Corruption

TOOL 8: Methodology for Investigating Corruption

Tools for Operators

TOOL 9: Human Resource Management (HRM) Practices and Performance

TOOL 10: Blowing the Whistle

TOOL 11: Teaching Ethics in Both Civil Service and Outside

TOOL 12: Information Technology – IT

TOOL 13: Disciplinary Procedures

TOOL 14: The Integrity Pact

TOOL 15: Codes of Conduct

TOOL 16: Citizens Charters

TOOL 17: Complaints Mechanisms

TOOL 18: Disclosure

TOOL 19: Law

TOOL 20: Public Procurement

Tools for Regulators

TOOL 21: Anti-Corruption Commissions

TOOL 22: Audit Institutions

TOOL 23: Access to Information

Section 3: **IMPLEMENTING THE ANTI-CORRUPTION PLAN**

Appendix 1: List of Case Studies and Case Surveys

Appendix 2: Sources of More Information

Acknowledgements

Glossary
[to be inserted later]

ABOUT THIS SERIES

This series of reports has been produced by the WEDC Institute as part of a project entitled '**Accountability Arrangements to Combat Corruption**' (initially funded by the Department for International Development, UK). The toolkit, country case studies and case surveys provide evidence of how anti-corruption initiatives in infrastructure delivery (such as water supply, sanitation, drainage, access roads and paving, transport, solid waste management, street lighting and community buildings) can contribute to pro-poor outcomes.

For more information, please visit our web page:
http://wedc.lboro.ac.uk/projects/new_projects3.php?id=191

About these tools

Problems with corruption have long been recognised as key constraints to the development of sustainable services. The objective of this Toolkit is to propose a framework and tools geared to understanding, exploring and acting on corruption in the delivery of services. The scope of the work covers infrastructure services in urban and rural areas of developing countries.

This Toolkit brings together, in a systematic way, a variety of individual tools which together support the process of **combating corruption in infrastructure services**. The tools themselves are synthesised from real world experience; derived from a review of literature, desk-based case surveys and country case studies. These are not academic concepts but genuinely operational tools which can be used in practical situations. By taking these tools, and relating them systematically to various aspects of combating corruption, this Toolkit should fill the urgent need expressed by

Each of the individual tools is presented in Section 2, and is structured according to the following sub-headings;

- Description
- Action points
- Related case surveys and case studies
- Further Guidance

Accountability is thought to be enhanced by the introduction of competition in service delivery, for example through a clear split of responsibility for policy definition, service provision and monitoring. The tools within this Toolkit are therefore organised according to the key anticipated users of the respective tools, namely Users, Operators and Regulators.

A key feature of the Toolkit is its use of cross referencing to provide information about source materials for the specific tools. This guides those who wish to find out more about a particular tool to the further information sources (such as case surveys and case studies) which they can use. References are also made to specific examples which have experience in using the tools to combat corruption in the delivery of infrastructure.

Who should read this toolkit and the series?

These tools are targeted at the following groups of people:

- Policy makers (including staff of international development agencies), who need to develop improved management strategies.

- Professional staff of utilities, local government (both urban and rural), and non-government organisations (NGOs) who are involved with infrastructure service delivery and in developing programmes to reduce corruption.
- Regulators of infrastructure services.
- Consumers and users of services.

How these Tools will help you

These Tools provide guidance in order to:

- help formulate policy.
- prepare and implement action plans.
- monitor and report performance.
- assess the status of existing plans.

How to use this toolkit

The toolkit is divided into the following sections.

Section 1 is intended to improve the readers' knowledge of both corruption and strategies for infrastructure service delivery. In addition, this section explains why the interests of the poor need specific attention in designing anti-corruption initiatives.

Section 2 makes suggestions on how to design an anti-corruption plan. This section describes a number of common scenarios or dilemmas that reflect various aspects of corruption in the infrastructure sector. The ideal response to these scenarios is suggested. This section also provides a number of the tools for users, operators and regulators to use in the design on anti-corruption strategies. For example,

- **Service Users:** Community based initiatives may use a select set of more participatory tools to catalyse bottom-up initiatives to monitor service delivery, raise public awareness about corruption, or to promote partnerships with government.
- **Service Operators:** Service Providers, in their various forms, may use the range of tools presented in this Toolkit in their efforts to clean up local governments. These tools are intended to achieve a variety of objectives ranging from mechanisms to protect whistleblowers, checks on staff, effective complaints mechanisms and procedures for appeals, staff training in areas such as ethics and reducing discretion in service delivery.
- **Regulators:** Regulators may adopt the tools in their on-going efforts to ensure accountable and responsive infrastructure delivery.

Section 3 describes how to implement the anti-corruption action plan.

The framework suggested in Section 3 can be applied as an over-all concept and approach, together with all of the relevant tools, or a specific set of tools can be used to improve or support one or more particular elements.

The authors recommend that readers start by reading through the whole book. It is envisaged that the reader will use the scenarios as a guide to the selection of tools or else look up specific tools directly. Readers may then refer back to the information in Section 1 in order to design a corruption prevention plan and then to Section 3 for advice on how to implement the plan. Thus readers should be able to dip in and out of the toolkit.

The ways in which this Toolkit can be locally applied by the users, operators and regulators of infrastructure services will vary significantly, depending not only upon local circumstances but also upon the technical capabilities of the personnel involved, together with the time, funds and

technical facilities available. Local application means that the tool and its use can be modified to suit local contexts. Variation can also depend on what it is intended to achieve: different expected outcomes will be served by different ways of choosing and applying the particular tools.

Readers can refer to Appendix 1 to find details of the case surveys, case studies and other research outputs from the project '**Accountability Arrangements to Combat Corruption**'.

Appendix 2 'Where to find out more' offers suggestions on sources of further information.

M. Sohail
Series Editor

SECTION 1: UNDERSTANDING CORRUPTION

Infrastructure delivery

The term 'infrastructure services' covers a wide variety of activities but is defined here as those services derived from physical infrastructure networks or installations, including water supplies, sanitation, drainage, access roads and paving, street lighting, solid waste management and community buildings. These services are normally the responsibility of a local government. However, over the past decade, **private participation** (for financing, provision, and regulation) in infrastructure provision has grown significantly in different forms. Some governments contract services out—to lower tiers of government, the private sector, to Non Government Organisations (NGOs), or to communities themselves.

The public sector has long been identified as a cause of corruption¹. For example, utilities may be obliged to supply political favours in the form of excess employment, the depressing of tariffs, political targeting of new investments, and the distribution of contracts on the basis of political criteria. The consequences of this kind of corruption include: high costs, scarcity of resources, inadequate services, low service quality, and unsteady finances.

However, it is rarely acknowledged that corruption is a symptom of poor governance in both private and public spheres. Corruption is also relatively widespread in the construction and engineering industry in both developed and developing countries.

Corruption, Infrastructure and the poor

Poverty has many dimensions. In addition to low income (living on less than \$1 a day), illiteracy, ill health, gender inequality, and inadequate public services are all aspects of being poor. In 2000, about 2 of every 10 people in the developing world were without access to safe water (for example dirty water claims the lives of 5,000 children every year); 5 of 10 lived without adequate sanitation; and 9 of 10 lived without their wastewater treated in any way.

The effect of corruption on infrastructure can be gauged through both its direct impact (for example, increasing the cost of public services, lowering their quality and or restricting poor people's access to such essential services as water and sanitation) and indirect impact (through diverting public resources away from social sectors and the poor, limiting development, growth and poverty reduction). The poor in particular are easy targets for extortion, bribery, double-standards and intimidation.

Furthermore, the cost to poor individuals of challenging corruption is often greater than any benefits for example they may run the risk of losing their relationship with a patron and possibly losing what they have. Moreover, in many instances poor people do not perceive corruption as wrong, as they have always experienced accessing infrastructure services in such a way.

Many bilateral and multilateral agencies seek to foster accountability as a means of achieving the UN's Millennium Development Goals for human development by reducing corruption and improving the quality of crucial public services (for example see the DfID White Paper entitled '*Eliminating world poverty: Making governance work for the poor*' and the World Development

¹ As demonstrated by a number of academic theories such as public choice theory, agency theory, transaction cost analysis, new public management, and property rights theory.

Report, 2004). Accountability to citizens is achieved when the state ensures that utilities, water and sanitation boards, and government departments provide efficient and equitable services for all citizens, including the poor.

Action Points:

- Increase government spending on poor people and on the services poor people need.
- Ensure public spending reaches poor people i.e. through expenditure tracking.
- Incentives/service ethos for front line service providers in poor areas.
- Mobilise communities of poor people to create demand for better services.

Corruption

Corruption is the misuse of **entrusted power** for personal gain either at one’s own instigation or in response to inducements. **Kinds of corruption include:**

- ⇒ Bribery (kickbacks, baksheesh, sweeteners and payoffs) - offering someone money in order to persuade him/her to do something; or the act of demanding an extra under-the-table payment or "gifts" for a return.
- ⇒ Embezzlement - theft of public resources by public officials; it is a form of misappropriation of public funds.
- ⇒ Fraud - an economic crime that involves some kind of trickery, swindle or deceit.
- ⇒ Extortion - using money (or other resources) extracted by the use of coercion, violence or threats to use force.
- ⇒ Nepotism - appointing family members to prominent positions.
- ⇒ Cronyism - granting offices or benefits to friends and relatives, regardless of merit.

Petty corruption is the everyday corruption that takes place where the public officials meet the public e.g. administrative procedures, and routine public services. Petty corruption includes “speed” or “grease payments”, these are a small payment made to secure or expedite the performance of a *routine, legal or necessary action*. Transparency International’s South Asia survey 2002 (in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka) found that lower income households spend a larger proportion of their income on bribes public services such as: healthcare, education, power, land administration, taxation, police and the judiciary and find it to be a heavy financial burden because of both the high frequency and the amounts paid.

Grand corruption involves politicians, senior officials, policy-makers, leading elites and major companies acquiring large amounts of public resources with the principle objective of maintaining their own power, status and wealth. Grand corruption seems to be rated by surveyed respondents as a bigger problem than petty corruption (TI’s Global Corruption Barometer 2004: Across the world, grand corruption was identified as a very big problem by 57 % of respondents. Fewer (45 %) cited petty or administrative corruption).

How corruption is defined depends on the context in which it is located, the perspectives of the definers and their purpose in defining it. Furthermore, in some countries, particular social taboos may lead some individuals to turn a blind eye to corruption.

Corruption— the misuse of entrusted power for personal gain —is particularly common in infrastructure service provision (DFID, 2002).

Whether you work for a company which needs to deal with a government agency for a license or are a government official engaging the private sector, you will look for the following warning signs:

Concentration of powers	Weak or non-existent	Poor transparency
--------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

	checks and balances	surrounding decision making
Restricted access to information	Elaborate bureaucratic processes and regulatory systems	Discretionary decision making
Lack of public participation	High tolerance for corrupt activities	Poor law enforcement/lack of sanctions

Engineering and construction companies have traditionally been unwilling to take a public stand against corruption. Tough sanctions against companies that bribe to win international business include forfeiture of the contract and blacklisting from future bidding. Companies are encouraged to introduce specific anti-bribery clauses into corporate codes of conduct and ensure that all employees know that these must be observed. In particular, progress has been made in recognising the problem of corruption by both multilateral development banks (MDBs) and export credit agencies (ECAs).

International initiatives aimed at clean business

- *Business Principles for the Construction Sector* was endorsed under the auspices of the 2004 World Economic Forum in Davos by 19 leading international construction firms with annual revenues in excess of \$70 bln (the initiative has been facilitated by the WEF, Transparency International and the Basel Institute on Governance) in attempts to bolster transparent and ethical business conduct in the industry. The companies have committed to fundamental principles, such as zero tolerance policy on bribery and development of practical and effective programmes of internal systems and controls for implementing that policy. See CASE SURVEY: Partnering Against Corruption
- Sector-specific initiatives like the *Publish What You Pay* campaign www.publishwhatyoupay.org
- *The OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions* and the accompanying national implementing legislation.
- *The Wolfsberg Principles* is an effort by private companies to fight corruption by practicing sound business and accepting to submit their social and ethical performance to public monitoring and scrutiny (corporate accountability). <http://www.wolfsberg-principles.com/>
- *TI Minimum Standards for Public Contracting* provides a global baseline for public contracting rules that meet minimum international standards. These will be launched with the Global Corruption Report 2005 in March 2005 (see the GCR 2005).

Yet, not all non-governmental organisations are impenetrable to corruption. To **avoid corruption in NGOs**, there have been a number of initiatives that monitor the accountability of NGOs; these include:

- *Humanitarian Accountability Partnership - International* carries out accountability projects to test the transparency and accountability of organizations.
- *Mango* is an NGO that also deals with accountability issues: its mission is to strengthen the financial management of NGOs working in humanitarian aid and development.
- The *Global Accountability Project (GAP)* aims to generate wider commitment to the principles and values of accountability. Its aims include enhancing the accountability of international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) to the individuals and communities they affect. In essence the GAP Framework sets out guidelines for accountability which are described in four dimensions: transparency, participation, evaluation, and complaint

and response mechanisms. Each dimension lists a series of targets for all aspects of a NGO's operation. This is a useful checklist or guide for donor's seeking to assess whether to channel aid through a particular NGO.

<p>Action point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bidders are advised to have a company Code of Conduct (clearly rejecting the use of bribes and other unethical behaviour) and a Compliance Program for the implementation of the Code of Conduct throughout the company. • Strengthen the oversight role of government, ombudsmen and the state regulators over the private and non state sector. • Integrity Pacts are relevant not only for large scale contracts but for all types of contracts and also for all types of companies

Figure 1: Areas of the Project Cycle Corruption Can Affect

Project selection	
	Corruption can negatively affect the selection of projects. For example, corruption can divert resources away from social sectors and toward defence and major infrastructure projects.
	Corruption may also encourage the selection of uneconomical projects because of opportunities for financial kickbacks and political patronage.
Planning stages	
	Project used as vote winners/opportunities for personal gain not on basis of priority/availability of financial resources.
	Planning in favour of high value infrastructure (white elephant projects) and against the interest of the poor.
	Project requirements may be overstated or tailored to fit one specific bidder.
Inspection stages	
	Weak oversight and supervision mechanisms have been created that would prevent detection of fraud and corruption.
	Kick-backs can be given to persuade inspectors to turn a blind eye to slow implementation of projects, unfulfilled contract requirements, and other instances of malpractice.
Design	
	Project design or timing of the project manipulated to benefit particular suppliers, consultants, contractors, and other private parties.
	Bribe for favourable environmental impact assessment/planning proposal/approval.
	Over designed and overpriced projects to increase potential corrupt earnings during implementation.
Bid and contract signing stage	
	Political parties levy large rents on international businesses in return for government contracts.
	Kickbacks for construction and supply contracts.
	Officials receive excessive "hospitality" from contractors and benefits in kind.
	Inadequate advertising of tender.
	Excessively short bidding time.
Construction	
	Provision of equipment or goods of lower than specified quality (typical examples include lesser cement or steel reinforcements)
	Corrupt contract amendments to a contract's scope of work and costs
	Outright theft of materials, equipment or services.
	Corrupt diversion of allocated project funding
	Duplication of payments, alteration of invoices, lack of supporting records, ineligible payments, over billing, misuse of funds (i.e. for purposes other than those aligned to project needs), unauthorised payments etc.

	Concealing substandard work.
	Bribe the relevant official to certify that the work was done according to specification.
Service delivery	
	Superiors in the public service charge “rents” from their subordinates.
	Siphoning off supplies to market.
	Ghost/absent workers.
	Use of contacts/money to get better/faster service or to prevent delays.
Maintenance and management stages	
	Corruption in procurement of equipment and spare parts.
	Withholding needed approval/signatures for gifts/favours.
	Bribes to win O&M contracts/ personnel appointments.
	Lower standard of construction to create the need for expensive repair and maintenance.
Subscription process	
	Extra-legal payments for new connections.
	Consumers pay money in order to speed up the process.
	Officials are paid to turn a blind eye to unauthorized connections.
Billing system	
	Opaque system of billing.
	Irregularities in ledger of paid bills.
Disconnection	
	Disconnecting customers in good standing.
	Extorting money to reconnect.
	Extorting money to prevent disconnection.
Fault redress	
	Extorting money for repairs that are meant to be free.
	Gift giving in return for favours in fault redress.

Exercise A: Is it Corruption?²

Scenario 1: *A civil servant is responsible for deciding on the award of a \$20,000 contract to a company who can provide consulting services to the civil servant's government agency. The civil servant's old friend (a small time businessman) submits a proposal for the tender and offers the civil servant a cash payment (stuffed in an envelope) to help “provide the incentives to take the correct decision.”* **Is offering the payment corruption on the part of the businessman? Is accepting the payment corruption?**

Response: The OECD Convention on the Bribery of Foreign Officials in International Business Transactions make offers of this kind of speed payment illegal in the briber's home country. The UN Anti-Bribery Convention has tried to extend this type of law around the globe. So, in countries which have ratified the UN Convention, the offerer is breaking the law.

As for the civil servant, this request probably violates the Public Procurement as well as Civil Service Acts. This scenario represents a “misuse of entrusted power for personal gain” because the acceptance of the cash is an unauthorised personal gain. The use of state funds in payment of the procured services represents the public resources at stake. Thus, the acceptance of the payment almost certainly represents corruption.

² Please note that the appropriateness of these responses may depend on the particular country be addressed. Readers may not under any circumstances rely on these answers for conduct in their country and are strongly advised to discuss the situation with their solicitor or civil service office official if these cases arise.

Scenario 2: *A businessman has submitted an order for pumps to the state owned and regulated manufacturer of pumps. The order fulfilment office has taken months to process the order. The businessman is told that if he offered the order fulfilment office a speed payment, he would get the pumps within 48 hours. Is it corruption to offer the speed payment?*

Response: If the state owned enterprise's staff are legally part of the civil service, then the offer of any speed payment would be a corrupt offer. It relies on "misuse of entrusted power for personal gain" (the gain to the official in charge of processing orders). This is a case for the investigators and possibly eventually the Administrative Tribunal.

Scenario 3: *A local government official has the authority to contract for waste management services. Last month, the waste management provider the local agency used went unexpectedly bankrupt, forcing the civil servant to identify a new one quickly. The local official's brother runs the only other company in town. Is it illegal nepotism for the civil servant to give the contract his brother?*

Response: Keep the definition of corruption in your mind (the misuse of entrusted power for personal gain). If the contract was intended to and succeeded in transferring of resources from the public sector to the family, the transaction is clearly corrupt. However, if the civil servant contracted in good faith in an attempt to save the government money and help pursue the objectives of his department, the transaction may not be corrupt. Factors to take into account would be the amount of searching cost and money the civil servant would need to incur to find a replacement company, the quality and value for money of the competitors, and the reversibility of the contract (can the contract help cover a difficult time until a better planned procurement can be designed later?)

Scenario 4: *A senior official is deciding on the award of a tender to a private company for the contract to operate and maintain a local water facility. The official is invited by the director of one of the largest consultancy firms bidding for the contract to a fancy 3 course dinner at the local Sheraton Hotel and is offered an antique gift worth \$1000 as a present to the government. Is the acceptance of this dinner and the gift corruption?*

Response: Many civil service statutes define a minimum acceptable value of gifts which can be received by civil servants (using around \$25). In practice, accepting the invitation is corruption (though the personal friendship and the possible diplomatic aspect of the dinner complicate matter). The appointee, however, is exposed to a number of risks. First, accepting these gifts – even if they are legally allowed— may appear to be corruption, and thus hurt the individual and his government. Second, the gifts may create the expectation of reciprocity (the company expects SOME kind of favour). The gift nominally belongs to the government and so should be presented to either the appropriate person at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or to the relevant official in charge of government property.

SECTION 2: DESIGNING AN ANTI-CORRUPTION PLAN

In the mid-1990s to early 2000s, several of the international donor organisations began funding work on national anti-corruption strategies. These strategies, implemented in countries such as Nicaragua, Bolivia, Uganda, Tanzania, Georgia, Latvia, Nigeria, and in other countries, had a number of common elements.

These common elements include:

1. Identify where corruption is occurring

As a company representative, corruption represents a potential increase in costs (bribe payments are both a project cost and potentially a legal/business cost if the company is prosecuted for engaging in corruption).

As a government official, your attempts to affect corruption will depend on how corruption is entrenched in other ministries and outside the public sector.

Given that corruption requires a demander and a receiver, an analysis of stakeholders contributing to corruption can also be valuable business information. The following list shows several of the stakeholders which should enter into your analysis. **Tool 7 describes in more detail how to determine concretely where corruption is.**

Stakeholder analysis is a vital instrument for identifying those groups and organizations that have significant and legitimate interests in specific service. Identify and list all potential stakeholders, these might include:

- * National government;
- * Provincial and local governments;
- * Regional or local planning departments, which coordinate land use and infrastructure planning;
- * Regulatory entities (such as commissions, environmental agencies and so on);
- * The utility management;
- * Front line service providers;
- * Political parties and individual politicians;
- * Labour/trade unions;
- * Multinational companies;
- * Domestic companies;
- * Suppliers of goods and services to the sector; and
- * Consumer organisations.
- * Households and communities;

Exercise B: Identifying where corruption is occurring

Scenario 1: *The local Department of Public Works received a budgetary disbursement of roughly \$20,000 into its bank account for the purchase of 1,000 metres of water piping. The project manager in charge paid a local company to issue a delivery order (though no pipe was delivered). The company kept half the money and the project manager kept the other half. **Would this crime be detectable?***

Response: The resources the government should apply depend on the *degree of risk* and the *costs-benefits* of pursuing the case. Clearly, spending £25,000 investigating and prosecuting a corruption case of £500 may be a bad use of public funds – particularly if the odds of recovering

the funds are low or the civil servant could not pay if the court issued an injunction against the civil servant for the payment of damages. There may be a number of mechanisms include:

- Asset declaration - might find these funds, though if a civil servant knows he or she must declare his or her assets, the civil servant would seek to put the funds in an area outside of inspection.
- A public sector audit would probably show that the money was spent on the pipes. Further investigation depends on an assessment of the likelihood of impropriety occurring in the purchase of the pipes.
- An audit of the business would probably fail to detect the bribe as the sum might represent petty-cash for the company, or might be lumped into another account (if the income used to finance the bribe was recorded in the company's books!).
- An internal investigation would rely on a member of the public complaining that the project was not executed.
- Expenditure tracking may increase the probability of detection, though the funds would still be recorded as 'delivered.'

Scenario 2: *You are aware that staff in your Public Works department use vehicles, office equipment, and furniture for personal purposes. They also make a large number of personal phone calls from the office telephones.*

Response: Such activities probably violate the Civil Service Act and Codes of Conduct i.e. not to use public property, facilities, services and financial resources for private purposes except when permission is lawfully given. You should not ignore the situation as you are most likely obliged to report any evidence or suspicion of breaches to the Code of Conduct.

2. The types of corruption are occurring

The list in Chapter 1 provided the types of corruption to watch out for. Many of these types of corruption occur together. Thus, even a reduction of a few types of corruption in the project cycle can result in a significant cost savings to the company and a large potential increase in the resources available to the government department to provide public goods.

Exercise C: The types of corruption that are occurring

Scenario 1: *You are the department head overseeing a \$2 million contract to provide water services. You have heard through a trusted colleague that he believes that a sub-contractor you use has been paying bribes to speed up the delivery of a number of business licenses.*

Response: The personal risk and business risk posed by this situation are large. Under the implementing legislation passed by OECD member countries, you may be personally criminally liable. If this happens, you should seek the advice of a competent lawyer.

Scenario 2: *You have applied for a job at the Electricity Board, where your cousin works. Your cousin has talked to the boss and persuaded him not to hold interviews but to give you the job.*

Response: The cousin has misused his official position for private purposes. As a public sector employee he should not have demanded or accepted favours or any other benefit for close relatives. Secondly, he could be accused of misusing his official position for improper advancement of his own interests.

Scenario 3: *A customer has contacted your office because a worker connecting houses to the mains water supply asked her for an additional fee to connect up her house up in advance of the scheduled date.*

Response:

A number of complaints (anonymous or otherwise) about a particular person or an institution may be helpful in triggering an investigation. Inform service users about how to report a case of corruption and what happens to the reports they make. Ask customers to provide :

- an account of what happened, how and why.
- the people involved in the incident. For example, the name and address of the person(s) who is alleged to have asked for a bribe or who is involved in the incident.
- any witnesses who saw what happened and can say that the incident took place and that the complainant is telling the truth.

Some people may be cautious about making complaints. However, if a complainant wishes to remain anonymous this does not mean that his/her complaint is worthless.

3. The costs and effects of corruption

Economists and financial analysts have become much better at calculating the costs of corruption. These costs include *direct costs* (the actual money paid by the company or the project the government agency could have done but now no longer has the money for. The *indirect costs* focus mostly on what economists call ‘resource distortion.’ Such distortion consists of the longer-term effects of corruption. Some examples include the loss in productivity in a department because relatives are working there instead of highly skilled experts, the economic costs of delays in obtaining business licensing and other indirect costs.

Exercise D: Cost and Effects of Corruption

Scenario 1: *As the head of a small public agency, you have decided to move toward performance based management – publishing your agency’s consumer satisfaction rates (among other data). **Is this a good way to fight corruption in your agency?***

Response: Remember, your goal is to reduce the misuse of entrusted power for personal gain. As a public sector manager, you will want to weigh the benefits in potential reductions from unauthorized personal gain against the resources you are diverting into a programme of monitoring and publication.

Scenario 2: *You run a small department (either in the government or in a company). You strongly suspect that some of your employees are involved in corruption. Office supplies seem to go missing and you see some employees driving nicer cars than their salaries would probably allow. **Will you try to tackle the problem yourself?***

Response:

In accordance with the principle of “zero tolerance”, we are obliged to report suspicion or evidence of corruption committed by colleagues or others. As the manager, if you ignore the problem, and corruption discovered in the department, and it is later prosecuted, the penalties against you could be severe. Knowing that corruption exists certainly suggests the need for a series of department reforms. You will probably choose those areas with the greatest risk first (those where cash is involved). You should seek professional advice before you expose yourself and agency to possible risks.

Some of the surveys mentioned in Tool 7 cover the costs and effects of corruption.

4. Factors that contribute to corruption

So many factors contribute to corruption – low government salaries and the extent of corruption in other parts of the public/private sector are important contributors. Combating corruption necessitates affecting change in the individuals in terms of: knowledge, skills, attitudes (or beliefs), and behaviour (or action). Many of these factors have already been covered in Chapter 1.

Exercise E: Factors that contribute to corruption

Scenario 1: *A state owned industry is being privatised; the prospective new owner of the industry is said to have connections to the minister responsible. No information about sale prices and valuations has been published.*

Response: The media can control corruption by informing public policy and decision makers, raising public awareness about corruption, investigating and report incidences of corruption, expose corrupt officials, and prompt investigations by official bodies. Think about writing a letter to national and local papers. Also think about contacting local MPs, NGOs and other agencies to create interest in monitoring the privatisation process.

Scenario 2: *You are overseeing the design of a project for a new sewage works. However, the design has been changed recently, for no apparent reason. You suspect that the changes have been made to benefit particular contractors.*

Response: You are obliged to report suspicion or evidence of corruption committed by colleagues or others. However, there must be sufficient evidence for the case to be investigated.

Scenario 3: *You are overseeing the implementation of a road building project and need to check the financial documentation, such as invoices and authorizations. However, you cannot find any of the documents and suspect that corruption has occurred.*

Response: You should not ignore the situation as you are most likely obliged to report any evidence or suspicion of breaches to the Code of Conduct. Report the incidence to your superior in order to start an internal investigation on whether or not corruption has taken place.

5. Decide what should be done about corruption

Policing is not an answer to institutionalized corruption: Reform programmes in the infrastructure sector should focus on getting “the system” right rather than removing single corrupt individuals – this will not suffice to achieve reform where corruption is systemic. It is important to remove the root causes of the problem. In fact, prevention can be more effective and infinitely more economic than investigation and prosecution. The following tools will give you an idea of the available remedies for your particular circumstances.

Exercise F: Designing a Company or Agency Anti-Corruption Programme

Scenario 1: *You work in a line ministry. You receive a letter from an official in the anti-corruption agency asking you for your opinion about fighting corruption. In the letter, they ask about your priorities and the actions to undertake. What is your response?*

Response: There are a number of ways to tackle the problem. Remembering the definition of corruption, you will focus on ways your agency can induce the misuse of **entrusted power** for personal gain. Remembering the *risk management perspective*, you will focus on those areas most vulnerable to corruption. Much of the material in this toolkit will help you answer this question.

Scenario 2: *Last month, a manager of a competitor company was arrested on charges of corruption. It is rumoured this is because a former employee at that company was paying bribes. You decide that your company must be completely corruption free. What plan do you put in place?*

Response: There are a number of ways to tackle the problem. Many tools are presented in this toolkit which can provide some of these remedies. Options to consider include:

Surveillance of employees – particularly those suspected of corruption or in jobs with discretionary use of funds and in constant contact with government officials may be conducted. Such surveillance may include video, audio, or the close monitoring of budgets. You will need to ensure you are complying with human rights and the country's employment law and should take legal advice before proceeding.

Internal audit/inspection – often the responsibility of an internal office of oversight or the company Ombudsman, you may wish to give an office discretion to pursue internal questioning or make regular checks of areas prone to corruption. Make sure clients, suppliers, and others have contact information for this office and can report incidences of corruption. While anonymous reports are problematic at a legal level (and certainly can not be used in a disciplinary or legal action); they may help provide pointers to weak areas.

It should be kept in mind, however, that the framework describing the decision-making process should not be interpreted as a simple linear sequence of activities. In reality, the process is more disordered, with potential overlaps across phases.

TOOLS FOR SERVICE USERS

TOOL 1: Supporting Civil Society Initiatives

Description

Civil society organisations include labour unions, professional associations, chambers of commerce, religions, student groups, cultural societies, sports clubs and informal community groups or grassroots associations. Some of these organisations have worked successfully against corruption; for example by:

- carrying out corruption surveys;
- acting as advocates for clean government;
- stakeholder consultations and public hearings,
- exposing abuses and creating public awareness to build awareness about the problems and solutions;
- acting as service provider in areas where (corrupt) governments fail to deliver services
- formulating and promoting action plans to fight corruption;
- monitoring government action and decisions; and
- providing leadership to remove corrupt leaders.

Professional networks of international advisers, international sector specialists, researchers, national trainers, government bureaucrats who specialize in good governance, anticorruption efforts, financial analysis and similar matters also play a valuable role. Their expertise on corruption plays a crucial role in providing technical support to reforms.

NGOs have played a key role in making citizens aware of their rights and training them in obtaining what they are legally entitled to. Information can be disseminated through community presentations and workshops, the use of music, art and drama, posters and billboards. As electronic mediums become more readily accessible, on-line publications of such material can increase the public's knowledge and awareness of how to increase transparency and contribute to better governance.

Civil society initiatives are able to trigger changes in either service norms (re-shaping attitudes, reverse public apathy and changing tolerance for corruption) or the ways services are delivered (organisational change e.g. monitoring the social and ethical performance of the public officials).

- In an initiative by the Lebanese Transparency Association, citizens are given a manual which describes in simple terms the procedures necessary to acquire a construction permit, including the documents, fees and deadlines required.
- The successful introduction in 1997 of an annual anti-corruption day in Morocco by Transparency International Morocco, aims at raising awareness, through a series of events, among citizens, businessmen and members of government of the negative effects of corruption;
- A series of short television dramas were broadcast in Niger in order to raise awareness and influence attitudes towards the problem of corruption. The films covered three fields in which corruption is viewed as a serious problem: health, education and customs. The sketches were broadcast at prime time for six weeks prior to a national seminar on corruption.
- Transparency Thailand (TT) produced a series of radio shows dealing with the problems of corruption and the lack of transparency in government and business circles. The shows were aired on a major Bangkok radio station with an audience of over 1 million people. Later, TT was invited to broadcast an additional 15 minute radio slot on the country's military radio network covering many more remote and rural areas of Thailand.
- Transparency International has produced a Toolkit dedicated to youth anti-corruption education. TI National Chapters have also designed training course for secondary school

- teachers and have been engaged in the design and implementation of anti-corruption curricula in schools and universities.
- TI Brazil air short anti-corruption radio broadcasts aimed at awareness-raising and behavioural change on a São Paulo-based radio station. The initiative, called '**Say no to corruption**', began broadcasting in August 2001 and has since been replicated by at least nine other Brazilian radio stations.
 - In Lithuania's National Anti-Corruption Programme (adopted in 2002) and Lithuania's Law on Corruption Prevention emphasis is placed on the prevention of corruption and public education. A Project on 'Preventing Corruption through Education, Information and Consciousness Raising 2002-2004' was put together by the Lithuanian authorities. The project aims at increasing anti-corruption awareness through education of the youth (including developing and implementing anti-corruption education programmes in higher schools), dissemination of anti-corruption information, expansion of sociological basis and awareness-raising on anti-corruption issues, such as the financing of political parties and campaigns, thus contributing to the development of civic society.

Action points:

- NGOs have used TV and radio broadcasts to communicate their messages and campaigns to the widest possible audiences.
- Establish mechanisms for the public to express opinions but also to ensure their voice is reflected in government decisions, thus making s responsive and accountable to the community.
- Improve knowledge on how to report corruption
- Provide incentives for bureaucrats to take notice and act upon complaints of corruption
- Identify colleagues who share similar professional responsibilities
- Learn about workshops, conferences, and other events most relevant to corruption in the infrastructure sector to facilitate information and knowledge sharing.

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Committees of Concerned Citizens, Dhaka

Transparency International Bangladesh created grassroots pressure groups called Committees of Concerned Citizens (CCCs) to 'promote integrity and curb corruption in public sector service delivery systems in selected sites of Bangladesh through grassroots participation of the recipients of public services'.

CASE SURVEY: PSAM, South Africa

Corruption as a way of life is one of the many enduring legacies of apartheid. There is a legal mandate in South Africa for civil society participation in the local governance process and in supporting the government's anti-corruption strategy. The Public Service Accountability Monitor (PSAM) is an independent research and monitoring institute dedicated to strengthening democracy in South Africa.

CASE SURVEY: Parivartan, India

The Right to Information (RTI) has been recognized the world over as an important instrument for checking corruption and misuse of power. An NGO called Parivartan, along with a number of people living in slum areas in Delhi have been accessing records of public works in various parts of Delhi where corruption is suspected in the delivery of public works.

Further Guidance

TOOL 3: Training Communities as Monitors

TOOL 4: Partnerships between Government and Civil Society

TOOL 7: Monitoring and Measuring the Nature and Extent of Corruption

TOOL 2: Working with the Media to Detect and Prevent Corruption

Description

The media can do much to disseminate information about public services. Higher newspaper circulation in Indian districts is associated with better local-government performance in distributing food and drought relief. The media can control corruption by informing public policy and decision makers, raising public awareness about corruption, its causes, consequences and possible remedies, investigating and report incidences of corruption, expose corrupt officials, and prompt investigations by official bodies.

Arguments for media coverage

- Without access to relevant information poor people are unable to organize and act appropriately to protect their interests, highlighting the importance of the independent media sector - including Internet, media, informal journals and newsletters
- The media can also reinforce the work and legitimacy of both parliaments and their anti-corruption bodies and create pressure for change to laws and regulations.

Problems with media coverage

- Low literacy is a significant barrier to the dissemination of printed information. The role of radio to disseminate relevant information has increased, especially with the introduction of community radio stations.
- Increased awareness of corruption might lead to a general perception that the corruption has increased in the country.
- The orientation of most media to business and elite interests makes it difficult to get coverage for issues that affect poor people.
- There may be a conflict of interest between the editors and sub-editors, programmers and producers desire to attract a wide readership, ample advertising, and profit and exercising its function of informing the public about corruption issues affecting the poor.
- Freedom of the press is negatively correlated with the level of corruption: "Official Secrets Act" censorship & anti-libel laws/ criminal libel actions have been used to muzzle journalists, and intimidate them.
- The effectiveness of the media depends on access to information and freedom of expression, as well as professional and ethical investigative journalists.
- The more people who can read, the stronger the influence of the media. But information is not enough. People must also have the legal, political, and economic means to press demands against the government.

Action Points:

- Many anti-corruption initiatives have been launched in high-profile press conferences, and efforts made to ensure that the media coverage is wide. For example with the preparation of press kits with small printable stories, media-friendly press releases, and translation of the main report into local languages.
- NGOs have realized that the media can be used to make the findings widely known, making it difficult for the agency concerned to ignore the findings.

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Newscan, Bangladesh: News Scan Database, Bangladesh
Transparency International Bangladesh (TIB) developed the 'News Scan Database', a database of corruption stories from newspaper archives. This tool is intended not only to measure the nature and extent of corruption in Bangladesh, but also to encourage the media to further investigate and report instances of corruption.

CASE SURVEY: Radio Against Corruption: To be Alive.

To Be Alive is a community-focused programme broadcast on state radio in the poor rural region of Kutch, Gujarat's largest district. The programme is broadcast through the government network 'All India Radio'. The programme has become a public watchdog and issues a warning to those tempted to abuse their position that somebody is watching. Community radio facilitates social change by enabling ordinary citizens to demand accountability from the government.

CASE SURVEY: Report Cards, India.

Reports cards have raised public awareness of corruption in service delivery and of poor performance. Media and NGOs need to play an active role in promoting the findings as well as in catalysing citizens to demand accountability, accessibility and responsiveness from service providers. Adverse publicity has encouraged agencies to respond to the findings and tackle problems in their organisations.

Further Guidance

TOOL 1: Supporting Civil Society Initiatives

TOOL 6: Tracking of Public Funds and Expenditure

TOOL 22: Access to information

TOOL 3: Training Communities as Monitors

Description

Training communities to monitor the delivery of infrastructure in effect breaks up hierarchical accountability of traditional bureaucracy, i.e. reporting up the line to the senior officers and politicians, replacing it with direct accountability to communities. If the users, and particularly the poor, can monitor and discipline poorly performing service providers, this will result in better services. Service users are considered best placed to monitor the services on which they depend, due to greater incentives and information, as well as face-to-face interaction with frontline providers.

Citizens have been directly involved in fighting corruption by monitoring their infrastructure delivery. For example,

- Community-based audits have been conducted where corruption is suspected in the delivery of public works. These have been organised in slum areas of Delhi by an NGO called Parivartan. This mechanism has mobilised public opinion on local government policies and practices and helped in establishing transparent decision-making practices. The NGO has also provided training and support for community vigilance during construction projects to provide a useful safeguard against corruption, for example by explaining projects, interpreting technical details, relaying concerns to engineers.
- In Bangalore, the Children's Movement for Civic Awareness have surveyed the quality of the city's roads. The children were given checklists in order to monitor the presence of side drains, evenness of surface of the footpath, obstructions to pedestrians, number of potholes, number of cracked areas, presence of signs or painted lines to indicate a road hump, unfilled or un-compacted diggings for electrical or telephone cables. The children presented the findings on quality of roads to the Bangalore municipal commissioner at a public hearing and the findings were reported to newspapers.
- In the Philippines, NGOs have sent monitors with cameras and photocopies of contracts to uncover corruption by comparing infrastructure plans on paper to what was actually built.
- Service users may be represented on the boards of specialist agencies, such as public utility regulatory body in Ghana, or involved in nationwide consumer watchdog groups in Zambia. In Indonesia, an NGO called Yayasan Lembaga Konsumen collects consumer complaints via newspaper adverts, brochures, radio adverts, and organises meetings between complainants, regulators, service providers and the media so that they can be resolved (Lazzarini, 2004).
- Paul (1992, 1991) has demonstrated how organised public feedback in the form of report cards can be used to challenge service providers to be more efficient and responsive to consumers. The Report Card which has been applied in a number of countries including India and the Philippines. Modelled on a private sector practice of conducting client satisfaction surveys, report cards solicit user perceptions on the quality, efficiency, and adequacy of the various public services that are funded by tax-payers.
- Transparency International Bulgaria undertook to monitor the privatisation process of Bulgaria's telecommunications company. Their finding and subsequent publication of corruption in the process led to the privatisation process being halted. TI Bulgaria was then officially invited to monitor the bidding and implementation of further national privatisation projects.

Community pressure can also create incentives for zero corruption of public providers. In many places the public servant is a permanent member of the community, facing substantial social pressures to bend rules to the benefit of local preferences.

Donors can also encourage citizen monitoring of service providers, such as report cards and public expenditure tracking surveys. They can help monitor the use of services and support benefit-incidence analyses to identify the groups missing out. However, that involving providers in the design of the monitoring process is critical to ensuring buy-in for the results

Action Points:

- Citizens need to have an incentives and ability to monitor (as well as discipline) the provider
- There is often a need for an enabling legal and regulatory environment for citizens groups to seek redress through appropriate public accountability institutions
- Coordinating voice is difficult. Citizens groups need organisational capacity and leadership to overcome coordination and collective action problems.
- Incentives for policymaker and provider to respond to citizen voice and participation
- Scaling up ad hoc and fragmented voice and participation initiatives is not easy.
- Remove fear of harassment

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Report Cards, India.

First used in Bangalore in 1993, report cards use citizen feedback (from the poor and marginalized sections of society) to rate the performance of public services agencies, such as the electricity board, water board, telecommunications, and public banks amongst others. Information can be used to signal that the service provider needs to take corrective action (adopt client friendly practices and policies, introduce performance standards and improve transparency in operations) as well as to enable comparisons between agencies and locations.

CASE SURVEY: Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Governance, Philippines

In the Philippines civil society organizations have become partners with government agencies in order to reduce corruption in public works as well as in ensuring transparency. One example of which is the Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (CCAGG), an NGO Watchdog in the Province of Abra.

CASE SURVEY: Committees of Concerned Citizens, Dhaka

Transparency International Bangladesh created grassroots pressure groups called Committees of Concerned Citizens (CCCs) to 'promote integrity and curb corruption in public sector service delivery systems in selected sites of Bangladesh through grassroots participation of the recipients of public services'.

CASE SURVEY: Parivartan, India

The Right to Information (RTI) has been recognized the world over as an important instrument for checking corruption and misuse of power. An NGO called Parivartan, along with a number of people living in slum areas in Delhi have been accessing records of public works in various parts of Delhi where corruption is suspected in the delivery of public works.

Further Guidance

TOOL 4: Partnerships between Government and Civil Society

TOOL 7: Monitoring and Measuring the Nature and Extent of Corruption

TOOL 8: Methodology for Investigating Corruption

TOOL 4: Partnerships between Government and Civil Society

Description

Partnerships give service providers an incentive to respond to service users demands. Partnerships between government and civil society in the various forms of public service provision involve the contribution of local knowledge and experience to service delivery, which strengthens the signal system about performance to service providers. If the poor have a say in service delivery it is thought this would be more likely to get access to accountable, affordable and appropriate services, for example front line service providers are made accountable and self-regulating outside their agency through monitoring by the communities. Partnerships create a mix of local public pressure, expectation, competition, information and publicity ensure accountability is shared between users and service producers

There are a number of successful joint initiatives:

- Community volunteers have been involved on citizen advisory boards to provide local authorities with information and recommendations on local issues.
- Citizens have also been involved in public hearings in order to address policy makers on important local issues, particularly budgetary concerns. This allows public officials to request comments and information and access expert advice from the public

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Integrity Pacts, Korea

An “Integrity Pact” is a tool developed by Transparency International (TI) during the 1990s. It is essentially an enforceable agreement to behave with integrity in relation to their obligations under a project. An Integrity Pact contains important mutual commitments made by public officials in charge of the procurement and bidders for construction works or providers of goods and services.

CASE SURVEY: Poder Ciudadano, Argentina

The Programme for Transparent Contracting combines a Public Hearing where municipal authorities convenes citizens, businesses, experts, and representatives of the opposition to express their objections and suggestions about the planned terms of the contracting; and Signing an Integrity Pact wherein the municipal authorities and all businesses competing in the bidding make mutual commitments to prevent the payment of bribes.

CASE SURVEY: Participatory Budgeting, Brazil

Participatory budgeting has been used in a number of Brazilian cities and most successfully in the cities of Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, where citizen assemblies in each district of a city determine priorities for the use of a part of the city’s revenues.

CASE SURVEY: Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Governance, Philippines

In the Philippines civil society organizations have become partners with government agencies in order to reduce corruption in public works as well as in ensuring transparency. One example of which is the Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (CCAGG), an NGO Watchdog in the Province of Abra.

Further Guidance

TOOL 1: Supporting Civil Society Initiatives

TOOL 3: Training Communities as Monitors

TOOL 14: The Integrity Pact

TOOL 5: Bringing in Donor Anti-Corruption Mechanisms

Description

Donors supply 20% or more of public resources in more than 60 low-income countries; more than 40% of public resources in at least 30 poor countries. Corruption generally has strong negative development effects. The growing concern with corruption has resulted in a whole range of initiatives both on the side of the donors and the international financial institutions (IFIs). For example

The following is a selection of donor mechanisms geared towards preventive measures developed to deter corruption in donor projects.

- *External in-depth audits of selected projects*; The World Bank periodically launches surprise audits of its own projects, conducted by internationally recognised audit firms. The audits have revealed a number of deficiencies ranging from departure from agreed procurement procedures to a lack of proper documentation surrounding the procurement process. As a consequence, it has declared 'misprocurement' on about 40 contracts with a total value of USD 40,000.
- *Hotlines for reporting corruption*: Since 1998, the World Bank has operated a free hotline operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week, staffed by multilingual trained specialists to accept complaints of abuse from Bank staff and the general public from countries around the world.
- *Access to information*: A key aspect of NORAD's anti-corruption policy is that all grants to governments, non-governmental organisations and other partners are published on its homepage and on all Norwegian Embassy homepages.
- *Strengthening internal donor practices and procedures*: (i.e. project selection and procurement and disbursement strategies); The World Bank has developed a number of analytical instruments, including: the Social and Structural Reviews (SSRs); the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs); the Institutional and Governance Reviews (IGRs); Public Expenditure Reviews (PERs); Country Financial Accountability Assessment (CFAA), Country Procurement Assessment Review (CPAR).
- *Strengthening partner accountability and capacity*; IFIs also tend to provide assistance to borrower countries in the form of: help in the design of governments' anti-corruption programmes; conducting surveys that diagnose the extent and character of corruption in a given country; and disseminating the results of survey; facilitating and providing workshops and training for government officials and member of civil society.
- In 1999 low-income countries began preparing Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) as the basis for concessional lending from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and for debt relief under the enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Debt Initiative. A country's poverty reduction strategy can link public expenditures explicitly to service delivery for the poor, build country ownership, and strengthen citizen voice through consultations with civil society.
- Poverty and Social Impact Assessments (PSIA) of all loan-funded projects.
- Utstein Group Partnership (U4) consists of the international development agencies/foreign departments in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Norway and Germany to co-ordinate its development assistance policies (<http://www.u4.no>). U4 has established a virtual anti-corruption resource centre and developed transparent systems for procurement and public information to ensure that the movement of funds through the system can be publicly observed and that charges paid for services are clearly defined.

Action points:

- Where corruption and mismanagement are found to have taken place, options include i) Debarment from future projects/contracts, ii) Internal enforcement measures against staff involved in corruption and fraud and iii) Legal action by recipient country authorities

•Donors can help to strengthen the links between users and existing providers in order to ensure that aid-funded services reach poor people.

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Department of Institutional Integrity, World Bank

The World Bank Group created the Department of Institutional Integrity (INT) to investigate claims of fraud and corruption – in Bank Group operations and allegations of staff misconduct– and a Sanctions Committee to adjudicate cases and assess penalties.

CASE SURVEY: The Campo Elias program, Venezuela

A World Bank program in Campo Elias, Venezuela (April 1998 to December 1999), used participation in public policymaking to combat corruption in service delivery. Strategies for municipal reform were developed based on survey findings and group decisions. As a result corruption has fallen and services are delivered more efficiently.

Further Guidance

TOOL 3: Training Communities as Monitors

TOOL 4: Partnerships between Government and Civil Society

TOOL 10: Blowing the Whistle

TOOL 6: Tracking of Public Funds and Expenditure

Description

Public services often fail poor people because government spends its funds unwisely. If budgets are misallocated or misappropriated, service quality, quantity, and access suffer. Discrepancies between policy statements and actual delivery can trigger civic action against corruption in the public sector, thus contributing to improved accountability.

Participatory budgeting has become increasingly popular in the context of decentralisation and creates opportunities for greater citizen and local legislature involvement. Participatory budgeting helps improve transparency in the financial administration of local authorities and contributes to a more equitable distribution of resources. Public budget hearings at local level raise citizens' awareness of the goods and services they should receive and breaks with the tradition that the budget process should occur exclusively within the executive, with the input only of budget technicians and a few politicians.

Examples of tracking public expenditures include:

Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (PETS) -- pioneered in Uganda and at present used in a number of countries including in Tanzania – track expenditures in priority sectors at all levels. PETS compare budgetary allocations to actual spending. This involves 'following the money' to where it is spent, comparing budgetary allocations with records of transfers and receipts at each level of government. The data compiled show how much of the funds reach the intended beneficiaries. It will also indicate at what level any leakage or diversion takes place.

Citizens have been directly involved in **participatory budget** formulation and spending reviews in Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, Brazil and in Recife. Participatory budgeting started as a means for the citizens to participate in priority-setting, resource allocation and budget formulation and then to hold the municipal government accountable for executing the budget.

Public awareness and citizen engagement in budget processes has been increased through **public hearings**. There are many examples of such initiatives, such as that conducted by Mazdoor Kisan Shakthi Sangathan (MKSS), or the Workers and Peasants Power Association, a grassroots organisation based in India.

The South Africa **Public Service Accountability Monitor (PSAM)** monitors the management of public resources and cases of misconduct and corruption by the government. PSAM provides a database of information on budget allocations and resources available to various government departments, as well as their plans for the use of these resources, any problems they may experience during the course of their implementation and recommendations made by oversight bodies..(www.psam.org.za)

PROOF (Public Record of Operations and Finance) Since August 2002, PROOF has been obtains quarterly statements from Bangalore Municipal Corporation and sharing them with the public through regular public meetings and a weekly radio talk show.

Report cards on public services are another way to assess whether public funds go missing. A report card is a survey that assesses the performance of, for example, water supply. It measures both quantitative and qualitative indicators of service delivery through direct citizen feedback. If results of the report card surveys are fed back to service providers, they provide an incentive for increased accountability. If they are widely disseminated amongst the public, together with budget information, they provide an opportunity for citizens to get involved in the budget allocation process and to ensure that the budget addresses their needs.

Action point:

- Present expenditure records in simple language to the public

Related Case Surveys

CASE SURVEY: Financial disclosure, India: PROOF Financial Disclosure, India

PROOF (Public Record of Operations and Finance) is a public campaign launched in 2002, in Bangalore. The PROOF campaign aims to institute systems to ensure quarterly financial disclosure by the city Municipal Corporation and ensure that citizens participate in the process of evaluation of local government performance. The Municipal Corporation supplies quarterly financial performance in a user-friendly format.

CASE SURVEY: Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Governance, Philippines

In the Philippines civil society organizations have become partners with government agencies in order to reduce corruption in public works as well as in ensuring transparency. One example of which is the Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (CCAGG), an NGO Watchdog in the Province of Abra. The participation of an NGO like the CCAGG in government audit activities has demonstrated that NGOs and communities can be effective auditors, ensuring that construction projects are properly executed/implemented and also enhance transparency and accountability

CASE SURVEY: Report Cards, India.

First used in Bangalore in 1993, report cards use citizen feedback (from the poor and marginalized sections of society) to rate the performance of public services agencies, such as the electricity board, water board, telecommunications, and public banks amongst others. Information can be used to signal that the service provider needs to take corrective action (adopt client friendly practices and policies, introduce performance standards and improve transparency in operations) as well as to enable comparisons between agencies and locations.

CASE SURVEY: Equity of Distribution Indicator, Malawi.

The Equity of Distribution Indicator involves a survey of water points and their condition, together with their GPS (Global Positioning System) positions. It is a way of measuring the difference in access to water services between poor and non-poor areas (e.g. in a whole district). Water Point Mapping has had an impact on the allocation of water points within and between districts in Malawi. But, so far, has only had a marginal impact on nation-wide planning and monitoring processes with regard to water supply.

Further Guidance

TOOL 18: Disclosure

TOOL 21: Audit Institutions

TOOL 22: Access to Information

TOOL 7: Monitoring and Measuring the Nature and Extent of Corruption

Description

Surveys aim to measure corruption and assess service delivery. The objectives of monitoring/measuring corruption include patterns and root causes of corruption, quantify the costs of corruption to the average citizen, increase public interest in the issues surrounding corruption and provide a basis for actions as well as inform service providers, identify areas for reform, as well as provide information to civil society that strengthens the voice relationship and client power. Implementation of a comprehensive survey requires financial resources. It is important to ensure that information reaches different audiences i.e., use different media print, electronic and the Internet.

Three common models that exist are:

1. Independent civil society organizations undertake the initiative (such as national chapters of Transparency International e.g. Kenya Bribery Index www.tikenya.org); Transparency International National Integrity System (NIS) Country Studies; TI Corruption Perceptions Index **The Bribe Payers Index (BPI)**.
2. Service providers themselves seek client feedback directly; and
3. An oversight agency undertakes the initiative. Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) **Country Forecast Index**; Opacity Index by PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC); USAID Country Assessments; UNDP Country Assessment in Accountability and Transparency; OECD Surveys; The World Bank has a number of governance tools that permit the measurement of corruption: Quantitative Service Delivery Surveys (QSDS) Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (PETS); Public Officials Surveys.

Transparency International has developed a series of risk assessment discussion documents for the construction industry and offers models of construction integrity pacts. The **Public Contracting Monitoring System (PCMS)** is a tool aimed to observe and monitor (measure) public contracting systems in terms of an "ideal" contracting system in terms of transparency, corruption prevention, and control. This gap between the ideal system and the actual situation is defined as corruption risk.

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Diagnostic surveys, Uganda.

Public expenditure tracking survey (PETS) and quantitative service delivery surveys (QSDS) are new tools for diagnosing corruption and other problems relating to basic service provision in developing countries. Surveys make it possible to investigate the causes responsible for corruption, including leakage of funds and bribery. The experience in Uganda shows that a survey can provide a useful check on the supply side of service delivery when institutions perform poorly and official statistics are lacking or of poor quality. Performing a survey alone will not reduce corruption in service delivery- after the survey data have been collected, analyzed, and disseminated—when the government must start introducing reforms that tackle fundamental sources of corruption.

CASE SURVEY: Urban Bribery Index, Kenya.

The Kenya Urban Bribery Survey is used to assess corrupt practices in urban areas and thereby help inform strategies to increase transparency and accountability at the local level. The data produced can act as a useful tool in pressurizing public officials to do something about corruption on the basis of a common picture of the extent of bribery in service provision. The survey process

can be repeated over time and compared across services and cities, putting greater pressure on public officials to listen.

Action points:

- Issue a working paper/brief alongside the publication of the survey results to interpret the data, making the tool easier to use for advocacy purposes.
- A well-prepared strategy for dealing with the response from the media and the surveyed institutions/sectors is essential.
- Avoid confrontation from the institutions/government agencies that have been rated as worst performing ones by publicly explaining the methodology and the outcome.
- Make recommendations to bring about positive change.
- Continued monitoring is advised to measure any changes over time and the pattern of such changes.

Further Guidance

TOOL 1: Supporting Civil Society Initiatives

TOOL 8: Methodology for Investigating Corruption

TOOL 16: Citizens Charters

TOOL 8: Methodology for Investigating Corruption

Description

The project '**Accountability Arrangements to Combat Corruption**' has developed a methodology to investigate corruption in the infrastructure sector. This methodology enables an analysis of real life situations based on multiple sources of evidence and a combination of qualitative and quantitative research techniques. The methodology has been piloted in South Africa, Nigeria, Kenya, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Georgia, Ukraine and Nepal in 2005-2006. The research was conducted in partnership with local research institutes, universities and NGOs.

The methodology for investigating corruption consists of:

- A case study approach: due to the predominant 'how and why' nature of researching corruption
- A combination of qualitative and quantitative research techniques

This methodology will not necessarily generate statistically representative universal generalizations; however, such studies do contribute to the logical explanation of events on the basis of both quantitative and qualitative data. The main expected learning objectives are an analysis of corruption in infrastructure delivery including an understanding of the causes of corruption, the effects of corruption on the livelihoods of the poor, review of accountability initiatives in infrastructure delivery and the nature of the impact of greater accountability on pro-poor service delivery

The services under investigation might include water supply, sanitation, drainage, access roads and paving, transport, solid waste management, street lighting and community buildings. But case studies may also include related process such as lands registry, licensing of routes for transport, examination of vehicles for safety etc.

This methodology emphasises the importance of users, operators and regulators' perspectives of corruption. The study locations should be selected to provide a variability of situation, which gives a more rigorous approach to testing the viability or potential applications of the lessons learned; as well as to represent areas with a significant number of poor people.

A pro-poor focus in the research is aimed to assess how greater accountability in service delivery improves the assets and capabilities of the poor, enables the voices of the poor to be heard in policy discussions as well as to ensure that publicly provided services are specifically targeted to the needs of the poor.

The flexibility of the case study methodology allows for the selection of a combination of qualitative and quantitative research techniques. These techniques might include:

1. **Document/article review:** Scan official reports, press articles and research documents for information.
2. **Questionnaires:** on corruption in general and in infrastructure service delivery.
3. **Semi-structured interviews** (guided by checklist) with a wide range of stakeholders, including municipal professionals, private sector contractors, local leaders, elected officials, NGO staff, community organisations, academics and especially low-income residents. In certain instances it might be possible to interview those who have been convicted and sentenced in cases involving infrastructure-related corruption.
4. **Focus group discussions** with a range of stakeholders including service users (guided by checklist).
5. **Direct observations** (guided by a checklist) for example a transact-walk could be conducted in the slum to collect supportive information in the study location.

6. **Corruption Diary:** It might be feasible to ask an informant to write about their experience of corruption (on either the demand or supply side) in the form of a diary or in the style of a story.

The following activities are typically undertaken when conducted the research:

- Selection of sample communities using criteria developed.
- Collection of secondary data and information.
- The data collection stage will be preceded by the field-testing.
- Use of city forums/focus group discussions with users, providers/operators and regulators.
- Development of interview formats for focus group meetings and for interviews with key actors from the users, operators and the regulators. Interviews with key actors such as those in: low-income settlements; professional organizations and interest groups; and local and national governments.
- Compilation of data and data analysis.
- Preparation of the draft research report.
- Discussions with users, regulators and operators.
- Identification of common issues that appear to be (at least in part) capable of some improvement.
- Further meetings should be arranged with the relevant parties to promote the use of the research findings and development and refinement of the report.
- At the end of this process, the researcher can present the main findings back to stakeholders and receive feedback through city forums, media releases, national meetings, e-mail shots, and local workshops.

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Participatory Corruption Appraisal, Indonesia

In 2000-2001, the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia and the World Bank jointly organized and developed an action research project called "Corruption and the Poor". The project was undertaken in three urban slums in Makassar, Yogyakarta and Jakarta and aimed to explore how corruption affects the urban poor in Indonesia through use of the Participatory Corruption Assessment (PCA) techniques.

Further Guidance

TOOL 2: Working with the Media to Detect and Prevent Corruption

TOOL 7: Monitoring and Measuring the Nature and Extent of Corruption

TOOL 22: Access to Information

TOOLS FOR OPERATORS

TOOL 9: Human Resource Management (HRM) Practices and Performance

Description

New public management has been seen as a way of making government work better. The practice involves importing private sector HRM practices into the public sector. New public management systems usually include the points below.

- Merit based hiring and promotion,
- Clear goals and objectives for the overall process;
- A learning culture grounded in evaluation and feedback;
- Stakeholder participation at all stages of programme design and implementation;
- Concrete links between results, planning and resource allocation
- Measurable performance indicators; performance targets will be monitored against an established baseline.
- Value for money
- Monitoring public satisfaction with the services

Corruption becomes more difficult to conceal because performance is continually monitored and reviewed. Leadership is identified by researchers as one of the most common factors that contribute to improved organisational performance within both public and private sector organisations in order to create greater collective responsibility for improved delivery of services

Ten Easy Administrative Steps to Take in a Public or Private Sector Department

1. Investigate delays in service delivery.
2. Watch staff lifestyle. (Subject to what the law allows.)
3. Use random checks on staff to test staff by posing as citizens needing a service, and offer bribes.
4. Transfer staff in posts that are considered to be “at risk”.
5. Develop mechanisms to protect whistleblowers.
6. Monitor private telephone calls, emails.
7. Develop effective complaints mechanisms and procedures for appeals, whether internally by a public servant or by a member of the public.
8. Invest in staff training in areas such as ethics, intended to change individual behaviours by reducing the incentives to engage in corrupt behaviours.
9. Minimizing unnecessary face-to-face contact and rotation of staff also decreases the chances for corruption by reducing the predictability with whom the public may be dealing.
10. Remove the anonymity of services providers for example through use of name badges.

In some contexts, levels of tolerance for petty corruption may be high, particularly if salaries are low. Inadequately paid public servants are more vulnerable to temptation than those who are paid well. Proper compensation and incentives for those in low positions can play a role in combating corruption, within a comprehensive package of civil service reform.

Action Points:

- Set professional and technical standards via accreditation and professional sanctions
- Promote the rules of the game in infrastructure delivery
- Improve quality standards (accreditation, quality assurance)
- Implement *Quality Awards*, (usually annually) for innovations and excellence in customer service, are intended to induce competition and sharing of experiences between organizations – UK has a quality awards under its citizens charter programme.

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Report Cards to the Mayor, Korea

The 'Corruption Report Card to the Mayor' was initiated in Seoul in 1999. Officers in charge of civil affairs and citizens who have submitted a civil application (or signed a contract with Seoul Metropolitan Government in a corruption prone area) receive a postcard which they mail back if they have experienced wrongdoing in their dealings. Seoul Metropolitan Government took the initiative and approached citizens directly rather than wait for them to approach local government with their concerns about corruption. It is important to process reports promptly and notify the result of the investigation to the public accurately and fairly. Public information campaigns are essential for the initiative to be successful.

CASE SURVEY: Integrity Pacts, Korea

An "Integrity Pact" is a tool developed by Transparency International (TI) during the 1990s. It is essentially an enforceable agreement to behave with integrity in relation to their obligations under a project. An Integrity Pact contains important mutual commitments made by public officials in charge of the procurement and bidders for construction works or providers of goods and services.

CASE SURVEY: Citizen Evaluation System on Administrative Services Korea

Citizen Evaluation System on Administrative services has three components:

1. The Citizen Satisfaction survey
2. Saturday Date with Mayor
3. Email the Mayor program

Significant user responsiveness has taken place, which has improved service delivery in terms of stronger guarantees of service standards, more regular opinion surveys, and more consumer education.

Further Guidance

TOOL 11: Teaching Ethics in Both the Civil Service and Outside

TOOL 13: Disciplinary Procedures

TOOL 15: Codes of Conduct

TOOL 10: Blowing the Whistle

Description

Whistle blowing reports of corruption and other malpractice can enhance the detection of fraud and corruption. Whistleblower protection encourages officials, employees and aggrieved citizens to report instances of ethical misconduct, waste, fraud and other forms of corruption. "Whistleblowers" inside service delivery institutions can be encouraged to complain to institutions such as anti-corruption commissions or Ombudsman offices, or through telephone "hot-lines" (operated at a central level or departments of the government).

Investigations should be handled with protection of and sensitivity to the rights of the whistleblower as well as the rights against those the whistle is being blown at. Complainants must be assured that their complaints will be taken seriously, and that they themselves will not be placed at risk. Laws may be needed to encourage and supplement whistle blowing, such as Access to Information Laws as well as procedures to ensure the confidentiality and protection of the identity of the whistleblower. No one (staff, partner or third party) who reports suspected fraud or corruption should be subject to retaliation or disciplinary action for having done so. At the same time, measures will be in place to ensure that the hotline is not used for retaliatory or other improper purposes. During the investigation, whistleblowers must be kept updated about progress made.

The investigation process and the expected outcome (criminal charges, disciplinary action) must be explained to the whistleblowers, as well as the likelihood of producing sufficient evidence to take action, and the duration and difficulties of investigation. Whistleblowers should also be informed that the further the investigation proceeds, the more likely it will become for their identity to be revealed and for them to be subjected to various forms of reprisal. Few whistleblowers are protected from retaliatory actions (such as being unjustly sacked) because of numerous loopholes and special conditions of these laws.

Points for whistle blowing:

- Technology may be helping the whistleblower's cause. Blogs and e-mails make it easier to raise the suspicions of regulators and to steer their enquiries

Difficulties:

- In some countries, social taboos must be overcome
- Whistle blowing involves a great deal of time and energy and stress.
- An effective internal reporting system must be established and widely publicized in the organization.
- There must be a real commitment within the organization to act upon disclosures and to protect those making them.
- It is common for organisations to retaliate against whistleblowers by questioning their character.

Action point:

- Ensure fair and just treatment for those who risk their own position for the good of the organization

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Independent Commission Against Corruption, Hong Kong

The Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) has an Operations Department investigating suspected corruption (from time to time its staff engage in undercover activities); Corruption Prevention Department evaluates where various agencies are vulnerable to corruption

and have helped agencies take remedial measures – with management experts, systems analysts, computer experts, accountants, lawyers, engineers and architects and the Community Relations Department, which educates the public and fosters support for the ICAC.

CASE SURVEY: Business Partnering Against Corruption

19 leading international companies from 15 countries with aggregate annual revenues in excess of US \$70 billion signed the '*Business Principles for Countering Bribery in the Engineering and Construction Industry*' at the WEF meeting at Davos in January 2004. An organization which adopts the Business Principles commits:

- to adopt a "zero tolerance" policy on bribery;
- develop a practical and effective program of internal systems and controls for implementing its anti-bribery policy.

Further Guidance

TOOL 15: Codes of Conduct

TOOL 18: Disclosure

TOOL 2: Working with the Media to Detect and Prevent Corruption

TOOL 11: Teaching Ethics in Both the Civil Service and Outside

Description

Education can play a key role in combating corruption for example by promoting professional ethics; training activities; and inclusion of anti-corruption education in the curriculum.

The aims of anti-corruption education include: increasing resistance to corruption by promoting ethical values, changing expectations and attitudes, developing public understanding of the consequences of corruption in the sector. Training can thus help to create an environment in which ethical decision-making is encouraged and where skills for moral reasoning and the solving of ethical dilemmas are developed. Relevant personal case studies or scenarios are likely to have an impact. Methodologies for teaching anti-corruption should be participative, interactive and related to real life, recognising the challenges of social diversity and diverging interests.

Guidance points

- have professional engineering institutions make codes of conduct
- analyze common ethical dilemmas and consequences
- don't make ethics training black and white or reliant on memorizing frameworks
- provide guidance on how to fit ethics into the curriculum
- Should engineers work outside personal values for when at work they conform to company behaviours?
- Don't focus on major, headline grabbing forms of corruption it is equally important to look at examples like accepting an expensive lunch from a contractor.
- consider using a range of teaching aids that academics can use such as case studies, reports and scenarios, short plays with ethical theme, video reconstructions, role plays

Difficulties

- the engineering curriculum is typically overloaded and the topic of ethics is often not taken seriously
- engineering ethics can be difficult to define
- it is not possible to set rules for every occasion, is it sufficient for engineers to comply with rules, or to make ethical decisions?
- the more complex the rules the less likely officers are to follow them – there is a need for a simple system

For more information, see www.raeng.org.uk which provides an ethics curriculum map. Two other good online resources are www.prs.heacademy.ac.uk/publication/ethics_across_curriculum.pdf and www.onlineethics.org/eng/index.html

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: The Campo Elias program, Venezuela

A World Bank program in Campo Elias, Venezuela (April 1998 to December 1999), used participation in public policymaking to combat corruption in service delivery. Strategies for municipal reform were developed based on survey findings and group decisions. As a result corruption has fallen and services are delivered more efficiently.

CASE SURVEY: OPEN system, Korea

In 1999, Seoul Metropolitan Government developed the On-line Procedures ENhancement for civil applications (OPEN), to achieve transparency in the city's administration by preventing unnecessary delays or unjust handling of civil affairs on the part of civil servants. OPEN is a web portal that publishes information relating to permits and licenses. Korea's advanced information

technology infrastructure has been used to modernise services, increase the convenience for citizens, improve performance, and to reduce the cost of administration to citizens.

Further Guidance

TOOL 9: Human Resource Management (HRM) Practices and Performance

TOOL 13: Disciplinary Procedures

TOOL 15: Codes of Conduct

Action point:

- Consider using a range of teaching aids such as case studies, reports and scenarios, short plays with ethical theme, video reconstructions, role plays

TOOL 12: Information Technology - IT

Description

IT can facilitate easy access to information by the public and can also ensure that individual civil servants can be held accountable for their actions. The use of ICT has transformed the delivery of public services and reduced corruption and improved efficiency and transparency in public transactions and services (such as closed circuit TV in service provider offices). Pilot projects have demonstrated the usefulness of ICT in tax collection, election monitoring, public procurement, maintaining land records. The Internet can be used for on-line public tendering, opening the information flow, and reducing opportunities for making potentially corrupt personal contacts. E-government, automation and computerisation of records has the advantage of easy recording, updating, processing and transfer of information, enhanced the monitoring of the speed with which goods are cleared, identified delays and enabled the reasons for any delays to be investigated.

The OPEN (Online Procedures ENhancement for Civil Applications) system, an internet portal launched by the Seoul Municipal Government in 1999 to increase the transparency and accessibility of administrative procedures to the public and thereby reduce corruption, publishes a variety of information related to the services, permits and licenses issued by the local government. The system has been very successful in accomplishing the aims it set out to achieve. Results from a survey of 1,245 citizens conducted in 2000, 13 months after the launch of the system, showed that 84.3% (984 out of 1,167 persons) believed that OPEN led to greater transparency, and OPEN has been promoted worldwide by international organisations such as the World Bank, the UN and Transparency International as an effective means to improving transparency and reducing corruption in the public administration.

India has seen a few innovative initiatives aimed at curbing public sector corruption over the recent years. These have been largely aimed at increasing public sector accountability and transparency as well as improving public service delivery, including innovative social auditing methods to monitor the activities of local officials. In terms of government-led initiatives, E-government and computerization of registration and records (successful examples include computerization of land records in Karnataka whereby a farmer can check the status of a application on computerized kiosks (some have touch screens); other property registration in Andhra Pradesh and inter-state border road checks in Gujarat)

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: OPEN system, Korea

In 1999, Seoul Metropolitan Government developed the On-line Procedures ENhancement for civil applications (OPEN), to achieve transparency in the city's administration by preventing unnecessary delays or unjust handling of civil affairs on the part of civil servants. OPEN is a web portal that publishes information relating to permits and licenses. Korea's advanced information technology infrastructure has been used to modernise services, increase the convenience for citizens, improve performance, and to reduce the cost of administration to citizens.

Further Guidance

TOOL 6: Tracking of Public Funds and Expenditure

TOOL 7: Monitoring and Measuring the Nature and Extent of Corruption

TOOL 22: Access to information

Action points:

- Establish more flexible ways of providing ICTs which facilitates equal access to all e.g. access in remote areas could be better realized through decentralization of the service provision function to local structures, use of mobile units, and one stop shops.
- Use of ICTs to combat corruption requires legislation/policies to enable the provision of information to the public as well as procedures for documenting key government policies and activities.

TOOL 13: Disciplinary Procedures

Description

Punishing those involved in corruption should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis but might include a policy of progressive discipline, ranging from:

1. *Oral warning* for a performance or behaviour problem.
2. *Demotion or loss of salary*.
3. *Written Warning* - which contains the following information: a description of the specific problem or offence; the most recent incident and when it occurred; previous actions taken to correct the problem (if applicable); expectations and acceptable standards of performance; and warning that further unsatisfactory behaviour or performance may result in further disciplinary action.
4. *Suspension* without pay for incidents which are serious - pending enquiries or trial (with the costs of salary payments for an unfilled post, and risks of long delay);
5. *Dismissal* (if regulations allow)– the officer concerned could take legal action if they thought the dismissal unfair, and the cost of defending the dismissal or paying compensation in a few cases may be less than the cost of having staff suspended for long periods.
6. *Exclusion* from obtaining contracts for a stated or unlimited period of time (blacklisting)
7. *Legal action* if a criminal action has been committed.

Action points:

- When employee discipline is done poorly, it's often seen as unfair, and can actually cause poor performance.
- Tell employees what you expect of them and what conduct you will not tolerate.
- Employees must have clear notice of the consequences of poor behaviour
- Enforcing the policy in a uniform manner will show employees that you take these rules seriously
- Ensure employee sees the sanction as fair, and consistent with the "offence".
- Other employees do not like to see a co-worker getting away with poor, unproductive behaviour while they do their jobs well

Further Guidance

TOOL 9: Human Resource Management (HRM) Practices and Performance

TOOL 15: Codes of Conduct

TOOL 18: Disclosure

TOOL 14: The Integrity Pact

Description

Transparency International (TI) designed and launched **the Integrity Pact (IP)** in the 1990s with the primary objective of safeguarding public procurement from corruption. IPs can be used by any procurement body, in its procurement practice. The Integrity Pact has already been successful in reducing corruption and cutting the costs of dozens of procurement procedures around the world in over 14 countries in public contracting ranging from telecommunications to public transport. TI advocates the use of an Integrity Pact to commit the authority and bidding companies to refrain from bribery.

The Integrity Pact is a binding agreement between the agency and bidders for specific contracts in which the agency promises that it will not accept bribes during the procurement process and bidders promise that they will not offer bribes. The IP is intended to accomplish two primary objectives:

- To enable companies to abstain from bribing by providing assurances to them that their competitors will also refrain from bribing, and government procurement, privatisation or licensing agencies will undertake to prevent corruption, including extortion, by their officials and to follow transparent procedures; and
- To enable governments to reduce the high cost and the distortionary impact of corruption on public procurement, privatisation or licensing.

TI UK has designed three integrity pacts for use specifically in the construction and engineering (C&E) sectors at the various stages of contracting, including execution. They are intended for use in both the public and private sectors. They contain enforceable sanctions and their effectiveness is assured by an independent assessor.

- **IP Sector:** An agreement between C&E companies working in the same sector to act with integrity when they compete against each other in tendering for any project anywhere in the world.
- **IP Project - Pre-qualification and Tender:** An agreement between the client, designer (if applicable) and all bidding C&E companies to act with integrity in relation to the pre-qualification and tender process for a specific project.
- **IP Project - Execution:** An agreement between the client, certifier (if applicable) and the selected C&E company to act with integrity in relation to the execution of a specific project

Examples of work on Integrity Pacts

A recent Integrity Pact in the Karachi Greater Water Supply Scheme is anticipated to save \$3.1million and has led to transparency in public procurement procedures to be implemented in the workings of KWSB. Most recently Integrity Pacts are to be used in the EUR 2 billion development of the Berlin-Brandenburg International Airport in Germany.

In Nepal, the Integrity Pact has been adapted to suit local conditions and priorities. It is a comprehensive effort on the part of the municipalities to eschew corrupt activities. It involves pledges on the part of elected officials and staff in the municipalities to forswear being involved in corrupt practices. It also involves establishment of public grievance mechanism as well as an effective monitoring and evaluation system within the municipalities.

In Argentina in 2004, Poder Ciudadano (the TI National Chapter in Argentina) was instrumental in achieving the signing of an IP between the Municipality of Morón and four bidders for a garbage

collection service contracting process with an estimated contract award value of about US\$ 48 million during the first four years, with the option of extension. A Public Hearing on the bidding contract was held and led to a significant rewriting of the documents, which were published on the internet with information on what had been changed (and not changed) as a result of the Public Hearing. The IP was signed on a voluntary basis by all four pre-qualified bidders (one international, three local). Heavy sanctions were to follow comprising damages payable to the municipality in the amount of 10% of the contract value, and company blacklisting for 5 years. Conflict resolution was provided through national arbitration. The IP also contained corresponding obligations on the governor/mayor of Morón, on behalf of all the city officials, not to demand or accept any bribes and to prevent the extortion and acceptance of bribes by other officials, as well as sanctions against any officials violating their commitment. Civil society involvement was also provided for by the IP, through the participation of Poder Ciudadano in monitoring bid evaluation, the award decision process, and the implementation of the contract.

In Colombia, TICOL (the local TI National Chapter) has successfully applied the IP procedure to many projects at the national, provincial and municipal level. For example the telecommunications project ("Compartel" project). An IP was signed by 18 senior officials, including the Vice-President of Colombia and the Minister of Communications, in which they pledged to comply with all the relevant laws, not to solicit or accept any bribes and to report any offers of bribes. In addition IPs were signed by the bidders as well as Colombian citizens accountable for the program design and awarding process. A "Declaration by Colombian Citizens accountable for the Compartel Program Design and awarding Process" outlined the commitments of the signatories' vis-à-vis ensuring that the programme met the highest standards of integrity. The signatories included TICOL, the National University and the Vice-presidency of Colombia.

In Indonesia TI-Indonesia, was instrumental in applying an IP to a local government, the District of Kabupaten Solok. The 'Pakta Integritas Kabupaten Solok' (PIKS) was designed between three actors: the public (not only officials involved in contracting, but all civil servants under the jurisdiction of the Kabupaten government) and the private sectors as well as civil society, thus it is a more comprehensive IP. In addition to applying criminal and disciplinary sanctions in case of a violation of rules, civil servants can be punished for absence during working hours.

For more information, see:

www.transparency.org/global_priorities/public_contracting/integrity_pacts)

Action Points:

- The experience of TI national chapters has been that IPs work best when used in combination with other tools or activities, for example other private sector tools such as codes of conduct or activities such as Public Hearings.
- Independent monitoring is essential
- There must be clear sanctions

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Integrity Pacts, Korea

An "Integrity Pact" is a tool developed by Transparency International (TI) during the 1990s. It is essentially an enforceable agreement to behave with integrity in relation to their obligations under a project. An Integrity Pact contains important mutual commitments made by public officials in charge of the procurement and bidders for construction works or providers of goods and services.

Further Guidance

TOOL 4: Partnerships between Government and Civil Society

TOOL 15: Codes of Conduct

TOOL 19: Law

TOOL 15: Codes of Conduct

Description

Codes of conduct provide guidance on avoiding the misuse of official position and public resources for improper advancement of personal or financial interest, i.e. advantage to family, close friends and persons or organizations with whom they have business or political relations. Likewise, not use public property, facilities, services and financial resources for private purposes except when permission is lawfully given. The principle of “zero tolerance” is often embodied in such codes –obliging individuals to report suspicion or evidence of corruption committed by colleagues or others. Codes of conduct may also be used in the private sector: whereas public servants are expected to act in the public interest, those in the private sector are generally obliged to act in the interests of their employer

These codes often reflect the UK Committee on Standards in Public life (the Nolan Committee) principles of ethical behaviour such as: fair reward, integrity, honesty, objectivity, accountability, reliability, fairness. The code can be monitored through public complaints systems and enforced through disciplinary boards. Breaches to the Code may have implications for career or employment.

Two examples of work on codes of conduct

In the UK Transparency International TI (UK) has developed a code of conduct for individuals in the construction business and the Society of Construction Law’s Ethics Group issued a statement on ethical issues and has provided guidance on the application of ethical principles to promote discussion and debate on corruption issues.

South Korea has adopted a Code of Conduct for Maintaining the Integrity of Public Officials. This code, enacted by Presidential Decree in February 2003, specifies the standards of conduct to be observed by both state and local public officials. It covers areas related to the prevention of conflict of interest, the prohibition to use public office for private purposes, and the obligation of neutrality and impartiality. It also regulates the legitimate acceptance of gifts from persons related to public duties and other unfair advantages, which is of particular importance in a context in which the presentation of gifts forms an integral part of the national culture. Reports suggest that, since the code came into force, the number of duty-related offerings of gifts and hospitality have reduced substantially.

Action Points:

- Educate employees about the agency-specific codes of conduct so that they understand the rules, obligations and expectations of standards to which they must abide and to encourage the development of a culture of integrity within the organisation.
- Ensure that a budget is allocated for ethics training and education purposes
- Establish appropriate disciplinary procedures for staff in breach of the code of conduct
- Establishment of an independent and credible complaints mechanism.
- Continual review of the code to highlight weaknesses and loopholes

Related Case Surveys

CASE SURVEY: Integrity Pacts, Korea

An “Integrity Pact” is a tool developed by Transparency International (TI) during the 1990s. It is essentially an enforceable agreement to behave with integrity in relation to their obligations under a project. An Integrity Pact contains important mutual commitments made by public officials in charge of the procurement and bidders for construction works or providers of goods and services.

Further Guidance

TOOL 11: Teaching Ethics in Both the Civil Service and Outside
TOOL 13: Disciplinary Procedures
TOOL 18: Disclosure

TOOL 16: Citizens Charters

Description

Citizen Charter is a document which publishes service standards that customers are entitled to expect across an entire organisation or service area. It is a set of measurable and auditable promises made to customers. Citizens Charters promote a range of methods for improving basic standards, the availability of choice in the quality of provision and value for money in the public sector, including competition, contracting out, privatisation, performance related pay. Charters change service provision by defining service standards, ensure that users are consulted about their needs as well as setting targets for responses times, waiting times, charges and fees. Charters increase accountability through the publication of information about and requirements for government services. Officials can be trained in good practice and threatened with negative consequences if they fail to meet at least minimum standards. Charters normally have a non-statutory basis.

In South Africa the initiative known as Batho Pele (which means people first) is predicated on the underlying principle that public servants have a duty to serve the government impartially and with integrity and honesty. An important part of that duty is to ensure that services the government provides are delivered to the highest standards and in accordance with the government's wish to respond to the needs of all the people of South Africa

Action Points for Establishing a Citizens Charter

- Charters can be used wherever there is no effective competition or choice for the individual consumer
- Standards regarding quality, timeliness, cost, integrity and coverage of services must be published and monitored as a service that individual users can reasonably expect. Performance against those standards must also be published. Public servants must be courteous and provide helpful service.
- Charters make public service providers directly accountable to their customers through assurance of quality, access to information and guarantee of redress when things go wrong
- Charters can enhance public expectations, which in turn placed pressure on staff to change the way they delivered services
- Establish obligations to inform and be accessible; information must be made readily available in plain language about how the service is run, what it costs, how it performs and who is in charge

Related Case Surveys

CASE SURVEY: Report Cards, India.

First used in Bangalore in 1993, report cards use citizen feedback (from the poor and marginalized sections of society) to rate the performance of public services agencies, such as the electricity board, water board, telecommunications, and public banks amongst others. Information can be used to signal that the service provider needs to take corrective action (adopt client friendly practices and policies, introduce performance standards and improve transparency in operations) as well as to enable comparisons between agencies and locations.

CASE SURVEY: Citizen Evaluation System on Administrative Services Korea

Citizen Evaluation System on Administrative services has three components:

4. The Citizen Satisfaction survey
5. Saturday Date with Mayor
6. Email the Mayor program

Significant user responsiveness has taken place, which has improved service delivery in terms of stronger guarantees of service standards, more regular opinion surveys, and more consumer education.

Further Guidance

TOOL 3: Training Communities as Monitors

TOOL 4: Partnerships between Government and Civil Society

TOOL 17: Complaints Mechanisms

TOOL 17: Complaints Mechanisms

Description

Complaints Channels: Just as in the private sector, open and effective complaints channels and complaint handling procedures in the public sector serve to raise levels of performance and to identify those responsible for malpractice (using complaints as a management tool to monitor the standards of service and changing customer expectations). Complaints about corruption trigger investigation, prosecution or other sanctions. The grievance redress machinery should be strengthened as well as accompanied by close monitoring of delays, the punishment of criminal officials and steps to remove causes of grievances. Reporting corruption and other crimes may leave the reporting individual open to retaliation and place him or her in danger.

A system of receiving and acting upon complaints is an essential part of consumer services; utilities, line agencies and municipalities all require a system for receiving and logging complaints. These systems may exist without being well-publicised, and are hence little known to the consumers. For example, people can complain in writing, telephone, or paying a personal visit to an office. Having received and logged a complaint, the key point is that remedial action is taken. This can be checked by having a simple book-keeping system which allows the action to be recorded against the complaint. The register needs to be subject to external audit on a regular basis. It is also important to admit and correct mistakes and offer apologies when it is appropriate to do so; keeping customers informed about the progress complaint and treat customers with respect

Action Points:

- Raise public awareness as to where and how to complain, for example through campaigns giving the public hotlines and ensure members of the public can easily discover the identities of those civil servants they are dealing with.
- Establish a feedback mechanism to keep the public informed about the number of complaints, types of complaints, action taken on the complaints.
- Establish a disciplinary mechanism with the capability to investigate complaints and enforce disciplinary action when necessary.
- Create a public relations office to keep a file of published articles to keep the Managing Director informed about public concerns and to enhance public image.

Further Guidance

TOOL 3: Training Communities as Monitors

TOOL 7: Monitoring and Measuring the Nature and Extent of Corruption

TOOL 16: Citizens Charters

TOOL 18: Disclosure

Description

Most forms of corruption involve the loss of funds from the Treasury and a gain of funds into private bank accounts. Thus, audits, the disclosure of assets and better systems of public sector financial management can both decrease the likelihood of corruption and detect it when it does occur.

Disclosure contains information about assets, including investments, bank accounts, pensions, as well as property and major items of personal property both domestically and in other countries and currencies. Penalties for failing to disclose as required, or for making false or misleading disclosure, must be severe enough to act as a significant deterrent i.e. discharge and other disciplinary sanctions.

The monitoring of the assets, income, liabilities and life-styles of certain public decision-makers and officers can significantly reduce corruption. Where possible, disclosure is made to specially established bodies, such as inspectors or auditors general that are trusted to take any necessary actions. Applying a **risk management model** of reducing corruption, monitoring should be applied to those officials at or above a fixed level of seniority or those who hold positions where they transact with the public or are otherwise well-placed to extract bribes, for example, in the area of revenue assessment and collection and of the exercise of discretionary powers. Many countries – recognising that assets are fungible and may be hidden in the bank accounts of friends and family – extend asset monitoring to close family members.

Public expenditure tracking surveys can also be used to follow the flow of funds through tiers of government and to determine whether the funds actually reach their intended destination. Tracking surveys not only highlight the uses and abuses of public funds, but also give insights into capture, cost efficiency, decentralization, and accountability.

Action points:

- Specific legislation needs to be passed on disclosure of assets of public officials
- An office can be established within the local government to monitor the disclosures and to pursue anomalies that are observed.
- Contractual requirements can be made either to disclose financial assets (nondisclosure) or to refrain from corrupt behaviour.
- There should be sanctions for deliberate failure to provide accurate information.

Related Case Surveys

CASE SURVEY: Financial disclosure, India: PROOF Financial Disclosure, India

PROOF (Public Record of Operations and Finance) is a public campaign launched in 2002, in Bangalore. The PROOF campaign aims to institute systems to ensure quarterly financial disclosure by the city Municipal Corporation and ensure that citizens participate in the process of evaluation of local government performance. The Municipal Corporation supplies quarterly financial performance in a user-friendly format.

CASE SURVEY: Diagnostic surveys, Uganda.

Public expenditure tracking survey (PETS) and quantitative service delivery surveys (QSDS) are new tools for diagnosing corruption and other problems relating to basic service provision in developing countries. Surveys make it possible to investigate the causes responsible for corruption, including leakage of funds and bribery. The experience in Uganda shows that a survey can provide a useful check on the supply side of service delivery when institutions perform

poorly and official statistics are lacking or of poor quality. Performing a survey alone will not reduce corruption in service delivery- after the survey data have been collected, analyzed, and disseminated—when the government must start introducing reforms that tackle fundamental sources of corruption.

CASE SURVEY: Auditor General, Lesotho

The Auditor-General holds public officials accountable to the public and to the Legislature for their performance and stewardship of public funds and assets. The Auditor-General is responsible for auditing government income, acts as a watchdog over financial integrity and the credibility of reported information.

CASE SURVEY: Participatory Budgeting, Brazil

Participatory budgeting has been used in a number of Brazilian cities and most successfully in the cities of Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, where citizen assemblies in each district of a city determine priorities for the use of a part of the city's revenues.

Further Guidance

TOOL 10: Blowing the Whistle

TOOL 13: Disciplinary Procedures

TOOL 15: Codes of Conduct

TOOL 19: Law

Description

National law in almost every country in the world prohibits corruption and the taking of bribes. These laws include the Civil Service Act (if one exists) and is often enshrined in other legislation (such as the Public Procurement Act). The enforcement of these laws usually falls to three bodies: the criminal courts, the Administrative Courts (or Tribunals) and the Civil Service membership associations.

International Legislation and Conventions are additions to national legislation. They are often binding and ratified by a number of countries, and attempting to increase the political will to curb corruption and corruption-related crimes such as trans-national bribery, international crime, money laundering and extradition. The most comprehensive international conventions are

- The OECD Convention against Bribery (http://www.oecd.org/document/24/0,2340,en_2649_37447_1933144_1_1_1_37447,00.html), which, as of October 2002, has been ratified and implemented by 35 countries. The UN General Assembly adopted the United Nations Declaration against Corruption and Bribery in International Commercial Transactions (<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/51/a51r191.htm>) The Declaration deals with both private and public sectors, and calls for the enactment and enforcement of laws prohibiting bribery in international transactions. It criminalizes the bribery of foreign public officials and bans tax deductibility of bribes). In addition to the UN and OECD conventions, there are a number of regional and issue-specific treaties:
- The Southern African Development Community (SADC) Protocol on Corruption (http://www.sadc.int/index.php?lang=english&path=legal/protocols/&page=p_corruption), which in addition to defining and describing corruption has a threefold purpose: to promote the development of anti-corruption mechanisms at the national level, to promote co-operation between the SADC countries in the fight against corruption and to harmonise anti-corruption national legislation in the region.
- The Organisation of American States (OAS) established the Inter- American Convention against Corruption (<http://www.oas.org/juridico/english/Treaties/b-58.html>), the first international convention against corruption ever adopted (from 1997). It has been ratified by 22 OAS countries, and is relatively broad in scope.

Further Guidance

TOOL 10: Blowing the Whistle

TOOL 14: The Integrity Pact

TOOL 20: Anti-Corruption Commissions

TOOL 20: Public Procurement

Description

In most developing countries, the majority of public expenditure is channelled through the procurement system. Most “grand corruption” occurs in public procurement. Leakages, primarily through fraud and corruption, can mean substandard equipment and infrastructure, unnecessary low-priority goods, higher program costs, and poor-quality public services. Improving procurement requires extensive analysis of its rules, procedures, and institutional arrangements.

Procurement is the process of buying the goods, works or services, in this case infrastructure and services. The three roles in the procurement process are the *promoter*, the *engineer* and the *contractor*. The *promoter* (for example an urban government) plans, prepares briefs, commissions design work and hires an *engineer*. The *promoter* wants the best value for money. The engineer is usually responsible for design, monitoring and quality assurance of the contracts and for hiring a *contractor* to undertake the construction work. In many government organizations, the *engineer* is a full-time employee. The engineer has the important role of ensuring that the interests of the promoter are met and that the contractor is duly paid for his efforts. The promoter wants the best value for money and the contractor wants a good profit.

Satisfactory performance can be broadly defined in terms of the three fundamental objectives of:

Quality: has the work been done in accordance with what was specified?

Time: has the work been completed satisfactorily within the time specified?

Cost: has the work been completed within the costs agreed in the contract?

The key steps that must be taken from when the need for infrastructure is established to completion of the contract are outlined in the table below.

Figure 1: **Standard Engineering Department procurement procedure**

Narrative	Commentary
1. Formulation of a scheme and its requirements	Need not necessarily be done by the Engineering Department (ED); the ED procurement procedure starts once the requirements of the scheme have been put before it, regardless of their origin.
2. Preliminary cost estimates are prepared	In general, the basis is ‘rule of thumb’ and use of past data.
3. Administrative approval of estimates	Approval by the designated officials authorizes the initiation of the work. The larger the scale of the works, the more senior is the approving official. Some officials, such as the Chief Engineer, have unlimited powers.
4. Preparation of surveys, designs and detailed cost estimates	The basis of these cost estimates is the government approved Schedule of Rates and approved details. Public Works Department (PWD) is the main source of reference in this regard.
5. Approvals by appropriate officials in the ED; this usually involves the Chief Engineer, and is termed ‘technical sanction’	Technical and financial feasibility authorization. The official giving such approvals must be sure that the proposed work is technically feasible and financially viable. The designs and estimates are scrutinized in detail. The procedure prescribes the level of the official who is to give approval depending on the scale of the works.
6. Notice inviting tender	A notice to the potential contractors to submit tenders for the

	notified work. The procedure prescribes the level at which the notice should be advertised: in the case of some very small-scale works, pasting a notice on a board in the offices is sufficient; in the case of larger contracts, the notice should be advertised in the national or international newspapers for a minimum number of days.
7. Tender opening	Offers are opened in the presence of a committee. The committee comprises of a technical section, legal branch and accounts department. The offers are read aloud in the presence of the tenderors and recorded in a register. The committee then signs the register. The idea is to ensure that no changes are made in the bid price after the bid opening.
8. Work order start date	This signifies that start of the contract. This is a letter issued by the authorized official advising the contractor to start the work within a certain number of days. The contract duration starts from the date of issue of this letter.
9. Actual start date	The date work starts on site may differ from the authorized date. Although in micro-contracts there is no prescribed mobilization advance, many work orders demand that the work be started within 7 working days from the date of issue of the work order.
10. Completion of the work	This is marked by the date of the last measurement done at site. In many cases a 'measurement book' is used and the designated official takes the measurements and enters them in the presence of the contractor. In public sector procurement governed by the PWD rules, the entry in the measurement book is the final recording and cannot be challenged.
11. Facility becomes operational	In some cases, the infrastructure does not come into use at the same time as the work contract is completed. There are some time lags involved, for example, between the time when water supply pipelines are completed and when the water is actually supplied through those lines. For the end user, the operational date of the infrastructure is important rather than just the date when the contract is completed.
12. End of the defects liability period	Marked by the last entry of the measurement book, as reflected in the completion certificate. Usually six months after completion of the work.

Procurement of urban infrastructure in the public sector is regulated by the relevant legal, financial, municipal and administrative rules. These rules were typically set out in Public Works Department (PWD) procedures of the local governments in the study countries. The chain of responsibility involves action by many different officials. The whole process of procurement is very sensitive to delays in approval procedures, which in turn cause delays in awarding the contract and later delays in infrastructure delivery. Furthermore, the accuracy of the estimates upon which the contract cost is evaluated is critical, as departmental budgetary ceilings restrict payments to contractors.

Information technology can reduce opportunities for the discretionary use of public funds, increasing the impartiality and integrity of such operations, reduces opportunities for corruption and increases the accountability of public officials. Brazil, Chile, Mexico, the Philippines, and the Republic of Korea, among others, have developed strong e-procurement systems that lower costs and increase transparency, competition, and efficiency. For an example, see the case survey on 'E-procurement, Korea'.

Action Points:

- The WTO website includes information on best practice in government procurement see www.wto.org
- Free Trade of the Americas (FTTA) Government Procurement site (www.ftaa-alca.org) contains data on national legislation, regulations and procedures on government procurement for a number of countries.
- The World Bank's Country Procurement Assessment Review (CPAR) is a diagnostic measurement tool used to assess the procurement system and processes of a given country.
- Oxfam's Ethical Purchasing Policy states that Oxfam will strive to purchase goods and services which are produced and delivered under conditions that do not involve the abuse or exploitation of any persons and that have the least negative impact on the environment.
- TI has also produced a database of procurement tools. TI website contains information on over 20 countries' procurement systems (brief descriptions of how central government procurement activities are administered).
- TI Argentina (Poder Ciudadano) has developed The Integrity pact as a mechanism for rendering public procurement more transparent.

Related Case Surveys

CASE SURVEY: Business Partnering Against Corruption

19 leading international companies from 15 countries with aggregate annual revenues in excess of US \$70 billion signed the '*Business Principles for Countering Bribery in the Engineering and Construction Industry*' at the WEF meeting at Davos in January 2004. An organization which adopts the Business Principles commits:

- to adopt a "zero tolerance" policy on bribery;
- develop a practical and effective program of internal systems and controls for implementing its anti-bribery policy.

CASE SURVEY: Report Cards to the Mayor, Korea

The 'Corruption Report Card to the Mayor' was initiated in Seoul in 1999. Officers in charge of civil affairs and citizens who have submitted a civil application (or signed a contract with Seoul Metropolitan Government in a corruption prone area) receive a postcard which they mail back if they have experienced wrongdoing in their dealings. Seoul Metropolitan Government took the initiative and approached citizens directly rather than wait for them to approach local government with their concerns about corruption. It is important to process reports promptly and notify the result of the investigation to the public accurately and fairly. Public information campaigns are essential for the initiative to be successful.

CASE SURVEY: Poder Ciudadano, Argentina

The Programme for Transparent Contracting combines a Public Hearing where municipal authorities convenes citizens, businesses, experts, and representatives of the opposition to express their objections and suggestions about the planned terms of the contracting; and Signing an Integrity Pact wherein the municipal authorities and all businesses competing in the bidding make mutual commitments to prevent the payment of bribes.

CASE SURVEY: E-Procurement, Korea

An e-procurement system was introduced in the Republic of Korea in 1998 for purchasing goods and services and arranging contracts for construction projects. All procurement from purchase requests to electronic tendering, and payment is processed on line. Automation has simplified the bidding procedure, improved competition, avoided preferential treatment, and eliminated non-arbitrary behaviour officials take a 'pledge of integrity' which, together with punitive measures for wrongdoing, has led to an open and transparent procurement process.

CASE SURVEY: Public procurement Transparency, Ecuador

www.licitenet.com was launched on 16 November 2001 and is an online database created to inform the public about the process of public procurement in Ecuador. The purpose was to create a viable system offering relevant information both to the public and to state contractors, as well as

providing a forum for the discussion of public procurement in Ecuador. Anyone can access the database and inquire about specific procurement processes throughout Ecuador.

Further Guidance

TOOL 14: The Integrity Pact

TOOLS FOR REGULATORS

TOOL 21: Anti-Corruption Commissions

Description

An independent anti-corruption agency may have been established in your country to:

- Investigate corruption cases and initial prosecutorial function
- Educate and raise awareness about the harms of corruption as well as possibly to train government employees and elected and appointed officials (in co-operation with the civil service college).
- Provide analysis, policy briefs and even propose draft legislation to policymakers.

An Anti-Corruption Agency is more likely to be established where corruption is, or is perceived, to be so widespread that existing institutions cannot be adapted to develop and implement the necessary reforms. Conventional law enforcement agencies are less able to detect and prosecute complex corruption cases. As such, the agency often has greater public credibility. Some anti-corruption commissions receive and investigate allegations of mal-administration – many involving corruption or the lack of accountability and transparency. Often cited successful commissions include the Hong Kong Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC), <http://www.icac.org.hk/eng/main/index.html>; Central Vigilance Commission India <http://cvc.nic.in>; Singapore Corrupt Practices Investigations Bureau (CIPB) and Botswana Directorate for Economic Crime and Corruption (DCEC) http://www.gov.bw/government/directorate_on_corruption_and_economic_crime.html

Successful anti-corruption agencies are often believed to have:

- Direct political support at the office of the prime minister or president
- Security and independence of budgets and adequate resources to undertake its mission;
- Job security and competitive salaries for staff
- Investigatory powers such as to access documentation and the legal right to carry out interrogations
- Support and trust from community groups and the public in general
- An internal oversight body to investigate breaches of its code of conduct, or a body that monitors and reviews all complaints.

Related Case Surveys

CASE SURVEY: Independent Commission against Corruption (ICAC) of Hong Kong.

The Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) has an Operations Department investigating suspected corruption (from time to time its staff engage in undercover activities); Corruption Prevention Department evaluates where various agencies are vulnerable to corruption and have helped agencies take remedial measures – with management experts, systems analysts, computer experts, accountants, lawyers, engineers and architects and the Community Relations Department, which educates the public and fosters support for the ICAC.

Further Guidance

TOOL 7: Monitoring and Measuring the Nature and Extent of Corruption

TOOL 21: Audit Institutions

TOOL 22: Access to Information

Action points:

- It is important to consider whether to establish a separate anti-corruption agency to deal exclusively with corruption problems, whether to modify or adapt existing institutions, or some combination of both.

- Support for policies like civil penalties, blacklisting of corrupt firms, extradition arrangements, and other legal provisions enable the profits of the corrupt to be seized and forfeited, inside or outside the country.
- Co-operating with both conventional law enforcement agencies – and an anti-corruption agency – can be costly

TOOL 22: Audit Institutions

Description

Public sector auditing is a *set of tests* which investigate whether statements made about a government agency's finances are accurate, timely, and complete in comparison with a particular reporting standard. An audit's primary purpose is to provide a third-party view about whether a public sector manager's claims about the financial performance of a budgetary entity are reported in the time period they are claimed to be in, in the budget category they are reported to be in, that figures cover all transactions in a particular budget category and as *given some level of audit risk*.

Designing internal audit relies on managerial decisions related to the following:³

1. The choice of an acceptable level of audit risk
2. A set of probes or tests in areas of the highest corruption risk
3. An evaluation of the rules and operating procedures in areas where corruption might appear
4. Applying statistical methods to regular operating information to detect improprieties.

Department managers may use audit information in several ways:

- The weaknesses identified in the audit can help guide priorities for an anti-corruption action plan
- Auditors and audit institutions need to be both well funded and have independence against political/ managerial interference.
- Roles should be clearly defined and communications established between audit institutions, anti-corruption agencies, law enforcement agencies to avoid conflict.

The Auditor-General, especially in smaller developing countries, may require additional outside help to deal with complex situations. The Lesotho case (see case survey Auditor General, Lesotho) was key in highlighting the role of the bribe giver (contractors and consultants from developed countries) in the context of construction contracts. Companies and individuals who solicit and receive bribes can be successfully prosecuted. The case of Lesotho demonstrates the importance of building strong institutions that can tackle corruption. Prosecutions constitute a considerable drain on Lesotho's financial resources. No offers of financial assistance to Lesotho were forthcoming. Conventional mechanisms for investigating corruption, such as audit and legislative reviews, may not be adequate when the institutions are weak, as is common in many developing countries.

Related Case Survey

CASE SURVEY: Auditor General, Lesotho

The Auditor-General holds public officials accountable to the public and to the Legislature for their performance and stewardship of public funds and assets. The Auditor-General is responsible for auditing government income, acts as a watchdog over financial integrity and the credibility of reported information.

CASE SURVEY: Financial disclosure, India: PROOF Financial Disclosure, India

PROOF (Public Record of Operations and Finance) is a public campaign launched in 2002, in Bangalore. The PROOF campaign aims to institute systems to ensure quarterly financial disclosure by the city Municipal Corporation and ensure that citizens participate in the process of evaluation of local government performance. The Municipal Corporation supplies quarterly financial performance in a user-friendly format.

³ As with legal issues presented in this toolkit, the auditing procedures described in this manual may not be relied upon given different public sector accounting traditions around the world. The reader is urged to consult a competent and qualified accountant or auditor for more information. These points apply to private sector as well as public sector managers who wish to establish management audits which may be in addition to the formal audit procedures of the company or public sector agency.

Further Guidance

TOOL 5: Bringing in Donor Anti-Corruption Mechanisms

TOOL 6: Tracking of Public Funds and Expenditure

TOOL 18: Disclosure

Action Points:

- Audit institutions need to be both well funded and have independence against political interference.
- Action should be taken on reports.
- Reports should be made public.

TOOL 23: Access to Information

Description

An obvious way of both denouncing and renouncing corruption is by publishing information about public services. Access to information is one of the most effective tools for curbing corruption. Information is central to effective civil society participation and monitoring of government activities. An informed citizenry can considerably enhance accountability of public officials on their conduct and on decisions made on matters affecting the public such as service delivery.

One of the basic underlying principles of public servants is transparency of their work. Public servants are obliged to provide their superiors, state control agencies with information about their work. However, public agencies are often not effective in communicating information to the public, or dealing with enquiries what they are doing. This could be due to incompetence or negligence, but it may also be as a result of bureaucrats seeking to use their control over information to strengthen their power.

Service provider agencies have an obligation to develop proactive information mechanisms. These include such mechanisms as the routine regular production of reports and similar documents, the use of the Internet and computer networks; radio and television broadcast media; public service announcements (PSAs), print media such as newspapers; and personal appearances by government officials.

Poor people often lack access to information that could assist them. This includes information on rights protected under law, where to get legal assistance, information on service delivery, how to gain access to services, and development initiatives. Access to information legislation provides citizens with a statutory "right to know". Time limits can be imposed for the time within which the administration must respond to requests.

Improving access of poor people to libraries, internet, advice offices, government offices and constituency offices so that they can get the information they may need in order to mobilize or create organizations that enable them to access resources as well as to develop a personal sense of capability and entitlement.

The Australian Institution of Engineers and the American Society of Civil Engineers have both published Report Cards on the nation's infrastructure that rate the asset condition, asset availability and reliability, asset management and sustainability, (including economic, environmental and social issues). When a service provider can compare its performance with others, this information will trigger internal reforms in terms of policymaking and monitoring, better resource planning, better accounting, auditing and procurement and better performance. Service users and NGOs can also make comparisons about the performance of different operators in different regions, to use voice in an informed way and create a competitive pressure for service providers to improve. In cases where no reporting exists, freedom of Information laws may also enable service users access to internal emails and memos.

Around the world, the introduction of greater transparency in the functioning of government and public bodies has increased access to information, for example, regarding publication of procedures for various statutory approvals, allotment of land and property systems of assessment and levy of taxation award of work tenders, large orders for procurement of goods and services, delivery of civic services, identification of beneficiaries under various government schemes.

Methods of listening to customers – particularly with an eye toward improving service delivery and reducing corruption – include:

customer surveys	customer follow up	customer contact
------------------	--------------------	------------------

customer reports,	customer councils	focus groups
listed contacts for assistance	customer interviews,	customer service training,
test marketing	inspectors	ombudsmen
complaint tracking systems	telephone hotlines;	

For example, in the UK 1998 the Service First Unit of the Cabinet Office commissioned MORI the market research company and Birmingham University School of public policy to set up a Peoples Panel of 5000 members of the public selected randomly across the UK and representative of a cross section of the population. Members are consulted on how public services can be delivered and how that delivery can be improved from the point of view of service users. The panel is used to track attitudes and opinions over time and determination of reasons for change.

Action points:

- Government agencies should post details of the services they provide and the official charges for them to improve information transparency – for example through free distribution of clear and detailed brochures that explain procedures, publish schedule for fees and connection sizes.
- The citizen's legal right of access to information should be enforced; and also confers on government the obligation to facilitate access.
- The Internet has opened up new possibilities for governments to interact with their citizens and to reduce information asymmetries. It requires human and financial resources as well as electronic capability on the part of the responsible organization.
- Institutionalize of freedom of information legislation to guarantee citizens and users responsible access to official information concerning government institutions

Related Case Surveys

CASE SURVEY: Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Governance, Philippines.

In the Philippines civil society organizations have become partners with government agencies in order to reduce corruption in public works as well as in ensuring transparency. One example of which is the Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (CCAGG), an NGO Watchdog in the Province of Abra. The participation of an NGO like the CCAGG in government audit activities has demonstrated that NGOs and communities can be effective auditors, ensuring that construction projects are properly executed/implemented and also enhance transparency and accountability.

CASE SURVEY: Report Cards, India.

First used in Bangalore in 1993, report cards use citizen feedback (from the poor and marginalized sections of society) to rate the performance of public services agencies, such as the electricity board, water board, telecommunications, and public banks amongst others. Information can be used to signal that the service provider needs to take corrective action (adopt client friendly practices and policies, introduce performance standards and improve transparency in operations) as well as to enable comparisons between agencies and locations.

CASE SURVEY: The Campo Elias program, Venezuela.

A World Bank program in Campo Elias, Venezuela (April 1998 to December 1999), used participation in public policymaking to combat corruption in service delivery. Strategies for municipal reform were developed based on survey findings and group decisions. As a result corruption has fallen and services are delivered more efficiently.

CASE SURVEY: Participatory Budgeting, Brazil.

Participatory budgeting has been used in a number of Brazilian cities and most successfully in the cities of Porto Alegre and Belo Horizonte, where citizen assemblies in each district of a city determine priorities for the use of a part of the city's revenues. Participatory budgeting requires resource and a real and sustained commitment by the city management to transparency as well as continuous publicity and education of the citizens who are being asked to participate.

CASE SURVEY: Parivartan, India

The Right to Information (RTI) has been recognized the world over as an important instrument for checking corruption and misuse of power. An NGO called Parivartan, along with a number of people living in slum areas in Delhi have been accessing records of public works in various parts of Delhi where corruption is suspected in the delivery of public works.

Further Guidance

TOOL 2: Working with the Media to Detect and Prevent Corruption

TOOL 6: Tracking of Public Funds and Expenditure

TOOL 12: Information Technology - IT

Section 3: IMPLEMENTING THE ANTI-CORRUPTION ACTION PLAN

Risk management forms the basis of any good anti-corruption action plan. Detecting and prosecuting corruption require money, thus systems need address high risk areas first (particularly where money is handled). Easy systems to look at include:

- labour and management (minimum wages and working conditions).
- contractors or suppliers (regulatory rules to ensure competition in subcontracting and procurement).
- customers (service standards and penalties for default; complaint mechanisms).

Focus on creating islands of excellence: These are pockets of clean practice in either geographical areas or the infrastructure sector in a local government setting. Actors (the public and the private sectors as well as civil society) might agree to renounce certain practices and adopt accepted codes of ethical conduct.

Again, it should be kept in mind, however, that the framework describing the implementation of the anti-corruption action plan process should **not** be interpreted as a simple linear sequence of activities. In reality, the process is more disordered, with significant overlaps across phases; in addition, some activities can apply in different phases.

What should be included in the plan?

The plan should include:

- aims and objectives (short -term, medium-term and long-term objectives),
- outcomes,
- key audiences you will engage with and how will you try and influence them
- strategies,
- the timeline,
- budgets and
- risks and assumptions involved

Three desired types of outcomes of your plan might include:

- Policy and practice change (at the level of local government, government departments, companies, NGOs) – this could refer to change in budget allocation, legislation, access to services - and has tangible outcomes that are relatively easily evaluated.
- Attitude and behaviour changes of certain groups of people (for example employers, the public, employees) – this could refer to persuading officials not to take bribes. However, changing people's attitudes and behaviour is hard to do effectively and more difficult to evaluate.
- Changes in the social, political, and legal environment so that the general public have improved awareness of the problem of corruption in the infrastructure sector and have increased opportunities to influence the policies and practices that affect them.

Who is involved in planning?

A coalition of stakeholders that would lead the anti-corruption reform effort might include:

- Consumers, users and community-based organisations
- Other representatives/leaders of the poor;

- Non-government organisations;
- Unions;
- Municipal staff;
- Local politicians and decision-makers;
- Private sector operators and providers; and
- Interested parties at higher levels of government.

When implementing the plan it is important to identify key champions within government, civil society and private sector and form a coalition of stakeholders. Pay particular attention to achieving some "quick wins" to build credibility and public confidence. These might be publicised through grassroots participation in decision-making or public education/awareness raising mechanisms (meetings, newsletter, communications committee made up of representatives from all partners: public, private and community, web pages).

However, it should be borne in mind that anti-corruption initiatives risk becoming expert driven rather than based on the experiences and struggles of ordinary people. NGOs can help to fill gaps in understanding about the poor, facilitate civil society involvement and provide skills that other partners lack. Rather than rely on individual action, it is essential to mobilize groups of poor people to increase their collective power over service providers in order combat corruption in service delivery.

How can existing constraints be overcome?

Capacity building is important. One of the best way to fight corruption is to run good organisations. Capacity is the ability of individuals, organisations and societies to perform functions, solve problems and set and achieve goals. It is important to consider the skills and resources (money, people, knowledge and reputation) you have and the limitations you are under. **Capacity development** is about specific actions, learning specific skills, knowledge and attitudes, performing specific functions, solve problems, define and achieve objectives, promoting learning, boosting empowerment, developing social capital, creating enabling environments, integrating cultures and changing personal and societal behaviour.

Motivation is necessary if employees are to achieve goals and targets such as improved service delivery performance and combating corruption. Improving motivation is thought to require:

- Clear and achievable goals and targets.
- Pressure from managers to achieve goals.
- A measure of control over their work.
- Recognition of efforts.
- Rewards: internal rewards: sense of achievement, pride and feelings in goal/target attainment / external rewards: pay, promotion, and recognition.

Bringing engineers face to face with the daily hardships of customers can increase the moral cost of misconduct and is essentially preventative, rather than relying on the stick of enforcement and prosecution. Where daily informal social interaction between clients and officials are an important part of activities, this can create a social pressure to do a good job through monitoring by the communities.

Most people would prefer to be, and seen to be, honest and respected for their personal integrity. Thus, agencies might promotion values like integrity, selflessness, objectivity, accountability, transparency, honesty and leadership and service-oriented conduct to help prevent corruption.

<p>Action Points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Train staff not only think morally but also act morally.
--

•Encourage staff to stand by their convictions (empathy, conscience, self-control, respect, kindness, tolerance, and fairness) and counter any ethical challenges and pressures they will inevitably face and to choose the right moral choices

Who manages the plan?

The agencies should establish:

- a committee to oversee the development and implementation of the anti-corruption plan; and
- a management team responsible for day-to-day management. Their responsibilities might include monitoring and enforcing adherence to strategy; informing consumers about their rights and obligations; serving as an appeals body for consumer complaints of corruption; advising policymakers as regards policies to combat corruption and improve services.

Enforce accountability to the plan

Accountability ensures compliance with an anti-corruption strategy in two ways: firstly by making service providers explain and justify their actions and secondly through sanctions (e.g. civil penalties, blacklisting of corrupt firms, extradition arrangements) imposed on officials found to have behaved corruptly.

Strengthening individual accountability requires each individual taking responsibility for his or her actions. This can be improved by:

- setting professional and technical standards
- promoting the rules of the game including ethics
- improving quality standards (accreditation, quality assurance)

Why monitor performance?

While putting the anti-corruption plan into action it is important to monitor the effect that the activities are having on the targeted audience and the wider impact. Performance monitoring allows the agency to ensure that staff behaviour is consistent with the anti-corruption strategy. Performance reporting reveals whether planned actions have achieved their objectives, but also identifies common problems and allows improvements to be built into the system for the future. If the separation of policy maker from provider is clear, the policy maker should do the monitoring. If the separation is not clear independent of the regulator needs to be ensured by placing monitoring function outside the responsible ministry. From monitoring and evaluation exercises amend and improve your plans.

Choosing Performance Indicators

When choosing performance indicators for service delivery for a particular period and for the local context, managers need to take account of the following factors:

- requiring operators to report specific performance indicators;
- independent audits and spot checks to verify reported information;
- publication of performance information, so that consumers know what is expected;
- consumer surveys and complaints mechanisms;

Indicators may be quantitative or qualitative in nature. The average cost incurred and the time taken is both quantitative indicators. By contrast, a community member's perception of his or her satisfaction is essentially qualitative in nature. Key performance indicators might include

- technical efficiency losses;
- quality indicators;

- reliability of service;
- consumer satisfaction;
- complaint response/resolution times;
- repair response/completion times; and
- access to service (i.e. percentage of the population covered).

Once the clear performance indicators have been selected, the operators of the service should be required to: publish key performance indicators regularly; provide complaint mechanisms; and consult consumers regarding major new policies through surveys and public forums. In addition, the municipality could establish its own mechanisms, such as a formal consumer committees and surveys, for assessing public opinion about services.

- Decide on an appropriate reporting structure.
- Use performance indicators as the basis for the output performance reports.
- Establish clear performance requirements and incorporate them, request the operators of the service to publish key performance indicators regularly
- Performance measurements are not absolute, but relative to the country context, social expectations, the availability of resources, the tasks at hand and the organizational alternative available to achieve given ends

APPENDIX 1: List of Case Studies and Case Surveys

Case Studies

1. Addressing Corruption in Infrastructure Services in Georgia.
2. Accountability Arrangements to Combat Corruption in the Delivery of Infrastructure Services in Bangladesh.
3. "I won't sell my brother". Corruption in Infrastructure Delivery: A South African Case Study.
4. An Overview of Corruption in Infrastructure Provision and Service Delivery at the Municipal Level in Nepal and the FNCCI Anti Corruption Project.
5. Good Governance and Provision of Affordable Housing in DKI Jakarta, Indonesia.
6. The Struggle against Corruption in Housing and Municipal Services, Ukraine.
7. Lok Satta, India?
8. Nadeem Manzoor Hasan, Karachi Pakistan?
9. Social Development Network (SODNET) Kenya?
10. Gabriel Aduda, INTEGRITY, Nigeria?

Case Surveys

1. Campo Elias program, Venezuela
2. Report Cards, India
3. Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Governance, Philippines
4. Committees of Concerned Citizens, Dhaka
5. Independent Commission Against Corruption, Hong Kong
6. Urban Bribery Index, Kenya
7. Poder Ciudadano, Argentina
8. PSAM, South Africa
9. OPEN system, Korea
10. Radio Against Corruption, India
11. Report Cards to the Mayor, Korea
12. Partnering Against Corruption
13. Participatory Budgeting, Brazil
14. Participatory Corruption Appraisal, Indonesia
15. Parivartan, India
16. Financial Disclosure, India
17. Integrity Pacts, Korea
18. News Scans, Bangladesh
19. Department of Institutional Integrity, World Bank
20. Diagnostic Surveys, Uganda
21. e-procurement, Korea
22. Equity of Distribution Indicator, Malawi
23. Citizen Evaluation System on Administrative Services Korea
24. Auditor General, Lesotho
25. Public procurement Transparency, Ecuador
26. Private sector infrastructure related corruption, Europe

APPENDIX 2: Sources of More Information

COURSES

Anti-Corruption Related Courses and Practitioners' Training at University Levels

- **Kazakhstan:** Course on Preventing Corruption (first held in 2002 and coordinated by TI Kazakhstan: www.transparencykazakhstan.org)
- **Australia:** The executive training course "Corruption and Anti-Corruption" has been taught since 1998 by The Australian National University - Asia Pacific School of Economics and Government (APSEG) in partnership with the New South Wales Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC). It was devised in consultation with Transparency International (Australia).
- **Hungary:** The course "Strategic Corruption Control and Organizational Integrity" is held at the CEU (as part of its Summer University Programme) in co-operation with the Tiri Network, London and the Center for Policy Studies, Central European University, Budapest. Hungary
E-mail: summeru@ceu.hu Website: <http://www.ceu.hu/sun>

BOOKS

Bradhan, P., Mookherjee, D. Corruption and Decentralisation of Infrastructure Delivery in Developing Countries www.econ.yale.edu/~egcentre/docdecdelinf.pdf

Davis, J. (2004) Corruption in public service delivery: experience from South Asia's water and sanitation sector. *World Development*, 32 (1), 53-71.

Giorgio Blundo and Jean-Pierre Olivier de Sardan with N. B. Arifari, M. T. Alou and M. Mathieu (2006) *Everyday Corruption and the State: Citizens and Public Officials in Africa*, Zed Books.

Goetz, A.M. and Jenkins, R. (2004) *Reinventing Accountability: Making Democracy Work for the Poor*, London: Macmillan/Palgrave.

Hardjono, Ratih and Stefanie Teggemann (eds.) (2002) *The Poor Speak Up: 17 Stories of Corruption. The Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia*.

Holloway, Richard and Stefanie Teggemann (2002) *Participatory Corruption Appraisal: A Methodology for Assessing how Corruption affects the Urban Poor. The Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia and the World Bank*.

Klitgaard, Robert, Ronald MacLean-Abaroa, H. Lindsey Parris (2000) *Corrupt Cities: A Practical Guide to Cure and Prevention*. The World Bank, Washington, DC.

Paul, S. (2002) *Hold the State to Account; Citizen Monitoring in Action*. Bangalore: Public Affairs Centre.

Pope, Jeremy (2000) *Confronting Corruption: The Elements of a National Integrity System* (TI Sourcebook). Transparency International, Berlin. Available at: <http://www.transparency.org>

Reinikka, Ritva, and Jakob Svensson. 2002. *Measuring and understanding corruption at the micro level*. World Bank, Development Research Group. www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/corruptionBielefeld1.doc

Rodriguez, D., Waite, G. and Wolfe, T. (eds.) (2005). *The Global Corruption Report 2005*. Pluto Press, London. <http://www.globalcorruptionreport.org>

Transparency International. The Corruption Fighters Toolkit
<http://www.transparency.org/toolkits/index.html>

Transparency International. Transparency International Source Book
<http://www.transparency.org/sourcebook.index.html>

UNDP (2002) Corruption and the urban poor- Urban voices, NO 38 August 2002- UNDP/TUGI
www.ucl.ac.uk/dpu-projects/drivers_urb_change/urb_governance/transparency_corruption.htm

UNODC (2002) United Nations Anti-Corruption Toolkit. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Vienna. Available at: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/corruption_toolkit.html

Upp, Stephanie (1995) Making the Grade: A guide for implementing the report card methodology. Public Affairs Centre, Bangalore.

World Bank (2004) *World Development Report: Making Services Work for Poor People*. Washington DC.

Bo Dal, E. and Rossi, M.A. (2004) *Corruption and Efficiency: Theory and Evidence from Electric Utilities*. Mimeo, University of California, Berkeley and University of Oxford.

Boehm F. and Polanco, J. (2003) 'Corruption and Privatisation of Infrastructure in Developing Countries'. Transparency International Integrity Pact And Public Procurement Programme Working Papers No. 1.

Estache, A. and Kouassi, E. (2002) *Sector organization, governance, and inefficiency of African water utilities*. The World Bank Institute, [World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 2890](http://www.worldbank.org/policyresearch/workingpapers/paper2890).

Hall, D, Lobina, E, Viero O-M, Maltz, H. (2002). *Water in Porto Alegre, Brazil – accountable, effective, sustainable and democratic*. London. Public Services International Research Unit.

WEBSITES

a. World Bank

The World Bank Institute: <http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance>

World Bank Institute Governance and Anti-Corruption Newsletter Website:
<http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/newsletter/index.html>

World Bank Anticorruption Home Page

<http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/index.cfm>

World Bank Institute- Anti-Corruption Program

<http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/anticorruption/>

CPAR (Country Procurement Assessment Review):

<http://www.worldbank.org/html/opr/procure/borrower.html>

Empirical Tools for Anti-Corruption and Institutional Reform:

<http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/guide.htm>

b. International Monetary Fund

IMF Manual on Fiscal Transparency <http://www.imf.org/external/np/fad/trans/manual/index.htm>

c. USAID

USAID anti-corruption resources <http://www.usaid.gov/deomcracy/anticorruption>

Centre for Democracy and Governance (USAID) A Handbook on Fighting Corruption
www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance

d. OECD

AnCorR Anti-corruption Ring on-line (OECD Anti-Corruption Division)
www.oecd.org/daf/nocorruption/index.htm

OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials

<http://www.oecd.org/oecd/pages/home/displaygeneral/0,3380,EN-document-88-nodirectorate-no-no-7198-31,00.html>

OECD Anti-Corruption Network Action Plan

<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/60/59/12593443.pdf>

e. UN

UNDP Management and Governance Division (MagNet): <http://www.undp.org/governance>

UNDP/OECD Integrity Improvement Initiatives in Developing Countries

<http://magnet.undp.org/Docs/efa/corruption/Corrupti.htm>

UN Public Administration Network (UNPAN) <http://www.unpan.org/>

UNDP PARAGON (Training Module on Public Service Ethics and Accountability)

<http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/eropa/unpan002651.pdf>

UNDP Case Studies on Anti-Corruption <http://intra.undp.org/bdp/anti-corruption/casestudies.htm>

UN CICIP (Centre for International Crime Prevention Anti-Corruption Tool Kit)

http://www.odccp.org/corruption_toolkit.html

United Nations Centre for International Crime Prevention www.undcp.org/odccp

United Nations Convention against Corruption:

http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/convention_corruption_merida.html

f. Civil Society Organisations, Academe, Media and other information sources

Anti-Corruption Gateway for Europe and Eurasia <http://nobribes.org>

BETA news agency, Clean Hands pages www.beta.co.yu/korupcija/eng

Centre for International Private Enterprise www.cipe.org/programs/corruption

Colgate University, Corruption Bibliography <http://people.colgate.edu/mjohnston>

Committee to Protect Journalists www.cpj.org

Ethics Resource Centre www.ethics.org

Freedom of Information portals www.freedominfo.org and www.accessinitiative.org

Global Access Project (Centre for Public Integrity) <http://www.publicintegrity.org>

Global Witness (Publish What you Pay Initiative)

www.globalwitness.org/campaigns/oil/publish_what_pay.html

Paris Declaration www.parisdeclaration.org

Philippine Centre for Investigative Journalism www.pcij.org

Americas Accountability/Anti-Corruption Project (AAA) Respondanet www.respondanet.com

The Corruption On-line Research and Information Centre (CORIS)
<http://www.transparency.org/coris>

The International Budget project <http://www.internationalbudget.org/index/htm>

The SEE Legal Development Initiative www.seldi.net/anti_corruption.htm

The Urban Governance Initiative (TUGI) <http://www.tugiapdip.net>

TIRI www.tiri.org

Transnational Crime and Corruption Center at American University www.american.edu/tracc

Plunderwatch <http://www.plunderwatch.com>

Global Corruption Report <http://www.globalcorruptionreport.org>

UNICORN United Against Corruption: A Global Unions Anti-Corruption Network
<http://www.againstcorruption.org>

Institute of Social and Ethical Accountability <http://www.accountability.org.uk>

The Corruption Research Centre (Georgia) <http://crc.gateway.ge>

The Public Affairs Centre: www.pacindia.org

Corruption Prevention Network: <http://www.corruptionprevention.net>

Corporate Watch: <http://www.corporatwatch.org>

Corporate Social Responsibility Forum: <http://www.ibif.org/csr/csrwebassist.nsf/contact/al.html>

Centre for Ethics in Government: <http://www.ncsi.org/program/ethic>

Centre for Public Integrity: <http://www.icji.org/default.aspx>

Centre on Budget and Policy Priorities: <http://www.cbpp.org>
Consumer Action Group: <http://cag.org.in/index.htm>
Public Services International Research Unit: <http://www.psir.org>
The Corporate Monitoring Project: <http://www.corpmon.com>
Partnerships for Transparency: <http://www.partnershipsfortransparency.org>
PROBIDAD: <http://www.probidad.org>
Public Service International: <http://www.world-psi.org>
Southern African Online Corruption Information Centre:
<http://www.iss.org.za/corruption/index.htm>
Government Accountability Project: <http://www.whistleblower.org>
International Union of Local Authorities: <http://www.iula.org>
Indonesia Corruption Watch: <http://www.antikorupsi.org>
Public Service Accountability Monitor (PSAM): www.psam.ru.ac.za
Parivartan : <http://www.parivartan.com>
Ethics Resource Centre : <http://www.ethics.org>
Open Society Institute: www.lgi.osi.hu
Transparency International: <http://www.transparency.org>

g. Other Inter-Governmental Organisations

European Bank for Reconstruction and Development: www.ebrd.org
EUROSAI: www.eurosai.org
Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC):
www.parlcent.ca/gopac/index_e.php
Group of States against Corruption: www.greco.coe.int
Southern African Development Community Protocol against Corruption:
<http://www.safac.org.zw/pages/SADCProtocol.htm>
Task Force on Organized Crime in the Baltic Sea Region:
www.balticseataaskforce.dk/Corruption/Corruption.htm
Utstein Anti-Corruption Resource Centre: <http://www.U4.no>

h. Best Practice Examples

e-procurement initiatives to improve transparency and efficiency:
Philippines: http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/egov/philippines_eproc.htm,
Chile: http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/egov/eprocurement_chile.htm
The Auditor-General in Canada: <http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/domino/oag-bvg.nsf/html/menue.html>
The Accountant General Tanzania: <http://www.u4.no/projects/project.cfm?id=480>
Lithuania Special Investigations Service: http://64.49.225.236/rc_Lithuania.htm
Botswana Directorate on Corruption and Economic Crime:
http://www.gov.bw/government/directorate_on_corruption_and_economic_crime.html
The Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption is a good network for legislators working against corruption: http://www.parlcent.ca/gopac/index_e.php
The Seoul OPEN system: [http://english.metro.seoul.kr/government/policies/anti/civilapplications/Disclosure systems, Mexico Declaranet](http://english.metro.seoul.kr/government/policies/anti/civilapplications/Disclosure%20systems,%20Mexico%20Declaranet): <http://www.declaranet.gob.mx>
UNPAN: <http://www.unpan.org/EthicsWebSite/inc/ethicspg.htm>
Transparencia en la Gestión Pública: <http://www.cristal.gov.ar/Englishindex.html>
The World Bank (2001) Filipino Report Card on Pro-Poor Services. Working paper No. 27106. Available at: www.worldbank.org/participation/web/webfiles/philipreport.htm
UN-HABITAT (online) Report Card on Public Services in Bangalore. UN-HABITAT Best Practices website: <http://www.bestpractices.org>
Central Vigilance Commission India: <http://cvc.nic.in>,
Transparency International Kenya. The Kenya Urban Bribery Index (KUBI) Report: <http://www.tikenya.org>
Hong Kong Independent Commission against Corruption:
<http://www.icac.org.hk/eng/main/index.html>
Hong Kong Ethics Development Centre: <http://www.icac.org.hk/hkedc>
New South Wales state Independent Commission Against Corruption: <http://www.icac.nsw.gov.au>

Korean Independent Commission Against Corruption: <http://www.kicac.go.kr>
Seoul Institute for Transparency: <http://www.sit.re.kr>
Pakistan National Accountability Bureau: <http://www.nab.gov.pk>
Anti-Corruption Convention and Treaties: <http://www.u4.no/links/treaties.cfm>
Philippine Centre for Investigative Journalism: <http://www.pcij.org/>
The Wolfsberg Principles is an effort by private companies to fight corruption:
<http://www.wolfsberg-principles.com/>
Education and training in ethics:<http://www.iipe.org/resourcedocs/training.html>
The 10th International Anti-Corruption Conference:
<http://www.10iacc.org/content/phtml?documents=1048wrks=10>
The 11th International Anti-Corruption Conference:
http://11iacc.org/iacc/html/confer_3

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the many different people who have willingly contributed their knowledge, opinions and time to the development of this work. The following is an indicative, rather than exhaustive, list of organizations and/ or people who have provided support.

Bryane Michael, University of Oxford and Oxford Business Knowledge Ltd.

Danang Widoyoko, Indonesia Corruption Watch, Indonesia

Department for International Development (DFID), UK, and country and regional offices.

Deryck Brown, Commonwealth Secretariat

Glenn Hollands, Mbumba Development Services

Ihor Kyrylchuk, Association of Ukrainian Cities and Communities, Ukraine

INTEGRITY, Nigeria

Jayaprakash Narayan Lok Satta, India

Md. Shahabuddin, Institute for Development Policy Analysis and Advocacy (IDPAA) at PROSHIKA, Bangladesh

Nadeem Manzoor Hasan, Pakistan

Neill Stansbury, Transparency International UK.

Purusottam Man Shrestha, Kathmandu, Nepal

Social Development Network (SODNET) Kenya

Susan Rose Ackerman, Yale University

Tamara Sulukhia & Maryam Sekhniashvili of Georgian Association of Urban Development, Georgia

We are also grateful to the external reviewers including ??? and for proof reading and editing ???

Special thanks to the people from the low-income settlements in the various case locations that have contributed to the research and have provided their perspectives on the issues. We feel greatly indebted to them.