

Corruption and Public Sector Reform Monitoring Systems

Query:

Can you provide any examples of public sector and parliamentary reforms monitoring and evaluation systems that have integrated relevant corruption indicators?

Purpose:

As part of our ongoing support to the Zambian Government mainstreaming anti-corruption and implementing an anti-corruption strategy, we would like to learn how we could incorporate anti-corruption objectives and indicators in current reform programmes.

Content:

- Part 1: Current Experiences with Monitoring National Anti-Corruption Policies
- Part 2: Monitoring Anti-Corruption Efforts as part of Public Sector Reforms
- Part 3: Further Reading

Summary:

While most national anti-corruption strategies (NACS) recognise that anti-corruption efforts and public sector reforms are intrinsically related, the link between NACS and main government policies is often missing at the operational level. Most NACS provide for review mechanisms that primarily focus on monitoring anti-corruption measures as illustrated by the cases of Georgia, Zambia, Pakistan, Indonesia, Nicaragua or Tanzania. The implementation and impact of such mechanisms has been limited so far, due to lack of capacity, political will, resources and coordination capacity between the various public agencies involved. Civil society has also been insufficiently involved in the monitoring of NACS. An alternative approach consists in mainstreaming anti-corruption efforts as part of broader public sector governance reforms. Although this has not been the envisaged approach in most countries so far, a wide variety of governance indicators have been developed to capture the various dimensions of public governance as well as identify areas for improvement in selected aspects of public sector governance.

Part 1: Current Experiences with Monitoring National Anti-Corruption Policies

Article 5 of the UNCAC stipulates that state parties commit to *“develop and implement or maintain effective, coordinated anti-corruption policies that promote the participation of society and reflect the principles of the rule of law, proper management of public affairs and public property, integrity, transparency and accountability.”* Such formulation implicitly recognises that there are many overlaps between anti-corruption and public sector reforms. As anti-corruption efforts relate to promoting transparency, integrity and accountability and proper management of public affairs, national anti-corruption strategies typically include elements of public sector reform. UNCAC preventive measures also contain a large array of provisions that relate to public sector governance including in the areas of hiring and promotion, public sector ethics, procurement and management of public finance.

Authored by:

Marie Chêne

U4 Helpdesk

Transparency International

mchene@transparency.org

Reviewed by:

Robin Hodess, Ph.D.

Transparency International

rhodess@transparency.org

Date:

28 April 2008



Although most anti-corruption policies have conceptually strived to build on such reform programmes and include key components of public sector reform as part of their planned activities, in practice, the link between anti-corruption strategies and other main government policies is often missing or remains limited. This may be due to dispersion of actors and interests, insufficient political will as well as lack of capacity, awareness or political weight of the anti-corruption lead agency. As a result, activities under the anti-corruption strategy seem to be mostly conducted as add-on activities through various ministries and state institutions. (Please see: <http://www.u4.no/themes/uncac/report.cfm#u4brief>).

Review of Anti-Corruption Policies 'Monitoring Mechanisms

In most countries, roles and responsibilities for monitoring anti-corruption strategies are set out in the overall anti-corruption documents. The review of existing monitoring mechanisms suggests that in practice, such provisions have faced major implementation challenges, with weak and irregular coordination. The institutions in charge of the monitoring process often lack the capacity, commitment or political weight to take a pro-active role in this regard. The overall responsibility is usually assigned to the Office of the President or to a State Minister with the view to providing required political leverage to deal with subordinate line ministries and public agencies. The following examples are based on a U4 report on implementation of Article 5 of the UNCAC in six countries. (Please see: <http://www.u4.no/themes/uncac/report.cfm>).

Georgia

The 2005 anti-corruption action plan requires that ministries report on a quarterly basis to the State Minister for reform coordination on progress of implementation. The State Minister is required to report twice a year to the President. Civil society organisations such as TI-Georgia found this reporting process to be rather superficial in practice and not always conducted against international standards. One of the major flaws of this mechanism is also the lack of provision for public involvement in the monitoring and implementation of the anti-corruption policy. The 2007 plan makes little reference to public awareness. TI Georgia has been publishing and distributing monthly reports on key aspects of the reform process as part of its international commitment monitoring programme.

Indonesia

MenPan, the Minister of State Administration is responsible for implementing, coordinating and monitoring the national anti-corruption strategy, Ren-PK. Ren-PK explicitly states that monitoring should be conducted both internally and externally. Internally, MenPAN is tasked to monitor and evaluate progress. Externally, civil society should be included in the monitoring process through working groups coordinated by MenPan. MenPan elaborated a complex reporting mechanism, known as Komonev, supposed to feed data from each ministry, province and district to MenPan, with Kormonev teams established regionally for this reasons. Data collected through this mechanism should be aggregated and analysed by MenPan and submitted to the President in the form of an implementation report twice a year. In practice, this elaborated mechanism faces a number of practical and operational challenges. In addition, MenPan does not seem to have sufficient capacity, political authority and resources to coordinate this process effectively. As a result, some government institutions have shown little commitment to implemented Ran-PK.

Nicaragua

Before the shift in power that occurred in January 2007, the implementation of the anti-corruption strategy was the responsibility of the Ministry of Finance and the Secretariat of Communication of the Presidency (SCP). The main body in charge of monitoring the action plan was the SCP. This body had to collect data from other ministries and public office regarding the implementation of the strategy and to report to the Anti-Corruption Fund using agreed upon indicators. The SCP used surveys to measure corruption. In 2003 and 2006 surveys were conducted among thousands of households, focussing on five types of government institutions providing services to the public.

Pakistan

The Steering Committee created for the strategy development process was converted into an Implementation Committee, headed by the chairman of the accountability bureau and charged with the monitoring of the anti-corruption strategy. The strategy required quarterly meetings to review plan implementation, provide advice and guidance for improvement. As of August 2007, the Committee had not met for nearly two years. Theoretically, the composition of the Implementation Committee included representatives from civil society and the media, but they have not been involved in practice.

Tanzania

In Tanzania, the National Anti-Corruption Strategy Action Plan (NACSAP) uses a different implementing model, with each agency being responsible for the implementation of its specific action plan. All agencies are required to report to the President on progress through quarterly self assessment reports. The President's Office was assigned the role of coordinating and monitoring the implementation of NACSAP through a strategic reporting system. This system consists of one page reports with information about the number of corruption complaints, action taken, self-assessment of performance against targets, and five targets to be achieved in the next quarter. In practice, compliance has been limited and mainly focuses on complaints and action taken. There is no participation of external actors such as civil society.

Zambia

The NACS was launched in 2007 and includes an attempt to identify roles and responsibilities for participating public agencies. Some critics argue that the policy would need further clarification of roles and responsibilities. The Anti-Corruption Commission is the lead agency charged with the implementation of most envisaged measures and overall coordination, with a risk of overburdening its capacities.

Armenia

To support the implementation of the 2004 Anti-Corruption Strategy, an anti-corruption participatory monitoring methodology has been devised and conducted in 2007 for the healthcare and education sectors with active involvement of the media with the view to fostering civil society participation in monitoring of the National Anti-Corruption Strategy (NACS). This methodology was subsequently approved by the State Anti-Corruption Council. (<http://europeandcis.undp.org/governance/parac/show/A4CC9DE6-F203-1EE9-B3E49BEEBD395085>)

Emerging Lessons

A few lessons emerge from the review of existing monitoring mechanisms.

Coordination of the monitoring

Anti-corruption policy making is a complex process cutting across different sectors and institutions of a country's governance system and carried through various public agencies and bodies, which makes monitoring a challenging task. The lead agency in charge of coordinating and monitoring the implementation of the anti-corruption policy should have sufficient authority, resources, capacity or political backing to perform its mandate and compel line ministries to implement measures and report on progress.

Adequate resources and capacities

Effective monitoring requires adequate resources and expertise and an independent monitoring body. In the cases reviewed, there was often a gap between limited institutional capacity, insufficient resources allocated to the monitoring process and rather ambitious objectives, such as in Indonesia. Monitoring reviews must be conducted on a periodic basis in order to assess progress over time. Because monitoring is an ongoing process with periodic progress reviews, funding must be adequate, predictable and dependable.

Identification of simple, meaningful and manageable indicators

A further challenge to overcome is the poor quality of information and difficulty to get access to relevant information in most developing countries. There is a need to keep a reasonable balance between the need for data and the cost of data. Collection of quality information has proved to be a challenging task in countries where capacity is weak. In view of resource and capacity constraints, an effective mechanism should identify simple but meaningful indicators that can be managed in countries with weak data collection, processing and analysing capacity.

Combination of monitoring methods, including internal and external assessments

Most monitoring mechanisms are based on self-assessment of progress. Experience with monitoring anti-corruption conventions indicate that effective mechanisms involve to some degree a combination of monitoring methods including self-assessments, expert reviews, peer reviews, country visits and the publication of a report with recommendations for improvements. This approach can be applied at national level by providing for both internal and external assessment of implementation progress.

Involvement of non-state actors

To be credible and acceptable, the monitoring mechanism must reflect extensive participation by a variety of stakeholders. A missing element in most of the reviewed mechanisms is the lack of involvement of civil society at any stage of the process. Very few mechanisms explicitly provide for allowing civil society's input in the monitoring, even less actually implement such provisions. An effective monitoring mechanism should provide for civil society participation and public access to information and documents.

Part 2: Monitoring Anti-Corruption Efforts as Part of Public Sector Reforms

In parallel to developing anti-corruption policies, most developing countries have engaged in core governance and public sector reforms that include anti-corruption related measures. In countries that have not formulated an explicit anti-corruption policy, such reforms are usually considered to be an essential part of the anti-corruption agenda. The main objective of these measures is to increase the effectiveness, transparency and accountability of the public sector through improved administrative, financial and control systems. In such an approach, anti-corruption efforts are implicitly embedded into broader governance reforms, making anti-corruption a by-product of public sector reform.

Challenges Involved in Monitoring Anti-Corruption as Part of Broader Governance Reforms

This approach is recommended by the U4 Brief on the implementation of article 5 of the UNCAC as a way to address some of the challenges involved in implementing anti-corruption strategies that cut across many other government policies. Effective anti-corruption policies should be embedded in broader coordinated policies instead of being conducted in isolation from other governance reforms. In other words, the challenge is to mainstream anti-corruption efforts by including a strategic anti-corruption dimension in all relevant areas of core governance reforms. All the above-mentioned countries, including Zambia, have been undergoing a complex and intensive restructuring and modernisation of the public sector, with the view to making it more effective, efficient and accountable. Within this framework, reform efforts have focussed on core areas of public governance such as public expenditure management and financial accountability, administrative and civil service reform, decentralisation, tax and revenue functions and parliamentary reforms.

In theory, mainstreaming corruption into the monitoring and evaluating of ongoing governance reform could help strengthen the links between anti-corruption and other core areas of governance reforms. However, the U4 report concludes that this has not been the approach in most cases so far. While monitoring mechanisms have been established within the framework of anti-corruption strategies, there have been few practical and horizontal links with broader core governance reforms.

According to this report, monitoring anti-corruption results derived from core governance reforms would involve in practice:

- Identifying specific aspects of core reforms that are crucial for increasing transparency, integrity and accountability. Relevant provisions covered by the UNCAC may help mapping key elements.
- Agreeing with all stakeholders on which elements should be prioritised and which institutions or sectors should be piloted;
- Selecting relevant indicators that allow measurement of progress in reducing corruption or increasing transparency;
- Establishing an appropriate monitoring mechanism;
- Disseminating results and advocating for change.

Using such an approach would require different institutional arrangements and efforts to increase information management capacities at the local level.

Examples of Public Governance Monitoring Systems

There are a few examples of strengthening the link between anti-corruption efforts and public sector reforms or monitoring corruption and anti-corruption efforts as part of broader government commitment to political, economic or corporate governance.

Mozambique's Anti-Corruption Strategy (ACS) for 2006/2010 constitutes an example of striving to link anti-corruption to public sector reform as well as involve the various sectors of society in the process. The ACS has been designed by an Inter-ministerial Commission on Public Sector Reform as an integral part of the overall public sector reform strategy, whose primary objective is to improve service delivery to citizens. The public reform strategy is built around five major components, including rationalisation of public service delivery structures, human resource development policy, management of public policy processes, financial management; and good governance and the fight against corruption. The ACS identifies seven major objectives, ranging from rationalisation of administrative procedures, improvement of efficiency and quality of the justice system, strengthening the public financial system to promoting the participation of civil society in the fight against corruption. For each objective, the ACS details results and specific indicators consistent with the other components of the overall public sector reform. A Technical Commission composed of representatives of the executive, the judiciary, the legislature, civil society and the business sector is in charge of monitoring the strategy with two consultative bodies, the National Anti-Corruption forum and the Provincial forum. (<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/mozambique-anti-corruption-strat.pdf>). The Helpdesk has not found an account of how this approach has been implemented in practice and cannot draw conclusions on its effectiveness to tackle and monitor corruption and anti-corruption efforts in the country.

Although corruption was not the main focus of the intervention, **Albania** provides another example of monitoring a comprehensive administrative and civil service reform program that includes elements that are relevant to the fight against corruption. Since 2000, the country is undergoing a comprehensive policy reform programme to strengthen weak institutional and governance capacity with the support of the World Bank. Monitoring was designed as an integral part of the reform programme. The Government committed to monitor a core set of indicators with varying degree of periodicity during the implementation of reforms. Some of these indicators address corruption-related risks by looking at operational efficiency or human resource management issues, using indicators such as transparent competitive procurement, delays in auditing, civil service system of incentives,

incidence of political appointee in the civil service, etc.¹ The government also committed to publicly report on progress through the publication of a newsletter.

The **New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)** also provides an example of a monitoring mechanism of participating states' commitment to ensure that their policies and practices conform to common standards of political, economic and corporate governance.² The mechanism is a system of "self-monitoring" by which African countries review each others' political and economic governance. As such, the APRM does not exclusively focus on anti-corruption, but includes elements of monitoring of government anti-corruption activities and performance against the African Union anti-corruption convention requirements. The review process includes country self-assessments based on a questionnaire, expert review teams, and on-site visits by expert review teams who consult with government, private sector and civil society representatives, active plenary discussions, revision of country reports and action plans by APR Panel of Eminent Persons. Zambia has notified the African peer-review secretariat of its decision to accede to the African peer-review mechanism and the country is expected to be reviewed in the course of July 2008.

Corruption Indicators and Diagnostic Tools for Public Sector Governance

Monitoring involves regularly measuring progress towards achieving an objective. As corruption cannot be measured directly, anti-corruption objectives must be translated into a set of disaggregated indicators that can provide information on progress made. A wide variety of governance indicators have been developed to capture the various dimensions of public governance as well as identify areas for improvement in selected aspects of public sector governance.³ Although their focus is usually broader, some of them implicitly cover areas of public reform that are relevant to anti-corruption work, while others explicitly include corruption indicators.

They are typically based on expert assessments, surveys or a combination of both approaches. Some of them such as Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) or Human Resource Management indicators (HRM) focus more specifically on measuring the quality of processes, rules and practices governing public affairs. These are particularly useful to monitor progress in implementing priority anti-corruption reforms. Others, such as the TI Corruption Perceptions Index, the World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators or Investment Climate Assessments, measure general outcomes of public governance and are more useful to indicate the overall extent of governance problems in a given country. An overview of the major governance indicators currently in use has been provided in a recent Expert Answer on Assessing Impact of Anti-Corruption Measures in Burkina Faso (Please see attachment).

¹ Please see for a detailed list of indicators used:

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPUBLICSECTORANDGOVERNANCE/EXTADMINISTRATIVEANDCIVILSERVICEREFORM/0,,contentMDK:20134434~menuPK:1920012~pagePK:210058~piPK:210062~theSitePK:286367,00.html>

² For a comparative assessment of international conventions' monitoring mechanisms, including the APRM, please see: www.transparency.org/content/download/10617/90979/file/c3.

³ For an overview of available governance indicators that can be used/combined to monitor public governance, please see:

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPUBLICSECTORANDGOVERNANCE/0,,contentMDK:21530146~menuPK:286310~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:286305,00.html> and <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PUBLICSECTORANDGOVERNANCE/Resources/AGI-PSGB.ppt>

Monitoring specific governance measures

Designing and monitoring sector specific reform requires specific and disaggregated data, using a wide range of data sources and tools (official surveys, expert assessments, statistics or a combination of these various sources of data). Areas of public reform that are especially relevant to anti-corruption initiatives encompass reform of the judiciary, civil service or parliaments with the view to creating interlinked systems of oversight and accountability. In addition to these broad institutional efforts, a number of public functions need to be strengthened and monitored for establishing effective safeguards against corruption at sectoral level, including public financial management and public procurement, civil service and administrative procedures, tax and revenue functions, decentralisation and parliamentary reforms.

Public Financial Management (PFM)

Good public financial management systems can prevent corruption and help detect and prosecute corrupt practices. They provide for proper management of public resources, allow tracking of improper expenditures and support audit functions. A wide variety of tools have been developed by various stakeholders to monitor and evaluate the institutional performance of a country's PFM.

Tools developed by the World Bank in this regard include Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (PETS), Quantitative Service Delivery Surveys (QSDS), and Country Financial Accountability Assessments (CFAA). UNDP has also developed a toolkit, the "Country Assessment in Accountability and Transparency" (CONTACT), to assist governments in assessing public financial accountability systems and identify areas of improvement including public sector corruption, consisting of a comprehensive self-assessment of strengths and weaknesses in various areas of public management, including corruption. OECD/DAC has also developed a basic framework for measuring PFM performance, the "PFM Performance Measurement Framework". Other bilateral organisations have also developed their own instruments or guidelines for assessing PFM systems and capacity, such as DFID's Assessment of Fiduciary Risks. Public procurement and contract awarding are areas linked to PFM that are especially vulnerable to corruption. The World Bank's Country Procurement Assessment Reviews (CPAR) provide an analysis of the public sector's procurement system, including control and oversight functions. The Open Budget Index, composed of a set of sub-indicators measuring transparency of budget processes, provides another source of valuable information.

Administrative and Civil Service Reforms

Administrative structures and procedures as well as terms of public employment may contribute to an effective anti-corruption strategy. A professional, adequately paid and well-motivated civil service can contribute to reduce corruption. Merit-based recruitment and promotion, performance-oriented HRM practices as well as an appropriate system of incentives and sanctions can reduce opportunities for rent-seeking and corruption. Public official surveys have been used to measure the quality and performance of the institutional environment, including formal constraints such as rules, laws and procedures as well as informal constraints such as norms of behaviours, codes of conduct and systems of incentives and sanctions to promote or prohibit certain practices and behaviour. Examples of public official surveys specifically dealing with corruption include in-depth surveys conducted by the World Bank as part of the Governance and Anti-Corruption Assessments. (Please see: http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/capacitybuild/pdf/summary_publicofficial.pdf)

Tax and Revenue Functions

Tax and customs departments are typically sectors very exposed to corruption risks. Some African countries such as Uganda have granted revenue authorities more autonomy in hiring and setting pay scales. Reforms in this sector have included measures such as rotation, separation of functions, reduction of discretionary powers or simplification of the rules and procedures. A U4 answer has

specifically dealt with indicators of corruption in tax revenue authorities. (Please see: <http://www.u4.no/pdf/?file=/helpdesk/helpdesk/queries/query147.pdf>).

Decentralisation

Decentralisation has become a major feature of public sector reform in many countries. Governments have strived to decentralise their activities and shift decision-making to the local level in order to promote public participation, government accountability, as well as responsiveness of public policies and service delivery. Some governance assessments specifically look at local governance indicators through local fiscal monitoring, random public audits at the local level, citizen score cards, etc. An example of tools designed to capture local governance is the Indonesian Corruption Perception Index (CPI). TI Indonesia is conducting a CPI survey to measure a level of corruption in local government in 50 cities throughout Indonesia, based on local expert perceptions (CPI) as well as measure the level of bribery in several government bodies.

Parliamentary reform

The role of parliaments in fighting corruption has been extensively discussed in a previous Expert Answer on parliamentary approaches to corruption. (Please see: <http://www.u4.no/pdf/?file=/helpdesk/helpdesk/queries/query154.pdf>). As the institution through which government is held accountable to the electorate, parliaments have a key role to play in the fight against corruption. They contribute to establishing appropriate anti-corruption legal frameworks and have oversight functions in sensitive areas such as budget monitoring. Parliamentary reform focuses on promoting transparency by making parliamentary activities accessible to the public and developing public consultation mechanisms as well as strengthening parliamentary control and oversight of the government's actions, especially with regard to budget activities.

An example of monitoring parliamentary performance in key areas of public governance is currently being developed by the Parliamentary Centre in cooperation with the World Bank Institute. The objective of the exercise is to prepare baseline studies, establishing benchmarks of progress and making comparisons between parliaments and/or for a given parliament over time. A parliamentary report card has been developed to this effect, evaluating performances in four critical areas including legislation, budget, oversight and representation. A set of indicators has been developed in the form of a questionnaire that contains 37 questions. Performance indicators include openness and transparency, participation and accountability criteria. This scorecard has been piloted in Cambodia with representatives of the National Assembly, senators and civil society. (Please see: http://www.parlcent.ca/indicators/index_e.php).

Monitoring broad governance measures and outcomes

Other tools have been developed to provide a more comprehensive and holistic assessment of the overall state of public governance, while allowing a specific diagnosis of the strengths and weaknesses of the various sectors and institutions.

TI's **National Integrity System (NIS) country studies** are qualitative reports that provide a detailed and nuanced assessment of anti-corruption systems at country level. Since their introduction in 2001, these studies have provided a rich resource that profiles strengths and weaknesses in national anti-corruption systems. TI is currently working on developing a scoring system for the NIS country studies that will allow the systematic monitoring of the key institutions, laws and practices that contribute to promote integrity, transparency and accountability in a given country. The report on Zambia was finalised in 2007 and provides a comprehensive overview of the state of the national integrity system in the country. (http://transparency.org/content/download/28013/422220/file/NIS_Zambia_Report_2007.pdf).

The **Global Integrity Index** uses a similar approach to track governance and corruption trends around the world. The Index assesses the existence, effectiveness, and citizen access to key national-level anti-corruption mechanisms used to hold governments accountable, using close to 300

Integrity Indicators systematically gathered for each country covered. The sub-indicators provide detailed information on the various elements of public governance that promote accountability and prevent corruption. (<http://report.globalintegrity.org/globalIndex.cfm>). Zambia is currently being included in the 2007 index.

Monitoring progress in public governance can also be done by measuring quantitatively or qualitatively specific aspects of corruption or governance using a set of single indicators. Such approaches allow the collection of more specific data on the various dimensions of corruption that occur in different institutions, sectors or levels of society. Nationally representative surveys of firms, households and/or public officials such as the one used for the **Kenya Bribery Index** (http://www.tikenya.org/documents/urban_bribery_index.doc) or the World Bank **Governance and Anti-Corruption assessments**, are examples of such methodologies. When repeated on a regular basis using a consistent methodology, such as in the case of the Kenya Bribery Index, they can potentially be used to track and monitor anti-corruption progress as they provide valuable hindsight on trends overtime.

Highly aggregated data from CPIAs or perception based governance indicators (CPI or WGI) have proven to be powerful tools for world wide comparison and awareness raising purposes. They monitor public governance in general terms but provide little information on specific governance issues at the country level.

Country Policy and Institutional Assessments (CPIAs)

Produced annually by the World Bank, CPIAs assess how effective country policies and institutions are at reducing poverty, promoting growth and using development assistance. The approach uses twenty criteria clustered in four groups, including economic management, structural policies, policies for social inclusion and equity and public sector management and institutions. This last cluster captures key aspects of governance, including transparency, accountability and corruption in the public sector.

Corruption Perception Index (CPI)

The CPI assesses and compares every year levels of corruption among public officials and politicians in a wide range of countries around the world, as perceived by business people and country analysts. The CPI is an "index of indices" composed from nine different sources that all provide a ranking of countries based on expert assessments and opinion surveys. Although it has proved to be a powerful awareness raising tool, the CPI cannot be used to monitor progress, track change over time or assess impact of anti-corruption measures either in absolute or comparative terms. Changes in the ranking or scores may be imputed to factors others than changes in actual levels of corruption.

The World Bank Governance Indicators (WGI)

The Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) produced by the World Bank Research Institute consist of six aggregate indicators of governance covering 200 countries, combining cross country data from 30 organisations including the sources used for the CPI. These six aggregate indicators include 1) voice and external accountability; 2) political stability and lack of violence; 3) government effectiveness; 4) lack of regulatory burden; 5) rule of law; and 6) control of corruption. (Please see: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWBIGOVANTCOR/Resources/wps4370.pdf>).

Part 3: Further Reading

[Anti-Corruption Policy Making in Practice \(2007\)](#)

This report explores what form such an approach could take, and examines in depth how national anti-corruption policies or strategies have come into being in six countries: Georgia, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Tanzania and Zambia. From a public policy perspective the authors look

specifically at the catalysts and driving forces, how reforms were selected, prioritised and implemented, and finally, what role development partners played in the overall process.

<http://www.cmi.no/publications/file/?2914=anti-corruption-policy-making-in-practice>

The Public Sector Governance Reform Cycle: Available Diagnostic Tools

This Premnote provides an overview of public sector governance tools developed by the World Bank to assess and understand the nature and sources of governance problems with the view to improve public sector governance. <http://www1.worldbank.org/prem/PREMNotes/premnote88.pdf>

Actionable Governance Indicators

The World Bank's new Governance and Anti-Corruption Strategy explicitly endorses greater use of "disaggregated and actionable governance indicators to help client country reformers assess how effective their governance reform measures are, as well as for fostering greater learning from those programs of governance reform support. This World Bank page provides an overview of existing AGI methodologies and data resources.

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPUBLICSECTORANDGOVERNANCE/0,,contentMDK:21530146~menuPK:286310~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:286305,00.html>

Building a Performance-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System

In the wake of growing pressure in developing countries to improve the performance of their public, performance-based monitoring and evaluation systems are constructed to be able to track the results or lack thereof by government. This paper describes a 10 step approach to the design of such monitoring systems.

http://www.aes.asn.au/publications/Vol1No2/building_a_performance_based_monitoring_&_evaluation_system.pdf