



# TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL

Dr. Peter Eigen  
Chairman, Board of Directors

Dr. Kamal Hossain  
Chairman, Advisory Council

International Secretariat  
Otto-Suhr-Allee 97-99  
D – 10585 Berlin, Germany  
Tel: 49-30-3438 20-0  
Fax: 49-30-3470 3912

e-mail: [ti@transparency.org](mailto:ti@transparency.org)  
<http://www.transparency.org>

## *Press Release*

# Transparency International Releases the Year 2000 Corruption Perceptions Index New index is based on multiple surveys from 1998-2000<sup>1</sup>

***"Our index is a vital reminder to the international community that far more must urgently be done to fight bribery," says TI Chairman Peter Eigen***

*Berlin, September 13, 2000*

Transparency International, stating that its Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) is a valuable reminder that corruption remains widespread in very large numbers of countries, today issued the year 2000 CPI ranking 90 countries.

"Corruption takes many forms and is a universal cancer," said Peter Eigen, Chairman of Transparency International (TI), the world's leading anti-corruption organization. He stressed that: "Our new index again shows that corruption is widely seen to be very high in many countries. On the eve of the Olympic Games, too, it is worth recalling the bribery scandal that enmeshed the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the fact that some of the leaders of the bribe-scarred IOC are still running the show. Then, we must not forget as we publish our new index here in Germany that all the details of the secret party political payments in Chancellor Kohl's era have still not been disclosed."

TI, founded in 1993, now has National Chapters in more than 70 countries. The Corruption Perceptions Index, which TI first launched in 1995, ranks countries in terms of the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among public officials and politicians. The 2000 CPI is a composite index, drawing on 16 surveys from 8 independent institutions. The surveys embrace the perceptions of business people, the general public and country analysts. The surveys were undertaken over the last three years and no country is included in the CPI unless there are results from a minimum of three surveys.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Each year TI builds its CPI on the basis of numerous opinion polls undertaken over a three-year period. The survey sources vary to some degree from one year to the next and thus it would be inaccurate to suggest that precise comparisons are valid, for example, between the 1999 CPI and the 2000 CPI.

<sup>2</sup> A detailed explanation of the surveys and sources and the methodologies used by TI in compiling the CPI is available in a CPI 2000 Framework Paper at TI's website: [www.transparency.org](http://www.transparency.org).

Dr. Eigen noted that: "The CPI 2000 should remind everyone that the fight against corruption dare not be relaxed. We all yearn for improvement, but positive change only comes slowly when the enemy is endemic corruption. Perceptions of levels of corruption do not change greatly from one year to the next. Positive results are only going to emerge from tireless and consistent multi-year efforts."

However, the conditions which could promote more transparent practices are themselves changing. Dr. Eigen noted that countries responsible for the bulk of world exports have passed national laws making corporate bribe-paying to foreign public officials a criminal offence. Numerous developed countries have also launched initiatives against money laundering, while awareness is growing in export credit agencies and development assistance agencies that challenging corrupt practices is vital.

TI's Chairman added: "Critical to success is public pressure, and we are seeing in opinion polls and election campaigns that the public at large in rising numbers of countries is becoming increasingly intolerant of leaders who abuse their public office for their personal gain. Our National Chapters are at work around the globe and they are making a difference. We encourage everyone to learn more about the progress being achieved by reading our new *Transparency International Annual Report 2000*, which we are posting on our website today."

The fact that change takes time is poignantly illustrated by the CPI 2000, which shows Nigeria in last position. Dr. Eigen said: "Valiant efforts are being made by President Olusegun Obasanjo to promote large-scale changes in a country whose people have been robbed by the grand corruption of their past leaders. But, the process of change initiated by the new President is barely 12 months old and so it is not surprising that Nigeria's CPI score is virtually unchanged."

TI's Chairman added: "The eyes of the world are on President Obasanjo, a former Advisory Council Chairman of TI, who was imprisoned by the former Nigerian Government of General Sani Abacha because of his pro-democracy and anti-corruption views. President Clinton has just visited Nigeria and joins a growing list of world leaders who recognise that the country needs assistance. Nigeria must have debt relief and IMF and World Bank support, as well as international business support, to get its economy going again and set the conditions that will realistically make it possible to wage a sustained successful attack on the entrenched bastions of corruption. TI is pledged to assist President Obasanjo's courageous anti-corruption drive."

TI said that the public needs to be aware of the damage wrought by corruption. It noted the Gallup International 2000 Millennium Survey, which interviewed about 57,000 people in 60 countries and found that where corruption is at its worst, disillusionment with democracy is at its highest. This is shown to be particularly so in Central and Eastern Europe. The Gallup International survey shows that the democratic gains of the past decade are quite literally at risk, said TI.

### **CPI only shows one side of corruption**

TI has always stressed that corruption is not just the product of public officials taking bribes (the corruption aspect highlighted in the CPI), which is widely seen to be particularly serious in many developing countries and countries in transition, as again reflected in the CPI 2000. To correct this impression and to highlight the bribe-giving side of the corruption coin pursued by international corporations and domestic businesses, TI published a Bribe Payers Index (BPI) last year and a detailed set of survey results on perceptions of bribe paying in

January of this year. Because of the importance of this kind of information, TI will undertake a new and comprehensive survey into bribe paying in 2001.<sup>3</sup>

Peter Eigen stated: "Highlighting the bribe-paying side of the corruption equation is important right now. First, many of the street protests that we are seeing at major conferences, which started in Seattle last November, reflect distrust of globalisation and the role of business in the international economy. Transparency in business dealings is more important than ever and corporations should see the protests as a challenge to them to act with integrity. Second, this year we have seen an increasing number of countries ratify the 1997 OECD Anti-Corruption Convention, but it is urgent that they now enforce it and that companies demonstrate that they are in compliance."

### **New CPI is a rolling Index based on 1998-2000 data**

The CPI is based on the understanding that levels of corruption are not sharply changed by short-term actions, while perceptions of corruption may fluctuate significantly based on highly visible events. TI Executive Director Jeremy Pope explained that: "The CPI is a poll of polls conducted over a period of three years. The new CPI is based on surveys for the 1998-2000 period. This multi-year approach is more accurate and realistic. The rankings fail to fully take into account the impact of recent scandals that have damaged perceptions of the integrity environment of a country, nor do the rankings tend to reflect recent efforts by governments to introduce anti-corruption reforms in their countries."

"The rankings are important, but the exact placements of countries should not be given undue weight by the press," said Mr. Pope. "We only have good enough polling data for about one-half of the world's nations and I believe that there are many countries which, if we had the numbers, would rank even below the lowest countries on today's new CPI. As can be seen in the attached tables, for some countries there are only a few data sources and wide differences in the data results. In such cases, in particular, small differences in ranking between countries should not be overestimated. Comparing the ranking of countries from one year to the next demands care and TI encourages people to review fully the even more detailed data from the sources that are available on the TI website."

This year's CPI covers 90 countries, compared to 98 last year. Some countries had to be dropped because there was insufficient 1998-2000 data. For example, some of the surveys used in the CPI are based on international investor attitudes and if a country is widely seen to no longer interest investors, then some survey sources may drop that country in their polling. The message is clear: dropping out of the CPI for lack of data may be bad news for countries and may indicate reduced investor interest stimulated by enhanced perceptions of widespread corruption in these countries.

TI Chairmen Eigen said: "We are building on our CPI work. We recognise that more organisations are now researching corruption and we welcome this. At TI we are strengthening our knowledge at the international level and through initiatives undertaken by our national Chapters, and we have started developing a *Global Corruption Report*, which we plan to publish in conjunction with the CPI and the BPI next year."

---

<sup>3</sup> TI's Bribe Payers Index is fully available at TI's website at: <http://www.transparency.org/documents/cpi/bps.html>. Noting that the international press is increasingly reporting on bribe paying and bribe taking, TI has recently started to publish a daily set of headlines and a guide to international press articles on corruption on the front page of its website at: [http://www.transparency.org/press\\_moni.html](http://www.transparency.org/press_moni.html)

## The 2000 Corruption Perceptions Index

Country Rank	Country	2000 CPI Score	Surveys Used	Standard Deviation	High-Low Range
1	Finland	10.0	8	0.6	9.0 -10.4
2	Denmark	9.8	9	0.8	8.6 -10.6
3	New Zealand	9.4	8	0.8	8.1 -10.2
	Sweden	9.4	9	0.7	8.1 -9.9
5	Canada	9.2	9	0.7	8.1 -9.9
6	Iceland	9.1	7	1.1	7.3 -9.9
	Norway	9.1	8	0.7	7.6 -9.5
	Singapore	9.1	11	1.0	6.2 -9.7
9	Netherlands	8.9	9	0.6	8.1 -9.9
10	United Kingdom	8.7	9	0.6	7.3 -9.7
11	Luxembourg	8.6	7	0.7	7.4 -9.3
	Switzerland	8.6	8	0.3	8.1 -9.1
13	Australia	8.3	10	1.0	6.7 -9.3
14	USA	7.8	10	0.8	6.2 -9.2
15	Austria	7.7	8	0.7	6.2 -8.5
	Hong Kong	7.7	11	1.2	4.3 -8.6
17	Germany	7.6	8	0.8	6.2 -8.4
18	Chile	7.4	8	0.9	5.7 -8.4
19	Ireland	7.2	8	1.9	2.5 -8.5
20	Spain	7.0	8	0.7	5.9 -8.0
21	France	6.7	9	1.0	4.3 -7.7
22	Israel	6.6	8	1.3	4.3 -7.9
23	Japan	6.4	11	1.3	4.3 -7.8
	Portugal	6.4	9	0.9	5.3 -8.1
25	Belgium	6.1	9	1.3	4.3 -8.8
26	Botswana	6.0	4	1.6	4.3 -8.2
27	Estonia	5.7	4	1.6	4.4 -8.1
28	Slovenia	5.5	6	1.1	4.1 -7.3
	Taiwan	5.5	11	1.4	2.5 -7.2
30	Costa Rica	5.4	4	1.9	3.8 -8.1
	Namibia	5.4	4	0.8	4.3 -6.1
32	Hungary	5.2	10	1.2	3.9 -8.1
	Tunisia	5.2	4	1.5	3.8 -7.1
34	South Africa	5.0	10	0.9	3.8 -6.6
35	Greece	4.9	8	1.7	3.7 -8.1
36	Malaysia	4.8	11	0.6	3.8 -5.9
37	Mauritius	4.7	5	0.8	3.9 -5.6
	Morocco	4.7	4	0.7	4.2 -5.6
39	Italy	4.6	8	0.6	4.0 -5.6
	Jordan	4.6	5	0.8	3.8 -5.7
41	Peru	4.4	5	0.5	3.8 -5.0
42	Czech Republic	4.3	10	0.9	3.3 -6.2
43	Belarus	4.1	3	0.8	3.4 -4.9
	El Salvador	4.1	4	1.7	2.1 -6.2
	Lithuania	4.1	4	0.3	3.8 -4.4
	Malawi	4.1	4	0.4	3.8 -4.8
	Poland	4.1	11	0.8	2.8 -5.6

## The 2000 Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI)

### Notes

**2000 CPI Score** -relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by business people, risk analysts and the general public and ranges between 10 (highly clean) and 0 (highly corrupt).

**Surveys Used** - refers to the number of surveys that assessed a country's performance. 16 surveys were used and at least 3 surveys were required for a country to be included in the CPI.

**Standard Deviation** indicates differences in the values of the sources: the greater the standard deviation, the greater the differences of perceptions of a country among the sources.

**High-Low Range** provides the highest and lowest values of the sources. And, because of statistical factors it is possible, as seen in the top three cases in this CPI, that the highest value exceeds 10.0 in this column.

## The 2000 Corruption Perceptions Index

Country Rank	Country	2000 CPI Score	Surveys Used	Standard Deviation	High-Low Range
48	South Korea	4.0	11	0.6	3.4 -5.6
49	Brazil	3.9	8	0.3	3.6 -4.5
50	Turkey	3.8	8	0.8	2.1 -4.5
51	Croatia	3.7	4	0.4	3.4 -4.3
52	Argentina	3.5	8	0.6	3.0 -4.5
	Bulgaria	3.5	6	0.4	3.3 -4.3
	Ghana	3.5	4	0.9	2.5 -4.7
	Senegal	3.5	3	0.8	2.8 -4.3
	Slovak Republic	3.5	7	1.2	2.2 -6.2
57	Latvia	3.4	3	1.3	2.1 -4.4
	Zambia	3.4	4	1.4	2.1 -5.1
59	Mexico	3.3	8	0.5	2.5 -4.1
60	Colombia	3.2	8	0.8	2.5 -4.5
	Ethiopia	3.2	3	0.8	2.5 -3.9
	Thailand	3.2	11	0.6	2.4 -4.0
63	China	3.1	11	1.0	0.6 -4.3
	Egypt	3.1	7	0.7	2.3 -4.1
65	Burkina Faso	3.0	3	1.0	2.5 -4.4
	Kazakhstan	3.0	4	1.2	2.1 -4.3
	Zimbabwe	3.0	7	1.5	0.6 -4.9
68	Romania	2.9	4	1.0	2.1 -4.3
69	India	2.8	11	0.7	2.3 -4.3
	Philippines	2.8	11	1.0	1.7 -4.7
71	Bolivia	2.7	4	1.3	1.7 -4.3
	Cote d'Ivoire	2.7	4	0.8	2.1 -3.6
	Venezuela	2.7	8	0.7	2.1 -4.3
74	Ecuador	2.6	4	1.0	2.1 -4.3
	Moldova	2.6	4	0.9	1.8 -3.8
76	Armenia	2.5	3	0.6	2.4 -3.5
	Tanzania	2.5	4	0.6	2.1 -3.5
	Vietnam	2.5	8	0.6	2.1 -3.8
79	Uzbekistan	2.4	3	0.9	2.1 -3.7
80	Uganda	2.3	4	0.6	2.1 -3.5
81	Mozambique	2.2	3	0.2	2.4 -2.7
82	Kenya	2.1	4	0.3	2.1 -2.7
	Russia	2.1	10	1.1	0.6 -4.1
84	Cameroon	2.0	4	0.6	1.6 -3.0
85	Angola	1.7	3	0.4	1.6 -2.5
	Indonesia	1.7	11	0.8	0.5 -3.2
87	Azerbaijan	1.5	4	0.9	0.6 -2.5
	Ukraine	1.5	7	0.7	0.5 -2.5
89	Yugoslavia	1.3	3	0.9	0.6 -2.4
90	Nigeria	1.2	4	0.6	0.6 -2.1

## The 2000 Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI)

### Notes

**2000 CPI Score** -relates to perceptions of the degree of corruption as seen by business people, risk analysts and the general public and ranges between 10 (highly clean) and 0 (highly corrupt).

**Surveys Used** - refers to the number of surveys that assessed a country's performance. 16 surveys were used and at least 3 surveys were required for a country to be included into the 2000 CPI.

**Standard Deviation** indicates differences in the values of the sources: the greater the standard deviation, the greater the differences of perceptions of a country among the sources.

**High-Low Range** provides the highest and lowest values of the sources. And, because of statistical factors it is possible, as seen in the top three cases in the CPI, that the highest value exceeds 10.0 in this column.

<i>Additional Information on the 2000 Corruption Perceptions Index</i>	
<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Background Information – Questions &amp; Answers on the CPI</b>
<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Survey Sources for the 2000 CPI</b>
<b>Page 10</b>	<b>General Press Contacts for the 2000 CPI</b>

Background Information:

## **Questions & Answers on the 2000 TI Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI)**

### **What is the Corruption Perceptions Index?**

The TI Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) this year ranks 90 countries in terms of the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among public officials and politicians. It is a composite index, drawing on 16 different polls and surveys from 8 independent institutions carried out among business people, the general public and country analysts.

### **For the purpose of the TI indices, how is corruption defined?**

TI focuses on corruption in the public sector and defines corruption as the abuse of public office for private gain. The surveys used in compiling the CPI tend to ask questions in line with the misuse of public power for private benefits, with a focus, for example, on the bribing of public officials or giving and taking of kickbacks in public procurement.

### **What is the role being played by exporters in international criminal transactions?**

In 1999, TI published an additional index, which ranked exporting countries according to their propensity to offer bribes. This Bribe Payers Index (BPI) can be obtained from <http://www.transparency.org/documents/cpi/index.html#bpi>. The BPI complements the CPI and underlines the point that corruption in international business transactions involves both those who take and those who give. Looking only at those who take, as is suggested by the CPI, provides an incomplete picture and a new BPI is planned for next year.

### **Is it right to conclude that the country that has the lowest score in the CPI is the world's most corrupt country?**

No. Transparency International bends over backwards to convince journalists and others that this is a false interpretation. Firstly, there are over 200 sovereign nations in the world and the CPI only ranks 90 – TI does not have sufficient reliable data for all countries. Secondly, the CPI is based on polls, which are snapshots in time and solely reflect opinions.

### **Why is the CPI based on perceptions only?**

It is impossible to base comparative statements on the levels of corruption in different countries on hard empirical data, e.g. by comparing the number of prosecutions or court cases. Such cross-country data does not reflect actual levels of corruption, rather it highlights the quality of prosecutors, courts and/or the media in exposing corruption. The only method of compiling comparative data is therefore to build on the experience and perceptions of those who are most directly confronted with the realities of corruption. The CPI is based on 16 polls and surveys. Some of these are surveys of residents, including locals and expatriates. Of these, some poll the public at large while others target business elites. Another group of polls is based on the analysis of country experts, largely non-resident.

### **What are the criteria in determining which surveys are used?**

TI seeks excellent data for the CPI and to qualify, the data has to be well documented and reliable. TI strives to ensure that the sources used are of the highest quality, that the survey work is performed with complete integrity and that the methodologies used to analyse findings are first class. TI is confident that these criteria apply to the CPI. A more detailed description of the underlying methodology has been written for the 2000 index to be obtained at [www.transparency.org](http://www.transparency.org) or <http://www.gwdg.de/~uwww/2000.html>. The methodology used is reviewed by a TI Steering Committee consisting of leading international experts in the fields of corruption, econometrics and

statistics. Members of the Steering Committee make suggestions for improving the CPI, but the management of TI takes the final decisions on the methodology used for establishing the CPI. Consequently, neither the CPI methodology nor its presentation modality ought to be interpreted as necessarily constituting endorsement by the Steering Committee or its individual members.

### **Which countries are included in the 2000 CPI?**

TI requires at least three sources from independent institutions to be available for a country before TI considers the database sufficiently robust for that country to be ranked in the CPI. Countries for which there might only be one or two data sources available are not included in the CPI.

### **Are old surveys used in the CPI?**

The CPI is based on 1998-2000 data. Fundamental changes in the levels of corruption in a country only evolve slowly, while public perceptions may change more swiftly and be influenced to some extent by short-term events, TI determined to base the CPI on a three year rolling average. Thus, this year's CPI is based exclusively on survey data collected between 1998 and 2000.

### **Which sources have contributed to the assessment of each individual country?**

Please see the final pages of this press release information package for the list of sources and surveys from which the CPI is derived. A list of the sources that contributed to the assessment of each country can be obtained via the Internet as an Excel-sheet ([www.transparency.org](http://www.transparency.org) or <http://www.gwdg.de/~uwvw/2000.html>). This list also provides further information on standard errors and confidence intervals for each country.

### **Can data from one year be compared with that from a previous year?**

This is somewhat problematic. The CPI incorporates as many reliable and up-to-date sources as possible. One of the drawbacks to this approach is that year-to-year comparisons of a country's score do not only result from a changing perception of a country's performance but also from a changing sample and methodology. Some sources are not updated and must be dropped as a result, while new, reliable sources are added. With differing respondents and slightly differing methodologies, a change in a country's score cannot be attributed solely to actual changes in a country's performance. Comparisons with the views collected in previous years can therefore be misleading.

### **Is the country score a reliable measure of a country's perceived level of corruption?**

In terms of perceptions of corruption, the CPI is a solid measurement tool. The reliability is different, however, for different countries. Countries with a low number of sources and large differences in the values by the sources (indicated by a large Standard Deviation) do convey less reliability as to their score and consequently their ranking. To strengthen understanding of the range of individual survey results for each country TI this year not only includes a column on Standard Deviation in its ranking table, but also a column that shows the High – Low Range of the survey scores.

### **Why did TI provide a high-low range this year?**

For some countries our sources exhibit significant differences in their scores. While this has always been indicated through high Standard Deviations, TI was asked to note the highest and lowest score per country in order to even more explicitly display the width of the assessments.

### **Do large high-low differences automatically suggest that a country's score is measured imprecisely?**

No, not necessarily! Countries with three or eleven sources can have the same high-low range, but in the latter case one can feel much more confident about the country's score if the Standard Deviation is not too high.

### **Which countries' scores deteriorated most between 1999 and 2000?**

As repeatedly said, making comparisons from one year to another is problematic. However, to the extent that changes can be traced back to the change in individual sources, trends can be cautiously identified. Remarkable examples for a downward trend are Zimbabwe, Ukraine and the Philippines. The considerable decline in their scores does not result from technical reasons - actual changes in perceptions are therefore likely. Noteworthy is also the deteriorating performance of Germany and Ireland.

### **Which countries improved most as compared to last year?**

With the same caveats applied, on the basis of data from sources that have been consistently used for the index, improvements can be observed for Croatia, Belgium, Spain and Japan.

Country	Score in 1999
Albania	2.3
Georgia	2.3
Guatemala	3.2
Honduras	1.8
Jamaica	3.8
Kyrgyz Republic	2.2
Macedonia	3.3
Mongolia	4.3
Nicaragua	3.1
Pakistan	2.2
Paraguay	2.0
Uruguay	4.4

### What happened to countries that were included in the 1999 CPI, but not in the 2000 CPI?

The countries listed in the accompanying table were included in the 1999 CPI, but could not be included this year because of insufficient topical survey data. The fact that they are not included does not imply in any form that perceptions of corruption relative to these countries have improved over the last year. TI's experience suggests that corruption remains a major problem for these countries, as it does for many others that are also not included in the 2000 CPI because of insufficient available data.

### Rather than present the CPI in terms of country rankings, why doesn't TI present the countries in groups under headings such as "a lot of corruption", "some corruption", "little corruption", and "no corruption"?

There is merit in presenting the countries under a set of categories, but this approach raises questions. For example, where should the category dividing lines be drawn? And should marginal changes result in altering a country's standing so markedly? Creating categories would require placing countries on the same level although they are perceived to be performing considerably differently. TI's management has opted for the currently used country ranking approach, while TI stresses the sensitivities of this approach by providing the data on the Standard Deviation and the High-Low Range scores and by providing substantial background information on the surveys on its website.

### Survey Sources for the 2000 CPI

Number	1	2	3
Source	Political & Economic Risk Consultancy		
Name	Asian Intelligence Issue		
Year	1998	1999	2000
Internet address	<a href="http://www.asiarisk.com/">http://www.asiarisk.com/</a>		
Who was surveyed?	Expatriate business executives		
Subject asked	Extent of corruption in a way that detracts from the business environment for foreign companies		
Number of replies	280	40-50 per country	1027
Coverage	12 Asian countries		14 countries

Number	4	5	6
Source	Institute for Management Development		
Name	World Competitiveness Yearbook		
Year	1998	1999	2000
Internet address	<a href="http://www.imd.ch">www.imd.ch</a>		
Who was surveyed?	Executives in top- and middle-management; domestic and international companies		
Subject asked	Bribing and corruption exists in the public sphere		
Number of replies	2515	4314	4160
Coverage	46 countries	47 countries	



## Survey Sources for the 2000 CPI

Number	7	8
Source	Economist Intelligence Unit	"International Working Group"
Name	Country Risk Service and Country Forecast	International Crime Victim Survey
Year	2000	1999/2000
Internet address	<a href="http://www.eiu.com">www.eiu.com</a>	<a href="http://ruljis.leidenuniv.nl/group/jfcr/www/icvs/Index.htm">http://ruljis.leidenuniv.nl/group/jfcr/www/icvs/Index.htm</a>
Who was surveyed?	Expert staff assessment (expatriate)	general public
Subject asked	Assessment of the pervasiveness of corruption among politicians and civil servants	During 1999, has any government official in your own country, asked you to pay a bribe for his service?
Number of replies	Not applicable	ca. 20,000
Coverage	115 countries	11 countries

Number	9	10
Source	World Bank and EBRD	Freedom House
Name	Business Environment and Enterprise Survey	Nations in Transit
Year	1999	1998
Internet address	<a href="http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance">http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance</a>	<a href="http://www.freedomhouse.org/">http://www.freedomhouse.org/</a>
Who was surveyed?	Senior businesspeople	Assessment by US academic experts and FH-staff
Subject asked	State capture and frequency of irregular, additional payments to public officials	Levels of corruption
Number of replies	3000	Not applicable
Coverage	20 transition economies	28 transition economies

Number	11	12	13
Source	World Economic Forum		
Name	Global Competitiveness Report		
Year	1998	1999	2000
Internet address	<a href="http://www.weforum.org">www.weforum.org</a>		
Who was surveyed?	Senior business leaders; domestic and international companies		
Subject asked	Irregular, additional payments connected with import and export permits, business licenses, exchange controls, tax assessments, police protection or loan application.		
Number of replies	3167	3934	4022
Coverage	53 countries	59 countries	

## Survey Sources for the 2000 CPI

Number	14	15	16
Source	World Economic Forum		Political Risk Services
Name	Africa Competitiveness Report		International Country Risk Guide
Year	1998	2000	2000
Internet address	<a href="http://www.weforum.org">www.weforum.org</a>		<a href="http://www.prsgroup.com">www.prsgroup.com</a>
Who was surveyed?	Senior business leaders; domestic and international companies		Expert staff assessment
Subject asked	How problematic is corruption? irregular, additional payments are required and large in amount.		Assessment of "corruption in government"
Number of replies	582	1800	Not applicable
Coverage	20 countries	26 countries	140 countries

**About TI:** Transparency International, founded in 1993, is the only global non-governmental and not-for-profit organisation devoted solely to curbing corruption. TI currently has more than 75 National Chapters around the world and TI's International Secretariat is in Berlin, Germany. Transparency International does not investigate or expose individual cases of corruption. For more information on TI, its National Chapters and its work, please go to:

<http://www.transparency.org>