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Established in 2005, Global Integrity is an international NGO with offices in Washington and Cape Town.

We are an innovation lab that produces high quality research and creates cutting-edge technology to advance the work of a global network of civic, public and private reformers pursuing increased transparency and accountability in governments.

We work with in-country teams of independently contracted researchers and journalists to track governance and corruption trends around the world.

We produce original reporting and quantitative analysis to promote accountable and democratic global governance that is in the public interest.
Cutting-edge Research & Data
- Global / Local Integrity Reports
- Strategic research partnerships (Ibrahim & Web Foundations)
- Governance Data Alliance (future)

Technology
- Indaba

International Political Engagement
- OGP
- Political Finance Transparency (future)

Thought Leadership
- Blogging
- Innovation Fund
- OpenGov Hub
The Global Integrity Report is an essential guide to anti-corruption institutions and mechanisms around the world, intended to help policymakers, advocates, journalists and citizens identify and anticipate the areas where corruption is more likely to occur.

The Report evaluates both good governance/anti-corruption legal frameworks and the practical implementation and enforcement of those frameworks, and takes a close look at whether citizen can effectively access and use anti-corruption safeguards.
The Report is prepared by local researchers, journalists and academics using a double-blind peer review process. More than 1,300 local contributors have participated in preparing the Report since 2004.

Each country assessment contained in the Global Integrity Report comprises two core elements: a qualitative Reporter’s Notebook and a quantitative Integrity Indicators scorecard.

109 Countries, some assessed up to 5 times, since 2004:
COUNTRY REPORTS
(109 COUNTRIES SINCE 2004)
What do we measure?

Integrity Indicators that make up an Integrity Scorecard measure the following:

1. The **existence** of public integrity mechanisms, including laws and institutions which promote public accountability and limit corruption. *In law/de jure/ Yes-No (100-0)*

2. The **effectiveness** of those mechanisms. *In practice/de facto/0,25,50,75,100*

3. The **access** that citizens have to those mechanisms.

Implementation Gap
INTEGRITY INDICATORS

Civil Society Practices & Freedoms; Media Practices & Freedoms; Access to Information; Political Participation; Election Integrity; Political Financing; Government Accountability; Budget Practices; Civil Service Regulations; Whistle-Blowing Measures; Procurement Safeguards; Privatization Safeguards; National Ombudsman; Government Auditing; Taxes and Customs Practice; State-Owned Enterprise Safeguards; Business Licensing and Regulation; Anti-Bribery Laws; Anti-Corruption Agency; Law Enforcement Oversight
What are the Integrity Indicators?

320 discrete questions per country (differs for local and sector tools)

Aggregating “In law” vs. “In practice” indicators generates a legal framework score and an implementation score – Comparing these captures the implementation gap

Each indicator has a score, an explanatory comment and a supporting reference

Ordinal scoring (0, 25, 50, 75, 100) anchored by unique scoring criteria

Double-blind and transparent peer review comments:

100% transparency: all disaggregated scores, comments, references, and peer review comments published.
EXAMPLE: ZIMBABWE

GLOBAL INTEGRITY REPORT: ZIMBABWE - 2011

This peer-reviewed country report includes:

**Integrity Indicators Scorecard:** Scores, scoring criteria, commentary, references, and peer review perspectives for more than 300 Integrity Indicators.

**Reporter's Notebook:** An on-the-ground look at corruption and integrity from a leading local journalist.

**Corruption Timeline:** Five years of political context to today's corruption and integrity issues.

Zimbabwe Highlights 2011

Zimbabwe's progress towards democracy suffered a setback in 2011, when presidential and parliamentary elections were marked by uncertainty. This was the result of a disagreement between President Robert Mugabe's ruling party (ZANU-PF) and Prime Minister Morgan Tsvangirai's Movement for Democratic Change about when elections should be held and how the Global Political Agreement, a 2008 power-sharing agreement, should be implemented.

GI - Integrity Indicators: Zimbabwe 2011

Overall Rating: Very Weak (56 of 100)
Legal Framework: 76 of 100
Actual Implementation: 36 of 100
Implementation Gap: (40)

Comparison to 33 diverse countries

The Global Integrity Report is an essential guide to anti-corruption institutions and mechanisms around the world, intended to help policymakers, advocates, journalists and citizens identify and anticipate the areas where corruption is more likely to occur.

The Report evaluates both anti-corruption legal frameworks and the practical implementation and enforcement of those frameworks, and takes a close look at whether citizen can effectively access and use anti-
## Zimbabwe - Scorecard 2011

**Election Integrity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In law, is there an election monitoring agency or set of election monitoring agencies/entities?</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the election monitoring agency effective?</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are elections systems transparent and effective?</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Back**

17 In law, is there an election monitoring agency or set of election monitoring agencies/entities?
18a: In law, the agency or set of agencies/entities is protected from political interference.

Score: Yes

Comments:
Zimbabwe Electoral Commission members are appointed according to the procedure set forth in Article 61(5) of the Constitution.

References:
1. Desmond Ncube, National Youth Coordinator, MDC-T, Sept. 6, 2011
2. The Global Political Agreement, Sept. 15, 2009
3. Article 61(5) of the Constitution

18b: In practice, agency (or set of agencies/entities) appointments are made that support the independence of the agency.

Score: 100 75 50 25 0

Comments:
The Zimbabwe Electoral Commission lacks the capacity to effectively monitor and manage elections in a free and fair manner. The commission’s eight members are appointed by the president and are subservient to President Robert Mugabe and his ZANU-PF party. The way the commissioners are appointed limits their freedom. Opposition leaders charge that the Electoral Commission has failed to monitor and act on complaints against the state-run Herald newspaper, which, critics charge, prints stories that are completely one-sided against the opposition and in favor of Mugabe and ZANU-PF as well inciting racial, religious and political hatred.

References:
1. Desmond Ncube, National Youth Coordinator, MDC-T, Sept. 6, 2011, Harare

18c: In practice, the agency or set of agencies/entities has a professional, full-time staff.

Score: 100 75 50 25 0

Comments:
The Zimbabwe Electoral Commission (ZEC) is underfunded, which has limited its ability to function. According to the opposition, the commission is staffed by intelligence operatives who are loyal to and support President Robert Mugabe. The ZEC also relies on civil servants who may not necessarily be aware of all the issues to look out for in an election in order to make it free and fair. Suspicions about the ZEC were also raised because of its failure to announce election results in a timely manner in 2008. There
SCORING CRITERIA

18b: In practice, agency (or set of agencies/entities) appointments are made that support the independence of the agency.

Score: 100 75 50 25 0

Comments:
The Zimbabwe Electoral Commission is key to effectively monitor and manage elections in a country that has a history of free and fair elections. The Commission is supposed to be independent of political influence. However, recent developments suggest that the Commission is failing to meet this criterion. The Commission has been criticized for its lack of impartiality, which has limited its ability to function. Individuals appointed to the Commission are often based on political considerations, which undermines the independence of the agency. Additionally, the Commission has been criticized for not providing adequate training to staff, which has limited its ability to function.

Scoring Criteria:
100: Appointments to the agency or set of agencies/entities are made based on professional qualifications. Individuals appointed are free of conflicts of interest due to personal loyalties, family connections or other biases. Individuals appointed usually do not have clear political party affiliations.
50: Appointments are usually based on professional qualifications. However, individuals appointed may have clear party loyalties.
25: Appointments are often based on political considerations. Individuals appointed often have conflicts of interest due to personal loyalties, family connections or other biases. Individuals appointed often have clear party loyalties.
0: Appointments are not based on professional qualifications. Individuals appointed are not free of conflicts of interest due to personal loyalties, family connections or other biases. Individuals appointed are not clear about their political party affiliations.

References:
For the director of the agency.


59c: In practice, the audit agency has a professional, full-time staff.

Score: 100 75 50 25 0

Comments: The Supreme Audit Institution is an independent civil service system. It is composite, consisting of a professional, full-time staff at all levels with significant leadership and advisory responsibilities. Yet according to the most recent national audit results, the agency's performance is below expectations, indicating a need for improvement.

In some instances, the agency has limited staff, which hinder its ability to fulfill its basic mandate. 50 Score Criteria: The agency has limited staff.

0 Score Criteria: The agency has no staff, or a limited staff that is clearly unqualified to fulfill its basic mandate.

Scores Provided:
100 Score Criteria: The agency has staff sufficient to fulfill its basic mandate.

50 Score Criteria: The agency has limited staff, but it is usually pointed out that the staff does not do enough to carry out its investigations.

59d: In practice, audit agency appointments support the independence of the agency.

Score: 100 75 50 25 0

Comments: Although the auditor is formally independent, his or her selection is made by Congress, and this links the head of this agency to political commitments, which are then reflected in the personnel structure and decisions.

According to the Transparency Index presented by Transparency for Colombia the Supreme Audit Institution is at moderate level of corruption risk. However, there is a widespread perception that at the local level staffing decisions are strongly supported by political criteria.

Similarly, according to the most recent survey on institutional performance conducted by the DANE, employees of the Supreme Audit Institution consider that political criteria play a very important role in the appointment of free appointment and removal employees (a score of 2.22 out of 5). The process of hiring through the civil service gets better scores (average 4.01), thus showing that most political interferences occur through non civil service appointments.
**Philippines Local Government**
An assessment of public sector transparency and accountability in ten diverse municipalities in cooperation with the La Salle Institute for Governance.
Released: February 2013

**Access to Information in the Mexican Municipalities**
A collaboration with the Instituto Mexicano para la Competitividad (IMCO) assessing the municipal-state relationship in the context of freedom of information implementation at the state level.
Released: May 2012

**State Integrity Investigation (United States)**
A collaboration with the Center for Public Integrity and Public Radio International assessing corruption risks in all fifty US states.
Released: March 2012

**Papua New Guinea Healthcare**
Fieldwork exploring access to information issues in healthcare at the level in cooperation with the Consultative Implementation and Monitoring Council (CIMC)
Released: January 2012

**Kenya City Integrity**
Indicator based fieldwork assessing accountability and transparency in Kenya’s three largest cities — Nairobi, Mombasa, and Kisumu. Fielded in cooperation with the Kenyan Association of Manufacturers, the Center for International Private Enterprise, Hakijami, & CSO Network.
Released: November 2011

**Guatemala Justice Sector**
Indicator based fieldwork assessing accountability and transparency in the justice sector.
Fielded in cooperation with Accion Ciudadana in Guatemala.
Released: July 2011
The State Integrity Investigation is an unprecedented, data-driven analysis of each state’s laws and practices that deter corruption and promote accountability and openness.

Experienced journalists graded each state government on its corruption risk using 330 specific measures.

The Investigation ranked every state from one to 50. Each state received a report card with letter grades in 14 categories, including campaign finance, ethics laws, lobbying regulations, and management of state pension funds.
STATE INTEGRITY INVESTIGATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>15th</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>28th</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>16th</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>29th</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>17th</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>30th</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>18th</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>31st</td>
<td>Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>32nd</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>33rd</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>34th</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>35th</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>36th</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>24th</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>37th</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>38th</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>26th</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>39th</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40th</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41st</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42nd</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43rd</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44th</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45th</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46th</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47th</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48th</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49th</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50th</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New York Corruption Risk Report Card

Rank among 50 states: 37th

Overall grade: D

Click a category to see detailed scores and notes.
New York - Procurement: D (66 %)

Indicator
Click on a question to see what our reporters evaluated

8.1  Is the public procurement process effective?  60%
8.2  Can citizens access the public procurement process?  71%
205: In practice, the conflicts of interest regulations for public procurement officials are enforced.

(Hide) Full Scoring Criteria:
These are the scoring criteria for this question.

Very Strong: Regulations regarding conflicts of interest for procurement officials are aggressively enforced.

Fair: Conflict-of-interest regulations exist, but are flawed. Some violations may not be enforced, or some officials may be exempt from regulations.

Very Weak: Conflict-of-interest regulations do not exist, or are consistently ineffective.

Reporter Notes: (Hide)

‘When I was in the comptroller’s office we used a statute that said state employees couldn’t sell anything to the state over the value of $25. But I think the rules are effective and things have become more strict.’ Ruth Walters, managing director The Walters Group, former assistant State Comptroller, Oct.14 by phone. Reporter in Albany. Subject in Albany.

‘Yes. See Sections 73 & 74 of the Public Officers Law,’ Heather Groll, Public Information Officer Office of General Services, by Oct. 14 by email Reporter and subject in Albany. less

Sources: (Hide)


Heather Groll, Public Information Officer Office of General Services, by Oct. 14 by email Reporter and subject in Albany.

Reviewer Notes: (Hide)
Reform Efforts

The State Integrity Investigation has sparked or accelerated reform efforts from elected officials in several states. They’re taking steps toward lowering their state’s corruption risk through increased transparency and accountability.

Measures passed
Delaware
Georgia
Iowa
Florida
Maine
Rhode Island

Measures proposed
California
Michigan
Ohio
South Carolina
North Dakota

Campaigns for reform
Arkansas
Hawaii
New York
Oklahoma
Texas
The MIF is supporting the **Global Integrity Trust** (based in South Africa) to recruit a network of experts in every African country to provide assessments of key social, economic and political indicators that will eventually feed into and bolster the Ibrahim Index of African Governance.

The project objectives:

- To ensure that governance data on Africa is owned by Africans and provided by in-country experts who are embedded in local contexts.

- To generate original expert opinion data of governance issues in 54 Africa countries to feed into the Ibrahim Index of African Governance.

- To build capacity of partner organizations and researchers in each country to carry out this kind of research independently and to nurture a community of practice.
The Indaba fieldwork platform is a multiuser, browser-based platform that allows geographically distributed teams to create, edit, and publish original content. This content can include text, quantitative data, and uploaded files of any type.

Indaba is an online tool that helps organizations collect, edit, review and publish information, such as policy scorecards, case studies or citizen audits.

Indaba is designed to make complicated, labor-intensive global fieldwork easier, systematic, and faster. One of the primary objectives is to reduce the time and effort involved with global fieldwork and data gathering in the “transparency and accountability” universe and to simultaneously allow data to be tagged, aggregated and analyzed across disparate organizations.

For more information see http://getindaba.org.
Current and planned Indaba users

- Article 19
- The Carter Center
- The Center for Public Integrity (United States)
- Consultative Implementation and Monitoring Council (Papua New Guinea)
- Global Integrity
- International Budget Partnership
- Instituto Mexicano para la Competitividad
- Kenyan Association of Manufacturers
- La Salle Institute for Governance (Philippines)
- Public Radio International
- Publish What You Fund
- Revenue Watch Institute
- World Resources Institute
- World Wide Web Foundation
Investing in risk-taking to encourage greater creativity in diagnosing and addressing accountability and transparency challenges
OUR INVESTEES

WHO RULES? (¿QUIÉN MANDA?)

PLANIZACIJA.RS

SIMPLY VISUALIZING POLITICS

POLICE-CITIZENS PROTOCOL

VERITZA.ORG
CONTACT US

Marianne.camerer@globalintegrity.org
info@globalintegrity.org
www.globalintegrity.org

Twitter (@GlobalIntegrity)
www.twitter.com/globalintegrity
THANK YOU