

NAMIBIA SENEGAL FRANCE TIMOR-LESTE POLAND BELGIUM CHAD MALTA PAKISTAN
 TUNISIA SIERRA LEONE EQUATORIAL GUINEA SEYCHELLES GREECE LESOTHO
 ANGOLA SWITZERLAND PERU BOTSWANA ZIMBABWE ESTONIA DJIBOUTI BANGLADESH
 LUXEMBOURG KAZAKHSTAN BURKINA FASO UNITED ARAB EMIRATES MAURITANIA CROATIA
 CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC OMAN MEXICO RWANDA BELARUS KYRGYZSTAN
 JORDAN ECUADOR UNITED KINGDOM CONGO-BRAZZAVILLE AUSTRIA GUYANA YEMEN
 VIETNAM ISRAEL SLOVAKIA DOMINICAN REPUBLIC BHUTAN MONTENEGRO MAURITIUS
 MALAYSIA MONGOLIA IRAQ AUSTRALIA NIGER PAPUA NEW GUINEA LIBERIA NEW ZEALAND
 DOMINICA UKRAINE LATVIA SOLOMON ISLANDS KIRIBATI FINLAND TURKEY ERITREA
 DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO KOREA(SOUTH) SWAZILAND MOLDOVA DENMARK
 UNITED STATES CAMEROON ETHIOPIA MALAWI TAJIKISTAN SINGAPORE MOZAMBIQUE
 BURUNDI ICELAND TANZANIA EL SALVADOR IRELAND NICARAGUA SAMOA LEBANON
 PORTUGAL HONDURAS CZECH REPUBLIC GERMANY CAPE VERDE MADAGASCAR RUSSIA
 GUINEA-BISSAU TONGA INDONESIA GHANA SUDAN NIGERIA HONG KONG GEORGIA
 HAITI ROMANIA FYR MACEDONIA VENEZUELA CHINA
 CHILE SYRIA NORWAY JAMAICA MYANMAR HUNGARY
 MALI BULGARIA BAHRAIN TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO
 CUBA SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE TURKMENISTAN
 IRAN QATAR ZAMBIA CAMBODIA ARGENTINA GAMBIA
 JAPAN COLOMBIA BOLIVIA PARAGUAY AZERBAIJAN
 PHILIPPINES INDIA PUERTO RICO MALDIVES BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA GUINEA
 SOUTH AFRICA COMOROS BENIN GUATEMALA BRUNEI ARMENIA CYPRUS NEPAL
 SAUDI ARABIA NETHERLANDS UGANDA AFGHANISTAN COSTA RICA LITHUANIA MOROCCO
 THAILAND TOGO SOMALIA ALBANIA CANADA KOSOVO BARBADOS SRI LANKA MACAU
 PANAMA URUGUAY EGYPT TAIWAN ALGERIA SERBIA KUWAIT LIBYA CÔTE D'IVOIRE
 KENYA UZBEKISTAN SWEDEN ITALY SPAIN GABON BRAZIL LAOS VANUATU SLOVENIA

CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX 2010

Transparency International (TI) is the global civil society organisation leading the fight against corruption. Through more than 90 chapters worldwide and an international secretariat in Berlin, TI raises awareness of the damaging effects of corruption and works with partners in government, business and civil society to develop and implement effective measures to tackle it.

www.transparency.org

Every effort has been made to verify the accuracy of the information contained in this report. All information was believed to be correct as of October 2010. Nevertheless, Transparency International cannot accept responsibility for the consequences of its use for other purposes or in other contexts.

ISBN: 978-3-935711-60-9

©2010 Transparency International. All rights reserved.

Design: Sophie Everett

Printed on 100% recycled paper.

CONTENTS

2010 RESULTS	2
WHAT IS THE CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX?	4
2010 FACTS	5
VISUALISING THE CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX	6
RESULTS BY REGION	
AMERICAS	8
ASIA PACIFIC	9
EASTERN EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA	10
EUROPEAN UNION AND WESTERN EUROPE	11
MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA	12
SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA	13
ANNEX A: SHORT METHODOLOGICAL NOTE	15
ANNEX B: SOURCES OF INFORMATION	16

TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ARE CRITICAL TO RESTORING TRUST AND TURNING BACK THE TIDE OF CORRUPTION

With governments committing huge sums to tackle the world's most pressing problems, from the instability of financial markets to climate change and poverty, corruption remains an obstacle to achieving much needed progress.


The 2010 *Corruption Perceptions Index* shows that nearly three quarters of the 178 countries in the index score below five, on a scale from 10 (very clean) to 0 (highly corrupt). These results indicate a serious corruption problem.

To address these challenges, governments need to integrate anti-corruption measures in all spheres, from their responses to the financial crisis and climate change to commitments by the international community to eradicate poverty. Transparency International advocates stricter implementation of the UN Convention against Corruption, the only global initiative that provides a framework for putting an end to corruption.

Denmark, New Zealand and Singapore are tied at the top of the list with a score of 9.3, followed closely by Finland and Sweden at 9.2. At the bottom is Somalia with a score of 1.1, slightly trailing Myanmar and Afghanistan at 1.4 and Iraq at 1.5.

Notable among decliners over the past year are some of the countries most affected by a financial crisis precipitated by transparency and integrity deficits. Among those improving in the past year, the general absence of OECD states underlines the fact that all nations need to bolster their good governance mechanisms.


The message is clear: across the globe, transparency and accountability are critical to restoring trust and turning back the tide of corruption. Without them, global policy solutions to many global crises are at risk.



RANK	COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	SCORE	RANK	COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	SCORE
1	Denmark	9.3	30	Spain	6.1
1	New Zealand	9.3	32	Portugal	6.0
1	Singapore	9.3	33	Botswana	5.8
4	Finland	9.2	33	Puerto Rico	5.8
4	Sweden	9.2	33	Taiwan	5.8
6	Canada	8.9	36	Bhutan	5.7
7	Netherlands	8.8	37	Malta	5.6
8	Australia	8.7	38	Brunei	5.5
8	Switzerland	8.7	39	Korea (South)	5.4
10	Norway	8.6	39	Mauritius	5.4
11	Iceland	8.5	41	Costa Rica	5.3
11	Luxembourg	8.5	41	Oman	5.3
13	Hong Kong	8.4	41	Poland	5.3
14	Ireland	8.0	44	Dominica	5.2
15	Austria	7.9	45	Cape Verde	5.1
15	Germany	7.9	46	Lithuania	5.0
17	Barbados	7.8	46	Macau	5.0
17	Japan	7.8	48	Bahrain	4.9
19	Qatar	7.7	49	Seychelles	4.8
20	United Kingdom	7.6	50	Hungary	4.7
21	Chile	7.2	50	Jordan	4.7
22	Belgium	7.1	50	Saudi Arabia	4.7
22	United States	7.1	53	Czech Republic	4.6
24	Uruguay	6.9	54	Kuwait	4.5
25	France	6.8	54	South Africa	4.5
26	Estonia	6.5	56	Malaysia	4.4
27	Slovenia	6.4	56	Namibia	4.4
28	Cyprus	6.3	56	Turkey	4.4
28	United Arab Emirates	6.3	59	Latvia	4.3
30	Israel	6.1	59	Slovakia	4.3

RANK	COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	SCORE	RANK	COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	SCORE
59	Tunisia	4.3	91	Bosnia and Herzegovina	3.2
62	Croatia	4.1	91	Djibouti	3.2
62	FYR Macedonia	4.1	91	Gambia	3.2
62	Ghana	4.1	91	Guatemala	3.2
62	Samoa	4.1	91	Kiribati	3.2
66	Rwanda	4.0	91	Sri Lanka	3.2
67	Italy	3.9	91	Swaziland	3.2
68	Georgia	3.8	98	Burkina Faso	3.1
69	Brazil	3.7	98	Egypt	3.1
69	Cuba	3.7	98	Mexico	3.1
69	Montenegro	3.7	101	Dominican Republic	3.0
69	Romania	3.7	101	Sao Tome & Principe	3.0
73	Bulgaria	3.6	101	Tonga	3.0
73	El Salvador	3.6	101	Zambia	3.0
73	Panama	3.6	105	Algeria	2.9
73	Trinidad and Tobago	3.6	105	Argentina	2.9
73	Vanuatu	3.6	105	Kazakhstan	2.9
78	China	3.5	105	Moldova	2.9
78	Colombia	3.5	105	Senegal	2.9
78	Greece	3.5	110	Benin	2.8
78	Lesotho	3.5	110	Bolivia	2.8
78	Peru	3.5	110	Gabon	2.8
78	Serbia	3.5	110	Indonesia	2.8
78	Thailand	3.5	110	Kosovo	2.8
85	Malawi	3.4	110	Solomon Islands	2.8
85	Morocco	3.4	116	Ethiopia	2.7
87	Albania	3.3	116	Guyana	2.7
87	India	3.3	116	Mali	2.7
87	Jamaica	3.3	116	Mongolia	2.7
87	Liberia	3.3			

RANK	COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	SCORE	RANK	COUNTRY/ TERRITORY	SCORE
116	Mozambique	2.7	146	Libya	2.2
116	Tanzania	2.7	146	Nepal	2.2
116	Vietnam	2.7	146	Paraguay	2.2
123	Armenia	2.6	146	Yemen	2.2
123	Eritrea	2.6	154	Cambodia	2.1
123	Madagascar	2.6	154	Central African Republic	2.1
123	Niger	2.6	154	Comoros	2.1
127	Belarus	2.5	154	Congo-Brazzaville	2.1
127	Ecuador	2.5	154	Guinea-Bissau	2.1
127	Lebanon	2.5	154	Kenya	2.1
127	Nicaragua	2.5	154	Laos	2.1
127	Syria	2.5	154	Papua New Guinea	2.1
127	Timor-Leste	2.5	154	Russia	2.1
127	Uganda	2.5	154	Tajikistan	2.1
134	Azerbaijan	2.4	164	Democratic Republic of the Congo	2.0
134	Bangladesh	2.4	164	Guinea	2.0
134	Honduras	2.4	164	Kyrgyzstan	2.0
134	Nigeria	2.4	164	Venezuela	2.0
134	Philippines	2.4	168	Angola	1.9
134	Sierra Leone	2.4	168	Equatorial Guinea	1.9
134	Togo	2.4	170	Burundi	1.8
134	Ukraine	2.4	171	Chad	1.7
143	Maldives	2.3	172	Sudan	1.6
143	Mauritania	2.3	172	Turkmenistan	1.6
143	Pakistan	2.3	172	Uzbekistan	1.6
146	Cameroon	2.2	175	Iraq	1.5
146	Côte d'Ivoire	2.2	176	Afghanistan	1.4
146	Haiti	2.2	176	Myanmar	1.4
146	Iran	2.2	178	Somalia	1.1



WHAT IS THE CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX?

Transparency International (TI) defines corruption as the abuse of entrusted power for private gain. This definition encompasses corrupt practices in both the public and private sectors. The *Corruption Perceptions Index* (CPI) ranks countries according to perception of corruption in the public sector. The CPI is an aggregate indicator that combines different sources of information about corruption, making it possible to compare countries.

The 2010 CPI draws on different assessments and business opinion surveys carried out by independent and reputable institutions¹. It captures information about the administrative and political aspects of corruption. Broadly speaking, the surveys and assessments used to compile the index include questions relating to bribery of public officials, kickbacks in public procurement, embezzlement of public funds, and questions that probe the strength and effectiveness of public sector anti-corruption efforts.

For a country or territory to be included in the index a minimum of three of the sources that TI uses must assess that country. Thus inclusion in the index depends solely on the availability of information.

Perceptions are used because corruption – whether frequency or amount – is to a great extent a hidden activity that is difficult to measure. Over time, perceptions have proved to be a reliable estimate of corruption. Measuring scandals, investigations or prosecutions, while offering ‘non-perception’ data, reflect less on the prevalence of corruption in a country and more on other factors, such as freedom of the press or the efficiency of the judicial system. TI considers it of critical importance to measure both corruption and integrity, and to do so in the public and private sectors at global, national and local levels.² The CPI is therefore one of many TI measurement tools that serve the fight against corruption.

¹For detailed information on the sources of information please see Annex B and visit our website at www.transparency.org/cpi

²Examples include National Integrity System assessments, which evaluate the degree of integrity, transparency and accountability in a country's anti-corruption institutions, and the Bribe Payers Index, which evaluates expert views of the supply of foreign bribery.

2010 FACTS

The 2010 CPI measures the degree to which public sector corruption is perceived to exist in 178 countries around the world. It scores countries on a scale from 10 (very clean) to 0 (highly corrupt).

The 2010 results are drawn from 13 surveys and assessments published between January 2009 and September 2010.

The 2010 CPI covers two countries fewer than last year's edition. The slight change resulted from individual sources adjusting the range of countries they assess. These adjustments in coverage made it possible to include Kosovo for the first time, but led to the exclusion of Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Suriname, for which only two sources of information were available this year.


Given its methodology, the CPI is not a tool that is suitable for trend analysis or for monitoring changes in the perceived levels of corruption over time for all countries. Year-to-year changes in a country/territory's score can result from a change in the perceptions of a country's performance, a change in the ranking provided by original sources or changes in the methodology resulting from TI's efforts to improve the index.

If a country is featured in one or more specific data sources for both of the last two CPIs (2009 CPI and 2010 CPI), those sources can be used to identify whether there has been a change in perceived levels of corruption in that particular country compared to the previous year. TI has used this approach in 2010 to assess country progress over the past year and to identify what can be considered to be a change in perceptions of corruption. These assessments use two criteria:


- (a) there is a year-on-year change of at least 0.3 points in a country's CPI score, and
- (b) the direction of this change is confirmed by more than half of the data sources evaluating that country.

Based on these criteria, the following countries showed an improvement from 2009 to 2010: Bhutan, Chile, Ecuador, FYR Macedonia, Gambia, Haiti, Jamaica, Kuwait and Qatar. The following countries showed deterioration from 2009 to 2010: the Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Madagascar, Niger and the United States.

VISUALISING THE CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX



DENMARK NEW ZEALAND SINGAPORE FINLAND SWEDEN
CANADA NETHERLANDS AUSTRALIA SWITZERLAND NORWAY
ICELAND LUXEMBOURG HONG KONG IRELAND
AUSTRIA GERMANY BARBADOS JAPAN QATAR
UNITED KINGDOM CHILE BELGIUM UNITED STATES
URUGUAY FRANCE ESTONIA SLOVENIA CYPRUS
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES ISRAEL SPAIN PORTUGAL
BOTSWANA PUERTO RICO TAIWAN BHUTAN MALTA
BRUNEI KOREA(SOUTH) MAURITIUS COSTA RICA OMAN
POLAND DOMINICA CAPE VERDE LITHUANIA MACAU
BAHRAIN SEYCHELLES HUNGARY JORDAN SAUDI ARABIA
CZECH REPUBLIC KUWAIT SOUTH AFRICA MALAYSIA
NAMIBIA TURKEY LATVIA SLOVAKIA TUNISIA CROATIA
FYR MACEDONIA GHANA SAMOA RWANDA
ITALY GEORGIA BRAZIL CUBA MONTENEGRO ROMANIA
BULGARIA EL SALVADOR PANAMA TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO
VANUATU CHINA COLOMBIA GREECE LESOTHO PERU
SERBIA THAILAND MALAWI MOROCCO ALBANIA INDIA
JAMAICA LIBERIA BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA DJIBOUTI
GAMBIA GUATEMALA KIRIBATI SRI LANKA SWAZILAND
BURKINA FASO EGYPT MEXICO DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE TONGA ZAMBIA
ALGERIA ARGENTINA KAZAKHSTAN MOLDOVA
SENEGAL BENIN BOLIVIA GABON INDONESIA KOSOVO
SOLOMON ISLANDS ETHIOPIA GUYANA MALI MONGOLIA
MOZAMBIQUE TANZANIA VIETNAM ARMENIA ERITREA
MADAGASCAR NIGER BELARUS ECUADOR LEBANON
NICARAGUA SYRIA TIMOR-LESTE UGANDA AZERBAIJAN
BANGLADESH HONDURAS NIGERIA PHILIPPINES
SIERRA LEONE TOGO UKRAINE ZIMBABWE MALDIVES
MAURITANIA PAKISTAN CAMEROON CÔTE D'IVOIRE
HAITI IRAN LIBYA NEPAL PARAGUAY YEMEN CAMBODIA
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC COMOROS CONGO-BRAZZAVILLE
GUINEA-BISSAU KENYA LAOS PAPUA NEW GUINEA RUSSIA
TAJIKISTAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
GUINEA KYRGYZSTAN VENEZUELA
ANGOLA EQUATORIAL GUINEA BURUNDI CHAD SUDAN TURKMENISTAN
UZBEKISTAN IRAQ AFGHANISTAN MYANMAR SOMALIA



Countries appear in order of rank. Please see country listing on p. 2 for exact country scoring and ranking.

RESULTS BY REGION: AMERICAS

RANK	REGIONAL RANK	COUNTRY / TERRITORY	CPI 2010 SCORE	90% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL *		SURVEYS USED
				LOWER BOUND	UPPER BOUND	
6	1	Canada	8.9	8.7	9.0	6
17	2	Barbados	7.8	7.1	8.5	4
21	3	Chile	7.2	7.0	7.4	7
22	4	United States	7.1	6.5	7.7	8
24	5	Uruguay	6.9	6.5	7.1	5
33	6	Puerto Rico	5.8	5.3	6.4	4
41	7	Costa Rica	5.3	4.7	6.0	5
44	8	Dominica	5.2	4.7	5.8	3
69	9	Brazil	3.7	3.2	4.3	7
69	9	Cuba	3.7	2.6	5.1	3
73	11	El Salvador	3.6	3.4	3.8	5
73	11	Panama	3.6	3.2	4.1	5
73	11	Trinidad and Tobago	3.6	3.0	4.3	4
78	14	Colombia	3.5	3.2	4.0	7
78	14	Peru	3.5	3.4	3.6	7
87	16	Jamaica	3.3	3.0	3.4	5
91	17	Guatemala	3.2	3.0	3.4	5
98	18	Mexico	3.1	2.9	3.3	7
101	19	Dominican Republic	3.0	2.7	3.2	5
105	20	Argentina	2.9	2.6	3.2	7
110	21	Bolivia	2.8	2.5	3.1	6
116	22	Guyana	2.7	2.6	2.8	4
127	23	Ecuador	2.5	2.2	2.7	5
127	23	Nicaragua	2.5	2.2	2.7	6
134	25	Honduras	2.4	2.2	2.7	6
146	26	Haiti	2.2	2.1	2.3	3
146	26	Paraguay	2.2	1.9	2.5	5
164	28	Venezuela	2.0	1.8	2.1	7

*The confidence intervals reflect the precision of the CPI scores. They indicate the range within which the most accurate value of the CPI score is most likely to fall. The wider a confidence interval is, the less precise the score.

ASIA PACIFIC

RANK	REGIONAL RANK	COUNTRY / TERRITORY	CPI 2010 SCORE	90% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL		SURVEYS USED
				LOWER BOUND	UPPER BOUND	
1	1	New Zealand	9.3	9.2	9.5	6
1	1	Singapore	9.3	9.2	9.4	9
8	3	Australia	8.7	8.3	9.0	8
13	4	Hong Kong	8.4	8.1	8.7	8
17	5	Japan	7.8	7.5	8.2	8
33	6	Taiwan	5.8	5.5	6.2	9
36	7	Bhutan	5.7	5.1	6.2	4
38	8	Brunei	5.5	4.7	6.1	3
39	9	Korea (South)	5.4	5.1	5.7	9
46	10	Macau	5.0	3.4	5.8	3
56	11	Malaysia	4.4	3.9	4.9	9
62	12	Samoa	4.1	3.4	4.7	3
73	13	Vanuatu	3.6	2.3	5.8	3
78	14	China	3.5	3.0	4.0	9
78	14	Thailand	3.5	3.2	3.9	9
87	16	India	3.3	3.0	3.5	10
91	17	Kiribati	3.2	2.3	4.7	3
91	17	Sri Lanka	3.2	2.9	3.6	7
101	19	Tonga	3.0	2.6	3.3	3
110	20	Indonesia	2.8	2.3	3.2	9
110	20	Solomon Islands	2.8	2.3	3.4	3
116	22	Mongolia	2.7	2.4	3.0	6
116	22	Vietnam	2.7	2.4	3.1	9
127	24	Timor-Leste	2.5	2.1	2.8	5
134	25	Bangladesh	2.4	1.9	3.0	7
134	25	Philippines	2.4	2.1	2.7	9
143	27	Maldives	2.3	1.7	2.7	3
143	27	Pakistan	2.3	2.1	2.6	7
146	29	Nepal	2.2	1.9	2.5	6
154	30	Cambodia	2.1	1.9	2.2	9
154	30	Laos	2.1	1.6	2.6	4
154	30	Papua New Guinea	2.1	1.8	2.5	5
176	33	Afghanistan	1.4	1.2	1.6	4
176	33	Myanmar	1.4	0.9	1.9	3

EASTERN EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA

RANK	REGIONAL RANK	COUNTRY / TERRITORY	CPI 2010 SCORE	90% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL		SURVEYS USED
				LOWER BOUND	UPPER BOUND	
56	1	Turkey	4.4	4.0	4.8	7
62	2	Croatia	4.1	3.7	4.5	8
62	2	FYR Macedonia	4.1	3.7	4.5	5
68	4	Georgia	3.8	3.0	4.7	7
69	5	Montenegro	3.7	3.1	4.3	5
78	6	Serbia	3.5	3.1	3.9	6
87	7	Albania	3.3	3.0	3.6	6
91	8	Bosnia and Herzegovina	3.2	2.8	3.5	7
105	9	Kazakhstan	2.9	2.2	3.7	8
105	9	Moldova	2.9	2.7	3.2	6
110	11	Kosovo	2.8	2.7	3.1	3
123	12	Armenia	2.6	2.5	2.8	7
127	13	Belarus	2.5	2.1	3.1	3
134	14	Azerbaijan	2.4	2.1	2.7	7
134	14	Ukraine	2.4	2.1	2.6	8
154	16	Russia	2.1	1.9	2.3	8
154	16	Tajikistan	2.1	1.7	2.5	7
164	18	Kyrgyzstan	2.0	1.8	2.3	7
172	19	Turkmenistan	1.6	1.4	1.8	3
172	19	Uzbekistan	1.6	1.5	1.7	6

EUROPEAN UNION AND WESTERN EUROPE

RANK	REGIONAL RANK	COUNTRY / TERRITORY	CPI 2010 SCORE	90% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL		SURVEYS USED
				LOWER BOUND	UPPER BOUND	
1	1	Denmark	9.3	9.1	9.4	6
4	2	Finland	9.2	9.1	9.3	6
4	2	Sweden	9.2	9.1	9.4	6
7	4	Netherlands	8.8	8.7	9.0	6
8	5	Switzerland	8.7	8.3	9.1	6
10	6	Norway	8.6	8.1	9.0	6
11	7	Iceland	8.5	7.7	9.2	5
11	7	Luxembourg	8.5	8.0	8.9	5
14	9	Ireland	8.0	7.7	8.3	6
15	10	Austria	7.9	7.4	8.4	6
15	10	Germany	7.9	7.5	8.3	6
20	12	United Kingdom	7.6	7.3	7.9	6
22	13	Belgium	7.1	6.9	7.2	6
25	14	France	6.8	6.4	7.2	6
26	15	Estonia	6.5	6.1	6.8	8
27	16	Slovenia	6.4	5.9	6.8	8
28	17	Cyprus	6.3	6.0	6.6	4
30	18	Spain	6.1	5.7	6.5	6
32	19	Portugal	6.0	5.4	6.7	6
37	20	Malta	5.6	5.3	5.8	3
41	21	Poland	5.3	5.0	5.5	8
46	22	Lithuania	5.0	4.4	5.5	8
50	23	Hungary	4.7	3.9	5.5	8
53	24	Czech Republic	4.6	4.1	5.1	8
59	25	Latvia	4.3	3.7	4.8	6
59	25	Slovakia	4.3	3.8	4.9	8
67	27	Italy	3.9	3.5	4.4	6
69	28	Romania	3.7	3.3	4.2	8
73	29	Bulgaria	3.6	3.2	4.0	8
78	30	Greece	3.5	3.1	3.9	6

MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA

RANK	REGIONAL RANK	COUNTRY / TERRITORY	CPI 2010 SCORE	90% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL		SURVEYS USED
				LOWER BOUND	UPPER BOUND	
19	1	Qatar	7.7	6.6	8.6	7
28	2	United Arab Emirates	6.3	5.4	7.3	5
30	3	Israel	6.1	5.7	6.6	6
41	4	Oman	5.3	4.1	6.4	5
48	5	Bahrain	4.9	4.1	5.7	5
50	6	Jordan	4.7	4.0	5.5	7
50	6	Saudi Arabia	4.7	3.3	6.0	5
54	8	Kuwait	4.5	3.3	5.9	5
59	9	Tunisia	4.3	3.0	5.6	6
85	10	Morocco	3.4	2.9	3.9	6
91	11	Djibouti	3.2	2.1	4.7	3
98	12	Egypt	3.1	2.9	3.4	6
105	13	Algeria	2.9	2.6	3.2	6
127	14	Lebanon	2.5	2.0	2.9	4
127	14	Syria	2.5	2.1	2.8	5
146	16	Iran	2.2	1.6	3.1	4
146	16	Libya	2.2	2.0	2.4	6
146	16	Yemen	2.2	2.0	2.5	4
175	19	Iraq	1.5	1.2	1.9	3

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

RANK	REGIONAL RANK	COUNTRY / TERRITORY	CPI 2010 SCORE	90% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL		SURVEYS USED
				LOWER BOUND	UPPER BOUND	
33	1	Botswana	5.8	5.4	6.2	6
39	2	Mauritius	5.4	4.9	5.9	6
45	3	Cape Verde	5.1	4.1	6.1	4
49	4	Seychelles	4.8	3.0	6.8	3
54	5	South Africa	4.5	4.1	4.8	8
56	6	Namibia	4.4	3.9	4.9	6
62	7	Ghana	4.1	3.4	4.7	7
66	8	Rwanda	4.0	3.2	5.1	5
78	9	Lesotho	3.5	2.8	4.4	6
85	10	Malawi	3.4	2.8	3.9	7
87	11	Liberia	3.3	2.7	3.9	4
91	12	Gambia	3.2	1.9	4.4	5
91	12	Swaziland	3.2	3.1	3.4	4
98	14	Burkina Faso	3.1	2.4	3.8	6
101	15	Sao Tome and Principe	3.0	2.6	3.3	3
101	15	Zambia	3.0	2.7	3.3	7
105	17	Senegal	2.9	2.6	3.1	7
110	18	Benin	2.8	2.3	3.3	6
110	18	Gabon	2.8	2.1	3.3	3
116	20	Ethiopia	2.7	2.4	2.9	7
116	20	Mali	2.7	2.2	3.2	6
116	20	Mozambique	2.7	2.4	3.0	7
116	20	Tanzania	2.7	2.4	2.9	7
123	24	Eritrea	2.6	1.7	3.7	4
123	24	Madagascar	2.6	2.2	2.9	6
123	24	Niger	2.6	2.3	2.9	4
127	27	Uganda	2.5	2.1	2.9	7
134	28	Nigeria	2.4	2.2	2.7	7
134	28	Sierra Leone	2.4	2.1	2.6	5
134	28	Togo	2.4	1.8	3.0	4
134	28	Zimbabwe	2.4	1.8	3.0	7
143	32	Mauritania	2.3	1.9	2.7	6
146	33	Cameroon	2.2	2.0	2.4	7
146	33	Côte d'Ivoire	2.2	1.9	2.5	7

Sub-Saharan Africa continued on next page.

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA CONTINUED

RANK	REGIONAL RANK	COUNTRY / TERRITORY	CPI 2010 SCORE	90% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL		SURVEYS USED
				LOWER BOUND	UPPER BOUND	
154	35	Central African Republic	2.1	2.0	2.3	4
154	35	Comoros	2.1	1.7	2.6	3
154	35	Congo-Brazzaville	2.1	1.9	2.3	5
154	35	Guinea-Bissau	2.1	2.0	2.1	3
154	35	Kenya	2.1	2.0	2.3	7
164	40	Democratic Republic of the Congo	2.0	1.7	2.3	4
164	40	Guinea	2.0	1.8	2.2	5
168	42	Angola	1.9	1.8	2.0	6
168	42	Equatorial Guinea	1.9	1.7	2.1	3
170	44	Burundi	1.8	1.6	2.0	6
171	45	Chad	1.7	1.6	1.9	6
172	46	Sudan	1.6	1.4	1.9	5
178	47	Somalia	1.1	0.9	1.4	3

ANNEX A: SHORT METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

The *Corruption Perceptions Index* (CPI) 2010 is an aggregate indicator that brings together data from sources that cover the past two years. For the 2010 CPI, this includes surveys published between January 2009 and September 2010.

DATA SOURCES:

- The 2010 CPI is calculated using data from 13 sources by 10 independent institutions. All sources measure the overall extent of corruption (frequency and/or size of bribes) in the public and political sectors, and all sources provide a ranking of countries, i.e. include an assessment of multiple countries.
- Evaluation of the extent of corruption in countries/ territories is done by two groups: country experts, both residents and non-residents, and business leaders. In the 2010 CPI, the following seven sources provided data based on expert analysis: African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, Bertelsmann Foundation, Economist Intelligence Unit, Freedom House, Global Insight and the World Bank. Three sources for the CPI 2010 reflect the evaluations by resident business leaders of their own country, IMD, Political and Economic Risk Consultancy, and the World Economic Forum.
- For CPI sources that are surveys, and where multiple years of the same survey are available, data for the past two years is included.
- For sources that are scores provided by experts (risk agencies/country analysts), only the most recent iteration of the assessment is included, as these scores are generally peer reviewed and change very little from year to year.

STEPS TO CALCULATE THE CPI:

1. The first step to calculate the CPI is to standardise the data provided by the individual sources (that is, translate them into a common scale). We use what is called a matching percentiles technique that takes the ranks of countries reported by each individual source. This method is useful for combining sources that have different distributions. While there is some information loss in this technique, it allows all reported scores to remain within the bounds of the CPI, i.e. to remain between 0 and 10.
2. The second step consists of performing what is called a beta-transformation on the standardised scores. This increases the standard deviation among all countries included in the CPI and makes it possible to differentiate more precisely countries that appear to have similar scores.
3. Finally, the CPI scores are determined by averaging all of the standardised values for each country.

RESULTS:

- The CPI score and rank are accompanied by the number of sources, the highest and lowest values given to every country by the data sources, the standard deviation and the confidence range for each country.
- The confidence range is determined by what is called a bootstrap (non-parametric) methodology, which allows inferences to be drawn on the underlying precision of the results. A 90 per cent confidence range is then established, where there is only a five per cent probability that the value is below and a five per cent probability that the value is above this confidence range.

For a more detailed explanation of the CPI method please visit www.transparency.org/cpi

ANNEX B:

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

NUMBER	1	2	3
ABBREVIATION	ADB	AFDB	BTI
SOURCE	Asian Development Bank	African Development Bank	Bertelsmann Foundation
NAME	Country Performance Assessment Ratings	Country Policy and Institutional Assessments	Bertelsmann Transformation Index
YEAR PUBLISHED	2010	2010	2009
INTERNET	www.adb.org/Documents/Reports/Country-Performance-Assessment-Exercise/default.asp	www.afdb.org/pls/portal/url/ITEM/5008432D529957FAE040C00A0C3D3A86	www.bertelsmann-transformation-index.de/english
WHO WAS SURVEYED?	Country teams, experts inside and outside the bank	Country teams, experts inside and outside the bank	Network of local correspondents and experts inside and outside the organisation
SUBJECT ASKED	Transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector	Transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector	The government's capacity to punish and contain corruption
NUMBER OF REPLIES	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
COVERAGE	28 countries (eligible for ADF funding)	53 countries	128 less developed and transition countries

NUMBER	4	5	6
ABBREVIATION	CPIA	EIU	FH
SOURCE	World Bank (IDA and IBRD)	Economist Intelligence Unit	Freedom House
NAME	Country Policy and Institutional Assessment	Country Risk Service and Country Forecast	Nations in Transit
YEAR PUBLISHED	2010	2010	2010
INTERNET	http://go.worldbank.org/S2THW11X60	www.eiu.com	www.freedomhouse.hu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=196
WHO WAS SURVEYED?	Country teams, experts inside and outside the bank	Expert staff assessment	Assessment by experts originating from or resident in the respective country
SUBJECT ASKED	Transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector	The misuse of public office for private (or political party) gain: including corruption in public procurement, misuse of public funds, corruption in public service, and prosecution of public officials	Extent of corruption as practiced in governments, as perceived by the public and as reported in the media, as well as the implementation of anti-corruption initiatives.
NUMBER OF REPLIES	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
COVERAGE	77 countries (eligible for IDA funding)	135 countries	29 countries/territories

NUMBER	7	8	9
ABBREVIATION	GI	IMD	
SOURCE	Global Insight	IMD International, Switzerland, World Competitiveness Center	
NAME	Country Risk Ratings	IMD World Competitiveness Yearbook	
YEAR PUBLISHED	2010	2009	2010
INTERNET	www.globalinsight.com	www.imd.ch/wcc	
WHO WAS SURVEYED?	Expert staff assessment	Executives in top and middle management in domestic and international companies	
SUBJECT ASKED	The likelihood of encountering corrupt officials, ranging from petty bureaucratic corruption to grand political corruption	Category Institutional Framework - State Efficiency: "Bribing and corruption exist/do not exist"	
NUMBER OF REPLIES	Not applicable	3,960	
COVERAGE	201 countries	57 countries	58 countries

NUMBER	10	11
ABBREVIATION	PERC	
SOURCE	Political & Economic Risk Consultancy	
NAME	Asian Intelligence Newsletter	
YEAR PUBLISHED	2009	2010
INTERNET	www.asiarisk.com	
WHO WAS SURVEYED?	Expatriate business executives	
SUBJECT ASKED	How serious do you consider the problem of corruption to be in the public sector?	
NUMBER OF REPLIES	1,750	2,174
COVERAGE	16 countries	16 countries

NUMBER	12	13
ABBREVIATION	WEF	WEF
SOURCE	World Economic Forum	
NAME	Global Competitiveness Report	
YEAR PUBLISHED	2009	2010
INTERNET	www.weforum.org	
WHO WAS SURVEYED?	Senior business leaders, domestic and international companies	
SUBJECT ASKED	Undocumented extra payments or bribes connected with 1) exports and imports, 2) public utilities, 3) tax collection, 4) public contracts and 5) judicial decisions are common/never occur	
NUMBER OF REPLIES	More than 12,000	More than 13,000
COVERAGE	133 countries	139 countries

Transparency International
International Secretariat
Alt-Moabit 96
10559 Berlin
Germany

Phone: +49 - 30 - 34 38 200
Fax: +49 - 30 - 34 70 39 12

ti@transparency.org
www.transparency.org