

# **Discussion Paper on Transnational Crime and Corruption:**

**An overview of initiatives by other international organizations**

February 2010

*Prepared by the Research Team of the OSCE PA International Secretariat*

## Contents

I. Introduction.....	3
II. International Financial Institutions’ collaborative efforts.....	4
III. The World Bank Group.....	4
IV. International Monetary Fund.....	6
V. European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD).....	6
VI. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).....	7
VII. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).....	9
VIII. Transparency International.....	10
IX. Financial Action Task Force (FATF).....	10
X. Global Organization of Parliamentarians against Corruption (GOPAC).....	11
XI. Council of Europe.....	12
XII. European Union.....	14
XIII. Inter-Parliamentary Union.....	16
XIV. NATO.....	16
XV. G-20.....	17
XVI. G-8.....	18
XVII. Conclusion.....	18
APPENDIX A.....	20
APPENDIX B.....	25

## I. Introduction

Corruption throughout the OSCE area impedes the progress of democracy and has a detrimental effect on all three dimensions of security. Besides impacting economic development, corruption undermines the legitimacy, credibility and functioning of the State and its institutions. Further, corruption enables transnational crime which has a profound impact on the human dimension. Trafficking in human beings and new forms of slavery, for example, are made possible in many cases by corruption on various levels of government.

The OSCE PA can play an important role in pushing participating States to take the lead in fighting corruption, strengthening the rule of law and ensuring separation of powers. With the PA's leadership, countries across the OSCE area can find the political will needed to take actions towards reducing corruption in areas such as ensuring the independence of the judiciary, reducing abuse of power in the police forces, eliminating collusion between the public and private sectors through improper party financing or abuse of parliamentary immunity, and promoting the important role of the press by curbing state interference.

In the dimension of **political affairs and security**, particular attention should be paid to addressing corruption within the State's institutions by promoting a culture of openness and transparency, countering nepotism and the misuse of administrative resources, and tackling the issue of improper political party financing. Attention should also be paid to corruption within the judiciary and police forces, particularly in regards to political and/or economic pressure placed on these State institutions.

In the **economic and environmental dimension** of security, one of the main issues of concern is the practice of public officials interfering in business activity and private ownership, which may include hostile takeovers and confiscation, as well as pressure placed by the tax and regulatory authorities in some countries. These activities in many cases serve to decrease investor confidence and can significantly hamper business activity. Corruption in the extractive industries should also be addressed, as well as hostile corporate takeovers that take advantage of corrupt judicial systems.

In the dimension of **democracy, human rights and humanitarian questions**, many issues of concern are directly impacted by corruption. Sex tourism, child exploitation, illegal labour migration, drug trafficking and trafficking in human beings are all enabled by a lack of border security that is made possible in many cases by the corruption of public officials. Without addressing corruption in this sphere, meaningfully tackling these transnational crime activities will continue to be unfeasible. In addition, the media, which serves a vital role in democratic societies, is often abused in corrupt systems.

It is clear then that in all of the three dimensions of security, corruption plays a corrosive role, and therefore ought to be addressed in a comprehensive way by the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly. Before engaging on this issue though, it is useful to examine what other international bodies have been doing in the global fight against corruption. The following report provides a

summary of the work already being done by international financial institutions and other multilateral organizations to curb corruption across the globe.

## II. International Financial Institutions' collaborative efforts<sup>1</sup>

The International Financial Institutions' Anti-corruption Task Force was established in February 2006 and unites the IMF, The World Bank Group, the European Investment Bank and multilateral development banks such as the European Bank of Reconstruction and Development, African Development Bank Group, Asian Development Bank and Inter-American Development Bank Group.

The purpose of the IFITF is to encourage greater harmonization among the institutions' approaches to combating corruption, particularly through greater standardization of the definitions of fraudulent and corrupt practices that are the basis for investigating and sanctioning wrong-doing in projects financed by various international institutions. Additionally, the IFITF has taken steps to enhance information sharing between the banks and has agreed upon guiding principles for analyzing integrity issues relating to their lending and investment decisions. The IFITF also explored ideas on how the IFIs could assist governments within their respective regions in their efforts to improve the detection, investigation and prosecution of fraud and corruption.

## III. The World Bank Group

The World Bank has been working on issues related to governance and anticorruption – in areas such as public sector performance, public financial management, civil service reform, decentralization, transparency and accountability – for more than a decade. Since 2007, the Bank's new strategy, **Strengthening World Bank Group Engagement on Governance and Anticorruption** (GAC), has given greater attention to governance and anticorruption initiatives within countries, as well as in its own operations, as an important condition for faster and more effective development.<sup>2</sup> This strategy identifies governance and anticorruption issues as critical to improving development outcomes such as the better delivery of services in health, education, roads, water, and electricity, better management of natural resource revenues, and more efficient investment in infrastructure.

---

<sup>1</sup> Anti-corruption report, The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, November 2006, <http://www.ebrd.com/about/integrity/report.pdf>. See also International Financial Institutions Anti-Corruption Task Force, September 2006.

<sup>2</sup> Developing the strategy, between November 2006 and January 2007, the World Bank Group conducted a global multi-stakeholder consultation process. More than 3,200 representatives from governments, civil society, donor agencies, parliaments, and the private sector participated in the consultations, which were held in 37 developing countries, 12 developed countries and 4 global dialogues through face-to-face meetings/workshops, videoconferencing, and electronic feedback via the World Bank's website (The World Bank Group: Implementation Plan for Strengthening World Bank Group Engagement on Governance and Anticorruption, <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTGOVANTICORR/0,,contentMDK:21447906~pagePK:210058~piPK:210062~theSitePK:3035864,00.html>).

## **Incorporating GAC in the Bank's Internal Operations**

Many World Bank projects now integrate governance and anticorruption dimensions as an intrinsic part of project design. These dimensions include assessing political economy realities – formal institutions and informal rules, as well as stakeholder interests – and factoring them into project design; incorporating stronger mechanisms to identify and mitigate risks of corruption in Bank-financed operations; and instituting stronger controls and oversight mechanisms, including an emphasis on disclosure and on monitoring by civil society and other third parties. Many of these projects also explicitly focus on using country-level procurement, financial management, and audit systems as a mechanism to build capacity within countries in these areas.

The Bank is increasingly moving towards longer-term, results-based support to various sectors, which will provide the foundation for building sustainable institutions; set in place effective safeguards and controls at the sector level in countries, and create processes that enforce accountability for results. The Bank's support to core public sector institutions – such as ministries of finance, procurement agencies, and in broad terms the civil service– includes support for improving their performance, efficiency, and accountability, and making those sectors better equipped to handle key functions such as budget formulation, implementation, as well as monitoring and oversight, performance management, and procurement reform.

A key global initiative for the Bank has been the Stolen Assets Recovery (StAR) initiative, launched in partnership with the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the goal of which is to deter asset theft and facilitate the recovery of assets stolen through acts of corruption. The program has initiated a range of policy and analytical work on asset recovery, and has also helped build capacity in countries for stronger anticorruption and asset recovery mechanisms.<sup>3</sup>

In 2006, the Bank embarked on a series of reforms resulting in the issuance of the Guidelines for Borrowers. These guidelines focus on preventing and combating corruption in Bank-financed projects to ensure that loan proceeds are used for their intended purpose, typically promoting development and reducing poverty. The Guidelines are intended to clearly delineate the actions that recipients of loan proceeds should take to try to prevent cases of fraud and corruption from occurring, and to address such situations should they arise.

Since 1996, the World Bank's Procurement Guidelines and Consultant Guidelines have enabled the Bank to sanction firms and individuals that are found to have engaged in fraud or corruption in connection with the procurement of goods or services, the selection of consultants, or the execution of any resulting contracts. Both sets of guidelines contain definitions of the specific sanctionable offenses of fraud, corruption, collusion, coercion and obstruction. Since 1999, more than 330 firms and individuals have been sanctioned by the Bank for engaging in fraud and corruption in Bank financed projects.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> "Bank, UN Join in Stepped- Up Drive to Help Countries Recover Looted Assets", The World Bank website, 17 September 2007, <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/ORGANIZATION/EXTPRESIDENT2007/0,,contentMDK:21475359~menuPK:64822279~pagePK:64821878~piPK:64821912~theSitePK:3916065,00.html>

<sup>4</sup> Relevant Guidelines on sanctions are available at: "Sanctions reform", The World Bank web page,

#### **IV. International Monetary Fund<sup>5</sup>**

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) works with its members to address corruption in areas where it has a mandate and expertise, including public resource management, tax administration, financial sector soundness, central bank safeguards, as well as anti-money laundering and combating the financing of terrorism, with an emphasis on establishing strong and transparent procedures and institutions in order to ensure accountability. The IMF also provides technical assistance to help strengthen countries' capacity to combat corruption by advising on appropriate anti-corruption legal frameworks, such as anti-corruption commissions, and asset declaration.

The IMF promotes good governance through specific initiatives which tie in with its oversight, lending, and technical assistance. It encourages member countries to improve accountability by enhancing transparency in policies, in line with internationally recognized standards and codes that cover government, the financial sector, and the corporate sector. The IMF has also developed guidelines that outline transparency principles in fiscal policies. These accompany manuals that describe good and best practices. The Code of Good Practices on Fiscal Transparency aims to encourage a better-informed public debate about the design and results of fiscal policy, and greater government accountability. In its work with lesser-developed countries, the IMF emphasizes adequate systems for tracking public expenditure related to poverty reduction. It partners with other international financial institutions and donors in the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) program, which helps member countries develop essential public financial management systems by measuring their performance.

An Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) was established in July 2001 to provide objective and independent evaluations on issues related to IMF policies and operations. The Office operates independently of IMF management and at arm's length from the IMF's Executive Board. IEO reports and information regarding the work program are publicly available.<sup>6</sup> The fact that IMF loans and assistance are typically disbursed in a number of installments<sup>7</sup> gives the Fund the right to suspend its co-operation with a country-recipient, thus providing that country with an incentive to commit to IMF practices and recommendations.

#### **V. European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)<sup>8</sup>**

The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) works with publicly owned companies, to support privatisation, restructuring state-owned firms and improvement of

---

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/PROJECTS/0,,contentMDK:21254834~pagePK:41367~piPK:51533~theSitePK:40941,00.html>

<sup>5</sup> "The IMF and Good Governance," International Monetary Fund Fact Sheet, 1 September 2009, <http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/gov.htm>

<sup>6</sup> "Transparency at the IMF," International Monetary Fund web page, <http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/trans.htm>. See also Review of the Fund's Transparency Policy, Background paper, International Monetary Fund, 27 October 2009, <http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2009/102609a.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> "Lending by the IMF," International Monetary Fund web page, <http://www.imf.org/external/about/lending.htm>

<sup>8</sup> Anti-corruption report, The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, November 2006, <http://www.ebrd.com/about/integrity/report.pdf>

municipal services. The Bank uses its close relationship with governments in the region to promote policies that will bolster the business environment. The mandate of the EBRD stipulates that it must only work in countries that are committed to democratic principles.

In the fulfillment of its obligation to take steps to prevent its funds from being diverted from their intended purposes, the EBRD's strategy encompasses prevention, detection, investigation and sanction. Its preventive measures include engaging in policy dialogue and technical assistance; strengthening corporate governance; and promoting international co-operation in the fight against corruption. When it comes to detection, the EBRD runs a hotline and offers whistleblower protection. The Bank also investigates corruption internally and externally, in both the public and private sectors.

The EBRD participates in anti-corruption campaigns by publicly supporting the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) and working with Transparency International, the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), the OECD and the Council of Europe. The EBRD is a member of the International Group against Corruption (IGAC) and co-founded the Multilateral Development Banks Investigator's Forum (MDBIF). The latter initiative led to the establishment of the International Financial Institutions' Anti-corruption Task Force (IFITF) (see below). The EBRD also supports the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) which promotes financial disclosure on the part of corporate interests involved in the extraction industry and by national authorities.

Another international effort that EBRD contributes to is the annual meeting of international investigators that brings together the senior officers of the investigative offices of the world's international organisations, including the MDBs, the United Nations and its specialised agencies, the International Criminal Police Organisation (INTERPOL) and European institutions, such as the EIB and the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF). The EBRD hosted this year's annual conference, which was focused on anticorruption and fraud initiatives, such as the establishment of inter-agency investigative task forces, cross-debarment and whistle-blowing.<sup>9</sup>

The EBRD's Office of the Chief Compliance Officer has exclusive jurisdiction to investigate all instances of misconduct on the part of the staff of the institution and contributes to the handling of allegations that may arise against members of the Board of Directors, the President, the Vice Presidents and the Chief Evaluator (internal investigations). The office also plays a key role in the Bank's response to allegations of fraud or corruption in its operations (external investigations).<sup>10</sup>

## **VI. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)**

The three main pillars of the UNODC can be identified as: 1) field-based technical co-operative projects to enhance the capacity of Member States to counter illicit drugs, crime and terrorism; 2) research and analytical work to increase knowledge and understanding of drugs and crime issues

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Anti-corruption report, The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, November 2006, p. 17, <http://www.ebrd.com/about/integrity/report.pdf>

and expand the evidence base for policy and operational decisions; and 3) normative work to assist States in the ratification and implementation of the relevant international treaties, the development of domestic legislation on drugs, crime and terrorism, and the provision of secretariat and substantive services to the treaty-based and governing bodies.<sup>11</sup> Issues addressed by the UNODC also include countering narcotics and law enforcement; drug prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; human trafficking; anti-terrorism and anti-corruption efforts; money laundering and fighting organized crime.<sup>12</sup>

As one of the core anti-corruption strategies, the UNODC co-operates with Transparency International, the British Department for International Development and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers and the Anti-Corruption Unit in order to strengthen the integrity of the judiciary. Two conventions were created by UNODC to address these problems: the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime<sup>13</sup> and the Convention against Corruption.<sup>14</sup>

The Protocol to the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime address the illicit manufacturing of and trafficking of firearms, the illegal trafficking in and transport of migrants and international trafficking in women and children. Other UN organs dealing with crime and corruption include the UN Centre for International Crime Prevention, the Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention, UN Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute and UN Development Programme: Democratic Governance.<sup>15</sup>

Each State Party to the UNCOG must apply effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal or non-criminal sanctions – including monetary sanctions – taking into account the gravity of the offence, and exercise them in accordance with domestic law.<sup>16</sup> Item 7 stipulates that each State Party if appropriate shall consider establishing procedures for the ineligibility of persons convicted of offences of corruption from holding public office or holding office in an enterprise owned in whole or in part by the State. The UN Convention against Transnational Crime also advises each State Party to apply effective measures and sanctions, taking into account the gravity of the crime and exercising them in accordance with domestic law.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> UNODC official web page: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/about-unodc/index.html>

<sup>12</sup> Make the World Safer from Crime, Drugs and Terrorism  
[http://www.unodc.org/pdf/unodc\\_brochure\\_2007.pdf](http://www.unodc.org/pdf/unodc_brochure_2007.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> From the OSCE member states Convention against Transnational Organized Crime was not ratified by: Andorra, the Czech Republic, Greece, Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, San Marino; Asian Partners for Cooperation that have not ratified this Convention are: Japan, Republic of Korea, Thailand.

<sup>14</sup> From the OSCE member states Convention against Corruption was not ratified by: Andorra, the Czech republic, Estonia, German, Holy See, Iceland, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Monaco, San Marino; from Asian Partners for Cooperation this Convention was not ratified by: Japan and Thailand.

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.undp.org/governance/sl-par.htm>

<sup>16</sup> Article 26, Item 4; Article 30; Article 52, Items 5, 6.

<sup>17</sup> Article 10, Item 4; Article 11.

## VII. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)<sup>18</sup>

The Multidisciplinary approach of the OECD includes the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention 2009, taxation, development aid and regional programmes.<sup>19</sup> All 30 OECD countries, as well as eight non-member countries, have adopted the Convention on Combating Bribery in International Business Transactions, which is an effort to eliminate bribes paid to foreign officials. The Convention requires countries to impose sanctions and provide for mutual legal assistance. The Recommendations on Tax Deductibility of Bribes to Foreign Public Officials Convention calls upon countries to disallow the tax deduction of bribes paid to foreign public officials. In 1999 the OECD Anti-Corruption Unit launched an online resource, OECD Anti-Corruption Ring Online, to provide governments and the general public with information about implementing effective policies and practices designed to curb corruption.<sup>20</sup>

Regional specific anti-corruption projects are carried out by: SIGMA – Support for Improvement in Governance and Management<sup>21</sup>, ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia-Pacific<sup>22</sup>, Anti-Corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia and OECD/AfDB Initiative to Support Business Integrity and Anti-bribery Efforts in Africa and Programme in Latin America, Middle East and North Africa (MENA). The OECD also holds regularly meetings on the topic, for example the Anti-Corruption Network for Eastern Europe and Central Asia 7<sup>th</sup> General Meeting on 25-27 June 2008 in Tbilisi, Georgia,<sup>23</sup> the Regional Seminar on Good Practices in corruption Prevention, organized by the Commission Against Corruption Macao and ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and the Pacific Agenda on 25-26 March 2009.

The Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions and its related documents calls on participating States to use proportionate and effective sanctions against foreign public officials involved in bribery. The range of penalties shall include deprivation of liberty sufficient to enable effective mutual legal assistance and extradition.<sup>24</sup> Civil or administrative sanctions include: exclusion from entitlement to public benefits or aid; temporary or permanent disqualification from participation in public procurement or from the practice of other commercial activities; placing under judicial supervision; and a judicial winding-up order.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> OECD member countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, UK, USA.

<sup>19</sup> [www.oecd.org/corruption](http://www.oecd.org/corruption)

<sup>20</sup> OSCE: List of Initiatives to combat corruption and strengthen the rule of law, Vienna, 7 April 2000

<sup>21</sup> Sigma is a joint initiative of the EU and the OECD supporting around 30 countries in the Central and Eastern European and Mediterranean regions in their initiatives to curb corruption. [www.sigmaxweb.org](http://www.sigmaxweb.org)

<sup>22</sup> A joint leadership of the Asian Development Bank and the OECD include 28 countries and economies of the Asia-Pacific region works on implementing the Anti-Corruption Action Plan for Asia and the Pacific. [www.oecd.org/corruption/asiapacific](http://www.oecd.org/corruption/asiapacific)

<sup>23</sup> [http://www.oecd.org/document/60/0,3343,en\\_36595778\\_36595926\\_43302460\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/60/0,3343,en_36595778_36595926_43302460_1_1_1_1,00.html)

<sup>24</sup> Article 3, Items 1, 2.

<sup>25</sup> Member countries' systems for applying sanctions for bribery of domestic officials differ as to whether the determination of bribery is based on a criminal conviction, indictment or administrative procedure, but in all cases it is based on substantial evidence.

## VIII. Transparency International

Transparency International is a global network fighting against corruption including more than 90 locally established national chapters as well as chapters-in-formation.<sup>26</sup> TI chapters do not exist in countries where civil society cannot operate freely or where there is no civil society interest in the organization. The organization does not investigate individual cases of corruption but is concentrated on providing reliable indexes and diagnostic tools concerning levels of transparency and corruption on all the levels from global to local.

Its Annual Corruption Perception Index (CPI)<sup>27</sup> ranks more than 150 countries in terms of levels of corruption based on expert assessments and opinion surveys. The Index Advisory Committee provides technical expertise and advice in the development of methodologies used by TI to measure corruption, while the Bribe Payers Index (BPI) and the Global Corruption Barometer (GCB)<sup>28</sup> complement the research of CPI. The BPI assesses the supply side of corruption and ranks corruption by source country and industry sector. The GCB is a public opinion survey carried out in more than 60 countries. TI national chapters in various regions are also involved in the process of measuring corruption, transparency and government, combining the general data with the local information.<sup>29</sup>

Since 2001 Transparency International has been publishing the Global Corruption Report (GCR) every year to provide the annual assessment and result of the anti-corruption efforts and situation concerning the level corruption in many countries. It draws attention to: analysis of the current situation; identification of new challenges; possible solutions to curb corruption. The GCR itself is divided into three sections: thematic focus (analysis of particular challenges), country reports and research.<sup>30</sup>

## IX. Financial Action Task Force (FATF)<sup>31</sup>

As an inter-governmental body, the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) has been combating money laundering and terrorist financing at national and international levels since 1989. The FATF monitors 35 member-states' progress in implementing adequate measures around the globe. The FATF established a series of Recommendations in 1990, which were edited in 1996 and 2003, designed to combat money laundering and terrorism financing and set out the basic framework of universal application. The first revision was necessary to take into consideration changes in money laundering trends and to assess future potential threats. Currently the 40+9

---

<sup>26</sup> Transparency International's official web page: <http://www.transparency.org>

<sup>27</sup> Corruption Perception Index 2009 [http://www.transparency.org/policy\\_research/surveys\\_indices/cpi/2009](http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2009)

<sup>28</sup> 2009 edition of the Global Corruption Barometer  
[http://www.transparency.org/policy\\_research/surveys\\_indices/gcb](http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/gcb)

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.transparency.org/publications/publications>

<sup>30</sup> GCR of 2007 was dedicated to corruption within judiciary branch; GCR of 2008 was devoted to corruption in the water sector, GCR of 2009 focuses on the private sector.

<sup>31</sup> Le Groupe d'action financière (GAFI)

[http://www.fatf-gafi.org/pages/0,3417,en\\_32250379\\_32236836\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.fatf-gafi.org/pages/0,3417,en_32250379_32236836_1_1_1_1_1,00.html)

Recommendations<sup>32</sup> cover the criminal justice system, law enforcement, the financial system and its regulations as well as international co-operation in this sphere.

The recommendations call on Member States to adopt measures similar to those mentioned in two UN Conventions. Such measures should include the authority to:

- identify, trace and evaluate property which is subject to confiscation
- carry out provisional measures, such as freezing and seizing, to prevent any dealing, transfer or disposal of such property
- take steps that will prevent or void actions that prejudice the State's ability to recover property that is subject to confiscation
- take any appropriate investigative measures

## **X. Global Organization of Parliamentarians against Corruption (GOPAC)<sup>33</sup>**

The Global Organization of Parliamentarians against Corruption was founded in 2002 at an international conference held in Ottawa, Canada in which 170 parliamentarians and 400 observers participated. GOPAC concentrates its efforts primarily on combating corruption and is comprised of 90 countries as members of the organization.

GOPAC covers the following regions where it has established specialized chapters:

- African Parliamentarians Network against Corruption (APNAC)
- The Arab Region Parliamentarians Against Corruption (ARPAC)
- A Caribbean chapter is in the process of formation (CaribPAC)
- A Central Asian Regional Chapter is in the process of formation
- South Caucasus Parliamentarians' Network against Corruption (CAUPAC)
- GOPAC-Europe as a non-partisan group of parliamentarians from across Europe
- LAPAC (Organization of Latin America Parliamentarians Against Corruption)
- North American regional chapter of GOPAC (NAPAC)
- The North East Asian Regional Chapter of GOPAC (NEAPAC)
- Newly Independent States Against Corruption (NISPAC)
- South Asian Parliamentarians Against Corruption (SAPAC)

GOPAC advocates for the criminalization of corrupt actions and works internationally to ensure effective investigation and prosecution. As parliamentarians, GOPAC also maintains that effective prevention of corruption requires improved governance, a key component of which is parliamentary oversight. In GOPAC's view, effective oversight includes reviewing all sources of revenue and expenditures; providing legislation and other parliamentary rules related to government budgeting, debt management, expenditure operations and financial reporting; and

---

<sup>32</sup> 40 Recommendations: <http://www.fatf-gafi.org/dataoecd/7/40/34849567.PDF>

<sup>9</sup> Special Recommendations on Terrorist Financing: [http://www.fatf-gafi.org/document/9/0,3343,en\\_32250379\\_32236920\\_34032073\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.fatf-gafi.org/document/9/0,3343,en_32250379_32236920_34032073_1_1_1_1,00.html)

<sup>33</sup> [http://www.gopacnetwork.org/main\\_en.htm](http://www.gopacnetwork.org/main_en.htm)

establishing rules that guide and enable parliaments to effectively oversee the implementation of the UN Convention against Corruption.<sup>34</sup>

## **XI. Council of Europe**

In 1981, the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers recommended taking measures against economic crime, including bribery (Recommendation No. R(81)12). The Ministers recommended that a Multidisciplinary Group on Corruption (GMC) be set up to prepare a programme of action against corruption. With the creation of the Multidisciplinary Group on Corruption (GMC) in 1994, under the responsibility of the European Committee on Crime Problems (CDPC) and the European Committee on Legal Co-operation (CDCJ), the fight against corruption was established as one of the Council of Europe's priorities.

In 1996 the Committee of Ministers adopted the Program of Action against Corruption prepared by the GMC and set the deadline for implementation in 2000. In June 1997, the Ministers of Justice of Council of Europe member States expressed concern regarding new trends in modern criminality, in particular the *organized, sophisticated* and *transnational character* of certain criminal activities. Fighting organized crime necessarily implied an adequate response to corruption.

In 1997 the Heads of State and Government of CoE's Member States decided that common responses to the challenges posed by the apparent increase in corruption and organised crime should be sought. They instructed the Committee of Ministers to adopt guiding principles to be applied in the development of domestic legislation and practice, to secure the rapid completion of international legal instruments pursuant to the Program of Action against Corruption and also to establish an appropriate and efficient mechanism for monitoring observance of the guiding principles and implementation of the relevant international instruments.

Also in 1997 the Committee of Ministers adopted Resolution (97) 24 pertaining to the 20 guiding principles for the fight against corruption and instructed the GMC to submit a draft text proposing the establishment of an appropriate and efficient mechanism for monitoring the observance and implementation of the Council of Europe's anti-corruption standard setting instruments.

In 1998 the Committee of Ministers authorized the establishment of the "Group of States against Corruption – GRECO" in the form of an enlarged partial agreement and in 1999 GRECO was set up by the following 17 founding members: Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain and Sweden. Since inception, its membership has grown considerably.

### **Council of Europe's Group of States against Corruption (GRECO)**

---

<sup>34</sup> Global Organization Of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC), Kuwait 2008: 3rd Global Conference Declaration, Position Statements and Resolutions, 19 November 2008, [http://www.gopacnetwork.org/Docs/kuwait/Declaration\\_and\\_new\\_resolutions%20ENG.pdf](http://www.gopacnetwork.org/Docs/kuwait/Declaration_and_new_resolutions%20ENG.pdf)

GRECO's objective is to improve the capacity of its members to fight corruption by monitoring their compliance with Council of Europe anti-corruption standards through a process of mutual evaluation and peer pressure. It helps to identify deficiencies in national anti-corruption policies, prompting the necessary legislative, institutional and practical reforms. GRECO also provides a platform for the sharing of best practice in the prevention and detection of corruption.

Membership in GRECO is not limited to Council of Europe member States. Any State which took part in the elaboration of the enlarged partial agreement may join by notifying the Secretary General of the Council of Europe. Moreover, any State which becomes a party to the Criminal or Civil Law Conventions on Corruption automatically accedes to GRECO and its evaluation procedures. Currently, GRECO comprises 46 Member States (45 European States and the United States of America). GRECO has granted observer status to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations – represented by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

GRECO monitors its members on an equal basis, through a process of mutual evaluation and peer pressure. GRECO monitoring comprises:

- a “horizontal” evaluation procedure (all members are evaluated within an Evaluation Round) leading to recommendations aimed at furthering the necessary legislative, institutional and practical reforms
- a compliance procedure designed to assess the measures taken by its members to implement the recommendations

GRECO operates in cycles: evaluation rounds, with each covering specific themes. GRECO's first evaluation round (2000–2002) dealt with the independence, specialisation and means of national bodies engaged in the prevention and fight against corruption. It also dealt with the extent and scope of immunities of public officials from arrest, prosecution, etc.

The second evaluation round (2003–2006) focused on the identification, seizure and confiscation of corruption proceeds, the prevention and detection of corruption in public administration and the prevention of legal persons (corporations, etc) from being used as shields for corruption. The third evaluation round (launched in 2007) addresses (a) the incriminations provided for under the Criminal Law Convention on Corruption and (b) the transparency of political party funding.

The evaluation process follows a defined procedure, where a team of experts is appointed by GRECO for the evaluation of a particular Member State. The analysis of the situation in each country is carried out on the basis of written responses to a questionnaire and information gathered in meetings with public officials and representatives of civil society during an on-site visit to the country. Following the on-site visit, the team of experts drafts a report which is communicated to the country and available for comments before it is finally submitted to GRECO for examination and adoption. The conclusions of evaluation reports may state that legislation and practice comply or do not comply with the provisions under scrutiny.

## **XII. European Union**

In 2008, the Council of the European Union approved the United Nations Convention against Corruption on behalf of the European Community through its decision (2008/801/EC).<sup>35</sup> The Convention provides for a high standard of preventive and technical assistance measures in matters within the Community's powers, in particular with regard to the internal market. This includes measures to prevent and to combat money laundering, as well as standards on accounting in the private sector and on transparency and equal access of all candidates for public works supply and service contracts.<sup>36</sup> The Council also signed the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime in its decision of 29 April 2004,<sup>37</sup> as well as the Convention's two protocols: the Protocol to prevent, suppress, and punish trafficking in persons, and the Protocol on the illicit manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms.

### **Europol, European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and European Crime Prevention Network**

Since 1 January 2010,<sup>38</sup> the European Police Office (Europol) has been the European Union agency tasked with the responsibility for law enforcement cooperation between member States. Its tasks are to support and strengthen mutual cooperation between Member States in preventing and combating terrorism and organized crime, including other forms of serious crime. It has legal personality and has competence in situations where two or more Member States are in need of a common approach to tackle organized crime, terrorism and other forms of serious crime. The European Commission established the European Anti-Fraud Office in 1999<sup>39</sup> to protect the European Community's financial interests, fight against fraud and any other illegal activities. OLAF conducts fraud investigations in all the Member States and within the European institutions themselves. It can also conduct investigations in non-member countries with which it has agreements. A Council decision<sup>40</sup> set up a European Crime Prevention Network organized through a Secretariat and contact points in the Member States.

### **Fight against organized crime and corruption**

The EU's fight against organized crime is concentrated on trafficking in human beings, arms and drugs and economic and financial crime, corruption and money laundering. It also covers new

---

<sup>35</sup> Council Decision 2008/801/EC of 25 September 2008, on the conclusion on behalf of the European Community, of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2008:287:0001:0110:EN:PDF>, accessed 04/02/2010.

<sup>36</sup> EU Official Website, "Summaries of EU Legislation", United Nations Convention against Corruption, [http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/fight\\_against\\_fraud/fight\\_against\\_corruption/133300\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/fight_against_fraud/fight_against_corruption/133300_en.htm), accessed 04/02/2010.

<sup>37</sup> Council Decision of 29 April 2004 on the conclusion on behalf of the European Community of the United Nations Convention against Organized Transnational Crime, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:261:0069:0115:EN:PDF>, accessed 05/02/2010.

<sup>38</sup> Council Decision 2009/371/JHA of 6 April 2009 establishing the European Police Office (Europol), <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:121:0037:0066:EN:PDF>, accessed 05/02/2010.

<sup>39</sup> Commission Decision of 28 April 1999 establishing the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF), [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/pri/en/oj/dat/1999/1\\_136/1\\_13619990531en00200022.pdf](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/pri/en/oj/dat/1999/1_136/1_13619990531en00200022.pdf), accessed 04/02/2010.

<sup>40</sup> Council Decision 2001/427/JHA of 28 May 2001 setting up a European crime prevention network.

dimensions of organized crime, such as cybercrime and environmental crime.<sup>41</sup> The integrated approach that guides the actions of the EU extends from prevention to law enforcement. Under the Hague Programme and with the Communication “Developing a strategic concept on tackling organized crime” dated 4 June 2006 to the Council and the European Parliament, the European Commission aims to focus its strategy on the collection of information and intelligence, prevention, and co-operation between law enforcement authorities, judicial authorities. A report on the implementation of the Hague Programme was drafted in a communication dated 10 June 2009 from the European Commission, describes improvements in the field of the fight against organized crime.<sup>42</sup>

The Stockholm Programme adopted by EU Head of States and Governments in December 2009 defines the EU work for 2010-2014 regarding the area of freedom, security and justice, focusing on the fight against organized crime and corruption as priorities. The European Council calls upon the Member States and the Commission to enhance the capacity for financial investigations, to further develop information exchange between the Financial Intelligence Units (FIUs) in the fight against money laundering, improve the prosecution of tax evasion and corruption in the private sector and facilitate the exchange of best practice in prevention and law enforcement particularly within the framework of the Anti-Corruption Network.

The European Council invites the Commission to develop indicators to measure efforts in the fight against corruption and to develop a comprehensive anti-corruption policy in close cooperation with GRECO and to report to the Council in 2010. The Commission should also increase coordination between member States in the framework of UNCAC, GRECO and OECD work in the field of combating corruption.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> EU Official Website, Summaries of EU legislation, Fight against organized Crime, [http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/justice\\_freedom\\_security/fight\\_against\\_organised\\_crime/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/justice_freedom_security/fight_against_organised_crime/index_en.htm), accessed 04/02/2010.

<sup>42</sup> Threats to the EU come from organized crime gangs' involvement in drugs, stolen vehicles, robbery and high tech crime such as identity theft. These along with financial crimes - fraud, counterfeiting, money laundering – all generate large profits and are harmful to the EU's economy. The establishment of national asset recovery offices for faster EU-wide tracing of funds has been encouraged and an intelligence-led approach was promoted in view of tackling these threats. On money laundering, FIU.NET has been established. This decentralized computer network connects EU Financial Intelligence Units to exchange efficiently financial intelligence information. A new instrument on the fight against organized crime allows for further co-operation between Member States. The Commission in May 2007 proposed a series of measures for better coordination in the fight against cyber crime, both among law enforcement authorities and between them and the private sector. The establishment of the Financial Coalition against Child Pornography enables the Commission, credit card issuers, law enforcement bodies and internet service companies to work together to eliminate commercial child pornography by taking action on the payment systems used to fund these illegal operations. The Commission put forward a framework decision for strengthening actions to prevent and combat child exploitation in spring 2009, alongside a proposal for a framework decision on trafficking in human beings following up the 2005 action plan., *in* Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions, An Evaluation of the Hague Programme and Action Plan, COM (2009) 263, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2009:0263:FIN:EN:PDF>, accessed 04/02/2010.

<sup>43</sup> Council of the European Union, Note from the Presidency to the European Council on the Stockholm Programme, 2 December 2009, [http://www.se2009.eu/polopoly\\_fs/1.26419!menu/standard/file/Klar\\_Stockholmsprogram.pdf](http://www.se2009.eu/polopoly_fs/1.26419!menu/standard/file/Klar_Stockholmsprogram.pdf), accessed 05/02/2010.

### **XIII. Inter-Parliamentary Union**

Founded in 1889 by parliamentarians from the United Kingdom and France, the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) is an international organization of Parliaments made up of 151 Members and 8 Associate Members.<sup>44</sup> It has six main areas of activity: Representative Democracy; International Peace and Security; Sustainable Development; Human Rights and Humanitarian Law; Women in Politics; and Education, Science and Culture.<sup>45</sup> The IPU is concerned with the issues of transnational crime and corruption especially where the effects of these issues intersect with the IPU's main activity areas.

In 1995 at the 94<sup>th</sup> Parliamentary Conference, the IPU adopted a resolution entitled "Parliamentary Action to Fight Corruption and the Need for International Co-operation in this Field." The resolution acknowledges the importance and urgency of these issues, and calls for international as well as national-level action.<sup>46</sup>

The First Standing Committee on Peace and International Security held a panel discussion during the 121<sup>st</sup> Assembly in Geneva, Switzerland on 20 October 2009 on the subject item "Cooperation and shared responsibility in the global fight against organized crime, in particular drug trafficking, illegal arms sales, human trafficking and cross-border terrorism." The item was chosen by the First Standing Committee for formal debate during the 122<sup>nd</sup> Assembly which will be held from 27 March to 1 April 2010 in Bangkok, Thailand.

On 18 December 2009 a preliminary draft resolution with the same name as the subject item was submitted to the First Standing Committee. The draft resolution recognizes the "significant challenges that are faced by law enforcement and judicial authorities in responding to the ever changing means used by transnational criminal organizations to avoid detection and prosecution,"<sup>47</sup> and encourages IPU Member Parliaments to better integrate national efforts, and promote international effort to combat transnational crime and corruption.

### **XIV. NATO**

NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme requires that partner countries meet specific commitments including transparency in national defence planning and budgeting to establish

---

<sup>44</sup> Inter-Parliamentary Union, "Members of the Union," <http://www.ipu.org/english/membshp.htm>, accessed: 2 February 2010.

<sup>45</sup> Inter-Parliamentary Union, "Main Areas of Activity of the Inter-Parliamentary Union," <http://www.ipu.org/iss-e/issues.htm>, accessed: 3 February 2010.

<sup>46</sup> "Parliamentary Action To Fight Corruption And The Need For International Co-Operation In This Field," 94<sup>th</sup> Inter-Parliamentary Conference, 13 October 1995, Bucharest, Romania, Inter-Parliamentary Union, <http://www.ipu.org/conf-e/94-1.htm>, accessed: 3 February 3, 2010

<sup>47</sup> "Cooperation and Shared Responsibility in the Global Fight Against Organized Crime, In Particular Drug Trafficking, Illegal Arms Sales, Human Trafficking, and Cross-Border Terrorism," Preliminary Draft Resolution First Standing Committee, 18 December 2009, <http://www.ipu.org/conf-e/122/1Cmt-prel-dr-res.pdf>, accessed: 3 February 2010.

democratic control over armed forces.<sup>48</sup> PfP Trust Funds provide the mechanism for funding the activities that take place under NATO PfP partnerships.<sup>49</sup>

On 1 July 2008 NATO launched a new Trust Fund designed to build integrity and identify best practices in defence establishments. This is the first of such projects where the goal is to provide practical support to institution-building in the defence sector. Some of the elements of this project include integrity-building courses for civilian and military personnel.<sup>50</sup> One of the results of this initiative is collaboration with Transparency International. Through this collaboration three counter-corruption training courses were developed as part of NATO's "Building Integrity" initiative in 2009. These training courses took place in Kabul and were attended by 30 to 40 senior officials of the Ministry of Defence and Ministry of Interior.<sup>51</sup> The motivation behind the development of these courses is that they will be able to be delivered to a variety of individuals all over the globe, and become a useful tool in the fight against corruption.

## **XV. G-20**

The Group of Twenty (G-20) Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors was established in 1999 to bring together systemically important industrialized and developing economies to discuss key issues in the global economy. The G-20 is a forum for international economic development that promotes discussion between industrial and emerging-market countries on key issues related to global economic stability.<sup>52</sup>

In the Pittsburg Statement the G-20 leaders reaffirm their commitment in the fight against tax havens, money laundering, financing of terrorism, and prudential standards. The statement welcomes the expansion of the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information and the agreement to deliver an effective programme of peer review. The Forum's work will focus on improving tax transparency and exchange of information so that countries can fully enforce their tax laws. The G-20 leaders also expressed their readiness to use countermeasures against tax havens beginning in March 2010. Welcoming the progress made by the Financial Action Task Force (FATF) in the fight against money laundering and terrorist financing, they call upon the FATF to issue a public list of high risk jurisdictions by February 2010. They also call on the FSB to report progress to address non-co-operative jurisdictions regarding international co-operation and information exchange in November 2009 and to initiate a peer review process by February 2010.<sup>53</sup> The G-20 also publishes a thorough and structured progress report on their initiatives.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "Topic: Partnership for Peace," [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics\\_50349.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_50349.htm), accessed: 15 February 2010.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> North Atlantic Treaty Organization, "NATO News: NATO Trust Fund helps build integrity," <http://www.nato.int/docu/update/2008/07-july/e0701b.html>, accessed 15 February 15, 2010

<sup>51</sup> Transparency International: The global coalition against corruption, "Defence Against Corruption: building integrity and reducing corruption in defence: Afghanistan," <http://www.defenceagainstdcorruption.org/our-work/governments/afghanistan>, accessed 15 February 2010.

<sup>52</sup> G20 Web Page, [http://www.g20.org/about\\_what\\_is\\_g20.aspx](http://www.g20.org/about_what_is_g20.aspx)

<sup>53</sup> G20 Leaders' Statement – The Pittsburgh Summit, 24-25 September 2009, p. 10, [http://www.g20.org/Documents/pittsburgh\\_summit\\_leaders\\_statement\\_250909.pdf](http://www.g20.org/Documents/pittsburgh_summit_leaders_statement_250909.pdf)

<sup>54</sup> "Progress report on the actions to promote financial regulatory reform issued by the U.S. Chair of the Pittsburgh G-20 Summit", 25 September 2009, [http://www.g20.org/Documents/pittsburgh\\_progress\\_report\\_250909.pdf](http://www.g20.org/Documents/pittsburgh_progress_report_250909.pdf)

## **XVI. G-8**

The G-8 efforts in the area of stolen assets recovery is described in the “Statement on Fighting High-Level Corruption,” issued in St Petersburg on 16 July 2006. This statement begins with an expression of renewal of commitment by the Leaders of the G-8 to fight corruption and improve transparency and accountability. Corruption is seen as a threat to the agenda of global security, open markets and free trade, economic prosperity, and the rule of law.

In the statement, the G-8 leaders committed to:

- Continue to investigate and prosecute corrupt public officials and those who bribe them;
- Work with all the international financial centers and G-8 private sectors to deny safe haven to assets illicitly acquired by individuals engaged in high-level corruption by pressing all financial centers to attain and implement the highest international standards of transparency and exchange of information;
- Implement fully the commitment to seek, when appropriate and in accordance with national laws, to deny entry and safe haven, to public officials found guilty of corruption;
- Support the global ratification and implementation of the UNCAC and call upon those states that have not already ratified the UNCAC to do so at the earliest date possible. Ensure vigorous implementation of the OECD Anti-bribery Convention by parties to the Convention, including through ensuring that domestic law adopted in this framework is effectively implemented and through further effective peer review evaluation. Fight vigorously against money laundering, including by prosecuting money laundering offences and by implementing the revised recommendations of the FATF-related customer due diligence, transparency of legal persons, and arrangements that are essential to tackling corruption.<sup>55</sup>

## **XVII. Conclusion**

As detailed above, there is considerable work being done on the international level in addressing corruption. As the world’s largest regional organization, there is much the OSCE can do to advance these efforts. Areas on which the OSCE PA can focus include tracing corruption trends in the OSCE area, reviewing institutional reforms in participating States, and identifying possible anti-corruption solutions.

The PA should encourage participating States that have not done so to sign and ratify existing anti-corruption conventions, such as the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), as well as relevant protocols. The countries that are already parties must also be encouraged to report on their implementation of the Convention as called for by the Conference of the States Parties. Further, the PA can urge that these conventions are strengthened, for example by promoting transparency of the review process in the UNCAC, which is vital to ensure implementation by governments.

---

<sup>55</sup> Stolen Assets Recovery (StAR) Initiative: Challenges, Opportunities, and Action Plan, UNODC/The World Bank, June 2007, p. 43, <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/NEWS/Resources/Star-rep-full.pdf>.

Where relevant, OSCE countries should also be encouraged to adopt voluntary instruments to prevent corruption, such as the OECD Principles of Corporate Governance, or agree to a review of their national practices in the fields of financial, monetary and fiscal transparency, anti-money laundering and other areas within the Standards and Codes initiative.<sup>56</sup>

The lack of consequential sanctions for corrupt governments must be addressed in a meaningful way by the OSCE PA. Considering the amount of economic and political influence wielded by many OSCE participating States, there is much that could be done on a bilateral basis to fight corruption in this regard. The OSCE PA could recommend, for example, that participating States place trade restrictions on companies based in countries that are deemed corrupt by Transparency International. The idea of travel restrictions being placed on corrupt public officials, including judges and prosecutors, should also be explored.

Some of the most effective anti-corruption initiatives of the OSCE, it should be pointed out, are being carried out by the Organization's Field Operations, which have seen a great deal of success in curbing corruption on the national and subnational levels. As these Field Operations are where the most important work of the OSCE takes place, participating States must provide them with relevant mandates and with sufficient financial and human resources to carry out their work.

---

<sup>56</sup> Reports on the Observance of Standards and Codes, The World Bank web page <http://www.worldbank.org/ifa/rosc.html>. The OSCE states who have not joined the initiative are: Andorra, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Liechtenstein, Malta, Monaco, the Netherlands, Portugal, Russian Federation, Spain, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, United States, Uzbekistan.

## APPENDIX A

### Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index 2009<sup>57</sup>

- The Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) table shows a country's ranking and score, the number of surveys used to determine the score, and the confidence range of the scoring.
- The rank shows how one country compares to others included in the index. The CPI score indicates the perceived level of public-sector corruption in a country/territory.
- The CPI is based on 13 independent surveys. However, not all surveys include all countries. The surveys used column indicates how many surveys were relied upon to determine the score for that country.
- The confidence range indicates the reliability of the CPI scores and tells us that allowing for a margin of error, we can be 90% confident that the true score for this country lies within this range.

Rank	Country/Territory	CPI 2009 Score	Surveys Used	Confidence Range
1	New Zealand	9.4	6	9.1 - 9.5
2	Denmark	9.3	6	9.1 - 9.5
3	Singapore	9.2	9	9.0 - 9.4
3	Sweden	9.2	6	9.0 - 9.3
5	Switzerland	9.0	6	8.9 - 9.1
6	Finland	8.9	6	8.4 - 9.4
6	Netherlands	8.9	6	8.7 - 9.0
8	Australia	8.7	8	8.3 - 9.0
8	Canada	8.7	6	8.5 - 9.0
8	Iceland	8.7	4	7.5 - 9.4
11	Norway	8.6	6	8.2 - 9.1
12	Hong Kong	8.2	8	7.9 - 8.5
12	Luxembourg	8.2	6	7.6 - 8.8
14	Germany	8.0	6	7.7 - 8.3
14	Ireland	8.0	6	7.8 - 8.4
16	Austria	7.9	6	7.4 - 8.3
17	Japan	7.7	8	7.4 - 8.0
17	United Kingdom	7.7	6	7.3 - 8.2
19	United States	7.5	8	6.9 - 8.0
20	Barbados	7.4	4	6.6 - 8.2
21	Belgium	7.1	6	6.9 - 7.3
22	Qatar	7.0	6	5.8 - 8.1
22	Saint Lucia	7.0	3	6.7 - 7.5
24	France	6.9	6	6.5 - 7.3

<sup>57</sup> Transparency International:  
[http://www.transparency.org/policy\\_research/surveys\\_indices/cpi/2009/cpi\\_2009\\_table](http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2009/cpi_2009_table)

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Country/Territory</b>	<b>CPI 2009 Score</b>	<b>Surveys Used</b>	<b>Confidence Range</b>
25	Chile	6.7	7	6.5 - 6.9
25	Uruguay	6.7	5	6.4 - 7.1
27	Cyprus	6.6	4	6.1 - 7.1
27	Estonia	6.6	8	6.1 - 6.9
27	Slovenia	6.6	8	6.3 - 6.9
30	United Arab Emirates	6.5	5	5.5 - 7.5
31	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	6.4	3	4.9 - 7.5
32	Israel	6.1	6	5.4 - 6.7
32	Spain	6.1	6	5.5 - 6.6
34	Dominica	5.9	3	4.9 - 6.7
35	Portugal	5.8	6	5.5 - 6.2
35	Puerto Rico	5.8	4	5.2 - 6.3
37	Botswana	5.6	6	5.1 - 6.3
37	Taiwan	5.6	9	5.4 - 5.9
39	Brunei Darussalam	5.5	4	4.7 - 6.4
39	Oman	5.5	5	4.4 - 6.5
39	Korea (South)	5.5	9	5.3 - 5.7
42	Mauritius	5.4	6	5.0 - 5.9
43	Costa Rica	5.3	5	4.7 - 5.9
43	Macau	5.3	3	3.3 - 6.9
45	Malta	5.2	4	4.0 - 6.2
46	Bahrain	5.1	5	4.2 - 5.8
46	Cape Verde	5.1	3	3.3 - 7.0
46	Hungary	5.1	8	4.6 - 5.7
49	Bhutan	5.0	4	4.3 - 5.6
49	Jordan	5.0	7	3.9 - 6.1
49	Poland	5.0	8	4.5 - 5.5
52	Czech Republic	4.9	8	4.3 - 5.6
52	Lithuania	4.9	8	4.4 - 5.4
54	Seychelles	4.8	3	3.0 - 6.7
55	South Africa	4.7	8	4.3 - 4.9
56	Latvia	4.5	6	4.1 - 4.9
56	Malaysia	4.5	9	4.0 - 5.1
56	Namibia	4.5	6	3.9 - 5.1
56	Samoa	4.5	3	3.3 - 5.3
56	Slovakia	4.5	8	4.1 - 4.9
61	Cuba	4.4	3	3.5 - 5.1
61	Turkey	4.4	7	3.9 - 4.9
63	Italy	4.3	6	3.8 - 4.9
63	Saudi Arabia	4.3	5	3.1 - 5.3
65	Tunisia	4.2	6	3.0 - 5.5

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Country/Territory</b>	<b>CPI 2009 Score</b>	<b>Surveys Used</b>	<b>Confidence Range</b>
66	Croatia	4.1	8	3.7 - 4.5
66	Georgia	4.1	7	3.4 - 4.7
66	Kuwait	4.1	5	3.2 - 5.1
69	Ghana	3.9	7	3.2 - 4.6
69	Montenegro	3.9	5	3.5 - 4.4
71	Bulgaria	3.8	8	3.2 - 4.5
71	FYR Macedonia	3.8	6	3.4 - 4.2
71	Greece	3.8	6	3.2 - 4.3
71	Romania	3.8	8	3.2 - 4.3
75	Brazil	3.7	7	3.3 - 4.3
75	Colombia	3.7	7	3.1 - 4.3
75	Peru	3.7	7	3.4 - 4.1
75	Suriname	3.7	3	3.0 - 4.7
79	Burkina Faso	3.6	7	2.8 - 4.4
79	China	3.6	9	3.0 - 4.2
79	Swaziland	3.6	3	3.0 - 4.7
79	Trinidad and Tobago	3.6	4	3.0 - 4.3
83	Serbia	3.5	6	3.3 - 3.9
84	El Salvador	3.4	5	3.0 - 3.8
84	Guatemala	3.4	5	3.0 - 3.9
84	India	3.4	10	3.2 - 3.6
84	Panama	3.4	5	3.1 - 3.7
84	Thailand	3.4	9	3.0 - 3.8
89	Lesotho	3.3	6	2.8 - 3.8
89	Malawi	3.3	7	2.7 - 3.9
89	Mexico	3.3	7	3.2 - 3.5
89	Moldova	3.3	6	2.7 - 4.0
89	Morocco	3.3	6	2.8 - 3.9
89	Rwanda	3.3	4	2.9 - 3.7
95	Albania	3.2	6	3.0 - 3.3
95	Vanuatu	3.2	3	2.3 - 4.7
97	Liberia	3.1	3	1.9 - 3.8
97	Sri Lanka	3.1	7	2.8 - 3.4
99	Bosnia and Herzegovina	3.0	7	2.6 - 3.4
99	Dominican Republic	3.0	5	2.9 - 3.2
99	Jamaica	3.0	5	2.8 - 3.3
99	Madagascar	3.0	7	2.8 - 3.2
99	Senegal	3.0	7	2.5 - 3.6
99	Tonga	3.0	3	2.6 - 3.3
99	Zambia	3.0	7	2.8 - 3.2
106	Argentina	2.9	7	2.6 - 3.1

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Country/Territory</b>	<b>CPI 2009 Score</b>	<b>Surveys Used</b>	<b>Confidence Range</b>
106	Benin	2.9	6	2.3 - 3.4
106	Gabon	2.9	3	2.6 - 3.1
106	Gambia	2.9	5	1.6 - 4.0
106	Niger	2.9	5	2.7 - 3.0
111	Algeria	2.8	6	2.5 - 3.1
111	Djibouti	2.8	4	2.3 - 3.2
111	Egypt	2.8	6	2.6 - 3.1
111	Indonesia	2.8	9	2.4 - 3.2
111	Kiribati	2.8	3	2.3 - 3.3
111	Mali	2.8	6	2.4 - 3.2
111	Sao Tome and Principe	2.8	3	2.4 - 3.3
111	Solomon Islands	2.8	3	2.3 - 3.3
111	Togo	2.8	5	1.9 - 3.9
120	Armenia	2.7	7	2.6 - 2.8
120	Bolivia	2.7	6	2.4 - 3.1
120	Ethiopia	2.7	7	2.4 - 2.9
120	Kazakhstan	2.7	7	2.1 - 3.3
120	Mongolia	2.7	7	2.4 - 3.0
120	Vietnam	2.7	9	2.4 - 3.1
126	Eritrea	2.6	4	1.6 - 3.8
126	Guyana	2.6	4	2.5 - 2.7
126	Syria	2.6	5	2.2 - 2.9
126	Tanzania	2.6	7	2.4 - 2.9
130	Honduras	2.5	6	2.2 - 2.8
130	Lebanon	2.5	3	1.9 - 3.1
130	Libya	2.5	6	2.2 - 2.8
130	Maldives	2.5	4	1.8 - 3.2
130	Mauritania	2.5	7	2.0 - 3.3
130	Mozambique	2.5	7	2.3 - 2.8
130	Nicaragua	2.5	6	2.3 - 2.7
130	Nigeria	2.5	7	2.2 - 2.7
130	Uganda	2.5	7	2.1 - 2.8
139	Bangladesh	2.4	7	2.0 - 2.8
139	Belarus	2.4	4	2.0 - 2.8
139	Pakistan	2.4	7	2.1 - 2.7
139	Philippines	2.4	9	2.1 - 2.7
143	Azerbaijan	2.3	7	2.0 - 2.6
143	Comoros	2.3	3	1.6 - 3.3
143	Nepal	2.3	6	2.0 - 2.6
146	Cameroon	2.2	7	1.9 - 2.6
146	Ecuador	2.2	5	2.0 - 2.5

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Country/Territory</b>	<b>CPI 2009 Score</b>	<b>Surveys Used</b>	<b>Confidence Range</b>
146	Kenya	2.2	7	1.9 - 2.5
146	Russia	2.2	8	1.9 - 2.4
146	Sierra Leone	2.2	5	1.9 - 2.4
146	Timor-Leste	2.2	5	1.8 - 2.6
146	Ukraine	2.2	8	2.0 - 2.6
146	Zimbabwe	2.2	7	1.7 - 2.8
154	Côte d'Ivoire	2.1	7	1.8 - 2.4
154	Papua New Guinea	2.1	5	1.7 - 2.5
154	Paraguay	2.1	5	1.7 - 2.5
154	Yemen	2.1	4	1.6 - 2.5
158	Cambodia	2.0	8	1.8 - 2.2
158	Central African Republic	2.0	4	1.9 - 2.2
158	Laos	2.0	4	1.6 - 2.6
158	Tajikistan	2.0	8	1.6 - 2.5
162	Angola	1.9	5	1.8 - 1.9
162	Congo Brazzaville	1.9	5	1.6 - 2.1
162	Democratic Republic of Congo	1.9	5	1.7 - 2.1
162	Guinea-Bissau	1.9	3	1.8 - 2.0
162	Kyrgyzstan	1.9	7	1.8 - 2.1
162	Venezuela	1.9	7	1.8 - 2.0
168	Burundi	1.8	6	1.6 - 2.0
168	Equatorial Guinea	1.8	3	1.6 - 1.9
168	Guinea	1.8	5	1.7 - 1.8
168	Haiti	1.8	3	1.4 - 2.3
168	Iran	1.8	3	1.7 - 1.9
168	Turkmenistan	1.8	4	1.7 - 1.9
174	Uzbekistan	1.7	6	1.5 - 1.8
175	Chad	1.6	6	1.5 - 1.7
176	Iraq	1.5	3	1.2 - 1.8
176	Sudan	1.5	5	1.4 - 1.7
178	Myanmar	1.4	3	0.9 - 1.8
179	Afghanistan	1.3	4	1.0 - 1.5
180	Somalia	1.1	3	0.9 - 1.4

APPENDIX B: OSCE COUNTRIES' MEMBERSHIP IN ANTI-CORRUPTION CONVENTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

OSCE PARTICIPATING STATES	STATUS OF UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION AGAINST TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME		STATUS OF UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION AGAINST CORRUPTION		MEMBERS OF THE COE'S GROUP OF STATES AGAINST CORRUPTION (GRECO)	CONVENTION ON COMBATING BRIBERY OF FOREIGN PUBLIC OFFICIALS IN INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS	FINANCIAL ACTION TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS (1990, 1996, 2003)
	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION, APPROVAL (AA), ACCESSION (a), SUCCESSION (D)	SIGNATURE	RATIFICATION, APPROVAL (AA), ACCESSION (a), SUCCESSION (D)			
ALBANIA	12-Dec-00	21-Aug-02	18-Dec-03	25-May-06	27-Apr-01	not ratified	not ratified
ANDORRA	11-Nov-01				28-Jan-05	not ratified	not ratified
ARMENIA	15-Nov-01	1-Jul-03	19-May-05	8-Mar-07	28-Jan-05	not ratified	not ratified
AUSTRIA	12-Dec-00	23-Sep-04	10-Dec-03	11-Jan-06	1-Dec-06	ratified	ratified
AZERBAIJAN	12-Dec-00	30-Oct-03	27-Feb-04	1-Nov-05	1-Jun-04	not ratified	not ratified
BELARUS	14-Dec-00	25-Jun-03	28-Apr-04	17-Feb-05		not ratified	not ratified
BELGIUM	12-Dec-00	11-Aug-04	10-Dec-03	25-Sep-08	1-May-99	ratified	ratified
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	12-Dec-00	24-Apr-02	16-Sep-05	26-Oct-06	25-Feb-00	not ratified	not ratified
BULGARIA	13-Dec-00	5-Dec-01	10-Dec-03	20-Sep-06	1-May-99	ratified	not ratified
CANADA	14-Dec-00	13-May-02	21-May-04	2-Oct-07		ratified	ratified
CROATIA	12-Dec-00	24-Jan-03	10-Dec-03	24-Apr-05	2-Dec-00	not ratified	not ratified
CYPRUS	12-Dec-00	22-Apr-03	9-Dec-03	23-Feb-09	1-May-99	not ratified	not ratified
CZECH REPUBLIC	12-Dec-00		22-Apr-05		9-Feb-02	ratified	not ratified
DENMARK	12-Dec-00	30-Sep-03	10-Dec-03	26-Dec-06	3-Aug-00	ratified	ratified
ESTONIA	14-Dec-00	10-Feb-03			1-May-99	ratified	not ratified
FINLAND	12-Dec-00	10-Feb-04	9-Dec-03	A 6/20/2006	1-May-99	ratified	ratified
FRANCE	12-Dec-00	29-Oct-02	9-Dec-03	11-Jul-05	1-May-99	ratified	ratified
GEORGIA	13-Dec-00	5-Sep-06		a 4 Nov 08	16-Sep-99	not ratified	not ratified
GERMANY	12-Dec-00	14-Jun-06	9-Dec-03		1-May-99	ratified	ratified

GREECE	13-Dec-00		10-Dec-03	17-Sep-08	1-May-99	ratified	ratified
HOLY SEE						not ratified	not ratified
HUNGARY	14-Dec-00	22-Dec-06	10-Dec-03	19-Apr-05	9-Jul-99	ratified	not ratified
ICELAND	13-Dec-00				1-May-99	ratified	ratified
IRELAND	13-Dec-00		9-Dec-03		1-May-99	ratified	ratified
ITALY	12-Dec-00	2-Aug-06	9-Dec-03	5-Oct-09	30-Jun-07	ratified	ratified
KAZAKHSTAN	13-Dec-00	31-Jul-08		a 18 Jun 08		not ratified	not ratified
KYRGYZSTAN	13-Dec-00	2-Oct-03	10-Dec-03	16-Sep-05		not ratified	not ratified
LATVIA	13-Dec-00	7-Dec-01	19-May-05	4-Jan-06	27-Jul-00	not ratified	not ratified
LIECHTENSTEIN	12-Dec-00	20-Feb-08	10-Dec-03		1-Jan-10	not ratified	not ratified
LITHUANIA	13-Dec-00	9-May-02	10-Dec-03	21-Dec-06	1-May-99	not ratified	not ratified
LUXEMBOURG	13-Dec-00	12-May-08	10-Dec-03	6-Nov-07	1-May-99	ratified	ratified
MALTA	14-Dec-00	24-Sep-03	12-May-05	11-Apr-08	11-May-01	not ratified	not ratified
MOLDOVA	14-Dec-00	16-Sep-05	28-Sep-04	1-Oct-07	28-Jun-01	not ratified	not ratified
MONACO	13-Dec-00	5-Jun-01			1-Jul-07	not ratified	not ratified
MONTENEGRO		d 10/23/2006		d 23 Oct 06	6-Jun-06	not ratified	not ratified
NETHERLANDS	12-Dec-00	26-May-04	10-Dec-03	A 31 Oct 06	18-Dec-01	ratified	ratified
NORWAY	13-Dec-00	23-Sep-03	9-Dec-03	29-Jun-06	6-Jan-01	ratified	ratified
POLAND	12-Dec-00	12-Nov-01	10-Dec-03	15-Sep-06	20-May-99	ratified	not ratified
PORTUGAL	12-Dec-00	10-May-04	11-Dec-03	28-Sep-07	1-Jan-02	ratified	ratified
ROMANIA	14-Dec-00	4-Dec-02	9-Dec-03	2-Nov-04	1-May-99	not ratified	not ratified
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	12-Dec-00	26-May-04	9-Dec-03	9-May-06	1-Feb-07	not ratified	ratified
SAN MARINO	14-Dec-00					not ratified	not ratified
SERBIA	12-Dec-00	6-Sep-01	11-Dec-03	20-Dec-05	1-Apr-03	not ratified	not ratified
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	14-Dec-00	3-Dec-03	9-Dec-03	1-Jun-06	1-May-99	ratified	not ratified
SLOVENIA	12-Dec-00	21-May-04		a 1 Apr 08	1-May-99	ratified	not ratified
SPAIN	13-Dec-00	1-Mar-02	16-Sep-05	19-Jun-06	1-May-99	ratified	ratified
SWEDEN	12-Dec-00	30-Apr-04	9-Dec-03	25-Sep-07	1-May-99	ratified	ratified
SWITZERLAND	12-Dec-00	27-Oct-06	10-Dec-03	24-Sep-09	1-Jul-06	ratified	ratified
TAJKISTAN	12-Dec-00	8-Jul-02		a 25 Sep 06		not ratified	not ratified
THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA	12-Dec-00	12-Jan-05	18-Aug-05	13-Apr-07	7-Oct-00	not ratified	not ratified
TURKEY	13-Dec-00	25-Mar-03	10-Dec-03	9-Nov-06	1-Jan-04	ratified	ratified
TURKMENISTAN		a 3/28/2005		a 28 Mar 05		not ratified	not ratified

UKRAINE	12-Dec-00	21-May-04	11-Dec-03	2-Dec-09	1-Jan-06	not ratified	not ratified
UNITED KINGDOM	14-Dec-00	9-Feb-06	9-Dec-03	9-Feb-06	18-Sep-99	ratified	ratified
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	13-Dec-00	3-Nov-05	9-Dec-03	30-Oct-06	20-Sep-00	ratified	ratified
UZBEKISTAN	13-Dec-00	9-Dec-03		a 29 Jul 08		not ratified	not ratified
<b>OSCE MEDITERRANEAN PARTNERS</b>							
ALGERIA	12-Dec-00	7-Oct-02	9-Dec-03	25-Aug-04		not ratified	not ratified
EGYPT	13-Dec-00	5-Mar-04	9-Dec-03	25-Feb-05		not ratified	not ratified
ISRAEL	13-Dec-00	27-Dec-06	29-Nov-05	4-Feb-09		ratified	not ratified
JORDAN	26-Nov-02	22-May-09	9-Dec-03	24-Feb-05		not ratified	not ratified
MOROCCO	13-Dec-00	19-Sep-02	9-Dec-03	9-May-07		not ratified	not ratified
TUNISIA	13-Dec-00	19-Jun-03	30-Mar-04	23-Sep-08		not ratified	not ratified
<b>OSCE ASIAN PARTNERS</b>							
JAPAN	12-Dec-00		9-Dec-03			ratified	ratified
REPUBLIC OF KOREA	13-Dec-00		10-Dec-03	27-Mar-08		ratified	ratified
THAILAND	13-Dec-00		9-Dec-03			not ratified	not ratified
AFGHANISTAN	14-Dec-00	24-Sep-03	20-Feb-04	25-Aug-08		not ratified	not ratified
MONGOLIA		a 6/27/2008	29-Apr-05	11-Jan-06		not ratified	not ratified