



Corruption Perceptions Index 2009

Released by
Transparency International
November 17, 2009

Press release
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)
Performance of South Asian Countries
Data Sources for Bangladesh
Methodological Note
List of countries by score, rank & data sources

Media Release

Corruption Perceptions Index 2009 **Bangladesh ranked 139th among 180,** **among a few countries whose score has improved most**

Dhaka/Berlin, 17 November 2009 – The Berlin-based international anti-corruption organization, Transparency International (TI) has today released its annual Corruption Perception Index (CPI) for 2009. The index provides international ranking of countries in terms of perceived degree of prevalence of political and administrative corruption.

The results show that Bangladesh, having scored 2.4 compared to 2.1 in 2008 in a scale of 0-10, is among nine countries that have improved most. However, with the score remaining below the threshold of 3 the country, continues to be in the league of those where corruption continued to be pervasive. Bangladesh has been ranked 139th from below, which is 139th among 180 countries included in the index this year. In 2008 Bangladesh was 10th from below and 147th among 180. In the same position with the same score with Bangladesh this year are Belarus, Pakistan and Philippines. In 2008 Pakistan and Philippines had scored 2.5 and 2.3 respectively, while Belarus 2.0.

It may be recalled that Bangladesh was earlier placed at the very bottom of the list for the fifth successive year from 2001-2005. In 2006 Bangladesh was ranked in no 3, in 2007 in no 7 and in 2008 no 10.

Bangladesh's score of 2.4 this year represents a significant improvement over last year (2.1). As the index represents 2-years rolling data, it reflects a perception of progress as a result of the then government's nationwide crackdown on corruption during 2007-08, which was also accompanied by important institutional and legal reforms to strengthen the capacity to fight corruption. The result also indicates a positive assessment of the fact that many of those reforms were carried forward, or so promised, by the newly elected government elected to power in December 2008 with an unprecedented public mandate achieved, thanks inter alia, to their pledge to fight corruption.

"Whether or not the improvement achieved by Bangladesh will be sustainable and whether further progress will be achieved will depend on the new government's will and capacity to deliver, especially in ensuring integrity, independence, impartiality and effectiveness of key institutions like the Parliament, Anti-corruption Commission, Election Commission, Information Commission, Judiciary, law enforcement agencies, the public service and the Human Rights Commission" said Dr. Iftekharuzzaman, Executive Director of Transparency International Bangladesh (TIB).

"The government's performance in ensuring integrity in public sector management, especially transparency in public procurement will be among key factors influencing Bangladesh's score in coming years. Equally important will be the extent of progress in enforcing the Right to Information Act and in strengthening the local government" he said.

Like previous two years Somalia has remained at the bottom of the list implying that corruption in that country is perceived to be highest, followed by Afghanistan and Myanmar in the 2nd and 3rd position and Sudan and Iraq in joint 4th.

At the other end, New Zealand, Denmark and Singapore have been ranked at the top, scoring 9.4, 9.3 and 9.2 respectively, meaning that in these countries corruption is perceived to be lowest, closely followed by Sweden and Switzerland with 9.2 and 9.0 respectively. Singapore is the only Asian country that has consistently been in the league of top 10. The only other Asian country to be among the top 15 countries is Hong Kong at number 12, performing better than such highly developed countries as Germany, Ireland, UK, Japan and USA.

Countries other than Bangladesh that have this year shown notable improvement are Belarus, Guatemala, Lithuania, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Syria and Tonga. On the other hand, significant declines in score have been seen in the scores of Bahrain, Greece, Iran, Malaysia, Malta and Slovakia.

As the world economy begins to register a tentative recovery from the Global Financial Crisis and some nations continue to wrestle with ongoing conflict and insecurity, it is clear from the CPI 2009 that no country or region of the world is immune to the perils of corruption.

"At a time when massive stimulus packages, fast-track disbursements of public funds and attempts to secure peace are being implemented around the world, it is essential to identify where corruption blocks good governance and accountability, in order to break its corrosive cycle" said Huguette Labelle, Chair of Transparency International (TI).

The vast majority of the 180 countries included in the 2009 index score below five on a scale from 0 (perceived to be highly corrupt) to 10 (perceived to have low levels of corruption). The CPI measures the perceived levels of public sector

corruption in a given country and is a composite index, drawing on 13 different expert and business surveys. The 2009 edition scores 180 countries, the same number as the 2008 CPI.

Fragile, unstable states that are scarred by war and ongoing conflict linger at the bottom of the index. These are: Somalia, with a score of 1.1, Afghanistan at 1.3, Myanmar at 1.4 and Sudan tied with Iraq at 1.5. These results demonstrate that countries which are perceived as the most corrupt are also those plagued by long-standing conflicts, which have torn apart their governance infrastructure.

When essential institutions are weak or non-existent, corruption spirals out of control and the plundering of public resources feeds insecurity and impunity. Corruption also makes normal a seeping loss of trust in the very institutions and nascent governments charged with ensuring survival and stability.

Countries at the bottom of the index cannot be shut out from development efforts and international assistance. Instead, what the index points to is the need to strengthen their institutions. Investors and donors should be equally vigilant of their operations and as accountable for their own actions as they are in demanding transparency and accountability from beneficiary countries.

Highest scorers in the 2009 CPI are New Zealand at 9.4, Denmark at 9.3, Singapore and Sweden tied at 9.2 and Switzerland at 9.0. These scores reflect political stability, long-established conflict of interest regulations and solid, functioning public institutions.

Overall results in the 2009 index are of great concern because corruption continues to lurk where secrecy rules, where institutions still need strengthening and where governments have not implemented anti-corruption legal frameworks.

Even industrialised countries cannot be complacent: the supply of bribery and the facilitation of corruption often involve businesses based in their countries. Financial secrecy jurisdictions, linked to many countries that top the CPI, severely undermine efforts to tackle corruption and recover stolen assets.

Globally and nationally, institutions of oversight and legal frameworks that are actually enforced, coupled with smarter, more effective regulation, will ensure lower levels of corruption. This will lead to a much needed increase of trust in public institutions, sustained economic growth and more effective development assistance. Most importantly, it will alleviate the enormous scale of human suffering in the countries that perform most poorly in the Corruption Perceptions Index.

Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2009

Frequently asked Questions and Answers

General

What is the CPI?

Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) ranks countries/territories in terms of the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among public officials and politicians. It is a composite index, a poll of polls, drawing on corruption-related data from expert and business surveys carried out by a variety of independent and reputable institutions. The CPI reflects views from around the world, including those of experts who live in the countries/territories evaluated.

For the purpose of the CPI, how is corruption defined?

The CPI focuses on corruption in the public sector. The surveys used in compiling the CPI ask questions relating to the abuse of public power for private benefit. These include questions on: 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, thereby covering both the administrative and political aspects of corruption.

Why is the CPI based only on perceptions?

It is difficult to assess the overall levels of corruption in different countries/territories based on hard empirical data, e.g. by comparing the amount of bribes or the number of prosecutions or court cases directly related to corruption. In the latter case, for example, such data does not reflect actual levels of corruption; rather it highlights the extent to which prosecutors, courts and/or the media are effectively investigating and exposing corruption. One reliable method of compiling cross-country data is, therefore, to draw on the experience and perceptions of those who see first hand the realities of corruption in a country.

How is the launch-date of the CPI set?

All decisions about the international launch of the CPI are made at the Transparency International Secretariat in Berlin. The specific launch date is chosen with a view to maximising global visibility and is generally pegged to related international events.

How is the CPI funded?

Transparency International is funded by various governmental agencies, international foundations and corporations, whose financial support makes the CPI possible (for a full list of donors, see http://www.transparency.org/support_us/support). Additional support for the CPI and TI's other global measurement tools comes from Ernst & Young. TI does not endorse a company's policies by accepting its financial support, and does not involve any of its supporters in the management of its projects.

Method

How many countries/territories are included in the CPI?

The 2009 CPI ranks 180 countries/territories, the same number as in 2008.

How are countries/territories chosen for inclusion in the CPI?

A minimum of three reliable sources of corruption-related data is required for a country or territory to be included in the CPI. Inclusion in the index is not an indication of the existence of corruption but rather depends solely on the availability of the minimum data requirements.

Why are countries/territories no longer covered in the 2009 CPI, and why are new countries/territories added?

Countries/territories are only included in the index if at least three sources of data are available. In 2009 a change in the country coverage of individual sources resulted in Brunei Darussalam being included, but Belize had to be dropped from the Index, as there was only one source available.

Which countries/territories might be included in future CPIs?

Transparency International is continuously and actively seeking to increase the number of countries and territories included in the CPI.

Countries or territories with two sets of data (insufficient for inclusion) are: Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Bahamas, Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Grenada, Kosovo, Liechtenstein, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, Antilles, North Korea, St. Kitts & Nevis and Tuvalu. At least one additional set of data is necessary for inclusion in the CPI.

What are the sources of data for the CPI?

The 2009 CPI draws on 13 different polls and surveys from 10 independent institutions. Data sources must be published in the past two years to be eligible for inclusion. All data sources must provide a ranking of countries/territories and measure the overall extent of corruption. This condition excludes surveys which mix corruption with other issues, such as political instability, decentralisation or nationalism. TI strives to ensure that the sources used are of the highest quality and that the survey work is performed with complete integrity. To qualify, the data must be well documented and the methodology explained to permit a judgment on its reliability.

Data from the following sources contributed to the index for Bangladesh: 1. Asian Development Bank's Country Performance Assessment Ratings 2008: Data compiled in 2008; 2. Bertelsmann Transformation Index (2010) by the Bertelsmann Foundation: Data compiled between November 2008 and May 2009 and to be published towards the end of 2009; 3. Economist Intelligence Unit (2009): Data compiled up to September 2009; 4. Global Insights (2008): data compiled in 2009: Data compiled in first half 2009; 5. World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment 2008: data were compiled between fall 2008 & spring 2009; 6. World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report 2008: data compiled first trimester 2008; and 7. World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report 2008: data compiled first trimester 2009.

Some institutions that donate their data to TI free of charge, for use in the CPI, do not allow disclosure of the data they contribute because their evaluations are only available to subscribers. Other institutions make their data publicly available. For a full list of data sources, details on questions asked and number of respondents for the 2009 CPI, please see the CPI methodology at <http://www.transparency.org/cpi>.

Whose opinion is polled for the surveys used in the CPI?

The expertise reflected in the CPI scores draws on an understanding of corrupt practices held by those based in both the industrialised and developing world and includes surveys of business people and country analysts. Sources providing data for the CPI rely on non-resident and resident experts. It is important to note that residents' viewpoints correlate well with those of non-resident experts.

Does the CPI's prominence influence respondents?

The CPI has gained wide prominence in the international media since its first publication in 1995. This has raised concerns that respondents' judgements may be overshadowed by the data reported by TI, which would introduce a problem of circularity. This hypothesis was tested in 2006 using a survey question posed to business leaders around the world. Based on more than 9,000 responses, knowledge of the CPI does not appear to induce business experts to 'go with the herd'. Rather, knowledge of the CPI may motivate respondents to determine their own views, and there is therefore little indication of circularity in the present approach.

How is the 2009 CPI produced?

The 2009 CPI is produced by the Transparency International Secretariat in Berlin. TI gathered the data, liaised with experts on the method, and calculated the Index. In past years, this work was carried out by a consultant and senior adviser to TI.

TI has a rigorous process for cross-checking final results, in collaboration with a number of experts from leading universities and institutes. As in years past, advice on the CPI methodology was provided by TI's Index Advisory Committee (http://transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/about). In addition, in 2009 a group of [experts](#) both advised TI during the calculation phase and reviewed the production of the Index: [Andrew Gelman \(Columbia University\)](#), [Rajshri Jayaraman \(European School of Management and Technology\)](#), [Meghan O'Malley Berry \(Columbia University\)](#), [Piero Stanig \(London School of Economics\)](#) and [Andreas Stephan \(JIBS, Jönköping University; CESIS, KTH Stockholm\)](#). Catherine Muller and Marc Vothknecht (DIW Berlin - German Institute for Economic Research) provided additional advice and independently checked the calculation of the 2009 CPI. For further information on the CPI's method, please consult the 2009 CPI methodology (www.transparency.org/cpi).

Change in scores between 2008 and 2009

Can country/territory scores in the 2009 CPI be compared to those in past CPIs?

The index provides a snapshot of the views of business people and country analysts for the current or recent years. Given its methodology, the CPI is not a tool that is suitable for monitoring progress or lack of progress over time. The only reliable way to compare a country's score over time is to go back to individual survey sources, each of which can reflect a change in assessment.

Year-to-year changes in a country/territory's score could result from a changed perception of a country's performance, a change in the ranking provided by original sources or a change in the CPI's methodology. Wherever possible, TI has identified those changes in scores that can be identified in the sources themselves.

Which countries/territories' scores deteriorated most between 2008 and 2009?

As indicated above, the CPI method is not well-suited to making comparisons of scores from year to year. To the extent that changes can be traced back to individual sources, however, trends can be identified.

Noteworthy examples of deteriorations from scores in the 2008 CPI to 2009 CPI on which more than half of the sources agreed include: Bahrain, Greece, Iran, Malaysia, Malta and Slovakia. In these cases, we can conclude that changes in perceptions of analysts and businesspeople regarding levels of corruption occurred during the last two years.

Which countries/territories' scores improved most?

With the same caveats applied, and based on data from sources that have been consistently used for the Index, we can point to improvements from 2008 to 2009 for: Bangladesh, Belarus, Guatemala, Lithuania, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Syria and Tonga.

Interpreting the CPI

Which matters more, a country/territory's rank or its score?

A country/territory's score indicates the perceived level of corruption in a country and the country's rank indicates its position relative to the other countries/territories included in the index. The score is a much more important indication of the perceived level of corruption in a country. A country's rank can change simply because new countries enter the index or others drop out.

Is the country/territory with the lowest score the world's most corrupt nation?

No. The country/territory with the lowest score is the one where corruption is perceived to be highest *among those included in the list*. There are more than 200 sovereign nations in the world, and the 2009 CPI ranks 180 of them. The CPI provides no information about countries/territories that are not included. Moreover, the CPI is an assessment of perception of administrative and political corruption – it is not a verdict on the corruption of nations or societies as a whole. The general public of those countries/territories who score at the lower end in the CPI have shown the same concern about and condemnation of corruption as publics from stronger performers. For more information, see TI's Global Corruption Barometer.

Example: What is implied by Somalia's bottom ranking and New Zealand's top ranking in the 2009 CPI?

Public sector corruption in Somalia is perceived to be the highest of all countries/territories included in the 2009 CPI. This does not, however, indicate that Somalia is the 'world's most corrupt country' or that Somalians are the 'most corrupt people'. While corruption is indeed one of the most formidable challenges to good governance, development and poverty reduction in Somalia, the vast majority of people are victims of corruption. Corruption by powerful individuals, and the failure of leaders and institutions to control or prevent corruption, does not imply that a country or its people are corrupt.

In the same light, New Zealand – whose perceived public-sector corruption is the lowest of the 180 countries surveyed – is not necessarily the 'world's least corrupt country' – and New Zealanders are not in turn immune to corruption. Though its institutional and governance framework have translated into what is perceived to be a success, with limited corruption, New Zealand – like any other state – remains susceptible to corruption.

Why is the impact (or lack thereof) of anti-corruption reform or recent corruption scandals not always evident in a country/territory's CPI score?

It is difficult to improve a CPI score over a short time period. The 2009 CPI is based on data from the past two years, relating to perceptions that may have been formed even further in the past. This means that substantial changes in perceptions of corruption are only likely to emerge in the index over longer periods of time.

Is the CPI a reliable measure of a country/territory's perceived level of public-sector corruption?

The CPI is a solid measurement tool of perceptions of public sector corruption. As such, the CPI has been tested and used widely by both scholars and analysts. The reliability of the CPI differs, however, across countries/territories. States with a high number of sources and small differences in the evaluations provided by the sources (indicated by a narrow confidence range) convey greater reliability in terms of their score and ranking; the reverse is also the case.

Is the CPI a reliable measure for decisions on aid allocation?

Some governments have sought to use corruption scores to determine which countries/territories receive aid, and which do not. TI does not encourage that the CPI is used in this way. Countries/territories that are perceived as very corrupt can not be written off. Rather they need help to emerge from the corruption-poverty spiral. If a country is believed to be corrupt, this should serve as a signal to donors that investment is needed in systemic approaches to fight corruption, based on mutual accountability. Additionally, if donors intend to support major development projects in countries/territories perceived to be corrupt, they should pay particular attention to 'red flags' and make sure appropriate control processes are established.

How does the CPI relate to other TI research products?

TI is an independent producer of empirical research on corruption. It has assembled a global research portfolio that combines qualitative approaches with quantitative ones, macro-level indicators with in-depth diagnostics, expert analysis with experience, as well as perceptions-based survey work. This body of research provides a comprehensive picture of the scale, spread and dynamics of corruption around the world. It also serves to mobilise and support evidence-based, effectively-tailored policy reform. TI's portfolio of global research products includes:

- **Global Corruption Barometer (GCB):** a representative survey of more than 70,000 households in more than 65 countries on people's perceptions and experiences of corruption. The most recent Global Corruption Barometer was published on 3 June 2009 and can be found under: http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/gcb.
- **Bribe Payers Index (BPI):** a ranking of leading, exporting countries according to the likelihood of their firms to bribe abroad. It is based on a survey of executives focusing on the business practices of foreign firms in their country. The most recent Bribe Payers Index was published on 9 December 2008 and can be found under: http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/bpi.
- **Global Corruption Report (GCR):** a thematic report that explores corruption with regard to a specific sector or governance issue. The report provides views of dozens of experts and practitioners in the field, in addition to case studies and reports from TI national chapters around the world. The GCR also features latest corruption-related research findings relevant to the theme. The most recent Global Corruption Report was published on 23 September 2009 and can be found under: <http://www.transparency.org/publications/gcr>
- **National Integrity System assessments (NIS):** a series of studies produced in-country that involves an extensive diagnostic assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the key institutions that enable good governance and integrity in a country. NIS assessments are published on an ongoing basis. For a full list and more information, please see: http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/nis

The **Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI)** is an important pillar in this portfolio, providing expert perceptions on corruption in an annual composite index covering 180 countries.

Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2009

CPI 2009: Score & Rank of Bangladesh compared to other South Asian Countries

#	Country	Score		Rank	
		2008	2009	2008	2009
1	Afghanistan	1.5	1.3 ▼	4	2 ▼ (179)
2	Bangladesh	2.1	2.4 ▲	10	13 ▲ (139)
3	Bhutan	5.2	5.0 ▼	36	36 ► (49)
4	India	3.4	3.4 ►	22	23 ▲ (84)
5	Maldives	2.8	2.5 ▼	17	14 ▼ (130)
6	Nepal	2.7	2.3 ▼	16	12 ▼ (143)
7	Pakistan	2.5	2.4 ▼	14	13 ▼ (139)
8	Sri Lanka	3.2	3.1 ▼	21	20 ▼ (97)

Figures in parentheses indicate rank as per list out of 180 countries

Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) 2009

Short methodological note

1. The 2009 Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) gathers data from sources that cover the past two years. For the 2009 CPI, this includes surveys from 2008 and 2009.
2. The 2009 CPI is calculated using data from 13 sources from 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.
3. For CPI sources that are surveys, and where multiple years of the same survey are available, data for the past two years is included to provide a smoothing effect.
4. 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.
5. 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 2009 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 2009 CPI reflect the evaluations by resident business leaders of their own country, IMD, Political and Economic Risk Consultancy, and the World Economic Forum.
6. To determine the mean value for a country, standardisation is carried out via a matching percentiles technique. This uses the ranks of countries reported by each individual source. This method is useful for combining sources that have a different distribution. 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.
7. A beta-transformation is then performed on scores. This increases the standard deviation among all countries included in the CPI and avoids the process by which the matching percentiles technique results in a smaller standard deviation from year to year.
8. All of the standardised values for a country are then averaged, to determine a country's score.
9. The CPI score and rank are accompanied by the number of sources, high-low range, standard deviation and confidence range for each country.
10. The confidence range is determined by 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 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 detailed explanation of the CPI method please visit www.transparency.org/cpi

Further details on CPI can be obtained from www.transparency.org



TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL

ADB: Country Performance Assessment Ratings by the Asian Development Bank
 AfDB: Country Policy and Institutional Assessment by the African Development Bank
 BF: Bertelsmann Transformation Index by the Bertelsmann Foundation
 EIU: Country Risk Service and Country Forecast by the Economist Intelligence Unit
 FH: Nations in Transit by Freedom House
 GI: Global Risk Service by IHS Global Insight
 IMD: World Competitiveness Report by the Institute for Management Development
 PERC: Asian Intelligence by Political and Economic Risk Consultancy
 CPIA: Country Policy and Institutional Assessment by the World Bank
 WEF: Global Competitiveness Report by the World Economic Forum

This Excel-sheet presents the Corruption Perceptions Index 2009 and additional background data. For information on data and methodology please consult the press release and the methodology documentation at www.transparency.org/cpi

Country Rank	Country / Territory	CPI 2009 Score	Surveys Used	Standard Deviation	Minimun Maximum Range		90 % Confidence Interval		ADB 2008	AfDB 2008	BF 2009	EIU 2009	FH 2009	GI 2009	IMD 2008	IMD 2009	PERC2008	PERC2009	WB 2008	WEF 2008	WEF 2009
					Min	Max	Lower bound	Higher bound													
1	New Zealand	9.4	6	0.3	8.8	9.7	9.1	9.5				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
2	Denmark	9.3	6	0.3	8.8	9.6	9.1	9.5				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
3	Singapore	9.2	9	0.3	8.6	9.5	9.0	9.4			#	#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	
3	Sweden	9.2	6	0.2	8.8	9.5	9.0	9.3				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
5	Switzerland	9.0	6	0.1	8.8	9.2	8.9	9.1				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
6	Finland	8.9	6	0.8	7.5	9.5	8.4	9.4				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
6	Netherlands	8.9	6	0.2	8.5	9.2	8.7	9.0				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
8	Australia	8.7	8	0.6	7.5	9.2	8.3	9.0				#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	
8	Canada	8.7	6	0.3	8.3	9.2	8.5	9.0				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
8	Iceland	8.7	4	1.3	6.7	9.6	7.5	9.4				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
11	Norway	8.6	6	0.7	7.4	9.2	8.2	9.1				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
12	Hong Kong	8.2	8	0.5	7.5	8.9	7.9	8.5				#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	
12	Luxembourg	8.2	6	0.9	6.7	9.1	7.6	8.8				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
14	Germany	8.0	6	0.5	7.5	8.8	7.7	8.3				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
14	Ireland	8.0	6	0.5	7.5	8.8	7.8	8.4				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
16	Austria	7.9	6	0.7	6.7	8.6	7.4	8.3				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
17	Japan	7.7	8	0.5	7.1	8.8	7.4	8.0				#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	
17	United Kingdom	7.7	6	0.7	6.7	8.8	7.3	8.2				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
19	United States	7.5	8	0.9	5.7	8.8	6.9	8.0				#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	
20	Barbados	7.4	4	1.1	6.4	8.8	6.6	8.2				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
21	Belgium	7.1	6	0.4	6.7	7.5	6.9	7.3				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
22	Qatar	7.0	6	1.8	4.5	9.1	5.8	8.1			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
22	Saint Lucia	7.0	3	0.4	6.7	7.5	6.7	7.5				#	#	#	#	#		#	#	#	
24	France	6.9	6	0.6	6.0	7.6	6.5	7.3				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
25	Chile	6.7	7	0.4	6.0	7.1	6.5	6.9			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
25	Uruguay	6.7	5	0.5	6.2	7.5	6.4	7.1				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
27	Cyprus	6.6	4	0.7	6.0	7.4	6.1	7.1				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
27	Estonia	6.6	8	0.7	5.1	7.1	6.1	6.9			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
27	Slovenia	6.6	8	0.6	5.5	7.5	6.3	6.9			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
30	United Arab Emirates	6.5	5	1.4	4.9	7.5	5.5	7.5				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
31	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	6.4	3	1.3	4.9	7.5	4.9	7.5				#	#	#	#	#		#	#	#	
32	Israel	6.1	6	1.0	4.7	7.2	5.4	6.7				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
32	Spain	6.1	6	0.8	4.7	6.7	5.5	6.6				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
34	Dominica	5.9	3	0.9	4.9	6.7	4.9	6.7				#	#	#	#	#		#	#	#	
35	Portugal	5.8	6	0.5	5.3	6.7	5.5	6.2				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
35	Puerto Rico	5.8	4	0.8	4.9	6.7	5.2	6.3				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
37	Botswana	5.6	6	0.7	4.7	6.7	5.1	6.1		#	#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
37	Taiwan	5.6	9	0.5	5.1	6.7	5.4	5.9			#	#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	
39	Brunei Darussalam	5.5	4	1.0	4.7	6.7	4.7	6.4				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
39	Oman	5.5	5	1.6	3.1	7.1	4.4	6.5				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
39	Korea (South)	5.5	9	0.4	4.8	6.0	5.3	5.7				#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	
42	Mauritius	5.4	6	0.7	4.7	6.7	5.0	5.9		#	#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
43	Costa Rica	5.3	5	0.9	4.6	6.7	4.7	5.9			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
43	Macau	5.3	3	1.8	3.3	6.9	3.3	6.9				#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	
45	Malta	5.2	4	1.4	3.3	6.7	4.0	6.2				#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
46	Bahrain	5.1	5	1.2	3.1	6.0	4.2	5.8			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
46	Cape Verde	5.1	3	1.8	3.3	7.0	3.3	7.0		#		#	#	#	#	#		#	#	#	
46	Hungary	5.1	8	0.9	3.8	6.7	4.6	5.7			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
49	Bhutan	5.0	4	0.9	3.9	6.0	4.3	5.6	#		#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	#	
49	Jordan	5.0	7	1.8	3.1	7.5	3.9	6.1			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
49	Poland	5.0	8	0.9	3.1	6.0	4.5	5.5			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
52	Czech Republic	4.9	8	1.2	3.7	7.5	4.3	5.6			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
52	Lithuania	4.9	8	0.9	3.7	6.7	4.4	5.4			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
54	Seychelles	4.8	3	1.9	3.0	6.7	3.0	6.7		#		#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
55	South Africa	4.7	8	0.5	3.8	5.1	4.3	4.9		#	#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
56	Latvia	4.5	6	0.6	3.6	5.1	4.1	4.9			#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	
56	Malaysia	4.5	9	1.0	3.1	6.2	4.0	5.1			#	#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	
56	Namibia	4.5	6	0.9	3.1	5.6	3.9	5.1		#	#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#	

Country Rank	Country / Territory	CPI 2009 Score	Surveys Used	Standard Deviation	Minimun Maximum Range		90 % Confidence Interval		ADB 2008	AfDB 2008	BF 2009	EIU 2009	FH 2009	GI 2009	IMD 2008	IMD 2009	PERC2008	PERC2009	WB 2008	WEF 2008	WEF 2009
					Min	Max	Lower bound	Higher bound													
56	Samoa	4.5	3	1.1	3.3	5.3	3.3	5.3	#					#					#		
56	Slovakia	4.5	8	0.8	3.4	5.2	4.1	4.9			#	#	#	#	#	#				#	#
61	Cuba	4.4	3	0.9	3.5	5.1	3.5	5.1			#	#									
61	Turkey	4.4	7	0.8	3.1	5.4	3.9	4.9			#	#		#	#	#				#	#
63	Italy	4.3	6	0.9	3.3	5.2	3.8	4.9				#	#	#	#	#				#	#
63	Saudi Arabia	4.3	5	1.5	2.3	5.9	3.1	5.3			#	#		#						#	#
65	Tunisia	4.2	6	1.9	2.3	6.6	3.0	5.5		#	#	#		#						#	#
66	Croatia	4.1	8	0.8	3.3	5.2	3.7	4.5			#	#	#	#	#	#				#	#
66	Georgia	4.1	7	1.0	2.7	5.2	3.4	4.7	#		#	#	#	#					#	#	#
66	Kuwait	4.1	5	1.3	2.7	6.0	3.2	5.1			#	#		#						#	#
69	Ghana	3.9	7	1.1	2.5	5.1	3.2	4.6		#	#	#		#					#	#	#
69	Montenegro	3.9	5	0.6	3.2	4.7	3.5	4.4			#		#	#						#	#
71	Bulgaria	3.8	8	1.1	2.5	5.2	3.2	4.5			#	#	#	#	#	#				#	#
71	FYR Macedonia	3.8	6	0.6	3.1	4.6	3.4	4.2			#	#	#							#	#
71	Greece	3.8	6	0.8	2.9	5.1	3.2	4.3				#		#	#	#				#	#
71	Romania	3.8	8	1.0	2.4	4.9	3.2	4.3			#	#	#	#	#	#				#	#
75	Brazil	3.7	7	0.8	3.1	5.6	3.3	4.3			#	#		#	#	#				#	#
75	Colombia	3.7	7	1.0	2.6	5.2	3.1	4.3			#	#		#	#	#				#	#
75	Peru	3.7	7	0.7	3.1	4.8	3.4	4.1			#	#		#	#	#				#	#
75	Suriname	3.7	3	0.9	3.0	4.7	3.0	4.7						#						#	#
79	Burkina Faso	3.6	7	1.3	1.9	5.1	2.8	4.4		#	#	#		#					#	#	#
79	China	3.6	9	1.1	2.3	5.5	3.0	4.2			#	#		#	#	#	#			#	#
79	Swaziland	3.6	3	1.0	3.0	4.7	3.0	4.7		#		#		#							
79	Trinidad and Tobago	3.6	4	0.8	2.9	4.7	3.0	4.3				#		#						#	#
83	Serbia	3.5	6	0.5	3.1	4.5	3.3	3.9			#	#	#	#						#	#
84	El Salvador	3.4	5	0.5	2.6	3.9	3.0	3.8			#	#		#						#	#
84	Guatemala	3.4	5	0.7	2.6	4.5	3.0	3.9			#	#		#						#	#
84	India	3.4	10	0.4	2.6	3.9	3.2	3.6			#	#		#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
84	Panama	3.4	5	0.4	3.1	3.9	3.1	3.7			#	#		#						#	#
84	Thailand	3.4	9	0.8	2.1	4.4	3.0	3.8			#	#		#	#	#	#			#	#
89	Lesotho	3.3	6	0.8	2.4	4.7	2.8	3.8		#	#			#						#	#
89	Malawi	3.3	7	1.0	1.9	4.8	2.7	3.9		#	#	#		#						#	#
89	Mexico	3.3	7	0.3	3.1	3.8	3.2	3.5			#	#		#	#	#				#	#
89	Moldova	3.3	6	1.0	2.2	5.2	2.7	4.0			#	#	#							#	#
89	Morocco	3.3	6	0.8	2.3	4.7	2.8	3.9		#	#	#		#						#	#
89	Rwanda	3.3	4	0.5	2.6	3.8	2.9	3.7		#	#			#					#		
95	Albania	3.2	6	0.3	2.8	3.6	3.0	3.3			#	#	#							#	#
95	Vanuatu	3.2	3	1.3	2.3	4.7	2.3	4.7	#					#						#	#
97	Liberia	3.1	3	1.0	1.9	3.8	1.9	3.8		#	#			#							
97	Sri Lanka	3.1	7	0.5	2.3	3.8	2.8	3.4	#		#	#		#						#	#
99	Bosnia and Herzegovina	3.0	7	0.6	2.2	3.9	2.6	3.4			#	#	#	#						#	#
99	Dominican Republic	3.0	5	0.2	2.7	3.3	2.9	3.2			#	#		#						#	#
99	Jamaica	3.0	5	0.4	2.6	3.4	2.8	3.3			#	#		#						#	#
99	Madagascar	3.0	7	0.4	2.5	3.5	2.8	3.2		#	#	#		#						#	#
99	Senegal	3.0	7	1.0	1.8	5.1	2.5	3.6		#	#	#		#						#	#
99	Tonga	3.0	3	0.3	2.6	3.3	2.6	3.3	#					#						#	
99	Zambia	3.0	7	0.3	2.6	3.5	2.8	3.2		#	#	#		#						#	#
106	Argentina	2.9	7	0.4	2.5	3.5	2.6	3.1			#	#		#	#	#				#	#
106	Benin	2.9	6	0.8	1.8	3.8	2.3	3.4		#	#			#						#	#
106	Gabon	2.9	3	0.2	2.6	3.1	2.6	3.1		#	#	#		#							
106	Gambia	2.9	5	1.7	1.5	4.9	1.6	4.0		#				#						#	#
106	Niger	2.9	5	0.2	2.6	3.1	2.7	3.0		#	#	#		#						#	
111	Algeria	2.8	6	0.4	2.3	3.4	2.5	3.1			#	#	#	#						#	#
111	Djibouti	2.8	4	0.6	2.0	3.3	2.3	3.2			#	#		#						#	
111	Egypt	2.8	6	0.4	2.4	3.5	2.6	3.1			#	#	#	#						#	#
111	Indonesia	2.8	9	0.7	1.6	3.7	2.4	3.2			#	#	#	#	#	#	#			#	#
111	Kiribati	2.8	3	0.5	2.3	3.3	2.3	3.3	#					#						#	
111	Mali	2.8	6	0.6	2.0	3.3	2.4	3.2		#	#									#	#
111	Sao Tome and Principe	2.8	3	0.5	2.4	3.3	2.4	3.3		#				#						#	
111	Solomon Islands	2.8	3	0.5	2.3	3.3	2.3	3.3	#					#						#	
111	Togo	2.8	5	1.4	1.6	5.1	1.9	3.9		#	#	#		#						#	
120	Armenia	2.7	7	0.2	2.3	2.9	2.6	2.8	#		#		#	#						#	#
120	Bolivia	2.7	6	0.5	2.1	3.3	2.4	3.1			#	#		#						#	#
120	Ethiopia	2.7	7	0.4	2.0	3.1	2.4	2.9		#	#	#		#						#	#
120	Kazakhstan	2.7	7	1.0	1.7	4.6	2.1	3.3			#	#	#	#	#					#	#
120	Mongolia	2.7	7	0.5	2.0	3.3	2.4	3.0	#		#	#		#						#	#
120	Vietnam	2.7	9	0.7	1.8	3.9	2.4	3.1	#		#	#		#		#	#			#	#
126	Eritrea	2.6	4	1.5	1.6	4.7	1.6	3.8		#	#			#						#	
126	Guyana	2.6	4	0.1	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.7						#						#	#
126	Syria	2.6	5	0.5	1.7	3.1	2.2	2.9			#	#		#						#	#
126	Tanzania	2.6	7	0.4	1.9	3.1	2.4	2.9		#	#	#		#						#	

Country Rank	Country / Territory	CPI 2009 Score	Surveys Used	Standard Deviation	Minimum Maximum Range		90 % Confidence Interval		ADB 2008	AfDB 2008	BF 2009	EIU 2009	FH 2009	GI 2009	IMD 2008	IMD 2009	PERC2008	PERC2009	WB 2008	WEF 2008	WEF 2009
					Min	Max	Lower bound	Higher bound													
130	Honduras	2.5	6	0.4	1.8	3.0	2.2	2.8			#	#	#	#					#	#	#
130	Lebanon	2.5	3	0.6	1.9	3.1	1.9	3.1			#	#	#	#							
130	Libya	2.5	6	0.5	1.8	3.3	2.2	2.8		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
130	Maldives	2.5	4	0.8	1.7	3.3	1.8	3.2	#		#	#	#	#					#	#	#
130	Mauritania	2.5	7	1.2	1.8	5.1	2.0	3.3		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
130	Mozambique	2.5	7	0.4	1.8	3.1	2.3	2.8		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
130	Nicaragua	2.5	6	0.4	1.8	2.8	2.3	2.7		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
130	Nigeria	2.5	7	0.4	1.9	3.1	2.2	2.7		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
130	Uganda	2.5	7	0.6	1.8	3.5	2.1	2.8		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
139	Bangladesh	2.4	7	0.6	1.4	3.1	2.0	2.8	#		#	#	#	#					#	#	#
139	Belarus	2.4	4	0.5	1.8	3.1	2.0	2.8		#	#	#	#	#							
139	Pakistan	2.4	7	0.5	1.7	3.1	2.1	2.7	#		#	#	#	#					#	#	#
139	Philippines	2.4	9	0.5	1.8	3.4	2.1	2.7			#	#	#	#	#	#	#		#	#	#
143	Azerbaijan	2.3	7	0.5	1.7	2.9	2.0	2.6			#	#	#	#					#	#	#
143	Comoros	2.3	3	0.9	1.6	3.3	1.6	3.3		#				#					#	#	#
143	Nepal	2.3	6	0.5	1.7	2.9	2.0	2.6	#		#			#					#	#	#
146	Cameroon	2.2	7	0.6	1.6	3.1	1.9	2.6		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
146	Ecuador	2.2	5	0.4	1.8	2.7	2.0	2.5			#	#	#	#					#	#	#
146	Kenya	2.2	7	0.4	1.8	2.9	1.9	2.5		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
146	Russia	2.2	8	0.4	1.6	2.6	1.9	2.4		#	#	#	#	#	#				#	#	#
146	Sierra Leone	2.2	5	0.4	1.8	2.7	1.9	2.4		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
146	Timor-Leste	2.2	5	0.6	1.3	2.7	1.8	2.6	#		#			#					#	#	#
146	Ukraine	2.2	8	0.5	1.7	3.1	2.0	2.6		#	#	#	#	#	#				#	#	#
146	Zimbabwe	2.2	7	0.9	1.3	3.3	1.7	2.8		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
154	Côte d'Ivoire	2.1	7	0.5	1.6	3.1	1.8	2.4		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
154	Papua New Guinea	2.1	5	0.5	1.4	2.7	1.7	2.5	#		#	#	#	#					#	#	#
154	Paraguay	2.1	5	0.5	1.7	2.7	1.7	2.5			#	#	#	#					#	#	#
154	Yemen	2.1	4	0.6	1.4	2.7	1.6	2.5			#	#	#	#					#	#	#
158	Cambodia	2.0	8	0.3	1.5	2.5	1.8	2.2	#		#	#	#	#				#	#	#	#
158	Central African Republic	2.0	4	0.2	1.9	2.4	1.9	2.2		#	#			#					#	#	#
158	Laos	2.0	4	0.7	1.5	2.9	1.6	2.6	#		#			#					#	#	#
158	Tajikistan	2.0	8	0.7	1.4	3.3	1.6	2.5	#		#	#	#	#					#	#	#
162	Angola	1.9	5	0.1	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.9		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
162	Congo-Brazzaville	1.9	5	0.3	1.4	2.4	1.6	2.1		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
162	Congo Democratic Republic	1.9	5	0.3	1.6	2.4	1.7	2.1		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
162	Guinea-Bissau	1.9	3	0.1	1.8	2.0	1.8	2.0		#				#					#	#	#
162	Kyrgyzstan	1.9	7	0.2	1.6	2.3	1.8	2.1	#		#		#	#					#	#	#
162	Venezuela	1.9	7	0.2	1.5	2.1	1.8	2.0		#	#	#	#	#	#				#	#	#
168	Burundi	1.8	6	0.3	1.4	2.3	1.6	2.0		#	#			#					#	#	#
168	Equatorial Guinea	1.8	3	0.1	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.9		#		#		#							
168	Guinea	1.8	5	0.1	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.8		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
168	Haiti	1.8	3	0.5	1.4	2.3	1.4	2.3			#			#					#	#	#
168	Iran	1.8	3	0.1	1.7	1.9	1.7	1.9			#	#	#	#							
168	Turkmenistan	1.8	4	0.1	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.9			#	#	#	#							
174	Uzbekistan	1.7	6	0.2	1.3	1.9	1.5	1.8	#		#	#	#	#					#	#	#
175	Chad	1.6	6	0.2	1.4	1.9	1.5	1.7		#	#			#					#	#	#
176	Iraq	1.5	3	0.3	1.2	1.8	1.2	1.8			#	#	#	#							
176	Sudan	1.5	5	0.2	1.2	1.8	1.4	1.7		#	#	#	#	#					#	#	#
178	Myanmar	1.4	3	0.5	0.9	1.8	0.9	1.8			#	#	#	#							
179	Afghanistan	1.3	4	0.3	0.9	1.6	1.0	1.5	#		#			#					#	#	#
180	Somalia	1.1	3	0.3	0.9	1.4	0.9	1.4		#	#			#							