

Categorization of anti-corruption interventions

Query:

I am looking to categorize agency work that relates to anti-corruption, not only interventions identified as anti-corruption but also interventions with anti-corruption components. Does such a classification exist and if not can you help me put in place a framework for organizing interventions?

Purpose:

We are scoping a proposed evaluation of anti-corruption work in our agency and need to make sense of the work that has been done.

Content:

Part 1: A suggested framework for anti-corruption interventions

Part 2: Suggested readings

Definition of Query:

The query seeks a classification of types of anti-corruption interventions. We have not been able to locate an already existing classification in the time available, so we have endeavoured to draw up an outline of types of anti-corruption interventions.

Please also see:

The U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre project database which includes a categorization of types of projects by keywords:

<http://partner.u4.no/projects/keywords.cfm>

The UNDP Governance Centre has their own classification on governance issues, and this might be useful to look at: see

<http://www.undp.org/oslocentre/> (e.g. human right, e-government)

Part 1: A framework for organizing anti-corruption interventions

One way of classifying anti-corruption interventions might be to separate interventions into three classes:

- Anti-corruption interventions aimed at *Punishment*
 - Anti-corruption interventions aimed at *Prevention*
 - Anti-corruption interventions aimed at inculcating *Values*
1. Anti-corruption interventions aimed at *Punishment*:
The aim of such interventions is to sanction a corrupt practice.
 2. Anti-corruption interventions aimed at *Prevention*:
These types of interventions are directed towards raising awareness of corruption and putting in place anti-corruption

Authored by:
Dr. Victoria Jennett
U4 Helpdesk
Transparency International
vjennett@transparency.org

Date:
25 September, 2006

mechanisms that prevent corruption from occurring.

3. Anti-corruption interventions aimed at inculcating *Values*:
This category applies to interventions that attempt to influence ethical behaviour.

In order to decide which kinds of projects/interventions to include in each of these classes it is worth considering “what is an anti-corruption project”? The U4 Anti-Corruption Resource Centre has considered this issue and here we provide some comments on our conclusions.

The question of “what is an anti-corruption project” confronts anyone trying to classify aid projects. At this point there is no unanimous view among Utstein agencies as to what can or should be labelled an anti-corruption project. In general the following points should be taken into account:

Apply a broad definition

The fight against corruption must be seen as an integral part of the effort to improve the governance structures of recipient countries. We know that in general only a small number of projects have the explicit aim of combating corruption. Most projects regarded by donors as anti-corruption projects consist of different types of public administration support. However, projects of this type often have an efficiency perspective, and their successful implementation will have reduced the room for corrupt behaviour. A broad definition of what constitutes an anti-corruption project must therefore be used.

Explicit and implicit anti-corruption focus

Include in your classification two types of projects: those with a focus which is:

Explicit: e.g. support to an Anti-Corruption Commission, and

Implicit: projects that have the reduction of corruption as a stated secondary or tertiary goal; e.g. support to an election observer mission *so long as the mission has a stated mandate to monitor and report corruption.*

Different donors – different practices

The fact that there is no consensus among donors on what an anti-corruption project is means that it is most often impossible to know the amount of resources that have been allocated to this sector. Comparisons between countries in respect of the projects in this field are therefore difficult and, at worst, meaningless. Although some will define an initiative as anti-corruption interventions only if the concept is included as part of the title, or among the primary objectives of the intervention, the projects in the U4 database are not subjected to such strict definitions. We find a number of projects listed that have been classified as anti-corruption projects despite the fact that they do not fit into such a narrow definition. Instead, donors seem to have embraced the views of the UN 'donors' meeting in 2003, where the following actions were determined to fall within the rubric of anti-corruption:

1. Raising awareness of the problem among the people and civil servants
2. Support for national anti-corruption programmes and anti-corruption agencies,

3. Support to amendments of national legislation on corruption,
4. Support for tax authorities and customs,
5. Support for financial management and audit,
6. Training programmes for civil society and the media,
7. Strengthen the procurement processes at central and local level,
8. Support for election processes,
9. Support for the court system,
10. Support for the public prosecution and police agencies, and
11. Support for the local government sector and decentralisation.

All the categories above are relevant in that they have a direct or indirect effect on corruption in society. There is no clear division between anti corruption interventions and support for strengthening good governance. The difference is mainly that interventions aiming at promoting good governance have other objectives, e.g. to improve efficiency of the public administration or to strengthen democracy in a society.

Include “de facto” anti-corruption projects

Another complicating factor is the nature of corruption and its political character. Corruption is always a sensitive issue in the dialogue between governments. In some countries it is downright impossible for donors to suggest a clear-cut anti-corruption project. The challenge is then to rewrite the project documentation so that it becomes less of a threat to the partner government. In some instances almost identical projects have been “sold” as two quite different things. This complicates the classification of projects. We therefore suggest including not only projects which *look* like a dog, but also those that *act* like a dog.

Part 2: Recommended reading

DAC Network on Governance, “Synthesis of Lessons Learned of Donor Practices in Fighting Corruption” Meeting on 1-2 July 2003
<http://www.u4.no/document/literature.cfm?id=196&key=52>

Heather Marquette, “Bilateral Donors and Anti-Corruption Work: The Myth of ‘Comparative Advantage’” (2001)
<http://www.u4.no/document/showdoc.cfm?id=44>

Jeff Huther and Anwar Shah, “Anti-corruption Policies and Programs: A Framework for Evaluation” (2000)
[http://wbi0018.worldbank.org/Research/workpapers.nsf/0/9fd464d371219b80852569ab0072c17d/\\$FILE/wps2501.pdf](http://wbi0018.worldbank.org/Research/workpapers.nsf/0/9fd464d371219b80852569ab0072c17d/$FILE/wps2501.pdf)

Lara M. Gabriel and Rick Stapenhurst with Mary Thomas (editors), “The Role of Bilateral Donors in Fighting Corruption” (2000)