

## E-ALERT | Anti-Corruption

December 2013

**TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL RELEASES 2013 CORRUPTION PERCEPTIONS INDEX**  
**China and India Continue To Be Perceived as Locations of Significant Corruption Risk**

On December 3, 2013, Transparency International (“TI”) released its 18th annual *Corruption Perceptions Index* (“CPI”), which ranks countries by their perceived levels of public-sector corruption.<sup>1</sup> The latest CPI figures show that China continues to be perceived as a jurisdiction of significant corruption risk, with a score of 40 out of 100 (where 0 represents most corrupt and 100 represents least corrupt).

While China ranks in the top half of the 176 countries surveyed, 79 countries are perceived as less corrupt. According to the CPI, China is perceived to be of comparable corruption risk as Bulgaria, Senegal, Tunisia, Greece, and Swaziland. India is perceived to be slightly more corrupt, with a score of 36. As shown by the table below, other jurisdictions in Asia Pacific range from New Zealand (91), Singapore (86), Australia (81), and Japan (74) to the Philippines (36), Bangladesh (27), Vietnam (31), Indonesia (32), and Thailand (35). Although some countries in the region have marginally higher or lower CPI scores than in the previous year, the 2013 report does not reflect substantial changes in the Asia Pacific Area on the whole. An interactive global map can be found [here](#).

**CPI Methodology**

The CPI scores and ranks countries based on how corrupt their public sectors are perceived to be. It is a composite index, constructed from a combination of 13 surveys and assessments of corruption that 12 independent institutions have collected over the past year. In addition to TI itself, these institutions include the World Bank, the World Economic Forum, the World Justice Project, the Economist Intelligence Unit, the African Development Bank, the International Institute for Management Development, the Bertelsmann Foundation, Political and Economic Risk Consultancy, Political Risk Services International, Global Insight, and Freedom House. The China data is based on 9 and the India data is based on 10 of these sources. 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.

Notably, the CPI is based only on perceptions of corruption. Because corruption is almost always illegal and thus hidden, it is difficult to measure the absolute level of corruption in a given jurisdiction. Attempts to do so would be more likely to show how effective prosecutors, the courts, or the media are in investigating or exposing corruption.

---

<sup>1</sup> Most of the data and much of the language that appears in the following sections can be found on the “[Results](#)” and “[In Detail](#)” web pages of Transparency International’s [2012 Corruption Perceptions Index](#) website.

Thus, capturing perceptions of corruption of those in a position to offer assessments appears to be the most reliable method of comparing relative corruption levels across countries.

In 2012, TI updated its CPI methodology to “better capture changes in perceptions of corruption over time” in individual countries. The new methodology uses only the raw scores given to each country, and then converts these raw scores to fit the CPI scale. As a consequence of this update, it is possible to compare CPI scores from one year to the next, starting with the scores in 2012.

## Graphical Data

### Comparison of CPI Scores by Country/Region (selected jurisdictions)

Year	China	Hong Kong	Macau	Taiwan	United States	United Kingdom	India	Brazil	Russia
2006	3.3	8.3	6.6	5.9	7.3	8.6	3.3	3.3	2.5
2007	3.5	8.3	5.7	5.7	7.2	8.4	3.5	3.5	2.3
2008	3.6	8.1	5.4	5.7	7.3	7.7	3.4	3.5	2.1
2009	3.6	8.2	5.3	5.6	7.5	7.7	3.4	3.7	2.2
2010	3.5	8.4	5.0	5.8	7.1	7.6	3.3	3.7	2.1
2011	3.6	8.4	5.1	6.1	7.1	7.8	3.1	3.8	2.4
2012	39	77	n/a <sup>2</sup>	61	73	74	36	43	28
2013	40	75	n/a	61	73	76	36	42	28

### Asia Area 2013 CPI Scores

New Zealand	91
Singapore	86
Australia	81
Hong Kong	75
Japan	74
Taiwan	61
South Korea	55
Malaysia	50
Mainland China	40
Mongolia	38
Sri Lanka	37
India	36
Philippines	36
Thailand	35

Indonesia	32
Vietnam	31
Nepal	31
Pakistan	28
Bangladesh	27
Kazakhstan	26
Laos	26
Kyrgyzstan	24
Myanmar	21
Tajikistan	22
Cambodia	20
Uzbekistan	17
Turkmenistan	17
<b>Average</b>	<b>41.4</b>

<sup>2</sup> TI did not report CPI data for Macau in 2012 or 2013.

### China's Corruption Perceptions Index Scores in Recent Years

Year	China's CPI Score	China's CPI Ranking	Total Countries Ranked	Countries with CPI Score Comparable to China (+/- 0.1 on old scale, +/- 1 on new scale)	Top-Ranking (Least Corrupt)	Bottom-Ranking (Most Corrupt)
2006	3.3	70	163	Croatia, Brazil, Egypt, Ghana, India, Mexico, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Senegal	Finland (9.6)	Haiti (1.8)
2007	3.5	72	179	Senegal, Brazil, India, Mexico, Morocco, Peru, Suriname, Georgia, Grenada, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Trinidad & Tobago	Denmark, Finland, New Zealand (9.4)	Somalia (1.4)
2008	3.6	72	180	Bulgaria, Macedonia, Mexico, Peru, Suriname, Swaziland, Trinidad & Tobago, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Thailand	Denmark, New Zealand, Sweden (9.3)	Somalia (1.0)
2009	3.6	79	180	Brazil, Colombia, Peru, Trinidad & Tobago, Serbia	New Zealand (9.4)	Somalia (1.1)
2010	3.5	78	178	Bulgaria, El Salvador, Panama, Trinidad & Tobago, Colombia, Greece, Lesotho, Peru, Serbia, Thailand	Denmark, New Zealand, Singapore (9.3)	Somalia (1.1)
2011	3.6	75	182	Romania, Gambia, Lesotho, Vanuatu	New Zealand (9.5)	Somalia (1.0)
2012	3.9	80	176	Sri Lanka, Serbia, Trinidad and Tobago, Burkina Faso, El Salvador, Jamaica, Panama, Peru	Denmark, Finland, New Zealand (9.0)	Somalia (8)
2013	4.0	80	177	Bulgaria, Senegal, Tunisia, Greece, Swaziland	Denmark, New Zealand (9.1)	Afghanistan, North Korea, Somalia (8)

Data sources for all tables and graphs: Transparency International; comparison tables and graphs compiled by Covington & Burling LLP

\* \* \*

If you have any questions concerning the material discussed in this client alert, please contact the following China-based members of our [Global Anti-Corruption practice group](#):

Eric Carlson	86.10.5910.0503	<a href="mailto:ecarlson@cov.com">ecarlson@cov.com</a>
Shaoyu Chen	86.21.6036.2509	<a href="mailto:schen@cov.com">schen@cov.com</a>
Tim Stratford	86.10.5910.0508	<a href="mailto:tstratford@cov.com">tstratford@cov.com</a>
Hui Xu	86.21.6036.2508	<a href="mailto:hxu@cov.com">hxu@cov.com</a>
Chaohui Liang	86.10.5910.0313	<a href="mailto:cliang@cov.com">cliang@cov.com</a>

This information is not intended as legal advice. Readers should seek specific legal advice before acting with regard to the subjects mentioned herein. Only qualified PRC nationals working in PRC law firms are permitted to practice PRC law. Accordingly, as is true for all non-PRC law firms, we cannot express any legal opinion concerning the interpretation or application of PRC law. If a formal PRC legal opinion is required in relation to any specific issues discussed in this memorandum, our practice is to arrange for such an opinion to be provided by one of our correspondent law firms in the PRC and to work closely with the PRC law firm in that exercise.

© 2013 Covington & Burling LLP. All rights reserved.