

# GLOBAL ANTI-CORRUPTION PLEDGE TRACKER

## METHODOLOGY NOTE

---

**After an initial discussion with leading academics, we are keen to develop and refine the methodology for this pledge tracking tool and are opening the methodology to consultation until November 30 2017. Submissions – either critiques of the current methodology and/or suggestions for improvements – should be [sent to Jameela Raymond](#).**

### PROGRESS SINCE THE SUMMIT

Transparency International UK worked with 28 TI chapters or partner organisations and 5 international organisations to track progress on the Anti-Corruption Summit commitments since they were announced.

Chapters were asked to:

1. **Select the commitments to monitor:**
  - Go through the relevant country commitments and eliminate which were too vague to track.
2. **Contact and work with government:**
  - Identify government department responsible for delivering each commitment
  - Inform the responsible department that their progress will be monitored
  - Identify expected timeline for delivering each commitment
3. **Track the commitments:**
  - Look for and provide public evidence<sup>[1]</sup> for each commitment where progress had been made
  - Make a note of which commitments were 'inactive', 'overdue', 'ongoing', 'underway' or 'complete'

International Organisations were asked to provide an internal analysis of progress on each commitment, providing public evidence for each and making a note of which commitments were 'inactive', 'overdue', 'ongoing', 'underway' or 'complete'

Bearing this methodology in mind, it is important to acknowledge the limitations of this project.

Whilst the sample used is large (over x% of the total commitments counted in September), it is still only a sample and the sample should not be seen as indicative of progress in areas or across themes that are not addressed. We were unable to monitor progress in all countries.

The definitions of the categories 'inactive', 'overdue', 'ongoing', 'underway' or 'complete' are outlined below.

- **Complete**  
This commitment has been completed, based on publicly available evidence
- **Underway**  
Activity has started on delivering this commitment, based on publicly available evidence

---

<sup>[1]</sup> Publicly available evidence could be a link to a government website, an online letter, a media article or blog – anything that is publicly available and supports the chapter's assessment that progress has started.

- **Ongoing**  
Commitment has no clear end point and activity has started, based on publicly available evidence
- **Overdue**  
Not completed by the deadline
- **Inactive**  
No activity has taken place on this commitment OR there is no accessible public evidence of activity having taken place on this commitment

## STRENGTH OF SUMMIT COMMITMENTS

- In September 2016 TI released an assessment of the strength of Summit commitments. Each commitment was assessed as to how 'concrete', 'new' and 'ambitious' it is.
- **Concrete commitments** are those with measurable language such as "we commit to join", or "we commit to establish". 'Somewhat concrete' commitments include language that signal intent to make progress without there being an easily measurable outcome. This includes phrases such as "we commit to explore" or "we support". Commitments identified as 'other' are those indicating existing actions that can be monitored, such as 'we will continue' or 'we are in the final stage of'.
- **"New"** commitments were defined as those generated by the Anti-Corruption Summit. "Somewhat new" commitments are those that are facilitated by or reinvigorated by the Summit but had been previously discussed. "Not new" commitments were already in place prior to the Summit. "Other" commitments refers to pledges that were already on the table but it is unclear when the commitment was made official.
- National civil society organisations took national context into consideration when assessing the level of **ambition**. For this reason similar commitments in different countries receive different assessments.
- Where we were unable to receive a response from civil society on a certain national issue in the available time, the commitment is marked as 'no information available'.

## ORGANISATIONS CREDITED FOR MONITORING THEIR RELEVANT GOVERNMENTS<sup>1</sup>

Afghanistan	Integrity Watch Afghanistan
Argentina	Poder Ciudadano
Australia	Transparency International Australia
Brazil	Transparency International Brazil
Bulgaria	Transparency International Bulgaria
China	Transparency International China
Colombia	Transparencia Colombia
European Commission	Transparency International EU
France	Transparency International France
Georgia	Transparency International Georgia
Germany	Transparency International Germany
Ghana	Ghana Integrity Initiative
Indonesia	Transparency International Indonesia
Japan	Transparency International Japan
Jordan	Rasheed
Kenya	Transparency International Kenya
Mexico	Transparencia Mexicana
Nigeria	Civil Society Legislative Advocacy Centre
South Korea	Transparency International Korea
Romania	Transparency International Romania
Russia	Transparency International Russia
South Africa	Corruption Watch
Spain	Transparency International España
Sri Lanka	Transparency International Sri Lanka
Switzerland	Transparency International Switzerland
Trinidad	Trinidad and Tobago Transparency Initiative
UK	Transparency International UK
Ukraine	Transparency International Ukraine
USA	Global Witness (USA), ONE (USA), Global Financial Integrity (USA)

<sup>1</sup> The Norwegian Government was not responsive to Transparency International Norway's attempt to monitor its Anti-Corruption Summit commitments. Norway is therefore not included in the database.