SDG Monitoring Methodology

The questionnaire is designed to help TI national chapters to assess progress towards three SDG targets linked to anti-corruption and government transparency – 16.4, 16.5 and 16.10. A number of policy areas are covered under each of these three SDG targets. They provide a holistic overview of a country's anti-corruption progress in a way that goes beyond the narrow understanding of corruption captured by the official global indicators.

Each policy area is assessed against three elements. First, a total of 66 questions (13 of which are optional) relate to the *de jure* legal and institutional framework. These questions require the researcher to provide a score, which can be used to develop a legal scorecard for each country. Second, 18 questions (8 of which are optional) concern country data from assessments and indices produced by civil society groups and international organisations. Finally, there are 61 questions (including 20 optional ones) which ask the researcher to provide a qualitative appraisal of the country's *de facto* efforts to tackle corruption.

Legislative framework

The purpose of the scored questions is to assess the legislative framework and the policies that have been formally established. These indicators allow for an easy comparison between countries' performance on a specific question or a set of selected questions in a given year. Most of the indicators can also be used to keep track of a country's progress on introducing and improving key policies and legal provisions over time.

Each question receives a standalone score. Based on the scores awarded by national researchers, a traffic light system is used to assess the legislative framework through the use of an easily understandable scorecard:

- **Dark red:** absent/non-compliant; indicates that the legislative framework on a specific issue is insufficient and not in line with international standards or with recommendations made by TI and other anti-corruption stakeholders.
- **Light red**: While there are some provisions in place to address a specific issue, they are insufficient and urgently need to be strengthened.
- **Yellow:** while the legislative framework partly addresses a specific issue, there is a need for further improvement.
- **Light green:** while there is a solid provision in place, there is some room for improvement.
- **Dark green:** compliant/strong; the country's legislative framework appears to be addressing a specific policy and is in line with acknowledged best practice.
- **White:** not applicable or no data available. Where possible, the use of this option should be avoided and an explanation should be provided as to why the question has not been scored.

A list of all the questions and an overview of the scores is provided in this spreadsheet.

Aggregating scores

The method of aggregating scores has been simplified as far as possible. Each scored question is worth a maximum of 1 point.

- A dark green response is worth 1 point.
- A light green response is worth 0.75 points.
- A yellow response is worth 0.5 points.
- A light red response is worth 0.25 points.
- A dark red response is worth 0 points.

- Where the "white" option (not applicable/ no data available) is selected, no score is awarded and the question removed from the aggregation.

All scored responses for each target (16.4, 16.5 and 16.10) are simply aggregated to determine the overall grade for each target.

For example, for 16.10 there are 9 scored questions. If a country was awarded 2 dark green (2 points), 1 light green (0.75 points), 3 yellow (1.5 points), 1 light red (0.25 points) and 2 dark red (0 points) scores, the total for 16.10 would be 4.5 points.
For each target the awarded score is divided by the total possible score to determine a percentage. In the example provided, therefore, 4.5/9 = 50%.

Finally, each of the three SDG targets is awarded a coloured grade as follows:
- 0%-20% = dark red
- 21%-40% = light red
- 41%-60% = yellow
- 61%-80% = light green
- 81%-100% = dark green

Our example would therefore be graded "yellow" for 50%.

Were some of the responses for the questions marked "white", these questions would be removed from the calculation. For instance, if for 16.10 a country was awarded the following scores 2 dark green (2 points), 2 light green (1.5 points), 1 yellow (0.5 point), 1 light red (0.25 points), 1 dark red (0 points) and 2 white (-), the country would score 4.25 out of a maximum possible score of 7. This would give an aggregated score of 61% for target 16.10, which would therefore be graded light green.

Indices

A number of established indices and ratings produced by civil society organisations and international organisations assess a country's performance in specific policy areas relevant to this shadow monitoring exercise. These indices also provide scores and indicators that allow for an easy comparison between countries. Many of the indices can also be used to monitor a country's performance over time.

The questionnaire makes use of data and insights collected by TI's Corruption Perceptions Index, TI's Global Corruption Barometer or assessments carried out by other civil society organisations, including:

- the Basel Institute on Governance's Basel Anti-Money Laundering Index;
- the Tax Justice Network's Financial Secrecy Index;
- estimates of illicit financial outflows by Global Financial Integrity;
- the Open Company Data Index produced by Open Corporates;
- Global Integrity's Money Politics and Transparency assessment;
- the International Budget Partnership's Open Budget Survey;
- the Freedom in the World report by Freedom House;
- Reporters Without Borders' World Press Freedom Index;
- the Right to Information Rating, produced by Access Info Europe and the Centre for Law and Democracy;
- the Open Data Barometer, produced by the World Wide Web Foundation; and
- the Global Open Data Index, created by Open Knowledge International.

The scores and results of these surveys and indices generally provide a comprehensive assessment on a specific issue, supplementing the legislative scorecard.

Implementation

Guided questions at the end of each policy area allow the researcher to provide an assessment of the practice and compliance with important legislative provisions. Researchers are also encouraged to include publicly available data that may provide valuable insights, for example statistics on enforcement. Furthermore, these sections also allow researchers to highlight relevant cases, reforms and changes that have occurred in the past two years.

Limitations

Firstly, it is important to note that the scoring methodology does not aim to provide a comprehensive assessment of a country's anti-corruption framework. Rather, scores seek to reflect if and to what extent certain best practice policies have been transposed into the national legislative framework. As such, the scorecard aims to highlight areas of the legislative framework that need to be reformed in order to create a robust anti-corruption system.

While a strong legislative framework is needed to effectively address corruption risks, it is in no way sufficient without independent institutions that have adequate capacity and resources to implement it and to ensure compliance. The scorecard cannot account for such implementation gaps.

Although it is being considered for future reporting rounds, a scored assessment of implementation and compliance with *de jure* anti-corruption provisions is currently beyond the scope of the 2017 shadow reporting exercise. Instead, the reports will seek to address the implementation of policies in practice in their narrative sections, including by highlighting exemplary cases and scandals, and, where available, by providing relevant statistics on compliance and enforcement.

Secondly, the methodology's ability to assess a country's performance in establishing a strong framework in a specific policy area is limited by to the broad scope of the questionnaire. Scores are not weighted, so that a policy area with a higher number of scored questions will naturally influence the overall target grade to a greater degree than a policy area with fewer scored questions.