About Corruption and Transparency in the Water and Sanitation Sector

Thematic Overview Paper 16
By: Kathleen Shordt, Laurent Stravato, Cor Dietvorst
Reviewed by: Donal O'Leary, Transparency International

December 2006
IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre

Please note that the TOPs are a web-based series. However, we feel that those who don't have access to the Internet should be able to benefit from the TOPs as well. This is why we have also made them available as paper versions.

This TOP is published as a PDF on IRC's website. A summary is made available as web text and will give you an idea of what the TOP is about before downloading the whole document.

Edited by: Bill McCann

Table of contents

Summary

Corruption undermines water and sanitation services. It is those without voice, the poor, who are systematically deprived by corrupt systems. Using resources honestly and effectively, rather than using more resources is arguably an answer to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for sustained water and sanitation services that reach the poor. However, there has been relatively little work to enhance honesty and transparency and reduce corruption specifically in the WASH sector. While there have been effective initiatives, these seem to remain isolated examples of good practice. A long-term perspective with sector-specific work on parallel fronts seems most realistic.

This paper is a brief overview of issues, approaches and information resources. The second half of the paper provides entry to the rapidly growing literature on corruption, transparency and honesty in the WASH sector. It is hoped that you, the reader, will find this a useful resource which will lead to further reading, learning about experience and research and, finally, to action promoting transparency, honesty and preventing corruption in the sector.

…decisions on solving the water crisis are prevented by bribery; it is now an emergency situation: decisions must be made to meet the needs of future generations, not the short-term profit of corrupt public officials or businesses.

Peter Eigen, Chairman of Transparency International,
on the launch of the Corruption Perceptions Index 2002

1. Introduction: The theme

Transparency and honesty are everyone's business. Every country seems to be subject to corruption. None, for example, received a score of 10 out of 10 (100% excellence) on the well-known Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index.

Transparency and honesty have been on the agenda of civil society institutions for a long time. In the 1960s and 1970s there were the people's movements and participatory programmes established around leaders such as Paolo Freire. Subsequently there were applications to sectors such as community development and health by Robert Chambers (1992) in his participatory approaches, to gender/water by Lyra Srinivasan (1990) and to health by David Werner (1978), among others. The strategies were sculpted to include transparency, open decision-making, participation by the poor, voice and choice, fair pricing, responsiveness and accountability. However, these participatory approaches were not mainstreamed at that time.

The last ten years have seen a resurgence of interest and a willingness to address transparency and corruption, from international agencies, many governments, citizen groups, media and non-governmental agencies. However a fundamental challenge remains: It is easy for governments, international agencies and institutions to say that they want improved and honest governance; it is much less easy to change their structures and their relationships with vested interests and with poorer groups to allow this to happen (IIED, 2004).

This paper focuses on honesty, corruption and transparency which, as used here, are taken to mean:
- *Corruption* is commonly defined as the abuse of entrusted power for private gain;
- *Honesty*: trying to work and act in a way that reflects known best practices; and
- *Transparency* refers to sharing information and acting in an open manner.

In this paper other important terms – accountability, voice/choice, participation, representation and regulation — are seen as tools for ensuring transparency, honesty and reducing corruption. Taken altogether these are key elements of good governance. (Definitions appear in Appendix 1).

The focus here is primarily on the water and, to a lesser extent, the sanitation sector. In the water sector, corruption and dishonesty take many forms. For example, corruption occurs when contractors give kick-backs to the engineering staff who assess the tender documents. At the international end, corruption can take the form of supporting programmes that are known not to represent best practice or local needs.

The following table shows a range of dishonest/corrupt practices in water and sanitation provision, adapted from the fine paper on public service delivery by Jennifer Davis (2004).

The table highlights the point that corruption is a function of transactions among people — what one actor transacts with another. In the table, some key actors in the water and sanitation sector are shown on the vertical and horizontal axes.

Table 1. Corruption in water and sanitation service provision

	Customers	Professional engineering staff. Agency managers.	Elected (and unelected) leaders	Contractors	ESAs, donors, central governments
Low technical staff	Bribes to falsify meter reading, conceal illegal connections. Failure to do assigned work. Over-charging.	Payments for job placement, promotions.		Collusion concealing substandard work.	
Professional engineering staff. Agency managers.	Speed money for faster maintenance, for connections, repairs. Kickbacks for non-payment.	Collusion in tendering Concealing sub-standard work. Payments for promotions, transfers.	Collusion in selection + approval of plans/schemes. Kickbacks. Payments for appointments.	Kickbacks for tenders, collusion substandard construction and under-performance in contracts.	Collusion in approving inferior projects, and in not investigating corruption; pressure to spend money.
Elected (and unelected officials)	Kickbacks for connections or to avoid disconnections, avoid payments.	Payments for transfers, promotions, appointments.	Collusion/kickbacks to senior politicians	Tendering kickbacks and free services.	Funding poorly designed schemes + activities not reflecting best practice.
Contractors		Contract kick-back Conceal sub-standard work.	Tendering kick-backs.	Collusion in contract bids.	Lack of monitoring: fear of "scandal".

This table is described in greater detail, with more examples and actors shown, in appendix 2.

2.   Why this theme matters

… The Bank has identified corruption as the single greatest obstacle to economic and social development.

<div align="right">

World Bank site on anti-corruption
http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/index.cfm

</div>

It has been estimated that corruption diverts perhaps 30% from the billions of dollars spent annually for international development loans (Dudley, 2000). In one of several studies, Daniel Kaufmann, Director of Global Governance at the World Bank Institute estimates that an improvement in the rule of law (or, say, control of corruption) from the current relatively poor to merely average performance could result in a fourfold increase in per capita incomes and a reduction in infant mortality of a similar magnitude (Kaufmann, 2003).

To improve governance and reduce corruption, at least 12 international conventions and guidelines, and at least 7 donor policies have been prepared, largely over the past decade (see the list of these, together with references to procurement and business guidelines in appendix 4). These include the U.N. Convention Against Corruption (2003) signed by 128 nations.

The implementation record for these conventions and policies is somewhat disappointing. Many observers argue that the enforcement of these policies and conventions in each nation is a key global challenge (Swardt, 2005). Some also call on the multi-national and bilateral donors to work harder to implement their own policies in deed as well as word (Osce, 2004; Bailey, 2003).

The water and sanitation sector

In the water sector, observers estimate that 20% to 70% of resources could be saved if transparency were optimized and corruption eliminated. Much of the water sector is focused on construction, with characteristics that expose it to corruption: competition for contracts, numerous levels of official approvals and permits, the uniqueness of the projects, opportunities for delays and overruns, and the need for rapid work (Stansbury, p. 36, Transparency International). In their study of water utility companies in Africa, Estache and Kouassi compared productivity among 21 water companies in Africa and found that nearly two-thirds of their operating costs were due to corruption (Estache, 2002). Seen from this point of view, good governance and transparency could free up most of the resources needed to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. Using resources honestly and effectively, rather than using more resources is arguably an answer to achieving the MDGs for sustained water and sanitation services that reach the poor. With more resources currently becoming available to achieve the MDG water and sanitation targets, it is imperative to prevent abuse and to use the funds wisely.

Much of the work has focused on governance, on the judiciary and on awareness raising and capacity building in general. There has been relatively little emphasis on the specific features of the water and sanitation sector. While there have been effective initiatives these seem to remain isolated examples of good practice, from a few governments such as Lesotho in the infamous Highlands Water Project (LHWP) and from institutions such as the water boards in Bogota and Tamil Nadu and NGOs such as the Transparency International Pakistan group and Bangalore Public Affairs Centre-PAC. It remains to bring many major stakeholders on board. Thus sector-specific programming and advocacy is urgently needed. Coalitions need to be developed or activated for the sector.

Basic questions remain to be addressed in the sector, such as: What is showing particular promise? How to scale up and sustain promising initiatives? How to genuinely engage the intermediate and local levels of government? What are the most efficient ways to improve contracting procedures without having to entirely transform institutions? How can institutional reform be carried out? What is the impact of preventive efforts on corrupt practices? There is surprisingly little empirical evidence to inform such questions.

Because this effort is new, even rather rudimentary knowledge needs to be developed. For example, IRC experienced some failures… albeit some rather amusing… in trying to conduct small international meetings and carry out an e-conference. From this we learned that mid-level professionals in the sector are still quite fearful of these issues, even while they believe in their importance. We had to 'learn' how to conduct a meeting on this sensitive topic by, for example, having participant-generated definitions, being positive, setting comfortable and positive ground rules.

3.   Some lessons learned

The extraordinary pioneering work of Transparency International, founded in 1993, has been instrumental in legitimizing efforts to focus on transparency, corruption and honesty around the world. It has stimulated international institutions – such as UNDP, the OECD, the World Bank — to develop policy and programmes. With this, a greater depth of understanding has emerged. Within the water sector, understanding how honesty can be subverted and corruption enabled has been the subject of a small number of recent research studies and action programmes. The results are reflected in the lessons learned below.

Decentralization and privatization are not immediate solutions

Some significant macro-reforms in governance and development assistance … such as decentralization and privatization…were strongly advocated by international agencies, in part as a way of improving effectiveness and reducing corruption. These reforms have not,

However, provided solutions as rapidly as foreseen and they have raised some new challenges (Barlow, 1999; Bailey 2003).

In their interesting overview, Kolstad and Fjeldstad (2006) show that the relation between decentralization and corruption is complex, depending on other variables such as the degree of social and economic equity, the complexity of the services, the flexibility and simplicity of regulatory systems, local capacity. Similar findings for the water sector are provided by Astana (2004) in his study in India, showing that decentralization can result in the local elite capturing the services. For example, where the government requires a 10% contribution for new water services local leaders can pay and appropriate the services for their own convenience. One key lesson of decentralization is that, if local level capacity, leadership and "readiness" (transparent management, systems, staff competencies) is lacking or ignored, it will invite inefficiency and corruption (Bailey, 2003).

A subject needing further study is the positioning of civil society groups and the conditions under which they can provide a voice and oversight for accountability. Some NGOs report that their efforts to ensure transparency are compromised when the local government employees who hire them are offenders themselves.

Another issue still open to considerable debate is the relationship between private sector involvement and corruption. On the one hand, in some settings, privatization has proceeded well. For example, in Chile, the performance and services of the private sector proved far superior to those of the public organisations they replaced and the improvements came about quickly -- in less than two years. Rapid water service development in Chile has been followed by expansion of water treatment and sewage services (Bitrán et al, 2003).

On the other hand, observers such as Budds (2003) and Braadbaart (2005) identify high rates of failure for public-private partnerships (PPPs) in the 1990s. While some early PPPs led to improvements, they concluded that this "was overshadowed by a wave of contract renegotiations, allegations of collusion and corruption and courtroom battles". Many PPPs were too ambitious and poorly designed, making them "susceptible to macroeconomic shocks and political opportunism". The judges are still out on this issue but the question may be how to maximize the effectiveness (and minimize corruption) of both private and public institutions on a sustained basis, rather than whether the private sector is better or worse than the public.

Participation needs more emphasis

Participation is a big word whose meaning derives from two main pools of experience. First, participation refers to what different stakeholders and their institutions do. Are different departments in the government involved? Are community groups and the poor really involved in planning, implementation and management and decision-making? In this sense, good governance is participatory, in that it should include relevant stakeholders taking part in joint decision-making. (Schneider,1999).

Secondly, participation refers to a specific set of tools that have become fairly well defined in the water/sanitation sector. These include participatory appraisal, community mapping, quantification of qualitative assessment[1] and so on.
The literature gives the impression that current international development work related to transparency and corruption still misses much participatory input in both senses of the word (Bailey, 2003). An area for further development is the consistent application of known and tested participatory approaches to ensure transparency and honesty and reduce corruption.

There is a tendency to subvert participatory approaches and tools by using them like mantras or formulas to collect information for its own sake, rather than to stimulate the use of that information locally to empower communities and groups to improve the water situation. *Participation* does not mean just collecting a lot of data from people and then doing a separate 'expert' analysis.

Keep a pro-poor focus

It is those without voice, the poor, who are systematically deprived in corrupt systems. For example, a study in India found that real coverage in piped water systems serving about 700,000 people increased by between 20% and 45% -- mainly for poor people — when socio-economic mapping and site selection for water points was carried out with the public (particularly women) and local government (Shordt and Stravato, 2005).
Another study in Malawi by Water Aid was undertaken with partner institutions and the government. It found that if the current financial resources were effectively targeted at the

---

[1] World Bank/IRC MPA system

unserved, usually poor areas, the MDG target for water service would be achievable even if the level of investment fell 30% below that seen during the last five years. If the work is not targeted, reaching the MDG target for water will be both expensive and possibly unachievable. (Stoupy, 2003)

Corruption undermines sustainability

Sustainability, in the sense used here, refers to the continuing flow of benefits from improved water supply and sanitation services. Lack of transparency and corruption undermines sustainability. For example, Esther Duflo analyzed how variability in water flows, poor design and construction and poor maintenance were distortions that resulted from corruption in a canal irrigation system in South India (Duflo, 2003).

This survey of the literature could not find studies of a commonly observed phenomenon - of repeated and unnecessary construction in communities. In these situations, communities may have, located very near each other, multiple water schemes which were badly constructed, or not needed or do not operate. Thus, some communities look like museums of poor water supply, with empty tanks, dry wells, broken pumps, cracked cisterns. It is not always the community that has failed to make repairs, but systems that, but systems that should not have been built and were not built to last. Further research on this might provide useful data for advocacy.

Gender and corruption

Two studies show that corruption is less severe where women hold a larger share of parliamentary seats and senior positions in government … and that women are less involved in bribe taking. (Bailey, 2003). There is anecdotal information, for example, about the advisability of having women serve as treasurers in water committees and the need for women to be involved in technology selection to reduce costs. More information is needed, specifically focusing on the effects of gender on transparency or corruption.

4.   Strategy and programming

This section contains suggestions about the elements of strategy that could be effective in addressing the challenges of transparency and corruption within the water and sanitation sector.

Work on parallel fronts over the long-term

One conclusion of this paper is that **working on parallel fronts** is efficient and probably will be effective. This includes: policy, laws, their implementation and monitoring, supporting action groups and NGOs, stakeholder and community participation, coalitions, research, tools. To succeed, the focus should not be exclusively on the national government or the public sector. Both 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' approaches are needed. Effort is needed at the regional level, reaching into nations through, for example, regional conventions. Similarly, municipal and sub-national experience can inform the nation. The effort will require *long-term commitment*. A three or five-year project cycle is insufficient.

Preventive and positive approaches

There have been successful anti-corruption initiatives from which we can learn. These success stories teach us the importance of having strategies for preventing corruption rather than mopping up afterwards (Klitgaard, 2000).

Current experience shows that **positive approaches** are needed. Transparency International, very early, decided to have a positive focus that does not concentrate on "naming names" or sensational investigations. This strategy helps to ensure that individuals and institutions that are fearful of the issue are more willing to join the effort. Activities might include: case studies of best practice, surveys of the current situation, action research identifying optimum approaches to community management or design of water schemes, preparation and advocacy of minimum plans/indicators without which a Later project can not be undertaken. For donors, examples of successful project action Can be sought and shared within their own agencies, providing a better handle on who is complying with transparency/corruption policy.

For institutions like IRC and its partners, a positive position is less threatening. The point is that transparency and anti-corruption measure can be implemented in most programmes without punitive feelings but as an obligation.

Preventive and positive strategies also imply that it is important to seek quick wins which achieve visible results, build confidence and credibility and allow time to address longer-term structural and institutional problems (Bailey, 2003). **Quick wins**, no matter how small initially, will also build confidence among partner institutions working at the national and sub-national levels.

An interesting example of emphasis on **positive, preventive approaches** is shown in the OECD publication: *Fighting Corruption and Promoting Integrity in Public Procurement* (available in PDF format by title). Public procurement is highly exposed to corruption; this is the report and collection of papers from a global forum held in Paris in 2004.More than 30 papers identify "weak links" in the public procurement process where the risk of corruption is high. They explore the best ways of improving transparency and accountability and of identifying effective actions to prevent, detect and sanction corruption.

Points of entry

There are many "points of entry". One approach to improving governance and ensuring honesty is to **focus on actions that concurrently serve other purposes**. NGOs have used this approach. For example, IRC's long-term work on community management and on monitoring have a significant focus on transparency and 'voice and choice' of the community in transactions within the water and sanitation sector. Enhancing participatory planning can also be a positive influence on improving efficiency in managing funds.

Another, more obvious point of entry, is to **seek greater transparency frontally** through, for example, establishing complaint systems, ombudsman services and investigating alleged corruption. This could focus on transactions that commonly take place in the sector such as beneficiary selection, tendering, construction, operation and so on. For example, the SEUF in India trained householders in how to monitor the work of masons for household latrines, how to monitor construction quality and reduce petty corruption.

A third point of entry might be **institutional reform**. Early efforts to address transparency issues were undertaken in the transition countries of the former eastern block. In some cases this anti-corruption work appears to yield promising results, as illustrated by the technical assistance offered by the OECD and European Union programme of *Support for Improvement in Governance and Management in Central and Eastern European Countries.* This worked on concrete activities in civil service development, law drafting, public expenditure management, public internal financial control, public procurement, and on Supreme Audit Institutions (Bryane, 2004).

The need is obviously great but organisations such as IRC and its partner NGOs may lack the leverage needed to reform institutions. One approach may be to work with larger institutions that have the power but lack the tools or technical expertise.

Collaboration and partnerships

Early in their work on transparency/corruption, institutions such as Transparency International, OSCE and OECD, began collaborating with regional and national partners. TI is perhaps the most visible, with partners in 85 regional and national groupings, many of whose members are voluntary and from a wide range of backgrounds.

Building coalitions seems fundamental and there are many examples that they work and get results. This implies that an important element of this strategy should be to **increase the number and the mix of actors,** both governmental and non-governmental. Unexpected and unusual alliances have been created between NGOs and other CSOs, including the public and private sector (Bailey, 2003).

Support is needed for the NGO/CSO groups. This may include exchange of information, structured visits, providing contracts for services, protection through advocacy, even legal protection. Some groups have to be paid and strategically deployed as well as trained for their work, to ensure effectiveness. The point is that little, under-resourced Davids will not uniformly defeat powerful, wealthy Goliaths.

One of the key themes in traditional monitoring and evaluation theory is that internal accountability does not necessarily work. Asking institutions and individuals to monitor their own work is sometimes almost like asking them to be dishonest (Shordt, 2000).
This highlights the importance of external feedback mechanisms, including, for example, focusing more on parliamentary, NGO and citizen oversight, participatory monitoring, complaint and reporting systems. In the water sector some civil society organisations have been promoted as independent monitors of both the tendering and execution of projects. The challenge is to encourage the pendulum to shift towards **external accountability mechanisms, with participatory approaches, providing for monitoring and feedback mechanisms outside the executive** *(*Kaufmann, 1999). Horizontal and vertical support is needed with, for example:

- larger institutions helping smaller ones: large NGOs helping smaller NGOs; donors in their central offices supporting their staff in programme and project offices; district government supporting local government.
- horizontal linkages among civil society organisations (universities, NGOs, women's organisations, youth organisations).

A corollary of a multi-stakeholder approach is that a singular focus on creating new public agencies to address governance challenges (such as new anti-corruption agencies or commissions) will not have the desired impact (Kaufmann, 1999; Shordt, 2000).

Awareness raising and capacity building

As a more subtle appreciation has emerged of the transactional contexts for honesty and corruption, the importance of strong institutions has become more obvious. Weak institutions can undermine even healthy policy changes. Thus another focal point must be on strengthening the *capacity of institutions* and their personnel.

Michael Bryane (2004) distinguishes two waves of work in the former eastern block countries, the first – on safeguards - has led the World Bank and regional development banks to invest heavily in projects that have been subject to allegations of corruption. As Susan Hawley argues (page 55), multilateral development banks and ESAs have an

impact and responsibility far beyond the sums of money they themselves invest, not least because the guarantees they issue help mobilize private sector investment. Raising awareness, through activities such as law reviews and orientations that focus on sensitizing individuals and institutions to the virtues of transparency and to the fact that corruption is not inevitable, should become the norm. The second wave relates to the need to move from awareness raising toward what Bryane calls the 'real work' of implementing policy, and targeted skills and capacity building.

There has been some critical reflection on the early awareness raising activities that have taken place in transition countries as well as in other nations. For example, Kaufmann (2003) has concluded that *the usefulness of anti-corruption 'campaigns', creation of new institutions or passage of laws, as well as much of the traditional public sector management and legal reform approaches, may have been over-rated*. Haarhuis and Leeuw (2002) find that the anti-corruption training of the first wave was little used by participants. Increased "awareness" alone, unlinked to tangible programming has created an atmosphere of cynicism and made it more difficult to fight corruption.

For the water sector this may imply a need to **combine advocacy and awareness-raising with more specific and focused action and capacity building**.

Apply and adapt existing tools

If one were setting out to design an anti-corruption strategy targeting the poor the tools and actions would include: setting up a complaints system, ensuring access to justice, attending to complaints, personal security in sanitation and water, participatory site selection and mapping. (Bailey, 2003). There are well-known strategies for ensuring that the poor are served and have social, economic, and physical access. Too often these are not applied.

Many tools and specific strategies have been developed to reduce corruption and improve transparency. Some of these, with special reference to the water and sanitation sector, are listed in Appendix 3, divided into three categories: Institutions and Groups; Tools and Actions within the programme cycle; Communication. About 90 specific tools and

strategies are listed, all aiming to improve transparency and reduce corruption in the sector—and there are undoubtedly more. Even allowing for the fact that there is some repetition across the categories, it is obvious that the number of known tools is large.

The over-riding questions, therefore, may not be what should be done but, rather: How can we ensure that these tools are adapted locally to a particular cultural and economic context…and are applied?

Furthermore, the application of tools and strategies does not automatically mean that the effort will succeed. A case study from the World Bank Institute (ND) describes a project in Indonesia which used a large number of tools and actions to reduce corruption. The

reported result was 20% to 30% savings in project costs. However, in monitoring the impact of this intensive effort, project staff reported that bribery, theft and nepotism were not eliminated… but still continued. It is important to implement strategies and to check their real impact—which usually implies some sort of monitoring activity.

There is an immediate need to **develop, adapt, test and advocate for consistent use of new and known tools** such as participatory site selection, complaints systems, triangulation in monitoring water programmes (monitoring information collected from a variety of different sources) and in ensuring the simple transparent accountability of resources. New tools for the water sector might include citizen scorecards; diagnostics based on survey reports from public officials, public service users, and firms; and tools to track public expenditures in detail.

5.   Programming implications at different levels

We have not yet reached the stage within the water sector where institutions have developed on-going programmes related to transparency/corruption specific to the sector. Therefore the following list of actions is meant to serve as a starting point for reflection and a tool for planning. For many of these activities, financial support would be required. Comments on this, as well as on this paper in general, would be very much appreciated.

Recommended actions: International level

Advocate and initiate water sector action
- *Draw attention to the need for sector specific-programming* to enhance transparency and reduce corruption in the water and sanitation sector. Have special events at international conferences such as the World Water Forum, the International Water Week, the WEDC conferences.

Collaborate
- Institutions can benefit from working together or, at least, consistently sharing information through *alliances and multi-stakeholder platforms*. There is much to be learned from organisations such as Transparency International. *Linking to the TI national groups* could also be considered in some countries.

Disseminate and share
- *Information/knowledge* collection, processing and sharing for the water and sanitation sector through, or linked to, existing internet websites.
- *Support sharing and regional/national programmes* through partner institutions, thematic groups or learning groups.
- *Sharing:* Implement a series of short information-sharing meetings or training programmes among multi-lateral, donor and INGOs.

Mainstream and apply programme internally
Corporate responsibility must be taken seriously, for example:
- INGOs should develop their own *internal monitoring systems* to (a) ensure their own honesty and transparency, and (b) ensure that this subject receives sufficient emphasis in their other programmes.
- Donor institutions should ensure *greater internal application of their own policies* through, for example, staff training programmes, identifying and advocating best practice and by monitoring their own projects/programmes for specific actions meant to support transparency and reduce corruption. The issue of monitoring 'programme support funding' needs special attention.
- Donor institutions should *provide funding* specifically for activities and projects to improve governance and reduce corruption.

- Develop programmatic indicators. *Monitoring indicators in the European Water Initiative (EUWI)* should include at least one indicator focusing on governance (transparency/corruption). This could be a first step forward.

Regional

- *Multi-stakeholder platforms* could be useful for developing conventions, policy and mainstreaming strategies on transparency.

National and sub-national: District, province and town

- Stimulate and *fund a variety of research*:
    - On the impact of inadequate programming and corruption. This can be useful used for advocacy and planning.
    - There have been many suggestions in this paper of research which is needed, or could be usefully replicated in other settings. It is suggested that most of this should have the character of 'action research'.
    - Targeted research: analysis of national policies. Application of national policies. Best practice and experience from district/sub-national levels shared.
- Support partner *NGOs and semi-governmentals to undertake activities (research, surveys, capacity development) that will help them enter this field*. This applies to work at the sub-national as well as the national level. Small grants to a number of interested institutions could be very useful in initiating sector-specific work in many countries.
- *Guidelines/policy*. Report cards of services and pacts for procurement. In the water sector, programmes contain cycles of implementation. These are analogous to projects within programmes. For these obligatory actions or minimum indicators for implementation might be usefully developed by multi-stakeholder groups.
- *Learning alliances*. Formal establishment of country groups, drawing on the experience and perhaps linked to TI national groups or UNDP offices. These could include south-north alliances as well.
- *Public education*. Complaints reporting systems. Civil society participation and oversight.
- *Tools*: Produce case studies, tool kits and undertake capacity building activities.

6. TOP Resources

All transparency/corruption information is available on websites. Books, downloadable from the sites, are available free of charge. There are a few websites dedicated to transparency and corruption issues. Many donors now have some information on their websites about governance and anti-corruption. In most cases it concerns policies, strategies and activities.

Sources of information on anti-corruption, governance, integrity, have mushroomed in the last ten years. There is an enormous range of materials, tools, documented cases, kits and so on. Research and quantitative analysis is less numerous.
The water and sanitation sector is not well covered and it is difficult to sort sector-specific material from the body of other information. In general, sorting, sifting through this is a major challenge. Therefore IRC has opened a thematic page on Transparency on its web site at: http://www.irc.nl/transparency. It includes a continually updated section on relevant resources.

TOP Websites

GENERAL

Transparency International (TI)
http://www.transparency.org/ email: corisweb@transparency.org
The TI website is the largest single source of anti-corruption information – and it is available in several languages. TI, through its International Secretariat and more than 85 independent national chapters around the world, works at both the national and international level to curb both the supply and demand of corruption.
TI focuses on prevention and reforming systems. The web-site provides access to CORIS (Corruption on Line Research and Information System) as well as access to its Source Book, Corruption Surveys(including the annual Corruption Perceptions Index), Tool Kit, the annual Global Corruption Report, country papers and a large number of other publications. Neither the website nor TI itself focus specifically on the water sector, but information appears which is relevant to the sector.

CORISweb is a decentralized, multilingual system currently holding over 16,000 resources. It also has legal texts, conventions and directives, research studies and papers, conference documents, links to other web sites, and a directory of anti-corruption organisations. Organisations and individuals worldwide are encouraged to become content partners.

Internet Center for Corruption Research
http://www.icgg.org/
A Joint Initiative of the University of Passau (Germany) and Transparency International. The web site includes the TI-Corruption Perceptions Index, academic research papers, and information on workshops and the annual course on "The Economics of Corruption".

Development Gateway: Governance

http://topics.developmentgateway.org/governance

The site focuses on governance issues. It seeks to complement existing resources and provide a platform for discussion on governance issues. As such, the Development Gateway actively encourages submissions on topics.

The key issues of the website are: · Anti Money Laundering; Corporate Social Responsibility; Corruption; Data on Governance; Democracy; Governance and Aid Effectiveness; Governance and Legal/Judicial Reform; Governance and Post-Conflict Nation-Building; Local Governance; Media and Freedom of the Press; and Public Sector Reform. It posts information that is sent in (and vetted first). Although not specialized in the water sector, its identification and abstracts of new publications in the general field of governance from around the world are particularly useful. There is an emphasis on transition countries and the former eastern block.

World Bank Group

Among the multilaterals, the World Bank offers the broadest and most diverse range of information, a great deal of it analytic and evaluative. There are two main thematic pages dealing with corruption:

- **World Bank Institute (WBI) - Governance & Anti-Corruption**
  http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance
  This site includes links to empirical diagnostic surveys of governance and corruption, learning programs, operational research and a databank as well as news items, calendar of events, and interactive data on governance. The WBI publishes a monthly Governance and Anti-Corruption Newsletter -
  http://newsletters.worldbank.org/external/default/main?menuPK=583418&pagePK=64133627&piPK=64133598&theSitePK=583411

- **World Bank - Anti-corruption.**
  http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/
  The tools and data subpage has examples of surveys, formats and results on corruption and governance. Subtopics:
  Country-Specific Corruption Surveys of Households, Firms and Public Officials
  Surveys of Firms
  Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys
  World Bank Institute's Governance Databank
  Other Corruption Surveys
  See also: **An Anti-corruption Project Guide for new projects**
  http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/PREMweek/AnticorruptionGuide.ppt

Other relevant pages include:

- **World Bank Group: Department of Institutional Integrity**
  http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/acfiu/acfiuweb.nsf/
  The Department of Institutional Integrity (INT) is the internal unit designated by the World Bank Group to investigate allegations of fraud and corruption in Bank Group operations and allegations of staff misconduct

- **GRICS: Governance Research Indicator Country Snapshot**
  http://info.worldbank.org/governance/kkz2004/gov2001map.asp
  Worldwide comparison of governance and socio-economic indicators: The Governance & Development Map Interface Web Tool. You can generate color-coded maps on governance issues, concentrating on the regions or countries.

U4 - Utstein Anti-Corruption Resource Centre
http://www.u4.no
The U4 group (Utstein Group) have established a website fully dedicated to their own anti-corruption activities. It provides lists of projects and activities and will include evaluations and analysis as these become available. This interesting website is supported by DGIS (Netherlands), DFID (UK), SIDA (Sweden), CIDA (Canada) and NORAD (Norway). Of particular interest is the website on lessons learned and best practices, which leads to interesting documents from leading institutions.
http://www.u4.no/document/lessonslearned.cfm

FIDIC Integrity management website
http://www1.fidic.org/resources/integrity/
http://www1.fidic.org/resources/integrity/default.asp
The FIDIC (International Federation of Consulting Engineers) has developed a Business Integrity Management System (BIMS), with formal procedures to identify potential risks, prevent and combat corruption and implement business integrity policies for the private sector. It maintains online resources for the implementation of integrity management in industry.

OSCE- Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.
http://www.osce.org/item/13568.html http://www.osce.org/documents/
The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), based in Austria, is a pan-European security body with 55 participating States. It may seem like an unlikely site until you realize that it has been working in transition and former eastern bloc countries where detailed work on governance and corruption began sometime ago. The website currently shows 230 publications on corruption and 120 on "water and corruption". Hard copies, including its interesting toolkit are sent free of charge.

OECD: Fighting Bribery and Corruption

http://www.oecd.org/about/0,2337,en_2649_34855_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

http://www1.oecd.org/daf/nocorruptionweb/info.htm

Website of the OECD Anti-Corruption Division has a search engine with older books and materials prepared before 2002. The ANCORR WEB Anti-corruption Ring Online also serves as an entrance door to several regional anti-corruption networks established under the auspices of the OECD.

- The ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia-Pacific, targeted at ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for the Asian and Pacific Economies.
- The Anti-Corruption Initiative for South Eastern Europe, targeted at countries from South Eastern Europe
- The Anti-Corruption Network for Transition Economies, targeted at countries from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Partnership for Transparency Fund

http://www.partnershipfortransparency.info/information_on_ptf.htm

The PTF finances specific time-bound activities or projects initiated by civil society organisations aimed at fighting corruption. These are small grants/technical support (range of $5,000-20,000).

Examples of activities supported by PTF:

- Monitoring of public contracts, public auctions for sale of public assets and privatization of public companies
- Reviews of draft legislation or regulations related to fighting corruption
- Participation in public commissions or inquiries related to corruption
- Initiatives to strengthen systems of financial accountability
- Surveys to track corruption
- PTF provided technical support for Karachi Water Board in relation to tendering and procurement.

WATER AND TRANSPARENCY

UNICORN – Global Unions Anti-corruption Network – Sector Water

http://www.againstcorruption.org/countrydetailsAll.asp?sectortopid=7

This site provides an overview of major (international) water companies and corruption-related news. Overviews by company and by date.

The Center for Public Integrity - The Water Barons

http://www.icij.org/water/

This web site is the result of a year-long investigation in 2003 by the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ) on the growth of three private water utility companies - Suez, Vivendi Environnement and Thames Water/RWE AG. The investigation was conducted amid fears that control over water resources could soon be taken over by a handful of monopolistic corporations. It concludes that the enormous expansion of these

Companies could not have been possible without the World Bank and other multilateral financial institutions. The ICIJ investigation focused on the activities of these companies in South Africa, Colombia, Indonesia, Philippines, Australia, France, the United States and Canada. The South African study claims there is a direct link between the policy of full cost recovery and disconnections and the 2000 cholera outbreak in the Dolphin Coast, where water supply was privatised in 1988.

World Water Week 2005 - Seminar - Can We Meet International Water Targets Without Fighting Corruption?
http://www.worldwaterweek.org/seminarsandsideevents/seminars6.asp
Proceedings of the seminar held in Stockholm on 21 August 2005. Includes key-note presentations from Transparency International and IRC, and case studies from Lesotho, India, Indonesia and Colombia. The seminar was convened by the Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the Swedish Water House, Transparency International (TI) and the Water and Sanitation Programme (WSP).

Appendix 1. Definitions

(Adapted from HABITAT and TI, 2004)
The meaning of words as used in this paper:

Accountability: Holding individuals and organisations responsible for performance, measured as objectively as possible. Accountability stands on three key pillars: financial, political and administrative.

Corruption: Misuse of office for private gain.

Governance: The exercise of authority through formal and informal traditions and institutions for the common good. Norms of Good (Urban) Governance are: sustainability, subsidiarity, equity, efficiency, transparency and accountability, civic engagement and citizenship, and security. (UNHABITAT- led Global Campaign on Urban Governance)

Integrity/honesty:
- Firm adherence to a code of especially moral or ethical values. Incorruptibility.
- Working in accordance with known and established best practices.

Transparency:
- Sharing information and acting in an clear, open manner.
- the conduct of public business in a manner that affords stakeholders wide accessibility to the decision-making process and the ability to effectively influence it. *(UNDP 1997, UN-HABITAT,*2000)

For more, see:
Thomas, M.A. and Patrick Meagher (2004) *A corruption primer: an overview of concepts in the corruption literature.* Paper No. 04/03. Center For Institutional Reform And The Informal Sector. The University Of Maryland. The Iris Discussion Papers On Institutions & Development.
http://www.iris.umd.edu/download.aspx?ID=9e2f27f7-3ae6-434f-bf54-35addf9aeb6e

At the organisational level, the Institute of Social and Ethical Accountability (UK) sees transparency as being one of the three elements of accountability, the other two being responsiveness and compliance.

According to their AA1000 Framework, **accountability** is made up of:

Transparency: to account to an organisation's stakeholders, which includes formal reporting but also other aspects of governance and behaviour, that make more visible the organisation's decisions, actions, performance and related outcomes.

Responsiveness: to respond to stakeholder concerns, which does not necessarily mean doing what stakeholders' want, but demonstrably, coherently and publicly responding to their demands.

Compliance: to comply with standards to which the organisation is voluntarily committed or must comply with for statutory reasons.

http://www.accountability.org.uk/research/default.asp?pageid=107 (accessed 15 November 2005)

Click to return to text page 2

Appendix 2. Typology—a catalogue of challenges for the water sector

This is a list of about 50 examples of lack of transparency, dishonesty or corruption in the water sector. This rough typology draws on the work of Jennifer Davis (2004), Esther Duflo (2003), the OCSE- Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (2004) and various meetings hosted by the IRC.

Customers

Breaks meters, vandalizes taps, etc.

Diverts water from agreed distribution: makes illegal connections

Bribes officials for faster or better services

Colludes with politically/economically powerful in community to withhold or give services on un-deserving basis

The 'contribution' required, according to government policy, from local community for new water supply is paid by influential leaders, leading to subsidized facilities being, in effect privately owned. (source: Right to Water e-mail discussion list, 26 May 2004)

Low technical staff

Bribes to falsify meter readings, conceal illegal connections.

Failure to do assigned work (turn off pumps, maintenance, etc) without extra payment

Over-charging for household construction such as of latrines

Pays supervisors for better job placement

Engineering staff, agency administrators + managers

Takes "speed" money from customers for faster maintenance, for connections, repairs

Collusion with contractors concealing sub-standard work

Pays managers or takes money from subordinates for transfers, promotions, hiring

Collusion with leaders in selection + approval of plans/schemes

Collusion with government or donors in not investigating corruption

Spends money quickly without accountability to please donors

Embezzlement: El Salvador's state water utility Anda, illegally deposited US$37 million in 399 bank accounts in less than 10 years. (El Diario de Hoy / BN Americas,19 Oct 2004.)

Collusion or receives payment or favours for construction/procurement contracts

- Tailor specifications to favour particular suppliers
- Restrict information about contracting opportunities
- Claim urgency as an excuse to award a contract to a single contractor without competition
- Breach the confidentiality of suppliers' offers
- Disqualify potential suppliers through improper pre-qualification requirements
- Take bribes

Elected (and unelected officials)

Takes money/services for connections or to avoid disconnections avoid payments

Takes payments for transfers, promotions, hiring

Withholds information on planning, finance, tendering from the public

Makes secret decisions to own advantage

Collusion/payments with other politicians from water funds

Colludes with donors/funding authorities to fund poorly designed schemes + activities not reflecting best practice.

Receives tendering kickbacks and free services

- fail to enforce quality standards, quantities or other performance standards of the contract
- divert delivered goods for resale or for private use
- demand other private benefits (trips, school, tuition fees for children, gifts)

Contractors and suppliers

Gives kickbacks to agency + engineers

Work is substandard and concealed

Steals materials

Colludes with transporters or labour unions for unfair profit

Tendering kick-backs to junior, senior water staff and to politicians

- Collude to fix bid prices
- Promote discriminatory technical standards
- Interfere improperly in the work of evaluators
- Offer bribes
- Falsify qualities or standards certificates
- Over or under-invoice
- Pay bribes to contract supervisors

Regulators/monitors (e.g., quality control consultants, NGOs)

Kick-backs: reports inaccurate or too complicated to be used.

Colludes (willingly or not) with engineers/managers/contractors to withhold damaging information.

NGOs are hired by municipalities and local government and therefore can be compromised in working for greater transparency.

External donors (international and central governments)

Does not follow acknowledged best practice: funds badly designed programmes

Does not investigate or audit to ensure honesty

Colludes to fund indifferently designed or badly implemented projects and programmes

Click to return to text.

Appendix 3. Tools and actions for the water sector

There are many different tools and strategies to support honesty in the water (and sanitation) sector. This list is taken from several sources: Shordt (2000, 2005), UN-Habitat and TI (2004), OECD (2003): Bruce Bailey (2003), and the IRC-sponsored e-conference and related meetings.

INSTITUTIONS AND GROUPS

Politicians
- Target the top officials in government and the leading political party to have them committed to rooting out elements that engage in corrupt behaviour.
- Politicians at intermediate and local level: demonstrate to them that honestly-managed programmes will win them popularity and votes.
- Develop video and media: the voice of the people
- Politicians, media, religious leaders advocate for transparency and honesty.

Involve civil society institutions
- Support researchers for surveys, action research, advocacy activities
- NGOs/CBOs should design and implement water and sanitation projects
- Independent monitoring: surprise financial and physical audits, setting up complaints or reporting systems for construction and O&M of water supply.
- Training and joint-planning for different institutions

Communities
- Community participation in planning and monitoring and/or community management that is facilitated by NGOs. Developing community capacity for transparency/honesty requires oversight.
- Set up public complaints system/informants. Training and mobilization for monitoring tenders, stockpiles and construction.
- Build citizen awareness and civil society partnerships to create a demand for cleaner politics and public service.

Implementers + water departments
- Separate the implementer from the regulator in water sector.
- Reform the government engineering departments through democratization, experimental pilot programmes, voluntary staff participation in planning and quality circles for improved/more honest working methods (example: TWAD Board, Tamil Nadu)
- Choose work locations for engineers in Government engineering departments by lottery to eliminate payments for desirable postings.
- Increase the salaries of water department employees. Provide incentives.

Donors

- Train own staff.
- Donors (bi-, multi-lateral, international) should implement their own policies on transparency, participation and anti-corruption. Donors should report on what proportion of the programmes they support have been monitored for transparency/corruption or have developed specific transparency/corruption activities.
- Develop support strategies for honesty and corruption that rely on local monitoring, not exclusively on international staff.
- Vet all decentralization proposals for internal checks and balances to prevent corruption.

Media

- Media professionals should be trained and active in reporting
- "Scorpion Unit" that identifies and publicizes corrupt individuals/groups. It can also have ability to initiate litigation.(example: South Africa)

Contractors, suppliers, implementers:

- Provide training/orientation. Organize reporting of corruption and payment delays.
- Break monopolies.
- Incentives for honest performance. Black-listing for bad performance

TOOLS AND ACTIONS WITHIN THE PROGRAMME CYCLES

Planning (and re-planning) water schemes

- Use sustainable water sources that are as close as possible to users (not far away to increase hardware costs)
- Keep technologies and designs as simple, practical and relevant as possible. This reduces opportunities for corruption and helps ensure sustainability.
- Involvement in planning:
    - Plan water service with the community. Involve leaders, rich/poor people, men/women.
    - Community members participate in (and approve) site selection of water points, the design of water distribution nets, physical mapping.
- Socio-economic mapping and participation in site-selection for distribution network and public water points (Example: Shordt 2005).
- Social inclusion: A representative community group checks the eligibility of "poor" households for subsidies, using agreed criteria...
- Economic inclusion and sustainability:
    - Develop the lowest-cost technologies that are relevant. Develop traditional water systems such as rain water harvesting systems.
    - Make clear and agreed plans for O&M, sustainability, reaching the poor.
- Simplify approvals procedures.

- Expenditure and approval monitoring to help to identify specific problems in financial systems that create blockages - arising from or encouraged by corrupt practices - and affect service delivery. (Bailey, 2003)
- Corruption perception surveys among community members and staff of water institutions.

Overall implementation of water schemes
- Perform quickly. Work rapidly in planning, release of funds and implementation. A long delay aids corruption and lacks transparency.
- Implementation strategies should be known and agreed among all stakeholders.
- Monitor payments/payment time periods.
- Monitor costs on running or periodic basis: Check big increases/decreases.
- Simplify information (plans, designs, reports, accounts) so that they are understandable and can be copied/handled by all stakeholders. Simplify approvals procedures
- Expand information technology: Internet can provide information for transparency and to increase responsiveness. E-procurement shows promise in some environments but must be accompanied by other systemic improvements.
- Corruption (perceptions) surveys
- Civic Engagement in Public Expenditure Management

Tendering, contracting and procurement
- Operate integrity pacts among contractors/suppliers (Examples: Karachi, Bogotá)
- Requirements for corporate codes of conduct and/or an agreed code of "zero tolerance" for corruption. Include "no bribery", "no corruption" clauses in contracts.
- Private water providers must produce asset management plans showing how services will be extended to the poor.
- For expenses over $100 or $1000 per week (depending on the person or institution) two signatures are required on an A-4 form.
- Require 2 or 3 joint signatures on financial and project documents
- Surprise procurement audits. Surprise audits of stored commodities and warehouses.
- Assess plans: monitor and compare costs for standard commodities among projects.

Tendering: control and openness: public tenders, open documents.
- Describe clearly and fairly what is to be purchased. Technical clarity: specifications, third party inspections, audits. (Bailey, 2003)
- Publicize the opportunity to make offers.
- Establish fair criteria for selection of suppliers and/or contractors.
- Receive offers (bids) from responsible suppliers.
- Compare the offers and determine which is best, according to the predetermined rules for selection.
- Award the contract to the selected bidder without requiring price reductions or other changes to the winning offer.
- Update schedules of rates if they exist
- Review effects of principle of only accepting the lowest bidder, if this exists.

- Use internet for tendering. Minimize contact between officials and those tendering through on-line contacts.

Quality of materials:
- Manufacturers and suppliers are told there will be no commission and are given immediate payments.
- Purchasing of local materials accompanied by community members
- Check on quality of materials by one or two of: third party company, ISO, community, NGOs/CBOs
- Compare local costs for commodities. Use local level procurement which can mean changing practices, to large infrastructure projects, to selling of government assets.

Penalties and incentives:
- Create a list of contractors known for honesty or dishonesty.
- Disbarment procedures for bidders who have engaged in fraud or corruption.
- Procedures to declare mis-procurement and cancel disbursement if a public servant is found involved in corrupt practice and corrective action is not taken.
- Procedures to stop work for misconduct of local government, contractors, community groups. (Example: Kerala Panchayat MOU for sanitation)
- Blacklist contractors whose work proves inferior after water scheme is commissioned.
- Greater transparency in the selection of consultants (public advertising of larger assignments, disclosure of short listed firms and technical scores, etc.).

Construction
- Intensive supervision by more than one stakeholder group.
- Community and third party monitoring of construction. Orientation is required first.
- For small constructions, provide technical specifications to selected community groups for monitoring. Orientation is usually required. (example: Kurup, 1994).
- Create a list of contractors known for honesty or dishonesty.
- Ensure adequate training for subsequent O&M of water scheme. This improves transparency and reduces delays.

Post-construction
Cost recovery, payment for water
- Fix water tariffs in blocks by quantity used to reduce opportunities for corruption.
- Use water meters in each household and organisation.
- Set up centralized, "one-stop" application/approval points for household water connection (example: Davis, 2004: Hyderabad)
- Monitor and publish water quality data on bulk providers' treatment plants and bottling plants.

Level of service and operation
- Have frequent, responsible inspections.

- Use assessment tools such as: Report cards (example: Bangalore), Independent monitoring, Checklists, Corruption Surveys. Participatory Corruption Appraisal about how corruption affects the poor.
- Support the "champions" at all levels who are willing to take on the corruption problem, offering them support and some degree of protection. Have whistleblower protection.
- Ethical Campaign Practices + Training. Complaints system. Ombudsman Office.
- Independent Audit Function. Independent Anti-Corruption Agencies

Monitoring/reporting
- Check and act on 'unpaid for water' by companies and institutions.
- Check illegal connections and fine (legalize) or stop service to these.
- Fault reporting and complaints systems for water: Set up fault reporting/complaints system, including planning with community members on how/where to report.
- Protect the staff involved in transparency/honesty issues: transfers and tenure.
- Donors put in place a stand-by monitoring unit that engages closely with all relevant institutions to see whether real progress is being made

COMMUNICATION

How to inform
- Give training in how to report at all levels. Set strict requirements for public reporting, for reporting to donors and so on.
- Publish reports on utility performance levels.
- Publish technical information for the public.
- At the water point site there can be simple information boards showing the total project cost, who contributes, amounts of contributions, contractor by name, prices, expected date of completion. (example from Nigeria).
- Computerize data collection on water and management. Make this available to public
- Media reports highlighting problems of corruption or lack of transparency. Media reports highlighting good practice.

Transparency in communication
- All decisions made and/or explained in public meetings. Have rules for open meetings.
- Access to Information Laws
- Public participation tools used. Example: transparency to reduce costs for householders in household latrine construction: give simple plans, list of materials, costs, labour time and labour costs to householders and to masons/contractors
- Setting up committees
  - Known rules for election or selection of members
  - Each group in committee's constituency to be represented by a committee member.
  - Quorum rules. Rules for meetings and decision-making (e.g., in public).

Click to return to text.

Appendix 4. List of international conventions and donor policies

To improve governance and reduce corruption, at least 12 international conventions and guidelines, and at least 7 donor policies have been prepared, largely over the past decade. These include the U.N. Convention Against Corruption (2003) signed by 128 nations.

- Council of Europe, Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime, November 1990
- Inter-American Convention Against Corruption 1996
- OECD Convention on Combating Bribery, 1997.
- Council of Europe, Criminal Law Convention on Corruption 1998
- Council of Europe, Civil Law Convention on Corruption 1999
- United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, 2000
- Jakarta Declaration For Reform of Official Export Credit and Investment Insurance Agencies 2000
- Warsaw Declaration: Toward a Community of Democracies 2000
- U.N. Convention Against Corruption (2003) signed by 128 nations.
- Corporate Governance Principles for Business Enterprises developed by Hermes Pensions Management and Asian Development Bank, circa 2003
- Asian Development Bank (ADB)/Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia and the Pacific (2004)
- The "five key elements" of the World Bank[2], circa 2004
- Many donor country policies including: the US Foreign Corrupt Practices Act 1977, Canada's Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions 1998, DFID (UK) Anti-corruption strategy 2001, (Norway) NORAD's good governance and anti-corruption action plan 2000-2001, (Germany) BMZ good governance position paper 2002, (Denmark) Danida's Anti-corruption Action Plan 2004, (Sweden) SIDA's Anti-corruption regulation 2004.

PROCUREMENT: Transparency International

In the excellent Global Corruption Report 2005, Peter Eigen notes: *More than US$4trillion is spent on government procurement annually worldwide. From the construction of dams and schools to the provision of waste disposal services, public works and construction are singled out by one survey after another as the sector most prone to corruption – in both the developing and the developed world. If we do not stop the corruption, the cost will continue to be devastating…. As many of the Global Corruption Report's country reports show, enforcement rarely matches up to the standards to which governments pay lip-service.*
http://www.globalcorruptionreport.org/gcr2005/download/english/introduction_and_ti_standards.pdf

---

[2] http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/index.cfm

In addition to these minimum standards, there is also a set of recommendations for actions organized by stakeholder groups. These deserve to be studied carefully and applied or adapted for application. The Business Principles for Countering Bribery, developed by Transparency International and Social Accountability International, provide a framework for the development of an effective anti-corruption policy (see www.transparency.org/building_coalitions/private_sector/business_ principles.html).

Click to return to text.

References

Astana, A.N. (2004). ´Corruption and decentralization: evidence from India's water sector´. In: Proceedings of the 30th WEDC International Conference, held at Laos, 2004. Loughborough, London, WEDC.

Azfar, O. et al. (1999). *Decentralization, Governance, and Public Services: The Impact of Institutional Arrangements.* Working paper. Maryland, U.S., University of Mariland, IRIS http://www.iris.umd.edu/Reader.aspx?TYPE=FORMAL_PUBLICATION&ID=4ef56417-a8ee-450a-989d-44de4358555e

Bailey, B. B. et al. (2003). *Synthesis of lessons learned of donors in fighting corruption.*.JT00146561 DAC Network on governance. OECD. DCD/DAC/GOVNET http://www.u4.no/document/showdoc.cfm?id=61 http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UNTC/UNPAN016841.pdf

Barlow , M. and Clarke, T.(2004). *Water Privatization: The World Bank's Latest Market Fantasy.* Ottawa, Ontario Canada, Polaris Institute.

Braadbaart, O. (2005). ´Privatizing water and wastewater in developing countries : assessing the 1990s' experiments´. In: *Water policy* ; vol. 7, no. 4, p. 329-344. Abstract and ordering details - http://www.iwaponline.com/wp/00704/wp007040329.htm (accessed 14 November 2005).

Bryane, M. (2004).*The Rise and Fall of the Anti-Corruption Industry: Toward Second Generation Anti-Corruption Reforms in Central and Eastern Europe?* http://users.ox.ac.uk/~scat1663/Publications/Papers/Soros%20Article.pdf

Budds, J. and McGranahan, G.(2003). ´Are the debates on water privatization missing the point? Experiences from Africa, Asia and Latin America´. In: *Environment & Urbanization* vol 15, no 2. London, UK, IIED Human Settlements Programme. http://www.iied.org/human

Chambers, R. (1992). ´Actual or potential uses of RRA/PRA methods in health and nutrition´. In: *RRA notes*, no. 16: special issue on application for health. London, UK, International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)

Davis, J. (2004). ´Corruption in Public Service Delivery: Experience from South Asia's Water and Sanitation Sector´. In: *World Development*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 53–71, UK, Elsevier Ltd. http://www.elsevier.com/locate/worlddev

Drew, K. (2002).*The UK Export Credit Guarantee Department Corruption And The Case For Reform*. London, UK, Public Services International Research Unit (PSIRU).

Dudley, R. (2000). *The Rotten Mango: The Effect of Corruption on International Development Projects. Part 1: Building a System Dynamics Basis for Examining Corruption.* Oregon, USA. http://www.icgg.org/downloads/contribution06_dudley.pdf.

Duflo, E. (2003). *A Case study of corruption: canal irrigation in South India.* http://web.mit.edu/14.773/www/Wade.pdf.

Estache, A. and Kouassi, E. (2002). *Sector organization, governance, and inefficiency of African water utilities.* Washington, U.S.,The World Bank Institute. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 2890.*

Hall, David. (1999). ´Contracts, Concessions and Corruption in the Water Sector´. In: *Development in Practice,* vol. 9, no. 5. http://www.unhabitat.org/HD/hdv6n3/contracts.htm

Hall, D. and Lobina, E. (2002). ´Water privatisation in Latin America´. Presented at PSI Americas' Water Conference, San José, Costa Rica, July 2002. Public Services International Research Unit, University of Greenwich. http://ww.world-psi.org

IIED (2004). ´Participatory governance´. In: Environment & Urbanization, vol. 16, no. 1, April 2004.

Kaufmann, D.(1998). ´Challenges in the Next Stage of Anti-corruption´. In: *New Perspectives On Combating Corruption.* Washington, U.S., WorldBank http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/18117/challenges.pdf

Kaufmann, D. (2002). ´Transparency, Incentives and Prevention (TIP) for Corruption Control and Good Governance: Empirical Findings, Practical Lessons, and Strategies for Action based on International Experience´. Background Paper for Qinghua University-Carnegie Conference on Economic Reform and Good Governance: Fighting Corruption in Transition Economies, Beijing, April 11-12th, 2002 http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/18380/quinghua_paper.pdf

Kaufmann, D. (2003). *Rethinking Governance: Empirical Lessons Challenge Orthodoxy* Washington, U.S., World Bank Group - World Bank Institute. http://ssrn.com/abstract=386904

Klitgaard, R.; Maclean-Abaroa, R. and Lindsey Parris, H.(2000). *Corrupt cities : a practical guide to cure and prevention.* Washington, U.S., World Bank Institute. http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2000/10/07/000094946_00092605362082/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf

Lenton, R.; Wright, A. and Lewis, K. (2005). *Health, dignity and development: What will it take?* UN Millennium Project Task Force on Water and Sanitation. London, UK, Earthscan, http://www.unmillenniumproject.org/documents/WaterComplete-lowres.pdf

OSCE-Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. (2004). *Best practices in combating corruption.* Vienna, Switzerland. http://www.osce.org/item/13568.html http://www.osce.org/resources/

Schneider, H. (1999). ´Participatory governance for poverty reduction´. In: *Journal for International Development,* vol. 11, p. 521–534.

Schouten, T. and Moriarty, P. (2003). *Community water, community management: from system to service in rural areas.* The Netherlands, IRC and UK, ITDG publishing.

Srinivasan, L. (1990). *Tools for community participation: a manual for training trainers.* New York, NY, USA, PROWWESS/UNDP.

Shordt, K. et al. (2005-1). *Introducing the topic in the water sector: How to conduct a first meeting on transparency, honesty, corruption.* Delft, the Netherlands, IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre.

Shordt, K. and Stravato L. (2005-2). *Improved transparency and service using site selection as a tool. .* Delft, the Netherlands, IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre.

Shordt, K. (2000). *Action monitoring for effectiveness.* Delft, the Netherlands, IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre.

Stoupy, O. and Sugden, S. (2003). *Halving the proportion of people without access to safe water by 2015. A Malawian perspective. Part 2: New indicators for the millennium development goal.* London, UK, WaterAid. http://www.wateraid.org.uk/documents/Mlwi_Part2b_Table_Contents.pdf

Stravato L. and Shordt K. (2005). *Transparency, Honesty and Corruption in the Water and Sanitation Sector Lessons learned from an e-conference.* Delft, the Netherlands, IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre.

Swardt, C. de. (2005). *Global Corruption Report 2005 – 6: Key developments in corruption across countries.* Berlin, Germany, TI.

Transparency International (2005). *Global Corruption Report 2005: Corruption in Construction and Post-Conflict Reconstruction.* Berlin, Germany, TI.

Thomas, M.A. and Meagher, P. (2004). *A corruption primer: an overview of concepts in the corruption literature.* Paper No. 04/03. Maryland, U.S.,The University Of Maryland, Center For Institutional Reform And The Informal Sector. http://www.iris.umd.edu/download.aspx?ID=9e2f27f7-3ae6-434f-bf54-35addf9aeb6e

UN-HABITAT (United Nations Human Settlements Programme) and TI (Transparency International). (2004). *Tools to Support Transparency in Local Governance.* Urban

Governance Toolkit Series. UN-HABITAT, Nairobi, Kenya and Transparency International (TI), Berlin, Germany.
http://hq.unhabitat.org/publication/TOOLKITGOVERNANCE.pdf

Werner, D. (1978). *Where there is no doctor.* California, U.S., The Hesperion Foundation,.

Wijk-Sijbesma, C. van. (2001). *The best of two worlds? Methodology for participatory assessment of community water services.* IRC, Delft, Netherlands. Technical paper series no. 38.

World Bank Institute. (?) *Safeguarding against Corruption in Projects: The Kecamatan Development Program.* Indonesia Country Team and WBI Anticorruption Thematic Group. Indonesia.

About IRC

IRC facilitates the sharing, promotion and use of knowledge so that governments, professionals and organisations can better support poor men, women and children in developing countries to obtain water and sanitation services they will use and maintain. It does this by improving the information and knowledge base of the sector and by strengthening sector resource centres in the South.

As a gateway to quality information, the IRC maintains a Documentation Unit and a web site with a weekly news service, and produces publications in English, French, Spanish and Portuguese both in print and electronically. It also offers training and experience-based learning activities, advisory and evaluation services, applied research and learning projects in Asia, Africa and Latin America; and conducts advocacy activities for the sector as a whole. Topics include community management, gender and equity, institutional development, integrated water resources management, school sanitation, and hygiene promotion.

IRC staff work as facilitators in helping people make their own decisions; are equal partners with sector professionals from the South; stimulate dialogue among all parties to create trust and promote change; and create a learning environment to develop better alternatives.

IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre
P.O. Box 2869
2601 CW Delft
The Netherlands
Tel. +31 (0)15 219 29 39
Fax. +31 (0)15 219 09 55
E-mail: general@irc.nl
Internet http://www.irc.nl