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About this Toolkit

This toolkit is designed to facilitate any citizens group, NGO, government department or organization to implement an Urban Corruption Survey to measure the level of corruption in public service delivery. The Urban Corruption Survey is a tool that assists stakeholders in understanding existing realities relating to corruption, transparency, and the quality of governance in their city. This assessment is essential to develop strategies to address existing problems and formulate systems to ensure greater transparency in the future. The overarching goals of this toolkit are to use 'grassroots' or 'bottom-up' initiatives to empower citizens to increase their skills and capacity for holding organizations and governments to account. This toolkit aims to eventually institutionalize mechanisms for effectively identifying, measuring and responding to corruption within public service delivery. To provide a practical understanding of this toolkit, each tool is explained under the following headings:

What is it?
Why would it be used?
How to use it?
When would you use it?
Who uses it?
How has it been used in the service delivery sector?
What use is it to the poor?

The tools complied in this toolkit are drawn from the field experience gathered during YSD's Urban Corruption Survey, and supplemented with other case studies, literature and other NGO anti-corruption toolkits. The goal is a set of operational tools that can be effectively applied to address realities in the field when attempting to measure corruption. This toolkit rejects using the top-down perspectives to view, understand, and identify corruption but rather employs the perspective of operators, regulators and service users, specifically focusing on impoverished and marginalized communities. It is our hope that these tools will prove effective for all in efforts to identify, respond to and reduce corruption in public service delivery.
I. Understanding Corruption

Corruption is commonly understood as the misuse of publicly bestowed power for political, social or personal gains. Forms of corruption include:

Bribery (kickbacks, baksheesh, sweeteners, payoff, protection money, gratuity, etc.): Offering money or valuables to persuade an individual to do something that would otherwise be rendered inappropriate or illegal by law or regulations; or the act of demanding a "gift" or "under-the-table" payment for specific returns. Bribery is corrupt by definition.

Embezzlement: Theft of resources by officials (misappropriation of public or private funds).

Fraud: An economic crime that involves deception, trickery or swindling.

Extortion: Using money or other resources extracted through coercion, violence or threats.

Nepotism: Disregarding official hiring/election protocol to appoint family members or friends into positions of power and prominence.

Cronyism: Bestowing offices or benefits to friends and relatives regardless of merit and qualifications.

Petty Corruption: Petty corruption (also known as administrative or bureaucratic corruption) is the corruption that takes place on a daily basis during interactions between officials and the public. This type of corruption is also identified as "survival" corruption or "corruption of need" as it involves junior or mid-level officials who may be grossly underpaid and rely on relatively small bribes to support their families and pay for their children's education. Even though petty corruption generally refers to small sums of money as opposed to the large sums present in "grand" or political corruption, the amounts are not "petty" for the individuals adversely affected. Petty corruption disproportionately hurts the poorest sectors of society who are regularly pressured to pay bribes to public service officials and institutions.

Grand Corruption: Grand corruption generally involves persons or companies that have access to large amounts of money and hold powerful influence (such as politicians, senior officials, policy makers, leading elites and major companies) that acquire large amounts of public resources to maintain their own power, status and wealth. Grand corruption is generally found to occur within government policies, project selection decisions, and procurement.

Corruption also has a tendency to fall under one of the three headings:

Collusive: meaning that both parties are willing involved in corruption and view it as a necessary part of achieving goals or services.

Extortion: meaning that one side is forcibly made to participate in corruption by way of threats.

Anticipatory: meaning that one side gives a bribe in anticipation of the improvements it will foster in service delivery (such as increasing the reliability and predictability of a public service, like water supply or electricity, or to speed up the process of acquiring these services).
Corruption can be both active and passive. Active corruption is where those affected are forced to pay daily bribes to those who they interact with to obtain service delivery. Passive corruption is the widespread effects of corrupt practices that lower a populations' quality of life and weaken overall public infrastructure.

II. Corruption and Poor Populations

Corruption affects all socio-economic classes differently, the key difference in the way corruption affects an individual or population has to do with achieved power and future access to power. There are five underlying factors, which explain poor populations' relationship to power and corruption:

1. Poor citizens lack financial resources and are more vulnerable to being negatively affected by corruption in bribes or service delivery
2. Poor citizens often lack access to information, knowledge and formal education, making it difficult for citizens to be aware of and advocate for their rights
3. Poor citizens often suffer discrimination at the hands of the police and within the legal system, resulting in a lack of infrastructure that would protect them from corruption or corrupt practices
4. Poor citizens lack a voice in public discourse, so their interests aren't always represented
5. Poor citizens lack connections to those who have power, and thus have very little influence on policies that would affect their quality of life

The poor are most vulnerable to corruption as they are often at the mercy of the rich and powerful in society, those who have access to information and influence policy and the gatekeepers that control access to goods and services. The poor may also be illiterate and unaware of the formal costs of these goods and services that they need to access.

III. Identifying Corruption in Public Service Delivery

Essential public services can be defined as those essential to development, health and well-being, and are usually provided by the government (or outsourced to private enterprises) to all citizens regardless of social-economic status. These services can also be identified as those that provide physical infrastructure, networks or structure to a city or village, such as water supply, sanitation, drainage, access roads and paving, street lighting, solid waste management and community buildings. Other examples of perhaps more widely recognized public services range from: healthcare, education, water and sanitation, government food programmes, public transportation, etc.

Corruption in public service delivery is a larger symptom of poor governance. Corruption is acknowledged to be prevalent in the construction and engineering
sectors of developing and developed countries alike. Moreover, the public sector is typically viewed as a breeding ground for corruption, as demonstrated in recent case studies and case surveys in Bangladesh, Georgia, Indonesia, Pakistan, Nigeria, South Africa, Nepal and Ukraine.

Examples of corruption in public service delivery can involve political pressure to bestow a contract on a family or friend's company or political acquaintance in exchange for low taxes, which can result in the government contracting a company that is perhaps inefficient, unqualified or ill equipped to practice effective service delivery. This results in the overall quality of services being lowered as service providers are selected not based on merit but through other inappropriate means.

Corruption can exist between officials, service providers, and citizens or in a combination of two or three categories. Citizens can actively encourage corruption by except bribery as a necessary part of service delivery. However, in extremely impoverished communities bribes may weigh heavily on the income of households or simply be unaffordable. This means that the most vulnerable and needy members of society may be deprived of their access to water or sanitation facilities because they cannot afford to pay a premium for their access.

Corruption can be measured through its direct impact on the poor (when basic services, like water and sanitation are absent or restricted), and by its increase on the costs or decrease on the quality of basic services. Corruption within public service delivery can also be measured in its indirect impacts, as it prevents the poor from receiving quality essential services on which they rely for survival and development. Overall, corruption within public service delivery can be viewed as something that not only deprives the poor and marginalized communities from basic services, but on a large scale that which impedes development and poverty reduction among the affected populations.

IV. What is an Urban Corruption Survey?

The Urban Corruption Survey is a tool that aids stakeholders in understanding the varied contexts surrounding corruption, transparency and the quality of governance in their city. This assessment is vital to organizing strategies that not only responding to current corrupt practices but aid in the establishment of a systemic infrastructure that guarantees an increase of transparency in the future.

The Urban Corruption Survey has the following key objectives:

To identify the organizations, institutions, or sections within institutions where corruption is prevalent

1. To quantify the costs of corruption to the average citizen
1. To increase public interest in the issues surrounding corruption
1. To provide a basis for actions to be taken in the light of the findings of the survey

The Urban Corruption Survey promotes the identification of unethical practices in specific urban areas, emphasizing average citizens perceptions of corruption in organizations operating at the local level.
The Urban Corruption Survey Methodology

What is it?

The Urban Corruption Survey methodology is the framework from which the Urban Corruption Survey is based. It is essential that the objectives of the Urban Corruption Survey be clearly defined to form a foundation on which to base the exercise design. The survey can be applied to all or some of the public agencies at the local level, or even to specific programmes or activities or sections within the local government and/or public and private service providers. The survey must be designed in such a way to gather information from all stakeholders, which includes the private and public officials (service providers) as well as citizens (beneficiaries). The target audience should also be clearly identified. It is only after these steps are complete that the survey instrument can be designed.

Why would it be used?

Conducting surveys is an important means of assessment. Surveys gather information from responses to written questionnaires or verbal interviews. They may be directed at general populations or be samples specifically chosen for comparison with other samples. They may gather objective data (for example, the nature or frequency of occurrences of corruption known to the respondent) or subjective data (the views, perceptions or opinions of the respondent). A wide range of data can be obtained about the types, nature, extent and locations of corruption, the effectiveness of efforts against it and the public perceptions of all of those.

How to use it?

Considerable expertise is needed to gather valid data and to interpret it correctly. When conducting a survey, it is important to choose representative samples of the population, as the nature of the sample is a major factor in assessing the survey results. A general public survey may show that only a small part of the population has experienced public sector corruption; a sample selected from among those who have had some contact with the government or a particular governmental area or process, such as employment or contracting, may produce a different result. Results of samples from government insiders may also differ from samples based on outsiders. The comparison of data taken from different samples is one valuable element of such research but comparisons can be valid only if the samples were correctly selected and identified in the first place.

For general public surveys, care must be taken to sample all sectors of the population. A common error is to over sample urban areas, where people are more accessible at a lower cost, and to under sample rural or remote populations. Valid results will not be yielded if the reality or perception of corruption is different in urban and rural areas. Samples selected more narrowly, for example by asking the users to comment on a particular service, must also ensure that a full range of service
users is approached. Anonymity and confidentiality are also important; corrupt officials will not provide information if they fear disciplinary or criminal sanctions, and many victims may also fear retaliation if they provide information.

The formulation of survey instruments is critical. Questions must be drafted in a way that can be understood by all those to be surveyed, regardless of background or educational level. All survey respondents must understand the question in the same way. In cases where many respondents are illiterate or deemed unlikely to respond to a written questionnaire, telephone or personal interviews are often used. In such cases, it is essential to train interviewers to ensure that they all ask the same questions using the same terminology.

An Urban Corruption Survey may use the following instruments as part of its methodology:

a. Focus Groups

It is difficult to acquire information on corrupt practices because often that information is not accessible, as it exists in confidential and hidden behaviour, rarely exposed or documented. An oral culture generally decides who will pay what to whom, so records are not kept. It is also difficult to get information on how corruption affects the poor, as there is a perceived risk that those who report or discuss incidents of corruption will face punishment or retribution. Focus groups are a good way to gather information in a forum where respondents feel safe and supported by their community. Focus Group Discussions (FGD) should be held separately to include a range of stakeholders including service users; households and service providers may be asked about their perceptions of corruption in infrastructure services, existing problems and possible solutions. In terms of fostering general public participation, it is a good idea to become familiar with local citizen's groups that have established trust among the community, and involve those groups in the organization of FGDs where members of community associations and the general public can meet to map their different views with regard to quality and efficacy of different basic services. For example, YSD held separate FGDs in the slum and non-slum areas by involving the Resident's Welfare Associations and the general public. FGDs were also held with government officials. The views and opinions of the focus group discussions were incorporated in the subsequent development of the survey questionnaire.

Focus groups are essentially in-depth discussion sessions, which produce qualitative rather than quantitative assessments, including detailed information concerning views on corruption, precipitating causes of corruption, and valuable ideas on how the government can combat it. Specific agendas for focus groups can be set in advance, or developed individually, either as the group starts its work or by advance consultations with the participants. Focus groups can also be used to generate preliminary assessments as the basis of further research, but should not be the only method used for such assessments. A focus group of judges may well be useful in developing research into corruption in the legal or criminal justice system, for example, but others, such as law enforcement personnel, prosecutors or court officials, may yield different results.
b. Interviews

Semi-structured, structured, and in-depth interviews should be conducted with a broad variety of stakeholders soliciting their views on corruption in general and its incidence in infrastructure service delivery in particular. Interviews can be held with municipal professionals, private sector contractors, local leaders, elected officials, NGO staff, community organizations, academics and especially low-income residents. In specific cases it may be feasible to interview those who have been tried and convicted in court cases involving infrastructure-related corruption.

c. Case Studies

Following basic quantitative and qualitative assessments that identify the extent of corruption and where it is occurring, case studies can be used to provide more detailed qualitative information. Specific occurrences of corruption are identified and examined in detail to identify the type of corruption involved, exactly how it occurred, who was involved and in what manner, what impact the occurrence had, what was done as a result, and the impact of any action taken. Information is usually gathered by interviewing those involved, although other sources, such as court documents or reports, may also be used if reliable. Case studies are particularly useful in assessing the process of corruption and the relationships that exist between participants, observers and others, as well as between causal or contributing factors. They can also be used to educate officials and members of the public about corruption. As mentioned previously, care in the selection or sampling of cases is important. Cases may be chosen as "typical" examples of a particular problem, for example, or attempts may be made to identify a series of cases that exemplify the full range of a particular problem or of corruption in general.

d. Sampling

Sampling exists to prevent bias in impact assessment and guarantee that a wide variety of stakeholders are represented. Bias can weaken an investigation resulting in a superficial or completely incorrect understanding of the issues being studied. Biases can exist in numerous ways and include: special bias (in terms of limiting respondents to easily accessible areas), professional and project bias (where only direct primary stakeholders are interviewed and those who are indirectly effected or lack a voice are ignored), person bias (when articulate elites of the community or those who are active community members are interviewed), temporal bias (where the sampling is limited to specific contexts that captures a specific but perhaps not widespread reality), diplomatic bias (where sensitive questions are avoided to prevent stress or arguments in favour of superficial questions that are easily answered), language and conceptual bias (when respondents are chosen on the basis that they speak the common language or are already familiar with the issues to be discussed).

When sampling one must also be concerned with the potential to ignore seemingly invisible or silent stakeholders, for example those residing in remote communities.
that are excluded from community services or suffering from high crime, illness, poverty rates, those suffering from terminal diseases, those who are particularly vulnerable and lacking a social influence or voice (i.e. children), those who face high levels of discrimination that has forced them to migrate to other areas or go into hiding, those who are fugitives from the law or activists, whistleblowers, journalists whose political or social expressions have made them a target for violence, those areas that are not accessible due to lack of infrastructure, natural disasters or extreme climates, migrant workers, the homeless, sex workers, child labourers, those who only speak minority languages, those without education.

Even if the most vulnerable groups are included in a sample, the interviewing process could seriously hinder the validity of the results. For example if sensitive questions are not asked in the right order, or using clear language, or context, the credibility of the sample could be compromised through introducing biases that lead to inaccurate findings and recommendations. Sampling should not only avoid bias but should be sure to represent a wide variety of stakeholders in both the assessment process (findings) and in the results (policy implications or decision-making) that follows. Also, samples should strive to counter inherent prejudices held against vulnerable populations by accurately representing their voices and views.

In the YDS Urban Corruption Survey, households were distinguished on the basis of their living in the slum and non-slum areas. Brahmapur city comprises nearly half million population living in 43,801 household as per the Revenue data of Brahmapur Municipality. A total number of 2003 households were selected for the study (4.5% of the total households) from both the slum and non slum areas covering all the 27 wards of Brahmapur Municipality. Samples from all the 27 wards were selected due to the small geographical region. 1252 samples from non-slum households and 751 samples from slum households were selected for the survey. Proportional Probability Size (PPS) method was used to select samples from each of the ward and same method was used to draw samples from both the slum and non-slum regions. The households from both the slum and non-slum areas were selected through using systematic random sampling.

e. Questionnaire

The most common survey instrument is the traditional questionnaire, and its quality is crucial to that of the survey. The questionnaire must aim to collect as much information as possible but within a simply and easily understood framework. It takes a substantial amount of time to properly structure a questionnaire and the questionnaire designer must be intimately familiar with the questions, know their objectives, and the type of information needed. All questions should be relevant, meaning, designed to solicit information that fulfils the survey’s objectives, and accurate, meaning that they collect the information required in a valid and reliable manner. For example, the wording, style, type and sequence in which questions are asked must motivate the respondent and aid recall. Additionally, a questionnaire should avoid asking questions that are difficult to answer, time consuming or embarrassing. If necessary, experts should be consulted regarding the design of the survey. Ideally, questions should be pre-tested in order to eliminate ambiguity.
The Urban Corruption Survey questionnaire covers the following key issues:

Frequency of interaction: Organizations that the respondent has interacted within in the last one year and how often (whether once a month or more often, less than once a month or only once in the last one year)

Purpose of Interaction: The purpose of interaction could be classified into five categories as follows:

a. Services (e.g., health, education, utilities)

b. Law enforcement or regulatory related

c. Business related

d. Employment

e. Other

Bribery Incidence: Whether or not bribes are required or demanded to obtain or expedite services (or avoid law enforcement) and what the respondents expect to would be the consequences of declining to bribe (i.e., satisfactory service, bad service, harassment, delay or denial of service)

Bribery Transaction: The actual bribes that the respondents have paid or know others (e.g., friends, business associates or competitors) to have paid. Respondents are to provide information on the amount, the frequency (every day, at least once a week, at least once a month, at least once in the last 12 months), and the purpose of the bribe, as classified above

Corruption Trend: Organizations which respondents have perceived improvement or deterioration in the level of corruption, the magnitude (small, moderate or big), and the period over which the change is perceived (last one year, last three years, last five years)

A questionnaire used in an Urban Corruption Survey should be based on Transparency International's Bribery Index, which is an aggregate of 46 indicators, which capture different dimensions and impact of bribery. However, depending on the context of the survey not all indicators need be measured. Indicators could include:

Incidence: How often people are asked for bribes in the organizations that they deal with.

Prevalence: The percentage of the populations that is affected by bribery in an organization.

Severity: Consequences of reduction of bribe, resulting in unsatisfactory service to denial of service altogether (i.e. no bribe, no service).

Favouritism: Favouritism refers to preferential treatment offered to family, friend and other associates that renders them access to specific services or opportunities based on personal preference, not professional merit.

Frequency: The actual level of bribery reported in an organization, that is, how many officials of the organization receive bribes

Cost: The estimated cost of bribery in an organization to the public, measured as a “bribery tax” per person.
**Bribe size:** The average size of bribes paid to officials of the organization.

**Computation of the Bribery Index in YSD's Urban Corruption Survey**

The corruption/bribery index captures different dimensions and impacts of bribery. These could include incidence, prevalence, severity, favouritism, frequency, cost, and bribe size. The overall index is an aggregate of all the indicators. The first four indicators: incidence, prevalence, severity, and favouritism are percentages in the sample. The other three, frequency, cost, and size of bribe, are actual values and are scaled by the highest value to obtain an index where the highest value equals 100. The aggregate index is the simple (i.e., un-weighted) average of the seven indexes. The index ranks all the institutions for which the survey provided sufficient information for statistically valid comparison. Each service index is also calculated and then aggregate index will be calculated. For example: the index value will be kept at 0 to 100, frequency indicators of incidence, prevalence, severity, and favouritism are entered into the aggregate index or raw percentage, each service index is to be calculated separately and the higher the value, the worse the performance (higher the corruption).

**Methodology Action Points:**

1. Identify target audience(s). These might include service providers, civil society organizations, the media, the general population, the poor, government, and donors.

2. Think about methods of creating awareness, and gathering as well as disseminating the survey results: presentations, media, conferences, press releases, public hearings, workshops, press kits, seminars, theatre, artwork, songs, puppet shows, films and so on.

3. Issue a working paper/brief alongside with the publication of the survey results to make the results easier to understand and therefore making the tool easier to use for advocacy purposes.

4. Design and implement a strategy for dealing with the response from the media and the surveyed institutions/sectors.

5. Avoid confrontation with the institutions/government agencies that have been rated as the most corrupt/worst performing, by publicly explaining the methodology and the outcome. Also, include representatives from these institutions in events such as public hearings so they don't feel shut out and feel that they can express their views. This might involve including such representatives at separate times than beneficiaries as to avoid one group feeling intimidated and silenced by the presence of the other.

6. Emphasize the importance, usefulness, and practicality of the findings, for example, in policy making.

7. Make recommendations to bring about positive change in public service delivery implementation.

8. Continue to monitor and measure any changes over time and the pattern of such changes.
Limitations of the survey

A central limitation in studies of this kind is found in the computation of values. Computation of any aggregate index invariably entails making subjective judgments about what to include and what to omit, what measures to use, whether or not to attach weights to individual components and, if so, what weights to attach. Cross sectional comparison (ranking units at a point in time) often entails a trade-off with comparability over time and vice versa. Corruption is a very new area of academic research, and there is as yet no accepted standard from which to judge what dimensions of it are more critical than others. Finally, the indicators that are chosen may not be the only possible ones. For any one aggregate index, there is always a different equally valid set or combination of indicators that could yield different rankings.

Funding

Adequate financial resources are a necessity for the proper implementation of a comprehensive survey. Moreover, support from the local government (at least in part if not in full) is also a necessary component in assuring the sustainability and ownership of any project designed to increase transparency within public service delivery. The costs of the survey will vary depending on the sample size, questionnaire and the survey method.

Reporting

Findings of the survey need to focus on addressing the various target groups identified in the beginning of the exercise. While a technical report detailing the methodology, questions, and statistical details is important, separate reports on the different aspects of the results should be created that are tailored to different audiences. Each of the indicators should be presented and discussed separately in the technical report.

Use of Media

It is important to ensure the information is widespread and reaches different audiences. Therefore, the media should be notified of the results of the study and invited to participate in public hearings, workshops and discussion groups that disseminate the findings. Also the findings should be available in different media forms such as electronic, print and on the Internet as to improve the public’s access to the findings.

When would you use it?

The methodology for investigating corruption can be applied to key points in the infrastructure project cycle (proposal preparation, release of funds and procurement, implementation) as well as service delivery. The research would be employed for understanding the mechanisms of corruption and the strategies for tackling it.
Who uses it?

The survey methodology can be used by a wide variety of stakeholders: sectors within government, private and public regulators, service providers (to benchmark service quality, diagnose gaps or identify corrective action), NGOs and community-based organizations (to gather feedback from users and advocate for solutions to commonly encountered problems and issues), by stakeholders consortiums of government officials, community representatives, academics, the media and so forth. Multi-stakeholder partnerships can use the approach to come to a consensus regarding the degree of corruption within service delivery, identify key actions to address this, and monitor and evaluate improvements in the service delivery sector. Also, development agencies can use the survey to benchmark service quality and monitor service delivery improvements as a result of the intervention of development projects and government policies targeting corruption within service delivery.

In essence, the Urban Corruption Survey could be implemented by those who need to develop improved anti-corruption strategies; who are involved with infrastructure service delivery, and concerned about accountability; regulators of infrastructure services, and organized consumers and users of services.

How has it been used in the public service delivery sector?

Survey results that apply to corruption in service delivery can be used in general policy recommendations. Unfortunately, there is not much data on estimates of both grand and petty corruption in service delivery.

The methodology for investigating corruption includes numerous aspects of service delivery and identifies multiple reasons for corrupt, inefficient and ineffective service delivery. By getting more accurate information on when, why and how much the poor pay for service delivery, including information about the cost, timeliness, coverage, and quality of each service, service providers (the state, private sector and NGOs) are better informed and equipped to make decisions on how to improve service delivery. This information is essential to developing a pro-poor anti-corruption strategy.

What use is it to the poor?

A pro-poor focus in researching corruption intends to assess both the ways in which the poor are affected by corruption in the service delivery sector, and how accountability in service delivery improves the assets and capabilities of the poor. The findings of the survey research should enable the voices of the poor to be heard in policy discussions, as well as to ensure that publicly provided services are designed to specifically address the needs of the poor.

Moreover, surveys can empower the poor to participate in government processes and act as agents in understanding, anticipating and exploring their needs and interests and making sure that those needs and interests are articulated to government policy makers and advocated for when not met. The poor can establish a strong voice and participate in municipal agenda-setting and aid administrations in finding solutions to local infrastructure issues and problems, as the process of conducting an Urban Corruption Survey involves confronting the lack of knowledge
and power among poor populations that renders them vulnerable to manipulation by corrupt practices of others. The use of an Urban Corruption Survey works to displace the notion of the stereotypical image of the poor as helpless to change their impoverished circumstances and anonymous and passive service benefactors.

Urban corruption surveys allow the poor to recognize and develop their voice through providing them with a vehicle through which to rate their awareness of service delivery norms and satisfaction with the current quality of public service delivery they receive. With the Urban Corruption Survey poor populations can grade service quality, accessibility, transparency, adequacy, including the treatment they've received from service providers, allowing beneficiaries to express their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the services, rate service delivery fees as affordable or unaffordable, and share their experiences regarding interactions with public service delivery officials. These are all important aspect of policy creation. The welfare and opinions of the poor must be monitored regularly, to assess if public agencies are becoming more (or less) responsive to their clients.

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Urban Corruption Survey, Orissa, India.

The Urban Corruption Survey was the first of its kind to measure levels of corruption in public service delivery in a specific urban local region in India. YSD established a benchmark for petty corruption in Brahmapur city with the Bribery Index methodology. This used indicators to rank the most corrupted institutions and investigated the causes of bribery and/or petty corruption while tracking 6.1 million bribes in basic service delivery.

CASE SURVEY: Diagnostic surveys, Uganda.

Public expenditure tracking survey (PETS) and quantitative service delivery surveys (QSDS) are new tools for diagnosing corruption and other problems relating to basic service provision in developing countries.

CASE SURVEY: Urban Bribery Index, Kenya.

The Kenya Urban Bribery Survey is used to assess corrupt practices in urban areas and thereby help inform strategies to increase transparency and accountability at the local level.

CASE SURVEY: Participatory Corruption Appraisal, Indonesia.

In 2000-2001, the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia and the World Bank undertook a Participatory Corruption Assessment to explore how corruption affects the urban poor in Indonesia.

Sources of more information

National Household and Private Sector Survey on Corruption Transparency Maroc: www.transparencymaroc.org

National Household and Private Sector Survey on Corruption, Forum Civil/TI Senegal: www.forumcivil.sn

Measuring Transparency in Municipal and Central Governments, Freedom of
Information Citizen Centre, Japan: www.jkcc.gr.jp
Transparency International-Kenya: www.tikenya.org
Opacity Index: http://www-opacityindex.com/
TI Corruption Perception Index: http://www1.transparency.org/surveys/index.html#cpi
World Bank diagnostics webpage.
TI has developed a series of risk assessment discussion documents for the construction industry: http://www.transparency.org.uk/construction.htm
Citizen Capacity Building

What is it?

Citizen group capacity building uses knowledge, training, community meetings and workshops, and other strategies to encourage civil society to express their views and interests and demand that their rights be upheld by governing bodies. Civil society can includes poor and marginalized populations, independent media, local communities, NGOs, trade unions, interest groups, professional organizations and the private sector.

Why would it be used?

Strengthening public knowledge and voice are two effective ways to engage the public in governance processes and anti-corruption initiatives. Civic skills can teach citizens and communities how to confront local and national issues of concern and when needed, advocate for change. Case studies have proven that increased public participation, access to information and level of awareness, are factors that can indirectly influence corruption. Additionally, an empowered public displays a greater involvement in and responsiveness to public policies, and is more likely to demand improved quality and quantity of public services, which in turn, positively influences development projects' outcomes. Furthermore, this also puts pressure on the government to respond to citizens' demands for quality public services and encourages dialogue between the two. Additionally, a demand for greater accountability and control of corruption among a network of citizen's groups fosters a dynamic system of checks and balances, which can reduce corruption.

How to use it?

The following accountability mechanisms aim to increase a citizen's civic skills by increasing their ability to gather and interpret information, to speak and listen cooperatively, to engage in dialogue effectively about conflicts and differences, to resolve conflicts, reach agreements, collaborate with peers, understand government policies and procedures, and advocate for change. Overall, increasing a citizen's civic knowledge should strengthen their voice and influence over public policies, the use of public resources, and empower them to play a more active role in decisions that affect them, with the aim of reducing the accountability gap between citizens and policy makers and improving provision of public services.
a. Increasing citizen knowledge and engagement

It is often the case that citizen's rights are violated or simply not upheld because citizens are ignorant of the rights and the services to which they are entitled. Knowledge of human rights, public service delivery norms and government programmes help citizens to develop expectations of effective service delivery implementation. Additionally, how to effectively engage with policymakers and the system and complaints mechanisms, encourages the public to demand that those rights be met and to engage with the government to increase quality, transparency and accountability in basic programmes and services. Citizen's knowledge can be increased through awareness raising/lobbying activities, organised protests, participatory budgeting and monitoring of public services and expenditures, citizens' feedback mechanisms, capacity building initiatives, complaints mechanisms, etc. Most importantly, knowledge also increases a citizen's confidence and empowerment to effectively engage with community members and government stakeholders in demanding their rights be met.

b. Citizen skill building

Citizen skill building can take the form of public workshops, training programmes, public meetings, etc. Below are some essential components to citizen skill building:

1. Building the capacity of media to establish a free press. Independent media can garner public support for anti-corruption initiatives and good governance. Initiatives focused on building the capacity of the media to investigate and expose corruption cases and more broadly, to support the emergence of a free and independent press can serve to educate and inform the public about corrupt government practices and galvanise public opinion and action against corruption.

2. Teaching citizens how to think critically. Generally, one would think that this would occur in schools or among families at home, but this is often not the case. Critical thinking is an important component in a citizen's ability to gather and process information, and distil information and experience into an overall understanding of major common issues in society. Citizens should be able to discern fact from fiction in the media, rumour from news, and demagoguery from honest debate.

3. Teaching citizens how to use the advocacy tools that exist in their community. An extremely important advocacy tool is the public's right to official information. Access to information is essential to generate and support citizen demand for good governance and anti-corruption, as it is not possible to mobilise for change
without access to information. Only informed citizens can stand up for their rights and hold public officials accountable for their actions and decisions. Right to information can allow citizen to observe the transparency, accountability and anti-corruption initiatives present in government processes. Therefore, skill building initiatives should focus on educating citizens regarding their right to information enshrined in their country's constitution and how to utilize that right to its full potential. This would include holding workshops on what information is accessible through the right to information laws, how to properly file a right to information application and how to file a complaint or appeal the application if the government response is unsatisfactory.

1. Training citizens in how to become more involved in policy development and implementation in their community. This includes citizen monitoring, which trains citizens on how to conduct a social audit of government programmes through directly monitoring those programmes in action and observing if those programmes meet their service delivery norms and prescribed legislation. Key monitoring data and information enables citizens to advocate for change and demand better public service outcomes. Participatory monitoring mechanisms can take many forms including citizen report cards, social audits (as mentioned above) and participatory or expenditure tracking.

c. Empowering citizen voice

It is important that citizens are not only knowledgeable about government programmes, initiatives, service delivery norms and advocacy tools, but that they know how to properly organize and use that knowledge to better the services that they receive. A citizen should have the ability to speak effectively on public issues, have strong communication skills, and be adept at listening to others. A citizen should possess the ability to understand, be understood, and be sensitive to different points of view and the reasons behind them. As well, a citizen should be able to discuss controversial issues in an informed way that does not include demonizing others or their opinions.

Empowering citizen voice can overlap with skill building in terms of how it trains citizens to effectively communicate with government officials. A central aspect in strengthening a citizen's voice is providing citizens with the knowledge to increase their confidence and the skills to empower them to action. A citizen's ability to express his/her viewpoints and demand for public accountability can be established by involving citizens in activities in which they are encouraged to express their views publicly. These can include focus groups, community meetings, workshops, public hearings, etc. Citizens should be comfortable challenging ideas and questioning positions that they either don't understand or don't see as playing a positive role in their community's development.
When would you use it?

Citizen capacity building should not be limited to a time or place; it should be an ongoing developmental activity in a democratic society. Citizen capacity building is an important issue and achievement for any and all anti-corruption programmes, which serve to inform the population.

Who uses it?

Everyday citizens, service providers, educators, government officials, NGOs, private organizations; essentially, every member of society can benefit from expanding their knowledge of their civic responsibilities and through that strengthening their individual rights, their community cohesiveness, and reinforcing the foundation of democracy on which their government is built.

How has it been used in the service delivery sector?

Since 1998, Practical Action, an international NGO, has been testing participatory approaches to better delivery basic services. Most recently Practical Action has called up participatory approaches to address components of good governance, such as improved accountability and collective decision-making. Additionally, YSD employs participatory approaches in its anti-corruption campaigns through involving community groups, citizens and service providers in public hearings, meetings, workshops and conferences. YSD uses various participatory methods to educate the public about how the local government works and what ethical standards its policy and practice should reflect as well as teaching citizens how to have realistic expectations about the delivery of public services. YSD’s Urban Corruption Survey and Citizen Report Card specifically aim to shed light on the public institutions and services that are functioning below standard and not meeting the population’s rights and needs.

What use is it to the poor?

Information about the civic knowledge, anti-corruption tools as well as the nature and scope of corruption (including the harm that it causes to citizens) creates a general public awareness among populations that are suffering the most as a result of corrupt practices (such as poor and marginalized communities), and awakens citizens to the true costs of corruption, which is lowering their quality of life by providing sub-par services. When a population becomes aware of how daily corruption lowers their quality of life, and are provided with the tools and support not only to confront this but to change it, public support can be easily mobilized for anti-corruption policies and programmes. The long-term effect of this process of citizen education and skill building can unite, mobilise and empower poor and marginalized populations. When citizens learn how to effectively battle corruption and participate in anti-corruption initiatives, they also have incentives to participate in public functions in general, as they have acquired the knowledge and skills to do so effectively. The participation of poor and marginalized populations in public policy that directly affects them allows for an improvement in such policy through the expression and advocacy of the rights and needs of the citizens.
Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Anti-Corruption Project Phase-2, Orissa, India.

Youth for Social Development (YSD) led an anti-corruption project phase-2, following their phase-1 project of the same name, to promote transparency and prevent bribery in basic public service delivery (e.g. water supply, public distribution system and land record) by enabling citizen and civil society monitoring and active participation, utilization of right to information, and facilitating advocacy to reduce corruption and improve service delivery in Brahmapur city of Orissa. This included establishing citizen monitoring committees, citizen training programmes, a citizens educational handbook on Right to Information, and organizing public hearings which included citizens, service providers and other concerned beneficiaries.

CASE SURVEY: Report cards, India. First used in Bangalore in 1993, report cards use citizen feedback (from the poor and marginalized sections of society) to rate the performance of public services agencies, such as the electricity board and water board.

CASE SURVEY: Report cards, Orissa, India. The YSD-led citizens' report card in Orissa, India, used the methodology of a Citizen Report Card (Bangalore) in assessing urban basic service in Brahmapur city of Orissa and used the information gathered through the report card to initiate civic engagement and demand improvements in basic services.

CASE SURVEY: Urban Corruption Survey, Orissa, India. The YSD Urban Corruption Survey established a benchmark for petty corruption in Brahmapur city with the Bribery Index methodology. This used indicators to rank the most corrupted institutions and investigated the causes of bribery and/or petty corruption while tracking 6.1 million bribes in basic service delivery.

Sources of more information

On Community Engagement:


The Government of Queensland, Australia, Online documentation on the "International Conference on Engaging Communities" (Brisbane, Australia; 14-17 August 2005). http://www.engagingcommunities2005.org/home.html

On Engaged Governance:

http://www.unpan.org/corethemes.asp


Community Engagement Techniques and Methods:

A website of the Community Engagement & Development Policy Unit of the Department of Communities, the Government of Queensland, Australia. www.getinvolved.qld.gov.au

Training Materials for Civic Engagement:


GIP 2010, Proceedings, Governance in Practice Network, facilitated by Practical Action and atleast 3 times per year.


Creation of Citizen Monitoring Committees and Social Audits

What is it?
A social audit or public audit is an ongoing process through which a citizen or group of citizens can participate in the monitoring and implementation of development work. It gives any citizen the legitimacy, not just to seek information, but also to record complaints, suggestions, and demand answers in the public domain. It allows for collective evaluation, and use of the non-written mode, and mandates demystification of documents and procedures. Training communities to monitor the delivery of essential services establishes a system of direct accountability to those communities that receive such services. If the users, especially the poor, can monitor and discipline poorly performing service providers, this is said to result in better infrastructure services. Moreover, if service providers receive the proper training and empowerment to self-monitor their implementation of service delivery and develop a cooperative relationship with the users as community monitors, it is less likely that corruption will occur.

Why would it be used?
The 2004 World Development Report connected effective government services with users (in this case the poor) at the centre of service provision, enabling them to monitor and discipline service providers, amplifying their voice in policy making, and strengthening the incentives for service providers to serve the poor. The ability to monitor service providers changes behaviour, social norms and institutional quality, even when institutional structure itself does not change.

Citizen Monitoring/Community Social Auditing through Community Score Card (CSC) process is a community-based monitoring tool and an instrument to exact social and public accountability and responsiveness from service providers. However, by including an interface meeting between service providers and the community that allows for immediate feedback, the process is also a strong instrument for empowerment.

How to use it?
It is hard for poor populations to have access to their entitlements due to the lack of information about their rights. NGOs such as YSD have trained slum inhabitants to monitor the bidding process of rural road projects, such as the contract selection process and awards (e.g. how, on what basis, criterion, bid selection, transparency,
corruption, abuse of confidentiality, conflict of interest, etc.), as well as the contract implementation and checking the quality of the rural roads (e.g. compliances with the agreement, quality maintained, contract reconciliation, price, time, efficiency and utilization of public resources, etc.)

Youth for Social Development began by designing a pilot phase, during which research was conducted to develop an understanding of the procurement process of PMGSY roads and develop check lists and monitoring parameters to be used by citizens. In the second step, YSD partnered with Public Affairs Centre, Bangalore, to design technical audit parameters to be used by community monitors in checking the quality of the PMGSY roads and monitoring the contract implementation, which emphasized the compliance to the agreement, as well as the quality and efficiency of the execution process. The Community Monitoring programme aligned with the objective to improve transparency and accountability and reduce risks of corruption with citizen participation, monitoring and advocate to improve in the process.

Public procurement is a key economic activity of the government and it is carried out with the taxpayer’s money, which has most vulnerable to corruption. Community monitoring of public procurement enhances transparency, good management, prevents misconduct, accountability, controls corruption and prevents waste of public resources. On the other side it also improves quality of service delivery (durability in case large scale infrastructure projects e.g. roads, bridges), and enhances the social and economic life of the poor and marginalized, while increasing development. Additionally, good quality of the transport (rural roads) enhances livelihood and opens better access to basic services like health and education.

The project aimed to address three specific needs among impoverished populations: a general lack of knowledge and information on the bidding process (the programme generated knowledge and information based on the bidding processes in PMGSY through the Right to Information); general lack of knowledge on road construction specifications and quality (the programme demystified and democratized knowledge of road construction through developing a specific toolkit to monitor the quality of rural roads (PMGSY)); the absence of community monitoring of the quality of roads (the programme created sustainable community road monitoring groups). It is in this vein that citizen monitoring and social audits can prove a successful tool in monitoring a wide variety of public services.

The Community Score Card process is an important part of social audits as it uses the community as its unit of analysis and is focused on monitoring at the local/facility level. It can therefore facilitate the monitoring and performance evaluation of services, projects and even government administrative units (like district assemblies, panchayats, municipalities) by the community themselves. Community members with knowledge of public services and policies should be recruited and trained from the target areas as citizen monitors. CSC is a grassroots process that can be employed in rural/urban settings.

The Community Score Card process allows for the tracking of inputs and expenditures, monitoring of quality of services and projects, generation of benchmark performance criteria that can be used in resource allocation and budget decisions,
comparison of performance across facilities/districts, generating a direct feedback mechanism between the service provider and user, building local capacity, strengthening the citizen's voice and community empowerment. The following points can be kept in mind to assure that a community-based audit is a success: (1) Ensure that citizens have the incentives and ability to monitor and discipline the service provider. (2) Develop organizational capacity and leadership in civil society organizations to overcome co-ordination and collective action problems. (3) Create incentives for policy makers and providers so that they respond to citizens' voice and participation. (3) Think about ways to scaling up ad hoc and fragmented voice and participation initiatives. (4) Remove fear of harassment. (5) Request that annual reports from service providers include a clear statement from the chief executive officer (CEO) about the organization's stance on corruption and should outline its corruption prevention strategies.

When would you use it?

Community-based audits can be conducted to expose corruption in public service delivery and government programmes and as a preventative measure to make sure that such services and programs are adhering to quality standards and delivery norms. Community audits can be used both as a deterrent to corrupt practices and as a means to investigate and expose corruption within services and government programmes.

Who uses it?

NGOs, local community organizations, and private and public programmes can employ citizen monitors to provide monitoring and evaluation of specific services and programmes. Service users and beneficiaries are often considered well placed to monitor the services upon which they depend as they have daily face-to-face interactions with front-line providers. Citizen monitoring is also a useful tool to educate citizens about service delivery norms and empower residents to monitor the programmes and services on which they depend. For a citizen to know that their knowledge and actions can affect the quality of services they receive is the first step in organizing communities to become advocates for quality services and programmes. There is a strong precedent of the poor participating in community monitoring of the water sector and as a result of such, many water projects targeting the poor have adopted participatory principles. Community pressure can also create incentives for zero corruption where front-line service providers are a permanent part of the community.

How has it been used in the service delivery sector?

Citizens have been directly involved in fighting corruption by monitoring their infrastructure delivery. For example: YSD has conducted social audits in few poverty alleviation schemes like Public Distribution System, Drinking Water and Sanitation, Integrated Child Development Programme and is now in the process of conducting social audit in Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme of JNNURM scheme in Brahmapur city of Orissa. YSD also builds skills of citizens to conduct monitoring of rural road construction and maintenance.
YSD in partnership with Public Affairs Centre, Bangalore, used Community Score Card method to monitor the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in Bolangir district of Orissa, as well as public institutions’ adherence to Right to Information in Brahmapur Municipal Corporation.

Additionally, in slum areas of Delhi, India, NGOs such as Satark Nagrik Sangathan and Parivartan have provided training and support for communities to access information on infrastructure using the Right To Information (RTI, 2001). Community members have also been trained to monitor construction projects to provide community control over the quality of construction and to act as a safeguard against corruption.

In Bangalore, India, the Children's Movement for Civic Awareness has surveyed the quality of the city's roads. The children were given checklists in order to monitor the presence of side drains, the evenness of surface of the footpath, obstructions to pedestrians, the number of potholes, number of cracked areas, presence of signs or painted lines to indicate a road hump, and unfilled or uncompacted holes for electrical or telephone cables. The children presented the findings on quality of roads to the Bangalore municipal commissioner at a public hearing and the findings were reported to newspapers.

Service users may be represented on the boards of public utility regulatory bodies such as they are in Ghana, or involved in nationwide consumer watchdog groups such as they are in Zambia.

Transparency International Bulgaria undertook to monitor the privatization process of Bulgaria's telecommunications company. Its findings and subsequent publication on corruption in the process led to the privatization process being halted. TI Bulgaria was then officially invited to monitor the bidding and implementation of further national privatization projects.

The ongoing World Bank effort to build a database of road construction and rehabilitation costs should help to provide benchmarks against which to estimate excess costs of construction in transport: http://www.worldbank.org/transport/roads/rd_tools/rocks_main.htm

In the Philippines, the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH) launched the 'Bantay Lansangan' (National Road Watch) Programme to increase access to information on DPWH projects. It aims to eradicate corruption in road building and maintenance efforts through the participation of all road stakeholders -government, the private sector, NGOs and road users- in the understanding, review, analysis, monitoring, and advocacy of reforms in the road sector.

The Public Affairs Centre, an Indian non-governmental organization based in Bangalore, pioneered a new approach to regulatory oversight. Using public meetings and a questionnaire-based survey summarized in a report card, it conducted a large social audit of perceptions about the public services provided by municipal authorities, including the Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board. The audit highlighted weak customer orientation, high levels of corruption and the perceived high-cost and poor-quality of service provision. Following a second audit in 1999, the
state government and municipal agencies embarked on a process of structured consultation. The Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board initiated joint programmes with local citizens groups and residents associations to improve services, extend connection to poor households and debate reform options. New grievance procedures were established to address corruption. By 2003, the social audit was registering real improvements, with poor households reporting a sharp reduction in bribes for connections and improvements in efficiency.

What use is it to the poor?

Improving services means making the interests of poor people matter more to providers; engaging poor clients in an active role - as purchasers, as monitors, and as co-producers (the 'short route of accountability') - can improve performance significantly. The poor have been involved in social and advocacy movements through which citizens have advocated for better service provision from the state as a social right.

The Indian NGO Parivartan has had success at mobilizing residents to monitor service providers, for example, by singing songs to inspire people to demand their rights and to participate actively in governance. Songs like Gandhi Tere Desh Mein describe the poor state of development in the country and the various problems faced by the poor, including the high levels of corruption they have to contend with. Other songs have described the rights of citizens and have urged them to call the government to hisab (account) - the rationale being 'hamara paisa hamra hisab' (our taxpayers money, our accounts).

Volunteers also use muhphat (puppet shows) to voice people’s expectations and demands for clean water, sanitation and basic infrastructure.

Parivartan has also developed training and information pamphlets to enable communities to monitor the work of contractors, in terms of how to evaluate the quality of work, the quality of materials delivered to them, and how to document and report problems they discover during construction.

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Report Cards, Orissa and Karnataka, India.

First used in Bangalore in 1993, report cards use citizen feedback (from the poor and marginalized sections of society) to rate the performance of public services agencies, such as the electricity board and water board.

YSD used the methodology of a Citizen Report Card in assessing urban basic service in Brahmapur city of Orissa and used the information gathered through the report card to initiate civic engagement and demand improvements in basic services.

CASE SURVEY: Community Score Card, Orissa, India.

YSD in partnership with Public Affairs Centre, Bangalore, used Community Score Card method to monitor the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in Bolangir district of Orissa, as well as public institutions’ adherence to Right to Information in Brahmapur Municipal Corporation.
CASE SURVEY: Social Audit and Citizen Monitoring, Orissa, India.
YSD has conducted social audits in few poverty alleviation schemes like Public Distribution System, Drinking Water and Sanitation, Integrated Child Development Programme and is now in the process of conducting social audit in Integrated Housing and Slum Development Programme of JNNURM scheme in Brahmapur city of Orissa. YSD also builds skills of citizens to conduct monitoring of rural road construction and maintenance.

CASE SURVEY: Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Governance, Philippines.
In the Philippines, civil society organizations have become partners with government agencies in order to reduce corruption in public works as well as in ensuring transparency.

CASE SURVEY: Committees of Concerned Citizens, Dhaka.
Transparency International Bangladesh created grassroots pressure groups called Committees of Concerned Citizens (CCCs) to 'promote integrity and curb corruption in public sector service delivery systems'.

CASE SURVEY: Parivartan, India.
An NGO called Parivartan, along with a number of people living in slum areas in Delhi have been accessing records of public works in various parts of Delhi where corruption is suspected in the delivery of public works.

Sources of more information


The Public Affairs Centre: www.pacindia.org

UN-HABITAT (online) Report Card on Public Services in Bangalore. UN-HABITAT Best Practices website: http://www.bestpractices.org


Stop Corruption: http://www.stopcor.ru/?english

Fostering Partnerships Between Service Providers, Government Officials and Citizens

What is it?
Partnering is a co-operative relationship between people or groups who agree to share responsibility for achieving a specific goal. Partnerships to combat corruption in the infrastructure sector might include government, private companies, labour unions, professional associations, chambers of commerce, religious organizations, student groups, cultural societies and informal community groups or grassroots associations.

Why would you use it?
Multi-sector partnerships between engineering services contractors, the state and civil society organizations are recognized to be an important strategy for poverty reduction. Like poverty, corruption is a deep-rooted and complex problem that comprises political, economic and social dimensions. If its causes are multi-dimensional, it follows that any strategy aimed at combating corruption must be similarly multi-dimensional in its approach. It is apparent that the public and private sector and civil society need to collaborate and pool their resources in order to combat corruption. Partnerships create a mix of local public pressure, competition, information and publicity. Partnerships are able to trigger changes in either service norms (re-shaping attitudes, reversing public apathy and changing tolerance towards corruption) or the ways services are delivered (organizational change - for example, monitoring the social and ethical performance of public officials).
How to use it?

Partnerships can be used for carrying out corruption surveys, acting as advocates for clean government, stakeholder consultations and public hearings, exposing abuses and creating public awareness, acting as service providers in areas where (corrupt)governments fail to deliver services, formulating and promoting action plans to fight corruption, monitoring government action and decisions, and providing leadership to remove corrupt leaders.

Organizing citizens can be a daunting task, particularly in developing countries that lack consumer associations and community social infrastructure. Tactics to organize citizens can include the use of TV and radio to broadcast messages and campaigns to a wide audience, establishment of mechanisms for citizens to freely express public opinions and make sure their voice is reflected in government decisions, such as public hearings, which increase service providers' responsiveness and accountability to the community. Improving citizen knowledge on how to report corruption can also organize citizens as they recognize one another as sharing a common goal towards lessening corruption in their community, also citizens can provide moral support to those reporting corrupt acts. As well, incentives can be provided for bureaucrats to take notice and act upon complaints of corruption. Workshops, conferences and other public events relevant to corruption in public service delivery can prove helpful in facilitating knowledge sharing and information.

Holding public hearings is part of the implementation of each of YSD's programmes. The goals of such are the following: participation of public officials in YSD social audit process and discourse with community in meetings, active participation of citizens and citizen groups in the audit process, and generating a set of advocacy agenda points, senior government officials/public service providers acknowledgement of citizen complaints regarding public service delivery, senior government officials/public service providers establishment of mechanisms to address complaints and improve public service delivery, and a decreased number of public service delivery complaints. YSD ensures community participation in its programmes through being persistently engaged with the community through different interventions in its project areas. YSD is in the continual process of mobilizing communities through working with their governing bodies and often going door-to-door engaging citizens in local issues that affect the quality of their lives.
When would you use it?

Partnerships with service users and in particular the poor, are thought to result in more accessible, accountable and transparent services. The expertise of NGOs or the private sector on corruption can play a crucial role in providing technical support to reforms. NGOs have played a key role in making citizens aware of their rights and training them in obtaining what they are legally entitled to.

Who uses it?

NGOs, government service providers, businesses, community groups and organizations all have been found to use partnership to increase the quality of their services and community access. Such partnerships allow different sectors (government, the private sector and NGOs) and professionals (engineers, sociologists, health workers, planners and so on) to input their different skills and finances and encourage multi-disciplinary approaches. NGOs, in particular, help to fill gaps in understanding about the poor, facilitate civil society involvement and provide skills that other partners lack.

Partnerships at the project level are exemplified by:

The YSD-led citizens’ report card in Orissa, India, which partnered with NGOs in its use of the methodology of a Citizen Report Card (Bangalore) in assessing urban basic service in Brahmapur city of Orissa and used the information gathered through the report card to initiate civic engagement and demand improvements in basic services;

Additionally the YSD Urban Corruption Survey partnered with organizations to establish a benchmark for petty corruption in Brahmapur city with the Bribery Index methodology. This used indicators to rank the most corrupted institutions and investigated the causes of bribery and/or petty corruption while tracking 6.1 million bribes in basic service delivery;

Community Score Card (NREGA and RTI). YSD in partnership with Public Affairs Centre, Bangalore, used Community Score Card method to monitor the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in Bolangir district of Orissa, as well as public institutions’ adherence to Right to Information in Brahmapur Municipal Corporation;

Anti-corruption Helpline: In partnership with the YSD established Coalition Against Corruption (CAC), an anti-corruption 'Helpline', was formed to register complaints
against corruption, then forwarded to senior level officials in the concerned government departments for remedial action. CAC then follows up on government response to complaints and involves media in positive and negative government responses to complaints;

The citizens' report card in Bangalore, India, which has resulted in an increase in citizen satisfaction with local agencies and in a decline in corruption;

Expenditure tracking surveys in Uganda, which have led to a reduction in budgetary leakages to local schools;

The participatory budgeting process in Porto Alegre, Brazil (and others);

The E-procurement of the Mexican government (Compranet);

Governance reforms undertaken in Albania, following the first in-depth country corruption diagnostic study in the late 1990s; and

Social audits conducted by the YSD and MKSS in India, which have yielded a wealth of information and documentation on corruption in public projects (many of which had been previously cleared by the public auditors).

How has it been used in the service delivery sector?

The majority of YSD's programmes would not be possible without the participation of service providers and other agencies. YSD engages with public officials and elected representatives at the local, district and city level. YSD works closely with Brahmapur Municipal Corporation, District Administration, on basic service delivery, Public Distribution System (PDS) and Right To Information (RTI). YSD also works with departments like urban and rural development, food supplies and consumers welfare at the state level and also with the Orissa State Information Commission. YSD also engages in alliance building for effective advocacy for improved governance (transparency and accountability). It has formed a city level Coalition Against Corruption (CAC) an alliance of civil society organization to fight against corruption and improve service delivery. The CAC meets in every quarter to discuss and action against corruption in public departments in Brahmapur city. Additionally YSD is member of few coalitions at the district and state level.

In the Philippines, civil society organizations have become partners with government agencies in order to reduce corruption in public works as well as to ensure transparency. One example of this is the Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good
Government (CCAGG), an NGO watchdog based in the Province of Abra. CCAGG monitors public projects implementation extensively. They have documented numerous instances of corruption in public projects such as ghost projects and incomplete works. CCAGG organizes and trains communities in monitoring their infrastructure construction projects and has conducted a participatory audit (in conjunction with the UNDP and Philippine Commission on Audit). Here residents themselves assessed the actual benefits derived from the public expenditures.

Government officials have since become ‘quite cautious’ about their actions in case they get ‘CCAGGed’ (the new slang term for having one's anomalies exposed). Such cases demonstrate that NGOs and communities can be effective auditors, ensuring that construction projects are properly executed/implemented and can also enhance transparency and accountability.

Procurement Watch, Inc. (PWI; another non-governmental organization), specializes in building systems of transparency and accountability into government contracting and procurement practices. PWI has also developed partnerships with government agencies to observe and study the systems in place for soliciting proposals and evaluating bids and awards. As part of this process, PWI conducts diagnostic exercises on procurements managed by the Bids and Awards Committee (BAC) of various agencies, including the health and defence agencies. Similarly, PWI has assisted the Philippine Ports Authority in preparing the terms of reference for the bidding of its port security services. PWI also develops research papers and press releases on the subject of best practices in procurement procedures.

The Public-Private Partnerships against Corruption Project has been implemented in Russia since 2001. Also in Russia, the Tomsk Coalition against Corruption unites 28 organizations such as non-profit organizations, business associations and media.

Coalition participants engaged in the task of raising the civic and legal awareness of the population, provided assistance to victims of corrupt public officials; this in turn attracted the attention of the general public to the necessity of counteracting corruption: http://www.changemakers.net/enus/node/847.

In Porto Alegre communities have started to assume part of the responsibility for the quality of services: users have promised the utility that they will help to prevent clandestine water connections, conserve the supply network, control consumption and combat the loss of water.
In Bangladesh, the Dhaka Water & Sewerage Authority and Chittagong Water & Sewerage Authority have directly worked in partnership with local NGOs to ensure the expansion of utility connections to the poorest slum areas in the cities, at a cost affordable to the households in these areas. The subsequent increase in bill collection and reduction in illegal connections also highlights the importance of involving users and civil society in a service that they want and are willing to pay for.

In some countries, the poor performance of the existing water provider has led to the active involvement of trade unions or workers' cooperatives in running services. In Bangladesh, the government gave the employees' union the contract to run the water system in one part of the capital city Dhaka, with another zone given to a local private company. After the first year of this experiment, the employees' co-operative had produced results so good that the water and sanitation authority handed over the private sector's contract to the union. The employees' co-operative achieved substantial improvements not only in customer services, billing and collection of fees, but also in reducing water loss. Corruption was reduced as staff were paid a real living-wage. Overall, the co-operative out-performed not only the private company, but also the existing public utility.

*What use is it to the poor?*

Existing NGOs and community-based organizations (CBOs) provide an important vehicle for working with poor communities. Efforts should be made to draw them into partnerships. Evidence suggests that those partnerships that have included NGOs in the past, for instance, have targeted the poor more effectively. Partnerships between the poor, government and the private sector also represent a change to the aggressive or confrontational stance (sit-ins, processions) the poor traditionally use to protest or to combat corruption. Partnerships can build up citizen empowerment, as people can use their new knowledge as a weapon against corruption and by increasing the information needed to develop their personal sense of capability and entitlement people increase their collective power over providers by organizing in groups. Additionally, citizens are develop the tools to fulfill their needs and aspirations.

Related case surveys

**CASE SURVEY: Committees of Concerned Citizens, Dhaka. Transparency International Bangladesh created grassroots pressure groups called Committees of Concerned Citizens (CCCs) to 'promote integrity and curb corruption in public sector service delivery systems'.**
CASE SURVEY: Parivartan, India. An NGO called Parivartan, along with a number of people living in slum areas in Delhi, have been accessing records of public works in various parts of Delhi where corruption is suspected in the delivery of public works.

CASE SURVEY: Integrity pacts, Korea. An integrity pact contains important mutual commitments made by public officials in charge of the procurement and bidders for construction works or providers of goods and services.

CASE SURVEY: Poder Cuidadano, Argentina. Poder Cuidadano developed The Programme for Transparent Contracting, which combines a public hearing and signing of an integrity pact wherein the municipal authorities and all businesses competing in a bidding process make mutual commitments to prevent the payment of bribes.

CASE SURVEY: Participatory Budgeting, Brazil. Participatory Budgeting has been used in a number of Brazilian cities to determine priorities for the use of part of the city's revenues.

CASE SURVEY: Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Governance, Philippines. In the Philippines, civil society organizations have become partners with government agencies in order to reduce corruption in public works as well as in ensuring transparency.

Sources of more information

Global Advice Network: http://www.business-anti-corruption.dk/

CEO Europe: http://www.corporateeurope.org

Partnerships for Transparency: http://www.partnershipfortransparency.info

The Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption: http://www.parlcent.ca/gopac/index_e.php


PROBIDAD: http://www.probidad.org

Americas Accountability/Anti-Corruption Project (AAA) Respondanet: www.respondanet.com

Global Access Project (Centre for Public Integrity): http://www.publicintegrity.org

Corruption Prevention Network: http://www.corruptionprevention.net

Transparency International: www.transparency.org

Parivartan: http://www.parivartan.com

Indonesia Corruption Watch: http://www.antikorupsi.org

TIRI: www.tiri.org
Networking Civil Organizations to Create a Coalition Against Corruption

What is it?

A coalition against corruption is a process of cooperation between various stakeholders with the aim to collectively launch initiatives to counter corruption and strengthen anti-corruption mechanisms in governance. A coalition can include companies, governments and civil society organizations which join forces to guarantee transparency and accountability in private and public service delivery.

Why would you use it?

Establishing alliances between like-minded organizations allows the issue of corruption to be approached and resolved from multiple angles and the impact of individual action can be increased. Collective action in the form of a coalition can prove to be a useful method to countering corruption jointly with all stakeholders in environments where corruption is entrenched and or legal enforcement of anti-corruption mechanisms are weak.

Coalitions against corruption serve as important tools in fostering key stakeholders (such as in the public sector, private sector and civil society) participation to establish deep-rooted anti-corruption culture in a sector. Such long term initiatives create the fundamental conditions for anti-corruption mechanisms to be effective and upheld by service providers and beneficiaries in the long run.

How to use it?

Coalitions against corruption can act as watchdogs to monitor the degree to which the government and private sector is effectively implementing anti-corruption strategies. Also coalitions can embark on awareness campaigns to make the general public aware of the benefits of fighting corruption and joining organizations that are part of a coalition. Coalitions can engage in advocacy to stimulate populations against corruption by providing information on the scope and consequences of corruption with the aim of stimulating a zero-tolerance for corruption.
Coalition initiatives can include the promotion of collective anti-corruption mechanisms such as the organization of service provider roundtables, best practice sharing, information campaigns, disseminating of advocacy materials in the form of leaflets and posters, providing resources and anti-corruption training for other NGOs and government oversight agencies, as well as cooperating with local anti-corruption authorities to produce regulatory reform.

*When would you use it?*

Anti-corruption coalitions can be useful in any society where corruption is present. Coalitions can be of use in a society that suffers from weak governance, poor service delivery and poverty; as well as in societies that have anti-corruption mechanisms that are failing to be implemented, or no anti-corruption mechanism at all. Coalitions can help to establish or strengthen such mechanisms, examine causes of corruption, and disseminate information to inform the public and government officials about the widespread harms created by corruption and use their sway to influence public policy in such as way so that governance mechanisms are strengthened and corruption is discouraged.

*Who uses it?*

Many NGOs, local organizations, private organizations, and government bodies across the globe have recognized the importance of forming coalitions against corruption and how they are a useful tool for strengthening governance and reducing corruption. In 2000, Transparency in Nigeria (a national chapter of Transparency International, the global coalition against corruption) began the first interaction session to form a coalition around the issues of corruption in Nigerian society and government. With the help of the International Human Rights Law Group, organizations were united and a year later formed the Zero-Corruption Coalition, whose mission is to "re-establish the culture of Transparency, Accountability, Integrity and respect for Human dignity in order to attain Good Governance and Social Justice" with the vision of creating "A Nigerian Society with Zero-Tolerance for Corruption." The coalition includes over 50 organizations and individuals from NGOs, government oversight agencies, labour unions, organized private sector bodies, professional groups and faith-based organizations. The coalition began by examining the weaknesses in the legal anti-corruption framework and strategizing on improvements. The coalition has identified lacking provisions within the government's Corruption Practices and other Related Offences Act specifically, in regard to the protection of whistleblowers and public access to information. The coalition drafted a bill including protection for whistleblowers to present to the national assembly. In addition to facilitating community participation and support for anti-corruption initiatives, the coalition has established a Zero-Corruption list-serve, which is an
interactive e-group, used to collate and disseminate global, regional and national initiatives, information, events and news in the area of anti-corruption.

*How has it been used in the service delivery sector?*

YSD engages in alliance building for effective advocacy for improved governance (transparency and accountability). It has formed a city level Coalition Against Corruption (CAC) an alliance of civil society organization to fight against corruption and improve service delivery. The CAC meets in every quarter to discuss and action against corruption in public departments in Brahmapur city. Additionally YSD is member of few coalitions at the district and state level.

*What use is it to the poor?*

Coalitions can both educate the poor and serve as powerful platforms for the expression of their views, needs and experience. Coalitions can advocate for the needs and issues that poor and marginalized populations face, which are often worsened by corrupt practices in public service delivery. Coalitions can also serve as a tool to unite otherwise fragmented poor communities and organize residents to effectively campaign against corruption.

Related case surveys

**International Coalitions Against Corruption**

CASE SURVEY: Since 1993, Transparency International (TI), a global network including more than 90 locally established national chapters and chapters-information, has been working to fight corruption in the national arena. The network includes relevant players from government, civil society, business and the media that work to promote transparency in elections, in public administration, in procurement and in business. TI's global network of chapters and contacts also use advocacy campaigns to lobby governments to implement anti-corruption reforms.

CASE SURVEY: The Affiliated Networks for Social Accountability (ANSA) are an initiative to promote, strengthen and sustain social accountability knowledge and praxis globally. Social Accountability refers to the ways and means in which citizens can hold public institutions accountable in terms of delivering public services, improving people's welfare and protecting people's rights and entitlements. Funded by the World Bank Institute, currently there are three regional ANSA hubs - Africa, East Asia Pacific, and South Asia, as well as a Global Seed Fund component to promote ANSA in different regions.

CASE SURVEY: The Orissa RTI Coalition - 'Utha Orissa' - comprises 15 coalition NGOs and one RTI activist network. We are all actively involved in empowering disadvantaged people to take up their rights and mainstream Right to Information
Clinics into their existing activities. Whilst the Coalition has common objectives different approaches are tailored to the needs of our programme area and beneficiaries.

CASE SURVEY: The UNCAC Coalition is a global network of over 240 civil society organisations (CSOs) in over 100 countries, committed to promoting the ratification, implementation and monitoring of the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC). Established in August 2006, it mobilises civil society action for UNCAC at international, regional and national levels.

CASE SURVEY: The Centre for the Study of Democracy (CSD), Bulgaria established a coalition of public and private stakeholders to introduce anti-corruption mechanisms into policy. The coalition's action plan greatly influenced the country's national anti-corruption strategy and succeed in reducing administrative corruption by half of its 1998 levels.

Sources of more information


Encouraging Community Skill Sharing and Civic Power

What is it?

Community skill sharing is when members of the same community interact to pass on skills they have acquired to help them fight corruption in their communities. This skill sharing creates an overall sense of civic power (pressure stemming from an organized group of citizens to create social change and make views heard) as the community unites to grapple with a common goal of countering corruption on a local scale. Community skill sharing works to increase a citizen’s knowledge, empowerment and voice. An example of some skills that would be useful in such community skills sharing would be, how to use Right to Information, what to expect from service delivery providers, how to interact with a government official, how to properly file a complaint against corruption, how to file an appeal against a government process, how to identify different types of corruption and respond appropriately, etc.

Before civic power can be established and community skill sharing occur, civic engagement must happen. Civic engagement is a general term that makes reference to all activities associated with citizens, civic duties, citizenship, community happenings, or public life. Civic engagement relates to the beginning of voluntary participation of any citizen, organization, business, government or public institution in civic life. Responsible civic engagement is the lawful and respectful participation of citizens in their own governance, public administration and public services. Civic engagement teaches citizens to begin to demonstrate the civic values and attitudes, knowledge and awareness, and participatory practices of effective and meaningful participation in democratic governance, which leads to the establishment of civic power.

Civic power and community skill sharing can be viewed as the results of active engagement of citizens and organizations - including civil society organizations, enlightened business and public institutions committed to societal change - in civic education, advocacy and civic action on behalf of citizen rights, the promotion of civic values and civic practices, the rule of law, and greater citizen participation and influence in governance, including policy and decision-making on the allocation of resources.
Why would you use it?

Community skill-building strengthens overall citizen unity and power to effectively battle corruption. The history of non-violent social movements and civic campaigns have proven that it is possible for citizens to battle corruption and win. Moreover, it is ordinary citizens who are the most effected by corruption. Teaching citizens how to recognize the corrupt practices that they encounter in daily life is the first step to organizing communities to fight against them. Corruption can effect citizens’ health, education, security, job, and even survival (if a citizen is relying on an essential public services that is suffering from poor implementation). Citizen curbing of corruption through skill sharing and civil power serves to support and strengthen participatory democracy, accountability and social and economic justice.

How to use it?

The following skills are an essential first part of successful organization and collaboration between community members: knowledge of how to participate, convene and lead meetings, negotiating and compromising skills, decision-making skills, dialogue and deliberation skills, collaborative teamwork skills, goal-setting skills, consensus-building skills, public problem-solving skills through a variety of methods (advocacy, service, political engagement) and working with other members of the community. These skills can be helpful in both allowing individual community members to learn advocacy tools and to share those tools with others within their community.

Communities can use the following activities as a vehicle for uniting to share skills to lessen corrupt practices in their community: workshops on non-cooperation when faced with participating in corruption (specifically when an official demands a citizen pay a bribe), workshops on civil disobedience, low-risk mass actions (such as non-violent protests), displays of anti-corruption posters and symbols, street theatre and stunts that teach citizens how to identify and respond to corruption as well as songs and poetry and humour, citizen report cards to chart the level of corruption in public services, civic report cards, monitoring of officials, institutions, budgets, spending and pubic services, social audits, social networking technologies (e.g., Facebook organizing, blogging), educating and training, social and economic empowerment initiatives, youth recreation, creation of parallel public service institutions, anti-corruption pledges; public awards, petition, vigils, marches, sit-ins, strikes and boycotts, nonviolent blockades, etc.

YSD engages in community skill-sharing to increase overall civic power in the form of holding public workshops, training programmes, citizen's hearings, community monitoring, civic monitoring, citizen's report cards, urban corruption surveys, etc.

When would you use it?

Development or improvement of existing community skill sharing and civic power is an important aspect of any sustainable anti-corruption campaign. It can also be used when citizens or communities feel that the public institutions or government they rely on is failing to provide them with transparent, accountable, efficient and affordable services.
Who uses it?

Individuals, associations, businesses, and public institutions may all participate in civic skill building and civic power in pursuit of civic objectives and priority concerns. Skill building and civic power can be engaged on the individual and mass level. From citizens discussing skills acquired at an anti-corruption workshop to those groups that host such workshops (government, private institutions, community organizations and groups, NGOs, etc.) this tool can be employed by individual citizens and groups alike. On an individual level it might begin with a simple discussion between neighbours about the poor state of a specific public service (like drains that are never cleaned and always clogged) and the discussion leading to both citizen and government roles and responsibilities in rectifying those service delivery problems. On a mass level it could take place in the form of training workshops, information meetings, community hearings, etc.

How has it been used in the service delivery sector?

Citizen skill building and civic power can take the form of many initiatives that have been used to decrease corruption and improve quality of service delivery. For example, citizen report cards use skill building to strengthen citizen voice and civic power so citizens can hold the public sector to account and engage effectively in deliberations on priority issues. Additionally, citizen monitoring and social audits also work to build the skills and civic power of citizens by educating them on public policy and service delivery norms, while providing them with the training and skills to properly monitor and evaluate the implementation of public programmes and conduct a social audit.

What use is it to the poor?

Skill sharing and civic power among poor populations can work to enable community members to express their views and demand their rights as they see their peers begin to do so. This expression can yield wider benefits in terms of encouraging social equity and the participation of the community in political processes and policies. Also, communities can use their organization and skills to help achieve public advocacy goals through effectively lobbying and engaging with government officials and policy makers. By engaging citizens an ownership process begins to take root by which citizens are motivated to continue advocating for improvement in public service delivery until their needs are met.

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Abou Munquar, Egypt: An NGO facilitated open and extensive dialogue among villagers to resolve the problems of drought among farmers that were located far away from the government built main canal. The villagers decided to build a web of smaller canals branching off from the main one to include all farmers equally in their access to water.

CASE SURVEY: Mombasa, Kenya: Council tenant groups employed community participation in the struggle to gain improved rights and service delivery in public
housing units. Mombasa has a recognised low and middle-income housing crisis, which has caused a measurable increase in the slum population. An example of the community action that sprang from this movement was the swift response that came from public housing residents when an elderly woman was suddenly evicted as a result of government corruption (her house was sold for profit without her knowledge). The housing residents united, prevented the eviction and helped the elderly women get settled back in her home. The council tenants have managed to keep rents at a reasonable rate, reduce corruption and the illegal allocation of plots, and prevent new housing developments that threaten to displace them.

Sources of more information


(2005) Building Democratic Institutions: Governance Reform in Developing Countries, Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.


Fraser, N. (1992) "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy", in C. Calhoun (ed.) Habermas and the Public Sphere, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.


What is it?

Just as in the private sector, open and effective complaints channels and complaint handling procedures in the public sector serve to raise levels of performance and to identify those responsible for malpractice. Common mechanisms geared towards encouraging complaints and deterring corruption include hotlines for reporting corruption. Since 1998, the World Bank has run a free hotline, which operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and is staffed by multilingual trained specialists to accept complaints of abuse from Bank staff and the general public from countries around the world. On a more local scale, YSD, in partnership with the Coalition Against Corruption (CAC), launched an anti-corruption 'Helpline', to register complaints against corruption, which were then forwarded to senior level officials in the concerned government departments for remedial action. CAC follows up on government response to complaints and involves media in positive and negative government responses to complaints.

Why would it be used?

Complaints can be used as a management tool to detect and monitor corruption in service delivery. Complaints mechanisms help identify areas or processes particularly vulnerable to corruption. Complaints mechanisms can ensure that anti-corruption measures and processes are enforced. Complaints about corruption should trigger investigation, prosecution or other sanctions. With complaints mechanisms, the victims of corruption have an official recourse. The image and reputation of the service provider can greatly benefit from this process.

The growing concern with the negative development effects of corruption has resulted in a whole range of initiatives both on the side of the donors and the international financial institutions (IFIs). Examples of issues that should be reported include: suspected contract irregularities and violations of procurement guidelines; bid manipulation; bid collusion; coercive practices; fraudulent bids; fraud in contract performance; fraud in an audit inquiry; product substitution; price manipulation; substandard or inferior parts or materials; cost or labour mischarges; kickbacks, bribery or acceptance of gratuities; abuse of authority; misuse of donor funds; travel related fraud; theft and embezzlement; benefits and allowance fraud; conflict of interest; misrepresentation; forgery; and so forth.

How to use it?

A system of receiving and acting upon complaints is an essential part of consumer services; utilities, line agencies and municipalities all require a system for receiving and logging complaints. For example, people can complain in writing, telephone or by paying a personal visit to an office. People should make their complaint as specific as possible and include details such as: what is the alleged wrongdoing they are reporting?; where and when did it take place (dates and times if available)?; who is/are the perpetrators?; how the individual or firm committed the alleged wrongdoing?; and why they believe the activity was improper? Having received and logged a
For complaints mechanisms to benefit the poor and vulnerable, they must be designed to ensure that people are able to report corruption without fear of reprisals and are assured that appropriate action is taken and sanctions are imposed. The mechanisms should also be widely publicized in poor communities, so that people have information about the mechanism and have access to it. The availability of complaints mechanisms tailored to the needs of the poor can help reduce public tolerance of corrupt practices. In Indonesia, an NGO called Yayasan Lembaga Konsumen collects consumer complaints via newspaper adverts, brochures and radio adverts, and organizes meetings between complainants, regulators, service providers and the media so that they can be resolved.

To strengthen complaints mechanisms, the following action points can be followed:

- Establish a written and documented system for collecting and resolving consumer complaints;
- Raise public awareness as to where and how to complain, for example through campaigns giving the public hotlines, and ensure members of the public can easily discover the identities of those civil servants they are dealing with;
- Ensure fair and just treatment for complainants;
- Ensure the capacity exists to receive and investigate complaints;
- Monitor delays in service delivery;
- Make sure staff know the standard of behaviour expected of them, together with the consequences if they do not comply with these standards;
- Give staff training on their responsibilities to report corrupt conduct and the procedures for doing this;
- Establish a feedback mechanism to keep the public informed about the number of complaints, types of complaints and action taken on the complaints;
- Establish a disciplinary mechanism with the capability to investigate complaints and enforce disciplinary action when necessary;
- Create a public relations office to keep on top of public concerns and to enhance public image.

**When would you use it?**

Anti-corruption complaint mechanisms that have already been tried and tested can be used to prevent fraud and corruption in public service delivery, as well as to investigate allegations of fraud and corruption or staff misconduct. Complaints can be registered when ethical misconduct, waste, fraud and other forms of corruption in the infrastructure sector are suspected. Complaints are generally registered when an individual or group is unsatisfied with a service.

**Who uses it?**

Such complaints mechanisms can be used by anyone (officials, employees and aggrieved citizens) with a suspicion or who has directly witnessed corrupt acts, including service providers. Anonymous complaints are often accepted provided they contain basic information (who, what, where, when and how). All utilities and service delivery providers and programmes should have effective beneficiary grievance mechanisms. Utilities should display information on the complaints received, solved and pending. Ideally, complaints mechanisms should be electronic and available on the internet, so beneficiaries can track the status of their complaints.
How has it been used in the service delivery sector?

Complaints about service delivery implementation, conduct of government officials and qualities of services can uncover corruption within a sector and result in decreased corruption and improved service delivery.

For example, Uganda's national water and sewerage utility has transformed the process by which consumer complaints are received and responded to. Beneficiary feedback is used as a mechanism to evaluate managers through the use of customer satisfaction surveys. The surveys as well as a visit by a researcher provides beneficiaries with the opportunity to express their concerns, which is then given to the utility's managers for action.

What use is it to the poor?

Effective complaints mechanisms prevent corruption, mismanagement, the waste of resources, and abuse of authority, by making it easier to expose incidents of corruption and impose punishments on its perpetrators. However, it should be acknowledged that in many developing countries impoverished citizens often times prefer to avoid getting in touch with government officials to report complaints (because they fear harassment from corrupt persons) and may be more at ease discussing common complaints with non-governmental organizations.

The incentives available for poor citizens to file complaints are often very limited. This is why citizen power is often more likely to occur through the collective advocacy of community groups, or NGOs rather than lone individuals. Often individuals require the motivation, training and hand holding that community groups and specialized NGOs offer to properly file complaints and achieve results. Results from complaints can be widespread: from communities gaining access to once denied services to individuals receiving their due benefits under government programmes in a corruption free manner. To assure that groups of citizens as well as individuals are motivated to use complaints mechanisms, they must receive assurance that their complaints would remain confidential and without reprisal and that their complaint would be appropriately responded to and punishments imposed to prevent the same complaint from occurring in the future. Complaints mechanisms should also be widely publicized in poor communities to increase local knowledge of complaint procedures and access. Complaints mechanisms should be tailored to the needs of the poor to help reduce public tolerance of corruption.

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: Department of Institutional Integrity, World Bank. The World Bank Group created the Department of Institutional Integrity (INT) to investigate claims of fraud and corruption.


CASE SURVEY: In Indonesia, an NGO called Yayasan Lembaga Konsumen collects consumer complaints via newspaper advertisements, brochures and radio advertisements, and organizes meetings between complainants, regulators, service providers and the media so that complaints can be resolved.
CASE SURVEY: Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC), Hong Kong. The ICAC investigates suspected corruption, evaluates where various agencies are vulnerable to corruption and helped agencies take remedial measures and educates the public.

CASE SURVEY: Business Partnering Against Corruption. The World Economic Forum’s Partnering against Corruption Initiative includes over 100 major international companies from the engineering and construction sectors that have committed to the ‘Business Principles for Countering Bribery in the Engineering and Construction Industry’.

Sources of more information
The World Bank: www.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/

ADB/OECD Anti-Corruption Initiative for Asia-Pacific: www.oecd.org/corruption/asiapacific

The Open Democracy Advice Centre provides support to whistle-blowers so as to build open and accountable public and private institutions in South Africa: http://www.opendemocracy.org

Freedom to Care was founded by whistle-blowers and promotes our ethical right as human beings sharing one small planet to accountable behaviour from large organizations - whether public or private: http://www.freedomtocare.org

Public Concern at Work is the leading charity in the UK on public interest whistle-blowing: http://www.pcaw.co.uk

Government Accountability Project (GAP) is a USA organization that aims to protect the public interest and promote government and corporate accountability by advancing occupational free speech, defending whistle-blowers and empowering citizen activists. GAP has produced a Whistle-blowers Survival Guide: http://www.whistleblower.org

Whistleblowers Australia (WBA) encourages self-help and mutual help and campaigns on issues that affect the ability of people to speak out without fear of reprisal: http://www.whistleblowers.org.au/

How to Complain: http://www.howtocomplain.com/

Consumers International: http://www.consumersinternational.org/

The Consumer Council for Water provides a voice for water and sewerage consumers in England and Wales: www.ccwater.org.uk/


Access to Information

What is it?

The purpose of access to information systems is to guarantee that citizens have access to information that is of public interest. Access to information legislation generally requires all government and public institutions to proactively release information so citizens are informed and the information can be readily accessed by any interested party. Additionally, access to information legislation assures that those who seek information receive accurate responses in a timely fashion. When institutions comply with the legislation and make information readily available they allow citizens to increase their knowledge and be more adept at requesting specific information via an application in the future. Consequently, access to information legislation allows individuals with a public duty to inform citizens (such as journalists) to be better prepared and motivated to be the most effective in their methods of informing the public. Access to information legislation also promotes the participation of citizens in public policy and implementation, while holding the government and its agencies to account in terms of conforming with the rule of law, managing public affairs, and property in a transparency and accountable manner and demonstrating integrity in all matters of governance and implementation.

Access to Information laws generally include the following points:

Every government agency or public institution or body is required to publish basic information about its function and implementation strategies (i.e. what it does and how) to provide a general understanding to the public on the purpose of the institution and to establish a foundation that facilitates citizens in filing rational requests for more specific information. Access to information requirements commonly include the publication of such things as legislative and other mandates, budgets, annual or other regular reports summarizing activities, and information about complaint or other oversight bodies, including how they can be contacted and reports on their work or the locations where such reports can be found.
The right to access information reflects the fact that government information belongs to the people and not the public body that holds it. Information is not 'owned' by any department or by the government of the day. Rather, information is generated with public money by public servants, paid out of public funds and is held in trust for the people. This means citizens have the right to access information about governments' actions, decisions, policies, decision-making processes and even information held by private bodies or individuals in some cases.

It is illegal to refuse the proactive disclosure of information or to deny applicants specific information that is deemed to be of public interest. This is subject only to such exceptions as are reasonably necessary to protect public interests or personal privacy. The subjects generally excluded from scrutiny under a right to information act may include cabinet discussions, judicial functions, law enforcement and public safety, intergovernmental relations and internal working documents. Therefore, access to information is not absolute. Some information may be held back where giving out of information would harm key interests that need to be protected. For example, information about troop deployment during a war or advice regarding national economic policies prior to their publication, are instances where it may be valid for officials not to disclose information, at least until a certain sensitive period has passed. Access is provided by giving applicants a reasonable opportunity to inspect the document or by supplying them with a copy.

An independent review body should be established to monitor if information subject to disclosure or exemption under the act is properly complied with and that information being disclosed is complete, accurate and done so in a timely manner. Generally, in the interest of efficiency and organization, the process of requesting information involves a presumption that information is accessible, giving the responsibility of determining that specific information should not be disclosed on the institution involved. The information requested should be reviewed by the responding organization or agency and identified as that which is subject to being withheld or disclosed. An independent authority should evaluate this process, and if their decision supports the organization in terms of not disclosing specific information, the applicant can appeal to a higher court or independent tribunal. The independent review is generally conducted by an unbiased party that would not be predisposed to either agree or disagree with the organization's decision to withhold documents. In turn, the independent evaluators should be counted upon to not release sensitive information if the decision to withhold it is deemed correct under the act. This process is extremely important as information formally requested under a Right to
Information Act can be sensitive and all parties should honor the necessary discretion, integrity and neutrality required in such a review process.

Generally, under access to information legislation, a reasonable time frame is established which allows for an application under the act to be properly responded to. This is intended to provide government agencies with sufficient time to search for, gather and review the information request, and if it proposes not to disclose information pertaining to the request, for the independent review process to proceed, while at the same time not permitting excessive or indefinite delay.

It is not unusual for information about private individuals to be void from public access although available to the private individual themselves if requested. Usually, rights of individual access are paired with rights to dispute information on the basis of it being incomplete or inaccurate. In cases where this is established, the process can be amended. Some forms of the Right to Information Act also allow the individual to place challenges or countervailing information on the record if a decision is made not to change the challenged information.

*Why would it be used?*

The use of legislation to gain access to information about public affairs, programmes, budgets, governance mechanisms and management tactics is a common measured used to fight corruption. Citizens and communities that are informed about governance issues that shape their daily lives, and the norms that government should adhere to in its programmes, practices and implementation, begin to develop realistic service expectations and operational standards which allow them to judge officials accordingly and pressure for change and reform when those standards are not met. Right to Information is a tool to facilitate citizen participation in public affairs, which is not possible without people having easy access to public information. Effective access to information can be viewed as a way to empower populations, as having access to information informs citizens and endows them with the power to challenge and influence policy and its implementation but as well, the process of filing a right to information application demonstrates and increases a citizen's interest and participation in public affairs as such processes are often user-initiated. People receive information as a result of their petition to the government, and each successful application will increase a person's confidence and knowledge of public affairs, and encourage citizens to use the process again to obtain information. As with all transparency and anti-corruption mechanisms, the purpose of a Right to Information is to inform and educate the public and highlight public affairs to increase and guarantee public accountability.
How to use it?

The difference between access to information systems and other transparency and public reporting mechanisms is that the former rests on public initiative and action. Where public reporting mechanisms involve information generated and disseminated by government agencies, access to information systems generate information only when people request it. In a properly regulated system, there is a balance which maintains that outsiders establish the agenda with regards to what information is requested and which issues investigated, and that some type of independent review guarantees that officials cannot arbitrarily or unreasonably deny access or avoid criticism, while at the same time protecting some limited categories of information from disclosure that might only benefit the individual behind the request and therefore would be considered to not be in the general public interest.

Although governments across the world agree that the public has a right to know about their operations and functions, reluctance to provide such information through the proper implementation of an access to information act remains. Studies show that the majority of government departments are able to quickly and painlessly adopt access to information legislation and that the costs associated with such are low. There is justification for governments to withhold information in some cases and place practical limits on the application freedom of information legislation, especially where the public interest dictates. For example, in cases of protecting personal privacy of health records, or state security secrets, the greater public interest may lie with confidentiality, or confidentiality may be essential to the basic process at hand.

YSD has a programme called "Right to Information Citizens Empowerment Programme" which aims to increase awareness on RTI and empower communities to use RTI. YSD provides handholding support to citizens on use of RTI through a 'HELPLINE' and training to the citizens and public officials on a 17-point information disclosure.

When would you use it?

Access to information legislation allows citizens to pose questions to the government and various agencies, request copies of documents, inspect and scrutinize documents and government programmes. It can prove especially helpful in circumstances where citizens are receiving poor public services as they can use access to information legislation to get paperwork that outlines their specific rights and entitlements in regards to government programmes and initiatives.
Who uses it?

Right to Information can be used anytime by any person, organization or body that wishes to know more about government or publicly funded programmes, initiatives or have access to any information that is of the public interest.

How has it been used in the service delivery sector?

Right to information has been used extensively by YSD in aiding citizens in receiving their full benefits from government programmes, knowing about service delivery norms and being aware of their eligibility in regards to specific government poverty initiatives. Through filing Right to Information applications residents not only improved service delivery where it was poor or non-existent and obtained their rights and privileges as outlined in programmes, but also successfully used their knowledge to battle corruption as they encountered it on a local level.

What use is it to the poor?

As mentioned above, poor populations can use RTI to get information on service delivery norms, to know their eligibility for specific government programmes, to receive quality services under such programmes and to battle corruption in service delivery. RTI is a tool that is easily utilized by the poor through workshops and information sessions, which teach citizens how to properly file an RTI application and how to follow up on their applications.

Related case surveys

India: Right to Information (RTI) Citizens Empowerment Programme (1)
"Soochana Sivir" Right to Information Camp (2) RTI Citizens Monitoring and Audit Programme (3) Social Audit of Implementation of Right to Information Act, 2005 in Brahmapur Municipality Corporation, Orissa

Right to Information Law Campaign and Implementation Analysis

YSD has a programme called "Right to Information Citizens Empowerment Programme" which aims to increase awareness on RTI and empower communities to use RTI. YSD provides handholding support to citizens on use of RTI through a 'HELPLINE' and training to the citizens and public officials on a 17-point information disclosure.

Sources of more information

Attempts towards Good-Governance through Democratic Decentralization and RTI Act, 2005: An Evaluation RS Dalal - Dynamics of Public Administration, 2010 - indianjournals.com

Right To Information Act, 2005 RKGPK Saini - 2009 - Deep and Deep Publications

Bhoomi, Gyan Ganga, e-governance and the right to information: ICTs and development in India P Thomas - Telematics and Informatics, 2009 - Elsevier

The Movement for the Right to Information in India: People’s Power for the Control of Corruption, National Centre for Advocacy Studies (India) - 2000

Working with the Media to Detect and Prevent Corruption

What is it?

Media means those organizations that have an organized way of disseminating current events, facts, opinions, entertainment and a host of other information through a variety of mediums such as newspapers, magazines, films, radio, television, books, CDs, DVDs, videos and other forms of publishing.

Why would it be used?

The media can actively participate in the dissemination of information on the quality and level of corruption within public services and policy suggestions that emerge from an Urban Corruption Survey. While the quality of media outlets differ, all media play a role in publicizing information for the public. Without access to relevant information, the poor are unable to organize and act appropriately to protect their interests. Higher newspaper circulation in Indian districts is associated with better local government performance in distributing food and drought relief. Consequently, freedom of the press is negatively correlated with the level of corruption. The media can control corruption by raising public awareness about corruption, its causes, consequences and possible remedies; investigating and reporting incidences of corruption; exposing corrupt officials; and prompting investigations by official bodies.

How to use it?

The following points outline the steps to knowing how to work with media to prevent corruption: (1) Look at the options for disseminating information about corruption in areas of low literacy, for example, through community radio stations. (2) Research the Official Secrets Act, anti-libel laws, access to information and freedom of expression. (3) Ask the question: Is the media orientated towards poor people or business and elite interests (looking for wide readership, advertising and profit)? (4) Does the independent media sector - the Internet, media, informal journals and newsletters - cover corruption issues? (5) Develop training for professional and ethical investigative journalists. (6) Launch anti-corruption initiatives in high-profile press conferences to ensure that the media coverage is wide. (7) Prepare press kits
with small printable stories, media-friendly press releases and translations of major reports into local languages. (8) Use the media to make survey findings on corruption widely known; this makes it difficult for the agency or agencies concerned to ignore the survey findings.

Successful anti-corruption reform in Singapore raised the cost of engaging in corruption by clarifying the definition of corrupt behaviour and by creating severe penalties for getting caught engaging in corrupt behaviour. Media coverage was used to deter corrupt officials through public shame and to create awareness throughout the community of the severity of punishments for engaging in corrupt activities.

**When would you use it?**

Investigative journalists might write about corruption in local and national papers or else the papers might include letters about corruption. NGOs have also used the media to publicize corruption and also to improved access to information. For example:

Transparency Thailand (TT) produced a series of radio shows dealing with the problems of corruption and the lack of transparency in government and business circles.

TI Brazil aired short anti-corruption radio broadcasts aimed at awareness-raising and behavioural change on a São Paulo-based radio station.

A series of short television dramas were broadcast in Niger in order to raise awareness and influence attitudes towards the problem of corruption.

**Who uses it?**

The more people who are able to read, the stronger the influence of the media. However, information is not enough. People must also have the legal, political and economic means to press demands against the service provider.

**What use is it to the poor?**

An independent media, often provided by grassroots activists, is often used as a tool for promoting social, environmental and economic justice in poor communities. It usually aims to empower marginalized people, who are under-represented in corporate media production and content. However, media that seeks to serve the interests of the poor typically struggles to survive in terms of readership (literacy may be a factor), advertising (advertisers do not advertise in it, because poor consumers cannot afford to buy their products), or profit (the poor might not be able to afford to buy it). This makes it difficult to get coverage of anticorruption issues that affect poor people.
How has it been used in the service delivery sector?

Transparency International Bangladesh (TIB) has launched a collection of articles about corruption, published in some leading national dailies to produce the News Scan Database Reports. The infrastructure sectors incorporated in the News Scan include: Power, Water Resources, Transport and Local Government. For example, the News Scan in 2000 revealed that in the power sector most corruption cases were related to abuse of power (15), embezzlement (7), bribery (5), fraud (4) and misuse of resources (4). Officials and engineers are involved in various irregularities, such as taking bribes from the public for reduced bills, embezzlement/system loss (unaccounted energy use and theft), and unauthorized and illegal connections. Most reported cases of corruption in the water resources sector related to embezzlement (when some officials bypassed the tender process and selected constructors on the basis of bribes payment). Project directors, engineers and other officials also misappropriated public funds in various construction projects.

Related case surveys

CASE SURVEY: News Scan Database, Bangladesh. Transparency International Bangladesh (TIB) developed the 'News Scan Database' to measure the nature and extent of corruption in Bangladesh, but also to encourage the media to further investigate and report instances of corruption.

CASE SURVEY: Radio Against Corruption: To Be Alive. To Be Alive is a community-focused programme broadcast on state radio in the poor rural region of Kutch, Gujarat, in India. The programme has become a public watchdog and issues a warning to those tempted to abuse their position that somebody is watching.

CASE SURVEY: Report cards, India. First used in Bangalore in 1993, report cards use citizen feedback (from the poor and marginalized sections of society) to rate the performance of public services agencies, such as the electricity board and water board.

CASE SURVEY: Report cards, Orissa, India. The YSD-led citizens' report card in Orissa, India, used the methodology of a Citizen Report Card (Bangalore) in assessing urban basic service in Brahmapur city of Orissa and used the information gathered through the report card to initiate civic engagement and demand improvements in basic services.

CASE SURVEY: Urban Corruption Survey, Orissa, India. The YSD Urban Corruption Survey established a benchmark for petty corruption in Brahmapur city with the Bribery Index methodology. This used indicators to rank the most corrupted institutions and investigated the causes of bribery and/or petty corruption while tracking 6.1 million bribes in basic service delivery.
Sources of more information

The Corruption List is an extensive collection of news reports on corruption: http://corruptionlist.com

The International Journalist’s Network (IJNet) is an online resource for media assistance news, journalism training opportunities, reports on the state of the media around the world and valuable media directories: http://www.ijnet.org

Philippine Centre for Investigative Journalism: http://www.pcij.org/

Committee to Protect Journalists: www.cpj.org


Berlin: http://www.transparency.org/publications/sourcebook


Conclusions, challenges, and lessons learned

The long-term impacts of implementation of an Urban Corruption Survey are substantial and include:

1. Reduction in Corruption in Public Service Delivery

   Reduction in corruption in the public service delivery is one of the most important long-term impacts of the Urban Corruption Survey. This will result in public service delivery being more economical and efficient, while at the same time assuring that a fair and transparent procurement process (in terms of private service providers) will help the government to select the honest and efficient service providers.

2. Transparency and accountability boosted

   Transparency in all the public service delivery steps will be achieved. Information at all stages will be made public and there will be public scrutiny of public service delivery norms and service providers’ adherence to such norms. As well, accountability among the public officials will be increased and faster grievances readdress achieved.

3. Citizens participation as a watchdog will increase

   Civil society and citizen engagement as a watchdog will be improved. As the community’s knowledge of public delivery norms increases and as community members acquire and share skills related to identifying and responding to corruption, the community will be empowered to oversee the process of service delivery, will be able to understand the tendering process, and monitor the implementation and quality of service delivery according to standards and norms. As well, the complaints processes will be strengthened as a result of the authorities involvement in the entire public service delivery process. On the demand side, governance will be strengthened and citizens and civil society will be able to scrutinize the public resources that fund service delivery.
Principles, values and culture of integrity will improve

There will be an increase in principles, values and the culture of integrity among the stakeholders engaged in the whole cycle of public service delivery including public officials, bidders and the market. There will be improvement overall information disclosure and dissemination. As well, public officials will be fully aware of their roles and responsibilities in regards to properly managing public service delivery and will be able to identify and respond to corruption in public service delivery according to anti-corruption mechanisms adopted.

Increase in overall social development

There will be improvement in service delivery process at all stages with equity and social justice. The quality of the rural roads and access to all sections and unreached locations will enjoy the benefits of the rural roads and accordingly access to basic services like livelihood, health, education increased and human development achieved.

Sense of ownership of the public property and services achieved

A sense of belongingness/ownership among the people will increase when they work as a citizen monitor and check the wastage of public resources, this will further helpful in maintaining and strengthening the quality of public service delivery.

Qualitative and quantitative impacts of the Urban Corruption Survey

The qualitative impacts of the Urban Corruption Survey is that we can begin to see a transformation in both how a public service delivery system functions and how citizens respond to that system. As a result, citizens are empowered to advocate for proper public service delivery, and public service delivery providers are aware of their roles and responsibilities. In the long term communities are more united, empowered and receive better public service, which improves their overall quality of life.

The quantitative impacts of the Urban Corruption Survey can be measured through less citizen complaints about specific services, improved access to public services and improved transparency within public service delivery, improved quality of public services, decrease in incidence of bribery in public service delivery, increased citizen civic and advocacy knowledge, increased citizen usage of advocacy tools (RTI, RTE, etc), the success of citizen monitoring groups, successful capacity building of citizen's groups and local organizations, and the degree to which citizens and public
Winning the Fight Against Corruption in Public Service Delivery - A Toolkit

YSD strives to provide citizens with both the infrastructure and the skills to effectively advocate for their rights and monitor and evaluate government and private public services. YSD also strives to include government officials, and private and public service providers in this process by increasing knowledge and cooperation between the public and government and private service providers. It is YSD's goal to create sustainable development, which is inclusive of the government and private sector and to facilitate activities that empower, inform and organize citizens to launch community-centred development initiatives.

Challenges and lessons include:

When launching an anti-corruption campaign such as the Urban Corruption Survey, it is expected that some service providers and policy makers might feel threatened by the initiative. This is why it is paramount that both service providers and policy makers are engaged in the early stages of the survey's development and sensitised to the values and practical benefits of conducting an Urban Corruption Survey.

Some service providers or government officials may not be receptive to the problems with public service delivery and implementation identified by the beneficiaries and the beneficiaries suggestions for improvements and changes. When faced with this tension it is wise to highlight both strengths and weaknesses emerging from the Urban Corruption Survey; prepare adequately and facilitate effectively to ensure that interface meetings between service providers, government officials and users are constructive rather than confrontational; and concentrate not only on addressing problems but also on solutions and proposals.

Service providers at the local level don't always have the capacity or leverage to make decisions or implement change. This is why it's vital to have senior officials and decision makers involved in meetings, hearings and allow them to become part of the feedback loop and interface.

Community members need to establish a realistic understanding of the constraints faced by service providers to avoid creating unrealistically high expectations.

In YSD's experience, although the organization has had measured success in its
initiatives and programmes, it remains a challenge to get full cooperation from service providers (in terms of policy changes in the area of service delivery) when organizing communities to monitor corruption in public service delivery and advocate for improved public service delivery. Even though YSD has succeeded in bringing public service officials to a public forum to engage with citizens on methods to improve service delivery, it is very difficult to change officials' bureaucratic mindset to become pro-citizen and pro service orientation. Although as a result of YSD programmes public service delivery has improved to some extent, true reform requires the cooperation from higher-level officials, which is difficult to achieve.

The effective implementation of a Urban Corruption Survey requires a combination of an understanding of the local socio-political governance process and context, a technically competent intermediary team to facilitate the process; a strong public awareness and information dissemination campaign to ensure effective community participation; participation/by-in of the service provider; and coordinated organized follow up.
### Annexure-I

**Questionnaire-Urban Corruption Survey**

#### A. Quality of Public Service Delivery

##### 2.1 Drinking Water Supply (Public Health Engineering Department)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.#</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1.1 | Do you have access to PHED water supply?                                | 1. Yes  
2. No (If, no, go to next service)                                                        |
| 2.1.2 | How frequently do you get PHED water supply?                            | 1. More than once a day  
2. Once a day  
3. Once in two days  
4. Once in three days  
5. Once in 405 days  
6. Less often |
| 2.1.3 | Is the frequency of water supply sufficient for your needs?              | 1. Yes  
2. No                                                                                     |
| 2.1.4 | Have you had any problems in the last year with your water supply?      | 1. Yes  
2. No (if no, go to next service)                                                          |
| 2.1.5 | If yes, what was the nature of your problem?                            | 1. To get water connection  
2. To repair the water disconnection  
3. To pay the bill  
4. Other (Specify )                                                                           |
| 2.1.6 | Did you contact PHED office about your problem?                         | 1. Yes  
2. No                                                                                     |

##### 2.2 Municipal Services (Brahmapur Municipal Corporation)

*Only to be asked to those with access to BMC services*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.#</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.2.1 | What Brahmapur Municipality services do you use?                        | 1. Garbage clearance/bin facility  
2. Drainage system  
3. Public Toilets  
4. Roads  
5. Streetlights  
6. Birth and death certificate  
7. Collection of property tax  
8. Other (Specify )                                                                           |
| 2.2.2 | Have you faced any problems with regard to these BMC services?          | 1. Yes  
2. No (If no, go to section 2.2.5)                                                         |
| 2.2.3 | Which service did you have problems with?                               | 1. Garbage clearance/bin facility  
2. Drainage system  
3. Public Toilets  
4. Roads  
5. Streetlights |
## 2.2.4 What was the nature of the problem with each specific service?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Garbage clearance/bin facility/Problem faced:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Drainage system/Problem faced:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Public Toilets/Problem faced:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Roads/Problem faced:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Streetlights/Problem faced:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Birth and death certificate/Problem faced:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Collection of property tax/Problem faced:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Other (Specify ______________) / Problem faced:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.2.5 Have you visited the BMC offices during the last year?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>No (If no, go to next service)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.2.6 If yes, for what purpose?

*Go to section 2.17 and complete to 2.1.26*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>To lodge a complaint regarding non-clearance of drains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>To lodge a complaint regarding non-clearance of garbage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>To lodge a complaint regarding necessary construction or clearance of roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>To lodge a complaint regarding necessary repair/replacement of damaged street lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>To obtain birth/death certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>To pay housing tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Other (Specify ______________)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.3 Public Health Care (Government Hospital)

*(To be administered if the household has access to Public Health Services)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL.#</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>Which type of hospital do you usually go to?</td>
<td>1. Medical college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. City hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Urban Health Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Private hospital (go to next service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Other (Specify ________________________)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>Did you visit the hospital in the last year as an.</td>
<td>1. In-patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>Have you had any problems with hospital services?</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td>If yes, what type of problem?</td>
<td>1. Doctor was not present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Treatment was not good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.4 Public Distribution System (Civil Supply Department)

(This section to be administered if the household has access to Fair Price (ration) shops)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.#</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.4.1 | What kind of ration card do you have?                                   | 1. BPL  
2. APL  
3. Antodaya  
4. Annupna  
5. Other (Specify ________ ) |
| 2.4.2 | Have you or any member of your house been to a ration shop to purchase items? | 1. Yes  
2. No (If no, go to section 2.4.11)                                          |
| 2.4.3 | If yes, are food items available at the shop?                           | 1. Yes  
2. No                                                                 |
| 2.4.4 | Are they weighed properly?                                              | 1. Yes  
2. No                                                                 |
| 2.4.5 | Is the right price charged for your quota?                              | 1. Yes  
2. No                                                                 |
| 2.4.6 | Does the ration shop owner supply a larger quantity than what you are eligible for at a higher price? | 1. Yes  
2. No                                                                 |
| 2.4.7 | If yes, what is the extent of the higher price?                         | Specify Rs. __________________________ |
| 2.4.8 | Is any of the following information posted on the shop’s display board or anywhere in the shop? | 1. Available items, price and stock position  
2. Shop business hours  
3. Owner’s license number and name  
4. PDS service delivery norms  
5. Grievance authority/address  
6. None are posted |
| 2.4.9 | In the last year have you faced any problems with the ration shop services? | 1. Yes  
2. No (If no, go to section 2.4.11)                                          |
|      | What problem(s) did you face?                                            | 1. Shop keeps irregular hours  
2. Shop posts no information on who to contact to report complaints  
3. Quality of rations are low  
4. Shop charges wrong price  
5. Amount or rations received is below my... |
### 2.5 BDA Services (Brahmapur Development Authority)
(This section to be administered if the household has access to BDA services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.#</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.5.1 | Have you visited the BDA office in the last year? | 1. Yes  
2. No (If no, go to next service) |
| 2.5.2 | If yes, for what purpose?  
*Go to section 2.17 and complete to 2.1.26* | 1. To get BDA approval for building construction  
2. To get renovation approval  
3. To purchase a BDA flat/house  
4. To purchase/lease BDA shop  
5. Other (Specify ____________) |

### 2.6 Land Record and Administration (Tehsildar, Sub-registrar and Sub-collector)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.#</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.6.1 | Have you visited the Sub-Registrar/Tehsil/Sub-Collector office for any purpose during the last year? | 1. Yes  
2. No (If no, go to next service) |
| 2.6.2 | If yes, which office have you visited? | 1. Tehsil  
2. Sub Registrar  
3. Sub Collector  
4. Other (Specify ____________) |
| 2.6.3 | If you visited Tehsil office, what was the purpose? | 1. To obtain land patta  
2. To obtain caste certificate  
3. For mutation (convert land classification)  
4. Determination of boundary of land/property  
5. To pay land tax  
6. To obtain land lease  
7. Other (Specify ____________) |
| 2.6.4 | If you visited Sub Registrar office, what was the purpose? | 1. To sell land/property  
2. To buy land/property |
3. Partition of land/property
4. Shift of land/property
5. To buy stamp paper
6. Other (Specify ____________________________)

2.6.5 If you visited Sub Collector office, what was the purpose? Go to section 2.17 and complete to 2.1.2b

1. Revenue Administration
2. Social Welfare Administration
3. Law and Order
4. Public Distribution System
5. Development
6. Women and Child Development Department
7. Formulation of plan and programme to tackle natural calamities
8. Assessment of loss of life, property and mitigation of miseries
9. Other (Specify ____________________________)

B. Quantification of Corruption
(The following section applies to all public services)

2.1.7 Was there information available in the office? (How to get service, who to contact, where to go, how to file complaints, etc?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.8. If no, how did you find the information?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through friends and relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office clerk/peon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer/public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The following section is only for respondents that said yes to middleman)

2.1.9 Did the middleman ask for money?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.1.10 If yes, how much?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BD A</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify Rs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.11 For what purpose?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BD A</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.12 Did you contact the concerned official/clerk?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BD A</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.13 Whom did you contact?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BD A</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level Official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Level Official</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.14 How long did it take for the officer to respond to your complaint?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BD A</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time taken to respond specify hrs/days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.15 If no, why did he not respond?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BD A</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present at desk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy with work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignored me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer wanted money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(The following questions are only for those who responded yes to the officer’s intention was to get extra money)

2.1.16 Did the official indicate or ask for a bribe/money?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.17 If yes, how did he indicate this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through his assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through another customer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.18 What was the amount asked?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify Rs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.19 What was the amount paid by you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify Rs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.20 If you negotiated the amount by how much was it reduced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.21 Why did you pay the bribe?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service monopoly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of service denial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 2.1.22 Have you ever used your social position to influence an official/service provider?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (if no, go to 2.1.23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.1.22 Do you feel he has done your work after knowing your social position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.1.23 Did the work get completed after the payment of a bribe?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.1.24 How much time did it take to solve your service delivery problem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify in time (hrs/days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.1.25 Are you satisfied with the services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (if no, go to 2.1.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.1.25 If yes, what is the extent of your satisfaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single response</th>
<th>PHED</th>
<th>BMC</th>
<th>Govt. Hospital</th>
<th>CSO</th>
<th>BDA</th>
<th>Tehsil Office</th>
<th>Sub-registrar</th>
<th>Sub-Collector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fully satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Perceptions of Corruption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.#</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1  | How would you rate the corruption in Brahmapur city?                   | 1. Big problem  
2. Moderate problem  
3. Small problem  
4. No Problem |
| 3.2  | Which services do you find the most corrupt?                          | 1. Drinking Water  
2. Municipal Services  
3. Public Health Care  
4. Public Distribution System  
5. Development Authority  
6. Land Records and Administration (Tahasildar, Sub-registrar, Sub-collector) |
| 3.3  | Do you find corruption in any other services in Brahmapur city? (Maximum three) | 1. ___________________________  
2. ___________________________  
3. ___________________________ |
| 3.4  | What kind of corruption do you think is most common in Brahmapur city? | 1. Small-scale petty corruption among low level officials (bribe)  
2. Large-scale mega corruption among government institutions and corporations (corruption in contracts, land grabbing etc)  
3. Other forms of corruption please specify ___________________________  
4. Don't know |
| 3.5  | In your opinion does Brahmpur city have corruption-reporting mechanisms? |                                                                                                 |
| 3.6  | If yes, what are they?                                                 | 1. Internal Vigilance Department  
2. Special Grievance cell  
3. District Grievance Cell  
4. Vigilance Department  
5. Ombudsman (lokayukta)  
6. Independent Commissions  
7. Independent Helpline  
8. Other (Specify ___________________________) |
| 3.7  | How do you evaluate the anti corruption mechanisms of the government in Brahmapur city? | 1. Very poor  
2. Poor  
3. Fairly good  
4. Good  
5. Very good |
| 3.8  | Have you or any one in your household reported a corrupt act by a public official? | 1. Yes  
2. No (If no, go to section 3.11) |
<p>| 3.9  | What was the action taken?                                             | 1. No response from authority                                                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.10</th>
<th>How does the extra payment made to get work done affect you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Corruption is a natural occurrence and a part of daily life. Do you agree or disagree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Corruption is perpetuated mostly by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>What do you think is the most common form of corruption?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>What are some possible suggestions to reform corrupt officials?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>What are your suggestions to check/stop corruption?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Action delayed  
3. Action taken immediately  
4. Work completed  
5. Other (Specify)  
1. Fully effects  
2. Moderately effects  
3. Somewhat effects  
4. No effect at all  
1. Completely agree  
2. Agree  
3. Disagree  
4. Completely disagree  
1. Public officials  
2. Politicians/elected representatives  
3. Middlemen  
4. Citizens  
5. Other (Specify)  
1. Favoritism  
2. Bribery  
3. Fraud  
4. Extortion  
5. Don’t know  
Record a maximum of three reasons:  
1.  
2.  
3.  
Record a maximum of three reasons:  
1.  
2.  
3.
Annexure-II
Charts and Table of Urban Corruption Survey, 2008 Findings

Table: Bribery Incidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Bribery Incidence (in %)</th>
<th>Average size of the Bribe (INR)</th>
<th>Cost of Bribe (INR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMC services</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Care</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Distribution System</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDA services</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>2843</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land record and Admin.</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table: Bribery cost on Households (100% Incidence on Households)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-slum</th>
<th>Slum</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Income of the Household</td>
<td>Rs.8427</td>
<td>Rs.5188</td>
<td>Rs.7210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribery Tax per Person</td>
<td>Rs. 1942</td>
<td>Rs.1404</td>
<td>Rs.1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribery Tax as a proportion of Income</td>
<td>23.04%</td>
<td>27.06%</td>
<td>24.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Aggregate Bribery Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service wise Rank</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Service Agencies</th>
<th>Bribery Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BDA Services</td>
<td>Ram Dev Authority</td>
<td>51.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land Record and Admini</td>
<td>Tehsil/Sub-Registrar</td>
<td>40.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Distribution</td>
<td>Civil Supply Dept.</td>
<td>35.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td>P.H.E. Department</td>
<td>33.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BMC Services</td>
<td>B.M. Corporation</td>
<td>29.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Health Care</td>
<td>Health &amp; F.W. Dept.</td>
<td>28.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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