



UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Experiences, good practices and challenges in measuring corruption and the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks

Part 1 – National experiences with assessing the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks

1. Does your country have any mechanisms in place to assess the effectiveness of its legislative and/or institutional anti-corruption framework? Please briefly summarize the methodology, scope and frequency of the process as well as any specific tools your country uses.

At national level, an inter-institutional working group, coordinated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation (MAECI) has been established over the years, at the aim to assess the effectiveness of the legislative and/or institutional anti-corruption framework.

This group also plays a role as reference point for the international for a, like the ACWG of G7 and G20.

In Italy mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of anticorruption measures and more in general the response of the institutional anti-corruption framework are coordinated by the Italian national anti-corruption Authority (ANAC).

From this point of view, it is useful to focus on the progress we have made in Italy in the last few years regarding:

- from one side the ways to prepare anticorruption plans, both at national and local level;
- from the other side on our approach in following and monitoring how this plans are translated into practice, and in collecting related data that allows us an evidence-based approach in our regulation activities.

The prevention of corruption and integrity system in Italy is based on a model that provides for planning and control activities both at a centralized national level - through the National Anti-corruption Plan (NAP) issued by ANAC - and at a decentralized, local level, through the specific integrity plans adopted by each public administration, with a “cascade” planning model that affects all levels of government. The NAP is a programmatic three years tool, updated annually, with the inclusion of indicators and targets in order to make the prevention of corruption strategic objectives measurable. The integrity plan adopted by each public administration identifies, on the basis of the NAP, the specific risks of corruption in each administration and the measures necessary to prevent them and to foster integrity (this measures are mandatory as rotation of assignments, training, civic participation, and specific for each organization). In order to be effective, also the integrity plans must contain measuring indicators and appropriate targets and should be coordinated with other programming tools, mainly the budget, ensuring the financial sustainability of the interventions.

After the first NAP, ten years ago, and during the first years of application of this system, the integrity plans tended to be mainly descriptive documents, with integrity and prevention of corruption objectives generic and difficult to measure. Over time, the quality of the integrity

Making the world safer from drugs, crime and terrorism

plans has progressively improved, but the ANAC has always recommended to further focus on the evaluation of the implemented initiatives.

For this reason, ANAC devoted a part of the last NAP (released in January 2023) to the strengthening of the tools to monitor the efficiency and the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures.

At micro level, ANAC highlighted that public administrations, in implementing anti-corruption policies, must define which processes have to be mapped in a standardized way. The processes that typically need to be mapped are those in which are managed financial resources. Moreover, the processes to be mapped are those exposed to significant corruption risks (risk analysis is mandatory for public procurement, recruitment, grants, concessions and authorizations areas, plus processes with a large level of discretion or with significant socio-economic impact). Once the processes to be mapped have been identified, public administrations have to proceed with the identification of the anti-corruption objectives, in practice. ANAC, according to a typical “management by objectives approach”, stressed that the objectives have to be few, sustainable, concrete, useful, not redundant. For each anticorruption objective have to be established: a person responsible, implementation times, indicators and targets (expected values) useful for monitoring and evaluating them. Moreover, ANAC always suggests to involve stakeholders and civil society in the evaluation of anticorruption and integrity initiatives. In this regard, it can be very useful to open channels for listening to stakeholders and conduct surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc. to detect potential aspects that have not been assessed or considered important by the administrations.

At macro level, ANAC in the last few years has been working to aggregate objectives and indicators taken from the integrity plans of public administration in order to elaborate trends and “taking pictures” of some specific phenomena related to corruption. In a medium-term perspective, anticorruption policies and strategies will be assessed by ANAC also using the risk indicators recently released in the context of a specific project about corruption measurement.

2. Please describe the institutional setup for assessing the effectiveness of the anti-corruption framework. Which institutions are involved in the assessment? Is there a mechanism for interagency cooperation in assessing the effectiveness of the anti-corruption framework? Does your country engage with academia, civil society and the private sector throughout these processes?

As described above, ANAC is the coordinator of a mechanism of institutional synergies involving all public administration in a top-down flow for objective and strategies and in a bottom-up flow for evaluation of measures that all public organization put in place to prevent corruption. NGOs and academia are involved in consultation processes ex ante and ex post. Furthermore specific participation processes focused on the NAP are structured in the context of the Italian Open Government Plan.

3. If your country uses indicators to assess the effectiveness of its anti-corruption framework, please describe the indicators as well as the data sources used.

Indicators are taken from the integrity plans elaborated by individual administrations and elaborated by ANAC on the basis of specific needs. As described above, ANAC is going to use also national and local risk indicators developed in the context of a specific project. For further information, please see also answer No. 5.

Istat estimates SDGs goals indicators on the prevalence of corruption experienced by families.

The population survey also includes estimates on the vote buying.

Other indicators regards the response of the State to corruption by law enforcements and judiciary system.

4. Please summarize any findings of the effectiveness assessment. If several exercises have been conducted, have any trends been identified?

The large work done on producing information on corruption, increased awareness on the possibility of measuring corruption and on the importance of using a data driven approach, to evaluate the effectiveness of anticorruption policies. This approach, used at national level, was also exported at the international one.

Findings and lessons learned are used not only to study the effectiveness of the anticorruption measures at national level, but also to drive the drafting of new plans and in some case to drive supervision activities in specific areas/sectors/areas in an iterative process.

5. How does your institution or country use the results of the assessments to inform policy-making? Has your country amended its anti-corruption framework in response to the outcomes of the effectiveness assessments?

ANAC bases its regulatory and supervisory action on data.

Data driven anticorruption policies and practices is the pre-requisite of any activities provided.

Measuring corruption, identifying red flags, early warnings and risk indicators is the prerequisite for knowing corruption phenomena and to establish preventive and repressive policies. For this reason, among other initiatives, ANAC has long been coordinating the project “Measuring the Risk of Corruption at Territorial Level and Promoting Transparency” – funded under the EU “National Operational Program on Governance and Institutional Capacity” - involving several other institutions, universities and experts.

In general terms, the main purpose of the project is to provide objective indicators to detect risks of corruption at the territorial level and to support prevention, integrity and transparency policies. The production of risk indicators is an important contribution not only in terms of increasing the scientific knowledge of the phenomenon but also for designing and evaluating contrast initiatives such as the ones contained in the anti-corruption plans.

On the one hand the results of the project are organized in a web portal, with data, dashboards, bibliographies, infographics, media materials related to the topic of corruption risk measurement; the publication of such indicators on a dedicated interface tool on the Web allows that they are widely usable by different categories of stakeholders. On the other hand, by monitoring the trends of the indicators over time, it will also be possible to obtain useful information on the effectiveness of anti-corruption policies and strategies.

To sum up, the monitoring, assessment and report activities are played at two levels: within each public administration, and overall concerning the national strategy of ANAC, since the NAP is updated every year based on the results of the oversight activity.

In the same direction of providing information, based on an objective approach, Istat established a survey, carried out in 2015-2016 and 2022-2023, in order to study the prevalence and the dynamics of petty corruption (mainly bribery) in 8 sectors of public administration and services. The survey also includes a measure of the usefulness of the illegal exchanges.

The results are useful in estimating the “dark figure of crime”, that means how many families did not report to the police the bribery requests.

Data from police on arrests, data on convictions and prosecutions, as well as data from confiscation and asset recovery are interesting to monitor the law effectiveness.

6. Which challenges has your country encountered in assessing the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks, and which steps have been taken to overcome them?

The objective approach of measuring corruption is still in progress. Even if the proactive attitude towards this direction, the process is not yet finished.

We also have to monitor the effectiveness of the recent law anti-corruption.

7. Which good practices could your country share regarding the measurement the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks that could benefit other States?

The features of the ANAC project to measure risk of corruption described above can be a model to follow in other countries too.

In particular, the open, transparent, concrete, analytical and participatory approach was a key to the success of the project which is recommended to be replicated in other contexts as well

8. Has your country been guided by any international efforts aimed at improving or assessing the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks (e.g., peer review mechanisms, methodologies provided by international organizations)? If not, are there any tools or measures by international organizations that you would consider helpful in this regard (e.g., guidance on data collection, provision of tools, stronger focus on effectiveness in peer reviews)?

Indeed international frameworks were and are a source of inspiration. In particular an added value for ANAC and for Istat was participating in the UNODC global consultation in view of the “UN statistical framework to measure corruption”, as well as the sharing of experiences during the UNODC international cooperation and prevention of corruption working groups.

Italy considers very useful the SDGs metadata repository for goal 16, as well as the Manual on measuring corruption towards surveys, UNODC published in 2018. Istat also took part to the Task force writing this Manual.

9. Please insert any information you would like to add, such as descriptions of indicators or links to sources or reports.

LINK:

<http://www.g20italy.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/G20ACWG-Compendium-of-Good-Practices-on-Corruption-Measurement.pdf>

<https://www.istat.it/evento/la-misurazione-della-corruzione-in-italia-analisi-stato-dellarte-e-prospettive/>

<https://www.istat.it/comunicato-stampa/la-corruzione-in-italia/>

Part 2 - National experiences with corruption measurement

A. Existing national or sub-national mechanisms to measure corruption and/or the effectiveness of anti-corruption frameworks

1. Does your country have any mechanisms in place to quantify or measure corruption? Please briefly summarize the methodology and scope (e.g. national, regional, sectoral) and frequency of the measurement process.

As mentioned above, ANAC has long been coordinating the *project “Measuring the Risk of Corruption at Territorial Level and Promoting Transparency”*

As part of the Project, ANAC is working to integrate as many data sources as possible, to design methodologies for calculation and validation of indicators, to involve as many institutional, academic, research, NGOs and other relevant actors to work together on the production and use of data and indicators. So far, have been developed and calculated 17 risk indicators using data related to public procurement and 48 context indicator using data related to criminality, environment, labor market, social capital, local economy, 5 risk indicator at level of municipalities. (

<https://anac-c1.board.com/#/screen/?capsulePath=Cruscotti%20Inglese%5CIndicatori%20di%20contesto.bcps&showMenu=false>)

Objectives of the project are:

- Construction of a set of public procurement and context risk indicators at territorial level;
- Setting of interoperability between information systems;
- providing dashboards of indicators and red flags on public procurement, corruption and maladministration;
- Promotion of civic participation and investment on dissemination of data on risks.

The results of the project are organized in a specific web portal, with data, information, bibliographies, infographics, media materials related to the topic of risk measurement. The core of the portal is the section related to the dashboards to release datasets and risk indicators.

The Project is promoting a participatory and structured path producing data and indicators on corruption risk, contextualizing them at the territorial level, which can be useful for the prevention

and repression of corruption, but also for *policy making*, for scientific and sociocultural debate and, possibly, for *benchmarking*. Sharing such methodologies and experiences could also be useful to promote an international debate on the subject, to start the verification of the replicability of some of the results achieved in different situations.

Following some technical details.

The National Database of Public Contracts in the context of the Project

The main source of data within ANAC is the National Database of Public Contracts (hereinafter BDNCP). Part of the data and indicators managed under the Project to measure corruption are taken from the BDNCP.

The BDNCP is a database that collects, integrates and reconciles data concerning public contracts transmitted by contracting authorities. The system is open to interoperability, under application cooperation, both with internal systems of the Authority, and with similar systems of other administrations.

ANAC manages the BDNCP, which incorporates all the information contained in existing databases, including at the territorial level, in order to ensure unified accessibility, transparency, publicity and traceability of the whole procurement process. ANAC establishes the modalities for the holders of such databases, subject to signatures of interoperability protocols, to ensure the confluence of the data.

The guiding principles of the BDNCP are as follows:

1. integrate the information collected in the context of the Authority's activities into a single database;
2. have reasonable, logically aggregated, accessible, reliable, up-to-date real-time data, secure and comparable over time;
3. make available to the various *stakeholders* involved in the procurement management processes a database for decision support.

Currently, this database supports both the Authority in its supervisory and regulatory functions, and all other public administrations interested in the life cycle of Public Contracts for planning, containment of expenditure and monitoring purposes.

All data from each steps of the complex procurement process are systematically acquired to ensure a timely and effective monitoring of the financial flows generated by public procurement and the collection of large amounts of data from geographically distant public bodies.

The data acquired with the BDNCP allow:

1. geographical studies (how contracting stations are distributed on the national territory in relation to a given scope of contracts)
2. economic surveys (which contracting stations spend more, how often, for which purchases)
3. surveys on procurement processes' timing, and

4. identification of recurring patterns as red flags to measure indicators useful for detecting corruption.

The BDNCP represents a unique experience at the European level, so much so that in 2018 it was awarded the first prize of the “*Better Governance through Procurement Digitalization*“ competition launched by the EU Commission, on the basis of its “completeness, data integrity, interoperability, availability of access and information analysis, *governance* and sustainability“. The BDNC was recognized as the best example of “*National Contract Register*“ within the European Union¹. Indeed, at European level there are no databases with an ultra-decade content comparable to BDNCP as the considerable interest from numerous universities and research institutes around the world shows.

In order to confirm and improve the results already achieved, the Data Base is constantly evolving along the lines of the complete *open data opening* with the publication of all the data relating to public contracts, the constant support for the full implementation of the digitalization of public procurement in Italy of the greater integration in the context of European databases.

The progressive digitization and use of electronic tools, the standardization of tendering procedures and the widespread availability of contract data are powerful tools to support transparency, competition and the prevention of corruption.

In order to allow greater accessibility of information and to facilitate consultation by both internal and external users, starting September 2020 the platform for the publication of data in open format (*Open-Data*) has been made public on the ANAC website. This allows the use of a substantial part of the database by “expert” users². A dashboard has also been created for guided access to the available information, which allow *self-service* analysis, from aggregated data to the details³.

The publication of the contents of the BDNCP in *open data* is an important result, because it facilitates even sophisticated forms of public use of a database of strategic interest to the country. The BDNCP can be used both to obtain timely information on individual purchases, and a series of useful descriptive statistics – through the presence of an easy-to-use interface – and to carry out processing of the so-called “big data” -- approximately 5 million records per year –. These analyses allow to feed a complex ecosystem, within which are the universities and research institutions, the media – today increasingly interested in forms of journalism “driven by data”, and non-profit organisation. The establishment of databases and the publication of data in open format on *public procurement* systems is certainly not a novelty at the international level, but the BDNCP stands out for the wide coverage, quantity and quality of the data.

Measuring the risk of corruption

The main objective of the Project is to provide appropriate indicators to measure corruption at the territorial level, to support the prevention of corruption and to promote transparency in the action of the Public Administration, while at the same time overcoming the limits of the statistical measurement of corruption currently available, mainly perceptive indicators.

¹ See:

https://ec.europa.eu/growth/content/european-commission-award-better-governance-through-procurement-digitalisation_en.

² See: <http://>

www.anticorruzione.it/portal/public/classic/Comunicazione/News/_news?id=c591bc320a7780422318aa12cd2d83d5.

³ Below, the link to the portal: <https://dati.anticorruzione.it/#/home>

The production of risk indicators of a quantitative nature on a systematic basis is in fact an important contribution not only in terms of increasing the scientific knowledge of the phenomenon but also in terms of the design of contrast measures that are more effective and adapted to the diversity of the contexts.

Indicators of corruption risk in procurement

The Project is particularly focused on the development of indicators of corruptive risks in public procurement, because of the relevance and high risk of corruption of this area and because of the availability of the BDNCP.

As mentioned above, the BDNCP is a valuable asset, with the more than 5 million public contracts overviewed in 2020 and about 53 million contracts over the last 10 years, for a value of about 2,240 billion euros. In terms of the quantity and detail of the data contained, the BDNCP represents a unique experience at least at European level, allowing the calculation of risk indicators of corruption with an extreme degree of territorial, sectoral and temporal detail.

These indicators can be calculated for public contracts which value equals to more than EUR 40,000 and for individual Administrations. The indicators can be eventually re-aggregated by territorial level (municipalities, provinces, regions, etc.) for subsequent analyses on their joint interaction.

Territorial aspect and data and context indicators

A further approach that is being developed by the Project starts from the observation of different of indicators in different geographical areas. It should be stressed in this respect that the purpose of constructing indicators is not necessarily to provide detailed predictive measures at unbundled level, but to highlight anomalies in the measures chosen which may reveal situations of corruption risk. The emphasis is therefore on the search for significant deviations of indices from “normal” situations.

From these premises, it is possible to perform more than one in-depth analysis to explain the corruption phenomenon according to two elements that can constitute two distinct blocks of a forecast model: the first is an element of *propensity towards corruption* which, in turn, constitutes a fundamental basis *on* which corruption can take root. The second, on the other hand, represents an idiosyncratic element which can lead to corruption even in the presence of a low propensity towards it or, on the contrary, to virtuous situations of limited corruption even in the presence of a high propensity observed in the context.

In this regard, the propensity to corruption can be imagined as a geographically identified factor that varies in space. Two neighboring provinces tend to have similar habits and customs which presumably lead to a similar propensity for corruption.

The propensity factor can be measured mainly through three instruments: a) the use of *proxies* of the phenomenon⁴; b) the use of models that take into account geographical trends; and c) the use of self-regressive spatial models such as those suggested by spatial econometry.

⁴ For example, one could use a *proxy* based on so-called “social capital”, a hypothesis of great suggestion but which also requires caution, as well as accurate and not easy scientific validation. In this regard, one of the topics covered by international scientific literature on the analysis and

Finally, the project developed a scheme for measuring the risk of corruption in which the reference territorial framework takes on a very important value, in view of the possibility of identifying indicators of social, economic and environmental contexts with a theoretical and not necessarily statistical link, with the consequences of corruption and its effects on the social context such as the harm to the free market, the cancellation of economic competition, the acquisition of inefficient services for communities, the delivery of poor and expensive infrastructures, etc. This strand of research aims to analyse a multiplicity of information sources from which to draw qualitative-quantitative data in order to represent the corruption phenomenon in its emerging component, identify signals of its possible hidden evolution, capture its evolution over time and identify particular risk areas, also in order to identify indicators and *red flags*.

To this end, *pillars, or domains*, (education, environment, social capital, local economy, labor market, criminality) have been defined, as has already been the case for many examples of measurement of complex multidimensional phenomena in the past.

“Open approach” to the processing of open data

Another highly innovative aspect of the project is the approach used for data processing. The calculation of the indicators is done using the same open format data described above, in a situation in which, thanks to complete transparency to the outside, the Authority will be one user among others. For the calculation of indicators, and in general to statistically analyse BDNCP and other data sources, we use a very widespread open source (and free) software, “R”, which responds to a wide range of statistical analysis needs of the data, including the analysis of large databases (as is the case with the BDNCP) and the use of the so-called artificial intelligence techniques.

Firstly, by allowing anyone with the necessary technical skills to “recalculate indices at home”, the objective of maximising transparency is pursued, thus avoiding the weaknesses of a possible technocratic and up-down approach. This aspect is then amplified by the possibility of modifying the calculations proposed by the Authority, or possibly proposing, calculating and publishing alternative indicators. The openness of the platform could fuel an “ecosystem” of those who are able to profit from them, to the obvious advantage, considering also that the public debate that would be fueled would prevent such measures from being perceived as “black boxes”. This is an important topic today, and is destined to acquire even greater relevance in the future, as the use of artificial intelligence techniques is spreading.

Secondly, this approach enables awareness-raising and training activities, both with regard to the databases used for the preparation and validation of indicators, and towards statistical techniques and analysis technologies: “open data” and “open source” programming languages, the value of which is also widely recognised in the labour market. The availability of such a precious exercise defined by a set of valuable data, and by an advanced practice, would then make it possible to better argue to the public the central value of transparency, the essential role that it plays for the smooth functioning of an advanced democracy.

measurement of corruption is in fact that of the relationship between social capital and corruption, based on the intuitive assumption of the relationship between the spread of corruption and culture/level of civic sense of the territorial area of origin of the actors of the corruption (see for example Raymond Fisman and Edward Miguel, "Corruption, Norms, and Legal Enforcement: Evidence from Diplomatic Parking Tickets", 2007, *Journal of Political Economy*; Simon Gächter and Jonathan F. Schulz, "Intrinsic Honesty and the Prevalence of Rule Violations across Societies", 2016.

Since 2011, Istat has been collecting data on citizens' experiences with corruption. This initiative began when the first Istat-CNEL Scientific Commission on Fair and Sustainable Well-being (BES) recognized the need for appropriate indicators in the "security" domain to represent the phenomenon and its impact on citizens. In the absence of data capturing the hidden aspects of corruption, beyond the legal side observable through judicial data, an experimental module was designed and integrated into the Victimization Survey on Citizens' Security. The goal was to obtain objective measurement data on the prevalence and incidence of corruption rather than perception indicators.

To achieve this, a module was designed in 2014 and 2015, primarily aiming to understand the hidden part of the phenomenon, the sectors most involved in corrupt practices, and the environment in which corruption thrives. The focus was on petty corruption, which occurs in interactions between citizens and public officials. However, following the design phase, the decision was made to expand the focus beyond the public sector to include the private sector, in line with the 2012 anti-corruption law that addressed private-sector corruption.

The design phase included a review of national and international literature, conducting focus groups with sector experts, and interviews with key witnesses. Experts considered included judges, journalists, academics, politicians, representatives of trade associations, and members of ANAC. Internationally, the UNODC and the World Bank served as reference points.

In 2015 was decided to insert for the first time the ad hoc module in the corresponding wave of the survey, an year later the indicator about the prevalence of family would have been established as the measure of the target 16.5.1 of the Goal 16 of UN SDGs.

In 2018, the United Nations produced a manual to support countries in measuring corruption through surveys (Manual on Corruption Surveys: Methodological guidelines on the measurement of bribery and other forms of corruption through sample surveys), aimed at measuring goal 16, target 5: "Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms," and specifically indicator 16.5.1: The percentage of people who had at least one contact with a public official and who paid a bribe to a public official, or were asked for a bribe by that official, in the previous 12 months.

The final choice was to construct a module to be included in the Citizens' Security Survey. Key themes are the detection of direct corruption experiences in eight sectors: health and care, assistance, education (school or university), employment (to obtain a job or benefits like transfers, promotions, raises, etc.), access to and use of public offices, justice, interactions with law enforcement and military forces, and access to public utility services (electricity, gas, water, telephone).

For each of these sectors, if one or more corruption episodes occurred in the last three years, the dynamics of the corruption are recorded, such as whether there was direct interaction between the

involved parties or the presence of intermediaries, the type and extent of the exchange, and the utility of the exchange and the reporting behaviour to the authorities.

Moreover, the importance of detecting indirectly known corruption was also highlighted, such as knowledge of others in one's entourage (relatives, neighbours, friends) experiencing corruption; witnessing illicit exchanges of money or favours in one's work environment; vote-buying in administrative, political, and European elections; and perceptions of corruption in the business and professional environment.

In the 2022-2023 edition, a set of questions was added to measure tolerance towards corruption and its inevitability. ### Corruption and the Families' Perspective

When asking questions, the interviewee is addressed with inquiries about whether anyone has asked them or their family members, directly or indirectly through intermediaries, or if it has been suggested or implied, that by paying extra money, giving gifts, or doing favours, they would receive the requested benefits or services. The exchange is clearly highlighted, even if the typical situation is reconstructed in a more subtle manner. The questions are adapted to different contexts and the possible actors of corruption, as illustrated in the examples provided for the healthcare and employment sectors.

In the healthcare sector: Has it ever happened to you or any of your family members living with you, when you needed a medical visit, a diagnostic test, hospitalization, or surgery, that to obtain or speed up the service or to assist you, a doctor, nurse, or other healthcare personnel, made it clear, suggested, or asked, directly or through others, for extra money, a gift, or other favours? And has it ever happened to you that in a public healthcare facility, a gynaecologist, obstetrician, surgeon, or anaesthetist asked you for money to assist or operate on you?

In the employment sector: Now let's talk about work. Has it ever happened to you or any of your family members living with you, when you were looking for a job, participating in public competitions, or trying to start a business, that someone made it clear, suggested, or asked, even through others, for money, gifts, or other favours? And has it ever happened to you that you were asked for money or something else for promotions, transfers, or other job benefits?

The next survey is planned for 2027.

Furthermore in order to implement the UNODC Statistical Framework to measure corruption, Istat organized a participated inter-institutional conference (6Th of June 2024) aimed at pushing the process of collaboration. Starting from these good results, in September 2024, Istat will launch the Italian Working Group at the aim to cooperate and exchange experiences to measure corruption.

2. Please summarize any findings of the measurement exercises. If several exercises have been conducted, have any trends been identified?

In 2017, Istat estimated that 7.9% of households have been directly involved in corrupt activities such as requests for money, favours, gifts, or other items in exchange for services or favours at some point in their lives (2.7% in the last 3 years, 1.2% in the last 12 months). Corruption has primarily affected the employment sector (3.2% of households), especially during job searches, participation in competitions, or the start of a new job (2.7%).

In 2022-2023, the prevalence over the entire course of life decreased to 5.4% and to 1.3% in the last 3 years, with the last figure probably affected by Covid-19 pandemic.

In 2022-2023, the vote buying involved the 2.7% of citizens, between 18 and 80 years old, who were offered money, goods or benefits in exchange for voting (3.7% in 2015-2016).

Other data available here: <https://www.istat.it/comunicato-stampa/la-corruzione-in-italia/>

For the ANAC portal, see above as well for details maps and infographics.

3. Which institutions are involved in the measurement efforts (*e.g. Ministry/ies, Anti-Corruption Agency, Civil Service Commission, Ethics Commission, National Statistical Office, Supreme Audit Institution, procurement authority, tax authority, law enforcement authority*)? Is there a mechanism for interagency cooperation in measuring corruption?

At Institutional level, Istat, Anac, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Economy and Public Finance, Bank of Italy, Agency for Assets recovery and Confiscated Assets, Supreme Audit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

For ANAC:

As explained above, the corruption measurement project coordinated by ANAC involves several other institutions, NGOs and Academia, both to provide data and to design and calculate indicators and to use them.

Concerning users, among others stakeholders, indicators today can be used:

- a. by the authorities and institutions that work on preventing and fighting against corruption, to better target oversight activities,
- b. but also by all other public bodies to develop their integrity plans and develop appropriate mitigation strategies,
- c. by Academia for research and studies,
- d. and by NGOs and citizens to perform social control.

4. Does your country engage with academia, civil society and the private sector in measuring corruption?

Yes, to plan the Istat surveys and the portal carried out by ANAC.

5. Which challenges has your country encountered in measuring corruption and which steps have been taken to overcome them? *E.g. Lack of resources, lack of methodological guidance, lack of technical capacity, lack of credibility of data, lack of legislation and procedures in place, multiplicity of data collection approaches, multiplicity of data sources and formats*

The main challenge was the need of huge quantity of resources (funds, time, human capital) to use and sustainability of the process. Another important challenge was the inter-operability of data sources.

In this perspective, Istat has to conduct the survey on corruption applied to businesses for measuring the 16.5.2 indicator.

There is a plan to study the judiciary verdicts on corruption. In the past, Istat and the University of Sant'Anna (Pisa) did it and merged these data with businesses registers.

Another interesting analysis to be replied, regards the statistical matching between register of public procurement winners with the one of businesses in order to look at the performance and wellbeing of firms that won public procurements.

The first experiment was made in 2018- 2019 under the agreement between Istat and ANAC.

6. Which good practices could your country share regarding the measurement of corruption that could benefit other States?

The inter-institutional cooperation and the reference to the International Guidelines.

B. Specific areas of corruption, indicators and sources

1. Which types of corruption does your country measure and which specific indicators does your country use to assess the level of corruption?

Please tick or describe the indicators your country uses to measure corruption.

	Direct measures (e.g. prevalence of corruption collected through surveys)	Perception (among general population or selected groups collected through surveys)	Risk constraints (factors that deter corruption, e.g. use of e-governance)	Risks Opportunities (Factors that enable corruption; e.g. little oversight)	Legislative response (<i>de jure</i> ; e.g. law in place)	(Criminal) Justice response (<i>de facto</i> ; e.g. arrests, convictions for corruption offences)
Bribery	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Embezzlement/misappropriation	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Money-laundering	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Illicit enrichment	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Abuse of functions	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Public hiring based on merit	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
			All public hirings are based on public selection			

	Direct measures (e.g. prevalence of corruption collected through surveys)	Perception (among general population or selected groups collected through surveys)	Risk constraints (factors that deter corruption, e.g. use of e-governance)	Risks Opportunities (Factors that enable corruption; e.g. little oversight)	Legislative response (<i>de jure</i> ; e.g. law in place)	(Criminal) Justice response (<i>de facto</i> ; e.g. arrests, convictions for corruption offences)
Independence and integrity of the judiciary	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> About civil justice	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Conflict of interest	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> It is forbidden to stay in the same office with relative	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Management of Public finances	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Public procurement	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Candidature for and election to public office	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Data on vote-buying	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Preventive measures for the private sector	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.
Preventive measures for state-owned enterprises	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Click or tap here to enter text.

	Direct measures (e.g. prevalence of corruption collected through surveys)	Perception (among general population or selected groups collected through surveys)	Risk constraints (factors that deter corruption, e.g. use of e-governance)	Risks Opportunities (Factors that enable corruption; e.g. little oversight)	Legislative response (<i>de jure</i> ; e.g. law in place)	(Criminal) Justice response (<i>de facto</i> ; e.g. arrests, convictions for corruption offences)
Training programmes	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Resources allocated to fight corruption	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Public reporting and access to information	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Protection of reporting persons	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Other: Risk indicators	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Other:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Other:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.
Other:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.

	Direct measures (e.g. prevalence of corruption collected through surveys)	Perception (among general population or selected groups collected through surveys)	Risk constraints (factors that deter corruption, e.g. use of e-governance)	Risks Opportunities (Factors that enable corruption; e.g. little oversight)	Legislative response (<i>de jure</i> ; e.g. law in place)	(Criminal) Justice response (<i>de facto</i> ; e.g. arrests, convictions for corruption offences)
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
Other:	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.	Click or tap here to enter text.

Please insert any information you would like to add, such as descriptions of indicators or links to sources or reports.

A reflection on the previous indicators will start on September 2024

2. Which methods and data sources does your country use to measure corruption?

- Population surveys
- Business surveys
- Public official surveys
- Administrative records
- Procurement data
- Banking data
- Criminal justice records
- Other:

C. Data collection and use

1. How does your country ensure the validity and integrity of the data collected on corruption?

Data quality controls and data monitoring

2. Are policies or mechanisms in place to

- Discuss and agree on data objectives, priorities and scope between relevant stakeholders

- Collect data to measure corruption systematically
- Collect data disaggregated by
 - sex
 - age
- Validate the accuracy and impartiality of the data collected to measure corruption
- Facilitate data sharing across institutions
- Integrate data from different sources
- Ensure easy access to data
- Release information on the measurement of corruption on regular basis (monthly, yearly)

3. Which technological tools or systems are employed by your country in the collection and analysis of relevant data?

For the ANAC scope of activities, see above.

4. How does your country utilize the data on corruption to inform policy-making and anti-corruption strategies?

Data are public available and are considered in order to plan policies.

Yes, for the ANAC scope of activities, see above.

5. Has your country participated in any international efforts or collaborations aimed at improving the measurement of corruption? If not, which efforts would you find helpful to inform your national measurement work?

Indeed international frameworks were and are a source of inspiration. In particular an added value for ANAC and Istat was participating in the UNODC global consultation in view of the “ UN statistical framework to measure corruption”, as well as the sharing of experiences during the UNODC international cooperation and prevention of corruption working groups

6. If your country does not currently measure corruption, can you indicate why? Would any international efforts, e.g., those by international organizations, be helpful to inform national efforts in this regard? Which tools, support or other measures would you consider helpful?