

# Corruption Correlations

## Corruption Correlations

Our blog “International Development and the Challenge of Public Sector Corruption” discusses the results of our examination of correlations for the control of corruption and government effectiveness and public financial management (PFM) performance.

## Corruption and Government Effectiveness

Correlations were calculated for the relationships between the control of corruption (capturing perceptions of the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain) and government effectiveness (including the quality of public services) for 184 countries using data from the World Bank’s 2013 Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI), together with World Bank 2013 per capita income data and Rand Corporation’s Trace (bribery) Matrix risk scores for these countries.

The Trace (bribery) Matrix risk scores have an inverse relationship with corruption control levels i.e. low Trace Matrix risk scores indicate relatively favourable levels of control over corruption whilst high Trace Matrix risk scores indicate relatively poor control over corruption. Strong relationships between WGI control over corruption /government effectiveness scores and Trace Matrix risk scores will result in relatively high negative correlation values.

Results were prepared for the total sample of 184 countries as well as the halves and quartiles of the sample.

## Corruption and Public Financial Management

Correlations were calculated for the relationships between some measures of PFM performance and the measures of corruption and government effectiveness for the 39 developing

countries for which Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessments were made available during the past three years from 2013 to 2015. The respective PFM performance measures used are performance indicators prescribed in the PEFA methodology applicable in 2011 comprising the [initial 2005 indicator set](#) and [subsequent amendments](#).

Results were also prepared for this sample of 39 countries as well as the halves and quartiles of the sample.

### **Correlations download**

The correlations are presented in a spreadsheet that can be downloaded [here](#).

---

# **Papua New Guinea Public Financial Management Profile**



# Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of the Papua New Guinea's recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country's 2015 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Papua New Guinea's performance and the performance of the other twenty-three countries that had PEFA assessments published in 2014-2015. All analyses have been prepared using results reported from using the 2011 PEFA methodology.

## Overall PFM performance

Individual country PFM performance has been determined by applying the following points scale to reported individual performance indicator (PI) scores as presented in Table 1. No points were allocated to PIs that were not scored because either data was unavailable, a D score was given or the PI was not applicable.


**Table 1: PI scoring methodology**

PEFA PI score	Points allocated
---------------	------------------

A	3
B+	2.5
B	2
C+	1.5
C	1
D+	.5
D	0

The graph in Figure 1 below shows Papua New Guinea’s overall score was ranked 21st out of the twenty-four countries.

**Figure 1: Aggregate PEFA scores for 24 countries**



Details of the distribution of overall country scores across PFM performance categories, as determined by PFMConnect, are presented in Table 2. Papua New Guinea’s overall score was 21.5 points.

**Table 2: Distribution of country PFM performance levels**

PFM performance	Overall Scores	Number of countries
Very strong	66.37-84	0
Strong	49.57-66.36	8


Moderate	32.77-49.56	7
Weak	15.97-32.76	8
Very weak	0-15.96	1
Total		24

Papua New Guinea’s overall PFM performance is classified as “weak”.

## PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Papua New Guinea’s individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no scores were recorded for the top eight indicators in Figure 2 as seven PIs (PI-4, PI-9, PI-19, PI-22, PI-23, PI-24, PI-25) received D scores whilst one PI could not be scored (PI-7) because of insufficient information.

**Figure 2: Papua New Guinea PI score comparisons**




Download a pdf version of Figure 2 here ([Papua New Guinea PIs](#)) to review individual PI scores in more detail.

Twenty PIs were assessed. Five PIs had scores above the country average, one PI had a score equal to the country average whilst fourteen PIs had scores below the country average.

## Performance across key PFM activities

The graph in Figure 3 below shows the average scores for the six key PFM activities compared with the average score recorded for these activities across the twenty-four country PEFA assessments we have studied.

**Figure 3: Papua New Guinea key PFM activity comparisons**



One key PFM activity recorded a score equal to the country average whilst five remaining key PFM activities recorded scores below the country average (one of the latter activities recorded a zero score).

### PEFA ASSESSMENT

You can download the 2015 PEFA assessment for Papua New Guinea [here](#).

---

# Nepal Public Financial Management Profile



# Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of the Nepal's recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country's 2015 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Nepal's performance and the performance of the other twenty-three countries that had PEFA assessments published in 2014-2015. All analyses have been prepared using results reported from using the 2011 PEFA methodology.

## Overall PFM performance

Individual country PFM performance has been determined by applying the following points scale to reported individual performance indicator (PI) scores as presented in Table 1. No points were allocated to PIs that were not scored because either data was unavailable, a D score was given or the PI was not applicable.


**Table 1: PI scoring methodology**

PEFA PI score	Points allocated
A	3
B+	2.5
B	2
C+	1.5

C	1
D+	.5
D	0

The graph in Figure 1 below shows Nepal's overall score was ranked 6th out of the twenty-four countries.

**Figure 1: Aggregate PEFA scores for 24 countries**



Details of the distribution of overall country scores across PFM performance categories, as determined by PFMConnect, are presented in Table 2. Nepal's overall score was 50.5 points.

**Table 2: Distribution of country PFM performance levels**

PFM performance	Overall Scores	Number of countries
Very strong	66.37-84	0
Strong	49.57-66.36	8
Moderate	32.77-49.56	7
Weak	15.97-32.76	8
Very weak	0-15.96	1
Total		24


Nepal's overall PFM performance is classified as "strong".



# PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Nepal’s individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no scores were recorded for the top two indicators in Figure 2 as these PIs (PI-27, PI-28) received D scores (because Parliament did not meet during the period reviewed for the PEFA assessment).

**Figure 2: Nepal PI score comparisons**




Download a pdf version of Figure 2 here ([Nepal PIs](#)) to review individual PI scores in more detail.

All twenty-eight PIs were assessed. Seventeen PIs had scores above the country average whilst eleven PIs had scores below the country average.

## Performance across key PFM activities

The graph in Figure 3 below shows the average scores for the six key PFM activities compared with the average score recorded for these activities across the twenty-four country PEFA assessments we have studied.

**Figure 3: Nepal key PFM activity comparisons**



Five key PFM activities recorded scores above the country average whilst the remaining one key PFM activity recorded a score below the country average.

## PEFA ASSESSMENT

You can download the 2015 PEFA assessment for Nepal [here](#).

---

# The Gambia Public Financial Management Profile



# Introduction

This note presents a series of charts which provide an **overview** of the Gambia's recent public financial management (PFM) performance based on this country's 2015 Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) assessment. Comparisons are made between Gambia's performance and the performance of the other twenty-three countries that had PEFA assessments published in 2014-2015. All analyses have been prepared using results reported from using the 2011 PEFA methodology.

## Overall PFM performance

Individual country PFM performance has been determined by applying the following points scale to reported individual performance indicator (PI) scores as presented in Table 1. No points were allocated to PIs that were not scored because either data was unavailable, a D score was given or the PI was not applicable.


**Table 1: PI scoring methodology**

PEFA PI score	Points allocated
---------------	------------------

A	3
B+	2.5
B	2
C+	1.5
C	1
D+	.5
D	0

The graph in Figure 1 below shows Gambia's overall score was ranked 17th out of the twenty-four countries.

**Figure 1: Aggregate PEFA scores for 24 countries**



Details of the distribution of overall country scores across PFM performance categories, as determined by PFMConnect, are presented in Table 2. Gambia's overall score was 27.5 points.

**Table 2: Distribution of country PFM performance levels**

PFM performance	Overall Scores	Number of countries
Very strong	66.37-84	0
Strong	49.57-66.36	8
Moderate	32.77-49.56	7


Weak	15.97-32.76	8
Very weak	0-15.96	1
Total		24

Gambia’s overall PFM performance is classified as “weak”.

## PI performance

The graph in Figure 2 below shows the scores for Gambia’s individual PIs compared with the average score recorded for each PI across the twenty-four PEFA assessments we have studied. Please note that no scores were recorded for the top three indicators in Figure 2 as it was not possible to score these PIs (PI-4, PI-7, PI-8).

**Figure 2: Gambia PI score comparisons**




Download a pdf version of Figure 2 here ([Gambia PIs](#)) to review individual PI scores in more detail.

Twenty-five of the twenty-eight PIs were assessed. Nine PIs had scores above the country average, one PI had a score equal to the respective PI country average whilst fifteen PIs had scores below the country average.

## Performance across key PFM activities

The graph in Figure 3 below shows the average scores for the six key PFM activities compared with the average score recorded for these activities across the twenty-four country PEFA assessments we have studied.

**Figure 3: Gambia key PFM activity comparisons**



Two key PFM activities recorded scores above the country average whilst the remaining four key PFM activities recorded scores below the country average.

### **PEFA ASSESSMENT**

You can download the 2015 PEFA assessment for Gambia [here](#).