**Progress of Serbia on the list of Transparency International**

***Corruption Perception Index (CPI) for 2013***

Serbia records an increase of index in 2013 from 39 to 42, and therefore shifting on the list from 80th to 72nd position. That index is still rather low and places Serbia **among countries with widespread corruption**. However, this progress should be used as **incentive** to initiate reforms that will ensure **systemic curbing of corruption**.

**Severe rhetoric** against corruption and certain **activities of law enforcement bodies** certainly influenced to somewhat **decreased corruption level in public services** that potential investors whose estimation is used to establish Index, get in contact with. However, **progress won’t be sustainable** if based solely on fear instead of removing of corruption causes.

That means that **significant reforms in public sector, serious commitment to prevention, active prosecution and accountable judiciary are needed**.

In the past year, most prominent systemic measure that might contributed to the increase of the Index was **beginning of new Public Procurement Law implementation**. Possible influence to perception could have been made by **adoption of Anticorruption Strategy and Action Plan** as well.

On the other hand: **Public sector** is still extremely **politicized**; anticorruption **provisions of the Law on Public Enterprises are directly violated**; **transparency of Government’s work** did not improve significantly; there is no systemic monitoring of implementing independent bodies’ decisions and recommendations nor initiating matter of accountability for unfulfilled obligations.

**Incomplete judiciary reform** imposes as a problem – mechanisms for estimating quality of judges’ and prosecutors’ work weren’t established or implemented, and prosecution of corruption cases, as well as proceeding on the basis of independent bodies’ reports on violating anticorruption regulations lasts extremely long.

Priority measures that should be implemented are: **greater transparency of state organs' work** (including rules on public debates and lobbying, increasing transparency of Government’s, public enterprises' and other institutions' work), **decrease of regulatory and financial state intervention** (e.g. licenses, approvals, subsidies) that create risks of corruption, continuation of the reform in the area of **public procurements and complete re-organization of public sector**, respecting and strengthening the **role of independent state organs** (Anticorruption Agency, Commissioner for Information of Public Importance, State Audit Institution, Ombudsman) and providing implementation of their decisions and recommendations, providing **transparency of media ownership** and financing of media, **independent, efficient and accountable judiciary**, protection of **whistleblowers and witnesses of corruption**, **proactive approach** in investigation of corruption, measures for **control of public officials' and servants' property**, strict **control of accuracy and comprehensiveness of the reports on campaign and political parties' financing**, investigating of suspicions on buying of election votes and abuse of public resources during campaigns, resolving of all cases where corruption was suspected **in previous years** but also **establishing of permanent structure of law enforcement state apparatus** that will ensure uncovering and punishing of such activities in future, instead of recently established *ad hoc* mechanisms.

**Serbia at this year’s list:**

Methodology for calculating the Index was changed in 2012.Instead of previous score from 0 to 10, evaluation now goes from 0 to 100. Results from 2011 are incomparable by simple multiplying with 10, due of different methodology, but it is possible to compare status on a table and position compared to other countries. Here is how the Index and position of Serbia, that is of FRY and SCG, changed from 2000 till today:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year** | **2000** | **2003** | **2004** | **2006** | **2007** | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **2011** | **2012** | **2013** |
| **Score** | **1,3** | **2,3** | **2,7** | **3,0** | **3,4** | **3,4** | **3,5** | **3,5** | **3,3** | **39** | **42** |
| **Rank/number of countries** | **89/**  **90** | **106/133** | **97/**  **145** | **90/**  **163** | **79/**  **179** | **85/**  **180** | **83/**  **180** | **78/**  **178** | **86/**  **183** | **80/**  **176** | **72/**  **177** |

At this year’s list, Serbia passed Bulgaria and catch up with Bosnia and Herzegovina. The same Index, as Serbian and B&H, have Sao Tome and Principe and South Africa. Last year we were in the company of China and Trinidad and Tobago.

Instead of Sri Lanka, directly in front of us, this year, are Italia, Kuwait and Romania, and behind us on the list are Bulgaria, Senegal and Tunis. Burkina Faso, Salvador, Jamaica and Peru, that were directly below the Serbia for 2012, kept the same Index, while Panama regressed.

Ranking of South-East European countries and territories:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Rank*** | ***Country***/***territory*** | **Score 2012** | **Score 2013 (change)** |
| **43** | **Slovenia** | **61** | **57 (-4)** |
| **53** | **Turkey** | **49** | **50 (+1)** |
| **57** | **Croatia** | **46** | **48 (+2)** |
| **67** | **Macedonia** | **43** | **44 (+1)** |
| **67** | **Montenegro** | **41** | **44 (+3)** |
| **69** | **Romania** | **44** | **43 (-1)** |
| **72** | **B&H** | **42** | **42 (0)** |
| **72** | **Serbia** | **39** | **42 (+3)** |
| **77** | **Bulgaria** | **41** | **41 (0)** |
| **80** | **Greece** | **36** | **40 (+4)** |
| **111** | **Kosovo** | **34** | **33 (-1)** |
| **116** | **Albania** | **33** | **31 (-2)** |

It is important to mention that, out of seven researches used, two contain data from 2012. From remaining five that contain data also for 2013, in the two Serbia has stagnated, and in three recorded growth. In one of the two, increase is extremely high, which significantly influenced to total increase of Index in 2013.

**Serbian evaluation by sources for 2012 and 2013**

**CPI 2012 CPI 2013**

* **Global Insight Country Risk Ratings\*** 42 52
* **Bertelsmann Foundation\*** 49 53
* **World Economic Forum\*\*** 35 37
* **Economist Intelligence Unit\*** 38 38
* **Freedom House\*\*\*\*** 47 47
* **International Country Risk Guide\*** 31 31
* **World Justice Project Rule of Law Index\*\*\*** 35 35
* **Evaluation 39 42**

\* Experts hired by a bank/ institution

\*\* Perception of the residents; examinees are mostly local experts, local businessmen and multinational firms

\*\*\* Local experts and general population, in 2013 the same research as in 2012 was used.

\*\*\*\* Perception of non-residents; examinees mostly derive from developed countries, research used in 2013 is the same as research from 2012.