



Agency Against Corruption, MOJ

Press Release

Date of release: 2020.01.23

Released by: Corruption Prevention Division, AAC, MOJ

Contact: Yeh Chien-Hua, Director

Telephone: (02)23141000, extension 2061

Taiwan ranked the 28th place among 180 countries worldwide in the assessment of CPI in 2019

The Transparency International (TI) announced the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) of 2019 on January 23 2020. Like 2018, there were 180 countries and regions (including Taiwan) in the world included in the assessment. Taiwan was ranked the 28th place in the assessment, which was an upward improvement from the 31st place it held in 2018. Taiwan won the score of 65 in this year and the score of 63 in 2018, which was an improvement of 2 points (full mark is 100 points) and ahead of 84% of the other countries/regions of the world. The performance of 2019 was the best since 2012 under the new standards of assessment.

In Asia-Pacific, Taiwan is just behind New Zealand (1st place with a score of 87), Singapore (4th place with score of 85), Australia (12th place with score of 77), Hong Kong (16th place with score of 76), Japan (20th place with score of 73), and Bhutan (25th place with score of 68), and ranked the 7th place in Asia-Pacific and remained the same as in 2018 (see Appendix I).

A brand new calculation method was introduced to CPI since 2012 to facilitate the comparison of countries in different years. In 2019, the assessment

of Taiwan was conducted with the use of the research findings from 8 institutions that helped to lay down the foundation for comparison. The institutions and scores adopted are: Global Insight (GI) with a score of 71.02 (a marginal rise of 0.02 from 2018), Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) with a score of 54.73 (a decline of 0.27 from 2018), International Institute for Management Development (IMD) with a score of 66.82 (a marginal rise of 0.82 from 2018), Political Risk Services (PRS) with a score of 58.55 (a decline of 0.45 from 2018), Bertelsmann Foundation (BF) with a score of 76.73 (a decline of 0.27 from 2018), World Economic Forum (WEF) with a score of 73.44 (a rise of 8.44 from 2018), Political and Economic Risk Consultancy (PERC) with a score of 54.56 (a rise of 3.56 from 2018), and Varieties of Democracies (V-Dem) with a score of 61.52 (a rise of 3.53 from 2018) (Appendix II).

The scoring of the 8 institutions as mentioned indicated improvement in 5 aspects and marginal decline in 3 aspects as compared with last year (the decline was less than 0.5, which is indeed the same in round figures). The scoring of WEF indicated significant improvement with a rise of 8.44 points. The assessment of WEF used a questionnaire survey of the corporate managers with an attempt to understand if there is possible corruption in some countries or regions by funneling public funds into individuals, companies, or organizations, and if enterprises have offered bribes against the law. Taiwan has gained successful achievement in this aspect, which indicated that Taiwan has properly implemented the United Nations Convention Against Corruption and the international review opinions of the country report under the UNCAC framework. It also indicated the effort made in the exchanges between the public and private sectors in assisting the private sector in the development of anti-corruption mechanisms, which is obvious.

CPI is the measurement of TI mainly aimed at the state of corruption and the interactions between the public and private sectors of different countries under subjective impression. For achieving high scores, countries or regions must make an effort to reduce the unfavorable effects of corruption on private enterprises to ward off illicit connection between the government and the business. The government of Taiwan has made ceaseless efforts over the years to set up the eGovernment for encouraging transparency in administrative process so that the public can complete information inquiry and applications for business online. The people could even engage in dialogue with the government so that they could understand the “transparency” and friendliness of the administrative process in public affairs. In addition, an anti-corruption platform has also been advocated for major national public construction projects to encourage transparency in the entire process to exclude the intervention of unjustified interference. This helped to reduce the anxiety of the risk of corruption deriving from major government construction projects. In addition, the Act on the Recusal of Public Servants Due to Conflicts of Interest has also been amended to fortify the mechanism of the recusal from the conflict of interest and the bill for the Whistleblower Protection Act for the protection of public interest was also launched to establish a perfect system for “the protection of the whistle blower,” This law encourages the uncovering of illegal activities related to corruption and helps to improve the transparency of the government in anti-corruption for positive feedback from the outside.

Integrity is a form of systemic engineering that requires comprehensive strategy, and could not be accomplished by just one government agency. Indeed, the joint effort and cooperation between the public and private sectors will be necessary. The assessment results of 2019 indicated improvement in Taiwan,

which also reflects our effort in aligning with the international community under the UNCAC is a step in the right direction. We will further our efforts to intensify the measures and refine our practices in anti-corruption so that the world could witness the determination of our country in fighting corruption.

Appendix I

Comparison of the scoring and ranking of countries assessed under the Corruption Perception Index (CPI) of Transparency

International in 2019 and 2018

Country, region	2019		2018		Comparing 2019 and 2018		Asia-Packing ranking in 2019
	Score	Ranking	Score	Ranking	Score	Ranking	
New Zealand	87	1	87	2	0	↑1	1
Denmark	87	1	88	1	↓1	0	
Finland	86	3	85	3	↑1	0	
Switzerland	85	4	85	3	0	↓1	
Singapore	85	4	85	3	0	↓1	2
Sweden	85	4	85	3	0	↓1	
Norway	84	7	84	7	0	0	
Netherlands	82	8	82	8	0	0	
Luxembourg	80	9	81	9	↓1	0	
Germany	80	9	80	11	0	↑2	
Iceland	78	11	76	14	↑2	↑3	
Canada	77	12	81	9	↓4	↓3	
United Kingdom	77	12	80	11	↓3	↓1	
Australia	77	12	77	13	0	↑1	3
Austria	77	12	76	14	↑1	↑2	
Hong Kong	76	16	76	14	0	↓2	4
Belgium	75	17	75	17	0	0	
Ireland	74	18	73	18	↑1	0	
Estonia	74	18	73	18	↑1	0	
Japan	73	20	73	18	0	↓2	5
United Arab Emirates	71	21	70	23	↑1	↑2	
Uruguay	71	21	70	23	↑1	↑2	
United States of America	69	23	71	22	↓2	↓1	
France	69	23	72	21	↓3	↓2	
Bhutan	68	25	68	25	0	0	6
Chile	67	26	67	27	0	↑1	
Seychelles	66	27	66	28	0	↑1	
Taiwan	65	28	63	31	↑2	↑3	7
Bahamas	64	29	65	29	↓1	0	

Country, region	2019		2018		Comparing 2019 and 2018		Asia-Packing ranking in 2019
	Score	Ranking	Score	Ranking	Score	Ranking	
Barbados	62	30	68	25	↓6	↓5	
Portugal	62	30	64	30	↓2	0	
Qatar	62	30	62	33	0	↑3	
Spain	62	30	58	41	↑4	↑11	
Botswana	61	34	61	34	0	0	
Brunei Darussalam	60	35	63	31	↓3	↓4	8
Israel	60	35	61	34	↓1	↓1	
Slovenia	60	35	60	36	0	↑1	
Lithuania	60	35	59	38	↑1	↑3	

Note: There were 180 countries included in the CPI of 2019. The above table is an extract of 28 countries scoring higher than 60.

Appendix II

Database cited in the assessment under CPI in 2019 and 2018 and the result of Taiwan in the assessment

Item	Name of Institution	Item for assessment	Scoring in 2018	Scoring in 2019	Comparison
1	全球透視機構 (Global Insight, GI)	國家風險評等 (Global Insight Country Risk Ratings)	71	71.02	+0.02
2	經濟學人智庫 (Economist Intelligence Unit, EIU)	國家風險評估 (Economist Intelligence Unit Country Risk Assessment)	55	54.73	-0.27
3	國際管理學院 (International Institute for Management Development, IMD)	世界競爭力年報 (IMD World Competitiveness Year Book)	66	66.82	+0.82
4	政治風險服務組織 (Political Risk Services, PRS)	國際國家風險指南 (Political Risk Services International Country Risk Guide)	59	58.55	-0.45
5	貝特斯曼基金會 (Bertelsmann Foundation, BF)	轉型指標 (Bertelsmann Foundation Transformation Index)	77	76.73	-0.27
6	世界經濟論壇 (World Economic Forum, WEF)	經理人調查 (World Economic Forum Executive Opinion Survey, EOS)	65	73.44	+8.44
7	政治經濟風險顧問公司 (Political and Economic Risk Consultancy, PERC)	亞洲情報 (Political and Economic Risk Consultancy Asian Intelligence)	51	54.56	+3.56
8	多元民主機構 (Varieties of Democracies, V-Dem)	多元民主計畫 (Varieties of Democracies Project)	58	61.53	+3.53