Corruption in Government
On December 6, 2007, Transparency International published the Global Corruption Barometer 2007, which is based on a survey of 63,199 respondents in 60 countries who rated their experiences of corruption. Respondents indicated which institutions most frequently demand bribes, where they find the greatest degree of corruption, and how they see both the future development of corruption and their governments' efforts to eradicate it. (Transparency International 2007).

A major finding of the survey is that citizens in countries across the globe continue to see political parties and parliaments as the institutions most compromised by corruption. This finding has been repeated throughout the years; that political parties and parliaments – the very institutions entrusted to represent the public interest in political decision-making, have been consistently rated as the most corrupt. “Our experience has shown that it is commitment at the top that will make or break efforts to fight corruption,” said Transparency International Managing Director, Cobus de Swardt. “These troubling numbers show that government faces a crisis of legitimacy, with the potential to undermine democratisation, stability and the protection of human rights.”

According to Transparency International, the general public was most skeptical, on average, in North and Latin America, the greater EU region and Asia-Pacific.

“That North Americans and Europeans see government efforts so negatively (with 19 and 28 per cent average approval ratings respectively), despite low levels of petty bribery, suggests that they are concerned about problems of grand corruption and the gap between the major graft that has been exposed and commitments to do something about it.”

Register of Interests
This chapter examines a narrow sector in the use of e-government to strengthen transparency and accountability of public servants, which is how governments prevent, identify, and monitor conflicts of interest by public servants by requiring them to register their financial and other interests. Key issues covered include how e-government educates the public and its servants about the code of conduct, how information about the activities and interests of public servants
is made public, and how e-government is used to manage cases when public servants violate the code of conduct.

Five countries that use e-government in this arena were studied. Three high income countries that were examined are Finland and Sweden, which are in the top tier of countries with the least corruption, followed by the United Kingdom. Mexico, which is rated as a middle income country, and Nigeria, which is a low income country, both occupy the lower tiers of the corruption index where a higher level of corruption is perceived by citizens and experts.

Characteristics of Good E-Governance Systems
Based on research, some best practices emerged that were common to most of the governments that were examined.

**Code of Conduct**
Fundamental to all governments was that there was a code of conduct for public servants that had been approved by a body with authority, which operated at either a national level and or state and local authority level. It may also be enacted as separate legislation or incorporated in the constitution.

**Requirement to register interests**
All governments studied required that the public servant disclose information to the government about their financial and other personal interests. This includes data about assets, income, liabilities, gifts, participation and ownership in outside businesses, and may also require the public servant to disclose this data for spouses, partners, and dependent children. Public servants were defined as elected officials in legislative bodies and high ranking members of the executive branch of government, such as the Minister and department heads. For some countries, staff of entities that were partly or completely administered by the federal government were also required to register, such as universities, entities providing public services, and in one case, all staff of the national bank (Mexico).

**Periodic Filings of the Register**
Interests have to be filed usually at the start of an assignment or when the post is assumed, at the end of the assignment, and annually to register changes during the incumbency.

**Public Availability of the Register**
How the register was made available to the public was the most interesting topic and correlates rather directly to the overall ranking of transparency of the country. For the most transparent countries, the register was posted on a website, either national or state, and was easy to research and find any public servant, even without knowing the name or location (United Kingdom, Finland). In other countries with less transparency, the register was not available to the public at all because national legislation had to be enacted to define how the register would be made public (Nigeria). In yet another country, the register was available on the internet but the user had to know in advance the name and location of the public servant in order to see the data that had been filed (Mexico).

**Monitoring Data Filed in the Register**
In all governments reviewed, responsibility to analyze and review the data was assigned to an organizational unit, usually one for parliament at the national level, members of the executive branch of government, and for public servants at the local level. In some instances, data is filed in a central database that permits historical tracking of data and automated analyzing/comparing of data (Mexico and Nigeria).

**Complaint System**

All countries had some type of system in place to receive and review complaints filed by citizens against the actions of public servants, or to register complaints of conflict of interests. There was material on the websites of all countries to explain the process to the public and three of the countries allowed complaints to be filed through the internet on the website (Finland, Sweden, and Mexico). There was not a uniform practice on how complaints could be accepted in the United Kingdom. At the national level of parliament, complaints are only accepted if they are signed and in writing. For some of the local and district councils in the United Kingdom, complaints are accepted if they are filed through the internet.

**Adjudication of complaints against public servants**

All the countries reviewed have a mechanism in place to render a binding opinion on whether a complaint of misconduct has merit and will result in administrative action taken against the public servant. There is also a scheme of sanctions that define what will happen to the public servant who violates the code of conduct. Usually the sanctions are administrative in nature and the servant can be suspended from office for some period of time, removed from office permanently, or referred for criminal prosecution.

For the Scandinavian countries (Finland and Sweden) the ombudsman system plays a key oversight role to ensure that the courts and authorities comply with the law and apply it equally to all citizens. Ombudspersons investigate actions by members of Parliament as well as the executive branches of government. With almost 200 years of experience in implementing the ombudsman system, Sweden takes the lead in establishing best practices in this area.

**Results of the complaints are published on the web site**

Statistics on cases which were reviewed by an adjudication body were found on the public websites for two countries (UK and Nigeria). For other countries, details of the cases by individual public servant were listed with a description of the case and the finding (UK, Mexico).

**Issues and Recommendations**

The most fundamental issue with e-government is whether it is available on a significant enough scale to become an effective tool for good governance. The United Nations in its 2008 survey of e-government readiness (based on 2007 data for 192 governments) notes that for the top 35 countries that were ranked as having achieved the highest level of e-readiness, there were no countries in that group from the African, Caribbean, Central American, Central Asian, South American, and Southern Asian regions. The UN report further explains that this trend is due to the high cost of deploying a robust infrastructure capable of handling e-government applications. It notes that “many developing countries have been unable to fully implement their e-government policies, mainly due to other competing pressing social issues that need to
be dealt with in the context of tight budget constraints, such as: health, education, and employment, to name a few." It is beyond the scope of this chapter to examine the complex issues surrounding e-government readiness in general, but it is a factor that should be considered when evaluating how effective e-government is being used as a tool.

Three areas were found where a review of current policy and practice may help strengthen the use of e-government and are listed below:

1. Access or easier access by the public to data on interests of public servants filed with the government
2. Better education to the public about the complaint process and what defines a conflict of interest, especially at the point of filing a complaint
3. Practices to maximize the use of ICT to support on-line filing of complaints.

In one case, the fundamental authority to perform a key function in this registration process is missing and this is needed to allow the public to access data that is registered by public servants (Nigeria). Where statistics were available for the cases that were adjudicated; it appeared that more than three-quarters of the complaints filed against public servants lacked evidence and therefore could not be substantiated (UK 75% and Nigeria 48%). For some, there appears to be a need to more thoroughly educate the public about what makes a viable complaint and what defines a conflict of interest.

In others, practices about how complaints may be received from the public should be reviewed periodically in light of advances in information and communication technology (ICT). For example, in some countries only written and signed complaints are accepted (UK for members of parliament and Nigeria at all levels). In other countries, on line filing is already made available by national authorities in Sweden, Finland, and Mexico as well as by many local authorities in the UK.

Future Trends
As countries become more e-government ready and as they gain momentum in their battle against corruption, they are aggressively using ICT as a tool to enforce the highest standards of behavior of public servants by requiring them to register their financial and personal interests (Mexico). Mexico has an automated registration system for public servants at the federal and state level. Furthermore, the government of Mexico, (at both the federal and state level), accepts complaints directly via the internet. The government even asks a citizen to describe the physical characteristics of the public servant who they are complaining about if they do not know their name. A simple example of how to address this problem would be to load the photographs of all public servants on the web site and let the user identify the photo of the public servant who is the subject of the complaint. This is not a far fetched idea. Finland already publishes the picture of the public servant (i.e. member of the national parliament) along with the financial and personal interests that are reported in the registry. For some of the district and local councils in the UK, this is also practiced. So why not link this feature with the complaint process?

It seems unlikely that any one country can exploit the full potential of all ICT tools to support the process of registering interests. There should be an evaluation conducted periodically to
examine the process for registration of interests and of filing of complaints against the vast capabilities that ICT has to offer, since the technology is constantly evolving. This will help to strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of governing and monitoring the behavior of public servants.

**Topics for future research**

One topic for future research is the relationship between e-government readiness, levels of income, and the level of transparency in a society. With country specific data available on e-government readiness and on transparency and corruption, it should be interesting to more systematically study this and related issues in the light of how ICT tools can improve transparency in the public sector.
A Case Study of Finland

Introduction
Finland is a high income country in northern Europe with a population of 5.18 million and an e-readiness rank of 15 out of 183 countries. Finland is one of the least corrupt countries in the world, and for 2007 it was ranked first among 180 countries in terms of the level of transparency. Why is Finland one of the most transparent countries in the world? Various reasons have been proposed to explain this. Welfare services in Finland are extensive: everyone over 65 is eligible to receive a pension, basic education is free, kindergarten, higher education, support for the unemployed and health care are available for everyone. It is an egalitarian society with a universal suffrage since 1906 allowing women not only the right to vote but also to stand as candidates for election. It is believed that these factors mitigate the temptation for citizens to offer bribes to civil servants or for them to demand bribes. Likewise, the impact of special interest groups on the electoral system is fairly low because the state funds political parties. The Finnish public administration is characterized by its openness to everyone. Even though civil servants have a good image, they are still subject to public scrutiny. In Finland the principal of openness applies to the public administration and the administration has a duty to explain decisions taken. Also the ombudsman system and the collective decision making structure may explain the low-rate of corruption in Finland. In this section we will take a look at the Finnish framework for e-government in public service.

Registration of Interests - Target Population
In Finland the duty to declare personal relevant commitments (financial and other) applies to Ministers and to senior civil servants in central government. Elected officials such as Members of Parliament, are advised to declare their commitments.

Elected Ministers
The members of the Council of State (Government) need to declare their personal relevant commitments (financial and other) upon their appointment to the Council of State (2-3 weeks after the appointment at the latest). This requirement is based on a constitutional amendment that took effect in Finland in 1995. Based on this provision the Ministers are not allowed during their term as minister to hold any other public office or other position that could interfere with the performance of their ministerial functions or endanger confidence in their actions. They also need to disclose their financial commitments. It is essential that all elements that might affect the objectivity of the minister are included in the declaration. The declaration applies in principal to the Minister, but if she/he thinks that the liabilities of close family members might affect his/her objectivity they should be disclosed as well.

This information regarding their commitments is filed with the Parliament but not reviewed. It is advised that the Members of Parliament disclose their information and most of them follow this advice. In practice this means that the public already has access to the information regarding the liabilities of a minister upon his/her appointment to the Parliament.

When the information is disclosed to the Parliament it becomes public and accessible to everyone. For Ministers, their data on financial and other interest is available on the internet.
since 1996 and the user can browse the site by the name of the minister, year, government or key word. Data prior to 1996 is available for inspection at the Parliament.  

Civil Servants  
Candidates for high office need to declare their personal relevant commitments. According to the act on State Civil Servants the requirement to declare personal relevant commitments applies to appointees to the posts of Chancellor and Assistant Chancellor of Justice at the Council of State, Commander of the Defense Forces, heads of departments at ministries and corresponding or higher posts plus heads of government agencies. All changes in the data need to be disclosed in a due course and given if asked by the authorities. Civil Servants need to disclose the information prior to their appointment to the high office. Liabilities will be declared to the relevant Ministry. The Chancellor of Justice and the Deputy Chancellor of Justice declare their interest to the Ministry of Justice.  

Civil servants are restricted from holding certain types of secondary occupations. They are not allowed to hold positions that might hamper them in performing their duties properly, would hinder their impartiality/objectivity, or otherwise hinder their capabilities to serve their clients, the public. Civil servants need to ask for permission from a relevant authority to hold a secondary occupation such as paid position or an assignment. The relevant authority will study each case individually and if it is decided that the secondary occupation does not hamper civil servants’ duties the permission will be granted.  

Elected Members of Parliament  
Elected Members of Parliament can voluntarily declare their personal relevant commitments, outside activities and financial liabilities.  

Data Required to be Registered  

Elected Ministers  
Ministers are asked to declare the following information: 1) Liabilities/Commitments in Finland and abroad, 2) Stocks/shares and other corporate ownership and other major assets (self and dependent child/ren), 3) Livelihood and other occupations, 4) Other significant property (e.g. real estate), 5) Other significant sources of income, 6) Liabilities and securities, 7) Positions of trust and administrative duties in private companies and associations, 8) Positions of trust within municipalities and public sector organizations, 9) Other significant liabilities, 10) Positions the Minister retains for him/herself during the term.  

Civil Servants  
The candidates for high office need to declare the following personal relevant commitments: 1) Liabilities/Commitments in Finland and abroad, 2) Positions of trust and administrative duties in associations and private companies, 3) Positions of trust within municipalities and public sector organizations, 4) Secondary occupations, 5) Other significant liabilities outside the high office, 6) Other significant liabilities that may hamper their performance, 7) Stocks/shares and other corporate ownership and other major assets, 8) Other property, 9) Other sources of income, 10) liabilities and securities given for a third party, 11) other relevant financial liabilities.
Elected Members of Parliament

Members of Parliament, if they so chose, may declare the following commitments: 1) Office within the government, municipality or other general government, 2) Paid position in private company or association, 3) Source of livelihood or other occupation, 4) Administrative duties, 5) Administrative duties in state-owned companies, 6) Administrative duties in financially significant companies, 7) Administrative duties in the banks or other financial institutions, 8) Administrative duties in significant organizations, 9) Positions of Trust, 10) Positions of trust in the interest groups: includes only nation wide or middle level positions of trust (e.g. professional organizations, organizations of economic life, the Association of Finnish Local and Regional Authorities), 11) Positions of trust within the municipalities or Lutheran church (council or executive committee), 12) Economic Situation, 13) Property earned for business activities or investments (if exceeds €50 000/property) and other significant ownerships of property, 14) Liabilities exceeding €100 000 for business activities or investments and securities and liabilities exceeding €200 000 for the same purposes.

Privacy Issues. Data regarding the financial interests of the Ministers is published on the Parliament website. Regarding Civil Servants the Data is not published, but the user can find the blank document the high officials need to disclose on the website of the Ministry of Finance. Regarding Members of Parliament the data is available to the public by accessing the website of the Parliament.

Adjudication Panel

In Finland two supreme bodies oversee the legislature: the Parliamentary Ombudsman and the Chancellor of Justice. Their tasks and powers are almost the same, but the small differences in the division of tasks between them determines which of them investigates a complaint. The Parliamentary Ombudsman exercises oversight to ensure that public authorities and officials observe the law and fulfill their duties in the discharge of their functions. The Chancellor of Justice supervises the legality of the official acts of the Government, its members and the President of the Republic. He also oversees the lawyers. From the constitutional point of view, the supervision of the legality of the Government's actions is one of the most important duties entrusted to the Chancellor of Justice.

The institution of the Ombudsman aims to ensure good administration and compliance with the constitution and principles of human rights. The Ombudsman and the Deputy-Ombudsman are both elected for a four-year term subject to renewal by the Parliament. If a person suspects that a public authority or an official has not observed the law or failed to perform a duty then he/she can contact the Parliamentary Ombudsman. Everyone has the right to complain in a matter concerning him/herself, but a complaint can also be made on behalf of someone else or together with others.

The ombudsman system is originally Swedish and in the following section we will take a look at how it works. The Ombudsman system originated in Sweden in 1809 when the National Parliament created the post in order to guarantee that the courts and authorities act in accordance with the law, that the rights of the citizens are guaranteed and that the law will be interpreted equally for all.
Filing a complaint with the Finnish Parliamentary Ombudsman is free of charge and it can be done by writing in free form or by using a complaint form. Either way the complaint should always include the following information: 1) the person or authority whose action the complainant criticises, 2) what action or decision the complainant considers illegal, 3) why the complainant considers the action or decision illegal, 4) whether the matter is under deliberation in a court of law or elsewhere, 5) what the complainant wants the Ombudsman to do²⁹.

Anyone can also file a complaint with the Chancellor of Justice in a matter concerning him or her or any other matter where is a reason to believe that an authority, public official or public body has acted in a manner that violates their rights, or a member of the Bar has neglected his or her responsibilities. In addition, anyone who believes that a basic right or liberty or human right guaranteed under the Constitution has not been observed, may turn to the Chancellor of Justice for redress³⁰.

Investigations
The Ombudsman and the Deputy-Ombudsman issued decisions on nearly 3600 complaints cases in 2007 in Finland. Approximately one decision out of six led to recommendations by the Ombudsman. In 2007 the Ombudsman and the Deputy-Ombudsman issued opinions to 500 officials outlining the unlawfulness of their action or their neglect of duty. In several cases the authorities corrected their errors during the investigations. In 2007 the Ombudsman issued 26 recommendations concerning rectification of errors or flaws in regulations and made 38 submissions.

The Ombudsman will launch an investigation when a complaint has been received, in order to guarantee good governance and respect for laws. Only in the most severe case will a criminal prosecution for malfeasance be issued. The Ombudsman can also issue an official reprimand to the party concerned. The Ombudsman is not in a position to investigate complaints that concern the Parliament as a legislative body, its members or the Chancellor of Justice of the Government. Nor are non-profit associations, banks, businesses or housing companies and private entrepreneurs or private persons subject to the Ombudsman's oversight. The Ombudsman does not generally investigate a complaint concerning matters more than five years old, those that are still pending before a court of law or another authority. The Ombudsman cannot amend or overturn the decision of a court or other authority nor order payment of damages³¹.

The decisions of the Ombudsman and Deputy-Ombudsman that are of special interest in the legal or general sense are published on the website of the Ombudsman in full or as summaries and accessible to anyone³².

When a complaint is filed with the Chancellor of Justice, the Chancellor may: 1) issue a reprimand to an official or body, 2) issue instructions on the proper procedure for future reference, 3) in more serious cases, order that charges be brought against the official in question. The Chancellor of Justice has the power to recommend amendment of provisions or regulations, to initiate proceedings to annul a court ruling or for some other extraordinary appeal. An investigation carried out by the Chancellor of Justice may in itself result in the authority or public official himself or herself correcting an error. The services of the Office of the Chancellor of Justice are free of charge to the complainant³³.
Adjudication Panel in Sweden
Swedish society is characterized by its openness and also is recognized as one of the least corrupt countries in the world. For 2007 Sweden was ranked fourth out of 180 countries in terms of having a high level of transparency. In order to guarantee an open society with access to information about the work of the Parliament, Government and government agencies, the principle of public access to official documents has been incorporated into one of the fundamental laws, the Freedom of the Press Act. This openness gives the Swedish people the right to inspect public documents.

As mentioned above the Ombudsman institution originates from Sweden. In Sweden the Parliament has emphasized that dealing with complaints from the general public is a central aspect of the work of the Parliamentary Ombudsman. The Parliamentary Ombudsman ensures that the public authorities comply with the laws. The Ombudsman institution is not limited to the Parliament, but similar institutions oversee different sectors of the society. In a democracy the authorities should be subject to an appraisal by a competent, autonomous body. With the Ombudsman institution, state officials and local authorities are aware that their actions may be subject to review by the Parliamentary Ombudsman and that disciplinary measures may be invoked for erroneous actions. The Parliamentary Ombudsman receives approximately 5,000 complaints annually.

Anyone who feels that he or she or someone else has been treated wrongly or unjustly by a public authority or a civil servant (at the national or local level) can complain to the Parliamentary Ombudsman by completing complaint forms which are accessible at the official website of the Ombudsman.

The Parliamentary Ombudsman registers all complaints that are received. The public has access to all complaints received or sent if they are not declared secret based on special grounds. For example representatives of the mass media have access to the complaints before they will be circulated to the various Ombudsman's departments. Heads of Divisions have then the right to decide which cases are to be allocated to the various executives. They will then determine whether the complaint is to be investigated or not. Each Ombudsman has the authority to decide which cases are to be examined for his or her respective department.

Recommendations
Finnish society is characterized by its high level of ICT use, knowledge-based economy based on social justice and a significant investment in education, research, and development. Thus in Finland there is a strong link between its highly developed human capital and its high e-government readiness.
We begin this chapter by examining how violations of the code of conduct are managed by the United Kingdom (UK), which is well advanced in using information technology to enhance transparency of the public service. The UK is classified as a high income country in Northern Europe with a population of 58.79 million, and an e-readiness rank of 10 out of 183.\(^{40}\) Civil servants, which is a category of public servants, follow a chain of command in which they are accountable to ministers of government departments, who in turn are accountable to the Parliament. Civil servants are expected to be honest and impartial in the exercise of their duties and most important, they must not allow their judgment or integrity to be compromised in fact or act in a manner that implies to a reasonable person that their integrity and judgment has been compromised. Four concepts form the basis of the code of conduct for civil servants; integrity, honesty, objectivity, and impartiality (in faithfully serving governments of different political persuasions.)\(^{41}\) As will be seen later, e-government plays an integral role in all phases of enhancing transparency.

**Ethical Framework**

An ethical framework for the public service in the UK is set by the Committee on Standards in Public Life, which is an independent, non-departmental body of the Cabinet Office that reports to the Prime Minister.\(^{42}\) It was established in 1994 by the Prime Minister following damaging allegations about the behaviour of Members of Parliament, ministerial patronage over public appointments, and the unregulated exodus of Ministers from public office to private sector directorships. This committee examines current concerns about standards of conduct of all holders of public offices, including arrangements relating to financial and commercial activities, and recommends changes in present arrangements which will help to ensure the highest standards of propriety in public life.\(^{42}\) Those persons working in the public service include Ministers, civil servants and advisers; Members of Parliament and UK Members of the European Parliament; members and senior officers of all non-departmental public bodies and of national health service bodies; non-ministerial office holders; members and other senior officers of other bodies discharging publicly funded functions; and elected members and senior officers of local authorities.\(^{43}\) Early on the committee came up with seven principles of public life which are: selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty, and leadership, and these principles\(^{44}\) have been widely adopted by all national and local governing bodies.

Although the standards for ethical behavior in the public life are recommended by the Committee on Standards in Public Life, the implementation of those standards falls to the Standards Board of England, which was formally established in March 2001 by an Act of Parliament, and operates independent of the government. The Standards Board receives and investigates allegations that members may have breached the Code of Conduct.\(^{45}\) It promotes the ethical behaviour of members who serve on some ten different types of local authorities including those for fire, transport, police, and the London metropolitan area. Public servants
covered by the Standards Board include councillors, members and co-opted or appointed members but exclude the staff in these authorities. There is a large population of public officials who work in community and town councils, which is considered the first tier in local government. For example, the Standards Board covers 386 local authorities, 8,350 parish councils, 47 fire and rescue authorities, 43 police authorities, 6 passenger transport authorities, and 7 national park authorities. Councillors are persons who are elected to represent an individual geographical unit on the council, known as a ward or, for smaller parishes - the entire parish or town council area. They are generally elected by the public every four years.

Standards Committees
Each local authority in turn has its own standards committee which supports the overall ethical framework by performing such tasks as adopting a customized code of conduct, educating members about the code of conduct, and hearing cases about violations of the code of conduct. Day to day support for the Standards Committee is provided by a monitoring officer, who ensures that members of the authority register their interests. Together the monitoring officer and the standards committee may review the register of interests that are filed, and seek clarification from a member on items (such as details about the ownership of real or personal property).

Codes of Conduct
In 2008, local authorities, aided by the Standards Committee and the monitoring officers, will be involved in a concerted effort to modify their codes of conduct to comply with a new national model that was approved by Parliament in May of 2007. Both houses of parliament, namely the House of Commons and the House of Lords, have approved their own codes of conduct which are modeled on the seven principles of public life that was recommended by the Committee on Standards in Public Life.

Registration of Interests - Target Population
We have selected a subset of the code of conduct, that of registration of interests, to understand how e-government works in this field. Elected members of parliament in both houses are required to declare and register their personal interests. Besides members of parliament, their secretaries and research assistants are also required to register their interests. Civil servants or those who work for the government departments are required to report any conflict of interest to the management of their department.

In addition to registering their interests with the clerk of their respective bodies, both Ministers of Parliament and councillors who serve on local authorities are required to declare their interests during meetings. Where the member has a defined interest in the outcome, the member is responsible for declaring pecuniary interests or benefits of whatever nature.

Data Required to be Registered
Members of parliament in both the House of Commons and Lords must register their interests in ten (10) basic categories: remunerated directorships, remunerated employment, clients, sponsorship of financial or material support, gifts, benefits and hospitality, overseas visits, overseas benefits and gifts, land and property, registrable shareholding, and miscellaneous and
unremunerated interests. They do declare the amounts if it relates to their role as a member of parliament. There are financial thresholds based on the salary of the minister of parliament that are used to determine when an item should be reported. Continuing interests such as employment or property remain on the Register until the Member of Parliament asks for them to be removed. ‘One-off’ benefits such as gifts, visits and donations appear with their date of registration and remain on the Register for a year from that date and until they have appeared in one printed Register.

Filing of the Data for the Register of Interests
Data that is used to complete the register of interests is filed with an official who is in charge of maintaining the register. For the House of Commons, there is a Register of Members Interests maintained under authority of the Office of Parliamentary Commissioner for Standards. The register is organized by name of the official with detailed data, and is published both in hard copy, which is made available for inspection as well as on the internet, where it can be downloaded. An annual register is published at the beginning of the legislative year. It is the responsibility of the individual member of parliament to register any changes to the data within four weeks of the change occurring. Updates between sessions are only published on the internet. The parliament website also has information about the rules applying to members, the procedure to handle complaints about failure to register and the rule against lobbying for reward or consideration.

Among local authorities, how the register is made available to the public varies; for some of the large district councils, for instance London and its surrounding area, the register is published on the internet; for others, the register is maintained by hard copy and available by appointment only.

Practices in the Review of Data
For the Commissioner for Standards in Parliament, there is no indication in the duties listed that there is a systematic review of data filed. Duties include monitoring the effectiveness of the code of conduct, training/arranging seminars on the code of conduct and holding hearings. This contrasts with practice at the local level where the monitoring officer and or the standards committee of the local authority do review data in the register.

Privacy Issues
Data that is registered by individual members of the governing body, whether at national or local authority level, is published both in hard copy and in the internet. It is identifiable by individual name and location of the governing body. Individual data items for each category are also published, i.e. names or organizations, companies that the member works for, dates, amount of compensation, trips taken, etc. In consultation with the standards committee and the monitoring officer, members may also exclude information that they believe may endanger them.

At least one councillor expressed her discomfort at disclosing this detailed information. A local Councillor justified her failure to register her interests on two grounds 1) register of interests is an unjustified invasion of her privacy given the limited remit of parish council and that councilors are volunteers and 2), the requirement to register interests will act as a serious disincentive for those considering putting themselves forward to serve as parish councillors.
The government panel that heard this case did not find that the requirement to register interests was an invasion of privacy. 54

Investigations
An important change that is required by the new law on the code or conduct for local authorities is that they will now receive and assess complaints of violations directly from the public. This is the reverse of past practice which was that the Standards Board assessed all complaints and referred some to the local authorities as appropriate. This may mean that the local standards committees and monitoring officers will have an increase in the number of cases they must investigate, hold hearings for, and make decisions about disciplinary action. If the standards committee assesses that a case is serious or has national implications, it will be referred to the Standards Board.

Under the old practice, the Standards Board published the results of investigations for breaches of the code of conduct by individual members of governing bodies. With this change, it is not clear how reporting arrangements for tracking statistics will be maintained once the primary responsibility for handling cases is handed down to local authorities.

Case Statistics
Statistics of cases for the period from 1 April 2006 - 31 March 2007, show that for 93% of the cases received by the Standards Board there was no evidence of breach or no further action with only 7% being referred to the monitoring officer for more investigation or to the adjudication panel. That trend continued in the succeeding period from April 2007 thru 23 Jan 2008, with 90% or more not resulting in any finding.55 The total number of allegations received by the Standards Board for the last three (3) reporting periods is shown below. 56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Allegations Received</td>
<td>2550</td>
<td>3549</td>
<td>3836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases with No Breach or No Further Action (Percentage)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjudication Panel for England
This panel is an independent tribunal that can decide if there has been a breach of the Code and, if so, what action to take. It receives the most serious cases and those which cannot be dealt with at a local level. It has the power to suspend a member from a council or particular activities for up to one year, or disqualify them from holding office for up to five years. It is not able to award damages or compensation.57 From the total of 336 cases referred to the Adjudication Panel, one was withdrawn and for 1 there was no decision. For the remaining 334 cases referred by the Standards Board or the local authorities to the Adjudication Panel, only 31 or 9.0% showed there was no breach, with the remaining 91 % showing there was a breach. The rest of the cases resulted in disqualification from holding office, suspension, partial suspension, reprimand, and breach found but no further action was taken. 58
Thirteen (13) applications were received for permission to appeal against the determinations of local Standards Committees by comparison with 18 in the previous year. Expressed as a percentage of the number of decisions taken by local Standards Committees the applications have decreased from 16% to 7%. Of the 13 applications received, 6 were allowed to proceed; the remainder were refused because in the Panel’s assessment, there was no prospect of an successful appeal. The Appeals Tribunals determined 11 appeals by comparison with 6 the previous year. Of those 11 which were considered by Appeals Tribunal the decision of the Standards Committee was upheld in 5 cases, and was dismissed in 4 cases, and 2 appeals had a different sanction imposed. Due to the small number of appeals any attempt to draw statistical deductions from the figures would be subject to a large margin of error. The total cost for the Adjudication Panel for 2006/2007 was £350,000 with 37 determinations amounting to a cost per determination of £9472.

**Concerns**

As shown in the table above for complaints received by the Standards Board, over 90% of the complaints received for the past two reporting periods were spurious. Possible explanations for this are that those who make complaints are not well informed about the details of the code of conduct, or that there was insufficient evidence to prove the allegation.

Under the previous framework for local authorities, a complaint was only accepted by the Standards Board if it was submitted in writing. This same practice applies for Parliament, where the Commissioner for Standards only accepts written complaints for members of the House of Commons. Since local authorities will now accept complaints directly from the public and make the first decision about how they should be handled, they will probably continue using whatever scheme they already have established to accept complaints about a wide range of matters, including violations of the code of conduct by councillors. Thus educating the public about what is a violation of the code of conduct at the point that they are ready to complain will become more important to prevent accusations that have no merit and to encourage responsible reporting for those that do.

**Recommendations**

This change in practice also offers an opportunity to consider whether anonymous complaints will be accepted even if there is supporting evidence. With the ease in which email accounts can be created in fictitious names, this is something that should be considered given that citizens may be afraid of retaliation for complaining about misconduct.

The educational component of the content of websites at both the national and local level is excellent. For example, the register of interests for members of the House of Commons and the House of Lords is easily available on the website of parliament and can be downloaded in an electronic file. For some of the larger district councils, the register of interests for local councillors is also available on the internet.

At the national level, two important bodies; the Standards Board and the Committee on Standards in Public Life have excellent websites full of educational and research material. The Standards Board, in partnership with other offices, has rolled out the Ethical Government Toolkit which is targeted at
local authorities to help them assess how well they are promoting and monitoring the ethical climate. This toolkit also explains changes in the code of conduct and the new responsibilities of standards committees and monitoring officers.

One issue is whether there should be minimum standards for websites for all local authorities and whether and what type of material should be available on the website. For example, should the register of interests for all district and local councils be made available on the website? If so, who will pay for this added cost for those authorities that cannot afford this?

Should complaints be managed centrally with referrals made electronically to the local authorities? This would ensure consistent data that could be easily tracked for statistics and trends, as well as allow for some oversight to ensure that all complaints were addressed. Since complaints were managed centrally by the Standards Board based on written submissions (prior to the new law of 2007), it is not much of a stretch to automate this practice and to permit local authorities access to the complaint data.

The government created a website www.direct.gov.uk where it has consolidated under Rights and Responsibilities all information about how to make a complaint against government and public bodies, including the police, housing, the national health service, institutes and bodies of the European community, individual councillors and local government. This is certainly a pro-active step to make it easier for a citizen to identify which body to complain to. From the complaints page, the user can select a specific local authority and be linked to their webpage for making a complaint.

Future Trends
In some ways advances in technology have raced ahead of our ability to utilize them effectively. For example, if a concerned citizen, using a mobile phone, sends a text message accompanied by a photo that shows evidence of a conflict of interest or some other misconduct, should that type of communication be ignored by the authorities?

In these days where ever more personally identifiable data is available about consumers and citizens, it creates opportunities to compare information reported or omitted by a public servant against records already available and collected for other purposes. For example, if a member of parliament reports no overseas trips, and a check against passport or immigration records shows multiple departures outside of the country, then government can compare these records to determine if it is likely that relevant trips may not have been reported, and to conduct further inquiries. If a local councillor reports owning no real property, but the local tax roles show him or her as a property owner, technology can be used to automate this types of verification.

At the point at which a complaint form is summoned up by a user, can the methods for providing information be enhanced to provide more useful data to avoid having a complaint rejected because it was incorrect, vague, or not supported by documents.

The UK has made important advances in using e-government to promote transparency and accountability, and certainly serves as an example of best practices in the area of transparency for registering the interests of public servants.
A Case Study of Mexico

Mexico is an example of an upper middle income country located in Central America with a population of 95.48 million, and an e-readiness rank of 37 out of 183. It has an e-readiness index of 0.590 which is well above the world average of .354 and the highest in the Central American region. The government is aggressively promoting the use of e-government in many sectors that affect public life. 62

Ethical Framework
The government of Mexico has enacted a federal law for the administrative responsibilities of public servants, known as “Ley Federal de Responsabilidades Administrativas de los Servidores Públicos.” It was first approved on 13 March 2002 and later amended on 21 August 2006. 63 It defines who the law applies to in terms of public servants, what the obligations of the public servants are, the responsibilities and administrative sanctions for public servants, the authorities and processes for implementing the system of administrative sanctions, and the register of interests (known as El registro patrimonial de los servidores públicos).

Registration of Interests - Target Population
There is long list of public servants who must declare their interests, and these include elected members and high officials of the national congress, department heads of the executive branches of the federal government, the president of the republic, executive heads of federally run institutions, members of the judiciary, members of the institute for federal elections, the supreme audit institutions, and all servants who manage financial resources of the republic. 64

Data Required to be Registered
Basic information should be reported including the type that is found on a resume, a description of their functions, their sources of income from their employment, responsibilities and commissions, information about their financial situation, their income from the last year, their real and personal property, financial investments and debts, and whether they were the subject of any procedures or administrative sanctions.

Filing of the Data for the Register of Interests
The initial declaration of interests has to be made within 60 days following assumption of office or when the public servant enters public service for the first time. Other times when the data has to be filed include when the public servant is re-entering the public service after 60 days or has left his previous job, or has changed the location of job or entity, in which case there was no completion of the job. A final declaration should be made at the end of the term within 60 days. Modifications to the declaration of interests should be reported during the month of May of each year.

At the Federal level, the government of Mexico has an automated system that allows for the electronic registration of the financial interests of public servants. Many of the state governments also have the same system of electronic registration.
Public Access to the Register
The law requires that the register for the declaration of interests is made available to the public, and the process for managing the registry is handled by the Secretary of the Public Function. The website of the Secretary of the Public Function is filled with educational material for the citizen as well as the public servant who has to declare their interests. The actual register (with names and details) is published on the website but the user cannot make random searches; the user must specify the full name (including both last names and a first name) of the public servant. Finding a list of elected public officials at the federal level can be accomplished by consulting another database stored on a different web site, that of the System of Legislative Information (Sistema de Información de Legislativa.) Data filed in the registry will be available to the public for 3 years after the servant has completed his term, appointment, or work.

Practices in Review
The Secretary of the Public Function is empowered to verify and audit the declaration of interest statements, as well as to obtain data from other federal departments, such as the national bank and the stock exchange, in order to conduct an investigation. The secretary can also ask public servants for a copy of their tax returns for the year which corresponds to the declaration of interest (if they have to file a tax return). If they did not file a tax return, they have to show proof that they were exempted from doing so. Goods acquired by public servants will also include those acquired by their partners, wives, and direct dependents, unless they received them on their own without any relation to the public servants.

Privacy Issues
This data filed by the public servant when they register their interests is recognized as a document that can be used in other proceedings and it can be requested by other agencies such as the Secretary of the Public Ministry and the judicial authority.

Investigations
Investigations are undertaken by the Secretary of the Public Function who can conduct audits to verify the data and changes in the financial situation of the public servant. When it appears that the financial status of the servant is much higher than his salary or reported sources of income, the Secretary can undertake an investigation according to Article 42 of the law. If an investigation is undertaken, other units or public institutions are obligated to cooperate and give the Secretary financial data or information about assets or other items related to the public servants, their spouses, partners, or direct economic dependents. Even the National Banking Commission and the Stock Exchange must cooperate in providing information, but only if it is requested by the Secretary or the Under-Secretary of the Public Function.

Case Statistics
If a citizen is unhappy about the treatment that he or she has received, they can file a complaint on the website. After an investigation by the local authority has been entered and a sanction has been issued, the information about the result of the investigation is posted on the web site. At the national level, the name of the public servant has to be entered into the database in order
to conduct a search. At the state level, finding the results of investigations by public servant was easy since the names were posted and did not have to be searched on an individual basis.

**Sanctions**
The Public Secretary shall establish how the register functions and will determine the sanctions in each case, and especially when public servants are relieved of their duties.

**Recommendations**
The process of retrieving information from the registry by individual public servant could be enhanced to make it easier for a citizen to retrieve and browse through data without having to know a specific name or enter it into the database. Making it easier to research public servants who have been sanctioned could also be enhanced at the federal level as well.

**Future Trends**
A sample of the websites for the state governments showed a high level of automation, most notably in the system developed for public servants to register their interests, known as Declaranet. This is an information system that is used on a national and state level to automate a continuous process of capturing and monitoring personal and financial data.

One area for research is to correlate the automation of the system of registry of interests by public servants with the level of corruption in the country. On the measures for the perception of corruption for 2007, Mexico ranks number 72 out of a scale of 180 countries, with a score of 3.5 as compared to the highest scores of 9.4 earned by Denmark, Finland, and New Zealand.
A Case Study of Nigeria

Introduction
As a country, Nigeria has suffered from endemic corruption for many years, as reflected by its scores on the Corruption Perception Index that is measured by Transparency International. For 2007, Nigeria was ranked 147 out of about 180 countries in terms of the level of transparency. Corruption has been rampant throughout all sectors of society and government, including the highest levels. During the regime from 1993–1998, the former Head of State, General Sani Abacha, was reported to have stolen between US$ 2–5 billion from the national treasury, thus earning him the distinction of being one of the world’s ten most corrupt leaders.

Ethical Framework
The ethical framework includes legislation against corruption and several enabling structures recently instituted by government, such as the Independent Corrupt Practices and Other Related Offences Commission, known as the ICPC, the Code of Conduct Bureau, the CCB, the Code of Conduct Tribunal, and the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission. Two watchdog bodies focus on monitoring the behavior of public servants; the Code of Conduct Bureau, which reviews the financial and other interests reported by public servants, and the Code of Conduct Tribunal, which hears cases concerning breaches in the code of conduct and failure of public servants to declare their assets.

The Code of Conduct Bureau and Tribunal Act, Chapter 56 LFN 1990 gave the Bureau the mandate to establish and maintain a high standard of public morality in the conduct of Government Business and to ensure that the actions and behaviour of public officers conform to the highest standard of public morality and accountability. Authority for implementing this mandate are found in the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Specific functions of the CCB are the following:

(a) receive declarations by public officers under paragraph 12 of part 1 of the Fifth Schedule to the Constitution.
(b) examine the declarations in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Conduct or any Law;
(c) retain custody of such declarations and make them available for inspection by any citizen of Nigeria on such terms and conditions as the National Assembly may prescribe;
(d) ensure compliance with and, where appropriate, enforce the provisions of the Code of Conduct or any law relating thereto;
(e) receive complaints about non-compliance with or breach of the provisions of the Code of Conduct or any law in relation thereto, investigate the complaints and, where appropriate, refer such matters to the Code of Conduct Tribunal.
(f) Appoint, promote, dismiss and exercise disciplinary control over the staff of the Code of Conduct Bureau in accordance with the provisions of an Act of the National Assembly enacted in that behalf.
**Code of Conduct**

The Code of Conduct, which is embedded in the Federal Constitution, contains provisions that are fairly standard as noted below. 76

- A public officer shall not put himself in a position where his personal interest conflicts with his duties and responsibilities.
- A public officer shall not receive or be paid the emoluments of any public office at the same time as he receives or is paid the emoluments of any other public office;

For high level public servants, such as the offices of President, Vice-President, Chief Justice of Nigeria, Governor and Deputy governor of a State, there are prohibitions about receiving remuneration from more than one governmental entity as noted below.

(1) A public officer shall not, after his retirement from public service and while receiving pension from public funds, accept more than one remuneration position as chairman, director or employee of:
   (a) a company owned or controlled by the government; or
   (b) any public authority.
(2) a retired public servant shall not receive any other remuneration from public funds in addition to his pension and the emolument of such one remunerative position.

Members of legislative houses shall be exempt from the provisions of paragraph 4 (regarding receiving remuneration from more than one source after retiring from the public service) of this Code

5. (1) Other paragraphs in the Code prohibit retired public officers from serving or being employed in foreign companies or foreign enterprises. In addition, public officers cannot accept property or benefits for doing or not doing their job. 77

**Definition of Public Servant**

The code of conduct applies to high ranking officials in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government, including the president and the vice president of the Federation. At the lower levels, the code of conduct also applies to governors and deputy governors of states and members and staff of local government councils, as well as staff of universities, colleges and institutions owned and financed by the Federal or State Governments or local government councils. 78 In practice, this definition encompasses a large number of servants. For example, the Code of Conduct Bureau reported in 2005 that over 40,000 servants were required to file declarations of assets.

**Declaration of Assets**

Every public officer is expected to do the following:
- declare his or her assets on assumption of duty, and thereafter, every four years and on leaving the service.
• declare in writing all of his/her properties, assets, and liabilities and those of his/her unmarried children under the age of eighteen years.

The above requirement also applies to all political office-holders who are expected to declare their assets on assumption of duty and on vacation of office.

Other interesting provisions in the Code are as follows:

• Any statement in such declaration that is found to be false by any authority or person authorised in that behalf to verify it shall be deemed to be a breach of the Code.
• Any property or assets acquired by a public officer after any declaration required under the Constitution and which is not fairly attributable to income, gift, or loan approved by the Code shall be deemed to have been acquired in breach of this Code unless the contrary is proved.
• A public officer who does any act prohibited by this Code through a nominee, trustee, or other agent shall be deemed ipso facto to have committed a breach of this Code.

Disclosing Registered Data to the Public
Section 3(c) Part 1 of the fifth Schedule of the 1999 Constitution gives the Bureau the power to retain custody of all declaration by Public Officers and make them available for inspection by any citizen of Nigeria on such terms and conditions as the National Assembly may prescribe.

There is no public inspection, either manually or electronically, as noted by the Code of Conduct Bureau on its website because these conditions for public inspection have yet to be prescribed. The CCB encourages the press to join the Bureau in advocating for the prescription of the conditions for public access to assets declaration of all Public Officers, or certain categories of public officers as is the case with the categorization for non-operation of Foreign Accounts. As recently as October 2007, in a two day public forum co-sponsored with the United Nations Development Program, the participants to this local forum recommended that the National Assembly expedite action on the bill before them on Public Access to Assets Declaration. Other recommendations made by this forum were to widen access to the anti-corruption agencies and build their capacity, and to strengthen penalties, as follows: 79

• The presence of all Anti-Corruption Agencies should be felt at the grass root levels for easy accessibility by the public.
• There should be more severe punishment applied on corrupt public officers to serve as a deterrent to other public servants.
• The Anti-Corruption Agencies in both the public and private sectors should engage in continuous capacity building and take steps to learn from other nations of the world with high anti-corruption ratings.

Practices in Reviewing Data/Collecting Data
The Code of Conduct Bureau has established a Bureau Information System (BIS) to manage the massive data generated from the declaration of assets by public servants. Between November 2004 and October 2005, a total of 57,582 forms were scanned of which 20,504 were resolved. 80
**Investigations**

Statistics published by the CCB reveal that for the period from 2000 through 2004, the number of public servants who were required to file statements and who failed to do so fell within a range of a low of .34% and a high of 1.06%. In 2005, that number rose sharply to 6.6% of the target population. The number of cases tried increased slightly from 557 in 2004 to 593 in 2005, but the percentage of convictions jumped to its highest level at 76% for 2005. From 2000 to 2005, the total number of cases resulting in a conviction were 2,396, whereas the number of convictions alone in 2005 was 453. Complaints received from the public for the period of 2001 – 2005 totaled 396, with 33% of those being generated in 2005 alone.

**Filing a Complaint**

Members of the Public can make complaints and file petitions about a breach of the Code, such as bribery, corruption, abuse of office directly to the CCB at any one of its offices located in each state within the country. Such petitions or complaints will only be accepted by the CCB if they are in writing and duly signed. These petitions or complaints are reviewed by a Petitions Screening Committee.

The CCB pledges to provide good customer service by acknowledging every petition/complaint received within 48hrs and by commencing preliminary investigations within two weeks of receipt.

- At the end of every investigation exercise, the petitioner(s) shall be informed/notified in writing, of the outcome of the petition.
- The investigation process shall maintain confidentiality of the petitioner(s)/witnesses unless otherwise stated by such persons.

If the investigation results in a finding that there was a breach of the Code, the case is forwarded to the Code of Conduct Tribunal (CCT) for prosecution.

**Issues**

A fundamental issue is that there is a pervasive belief that corrupt behavior is acceptable, and this belief is held at many levels of society and across many groups and individuals that cut across ethnic, religious and economic characteristics. For the country to move forward in advancing transparency in regulating conflicts of interest in the public service, it should approve legislation that was pending to provide access to the public to the declarations filed by its public servants. This will supply data that can be compared with other information and will help to determine if a breach in the code of conduct has or is likely to have occurred. Opening up this information to the public will give not only the ordinary citizen, but special interest groups and civil societies an opportunity to understand and monitor the individual actions and interests of public servants whom they monitor.

From the technical perspective, a limiting factor is that the infrastructure that supports e-government is at a very basic level. Nigeria is a low income country in Western Africa that has a low e-readiness rank of 136 out of 183 countries. According to the UN e-government readiness survey for 2007, the country ranks low in a world wide comparison of key
The overall e-readiness index (.3063) is a composite of four key indices: 1) the web-measure index, which measures the level of sophistication of the state’s on-line presence, 2) the telecommunication infra-structure index, 3) the human capital index, and 4) the e-participation index. Augmenting these indices poses significant challenges for a country with a population of almost 89 million and an overall income level characterized as low.

Recommendations
There is a link between low human capital and e-government readiness. With a higher level of education and skill the general citizen is likely to have greater access to ICTs and the benefits that it brings. In turn, citizens skilled in the use of emerging technologies are more likely to adapt it towards making gains in the economic, social, and political sphere. ICTs are able to diffuse learning, information and knowledge more speedily, more widely and more deeply than ever before. Information technologies are increasingly being used to complement traditional educational techniques. In recent years ICTs have been employed to reach far-flung areas previously served through traditional modes of schooling. Incorporating new technologies will enable education systems to adapt to the emerging learning and training needs of their society. Computer simulation, telematics, and teleconferencing, alongside educational TV or radio, have greater potential to reach larger audiences through e-learning than the traditional classroom process, and to make learning more effective, attractive and stimulating. One example of how the government could maximize the potential of ICT is in the area of educating children. Let us use an example where the government decides to purchase specially designed laptops for children. The government could then pre-load these laptops with special educational programs on anti-corruption, this would target a key audience at a formative period in their lives. Educational software that promotes ethics could also be developed that is targeted for the adult audience, since a laptop will be an object that adult members of the family will be exposed to as well.

One of the recommendations of Transparency International, in its Country Study Report of Nigeria in 2004, was that the government should formulate a National Action Plan on Corruption. With a national blueprint the government will have the basis to assess and evaluate progress in fighting corruption. Any component of the national plan should include how ICTs can be incorporated in the education of society, targeted at specific groups including adults who are illiterate, children who are not attending primary school, and others whose access to educational materials is limited by a variety of factors such as time, time and space, age, socio-cultural environment, work schedules and physical or mental handicaps.

There are signs of hope that the situation may be changing for the better. Transparency International’s Global Corruption Barometer 2007, which is a public opinion survey, reported that interviewees in Nigeria were decidedly optimistic, believing that future levels of corruption will fall.
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Under the Local Government Act, standards committees have five ‘statutory functions’. They must:
- give the council advice on adopting a local code of conduct;
- monitor the effectiveness of the code;
- train members on the code, or arrange for such training;
- promote and maintain high standards of conduct for members; and
- help members to follow the code of conduct.
£600 for employment, gifts and hospitality; ten per cent or £6,000 for rental income; and a hundred per cent or £60,000 for property and shares. The exception is sponsorship, where the threshold has been set at £1,000 to match that set for registration with the Electoral Commission.


Those public servants listed below have to declare their interests and swear that it is true:

1. Federal Congress, Deputies and Senators, Secretary Generals, Treasurers and Directors of the houses
2. Centralized Federal Public Administration- from the level of department head to the President of the Republic, and those mentioned in Sections 4, 7, and 13 of this article.
3. In Public administration Federal and state – all the public servants from the level of the chief of the department and those public servants required to declare in the Federal executive branch to the Director General or equivalent
4. The procurer General of the Republic – from the level of the chief of the department to the procurer general, including ministers of the judicial police
5. Judiciary of the Government, ministers of the supreme court of the nation, advisers of the Federal judiciary system, magistrates of the circuit, magistrates of elections, judges of the district, secretaries and others of whatever category
6. Federal Tribunal of Justice, Finance and Administration, in the labor tribunals and agricultural ones, magistrates, members of the ruling board, secretaries, (Actuarios) and others.
7. In the Secretary all the public servants of confidence
8. Institute for Federal Elections from the level of the department head to the presidential advisor.
9. Supreme Audit Authority of the Federation – from the level of the department head to the Auditor General
10. National Commission for Human Rights – public servants from the department head to the president of the commission
11. In other organs and institutions that determine the laws, from the level of the department head to the heads of the unit
12. All servants who manage financial resources, stocks/bonds and funds of the federation, who do inspections or monitoring, who determine qualifications for issuing licenses, permits and concessions, and those involved in adjudicating requests and contracts
13. Secretary of the Public Security – from the level of the department head to the Secretary of the Public Security and all members of the federal prevention police

Bank of Mexico – from the department head level to the Governor of the bank.


66 This requirement to produce a copy of the tax return is found in Article 37 of the Federal Law for Administrative Responsibilities.


Paragraph 5. (1) Retired public officers who have held offices to which this paragraph applies are prohibited from service or employment in foreign companies or foreign enterprises. (2) This paragraph applies to the offices of President, Vice-President, Chief Justice of Nigeria, Governor and Deputy governor of a State.

Paragraph 6. (1) A public officer shall not ask for or accept property or benefits of any kind for himself or any other person on account of anything done or omitted to be done by him in the discharge of his duties. (2) for the purposes of sub-paragraph (1) of this paragraph, the receipt by a public officer of any gifts or benefits from commercial firms, business enterprises or persons who have contracts with the government shall be presumed to have been received in contravention of the said sub-paragraph unless the contrary is proved. (3) A public officer shall only accept personal gifts or benefits from relatives or personal friends to such extent and on such occasions as are recognised by custom: Provided that any gift or donation to a public officer on any public or ceremonial occasion shall be treated as a gift to the appropriate institution represented by the public officer, and accordingly, the mere acceptance or receipt of any such gift shall not be treated as a contravention of this provision.

Paragraph 7. The President or Vice-President, Governor or Deputy Governor, Minister of the Government of the Federation or Commissioner of the Government of a State, or any other
public officer who holds the office of a Permanent Secretary or head of any public corporation, university, or other parastatal organisation shall not accept -
(a) a loan, except from government or its agencies, a bank, building society, mortgage institution or other financial institution recognised by law; and
(b) any benefit of whatever nature from any company, contractor, or businessman, or the nominee or agent of such person:
Provided that the head of a public corporation or of a university or other parastatal organisation may, subject to the rules and regulations of the body, accept a loan from such body.
Paragraph 8. No persons shall offer a public officer any property, gift or benefit of any kind as an inducement or bribe for the granting of any favour or the discharge in his favour of the public officer’s duties.
Paragraph 9. A public officer shall not do or direct to be done, in abuse of his office, any arbitrary act prejudicial to the rights of any other person knowing that such act is unlawful or contrary to any government policy.
Paragraph 10. A public officer shall not be a member of, belong to, or take part in any society the membership of which is incompatible with the functions or dignity of his office.


The detailed list of public servants that the Code of Conduct applies to is listed below.
1. The President of the Federation.
2. The Vice-President of the Federation.
3. The President and Deputy President of the Senate Speakers and Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives and Speakers and Deputy Speakers of Houses of Assembly of States, and all members and staff of legislative houses.
4. Governors and Deputy Governors of States.
5. Chief Justice of Nigeria, Justices of the Supreme Court, President and Justices of the Court of Appeal, all other judicial officers and all staff of courts of law.
6. Attorney-General of the Federation and Attorney-General of each State.
8. Chief of Defence Staff, Chief of Army Staff, Chief of Naval Staff, Chief of Air Staff and all members of the armed forces of the Federation.
9. Inspector-General of Police, Deputy Inspector-General of Police and all members of the Nigeria Police Force and other government security agencies established by law.
10. Secretary to the Government of the Federation, Head of the Civil service, Permanent Secretaries, Directors-Generals and all other persons in the civil service of the Federation or of the State.
13. Chairman, members and staff of local government councils.
14. Chairman and members of the Boards or other governing bodies and staff of statutory corporations and of companies in which the Federal or State Governments or local governments councils.
15. All staff of universities, colleges and institutions owned and financed by the Federal or State Governments or local government councils.
16. Chairman, members and staff of permanent commissions or councils appointed on full time basis.


UN e-Government Survey 2008, page 15. The Web Measure Index is based upon a five-stage model, which is ascending in nature and builds upon the previous level of sophistication of a state’s online presence. The model defines five stages of e-government readiness according to scale of progressively sophisticated citizen services. As countries progress, they are ranked higher in the Model according to a numerical classification corresponding to the five stages. Implicit in this model is the integration of the public sector agencies with full cooperation and understanding of the concept of collective decision-making, participatory democracy and citizen empowerment as a democratic right. http://www.unpan.org/egovkb/egovernment_overview/webmeasure.htm

85  UN e-Government Survey 2008, page 16. The telecommunication infrastructure index is a composite weighted average index of six primary indices based on basic infrastructural indicators, which define a country’s ICT infrastructure capacity. These are: PC’s/1000 persons; Internet users/1000 persons; Telephone Lines/1000 persons; Online population; Mobile phones/1000 persons; and TV’s/1000 persons. http://www.unpan.org/egovkb/egovernment_overview/infrastructure.htm
UN e-Government Survey 2008, page 17. The data for the human capital index relies on the UNDP ‘education index’ which is a composite of the adult literacy rate and the combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio with two third weight given to adult literacy and one third to gross enrolment ratio.
http://www.unpan.org/egovkb/egovernment_overview/humancapital.htm

UN e-Government Survey 2008, page 18. Promoting participation of the citizen is the cornerstone of socially inclusive governance. The goal of e-participation initiatives should be to improve the citizen's access to information and public services; and promote participation in public decision-making which impacts the well being of society, in general, and the individual, in particular.

E-participation is the sum total of both the government programs to encourage participation from the citizen and the willingness of the citizen to do so. It encompasses both the demand the supply side. For purposes of the UN Global Reports, however, e-participation limits itself to assessing the G2C aspect of participation at this time. Impact evaluations on the uptake of government e-participatory programs require a separate inquiry.
http://www.unpan.org/egovkb/egovernment_overview/eparticipation.htm

See for example, the One Laptop Per Child Project which is designing and manufacturing cheap and durable laptops for children in developing countries. There are also similar projects underway by other organizations that are also developing low cost laptops that can be sold in massive volumes to the educational authorities of many developing countries.
