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ABSTRACT
Current development theories as well as many international organizations have come to the realization that corruption is eating away development opportunities. It is one of the biggest challenges that the Caribbean, along with many other regions, will face when planning for the next generations' growth and progress.

The Caribbean’s modest resources make fighting corruption a priority. The devastating impact of waste, fraud and inefficiency on these countries’ economies, social development and political systems is much greater than on countries with abundant resources. The prominence of improved health and education on the region’s growth, for example, could be significantly impaired by corruption in public spending and abuses in service deliveries. Similarly, high corruption perception indexes, high corruption costs for doing business, and weak corruption controls, among other indicators, will have a negative impact on competitiveness, one of the keys to the Caribbean’s viability in the global economy.

Some Caribbean nations have been more successful than others in establishing and enforcing strict controls on corruption. The disparity among these and those with higher corruption levels would affect CARICOM’s ability to strengthen its relationship with the United States and international lending institutions. It will also affect the effectiveness of the Caribbean social agenda for development.

For CARICOM to achieve its objectives, the level of trust and respect among its constituent members must be optimized. Corruption - even the perception of it - undermines essential cohesiveness. Thus, applying the tools to prevent and act against corruption should be a cross-cutting commitment in all areas and for all CARICOM members. This paper will look at the characteristics of corruption in the Caribbean and propose a minimal anti-corruption agenda for CARICOM and its members.
I. INTRODUCTION

The realization that corruption is a major hindrance to development is widely held by most international donors, development practitioners and leaders sensible to the plight of their citizens and the wellbeing of their countries. It is a phenomenon that cannot be ignored. As the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) embarks on the Single Market and Economy (CSME), it has recognized that transparent and participatory governance is an essential component of its vision.

CARICOM’s plans for growth and progress for the next generations must not be cut short by corruption. The region’s modest resources make fighting corruption a priority. The devastating impact of waste, fraud and inefficiency on these countries’ economies, social development and political systems is much greater than on countries with abundant resources. The prominence of improved health and education for the region’s growth, for example, could be significantly impaired by corruption in public spending and abuses in service deliveries. Similarly, high corruption perception indexes, high corruption costs for doing business, and weak corruption controls, among other indicators, impact negatively on potential investors and on the required competitiveness for the Caribbean’s viability in the global economy.

Some CARICOM members have been more successful than others in establishing and enforcing strict controls on corruption. The high level of corruption in some countries, however, taints CARICOM’s image and could affect its ability to strengthen the relationship with the United States, entice investors and seek assistance from international institutions. It will also lessen the effectiveness of the CARICOM social agenda for development.

For CARICOM to achieve its objectives, the level of trust and respect among its constituent members must be optimized. Corruption - even the perception of it - undermines essential cohesiveness. Thus, applying tools to prevent and punish corruption should be a cross-cutting commitment for all CARICOM members in all areas. This paper will look at the characteristics of corruption in the Caribbean and propose a minimal anti-corruption agenda for CARICOM members.

II. WHY CORRUPTION MATTERS

It is well documented that corruption, the abuse of public office for private gain, robs citizens’ expectations for improvements in service deliveries, undermines trust in public institutions, particularly in the judiciary and security forces, and hinders investments by increasing the cost of doing business and distrust in investment security. There are clear correlations between corruption levels and a country or region’s degrees of social, economic and political development. It seems not accidental that nations with higher perceived levels of corruption also have lower levels of development.
The often held view that corruption flourishes because widespread poverty pushes poorly paid public servants to conduct illicit acts is not supported by solid evidence. Indeed, some employees may be inclined to supplement their income requesting or accepting illicit fees for services. Yet, public and private sector corruption is present in every country, rich or poor. Recent cases of embezzlement by prominent private sector executives and members of Congress in the United States and other affluent societies prove past assumptions wrong. Poverty is a result of corruption, rather than a cause. Again, it is not coincidental that rich, oil exporting countries, like Nigeria, have high levels of both poverty and corruption.

The Caribbean is not immune to problems of corruption. According to Professor Michael C. Collier’s research on the impact of corruption on small and medium states, “the Caribbean has a real political corruption problem that is significantly retarding the region’s development.”

Prof. Collier concluded that if small and medium states, “including those in the Caribbean, ever hope to develop they must address their corruption problems.” His study reveals four important findings:

- The most significant effects of corruption on Caribbean development are in total economic output (GDP per capita), capital formation, and in the rule of law.
- The X-inefficiencies that are being inserted into the Caribbean economies are a major cause of the region’s degraded economic outputs and low levels of capital formation.
- Sharing the spoils of the illegal international drug trade are decreasing rule of law as evidenced by the skyrocketing crime and violence rates across the region
- The levels of Caribbean corruption also affect the educational output, inequalities, and economic investment sources of these small and medium size states.

Moreover, Collier analyzed how improvements in corruption levels could affect conditions in individual Caribbean states. Applying data from different international sources, he made a few startling predictions for Haiti and Jamaica (using 1999 figures) if there were 1.0 unit improvement in political corruption in each of these states. The

---


2 Ibid, p. 15-16.
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figures in the following table suggest substantial and potential growth for these two countries when a very minor reduction of corruption takes place. The greater the prevention and reduction of corruption levels, the greater the opportunities for Caribbean growth.

The Effect of Improving Political Corruption Ratings by 1.0 Unit of Measure for Haiti and Jamaica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>Haiti</th>
<th>Jamaica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Increase in GNP (%)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Increase in Capital Formation (US$)</td>
<td>5.0 billion</td>
<td>1.7 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Increase in Foreign Direct Investment (US$)</td>
<td>860.0 million</td>
<td>286.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Increase in Domestic Savings (US$)</td>
<td>$2.3 billion</td>
<td>$761.6 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Collier (2002)

Similarly, corruption reduces the benefits of globalization and increases the likelihood of financial crisis. Brookings Institution scholar Shang-Jin Wei argues that paying bribes is the equivalent of paying an extra tax for international investors. When investors pay bribes to obtain business, “the country loses multiple dollars of potential foreign investment.” Wei reminds us that “corruption generates no tax revenue for the government,” while it causes business to feel the impact of additional taxes.3

Corruption is also linked to issues of crime and security. This is particularly daunting for CARICOM considering how perceptions of insecurity may reduce tourism. A March 2007 joint United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and World Bank Report on Drug and Crime in the Caribbean states that, “crime and violence present one of the paramount challenges to development in the Caribbean.”4 The Caribbean is the region with the highest murder rate in the world, surpassing even regions with armed conflict. The strongest explanation that UNDP and World Bank find for these staggering statistics is narcotics trafficking, which is normalizing illegal behavior, diverting justice resources from other activities and undermining and corrupting societal institutions, and much more.5

Since 1994, Professor Anthony Maingot has called attention to the link between drug trafficking and higher levels of corruption. He argued that “the drug trade contributes to and is facilitated by widespread and enduring corruption which permeates key

5 Ibid.
elements...of both public and private sectors.”

Defining this development as “the internationalization of corruption and violence,” Maingot also concluded that this was the greatest menace to Caribbean security.

III. WHY IT HAPPENS

Corruption is often the manifestation of multi-faceted, systemic weakness that requires a broad program of governance, public sector reform and consistent accountability throughout a society and government. The embezzlement of millions of dollars by a high level executive, the illicit enrichment of a prime minister and the petty corruption of a mid-level license inspector may differ significantly in the amount of resources involved but have very similar causes. Corruption is not just the domain of criminals. It is the act of corruption that makes criminals out of well-respected, apparently law-abiding, church-going, public elected and appointed officials.

Particular types of governance systems provide opportunities for corruption. Public Sector Management expert Geoffrey Shepherd, in presenting the World Bank’s view on corruption, argued that the political arrangements that prevail in a country will largely determine the opportunities for corruption: How is the power of the state held and exercised? How is the public service organized? These arrangements, argues Shepherd, “help determine the amount of public resources available, the discretion accorded to public officials, the incentives they face in the use of these resources, and the effective control exercised by the state over that discretion. Sometimes, an abundant endowment in resources that are in high demand in other countries—be it valuable minerals or drugs—adds substantially to the likelihood of corruption in a society by creating easy opportunities for gain.”

In essence, he reiterated the now classical formula proposed by Robert Klitgaard: corruption is equal to monopoly plus discretion minus accountability (corruption = monopoly + discretion – accountability).

---

7 World Bank Institute (www.worldbank.org/wbi)
The 2007 Transparency International Global Corruption Report, focusing on the judicial system, outlines three major causes of corruption in the judicial system.\textsuperscript{10} The Caribbean is not immune to these.

- the misuse of judicial funds and power (i.e. nepotism or manipulation of contracts for court construction and equipment)
- biased case allocation and bias in other pre-trial procedures (i.e. court clerks bribed to "lose" files and evidence)
- influence of any trial or court settlement, and the enforcement - or not - of court decisions and sentences
- bribes accepted by lawyers, court officials and judges for different "services"

The \textit{National Integrity Systems TI Caribbean Composite Study 2004}, which examined the integrity systems of eight CARICOM States (Antigua-Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines) argues that in addition to the narcotic-related corruption, money laundering and financial crimes threatening the region, the Caribbean states are also affected by “ineffective procurement systems, completely unregulated political parties and ‘winner-take-all’ majoritarianism that seriously undermines the quality of democratic governance.”\textsuperscript{11} Directed by Professor Trevor Munroe, the Report also argues that “petty corruption associated with administrative corruption is pervasive in a culturally permissive context.” \textsuperscript{12}

A proper anticorruption legislation and regulation framework is also essential in preventing and combating corruption. Among the smaller states mentioned above, only three (The Bahamas, Dominica and St. Lucia) require ministers and high government officials to disclose assets and financial interests. This is essential in reducing conflict of interest, particularly in the micro-states where it is often difficult to distinguish between nepotism and market necessity due to close family links\textsuperscript{13}. Despite efforts to reduce conflict of interest, not all states have the pertinent laws and regulations in effect. Also, even when the laws exist, “follow-up investigations by the responsible commission have been insufficiently systematic and relatively ineffective.”\textsuperscript{14}

While praising the efforts of Caribbean states to cope with these challenges and having democratic systems that perform quite well when compared with other Latin American


\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{13} United Nations (2007) op. cit.

\textsuperscript{14} Transparency International (2004), op. cit. p. 34.
and larger Caribbean states, the Report points out to some pre-disposing factors in the CARICOM states that require attention. Among them:

- Greater transparency and accountability in political parties, the public sector and the system of governance in general;

- Political and constitutional reform to reduce the degree of 'personal Prime Ministerial government', to strengthen checks and balances within the state, and empower civil society;

- Build institutional capacity in critical institutions such as the Auditor General, the Director of Public Prosecutions, the financial crimes units and the magistracy;

- Effective public education against corruption with a view to strengthening popular perceptions of the harmfulness of petty corruption and the need for more effective public engagement in raising levels of national integrity.

Additional factors contribute to lack of transparency and accountability in several CARICOM states. In some instances, proper and sufficient mechanisms for citizen participation in decision making and for monitoring the correct use of resources are lacking. Insufficient information and means to access available information also reduce the ability of citizens to be supportive of important policy decisions and also vigilant of the processes taking place in the region, including the CSME. Moreover, limited resources may inhibit the ability of small states to build institutional capacity in critical areas of their national integrity systems, such as in the office of the Auditor General and the Director of Public Prosecutions."

Lastly, reforming institutions, strengthening controls in the financial and judicial sectors, and providing more participation are essential but not enough if the leaders are not willing to set an example of transparency and accountability and make every effort to implement laws and regulations on the books, both at the national and international level. Political will is a key determinant of a nation’s ability to fight corruption.

IV. PERCEPTIONS OF CORRUPTION IN THE CARIBBEAN

Although the region’s leaders and citizens tend to reject corruption generalizations, studies conducted by international organizations influence the international community perception of the Caribbean. CARICOM cannot sweep corruption issues under the rug. Corruption is happening everywhere and there are mechanisms and tools as well as shared experiences and lessons learned, that are being used in combating it. Technical assistance is readily available from numerous international donors.

---
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There are dramatic contrasts in perception of corruption among CARICOM members. Due to lack of data, not all countries are being included in international assessments. Transparency International Corruption Perception Index (CPI), which compares 163 countries, includes only nine CARICOM countries. The differences in their rankings are abysmal. Barbados, for example, ranks No. 34 just behind Spain and the United States while Haiti ranks No. 163, right at the bottom of the list.

Transparency International Corruption Perception Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad &amp; Tobago</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the World Economic Forum’s Global Competitiveness Index, Barbados again achieves a ranking of 31 among 125 countries, not far from Chile and Spain. Jamaica ranks 60 and Trinidad and Tobago ranks 67. The only two other CARICOM countries analyzed, Suriname and Guyana, rank farther down in the list, 100 and 111, respectively. The Index provides a “holistic overview of factors that are critical to driving production and competitiveness, and groups them into nine pillars: institutions, infrastructure, macroeconomics, health and primary education, market efficiency, technological readiness, business sophistication and innovation.”

Mismanagement of public finances is seen as one of the indicators that affects the business environment and pulls competitiveness down.

---
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When looking at broader governance indicators used by the World Bank Institute, again CARICOM members differ significantly. In looking at control of corruption within an estimated range of -2.5 to +2.5 on the Worldwide Governance Indicators (2005), all CARICOM members included in the study ranked on the positive side, except Haiti, Guyana, Jamaica, Suriname and Belize. These countries ranked similarly on rule of law indicators, as the table below indicates.

**WGI: Worldwide Governance Indicators Country Snapshot 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Voice and Accountability</th>
<th>Political Stability/No Violence</th>
<th>Government Effectiveness</th>
<th>Regulatory Quality</th>
<th>Rule of Law</th>
<th>Control of Corruption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA</td>
<td>+0.54</td>
<td>+0.80</td>
<td>+0.48</td>
<td>+0.60</td>
<td>+0.73</td>
<td>+0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHAMAS</td>
<td>+1.14</td>
<td>+0.83</td>
<td>+1.28</td>
<td>+0.99</td>
<td>+1.33</td>
<td>+1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBADOS</td>
<td>+1.12</td>
<td>+1.18</td>
<td>+1.17</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+1.22</td>
<td>+1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELIZE</td>
<td>+0.92</td>
<td>+0.31</td>
<td>+0.13</td>
<td>+0.09</td>
<td>+0.02</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERMUDA</td>
<td>+1.03</td>
<td>+0.79</td>
<td>+1.02</td>
<td>+1.33</td>
<td>+0.88</td>
<td>+1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINICA</td>
<td>+1.12</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+0.57</td>
<td>+0.75</td>
<td>+0.66</td>
<td>+0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRENADA</td>
<td>+0.84</td>
<td>+0.49</td>
<td>+0.26</td>
<td>+0.36</td>
<td>+0.32</td>
<td>+0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUYANA</td>
<td>+0.49</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAITI</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMAICA</td>
<td>+0.57</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>+0.24</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. KITTS AND NEVIS</td>
<td>+0.87</td>
<td>+1.29</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
<td>+1.14</td>
<td>+0.82</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. LUCIA</td>
<td>+1.04</td>
<td>+1.10</td>
<td>+1.12</td>
<td>+1.14</td>
<td>+0.82</td>
<td>+1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES</td>
<td>+1.04</td>
<td>+1.14</td>
<td>+1.07</td>
<td>+1.14</td>
<td>+0.82</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURINAME</td>
<td>+0.74</td>
<td>+0.26</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>+0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO</td>
<td>+0.44</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>+0.29</td>
<td>+0.65</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>+0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank Institute
Views expressed by companies/firms on obstacles to investing in the Caribbean is another indicator that shapes the CARICOM’s international image. The *World Bank Enterprise Surveys* suggest that, while not the major obstacle, still corruption ranks among the top ten constraints identified by firms as a major or very severe obstacle to investments in Jamaica and Guyana, the only two CARICOM nations analyzed. The ten top obstacles are illustrated in the charts below.

**Top 10 Constraints to Firm Investment in Jamaica (2005)**

% of firms identifying problem as “major” or “very severe” obstacle

- Access to cost of financing
- Tax rates
- Crime, theft, & disorder
- Tax admin.
- Corruption
- Electricity
- Born/Reg. policy uncertainty
- Skills & education of workers
- Informality
- Customs & trade regulations

Source: World Bank Enterprise Surveys
V. CARICOM’S ANTICORRUPTION COMMITMENTS

Several CARICOM members have been making significant strides in preventing and combating corruption. Jamaica, Grenada, Antigua and other states have anti-corruption and/or integrity legislation. Guyana’s 2003 Fiscal Management and Accountability Act seeks to improve country systems in areas like fiscal management and procurement. Moreover, domestic and international concerns with financial crimes have resulted most recently in the adoption by some states (notably, the Bahamas, Dominica, Grenada, St Kitts-Nevis and St Vincent) of more stringent regimes against money-laundering. As a consequence, they have been removed from the OECD Financial Action Task Force's list of non-cooperating countries. Most countries in the region have taken steps to strengthen supervision of offshore banks, improve controls against money laundering and have made commitments to address harmful tax competitions.
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All CARICOM nations are members of the Organization of American States (OAS) and of the United Nations (UN). Most have signed and ratified the 1996 Inter-American Convention Against Corruption (IACC), committing these nations to the following two objectives:

- To promote and strengthen the development by each of the States parties of the mechanisms needed to prevent, detect, punish and eradicate corruption; and
- To promote, facilitate and regulate cooperation among the States Parties to ensure the effectiveness of measures and actions to prevent, detect, punish and eradicate corruption in the performance of public functions and acts of corruption specifically related to such performance.

Most nations have also signed the IACC Mechanism for Follow-Up on the Implementation (MESICIC). This mechanism serves to study implementation of the IACC commitments, facilitate technical cooperation activities, exchanges of information, experience, and best practices, and the harmonization of the States Parties’ domestic legislations. Six countries have yet to sign MESICIC, which could provide substantial support in implementing required reforms. They are: Antigua, Barbados, Dominica, Haiti, St. Kitts and Nevis and St. Lucia.

CARICOM State parties to the IACC have presented Report on Implementation of the provisions selected for review in the first round (2005-2006). Among them: The Bahamas, Belize, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago. The Committee of Experts reviewed and evaluated the reports and made recommendations to each country. Among some of the key recommendations are the following items:

- Establishing conflict of interest regime at all levels and branches of government;
- Designing and implementing training programs for public servants in charge of applying the systems, measures and mechanisms indicated in the report;
- Establishing mechanisms to encourage civil society and nongovernmental organizations to participate in public administration;
- Updating controls to make proper use of the resources entrusted to public servants in the performance of their functions;
- Regulating the conditions, procedures and other relevant aspects as regards making disclosures of income, assets, and liabilities public;
- Adopting freedom of information legislation and mechanisms to implement it;

• Creating or strengthening mechanisms to ensure that no appointments are made in breach of the rules in force on ineligibility and incompatibility in public service.

Each country should implement the recommendations made by MESICIC in order to be in compliance with the IACC.

Regarding the United Nations Convention Against Corruption CARICOM members are moving very slowly in accepting it. Despite the technical assistance offered to parties signatories to the Convention, few CARICOM members have joined. In fact, as of May 2007, only Barbados, Haiti, Jamaica and Trinidad & Tobago had signed the UNCAC and only Trinidad & Tobago had ratified it. This is a missed opportunity for CARICOM.

VI. CONCLUSION

Dr. Trevor Munroe frequently reminds us that, despite the hardships, the Caribbean states “remain distinctive in the extent of stable party governance, the frequency of free and fair elections, the normal exchange of power when oppositions accede to office by constitutional means and in the absence of one-party dictatorship, police-military rule, civil war and political assassinations.” It is thanks to these characteristics, including a free and vibrant media, that many corruption scandals have been disclosed in the region.

CARICOM leaders have made a major commitment to make the CSME a successful reality. They cannot do it alone but could with the support of the international community, including the United States, the European Union and the international organizations. Nor can they refuse to address corruption issues squarely, despite understandable concern with impact on tourism.

Just a month ago, a communiqué issued at the conclusion of the Tenth Meeting of CARICOM’s Council of Foreign and Community Relations, made absolutely no mention to problems of corruption. Pressing international concerns, such as the humanitarian deterioration of Darfur, the human rights situation in Zimbabwe, climate change and progress in resolving regional conflicts, are meritorious as concerns for CARICOM but not while ignoring severe problems of crime and security or drug trafficking that most observers place in the forefront of the challenges facing the Caribbean.

This recent communiqué is indicative of how CARICOM leaders often overlook addressing corruption issues at regional gatherings. Even when applauding “the moves by the OAS to broaden the traditional focus of the Organization on democracy,
good governance and the rule of law,’” the ministers made no reference to the unmet commitments of CARICOM to the Inter-American Convention Against Corruption and to the recommendations of MESECIC for compliance.

By seeming to ignore the problem of corruption, as well as the international anticorruption agreements, the phenomenon will not go away. The less it is discussed the more difficult it is to find solutions.

CARICOM is supporting and endorsing the initiative to establish a CARICOM Corporate Governance Framework. Among the six principles outlined, it argues for “the development of transparent and efficient markets, based in the rule of law and high ethical standards” and the “timely and accurate disclosure of all material issues.” The CSME vision has also proposed having democratic, transparent and participatory governance. These postulates should guide CARICOM in implementing proper measures to prevent and prosecute corruption.

VII. A FIVE POINTS ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENDA FOR CARICOM

1. Preventing, detecting and sanctioning corruption shall be included as one of the critical policy decisions of the Community, having the force of law throughout the region, as stated for critical policy decisions by Heads of Governments in the Rose Hall Declaration of 2003.

2. All countries should sign and ratify the major international and regional anticorruption international accords (IACC, MESICIC, UNCAC, and OECD) and take advantage of the technical assistance offered by each of them.

3. Governments in office shall be responsible for compliance with recommendations made by MESICIC and/or implementation of IACC and UNCAC, including harmonization of anticorruption legal framework among CARICOM members.

4. CARICOM shall establish and publish standards for “democratic, transparent and participatory governance,” as stated in the single vision for sustainable development and make it a requirement for continued membership in the Community.

5. CARICOM shall grant legal status to the Charter of Civil Society and provide the mechanisms for civil society participation in policy decisions and in monitoring each country’s compliance with anticorruption initiatives.

©Olga Nazario, Casals & Associates, Inc.
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Granting legal status to the Charter of Civil Society has been proposed repeatedly by Professor Norman Girvan of the University of the West Indies (see, “Towards a Single Economy and a Single Development Vision,” a Report by Norman Girvan in collaboration with the CARICOM Secretariat and the Special Task Force on the Single Economy; October 25, 2006).
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