**Text for the MPT website - Data**

1. Landing Page
   * Map
     + **Blue circle (top left)**
       - Each country scorecard consists of 50 indicator questions.
         * *NB: “50” should be in large text, as currently presented in the comp.*
     + **Green circle (bottom right)**
       - 54 countries
         * *NB: “54” in large text, as presented in the comp.*
       - The MPT research covered a diverse array of countries across the world.
         * *NB: small text in the bottom half of the circle.*
     + **Yellow circle (bottom left)**
       - Country scorecards include 23 *de jure* indicators, 20 *de facto* indicators, and 7 open text questions.
         * *NB: top half of the circle.*
       - Each scorecard presents a broad assessment of how political finance is regulated and enforced at the country level.
         * *NB: lower half of the circle*
   * **Integrity Indicator Scores column**
     + *New Title*: Integrity Indicators
       - Each integrity indicator is composed of three components:
         * A quantitative score, selected in accordance with strict scoring conditions that ensure the cross-country comparability of the information presented
         * An explanatory comment
         * A list of sources that provides the evidence upon which the score and comment are based
   * **Research Methodology column**
     + *Title: Research Methodology*
       - The research on the MPT Integrity Indicators was conducted between July and December 2014. The period of study for the research is January 2013 – July 2014, or where applicable, the most recent national level elections held within a country. Global Integrity worked closely with locally based experts and reviewers to gather the data, fact check the scores, comments, and sources, and compile each country scorecard.
   * **Analyzing the Results column**
     + *Title: Analyzing Results*
       - The MPT dataset documents the diversity of political finance systems across the world. Indicator scores enable comparisons across countries, while comments and sources for each indicator provide a unique window into the realities of regulation and enforcement in each country covered.
   * **Scoring Criteria box (right of country scores sorting tool)**
     + *New Title: Understanding a Country’s Scores*
       - Scorecards are divided into 5 sections:
         * Direct and Indirect Public Funding during Campaigns
         * Restrictions on Contribution and Expenditure
         * Reporting Requirements and Public Disclosure
         * Third Party Actors
         * Monitoring and Enforcement
       - A country’s in law score is the unweighted average of the scores on all 23 *de jure* indicators in a country scorecard: it provides an indication of how stringently a country’s laws regulate political finance. The in practice score is the unweighted average of the scores on all 20 *de facto* indicators. This measure assesses practical enforcement within a country. The composite score is the average of *all* scores on a given country scorecard, weighted by each of the scorecard’s five sections.
       - Note that quantitative scores fail to capture the scope of an indicator answer or full country scorecard, as do aggregated scores. Data users should always refer to the comments and sources in order to grasp what a given score or scores signify at the country level.

***FAQ Page***

***MPT Campaign Finance Indicators - Website FAQ***

1. ***What are the MPT Campaign Finance Indicators?***

The Money, Politics, and Transparency (MPT) Campaign Finance Indicators mobilized a highly qualified global network of more than 110 political finance experts from academia, journalism, and civil society to generate rich, comparative, country-level data on the transparency and effectiveness of political finance regimes across the world.  A rigorous cross-national survey, MPT examines both the *de jure* legislation regulating political finance and the *de facto* implementation of that legislation across 50 indicators and five issue areas fundamental to campaign finance regulatory systems.

1. ***What is an MPT Scorecard?  What aspects of political finance are covered in the MPT Campaign Finance Indicators?***

An MPT Scorecard is a unique instrument designed to provide a thorough assessment of the existing political finance regime in a particular country.  The 50 indicators in each scorecard are used to “score” the national-level institutional frameworks in place to regulate money’s influence in politics on metrics of transparency, accountability, and practical enforcement.

Each MPT country scorecard evaluates the regulation and enforcement of political finance across the following five categories and nine subcategories:

1. Direct and Indirect Public Funding

1.1 Direct Public Funding

1.2 Indirect Public Funding

2. Contribution and Expenditure Restrictions

2.1 General Rules on Electoral Campaign Contributions

2.2 Limits on Contribution and Expenditure during Electoral Campaign Periods

3. Reporting and Public Disclosure

3.1 Reporting Requirements to the Oversight Entity

3.2 Availability of Electoral Campaigns’ Financial Information to the Public

4. Third-Party Actors

4.1 Applicability of the Law to Third-Party Actors

5. Monitoring and Enforcement

5.1 Monitoring Capabilities

5.2 Enforcement Capabilities

1. ***How are the MPT Campaign Finance Indicators different from other comparative assessments of political finance?***

There are extensive data repositories already in existence that document the laws and legal mechanisms regulating country-level political finance.  Most notable among these is the [International IDEA Political Finance Database](http://www.idea.int/political-finance/), an invaluable resource for comparing the variety of legal regulations in place in different countries.  Existing data, however, focuses exclusively on *de jure* legal frameworks, and does not address the extent to which those frameworks are *de facto* regulated, or the outcomes they generate.  The MPT research fills this gap, providing exceptionally granular, evidence-based information on *both* relevant legal instruments *and* the efficacy of enforcement in 54 countries across the world.

By measuring the scope of the legal framework and assessing on-the-ground realities of political finance systems, and doing so systematically and comparatively, the MPT research delivers a detailed, comprehensive assessment of the role of money in politics, especially during campaigns.

1. ***What are the data sources for MPT?***

Each MPT country scorecard was thoroughly researched, written, and reviewed by local experts familiar with the nuance and complexity of domestic political finance systems.  The expertise of researchers and reviewers, and their expansive network of contacts within the country ensures that the data collected is accurate, highly relevant, and founded on pertinent research.  As a result, the MPT research is contextually rich and firmly anchored in on-the-ground realities.  original research conducted by locally based experts, managed by Global Integrity.  Data sources include original interviews with experts, information requests, newspaper and academic reports, and relevant laws and regulations on the books in a given country.  All data sources are current within the timespan January 2013 - July 2014, or in reference to the most recent national level elections.  These dates comprise the period of research for MPT.

1. ***How should I understand MPT scores?  How does scoring work?***

43 of the indicators in an MPT scorecard are given quantitative scores.  Possible scores for in law (*de jure*) indicators are 100 (Yes), 50 (Moderate), and 0 (No).  For in practice (*de facto*) indicators, 100, 75, 50, 25, and 0 are the available score choices.  In every case, chosen scores correspond to rigorously defined scoring conditions, making scores broadly comparable across countries.  Each indicator is thus standardized on a scale from 100 (high) to 0 (low).

Individual indicator scores are aggregated at the subsection and section level to generate subsection and section scores for each country scorecard.  Aggregate subsection scores are the average of all the indicator scores within that subsection, and section scores are the average of the relevant subsection scores.  This means that each subsection is weighted equally in the creation of overall section scores.

Each country scorecard also receives an overall aggregate score, which is the average of all five section aggregate scores.  As such, each section is equally weighted.  Note that overall aggregate scores are very limited in their usefulness -- their generality is such that they provide little information about the contextual strengths and weaknesses of a given political finance system.  Referring to section and subsection scores, and to individual indicator scores, as well as the explanatory comments included with each indicator, will be of much more use for practitioners and reformers hoping to better understand the nuances of political finance regulation and enforcement at the country level.

Countries also receive in law aggregate and in practice aggregate scores.  In each case, the aggregate is the unweighted average of all relevant indicators across the scorecard.

1. ***How should I use the MPT dataset?***

Each MPT Campaign Finance Scorecard provides a richly detailed country level snapshot of the particulars of campaign finance regulation and enforcement.  To best understand the characteristics and context of campaign finance systems, users of the data should make sure to go beyond aggregate scores.  The explanatory comments on each indicator illustrate the rich, contextual nature of political finance systems, and readers should always refer to the comments and sources in order to best understand the full range of information presented within a country scorecard.

Data users should use caution when comparing aggregated scores on MPT scorecards.  Individual indicators are comparable, as are section and subsection scores, to some extent.  Overall scores, however, though useful for understanding the broad sweep of a country’s campaign finance system, are too reductive to yield a great deal of information likely to be of use for reformers or policy makers.  GI highly recommends that readers reference indicator comments and sources, and that they pay special attention to open text indicators.

1. ***Why is there no MPT Campaign Finance Index?***

As explained above, an index based on country level aggregate scores would be reductive, failing to emphasize the strongest point of the MPT dataset, which is to give readers and users a strong understanding of the relative areas of strengths and weaknesses within a given country.  Data users can use the tool on the main landing page of this website to sort countries by their aggregate scores.  When doing so, however, they should also make sure to refer to section and subsection scores, and to carefully read through the comments on each indicator.  In doing so, they will better grasp the particular “pain points” of a country’s system, and be better able to assess which areas of the political finance system are subject to abuse or violation, and which areas should be the subject of potential reforms.

1. ***Are scores comparable across countries?***

Individual indicator scores aregenerallycomparable, as are section and subsection scores to a lesser extent, but overall aggregate scores should not be compared, as explained above.  Even at the indicator level, for a fuller understanding of existing laws and the enforcement within a country system, readers should always refer to the comments attached to each indicator.  In almost all cases, explanatory comments and the sources upon which they are based yield more actionable, useful information than simple quantitative scores.  Indeed, when viewed separate from the context provided in the explanatory comment and sources, quantitative scores may be misleading.

Do you have further questions?  For more information on the MPT Campaign Finance Indicators, please refer to other sections of this website, or contact Global Integrity via email at hazel.feigenblatt@globalintegrity.org.

***Contributors Page***

***MPT Campaign Finance Indicators - Project Contributors***
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***Methodology Page***

***MPT Campaign Finance Indicators - Methodology***

The Money, Politics, and Transparency (MPT) Campaign Finance Indicators mobilized a highly qualified global network of more than 110 political finance experts from academia, journalism, and civil society to generate rich, comparative, country-level data on the transparency and effectiveness of political finance regimes across the world. A rigorous cross-national survey, MPT examines both the *de jure* legislation regulating political finance and the *de facto* implementation of that legislation.

In an iterative process dating from March to June 2014, Global Integrity, Sunlight Foundation, and the Electoral Integrity Project worked in close consultation with a carefully selected reference group of political finance experts to develop a concise set of 50 indicator questions, which were compiled into a comparative country scorecard. The project partners also selected an economically, politically, and regionally diverse sample of 54 countries in which to apply the scorecard. The selection process, though not randomized, ensures that MPT reflects the exceptional variety characterizing the range of political finance systems across the world.

The MPT scorecard evaluates the key components of effective political finance regimes, including the regulation of direct and indirect public funding, limits on contributions and expenditure, reporting and public disclosure, the regulation of third party actors, and monitoring and enforcement. Researched scorecards account for both the existing legal particulars of each of these issue areas and the *de facto* realities of practical implementation in each country.

MPT delves into critical aspects of political finance by examining not only what laws are on the books, but also whether and how those laws are effectively enforced. The combination of rigorously selected quantitative scores and detailed, evidence-based explanations supporting those scores, in addition to the inclusion of a number of non-scored, open-text questions that provide additional, context-specific detail, make the MPT indicators a rich source of granular information for interested stakeholders, policy makers, and reformers. As such, the MPT data can serve as a useful resource for crafting more transparent, accountable political finance systems.

For more information on the methodology behind the MPT Campaign Finance Indicators, please see the detailed Methodology download.

***Category Findings (distinct for each category page)***

**Direct and Indirect Public Funding**

72% of countries in the MPT sample have laws that provide direct public funding to parties and/or candidates during campaigns. In practice, however, 39% of countries fail to distribute those resources equitably, and even fewer disburse funding transparently.

Despite the prevalence of laws banning the use of non-financial state resources, like vehicles, buildings, and staff, during election campaigns, such resources are abused, in practice, in 94% of countries.

65% of the sample, in law, provides some form of subsidized access to advertising during campaigns, but in practice, less than 30% of countries distribute advertising slots to parties and candidates in a transparent, equitable fashion. In sum, where systems of direct and indirect public funding are concerned, the realities of implementation often do not correspond with established legal frameworks.

**Contribution and Expenditure Limits**

Many countries have laws that regulate who may donate during campaign periods, how they can do so, and how much money may be spent during elections. In practice, however, parties, candidates, and their supporters frequently find inventive ways to subvert legal frameworks, channeling money into campaigns while bypassing oversight mechanisms.

**Reporting and Public Disclosure**

83% of countries in the sample require parties and/or candidates to submit financial reports that include at least some information on contributions and expenditure annually or within the campaign period. In practice, however, monthly reporting of such information is very infrequent. Moreover, in practice, in 87% of countries, at least some contributions are omitted from the reports filed with the electoral authority. This means that submitted information is often both less than timely and limited in scope.

In terms of public disclosure, despite the prevalence of laws mandating that political finance information be made broadly accessible to the public, only 3.7% of the sample actually makes all reported data available online in machine readable formats. Less than 25% of the sample provides information in fully standardized, comparable formats.

**Third Party Actors**

Third party actors are defined as non-political party, non-candidate electoral actors who independently solicit contributions and make expenditures directly related to electoral campaigns. They are infrequently regulated, either in law or in practice. Only 11% of countries prohibit such actors from any and all political activity or legally require them to report on their independent political expenditures and contributions. The salience of third party actors varies from country to country, but almost everywhere, it is difficult for citizens to obtain accurate information on the electioneering activities of these organizations.

**Monitoring and Enforcement**

Oversight authorities usually exist in MPT countries, but their effectiveness is often highly circumscribed due to a lack of merit-based, independent leadership. Only 13% of the sample, in practice, appoints leaders of oversight bodies based on merit, and only 15% fully guarantees the *de facto* independence of those appointees.

Capacity constraints and operational opacity frequently hamstring oversight institutions as well. Almost 70% of countries have oversight agencies that lack sufficient budget and staff; oversight bodies conduct numerous investigations in fewer than 50% of countries; and only in 13% do oversight agencies transparently publish investigation results.

These deficits combine to make the majority of oversight institutions at least somewhat ineffective. In 89% of countries, oversight bodies are unable to effectively impose sanctions and deter repeat violations of political finance laws.