

Human rights

Human rights

Human rights are the bedrock principles which underpin all societies where there is rule of law and democracy. Since the end of World War II, the core importance of human rights has been universally acknowledged. Today, against a backdrop of multiple conflicts, humanitarian emergencies and severe violations of international law, it is all the more essential that policy responses be firmly grounded in human rights, and that States comply with the binding obligations they have contracted when ratifying international human rights treaties.

From the fight against violent extremism to the struggle to eliminate poverty and our approach to managing migration, international human rights law provides an essential framework and guidance to responsible and sustainable policy-making. Parliamentarians have a deep connection to people's concerns. At a time when our societies are increasingly divided, parliaments can promote the essential values of respect, dialogue and compromise. There can be no place for discriminatory and xenophobic rhetoric, which scars societies and pushes communities to grow further apart. Parliaments that truly represent the full diversity of their society, adopt effective legislation, and hold their governments to account can powerfully shape a positive and inclusive future for their countries.

Human rights are the basic rights and freedoms that belong to every person in the world, from birth until death. They apply regardless of where you are from, what you believe or how you choose to live your life. They can never be taken away, although they can sometimes be restricted – for example if a person breaks the law, or in the interests of national security. These basic rights are based on shared values like dignity, fairness, equality, respect and independence. These values are defined and protected by law.

What are human rights?

Human rights are rights that every human being has by virtue of his or her human dignity. Human rights are rights inherent to all human beings. They define relationships between individuals and power structures, especially the State. Human rights delimit State power and, at the same time, require States to take positive measures ensuring an environment that enables all people to enjoy their human rights. History in the past 250 years has been shaped by the struggle to create such an environment. Starting with the French and American revolutions in the late eighteenth century, the idea of human rights has driven many revolutionary movements for empowerment and for control over the wielders of power, governments in particular. Human rights are the sum of individual and collective rights laid down in State constitutions and international law. Governments and other duty bearers are under an obligation to respect, protect and fulfil human rights, which form the basis for legal entitlements and remedies in case of non-fulfillment. In fact, the

possibility to press claims and demand redress differentiates human rights from the precepts of ethical or religious value systems. From a legal standpoint, human rights can be defined as the sum of individual and collective rights recognized by sovereign States and enshrined in national legislation and in international human rights norms. Since the Second World War, the United Nations has played a leading role in defining and advancing human rights, which until then had developed mainly within the nation State. As a result, human rights have been codified in various international and regional treaties and instruments that have been ratified by most countries. Today they represent the only universally recognized value system.

Examples of human rights In the area of civil and political rights

- Right to life
- Freedom from torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment
- Freedom from slavery, servitude and forced labor
- Right to liberty and security of person
- Right of detained persons to be treated with humanity
- Freedom of movement
- Right to a fair trial
- Prohibition of retroactive criminal laws
- Right to recognition as a person before the law
- Right to privacy
- Freedom of thought, conscience and religion
- Freedom of opinion and expression
- Prohibition of propaganda for war and of incitement to national, racial or religious hatred
- Freedom of assembly
- Freedom of association
- Right to marry and found a family
- Right to take part in the conduct of public affairs, vote, be elected and have access to public office

In the area of economic, social and cultural rights

- Right to work
- Right to just and favorable conditions of work
- Right to form and join trade unions
- Right to social security
- Protection of the family
- Right to an adequate standard of living, including adequate food, clothing and housing
- Right to health
- Right to education

In the area of collective rights

- Right of peoples to:
 - Self-determination
 - Development
 - Free use of their wealth and natural resources
 - Peace
 - A healthy environment
- Other collective rights:
 - Rights of national, ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities
 - Rights of indigenous peoples

Basic human rights principles

1. Human rights are universal: Human rights are universal because they are based on every human being's dignity, irrespective of race, colour, sex, ethnic or social origin, religion, language, nationality, age, sexual orientation, disability or any other distinguishing characteristic. Since they are accepted by all States and peoples, they apply equally and indiscriminately to every person and are the same for everyone everywhere.
2. Human rights are inalienable: Human rights are inalienable insofar as no person may be divested of his or her human rights, save under clearly defined legal circumstances. For instance, a person's right to liberty may be restricted if he or she is found guilty of a crime by a court of law at the closure of a fair trial.
3. Human rights are indivisible and interdependent: Human rights are indivisible and interdependent. Because each human right entails and depends on other human rights, violating one such right affects the exercise of other human rights. For example, the right to life presupposes respect for the right to food and to an adequate standard of living. Denial of the right to basic education may affect a person's access to justice and participation in public life. The promotion and protection of economic and social rights presupposes freedom of expression, of peaceful assembly and of association. Accordingly, civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights are complementary and equally essential to the dignity and integrity of every person. Moreover, respect for all rights is a prerequisite to sustainable peace and development.
4. The right to equality and the prohibition of discrimination: Some of the worst human rights violations have resulted from discrimination against specific groups. The right to equality and the prohibition of discrimination, explicitly set out in international and regional human rights treaties, are therefore central to the protection of all human rights. The right to equality obliges States to ensure observance of human rights without discrimination on any grounds, including sex, race, color, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, membership of a national minority, property, birth, age, disability, sexual orientation and social or other status. Moreover, it is important to note that discrimination is constituted not simply by an unjustifiable "distinction, exclusion or restriction" but also by an unjustifiable

“preference” in respect of certain groups. The fight against discrimination remains a struggle for many people around the globe today.

How do human rights help you?

Human rights are relevant to all of us, not just those who face repression or mistreatment.

They protect you in many areas of your day-to-day life, including:

- your right to have and express your own opinions
- your right to an education
- your right to a private and family life
- your right not to be mistreated or wrongly punished by the state

Why should you care about human rights?

Human rights are not just about the law. They are also about the decisions we make and situations we experience on a daily basis.

If we feel annoyed with something a politician does, most of us wouldn't think twice about talking about it with our friends online or in a pub. But when you do, you are exercising a human right - your right to free speech.

That's the thing about human rights. When they are being respected they go almost unnoticed. Most children in the UK don't wake up on a school day celebrating their ability to exercise their right to education. But those who have fled countries in which they were denied the right to go to school may well appreciate it that bit more.

We often take our human rights for granted, because they are based on principles that are intuitive - dignity, fairness, equality, respect and autonomy. More often than not, it is only when our rights are being violated that we stand up and take notice. Unfortunately human rights abuse is rife – thousands of people across the world are denied a fair trial, tortured and imprisoned because of what they think or believe. Civilians are targeted at times of war. Children are forced to fight. Rape is used as a weapon. That is why it is important that we do not take human rights for granted. And why it is important that they are enshrined in international law, so that we can hold states and people to account when they commit atrocities.

Understanding Corruption

Corruption is an extensive term, used to refer to a diverse collection of illegal and/or dishonest acts. A significant portion of the body of literature on corruption is dedicated to classifying various forms of corruption operationalizing the concept for pragmatic and analytical intentions. This portion of literature presents a wide variety of models of understanding, analyzing and combating corruption (Andvig, Fjeldstad, Amundsen, Sissener, & Soreide, 2000). This chapter provides an overview of the main discussions and debates within academic literature regarding definitions of corruption, models of understanding it, followed by a taxonomy of corruption; petty corruption vs. grand corruption, and forms of corruption including; bribes,

embezzlement, favoritism, etc., this section ends with a discussion on the economic cost of corruption on the national level and on the private sector.

2.1 Debates on the Definition of Corruption

Contemporary academic literature on corruption discusses different lenses for analyzing corruption; a political and economic lens – referring to political and economic corruption denoted as a structural problem; or through a social lens – individual and cultural corruption denoted as a moral problem (Andvig et al., 2000). Viewing corruption as a moral problem is often indicated as “moral decay”, which is seen in a social exchange taking place between individuals. This lens exposes incidents that fall within the umbrella term of corruption that are not defined by the confined dimensions of policies and laws. As a multi-disciplinary field, the moral lens sheds the light on other important dimensions, such as power abuse as a form of corruption and other situations that present moral breaches but fall far beyond the boundaries of the law. Researchers who subscribe to this notion design reforms that match the prescriptions for good governance and reinforcing the democratic rule of law (Andvig et al., 2000).

On the other hand, viewing corruption as a systemic problem brings up a wide array of structural issues that may contribute to or deter corruption within a system. Researchers who view corruption through this lens – occupying the majority of the contemporary body of literature – apply political and economic theory to analyze corruption (Andvig et al., 2000). In efforts to establish a unified understanding of what is meant by corruption, both academics and practitioners have agreed to a common definition of corruption as “misuse of public power for private benefit” (Lambsdorff, 2007; Mungiu-Pippidi, 2006; Rose-Ackerman, 2007; Spector, 2012). Corruption reforms within the structural lens are more successful in cases of confined corruption, within a particular public institute or sector (Andvig et al., 2000; Rose-Ackerman, 2007).

It is not surprising to find different versions of this definition in academic literature. Over the years, prominent academics interested in corruption issues have made valuable additions to defining corruption. Nye’s definition, is regarded as the classical definition, where corruption is defined as: “behavior which deviates from the formal duties of a public role because of private-regarding (personal, close family, private clique) pecuniary or status gains” (Nye, 1967, p. 419). Additionally, Samuel Huntington referred to corruption as: “behavior of public officials which deviates from accepted norms in order to serve private ends” (Huntington, 1968, p. 59). The similarities between these definitions are hard to miss, corruption is viewed as a “deviant” act, that does not comply with the universally agreed norms of behavior, which takes place between particular agents in a particular sector – the state (Andvig et al., 2000).

A review of the different versions of this definition shows that it hinges on three main corners: “private benefit”, “public power” and “misuse”. The term “private benefit” encompasses different forms of gains; cash, valuable goods, power or status. Gains could have an immediate nature or could take the form of promises for future favors or benefits that solely benefit the public official and/or relatives or friends, but not the public. “Public power” refers to the authority entrusted to public officials, politicians and bureaucrats to act on behalf of the public within the scope of their role and sector, such as the judiciary, police, tax authorities, public utilities (water, electricity, roads, etc.) and government services (health care, education). The verb that connects these two terms is “misuse”, which refers to an action that public officials take, by prioritizing individual interests over general public interests, the manner through which public officials may misemploy their entrusted power to serve their personal concerns over common public interest (Lambsdorff, 2007; Spector, 2012).

For practical reasons international organizations have identified working definitions that maintain the main elements of corruption, but wide enough to include various forms of corruption. The World Bank Group, adopted the following definition of corruption – “the abuse of public office for private gain” (World Bank, 1997). Transparency International, a global civil society organization leading the fight against corruption, uses a very similar working definition – “corruption is the abuse of entrusted power for private gain” (Transparency International, n.d.-a). These definitions emphasize an interaction between different sectors; public and private, and highlight the misbehavior that characterizes this interaction (Andvig et al., 2000). Another key international player is the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD), mainly concerned with economic cooperation and trade it adopts a slightly different working definition that transforms corruption from solely being a public sector malady, to affect the private sector too. Yet, more emphasis is put on the misbehavior in the interaction, rather than the sectors involved. According to the OECD’s Glossary of International Criminal Standards, corruption is the “abuse of public or private office for personal gain” (OECD, 2007).

2.2 Traditional Model for Analyzing Corruption

As a complex intertwined phenomenon, simple models were needed to build a better understanding of the dynamics that result in the prevalence of a culture of corruption. Only with a thorough understanding of the problem; causes, symptoms and interlinks; valid solutions can be formed. This section presents the traditional model of analyzing corruption, the principal-agent-client model, developed by Klitgaard in 1988.

As an interaction between two actors, one of them representing the state, corruption can be analyzed through the principal-agent-client model, where the principal entrusts their subordinate, the agent, with a task. The principal sets the rules and expectations regarding how the task is to be completed. The agent is responsible

for serving the client while abiding by these rules (Klitgaard, 1988; Lambsdorff, 2007). Klitgaard viewed corruption on a transactional level to equal monopoly plus discretion minus accountability (Klitgaard, 1988, p.75). This formula was used to design anti- 16 corruption reforms for decades, as it simply identifies how monopoly of resources, information discretion and accountability each independently influence corruption (Brinkerhoff, 2000).

This model is used to explain corruption in different spheres; national sphere, where interaction between state and non-state actors take place; and the national institutional sphere, where corruption takes place within different levels, agencies and branches of government (such as the judiciary, executive and legislative branches), in this case the client becomes another state actor in contact with another state actor, even though the interaction lacks a non-state actor, illicit behavior is still the concern (Andvig et al., 2000). This model assumes that the agent is the actor who is more likely to engage in corrupt behavior (Mungiu-Pippidi, 2015). Reforms prescribed based on this model of understanding corruption suggest policy tools that aim at reducing the opportunities and incentives for corruption such as: more monitoring bodies and higher punishments. These reforms, however, assume the presence of “principled principals” who are eager to take action to detect and penalize corrupt behavior (Klitgaard, 1988; Persson, Rothstein, & Teorell, 2013).

2.3 Taxonomy of Corruption

Depending on the nature and scope of a corrupt activity, corruption can be political corruption or administrative corruption. Political corruption, occurs within the top-levels of a public authority, typically, the heads of state and top officials abuse and ignore laws and regulations to serve their private interests by appropriating pay-offs, kick-backs or embezzle large sums of money or public good. Administrative corruption takes place at the implementation side of polices, within the civil service or within state actors. Petty corruption, is a daily act that citizens face in public hospitals, schools and police stations, involving a rather modest amount. Political and administrative corruption tend to mutually assist one another, as extensive administrative corruption is backed by political corruption, common in non-democratic, authoritarian countries (Amundsen, 2000; Andvig et al., 2000; Lambsdorff, 2007).

Another classification of corruption is based on the motivations of the players engaged in corrupt behavior. This is based on the notion that motives for corrupt behavior vary between different 17 contexts. This requires us to go beyond the predominant view of seeing corruption through its scale (petty or grand), form (bribe, extortion, fraud, etc..) or type of actor (business or political) and examine the motivations behind the action, which can be classified into “need” or “greed” corruption; “need” corruption takes place when “services that citizens are legally entitled to, such a receiving a birth certificate or healthcare and conditioned upon paying a bribe.” (Bauhr, 2012). This type of corruption indicates poor government

performance and low trust in its operations, which results in relationships that are built on coercion and extortion between the involved parties. On the other hand, “greed” corruption takes place when a corrupt action is done with the intention to attain extra advantages to which that person or institution is not entitled to. This type of corruption is characterized by mutual benefit relationships between the agent and the client (Bauhr, 2012).

Corruption is not a malady exclusive to the public sector only, “private” corruption has been an issue that colonized the agendas of several international trade organizations for decades. However, corruption is seen to be a more critical problem in the public sector than the private sector, possibly because public goods tend to attract more criticism than private goods, and public goods have a wider customer base, when compared to private goods (Andvig et al., 2000).

2.4 Forms of Corruption

Corrupt behavior comes in different forms, bribery is among the most commonly known form of corruption. Extortion, embezzlement, fraud, and favoritism are all varied forms of corruption. The section below presents widely used understandings of each of the above forms of corruption using the principal-agent-client model.

Bribery, is a payment by the client to the agent in return for access to preferential benefits the agent is not entitled to. The sought after additional benefit may be a service, a license, a permit, or a particular exemption. Payments are made in monetary terms or in kind. So widely used, there are many colloquial terms in different languages that refer to bribes; kickbacks, shay, gratuities, baksheesh, sweeteners, pay-offs and grease money (Amundsen, 2000; Andvig et al., 2000; 18 Lambsdorff, 2007). Rose-Ackerman (2007) emphasizes the economic effects of bribes on the personal wealth of officials receiving bribes and their tendency to “take actions against their principals”. Principals are referred to as “bureaucratic supervisors, politically appointment ministers, or multiple principals such as the general public” (Rose-Ackerman, 2007).

Extortion, is the case when the agent abuses their power to get financial or other types of personal benefits from the agent, by restricting the client’s access to a benefit they are legally entitled to without a payment. This payment is often done after the use of coercion, violence or threats by the agent on to the client (Lambsdorff, 2007). A commonly known example of this form of corruption is the mafia style coercion to collect “protection or “security” money from citizens and businesses. In situations of systemic wide scale corruption, the state, in particular security services extorts payments from citizens in return of their services (Amundsen, 2000; Andvig et al., 2000).

Embezzlement, under definitions of corruption that do not include a non-state actor in an interaction, but empathize the “abuse of public office for private gain”, embezzlement is considered a form of corruption. Referred to as the theft of public resources by the agents who administer them. With the intention to maximize their individual wealth, and their networks, agents may misappropriate funds or steal funds from the public institutions they are employed in. Agents use their official office to secure benefits and branch out their individual or business interests by infringing on public resources (Amundsen, 2000; Andvig et al., 2000). Like bribery and extortion, embezzlement indicates a violation of the rules set by the principal on how the agent is to complete assigned tasks (Lambsdorff, 2007).

Fraud, entails manipulation, distortion or deceit of information undertaken by the agent to get personal benefits from the agent or the client. Information-asymmetry between the agent and the principle is evident in this case, the trickery involved is based on an information advantage that the agent posses over the principal, as the agent is naturally more familiar about their daily tasks and flow of work. This imbalance creates an opportunity for the agent to manipulate the information they posses for their personal benefit (Amundsen, 2000; Andvig et al., 2000; Lambsdorff, 2007). Participation in an act of fraud can take an active or passive form, principals and agents can partake in fraud by looking the other way or take an active role in it and is commonly used to cover up for other forms of corruption (Amundsen, 2000; Andvig et al., 2000).

Favoritism, is another form of power abuse for preferential allocation of public resources. Some researchers argue that favoritism is a natural human inclination, to give advantage to family members, friends and others who are within the same social circles. However, favoritism indicates an inequitable apportioning of state resources to give advantage to a particular group over an other, based on racial, ethnic, tribal, religious or political discrimination. Nepotism is a particular form of favoritism, where certain state benefits, such as offices, contracts or licenses are given to members of the same kin regardless of their merit, as loyalty towards the group is seen to have a higher value than merit (Amundsen, 2000; Andvig et al., 2000). This tends to be common in authoritarian and semi-democratic regimes where individuals and groups are in better positions being close to “the source of power” in order to “enjoy a superior status, and therefore more influence” (MungiuPippidi, 2006).

It is important to distinguish between corruption other forms of criminal behavior between only private actors, i.e. not including the state. Illegal trade, contraband, insider dealings on the stock market, and production and circulation of counterfeit money are all illegal acts according to international legal conventions, however, are not regarded as acts of corruption as these are carried out in the absence of misusing public power (Lambsdorff, 2007).

2.5 Economic impact of corruption

A significant portion of the recent empirical literature has identified two widely accepted associations relating to the impact of corruption on economic growth. The first is an inverse relation between corruption perception indexes and levels of economic development – measured by per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This negative causality maintains its validity in different regions, countries, and political regimes. The second association is that there is an inverse relation between corruption perception indexes and lower growth rate (Tanzi & Davoodi, 2002).

It is widely accepted among economists that investment and growth are connected through a positive relationship. Consequently, if corruption affects investment, then it must also affect growth. Corruption may affect investment in a set of ways; size investment, size and composition of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), size of public investment, and the quality of investment decisions and of investment projects. The extensive literature in this area indicates strong positive links between FDI and growth, and strong inverse relations between flow of FDI and corruption (Tanzi & Davoodi, 2002).

Economic impact of corruption on a national level

Corruption results in unpredictable government institutions, leading to low certainty in expecting outcomes and fickle law enforcement. All of this feeds into a “downward spiral of ultimately unproductive economic activity, decreasing productivity, shrinking investment and loss of confidence in the effectiveness of government” (Brinkerhoff, 2000). Within the public sector and specifically public works projects, evidence shows that other things being equal, high corruption is strongly associated with low operation and maintenance expenditure, and high corruption is often associated with poor quality of infrastructure. Poor public infrastructure, consequently prompts the private sector to direct its investment to improve public infrastructure – limiting the growth of the economy where private investment could have been allocated in other productive channels, if public infrastructure was done right on the onset. The impact of corruption in poor infrastructure is unmistakable in the quality of paved roads, power outages, railway networks (Tanzi & Davoodi, 2002).

Economic impact of corruption on large enterprises and SMEs

Link between size of enterprise and vulnerability to corruption – large enterprises mostly engage in a cost-reducing kind of corruption, to benefit from relaxed government regulations and lower tax rates. Moreover, as a benefit of their size, large organizations could employ “facilitators” who are individuals with the right skill set and connections to bypass regulations and get protection from petty bureaucrats. Whereas for small and medium enterprises (SMEs), corruption is often of the cost-increasing kind, as they are forced to make payments that are crucial for their survival, but do not advance the productivity or profitability of the firm. Due to their size, SMEs are often seen as easy prey for coercion and extortion by public

officials. Considering that SMEs employ a significant segment of the labor force and create the bulk of the new jobs, corruption and anticompetitive practices amalgamate into one the most difficult hurdles for SMEs to overcome; increasing the costs of enterprise and reducing the rates of return (Tanzi & Davoodi, 2002).

If corruption has a negative impact on investment and economic productivity, then why does the private sector engage in corruption? Four main cases have been identified by the literature as reasons why private entities to engage in corrupt behavior when engaging with the state. First, bribes clear the market – in the case of allocating a scarce benefit and distribution is at the discretion of a public official, private entities may offer bribes to get access to the benefit if they are not entitled to, or more if there is a quota. Gaining unequitable access to subsidies is among the most common (Klitgaard, 1988; Rose-Ackerman, 1998). Second, bribes act as incentive bonuses – as public officials often have very little incentive to do their jobs or do them at all, so to avoid delays and roadblocks, private entities resort to bribes to get things done (Rose-Ackerman, 1998). Third, bribes lower costs – by paying off public officials private entities may enjoy lower taxes, customs, duties and regulations. In countries where corruption is rampant it may be easier to secure relations through connections and bribes rather than relying on institutional systems (Rose-Ackerman, 1998). Fourth, bribes permit criminal activities – private entities may pay off public officials to “look the other way” and allow the existence of illegal businesses. This is often done through intimidation and coercion (Rose-Ackerman, 1998). Drawing on the parallels of ‘need’ and ‘greed’ corruption, it is fair to conclude that the net impact of corruption reduces investment and consequently growth.

Scope of Corruption and Anti-Corruption Reform in Egypt

3.1 Scope of Corruption in Egypt

Egypt scored 34 and ranked 108 out of the 176 countries assessed in the 2016 Corruption Perception Index (CPI), an annual report developed by Transparency International that measures the perceptions levels of public sector corruption worldwide through soliciting expert opinion from business people and country experts (Transparency International, 2016a). Egypt has been scoring within the same range for the past few years, between 30 and 40 on a scale of 0 (highly corrupt) and 100 (highly clean). In 2015, Egypt scored 36 and ranked 88 out of the 168 countries assessed (Transparency International, 2015a). These last two years are very close to the 2014 ranking where Egypt scored 37 and ranked 94 out of 175 countries assessed. When compared to other Arab countries, Egypt ranks within the lower quadrant of the region, with UAE, Qatar and Jordan on the top of the Arab countries. Egypt has a closer ranking to Thailand, Algeria and Vietnam, which scored 35, 34 and 33 respectively. South Sudan is the lowest Arab country in the CPI, with a score of 11 and a rank of 175 out of 176 (Transparency International, 2016a).

Other global corruption measurement scales position Egypt within the same range in comparison to other countries globally and regionally. The 2016 Heritage Foundation's Index for Economic Freedom, ranks Egypt 125 globally and 12 regionally, it also highlights corruption as one of the main concerns that Egypt has to deal with. This position is shared by other institutions such as; the World Economic Forum and The World Bank which have indicated in different reports and press releases that corruption is one of the main hurdles to doing business in Egypt. This notion is also supported by public opinion surveys which have pointed out corruption as a "serious problem in Egypt". Additionally, there seems to be a general consensus that the situation has only gotten worse in recent years, due to the political and economical instability that the country has been going through (Transparency International, 2015a; World Bank, 2016). The latest NIS study for Egypt was conducted in 2014 through a widely inclusive process that engaged; the government, businesses, political parties, civil society organizations, media and higher educational institutions, the study concluded with an extensive list of recommendations to strengthen Egypt's weak anticorruption institutions (Transparency International, 2014). 23 Global Corruption Barometer for MENA 2016, provides more insight on the forms of corruption within a country through extensive expert and public surveys. Bribes are reported to be very common in Egypt, with reports indicating around half of the people who accessed public services in the past 12 months prior to the report have paid a bribe. Additionally, a quarter indicated that most the public sector is corrupt in Egypt, 48% consider the public sector to be somewhat corrupt and only 12% consider the public sector is not corrupt at all. Majority of the bribes are paid in courts, followed by public services and utilities. In light of all of that, more than half the people do not regard government efforts are enough to fight corruption (Transparency International, 2016b). These positions are not only held by the international community, but these concerns were mentioned by country level reports too. In 2012, during a period of high political uncertainty, the Economic and Financial Affairs Committee of the Shura Council (the upper house of the formerly bicameral Parliament of Egypt, Shura Council was abolished in the 2014 constitution) reported that wide spread corruption in the public sector is among the main reasons driving the public debt. The supporting evidence drew up on 65,000 cases of corruption in one year highlighting exaggerated operation costs (Daily News Egypt, 2012; Transparency International, 2014). Then a few years later in early 2016, the Central Auditing Organization (CAO) announced that the cost of corruption in Egypt between 2012 and 2015 was EGP 600 billion (Marsad, 2017). This figure is based on an extensive report (300+ pages report) that covered ten of the main sectors including; public services, petroleum, health, banking, tourism, and pharmaceuticals. The report goes on to list individual cases of corruption and the associated public cost with each case. Up on release the report was promptly contested by the president, which consequently resulted in a divided public opinion on the validity of the report. It is worth noting that the President of CAO was fired from his job on the premise of releasing this report to the public and faced an

extensive period of defamation that affected him personally and his family (Marsad, 2017).

3.2 Commitments to the International Community

As a global phenomenon there are a set of international agreements that the international community has drawn up to limit the spread and the exporting of corruption across borders. These agreements aim to establish a coherent legal framework within different countries to ensure that corruption can be caught and identified by officials no matter where it takes place. This section presents the three main anti-corruption agreements that Egypt is committed to; the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption, and the Arab Convention to Fight Corruption.

United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC)

On an international level, Egypt is a signatory on three international conventions that aim to strengthen anti-corruption efforts and enable experience sharing between involved countries. The most comprehensive agreement is the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), which is the first legally binding international anti-corruption instrument. Egypt signed the UNCAC in 2003 (UNODC, 2017a). UNCAC is a comprehensive agreement that requires States to undergo extensive reforms affecting their laws, institutions and practice. Reform measures promote prevention, criminalization and law enforcement, international cooperation, asset recovery, technical assistance and mechanisms for information sharing and implementation (UNODC, 2003). The UNCAC was adopted by the United Nations (UN) General Assembly in 2003 and signed by 140 countries. To date, the UNCAC has been ratified, accepted, approved or acceded to by 183 countries (UNODC, 2017a).

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is the designated body to support state countries with the provisions of the UNCAC (UNODC, 2017a). Both sectors, public and private are covered by the preventative measures set out by the Convention, the main measures are indicated here; establishment of anti-corruption bodies, which are independent, adequately resources and have adequately trained staff to implement anticorruption policies and disseminate knowledge; improve transparency of financing for election campaigns and political parties; implement safeguards in public service to promote efficiency and transparency; public officials are bound by codes of conducts and other requirements of financial disclosure and disciplinary measures; implement measures to prevent money laundering; promote transparency and accountability in matters of public finance; implement special anti-corruption measures in areas that require special attention – judiciary and public procurement; enhanced engagement with civil society through general reporting processes (Puddephatt, 2012).

African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption

Led by the African Union, the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption was adopted in 2003 signed by 49 countries. To date the Convention has been ratified by 38 countries. Egypt was among the late signatories to this Convention as it signed and ratified the Convention in January 2017 (African Union, 2017). Through this Convention, the African continent comes together to fight against corruption, key provisions of the Convention criminalize domestic and foreign bribery, diversion of property by public officials, illicit enrichment, money laundering, financing political parties through illicit and corrupt activities, and concealment of property. Furthermore, right to free access to information is declared by the Convention, beside the participation of non-state players in the fight against corruption; civil society and media in monitoring the implementation of the convention.

The Convention lists five main objectives: 1) Enhance anti-corruption mechanisms towards eradicating corruption within the public and private sector in each State Party; 2) Facilitate cooperation among state parties to prevent, detect and punish corruption related offences in Africa; 3) Harmonize policies and bylaws between State Parties to ensure smooth coordination across countries; 4) Remove obstacles in the way of socio-economic development for State Parties; 5) Promote values of transparency and accountability within public affairs (African Union, 2003).

Arab Convention to Fight Corruption

Led by the League of Arab States, the Arab Convention to Fight Corruption is the first pan-Arab anti-corruption mechanism. It is signed by 21 countries to date (except Somalia) – the Ministries of Interior and Ministries of Justice of each signatory. The Arab Convention to Fight Corruption declares that the fight against corruption is not only limited to the state, but a joint effort with the public and the civil society. The Convention is based on the Charter of the Arab League, the UN charter and regional and international anti-corruption conventions, including the UNCAC. The Convention stresses the importance for Arab countries to come together and fight corruption as a united front to eradicate corruption from the Arab world (Transparency International, 2012a).

Similar to the UNCAC, the Convention criminalizes bribery of national and international public officials, money laundering, illicit enrichment, abuse of functions, embezzlement and obstruction of justice. Key provisions highlight the importance of coordination and collaboration to particularly in areas of asset recovery and enhancing the role of individuals and civil society in the fight against corruption. Moreover, the convention urges State Party to protect witnesses, experts and whistleblowers (Transparency International, 2012a).

3.3 National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2014-2018

Fury against the widespread corruption in Egypt was one of the reasons that pushed the people take to the streets in January 2011. All through the different political changes that took place after Mubarak stepped down, after a reign that lasted 30 years, corruption has been high on the agenda in Egypt. This was further confirmed by the 2014 Constitution, which is regarded as the post revolution constitution.

Article 128 of the 2014 Egyptian Constitution, attests that “the state is committed to fighting corruption.” By declaring that fighting corruption is the responsibility of the state, the constitution mandates the state to put the adequate prevention and combating measures in place. The article continues to count on capable oversight bodies which are required to coordinate with one another to effectively fight corruption; promote values of integrity and transparency; and conserve public funds and national state operations. Corruption – as an issue receives a lot of stress within the constitution and is repeatedly identified as a state responsibility (Transparency International, 2014).

The National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2014-2018 is Egypt’s first strategy specialized in the area of corruption control. The strategy was developed by the National Sub-committee for the 27 Prevention of and Fight Against Corruption, and it builds on the 2014 Egyptian Constitution, the UNCAC, and the Arab Convention to Fight Corruption and draws a national vision towards improving administrative performance, preserving public funds and spreading values of integrity, accountability and transparency in all fields of work. Additionally, the Strategy cites a thorough analysis conducted to identify areas of weaknesses and strength within the internal environment (National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2014-2018).

The Strategy starts off by defining corruption as “the abuse of authorized power for private gain” to cover corruption in the private sector, in addition to the public sector. Then continues to classify corruption as petty corruption and grand corruption. A significant portion of the Strategy is dedicated to the reasons behind corruption in Egypt, based on an in-depth Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats analysis of the corruption phenomenon. Among the reasons listed are the following; administrative reasons, in particular – presence of bureaucratic and complicated government procedures, poor internal control systems within state entities, low capacity of state employees, low and uncompetitive salaries within the state system. Moreover, a set of legal reasons are listed including – poor witness and whistleblower protection, long legal and judicial procedures, presence of overlapping and multiple laws governing state activities, and lack of transparency provisions. Furthermore, the Strategy refers to a set of institutional arrangement challenges that contribute to the prevalence of the corruption phenomenon such as; internal limitations on external control bodies, lack of independence of anti-corruption bodies (as most report to the executive authority), limited coordination between anti-

corruption bodies and lack of public awareness on the role of anti-corruption bodies and activities in Egypt (National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2014- 2018).

The final section of the Strategy sets out the executive plan of the strategy presents, starting with a vision:

“Establish a society concerned with combating corruption and restoring the culture of transparency, integrity, justice, and devotion, supported by effective administrative bodies.”

And mission: “Combat corruption, reduce related impacts on all administrative, economic political and social levels, raise awareness of such impacts, promote anti-corruption agencies capacities to cooperate with local, regional and international concerned bodies in combating related crimes while taking in consideration international standards and best practices.” (National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2014-2018 - p.32)

Towards achieving this mission, the strategy sets out ten main goals that address the reasons and challenges listed in earlier sections of the Strategy. Each goal is assigned with a responsible execution body, period of execution, follow up responsible body and performance indicators. The Strategy brings together different state and non-state bodies, including; ministries, state organizations, civil society organizations and media. The Ministry of Planning, Follow-up and Administrative Reform, is among the top responsible bodies of implementing most of the goals, under the coordination and oversight of the National Sub-committee for the Prevention of and Fight Against Corruption. In addition to different corruption control bodies taking the lead in and following up on goals that pertain to promoting a culture of integrity and accountability, institutional reform and capacity building within their organization (National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2014-2018).

The National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2014-2018 brings together a group of corruption control bodies and sets out clear roles and mandates for each of them, within a time bound plan and indicators. The section below presents key institutions and units in Egypt’s anti-corruption institutional framework, all of which have a corruption control mandate and coordinate with one another for their daily operations and especially within the National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2014-2018.

3.4 Egypt’s Anti-Corruption Institutional Framework

Egypt has a multitude of supervisory authorities connected through a complex structure of dependent and independent relationships that form tangled relationships. Some institutions have more authority than others in the demanding fight against corruption (OECD, 2009; Transparency International, 2014). This section presents a selection of the most influential anti-corruption bodies, by discussing their mandates, main activities and how they fit within the larger anti-

corruption framework in Egypt. Main bodies presented below are: National Coordinating Committee for Combating Corruption (NCCCC), National Sub-committee for the Prevention of and Fight Against Corruption, Administrative Control Authority (ACA), Central Auditing Organization (CAO), Administrative Prosecution Authority (APA), Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing Combating Unit (MLCU), and Illicit Gains Department (IGD).

National Coordinating Committee for Combating Corruption (NCCCC)

An inter-ministerial committee, set up in 2010 to oversee and enforce anti-corruption provisions of the UNCAC and other conventions. The NCCCC is the main coordinating body for anti-corruption efforts, by supervising and synchronizing anti-corruption efforts among other anti-corruption efforts (Transparency International, 2015b). NCCCC is headed by the Prime Minister and brings together a set a diverse representation of ministries and public agencies including; Minister of Administrative Development, Minister of Justice, President of Administrative Control Authority, President of Administrative Prosecution Authority, representative of Ministry of Interior, representative of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, representative of General Intelligence Agency, representative of Central Audit Organization, representative of Money Laundering Combating Unit, representative of Public Prosecution Office (Administrative Control Authority, n.d.-b). The process through which representatives of the state agencies are selected to serve on the NCCCC is unclear (Transparency International, 2014).

NCCCC was established by cabinet decision number 2890 for the year 2010, and is mandated with four main areas of responsibility. First, executing anti-corruption provisions as per the UNCAC and other international agreements. Second, develop a unified vision for Egypt's anti-corruption 30 efforts which stirs the direction of the current anti-corruption institutional reforms. Third, represent Egypt in official inter-state events and report on Egypt's progress towards implementing agreed up on provisions. Lastly, conduct regular reviews of legislations and bylaws to ensure that all provisions are aligned with conventions where Egypt is a signatory (Administrative Control Authority, n.d.-b). It is critical to note, that the NCCCC does not have any investigative authorities, and it is unclear if this committee is independent or impartial (OECD, 2009; Transparency International, 2015b).

NCCCC is funded by a budget allocated through the Ministry of Justice, in addition to financial support from different international entities such as UNDP and Ford Foundation. The NCCCC is currently inactive however, the National Sub-committee for the Prevention of and Fight Against Corruption has taken over the role of the NCCCC. (Transparency International, 2015b).

National Sub-committee for the Prevention of and Fight Against Corruption

Embedded under the NCCCC, the National Sub-committee for the Prevention of and Fight Against Corruption is the execution arm of the NCCCC. Headed by the President of Administrative Control Authority, the sub-committee brings together; a representative of Ministry of Interior, a representative of Ministry of Administrative Development, a representative of Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a representative of Minister of Justice, a representative of Public Prosecution Office, a representative of General Intelligence Agency, a representative of Administrative Control Authority, a representative of Central Audit Organization, a representative of Administrative Prosecution Authority, and a representative of Money Laundering Combating Unit (Administrative Control Authority, n.d.-c).

As a sub-committee that reports to the NCCCC, its mandate is more specialized and operational, including; conducting studies and reviews in preparation for the National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2014-2018 and beyond, in addition to placing coordination mechanisms that enable effective information sharing between different state agencies. Moreover, the sub-committee is responsible for suggesting anti-corruption reforms to strengthen a culture of transparency and integrity, in addition to addressing high-level corruption complains and referring to relevant entities (Administrative Control Authority, n.d.-c).

Administrative Control Authority (ACA)

Established in 1964 by law 54, the Administrative Control Authority (ACA) is an independent organization presided over by the Prime Minister. The ACA is mandated with combating corruption in state-owned enterprises and private sector firms receiving public funds, by exerting financial, administrative and technical control over these agencies (OECD, 2009).

Furthermore, the ACA takes the lead on providing information and uncovering abuses, negligence and violations, in addition to supporting other state organizations with intelligence on high-level public officials and investigate alleged cases of corruption. The ACA is enabled to carry out its investigative role, by leaning on its extra ordinary rights to access to information and its power of judicial arrest anywhere in Egypt, with regards to any crimes that fall within its jurisdiction (Administrative Control Authority, n.d.-a).

As an executive body, the ACA is the only body with a dual mandate of preventing and combating corruption. When cases of corruption are identified, the ACA refers the cases to the relevant authorities depending on the nature of the case; Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing Combating Unit (MLCU), or Illicit Gains Department (IGD) or directly to the Administrative Prosecution Authority (APA) (OECD, 2009).

Central Auditing Organization (CAO)

Egypt's main audit institution, the Central Auditing Organization (CAO) was established in 1988 as an independent organization "subordinated to the President of the Republic" under law No. 144/1988 (OECD, 2009). CAO's main goal is to regulate and monitor the allocation of public funds. It also monitors central and local authorities, political parties civil service agencies, companies and banks which are at least 25% publicly funded. Additionally, it monitors the performance and tracks the progress of plan implementation (Transparency International, 2014).

One of the main roles of CAO is conducting studies that support the President and Parliament to make informed decisions about trends and the scope of corruption in different organizations (OECD, 2009). According to law 144/1988, amended by law 157/1998, general audit results and 32 annual reports produced by CAO are submitted to the President, Parliament, and the Prime Minister only, thus the CAO does not publish reports directly to the public (OECD, 2009).

Administrative Prosecution Authority (APA)

The Administrative Prosecution Authority is governed by Law 117/1958, which authorizes the agency to monitor and investigate all civil servants in all ministries and agencies at all levels. "The APA, which is supported by a large and professional staff, investigates administrative and financial crimes, and has the mandate to hand over perpetrators to criminal courts. The APA also serves as an internal reporting mechanism to which public officials may direct their complaints or reports of corruption."

One of the first anti-corruption agencies in Egypt, the Administrative Prosecution Authority (APA) established by law 117/1958 presided by the Ministry of Justice. The APA has one of the broadest roles in the anti-corruption arena, as it is responsible for monitoring and investigating civil servants across all ministries and agencies. The APA is the main body in bringing forward financial and administrative cases of corruption to the judiciary sphere. The APA received case referrals from the ACA after the cases are investigated and compiled. Lastly, the APA is also responsible for developing and maintaining internal reporting mechanisms within the public system, this gives the APA access and legitimacy to identify cases of corruption and take legal action accordingly (Transparency International, 2014).

Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing Combating Unit (MLCU)

Established by the anti-money laundering law 80/2002, which declares money laundering activities and financing terrorist activities as criminal activities, the MLCU is an independent financial intelligence unit. The MLCU aims to enhance money laundering and terrorist financing combating systems in order to limit the exploitation of public funds by criminal activity (Money Laundering and Terrorist

Financing Combating Unit, n.d.). Financial and non-financial institutions can refer suspicious transactions to the MLCU for investigation. The unit is comprised of experts from the Judicial authority, financial experts and highly qualified employees (Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing Combating Unit, n.d.; OECD, 2009).

Illicit Gains Department

A department within the Ministry of Justice, the Illicit Gains Department was established by law 11/1968 and is an independent judiciary body that aims at fighting corruption within the public sector, especially by prosecuting cases of illegal profiteering. The IGD is comprised of judges from 33 the court of first instance and the court of appeal, it is presided by either the President of the Court of Appeals or the President of the Court of Cassation (Ministry of Justice, n.d.). As a judiciary body, IGD does not investigate cases of corruption, but prosecutes them through its highly specialized members. The IGD receives referred cases from the ACA and other investigative bodies (OECD, 2009). The IGD is also known as the Illicit Gains Apparatus, Illicit Gains Authority, and Illegal Profiting Apparatus. These are the key anti-corruption institutions in Egypt, the section below provides more details on the scope and jurisdiction of the ACA, the only anti-corruption body with a dual mandate of preventing and investigating corruption.

3.5 Administrative Control Authority (ACA)

According to law 54/1964 – the law establishing the mandate and jurisdiction of the ACA – and law 92/1975 which further establishes its mandate. The ACA's mandate is comprised of two-folds; corruption prevention and investigation of alleged, or suspected, corruption (Administrative Control Authority, n.d.-a). In light of prevention measures, the ACA is mandated with improving administrative, technical and financial systems within the public sector, in addition to ensuring bylaws and regulations are properly implemented within all areas of the public sector. When it comes to investigating corruption, the ACA is mandated with investigating alleged and suspected corruption in all corners of public services by investigating public officials and non-public officials handling public funds, besides investigating official complaints submitted by the public and presented by media outlets. Furthermore, the ACA is mandated with providing high level public officials (Prime Minister, Ministers and Governors) with intelligence as requested (Administrative Control Authority, n.d.-a; OECD, 2009).

The ACA has control over all public institutions, bodies and agencies in Egypt. Including public sector companies, all their subsidiaries and branches. In addition to, public and private associations that provide public goods or services, and all other bodies that the state is part of through a monetary or non-monetary contribution (Administrative Control Authority, 2011). Within these bodies, the 34 ACA mainly specializes in crimes related to preserving public funds such as; embezzlement, misuse and misappropriation of funds, facilitating the misuse misappropriation of

funds, illicit gains and fraud. Additionally, the ACA is also mandated with investigating crimes of tax and custom evasion, money laundering, and crimes related to public health (Administrative Control Authority, 2011).

In order to fulfill its mandate, the ACA enjoys an extraordinary level of jurisdiction, law 54/1964 provides the ACA authority to get view and acquire documents from different public sector bodies, regardless of its confidentiality status, while maintain confidentiality rights of bank accounts. In addition to, summoning witnesses and suspects to give their statements and power of judicial arrest with regards to relevant crimes. Moreover, the ACA has the authority to request disciplinary action against a public official, in addition to suspension and release from service (Administrative Control Authority, n.d.-a).

The ACA carries out its responsibilities through four central control departments and regional departments. The central control departments are located in Cairo and Giza close to the biggest portion of the public sector, which hold the upper management of the ACA and controls the overall operations of the ACA. The regional control departments work on a governorate level through 23 offices across governorates and four geographical offices in North Sinai, South Sinai, New Valley and Beni Suweif (Administrative Control Authority, 2011).

In light of the recently launched war on corruption, which stresses on the need for a two-pronged approach – prevention and fighting corruption, the ACA is uniquely positioned because of its dual mandate to prevent and fight corruption, in addition to its wide and overarching jurisdiction over the public sector and public funds, making the ACA the main corruption control body in Egypt. Additionally, the need for a highly functional ACA is integral to effective corruption control, which makes the ACA a highly relevant and insightful case for study. Consequently, the ACA is the sole focus of this research, as the research delves to understand how the ACA understands its role; what are the governance mechanisms in place that allow the ACA to carryout its duties with integrity, transparency while maintaining accountability to the public; and if the ACA has adequate access to resources to fulfill its role. 35 The following chapter presents the conceptual framework that the research adopts to analyze the extent to which the ACA is enabled to fulfill its mandate. The chapter presents corruption as a collective action problem, then introduces the three-point criteria; role, governance mechanisms, and capacity, followed by a road map of how the research is conducted.

According to ACA the term of " administration corruption" is a technical expression means the spreading of infringing on public funds and profiteering from public posts in the society.

Types of " administration corruption" :

Corruption of high ranking officials or second tier at the state bodies. The ACA is emphasizing its efforts on fighting such types of corruption.

Forms of "administration corruption":

Spreading of bribery crimes, profiteering, abuse of authority, embezzlement among public servants.

The negative impacts of corruption:

- Fleeing of foreign investments.
- Economic recession and decline in exports.
- Arising monopoly.
- Tax and custom evasion.
- Increasing the rate of unemployment.
- Lack of loyalty.
- Occurring money laundry crimes.
- Hindering the trial process.
- Shake the foundation of the state.

Area of ACA Jurisdiction:

- 1- State Administrative Bodies
- 2- Public Business Sector.
- 3- Public Associations & Institutions
- 4- Private Sector undertaking any public work .
- 5- Organizations to which the State Contributes in any form.

Function of Administrative Control Authority according to the law 54/1964:

1. Researching and verifying the causes of insufficiency of business and production and suggesting the means susceptible to remedy.
2. Revealing the imperfection of administrative, technical, and financial systems which hinder the regular functioning of public organizations.
3. Following-up the execution of laws, and ensuring that the decisions, regulation and systems applied, are sufficient for realizing the objective of their establishment.
4. Detecting the administrative and financial contravention as well as the criminal actions committed by employees during the accomplishment of their function, and taking the necessary precautionary measures to avoid such occurrences within preparation, and denouncing those already accomplished.
5. Verifying the complaints presented by citizens about contravention to law, or negligence in the accomplishment of functional duties; also the observations and suggestions made by them with the aim of amelioration the service, and regularizing the flow of business and the quick accomplishment.
6. Following-up and studying the publications of the press about complaints, and journalistic investigations revealing cases of negligence, lack of due care Abuse of

power or exploitation, as well as other cases and aspects handled by the different mass media.

7. Providing the Cabinet Ministers, and to Governors, the information, data, and studies may demand, and for effecting any other supplementary work.

8. Assisting Conducting investigations on candidates for top management posts or candidates to be decorated

9. Conducting investigations on illegal gain cases.

10. Conducting investigations on suspicious financial operations that might include money laundering crimes by coordinating & exchanging information with Anti Money Laundering Unit in the Central Bank of Egypt.

Competence Of ACA Officers:

1- The right of demanding, consulting, or retaining any dossiers, documents or papers; or obtaining copies.

2- Summon Officials & Citizens to hear their testimony.

3- Suspension of employee or provisional separation from post, at the exigency of public interest.

4- Disciplinary penalties, any employee who have hidden information demanded by the members of Administrative Control, or who have refused of presenting or communicating information to them.

5- Judicial Mandate to search, investigate, and collect evidences .

The crime seized by ACA is divided into 2 categories:

The first one is considered one of the fundamental jurisdictions of ACA, those crimes committed by public employees at different states' bodies:

Infringing on public funds:

- Embezzlement.
- Facilitating seizure on public fund.
- Profiteering.
- Harming public funds on purpose.
- Fraud in procurements.

Profiteering of Public post:

- Bribery.
- Abuse of authority.
- Forgery official documents.

The second category is seized through coordination with other authorities:

- Tax and custom evasion.

- Money Laundry.
- Commercial fraudulent.
- Health care crimes.

The approaches of ACA regarding combating corruption:
The ACA has four approaches to fight corruption:

The first one is achieving precaution or preventive control through:

- Studying negative phenomena and gaps in laws & regulations and recommend the suitable means to avoid its occurrences.
- Improving the sources of information to early detect the contraventions especially in the sphere of tenders.
- Verifying the procedures of investigations on the candidate for the top management posts and applied the code of criteria to achieve integrity and impracticality.
- Carrying our regular investigations on posts more vulnerable to corruption.

The second one is initiative policy toward corruption through:

- Seizing infringing on public funds cases and the deviation of public servants.
- Persuading the cases of profiteering of public posts and illegal gain cases.
- Persuading the cases of custom & tax evasion.
- Paying a great attention to the citizens' complaints.

The third one is public awareness of the gravity problems caused by corruption

Other control authorities

The Public Prosecution

The Public Prosecution is an integral part of the judiciary. It shall carry out the investigation and prosecution of criminal cases, except those excepted by the law. The law shall determine its other jurisdictions.

The Prosecutor General shall be in charge of the Public Prosecution. He shall be chosen by the Supreme Council of the Judiciary from among those ranked as Vice presidents of the Court of Cassation, or from those ranked as Presidents of the Courts of Appeal or from the Assistants to the Prosecutor General. He shall be appointed by virtue of a Presidential Decree for four years or for the remaining years until he reaches the age of retirement whichever is earlier, and this appointment shall be only once during his term of service.

Accountability State Authority - ASA

Accountability State Authority - (ASA) is an independent Authority with a general legal personality that is affiliated to the President of the Republic. It aims

mainly at controlling the state funds and the funds of other public Authorities & companies.

The Accountability State Authority is an independent auditing institution established in Egypt in 1942 as an instrument of public finance control. The ASA supervises the management of public-sector companies and government departments, including about 130 central government departments and administrative units, 120 service agencies, 29 governorates, 50 economic authorities and more than 160 state-owned enterprises, political parties, trade unions, national and party news media, and all units subsidized by the State. The ASA may also audit and examine the work and accounts of any other entity, as assigned by the President, the Prime Minister or the People's Assembly of Egypt. It is independent of the cabinet, and reports directly to the President of Egypt, to whom it is subordinated.

the Central agency for organization and administration (CAOA)

The agency was established by act No. 118 of 1964,
Then, CAO A president decree No. 300 of 1991 for reorganizing CAO A structure,
Then, the state minister for Administrative Development decree No. 648 of 2001 for re-organizing CAO A structure,
Then, CAO A president decree No. 34 of 2008.
Finally, CAO A president decree No. 468 of 2009.

CAOA aims to reform governmental administration systems, achieve the goals of administrative reform, develop the civil service system, promote performance efficiency within different units of governmental administration, ensure justice and equity among employees beside the achievement of governmental bodies to their responsibilities.

CAOA takes necessary actions to perform competences mentioned in articles 5,6,7 of law 118/1964 for establishing it . CAO A tasks are as follows:

- 1 – Suggesting laws, decrees and regulations concerning State civil servants and provide advice on projects related to personnel affairs before their approval. Supervising the implementation of these laws, decrees and special regulations and issuing technical instructions and circulars that organizing work implementation .
- 2 – Developing the system of civil service affairs to ensure equal treatment, providing professional and technical support for personnel departments, conducting technical inspection on business procedures of these departments and send reports to their heads .
- 3 – Studying and identifying needs of labor professions and specializations in different administrative units according to suggestions of competent authorities, setting systems to select and appoint employees on the basis of

competence, equal opportunities and determined rules to ensure justice and transparency .

- 4 – Proposing the policy of salaries, bonuses, allowances, rewards, compensations and programs of health and social care. setting systems of job classification and evaluation, identifying their description, disseminating and recording them.
- 5 – Studying and reviewing projects of salary budget proposals of employees credits and number of jobs, identifying their levels and grades, approving them according to competent authorities needs and submitting all to the ministry of finance .
- 6 – Laying down policies and plans of employees training in the fields of organization and administration to improve their performance efficiency, supervising employees training centers, supporting training units, inspecting their technical performance, organizing public training courses and participating in elaborating programs to foreign missions trainees in the field of organization and administration.
- 7 – Keeping records and data of top management and leadership functions, establishing a system for job statistics. Developing administrative information systems and recording data of civil servants.
- 8 – Participating in mobilizing the war efforts by evaluating the quality and quality of human resources in different administrative units and planning for mobilizing in crisis times.
- 9 – Drawing administrative reform policy and its implementation plans and programs to raise leadership and administrative efficiency and the performance of the administrative machinery as a whole.
- 10– Reviewing projects of establishing new agencies and their organizational structures, studying proposals of reorganizing or modifying competencies of existing agencies before their approval by competent authority. Providing opinion about regulations of work flow and providing technical opinion and support in organizing, simplifying procedures, developing the governmental service performance and improving work systems and methods.
- 11– Designing systems for inspection, performance evaluation and following up to ensure the integrity and efficiency of employees performance .
- 12– CAOAs has the right to communicate directly with different governmental bodies in all levels and require data and statistics needed to practice its competences .

CAOA also has the right to communicate with local and international scientific bodies which practice similar activities to benefit from their experience and expertise after the approval of competent authority .