

The role of administrative prosecution as an example of a successful practice in combating and preventing corruption

In the context of the recommendation issued by the Open-ended Intergovernmental Working Group on the Prevention of Corruption in which State parties are encouraged to share their successful initiatives and practices in the area of corruption prevention, we present hereunder the administrative prosecution system as one of the systems adopted by the Egyptian Legislator since 1954 in the area of the fight against corruption. This system is based on designating a judicial body tasked with the investigation of significant financial and administrative violations (even if they do not involve criminal offences) committed by government employees and by other members of the many categories subject to the competence of the administrative prosecution. This system represents an approach found almost nowhere else in comparative law, and yet it has been clearly successful in Egypt, which led the Legislator to extend it by virtue of several legislations issued in the years 1958, 1959, 1978, 1983 and 1989.

I: Overview of the administrative prosecution system

The nature of administrative prosecution

Administrative prosecution is one of the judicial bodies in Egypt that has been granted by the Legislator total independence from the executive power in the performance of its duties. This is stated in the first article of the Administrative Prosecution Law No. 117 for 1958 and its amendments, where it is stated that “Administrative prosecution is an independent judicial body ...”.

Administrative prosecution terms of reference

The main administrative prosecution terms of reference with respect to employees subject to its jurisdiction are:

1. Investigating the financial and administrative violations referred to it by any administrative or regulatory body.
2. Examining the complaints referred to it by competent heads, official bodies or individuals concerning law violations or neglect in the performance of duties, and investigating those that are shown to be serious as a result of the examination.
3. Instituting and conducting disciplinary action in disciplinary courts.
4. Appealing disciplinary courts verdicts, when legal grounds exist for such appeal, in the Higher Administrative Court.
5. Referring facts that the administrative prosecution determines on the basis of its investigations that they involve criminal offences to the public prosecution (the public prosecution may institute a criminal action based on the investigations made by the administrative prosecution).

Characteristics of the administrative prosecution investigations

The main characteristics of investigations conducted by the administrative prosecution are:

1. Juridical character: the investigation is conducted by a member of the administrative prosecution, who is a member of a judicial body enjoying in the performance of his function all the privileges that are enjoyed by his peers in the public prosecution.
2. Total independence from the executive power: the administrative prosecution conducts its investigations in total independence from the executive power. The prosecution is not bound in its procedures or in its legal characterization of the facts by the opinion or the characterization of the administrative body to which the employee belongs. It is also not bound by a set processus by the administrative body concerning the same facts; the administrative prosecution may reopen an investigation into the same facts and act according to what its own investigations reveal.

3. Comprehensiveness: the administrative prosecution investigation is not limited to the fact or facts that are the subject of the original notification or complaint, but can extend to include all violations revealed during the investigations.
4. Breadth of the investigator's powers: this is because the Legislator has provided the member of the administrative prosecution with all the investigating powers that make the investigation procedurally complete and conformal to its legal stipulations. The main powers are:
 - (a) To issue an order to arrest and bring the witness in the cases specified by law.
 - (b) To authorize the search of persons and houses of employees alleged to have committed the financial or administrative violation when legally justified.
 - (c) To search places of work and other such places used by employees being investigated in their work.
 - (d) To ask that the employee be suspended from his functions if the interest of the investigation so requires.
 - (e) The right of access to papers and documents in the ministries and agencies, even if they are confidential.
5. Observance of safeguards guaranteeing impartiality and integrity: Law, Work Regulations in the Prosecution and legal judgments impose on the investigations conducted by the administrative prosecution a set of safeguards that guarantee them the greatest degree of impartiality and integrity. Some of these safeguards relate to the qualities that the member of the administrative prosecution doing the investigation must possess. These are the same as the qualities that a judge must possess, namely independence in his work, remoteness from sources of suspicion, impartiality, abstention from political activities and from any commercial activity or any work that does not befit the dignity of his function or conflicts with its good performance. As for the other guarantees, they relate to the procedural and substantive safeguards to ensure a proper investigation, such as the rules regulating hearing of witnesses after taking the oath, the rules regulating confronting the accused with the accusation or accusations levelled against him, abstaining from posing suggestive questions to the accused or witness, abstaining from posing questions based on personal information, etc.
6. Provision of a legal basis for imposing on the responsible employee the payment of the material damages that resulted from his action (civil liability): The administrative prosecution investigation does not stop only at determining the disciplinary responsibility of the worker, and whether there was a criminal offence requiring that he should be held criminally accountable, but it extends to determining the elements of civil omission liability such as faults, damages and causal relationship. This results in a request to impose on the worker the payment of the damages resulting from his violation to the extent that such damages were caused by his personal error. The Central Auditing Organization carefully monitors the administrative bodies' adherence to decisions by the administrative prosecution concerning the imposition of such payments.

Actions of the administrative prosecution in an investigation:

The action of the administrative prosecution in an investigation ends in one of the following ways:

1. Set processus: this happens if the investigation does not uncover any violation or if there is a violation for which one of the conditions for set processus is satisfied (e.g. set processus for insufficient evidence, unknown offender, abatement of the case due to the death of the accused or abatement of the case according to the law of limitations).
2. Refer the file to the administration to which the employee belongs to impose administrative sanctions on him.
3. Refer the file to the Disciplinary Court at the State Council (this usually happens in the case of serious violations because only the Court has the right to impose hard sanctions such as dismissal or forced retirement).

4. Refer the file to the public prosecution if the investigation reveals a criminal offense. In case the file is referred to the public prosecution, the latter may refer the file to the competent criminal court based on the investigation conducted by the administrative prosecution.

Categories of workers subject to the mandate of the administrative prosecution

As a general rule, the majority of civil servant categories in ministries and local governmental bodies and agencies are subject to the mandate of the administrative prosecution, as well as a number of other categories including workers in some non-governmental companies and private associations.

Types of violations investigated by the administrative prosecution

The investigations of the administrative prosecution deal with all financial, administrative or conduct violations allegedly committed by an employee. The Legislator has assigned a mandatory competence to the administrative prosecution with respect to financial violations committed by civil servants in the country. These violations include all actions that are detrimental to public funds or that may directly compromise public funds, such as the violation of the financial rules and instructions, the violation of rules for bidding and tendering, accountancy and public procurement, and in general all forms of abuse of public funds either intentionally or by negligence.

II: The role of the administrative prosecution in combating corruption

The investigations conducted by the administrative prosecution have an effective role in combating corruption. On the one hand, the assignment of an independent judicial body not subject to the influence of the executive power to investigate administrative violations even when they do not constitute criminal offences, and whose competence extends to facts that are revealed to it, even when such revelation does not occur through the entity to which the employee belongs, is a strong incentive for employees to abide by the provisions of the law and not get involved in acts of corruption. They know they can simply be held accountable and that they will not enjoy impunity simply through the collusion of their supervisors or the failure to report their violations by the entity to which they belong. The fact that employees are subject to the administrative prosecution's competence make them feel under constant judicial supervision.

On the other hand, the Legislator has given the administrative prosecution the possibility to point out to the administrative bodies subject to its mandate shortcomings in their work that allow for corruption. Through its investigations, the administrative prosecution does a thorough examination of the procedures of the administrative body that violates the law and issues recommendations to rectify them. Such recommendations include, for example, recommendations issued to rectify public procurement procedures, to control public spending, to draft rules governing the issuance of government permits in accordance with rules set by law, to rectify recruitment procedures that contravene the law, to impose the observance of certain health, environmental or legal requirements, to draft standards or codes of conduct in specific areas or to exclude a certain employee from performing certain functions (such as excluding an employee who has been convicted of financial violations from certain financial functions, or excluding a teacher accused of sexual harassment from girls' schools).

Thirdly, the disciplinary competence of the administrative prosecution has an important role in dealing with functional errors in their early and intermediate stages, and prevents such errors from becoming organized or widespread corruption.

Fourthly, the right of the administrative prosecution to receive complaints from the public is an important safeguard against any injustice that may be committed by employees in the different administrative bodies or their failure to perform their duties. This prevents widespread neglect and administrative corruption among them. The administrative prosecution also has the right to receive and investigate complaints from the employees themselves, either against their peers or against their supervisors involved in corruption. This encourages employees to report cases of corruption that come to their knowledge without fearing the power of those peers or supervisors and their ability to influence the investigation, which is not the case when the investigation is done by the administrative body itself.

III: The hot line set by the administrative prosecution to receive complaints from the public

The administrative prosecution, in cooperation with the Ministry for Administrative Development, has set up a service to receive complaints from the public by dialling a short telephone number (16117) known as the hot line. The Ministry of State for Administrative Development has provided financial and technical support to set up and operate this mechanism through a team under the supervision of the Ministry of State for Administrative Development tasked with receiving the complaints as follows:

I: Register the data of the caller: to ascertain the identity of the caller and prevent malicious complaints, he is to provide data from his National Number Card which allows the person receiving the complaint to verify, based on determinants previously known to him, the authenticity of the data provided.

II: Register a summary of the complaint: the citizen states his complaint, a summary of which is registered in the form designated for this purpose. The form is then referred to the information centre of the administrative prosecution via the international information network through a programme set for this purpose. There, members of the prosecution (the working group in the information centre) examine the complaint and refer it to the competent prosecution or competent body, as the case may be, to conduct the necessary investigation.

In order to assure the complainant that his complaint is being dealt with in a serious manner, instructions have been issued to all prosecutions in the Republic to the effect that members of the prosecution conducting an investigation must summon the complainant to hear from him details of his complaint and what documents useful to the investigation he may have. This is the opposite of what used to be done, where the entity subject of the complaint was contacted to obtain information about the complaint and then an investigation was conducted based on the result of this procedure. In some cases, this would lead to set processus based on information provided by the entity subject of the complaint, which could prevent the complainant from obtaining his right.

From mid-September until now the team tasked with receiving the complaints received 35 thousand calls, of which 7358 were registered. The rest were calls where the caller had refrained from revealing his data and were deemed malicious. They were ignored as they aim at compromising the integrity of employees without evidence. Of the registered complaints, 4495 were referred to the competent prosecutions to conduct the necessary investigations, as they were deemed serious and not calumnious.

Local and district administrations are the entities against which most complaints were received, mainly regarding bad services and the non-implementation of orders to tear down buildings in violation. Then follow the Ministry of Health agencies, were people complain from the irregular working of the health units and the low level of health services.

In addition to the above, a number of complaints were received against workers in entities having their own special disciplinary systems (police officers, workers in regular courts, university professors and workers in private universities) as well as complaints related to the slowness of judicial procedures before certain judicial bodies. Because the administrative prosecution is not mandated to investigate these categories, they were referred to the competent bodies for action.

Coordination with these bodies is currently underway to establish a follow-up mechanism of the complaints referred to it in order to inform the citizen of what has been done concerning his complaint.

Although the administrative prosecution is not mandated to investigate workers in the private sector, any complaint received by the information centre against the private sector is referred to the administrative bodies mandated with the supervision and control of the private sector, and the action that they take to eliminate the causes of the complaint is followed up.

A site has been established on the Internet for the administrative prosecution (www.ap.gov.eg). The possibility also exists for receiving complaints from individuals via e-mail with the same procedure applied to such complaints as described above. In addition, the site offers a number of services for

members of the prosecution, including research and studies related to the nature of their work, encyclopedias of laws and decisions regulating work in the administrative prosecution, judgments issued by the Egyptian higher courts reference to which constitutes an important guarantee of the uniformity of judicial principles, as well as connecting the administrative prosecution with other bodies involved in fighting financial and administrative corruption around the world to learn about the up-to-date methods they use to carry out their duties in this regard.

IV: The administrative prosecution and the standards of the United Nations Convention against Corruption

It can be clearly seen from the above, that the administrative prosecution plays a role in combating administrative corruption. The administrative prosecution is a judicial body mandated with law enforcement. It performs its duties in an independent manner without being subject to any influence. It has an important role not only in investigating facts involving administrative corruption, but also in preventing such corruption. Its investigations do not stop at determining the responsibility of employees, but extends to uncovering loopholes conducive to corruption in work laws, systems or applications. In each case it issues appropriate recommendations and measures, such as excluding employees from certain functions, for example carrying out financial duties or engaging in activities related to tendering or bidding or mandating the administrative body with the investigation of certain activities or establishing specific controls to regulate one of its sectors, etc.

The administrative prosecution contributes also to raising the awareness about corruption, its consequences and the ways to fight it, through the annual report issued by the prosecution and communicated to the relevant bodies. In that report, it monitors the main manifestations of corruption and the loopholes in existing legislations and regulations. It also offers suggestions to deal with these loopholes and shut all possible sources of corruption.

Finally, it may be said that the administrative prosecution has represented for over 55 years a successful example in combating and preventing corruption. It is an example that is especially applicable in developing countries (where the designation of an independent judicial body to conduct administrative and financial investigations provides an effective guarantee to the citizens and employees alike, and prevents the exercise of any political, partisan or presidential pressure on such investigations) and also in countries with a dense workforce (where it would not be envisaged, in the case that the administrative apparatus is huge or has experienced an increase in number, to adopt policies advocating the application of penal procedures to notifications received from employees and citizens. This would require the establishment of a judicial body that investigates such notifications and takes the necessary measures in their respect, and only reports to the public prosecution violations that are clearly serious).

Done on 13/5/2011

Prepared by:

Justice/Ahmad Atwa, head of the information centre in the administrative prosecution,
first deputy head and member of the technical bureau of the administrative prosecution

Justice/Mohammad Ramy, assistant secretary general for international cooperation affairs

The Social Contract Center as an example of successful anti-corruption practices*

The origin of the Social Contract Center is a joint project between UNDP and the Center for Information and Decision Making Support in the Council of Ministers. Its initial idea emerged in the 2005 Report on Human Development in Egypt with a view to formulating a concept for a new social contract for Egypt that would be acceptable to all parties, reinstate the trust between the citizen and the government and rationalize public policy in order to offer a descent life to all. Since its establishment in 2007, one of its priorities has been to study the phenomenon of corruption in Egypt and suggest solutions to fight its causes.

The anti- corruption practices implemented by the Center can be grouped under two pillars:

The first pillar: involvement in the drafting of a national anti-corruption strategy:

This is done through the following activities:

- The Center has studied and analysed many successful international experiences in the fight against corruption to ascertain their possible usefulness in Egypt. The Center has issued some studies in this regard, including:
 1. *Fighting Corruption, Lessons learned from International Experience (India-Ghana-Colombia)*, in order to present such experience and whether it can be useful to Egypt, in 2010.
 2. *The Legislative Framework for Combating Corruption: a Comparative Study of the Legislations in Some Countries* in order to present such legislations and whether they can be useful to Egypt, in 2011.
- The Center has prepared a number of quantitative and qualitative studies and research that aim at studying, researching and evaluating the corruption phenomenon in Egypt and its different legal, institutional and cultural dimensions in order to analyse the roots of the problem, clarify the reasons, location and dimensions of such corruption in the Egyptian society and the most appropriate ways to combat it. These studies include the following:
 1. *Between Corruption and Good Governance: Towards the Realization of the Social Contract and the Millennium Development Goals* which is a conceptual study that focuses on the theoretical framework of corruption, good governance and the millennium development goals, and the mutual relationships between these variables, in 2010.
 2. *National Survey of Citizen's views Concerning Corruption and the Quality of Government Services in Egypt* which is a survey that gauges the citizens' impressions about this phenomenon, in 2009.
 3. *The Legal and Institutional Framework for Combating Administrative Corruption in Egypt* identifies loopholes in these frameworks which may be a cause for corruption and suggests solutions for the gaps that are revealed, in 2009.
 4. *Corruption: Examining Some Legal Judgments* to ascertain the efficiency of legal and institutional system in the practical application, in 2010.
 5. *United Nations Convention against Corruption: Evaluating the Implementation and Analyzing Gaps in the Egyptian Case* to ascertain the extent to which Egypt is implementing this convention and suggest amendments to Egyptian laws needed to make them conform to it, before Egypt is to

* *Translator's note:* Each of the pages 8-10 should have a logo at the top with the inscription: "Social Contract Center Equality Participation Accountability", as well as the following at the bottom "106 Alkasr Alaini street Cairo Center Postal Number 11461 Cairo Egypt Tel.: +202 2792 3198/2971/0756, Fax: +202 2796 1381 scc@idsc.net.eg, www.socialcontract.gov.eg.

be subjected to the formal evaluation in 2013 in accordance with the implementation mechanisms for this convention, in 2010.

- Executive summaries were prepared for all studies and research conducted by the Center and sent to decision makers in the country and distributed to the media, civil society organizations and experts in this field via mail.
- The Center has held many round tables and workshops with the aim of raising awareness about the phenomenon of corruption, its causes and ways to combat it, in which all relevant bodies participated, including government and regulatory bodies, the private sector and civil society.

The last such workshop was entitled “*Evaluating anti-corruption mechanisms, legislations and institutions in Egypt*” (21 December 2010) which issued an important recommendation.

- The Center works with many bodies involved with the fight against corruption in order to draft the concept of a national anti-corruption strategy built on the studies conducted by the Center and other centres with a view to submit it to decision makers in the country.

The second pillar: prepare indicators and studies to gauge governance and corruption at the sectorial level

In a step that is the first of its kind at the regional level, the Social Contract Center has made great strides towards preparing indicators and studies to gauge governance and corruption at the sectorial level by focusing on three major sectors, namely health, education and water and sanitation, with the rest of the sectors to be covered in the near future. This is because of the importance of sectorial analysis due to the technical differences in the functioning of these sectors, and the fact that finding technical solutions for the problems they face may be different from one sector to the other. In this context, experts and consultants in the Center have carried out the following activities:

- Review past experience of countries and specialized international institutions in gauging governance and combating corruption in the health, education and water and sanitation sectors.
- Study and research the legal and institutional framework of each of the three Egyptian sectors with a view to achieving better and deeper understanding of the nature of each sector and the main laws related to each sector, responsibilities and authorities of each sector’s institutions, regulatory relationships, financial matters, performance of the sectors and future steps.
- Formulate and establish different and appropriate indicators following the example of a previously formulated general framework for gauging governance in order to measure the capacity of the government, the civil society, the private sector and the employees to apply the different principles of governance, namely accountability participation with the rule of law, responsiveness, effectiveness, efficiency, transparency, equality, in addition to fighting corruption in the three mentioned sectors.
- Indicators gauging governance and combating corruption in the health, education and water and sanitation sectors were discussed with the working groups concerned with each sector and which included representatives of workers in that sector from both government and private sector, interested civil society organizations and citizens benefiting from these services. Their comments were taken into account and included in the indicators.
- Preparations are underway to gather information and data required for the indicators through questionnaires on the views of the public or those receiving the service (household questionnaires), interviews with experts and service providers (experts and key informant interviews) and available data records.
- The data gathered on the indicators will be used to conduct research and studies on the sectorial analysis of corruption, submit results and recommendations to enhance the ability of decision makers to introduce good governance in the mentioned sectors and suggest specific strategies to combat corruption in those sectors.

- The relevant bodies engaged in the fight against corruption in those sectors will be involved in these strategies, and the results of this involvement, as well as the comments made by these bodies, will be reflected in the formulation of the strategies, which will then be published and disseminated.

Prepared by Dr. Sahar Altawila, Director, Social Contract Center
Cairo, May 12, 2011

**Transparency and Integrity Committee of the Ministry of State for Administrative
Development**
**Best preventive practices against corruption according to articles 5, 7, 8, 10, 12 and 13 of
the United Nations Convention against Corruption**

The Transparency and Integrity Committee was established by ministerial decision number 86 for 2007 as a standing committee to formulate policies and strategies aimed at combating administrative corruption in the government apparatus. Its membership includes representatives of the civil society, the press, the media, public figures, businessmen, as well as government representatives.

1. A careful examination of the decision to establish the Transparency and Integrity Committee and its duties as issued by the Minister of State for Administrative Development points to two facts: that it is the first governmental initiative aimed at dealing with the corruption issue through the establishment of an observatory to analyse the phenomenon of corruption in Egypt. Also, the Committee's composition corroborates the interlinking, overlapping and varied nature of corruption cases, and that the fight against corruption requires a partnership between civil society and the State's institutions. The role of the Committee is therefore complementary to the roles of existing regulatory bodies, and motivates organizations of civil society to make more efforts towards raising citizens' awareness about the need to combat corruption. For all of the above, the Committee carries out many tasks, including:

- Endeavour to propose policies to combat corruption, especially in vital areas such as government procurement, public function, etc. These are numerous and divergent tasks, and hence no single entity can apply them efficiently. They require the involvement of many agencies, as well as good institutional communications and professional training to improve the efficiency of their employees.
- Oversee and discuss anti-corruption policies through the provision of outcomes and results expected from those policies, identify the difficulties, the necessary steps to be taken to deal with this problem and specifying the handling mechanism.
- Coordinate for the purpose of applying anti-corruption mechanisms. This is an important role in view of the many entities and agencies involved in the implementation operation. The importance of coordination is seen in the supervision phase, when information and data are collected, benefiting from other experience and suggesting and developing practices.
- Increase and disseminate knowledge about anti-corruption policies and mechanisms, thus this body encourages different institutions, research centres and actors in this area to submit research, collect and disseminate special data, provide educational tools, inform the public of anti-corruption activities, mobilize support for reform efforts and inform the public about the effects of corruption influencing society. In this context, partnerships may be formed with civil society organizations and the media.

2. The Committee issues an annual report that monitors and analyses developments and steps taken by the official bodies in the State, the private sector and civil society organizations to enhance transparency and integrity in their agencies and in the Egyptian society, and expresses its views thereon.

3. The Committee works according to the premise that the phenomenon of corruption is the result of the lack of good governance, the lack of transparency, integrity and the rule of law and the slowness of administrative procedures. This leads to the waste of considerable resources and public funds, the sluggishness of economic development rates and failure to attract investments, and thus reduce the tangible returns of development.

4. Concerning the requirements of article 5 Preventive anti-corruption policies and practices: The Transparency and Integrity Committee has proposed a number of policies that embody the principles of rule of law, good administration of public property and matters, integrity, transparency and accountability through the formulation of proposals to support the legislative and institutional frameworks by proposing new draft laws on:

- Reviewing the public function law (the State's civil servants regulations number 47 for 1978).
- Provision of data and information.
- Development of the system for receiving and managing complaints from citizens.
- Protecting witnesses and persons reporting acts of corruption.
- Establish national indicators to gauge corruption through gauging its causes.
- Study the institutional situations and determine the problems associated with those situations in the administrative apparatus units of the State and their subsidiary bodies with a view to providing good government services available to all citizens where they live by simplifying administrative procedures and diversifying the channels through which such services are provided, in addition to supporting the investment environment by removing unnecessary and cumbersome administrative procedures that make the cost of investment excessive.
- Prevent conflicts of interest, applying the rules of good governance and activate financial control.
- Maximize the benefit from international experience by signing a project agreement with UNDP in May 2009 for three years aiming at enhancing transparency and integrity practices in civil service.

5. Concerning the requirements of article 7 Public sector development: Through the Ministry of State for Administrative Development, the Committee has taken the following steps:

- Prepare a new draft law on public functions to replace law 47/1978 in order to enhance the principles of competitiveness, merit and aptitude in the selection of civil servants, match wages with performance and establish efficient policies for reward and retribution. The draft law has been disseminated to the public and civil society organizations for advice and discussion. A number of steps have been initiated towards the promulgation of the law, including:
 - Hiring of civil servants, by appointment or contractually, through advertisement directed at the whole population in a way that guarantees an equal opportunity to all and equality among citizens, and specify recruitment criteria for civil servants in a framework of transparency, integrity and impartiality in the public interest. The existing system has been amended, as the Minister of State for Administrative Development decision number 25 for 1997 has been replaced by a new decision number 7 for 2010 on rules and checks for the recruitment system in order to establish serious and exact principles and mechanisms that ensure openness and equal opportunity in contracts related to work in the State. This is accomplished by automating the process and publishing all vacant government positions on the Egyptian Government's electronic service portal <http://jobs.gov.eg>. The decision also establishes a control and follow-up mechanism in which the society itself is the controller, because all decisions to conclude contracts are made public.
 - Setting up of the government procurement portal (as a result of the cooperation between the Ministry of State for Administrative Development, the Ministry of Finance and the General Organization for Government Services) in the context of establishing the principle of transparency and integrity in the State's government apparatus, rationalizing government spending and improving Egypt's transparency indicators. This is the first such portal in the Middle East (etenders.gov.eg), and is designed to help the government publish tenders in all areas through the Internet. The prime minister's decision number 33 for 2010 mandates that all government bodies publish bids electronically on the government procurement portal by publishing requirements and specifications for bids and limited and local tenders that they issue and whatever amendments thereon on the portal, without prejudice to their announcement in the way stipulated by the law for bids and tenders number 89/1998. The decision also establishes a mechanism for follow-up and control in this regard, in which civil society plays the role of controller because all decisions to conclude contracts or award bids or tenders are made public. The first stage of the portal has been

completed, and the second stage is in the process of completion, so that the entire cycle for bids and tenders will be undertaken in the electronic site.

- Improving the performance of public services and simplifying their procedures and transparency by connecting national databases. As citizens expect to receive better, faster and more efficient services, there was urgent need to establish a legal framework to regulate the availability and handling of data and information, rules for coordinating between concerned public agencies in this matter, examine cases in which private entities and civil society organizations have been harmed in the area of data and information, conduct field research and collect data. In anticipation of a law on the free handling of information and prepare government units to apply an integrated information system, new dispositions have been issued concerning the executive directors of information (prime minister's decision number 2552 for 2009 on creating the post of executive director of information in ministries' and governorates' departments) that specify rules for their selection and appointment, and the tasks that are assigned to them, in order to produce a clear positive effect on the citizens, and thus on the services provided to them with great efficiency.

6. Concerning the requirements of article 8 Codes of conduct for public officials: With a view to enhance honesty, responsibility and integrity among public officials, the Committee has prepared the code of professional conduct for civil servants, drawing on successful international practices in this regard. The code was prepared with the participation of a number of experts in human development and combating corruption and higher officials in the State's administrative apparatus in order to avoid the shortfalls of chapter ten of law number 47/1978 on the system of civil servants in the State; a review was made of the public employee's duties in a manner that conforms with international developments and responds to the modernization process of the general administration. The document was approved through a joint committee comprising the Ministry of State for Administrative Development and the Central Agency for Organization and Administration in 2010. However, the code was not published as it will be issued as an annex to the new law on the public function.

7. Concerning the requirements of article 10 Public Reporting:

- The Committee provided through its annual reports numerous data and information on laws and institutional frameworks where action is needed to close the gaps through which corrupt practices occur. It was the first agency to point to the problem of conflict of interest and the need to activate laws on holding officials accountable before a natural judge, in addition to pushing towards approval of the new law on the public function and the law regulating the release and handling of information.
- In the context of imposing and applying the principle of transparency and the right of people to know the services that are offered to them and how to obtain them, the Ministry of State for Administrative Development has established contact points for the Egyptian government and hot lines to enquire or complain about government services (19984 and 19468).
- Increase the number of locations where services are offered to the public to 500 by the end of 2010, and to 200 post offices, 6 centres in the professional and social collectivities and 500 centres within the branch system in cooperation with private sector companies.
- Enhance people's access to justice and improve and simplify its procedures by providing different court services through the one stop shop system in 38 courts, offering the court of cassation service via the Egyptian government portal www.egypt.gov.eg, developing 5 appellate courts and offering 15 interactive services, developing 19 courts of first instance and offering 35 interactive services for such courts through the Egyptian government portal, as well as developing 20 family courts, automating 85 courtrooms and developing and completely automating real estate registration offices in Gizeh and Northern Cairo.
- Develop government services at the local level by establishing 85 technological centres offering services in 27 governorates. About 5000 employees in cities and neighbourhoods in the governorates have received training on applications of electronic systems in the provision of government services.
- Automate services in qualitative directorates (60) in the governorates of Cairo and Gizeh.

- Design and fully operate electronic portals for 10 governorates.
- Automate fully the process of coordinating the acceptance to universities (interact with the students and their families, provide acceptance procedures to universities in an honest and transparent way that guarantees an equal opportunity to all).

8. Concerning the requirements of article 13 Participation of society: Despite being within the government apparatus, the Transparency and Integrity Committee was able to reach out efficiently to a great number of civil society organizations, as follows:

- Dedicate a chapter in its reports to the efforts of civil society organizations and the media in preventing and fighting corruption, pointing out successful experience and practices by a number of community associations in this regard.
- Hold discussion meetings with a group of civil society organizations, companies that offer electronic solutions to simplify procedures and the media to introduce them to the activities of the Committee and the relations between the Ministry's projects (institutional development and electronic governance) and fighting corruption.
- Reach out to people's and local councils in the governorates of Kena and Beni Sweif to define the phenomenon of corruption and the efforts made by the Transparency and Integrity Committee to fight corruption and raise awareness of its dangers, as well as expose the main manifestations of corruption and violations in the two governorates and discuss legal and regulatory ways to combat them.
- Production by the Committee of a number of informational materials (a documentary movie encouraging the citizen to hold fast to his right and fight corruption) and a summary of the employee code of conduct introducing the duties of the employee towards the citizen and towards the public function.
- The Committee proposed to civil society organizations and the public at large a number of issues related to the phenomenon of corruption in the framework of the annual celebration of the International Anti-Corruption Day, including the role of values and religious teachings in preventing corruption and the role of education in instilling the values of transparency, integrity and accountability in school students.
- Cooperate with research centres in conducting studies aimed at raising the citizen's awareness of some of the issues related to the fight against corruption (transparency of the State's public budget, and simplifying it so as to allow the citizen to exercise control over public funds + a brochure about elements of good governance and administration as a main requirement in the fight against corruption).

Prepared by: Dr. Ghada Moussa, Secretary General of the Transparency and Integrity Committee and Director of the Hawkama Center

12/5/2011