

Anti-corruption and Compliance Control Practices for Identifying and Evaluating Corruption Risks

Ahmadjonov Murodullo Nurali ogli
Assistant Prosecutor

Abstract

This article explores advanced international empirical practices for identifying and assessing corruption risks in public administration, highlighting the successful measures implemented by various developed nations. While it is impractical to fully replicate these systems, the insights gained from their experiences can inform and enhance domestic anti-corruption legislation. The Republic of Moldova, Slovenia, and South Korea serve as a case study, having made significant strides in combating corruption, as evidenced by their 2023 score of 42 points, 37 points, and 32 points respectively on the Transparency International index. This article examines the methodologies adopted by the aforementioned countries for assessing corruption risks within public administration, emphasizing the importance of public involvement and institutional accountability in mitigating corruption. By analyzing these countries' approaches, the article aims to provide valuable hands-on experience and guidance for other nations including my country - Uzbekistan seeking to improve its anti-corruption efforts on the whole in the fast-paced world.

Keywords: Empirical Experience, Whistleblowers Rights, Legal Framework, Public Involvement, Anti-Corruption Efforts, Methodology, Cooperation, Implementing Measures

APA Citation:

Ahmadjonov, M. (2024). Anti-corruption and compliance control Practices for Identifying and Evaluating Corruption Risks. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 2(10), 59-73. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.236>

I. Introduction

Today, various developed nations across the world have implemented effective measures to identify, prevent, and root out corruption risks within public administration, gaining significant positive results as a whole. Naturally, replicating the anti-corruption systems developed and currently practiced by foreign countries in their entirety is not feasible and more approachable way for obtaining positive outcomes (Ahmadjonov, 2023). However, many countries have utilized effective tools for identifying, assessing, and preventing corruption within state governance (AllahRakha, 2024a). By studying the experiences of foreign countries, we can gain valuable insights into handful regulations that can be implemented into our legislation.

Plethora of pragmatic practices for identifying and assessing corruption risks have been established in several countries worldwide. In turn, strengthening government institutions against corruption risks entails a whopping and joint effort to build and develop corruption-free government system in public administration (Aritonang, 2017). The given article sheds light on the mechanisms, approaches, top-down and bottom-up systematic structures of Moldova, Slovenia, and South Korea where there are effective laws, regulations, and robust civil society that detests corrupt behavior and are willing to come forward to eradicate it. Furthermore, this paper work underlines the absolutely important aspects of sweeping institutional reforms, accountability and integrity measures, and the advancement in technologies and innovations that create a policy of zero tolerance (Bakhramova, 2024). In turn, strengthening and enhancing the effectiveness of government institutions to withstand corruption-based practices necessitate wide-ranging approaches that address a bunch of issues linked to systemic vulnerabilities, loopholes, and shortcomings in the legislation and promote a culture of integrity (Jagtiani, 2020).

Additionally, a fundamental understanding of the law is now paramount for individuals involved in administration and business. Hence, a change in the quality, content, and complexion of legal education is now viewed as a catalyst for the growth of legal awareness of the democratic society. Thus there is an urgent need to bring awareness to people for their rights and duties, as well as remedies. Moreover, this article will underscore the significant influence of legal literacy in every domain in the interconnected world. Below, we will delve into the experiences of those countries in combating corruption and evaluating corruption risks.

II. Methodology

This article utilizes qualitative research methods, especially grounded theory analysis to identify and evaluate corruption-related risks in State Governance of the key three countries that have been in the full glare of international political area. The methodology of this article amount to an in-depth examination of prevailing legal literature of oversee countries related to identification and assessment of corruption risks, the components of the empirical approaches to corruption risks, and the rigid

strategies for enhancing hands-on approaches to bolster transparency alongside public trust in Public Administration across the globe. Throughout an all-around review and analysis of current legal literature, this study aims at enhancing a sweeping understanding of corruption risks, their significant nuances, and the methods that can be deployed to modify legislation within the legal area. In a sense, this approach enable us to obtain a thorough exploration of the subject matter, providing valuable insights into the understanding of dire consequences of illicit corruption actions, and making a significant contribution to deeper comprehension of evaluating, identifying, and rooting out corruption risks in public administration.

III. Results

Corrupt behavior is deeply rooted in historical origins, societal norms and political culture, meaning that it is not unusual case to find strong linkage between power, politics and nepotism on the whole (Carter & Bélanger, 2005). Comprehensively understanding and conveying the catastrophic consequences are absolutely vital for the all class of the society. In turn, the nuances and complicated facets of corruption urge us to delve more into its nature, which means that it is vitally crucial to acquire first-hand knowledge via doing research in the practice of developed nations (Cardellini Leipertz, 2024). In the domain of fighting against corruption on a large scale, it is noteworthy that the identification and eradicating of corruption risks in state governance are fairly and squarely associated with international experience utilized by aforesaid countries in this article. The legal process that has been employed by three countries for assessing and identifying corruption risks in draft and existing laws is carried out as follows. This legal process includes four steps that are divided into some stages.

- Collecting necessary documents (documents submitted include the draft legislative text along with primary materials for evaluation, explanatory notes on proposed amendments, and comprehensive sets of documents for detailed evaluation when full amendments are being introduced);
- Consulting with relevant organizations (simultaneously, sending draft documents to the relevant organizations for coordination with the Anti-Corruption and Civil Rights Commission to assess corruption risks, with detailed feedback);
- Preliminary publication of the draft laws;
- Analyzing normative-legal documents (with analysis results sent to the Commission).

During the process of evaluating existing laws, the actions of both parties involved are considered crucial. The actions expected from the relevant organizations include cooperating in the assessment (providing necessary documents for evaluation) and implementing the recommendations provided by the Commission, followed by

informing the Commission of their application. Based on the information above, the process of assessing corruption risks clarifies the criteria used in these evaluations. The following section provides detailed information about this criterion (Alkhodary et al., 2023). The law specifies that four main criteria must be given special attention to evaluating corruption risks: compliance with established rules, enforcement, attention to administrative processes, and anti-corruption controls (Gbaya, 2024). The aforementioned assessment criteria consist of four elements:

A. Compliance

Appropriateness of the distribution of powers; proper allocation of responsibilities without undue burdens, adequacy of the rules, completeness of content and the appropriateness of sanctions applied in case of violations, possibility of privileged treatment, the potential for certain companies, organizations, or individuals to benefit from the application of the law.

B. Enforcement

Details and objectivity of the granted powers; clear boundaries set to monitor excessive use of power, transparency of implementation, strength of obligation, exercise of rights, labor management, clarity in control mechanisms, possibility of financial loopholes, clear criteria for support, including state subsidies, and the creation of control mechanisms to prevent budget expenses through repeated subsidies.

C. Administrative process

Permission granting, ensuring the representation and participation opportunities for interested parties maintaining transparency, mandatory availability of information for citizens and stakeholders, predetermined procedures, and enabling citizens to know their anticipated rights, required documents, measures, implementation process, timeline, and outcome.

D. Anti-corruption Control

Probability of conflicts of interest, development of criteria, processes, and control mechanisms to prevent interference from private interests, tools within the anti-corruption system adopting internal control measures, assessing the necessity for anti-corruption legislation, likelihood of passive administrative actions due to the absence of legislative foundations, including potential inaction and negligence among public officials (Prevention of Corruption Act in Slovenia, 2018).

The decisive actions above have been working to aforementioned countries' advantage over the years of uninterrupted political growth in terms of rooting out corruption and illicit actions on the whole. Moreover, it is crucially vital to highlight that the prevention and eradication of corruption and corruption risks are among the primary duties of these aforesaid states (Van Genugten, 2019). To ensure the effectiveness of efforts in this domain, cooperation with solo stakeholders and groups

beyond the public sector, such as civic society, private sectors, and community-related organizations, should be taken into consideration.

IV. Discussion

As we pointed out above, numerous practices for identifying and assessing corruption risks have been used successfully in several countries across the globe. In turn, it is important to highlight that several international researchers have presented different viewpoints on identifying corruption risks in public administration. Specifically, these risks are considered to arise at the early stages of corruption, with various factors creating conditions that enable and encourage corrupt practices, as described in Klitgaard's corruption formula $C = M + D - A - T$, where corruption equals monopoly plus discretion minus accountability minus transparency (Sandra Marcelline et al., 2021).

While there may be some debate surrounding these formulas, it is crucial to restrict monopoly and discretion in public sector operations while promoting robust accountability and transparency. If monopoly and discretion are unavoidable to some extent, it is essential to focus on the laws and regulations aimed at preventing their abuse (AllahRakha, 2024b). This formula highlights the elements that contribute to corruption risks, including absolute authority in a specific area, discretionary power within that area, a lack of accountability, immunity from consequences, and ambiguous activities—all of which are factors that heighten the risk of corruption. Coming from my perspective and experience, Klitgaard has the point here and below, we will examine the experiences of the developed countries in combating corruption and assessing corruption risks.

A. Republic of Moldova

According to the international non-governmental organization "Transparency International" index, in 2023, the Republic of Moldova scored 42 points and ranked 76 among 180 countries in the fight against corruption. The Republic of Moldova has adopted and implemented various normative legal documents in its anti-corruption efforts, making it one of the countries consistently achieving better results in the annual international "Corruption Perceptions Index." Over the past three years, Moldova has undertaken effective measures to enhance the efficiency and independence of its judicial system and has taken significant actions to prevent political interference by politicians in the independent judiciary, thereby counteracting the manipulation of laws (AllahRakha, 2023c). It is noteworthy that on June 6, 2002, the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova passed the law "On the Center for Combating Economic Crimes and Corruption," which later became known as the National Anti-Corruption Center of the Republic of Moldova. This institution officially began its activities in 2012 and was renamed the "National Anti-Corruption Center."

Additionally, on April 25, 2008, the Parliament of Moldova passed the law "On

the Prevention and Fight against Corruption." Amendments and additions were made to the 2002-law in May 2012, renaming the center as the "National Anti-Corruption Center." Section 2 of the law, titled "Measures to Prevent Corruption," specified guarantees for preventing corruption in Article 5. These guarantees included conducting anti-corruption expertise on government normative legal drafts and legislative projects, submitting developed projects for public discussion, and evaluating the institutional corruption risks of these drafts.

Article 7 of the law defined the procedure for conducting institutional corruption risk assessments. According to this, the government was tasked with assessing institutional corruption risks and identifying organizational factors that could contribute to or potentially cause corruption, as well as developing recommendations to eliminate these risks. With the adoption of the law "On the Prevention and Fight against Corruption" in the Republic of Moldova and the assignment of responsibility for assessing corruption risks, on July 28, 2008, the Moldovan government approved Decision No. 906 titled "On Approving the Methodology for Assessing Corruption Risks in State Bodies and Institutions." This methodology served as a guide for assessing corruption risks within state administration bodies. Clause 52 of the methodology outlined the duties of officials participating in corruption risk assessment. According to it, an official working within public administration:

- Instructs institution leaders about the concept, purpose, and significance of assessing corruption risks;
- Teaches methods for identifying normative-legal bases, organizational structures, ethical standards, and ways to collect and evaluate risk factors, providing advice and recommendations;
- Monitors the corruption risk assessment activities;
- Develops recommendations for the work plan of the assessment group, the assessment of corruption-related risks, and the integrity plan;
- Participates in the meetings of the assessment group, ensuring compliance with the rules for risk assessment and adding comments or recommendations to the assessment report when necessary;
- Coordinates the development and implementation of the integrity plan.

Additionally, during 2008-2011, central government representatives were mandated to conduct corruption risk assessments within their organizations. The process of assessing corruption risks was outlined as follows:

- Existing conditions were assessed, including the legal system, organizational structures, and ethical norms;
- Research-based assessments were conducted to identify corruption risks, followed by an analysis of these risks;

- Measures to control and mitigate the likelihood and impact of corruption risks were implemented;
- Corruption risks were reassessed to reflect the actual situation.

Currently, the National Anti-Corruption Center of Moldova plays a significant role in ensuring that the systems for risk assessment through training, consulting, monitoring, and analysis are properly implemented by state representatives and institutions as a whole. The center educates those who are accountable for identifying corruption risks and supports assessment group meetings. In addition, it oversees risk assessment activities within an organization and provides recommendations regarding the development and implementation of transparency plans within the organization (The Integrity and Prevention Act in Moldova, 2020).

As highlighted above, assessing corruption risks and implementing appropriate measures cannot be a long-term endeavor without regular updates. Factors such as time, conditions, and changes in legislation necessitate continuous development of this process. Notably, on May 27, 2017, the Parliament of Moldova adopted the “Integrity Law.” With the adoption of this law, the 2008 Decision No. 906 “On Approving the Methodology for Assessing Corruption Risks in State Bodies and Institutions” was repealed. Regulations such as determining the entity responsible for assessing corruption risks and developing countermeasures were elevated to the level of law, enhancing their effectiveness and being enshrined in the “Integrity Law.” In turn, we can conclude that a state committed to combating corruption must elevate its actions for identifying, assessing, and mitigating corruption risks to the high legal level on the whole.

Article 2 of the “Integrity Law,” adopted on May 25, 2017, sets out its objectives, one of which is identifying corruption risks in public entities. The law also outlines the following related concepts:

- Weak performance – professional activities of public servants within state bodies that are susceptible to corruption risks;
- Risk factors – any circumstances within public administration bodies that facilitate, encourage, or contribute to the emergence or strengthening of corruption;
- Corruption risk – the probability and occurrence of corruption-related situations that negatively impact the execution of duties within state bodies.

Under Article 25 of the law, the leaders of public organizations are tasked with responsibilities for monitoring integrity. They are held accountable for eliminating corruption risks during the development of legislative, regulatory, and departmental documents and for managing corruption risks within the activities of the organization they lead. This article implies that corruption risks can be categorized into two groups: current corruption risks and potential future corruption risks. This allows for a more

detailed practical approach to identifying corruption risks. Additionally, Article 6 mandates that civil society and the media regularly publish analyses, reports, and various data regarding corruption risks.

Further and even more importantly, Article 27 specifies the rules for managing institutional corruption risks. According to this, corruption risk management is an internal assessment process carried out within public organizations aimed at identifying and managing corruption risks in professional activities. This process is entered into a special registry and includes details such as the corruption vulnerability of processes or special tasks within a public organization, risks obstructing the implementation of specific measures or tasks, the severity and significance of the risks, the relationship between risks and public organization actions, the person responsible for action, and the implementation period of timeline.

From the information provided above, we can summarize that the assessment of corruption risks in public administration in the Republic of Moldova is conducted as follows: the process is regulated by law, and the responsibility for internal assessments of corruption risks lies with the head of the state organization. Comparing the 2023 results from Transparency International's Corruption Perceptions Index, where Moldova ranked 76 out of 180 countries, with previous years allows us to gauge the effectiveness of the efforts undertaken to identify, assess, and combat corruption, as well as to prevent such crimes by Moldova Republic.

B. Republic of South Korea

South Korea has also demonstrated effective measures in eliminating corruption risks and combating corruption, positioning itself among the world's developed nations. On January 30, 2023, the country ranked 32nd with 63 points in the International Transparency Corruption Perceptions Index. The development of South Korea's corruption risk assessment system can be studied in three phases: the need for and origins of the program, its legal foundations and definitions, and the scope and process of the program (Transparency International, 2021). South Korea's legal hierarchy is structured top-down as follows: the Constitution of the Republic of Korea, laws, presidential decrees, prime ministerial and ministerial decrees, orders, and regulations. This sequence bears a striking resemblance to legislative system of Uzbekistan. The process of lawmaking in Korea includes the assessment of corruption risks, which will be further elaborated. The origins and necessity for implementing a corruption risk assessment program were established due to the following:

- Limitations in South Korea's anti-corruption policy (seeking solutions through the question of what could lead to corruption);
- Passive oversight focused on punishment post-corruption;
- Preventive limitations in areas with corruption risks;
- Functional weaknesses aimed at preventing corruption.

These factors were considered as causes and bases for corruption cases and were addressed by proposing enhancements to normative documents. As mentioned, South Korea focuses on legislation to combat corruption risks. Furthermore, integrating a system for identifying and assessing corruption-related risks in public administration was stipulated through internal legislation, involving the assessment of corruption-inducing factors, systematic analysis, and implementation of various measures. Hypothetical examples of potential corruption situations were developed, including vague and unclear criteria, excessive authority of government organizations, non-transparent regulatory practices embedded in legislation, and discretionary rules. The implementation of tasks in South Korea is clearly defined, which initiates the process of introducing and developing the system itself.

In 2006, the system for assessing corruption risks was introduced into public administration. On January 1, 2006, the “Anti-Corruption Act” was adopted, under which laws, decrees, and regulations began to be assessed for corruption risks using nine criteria. To this end, three working groups comprising 20 employees were established. On February 29, 2008, the independent anti-corruption commission was merged with the Korean Ombudsman and the Administrative Appeals Commission (Korea Independent Commission against Corruption, Ombudsman of Korea, and the Administrative Appeals Commission). The second phase of system enhancement began in 2015, with a new version of the “Anti-Corruption Act” being adopted. Another object was added to the scope of corruption risk assessment: internal documents related to public services could now be assessed for corruption risks at the request of the organization’s leader.

Ideas about corruption risk criteria evolved, leading to the adoption of the “Anti-Corruption and Bribery Prohibition Act” on February 2, 2016. Currently, a working group of nine employees is engaged in proposing amendments to legislation related to public services, reviewing and amending internal documents of organizations, identifying and eliminating corruption-inducing factors. Article 28 of the “Anti-Corruption Act” regulates the formation and operation of the commission. According to this article, the commission (ACRC) reviews and analyzes factors contributing to corruption risks in laws and provides recommendations to improve or amend them. The commission is authorized to make recommendations concerning laws, presidential decrees, prime ministerial decrees, ministerial decrees, administrative rules based on laws, decrees based on regulations, warnings, information, orders, mandatory insurance regulations, and internal rules of state organizations.

It should be noted that in 2017, the Republic of South Korea ranked 51st in the Corruption Perceptions Index published by the international non-governmental organization “Transparency International.” Due to anti-corruption reforms, it has seen a dramatic transformation, including 45th place in 2018, 39th in 2019, 33rd with 61 points in 2020, 32nd with 62 points in 2021, 31st with 63 points in 2022, and

maintained 32nd place with 63 points in 2023 among 180 countries. Based on the above figures, we can conclude that South Korea has managed to control corruption-related crimes effectively. The country's approach to assessing corruption risks primarily focuses on identifying and eliminating legislative gaps that could lead to corruption on the whole. Drawing from South Korea's experience, it is proposed that Uzbekistan's Anti-Corruption Agency be tasked with evaluating existing laws and legislative drafts for corruption risks. Additionally, specific mechanism-based criteria for assessing these risks should be developed and implemented into legislative documents.

C. Slovenia

Transparency is the best disinfectant and one of the most effective tools for preventing corruption-related crimes. This phrase highlights the importance of transparency in eliminating corruption risks and effectively combating and preventing such crimes. It should be noted that Slovenia currently holds 42nd place out of 180 countries in the Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index, with a score of 56 points. In Slovenia, the Integrity Plan is used as an effective tool to establish and ensure the transparency of 31 public sector organizations. This Integrity Plan is a documented process designed to evaluate an organization's exposure to corruption and assess its vulnerability. It includes identifying corruption risks related to various activities of a specific organization, evaluating how these risks might impact the organization, and developing measures to mitigate or eliminate these risks.

In 2004, Slovenia adopted the "Prevention of Corruption Act," which led to the introduction of transparency plans. However, transparency plans that were methodologically underdeveloped posed significant challenges to the "Commission for the Prevention of Corruption." As a solution, the "Integrity and Prevention of Corruption Act" was passed on June 4, 2010. This law led to an improved transparency plan that consisted of the following elements: expanding the scope of transparency plans and making their use mandatory for all state institutions, providing a new and clearer methodology, developing a detailed process for applying the transparency plan, and achieving greater openness.

According to the "Integrity and Prevention of Corruption Act," the use of transparency plans is obligatory for state structures, local self-government bodies, state agencies, state institutions, public utility organizations, and state funds as well. Under Article 47 of this law, the integrity plan must include: an assessment of the institution's susceptibility to corruption, identifying the names and positions of individuals responsible for the integrity plan, descriptions of organizational conditions, employees, and routine work processes that involve corruption risk, development of recommendations for improvements, quality of regulations and management in ministries and other organizations, transparency among employees and the institution; transparency and efficiency of processes, timely identification, prevention, and mitigation of corruption risks.

The Commission provides guidelines for other sections of the plan. The methodology for applying the transparency plan was developed by the Commission for the Prevention of Corruption, following these instructions: adapting international anti-corruption conventions, standards, and principles to national legislation; implementing the principles of ISO 31000 standards for risk management, applying principles from Australia and New Zealand, and a risk management guide developed by the Victoria Managed Insurance Authority (VMIA) for creating and implementing a risk management system.

The process of developing the transparency plan model begins with the Commission inviting individuals and organizations to contribute ideas. The Commission organizes seminars and training for those responsible for the transparency plan and provides support for open house events and dedicated hotlines available daily. A personalized approach is also employed for communication, which has shown positive results: acquiring more information about existing issues in organizations, increasing individual awareness, and motivating future work. Additionally, the Anti-Corruption Commission has prepared a set of documents to facilitate the process of developing transparency plans for individuals and organizations assigned to create them, along with continuous professional support. To emphasize the importance of transparency plans and to enable their explanation to the working team, a general notification is sent to the heads of all public sector structures. The adapted methodology for preparing transparency plans consists of five stages:

1. Preparation phase

This phase involves the main responsibilities of the organization's leadership in creating, adapting, and implementing the transparency plan, conveying its importance to all employees, appointing a transparency supervisor, forming a permanent working group within the organization for preparing the plan, and collecting all necessary information.

2. Identifying risks

This phase aims to answer questions about where, when, why, and how certain events may hinder, devalue, or delay the achievement of the organization's overall objectives. Since these risks are related to the working conditions, employees, and processes of the organization, they vary between organizations. The process of identifying risks requires the involvement of individuals who are fully aware of the organization and its management (AllahRakha, 2023b). The Anti-Corruption Commission outlines a preliminary set of risks that must be included in each organization's transparency plan. Risk groups may also be suggested by auditors and oversight bodies.

3. Identifying existing standards within the organization

This stage requires recognizing any internal standards that could be used to manage identified risks. If such standards exist, the working group must evaluate their

sufficiency and effectiveness to ensure proper risk management.

4. Risk assessment

For sources of risk that are poorly or partially managed, the working group determines the likelihood and potential impact of these risks on the organization.

5. Addressing risks

Based on the assessment, the necessary and appropriate standards are determined in accordance with the set deadlines for implementation. The risk register is compiled; including identified and confirmed risks, standards, priorities, responsible individuals, and deadlines for implementation. All employees must be informed of the contents of the transparency plan (Van Genugten, 2019).

Once the transparency plan is adapted, the organization submits it along with all related documents to the Commission (for the monitoring and review process). The Commission reviews the plan, ensuring that the provided guidelines have been followed, and then returns it to the organization with additional recommendations and instructions if necessary. The Commission may also set a timeline for improving the existing transparency plan or preparing a new one (AllahRakha, 2023a). Besides, whistleblowers right in Slovenia acts as a catalyst for gaining radical achievements with the proactive measures that can be carried out by the people that come forward to keep the responsible state body informed about the likelihood of corruption or predetermined actions of state officials who abuse of special power for private ill-gains.

In turn, this law provides the people with solid protective rights and helps them overcome fear of retaliation on the whole. Despite having lower rankings in the 2023 Corruption Perceptions Index, it is worth noting that over the past five years, these countries have achieved significant positive outcomes not only in identifying, assessing, and combating corruption risks but also in eliminating such crimes. The approaches used by these countries deserve colossal attention on the whole.

Conclusion

The examination of advanced international practices for identifying and assessing corruption risks reveals that while direct replication of foreign systems may not be possible, valuable and empirical knowledge can be gained to enhance domestic anti-corruption efforts. The case of the Republic of Moldova, Slovenia along with South Korea illustrates the importance of robust legal frameworks and structured methodologies in evaluating corruption risks. By prioritizing public participation and institutional accountability, aforesaid countries demonstrate a proactive approach to combating corruption, which can serve as a model for other nations including our country too. Ultimately, the insights gained from this analysis underscore the necessity for non-stop improvement and adaptation in anti-corruption strategies to effectively iron out the challenges posed by corruption in public administration.

Running proactive risk management, carrying out effective controls in both the public and private sectors, intensifying the legal literacy of people, enacting laws to protect Whistleblowers' security, their rights alongside providing them with monetary awards, and implementing aforementioned countries' effective practices into national legislation will definitely make a whopping contribution to transparency, integrity of government, and improve the economy, uniformity, the effectiveness of laws, democracy, and individuals' trust in public administration on the whole. Furthermore, the authority of the country has to be comfortable with taking responsibilities on amending rules, passing long-term laws, bringing in regulations and refining them on regular terms. By making a strenuous and collaborative effort with sufficient will, the government manages to root out the corruption-based crimes and risks that have been causing drastic ramifications in human-beings lives almost in every region of the world in public administration.



Bibliography

- Ahmadjonov, M. (2023). Anti-corruption and compliance control: Legal literacy among lawyers and law students. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 1(8). <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.145>
- Alkhodary, A., Jreissat, E. R., Saidat, Z., Ali, H., & Hasan, E. F. (2023). Examining the impact of e-governance on the performance of corporations: A case study of companies in Jordan. *Information Sciences Letters (ISL)*, 12(6), 2599–2617.
- AllahRakha, N. (2023a). Cybercrime and the law: Addressing the challenges of digital forensics in criminal investigations. *Mexican Law Review*, 16(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.37>
- AllahRakha, N. (2023b). Legal challenges for international fintech startups. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 1(3), 2–12. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.148>
- AllahRakha, N. (2023c). The impacts of artificial intelligence (AI) on business and its regulatory challenges. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.23>
- AllahRakha, N. (2024a). Addressing barriers to cross-border collection of e-evidence in criminal investigations. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 2(6), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.193>
- AllahRakha, N. (2024b). Global perspectives on cybercrime legislation. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(10), 6007. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i10.6007>
- AllahRakha, N. (2024c). Legal procedure for investigation under the Criminal Code of Uzbekistan. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.160>
- Anticorruption policies in Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine. (2017). 2(5), 2–17. Retrieved from <https://knowledgehub.transparency.org/assets/uploads/kproducts/Anti-corruption-policies>
- Aritonang, D. M. (2017). The impact of e-government system on public service quality in Indonesia. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ*, 13(35), 99. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2017.v13n35p99Avotra>
- Bakhramova, M. (2024). Harmonization of the legal framework for online arbitration. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 2(2), 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.154>
- Cardellini Leipertz, R. (2024). Sovereignty beyond borders: Unraveling the enigma of airspace and outer space interplay. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 2(7), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.201>
- Carter, L., & Bélanger, F. (2005). The utilization of e-government services: Citizen trust, innovation, and acceptance factors. *Information Systems Journal*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.13652575.2005.00183.x>
- Carter, L., Yoon, V., & Liu, D. (2022). Analyzing e-government design science artifacts: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Information Management*, 62(11), 63–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102430>
- Gbaya, M. S. (2024). The legal framework for regional organizations in Africa and the proactive role in addressing threats to international peace and security. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 2(8), 12–31. <https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp>
- Jagtiani, A. (2020). *Why legal literacy is important*. Medium. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/@aashnajagtiani/why-legal-literacy-is-important-98f4e0adba67>
- Law of the Republic of Moldova. (2015). XVI on preventing and combating corruption. 1(8).

Retrieved from <http://cislcen.com/app/webroot/html/country/Moldova/index.html>

OECD. (2018). Collusion and corruption in public procurement. 3(1), 69–108. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/daf/competition/46235884>

Parliamentary Assembly. (2017). Promoting integrity to tackle political corruption. 3(6), 12–32. Retrieved from <https://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/Xref-XML2HTMLLEN.asp?fileid=23930>

Prevention of Corruption Act in Slovenia. (2018). 2(7). Retrieved from <https://pace.coe.int/files/11673/html>

Prevention of Corruption Act in Slovenia. (2018). *PACE*, 2(7). <https://pace.coe.int/files/11673/html>

Sandra Marcelline, T. R., Asad, A., & Yingfei, Y. (2021). Examining the impact of e-government on corporate social responsibility performance: The mediating effect of mandatory corporate social responsibility policy, corruption, and information and communication technologies development during the COVID era. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.737100>

The Integrity and Prevention Act in Moldova. (2020). 4(6). <https://secure.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/download/file/082dbcc549f0934a014a2a5538f7126f>

The Integrity and Prevention Act in Moldova. (2020). 4(6). Retrieved from <https://secure.ipex.eu/IPEXL-WEB/download/file/082dbcc549f0934a014a2a5538f7126f>

Transparency International. (2021). *Holding power to account: A global strategy against corruption* (8th ed.). Transparency International. <https://www.transparency.org/en/the-organisation/our-strategy>

Transparency International. (2021). Holding power to account: A global strategy against corruption. 8(1), 5–18. Retrieved from <https://www.transparency.org/en/the-organisation/our-strategy>

UN. (2022). United Nations Office on Drugs and Corruption. 6(9). Retrieved from <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/ngos/CN0-anti-corruption-activities.html>

Van Genugten, W. (2019). Loopholes, risks and ambivalences in international lawmaking. *Journal of International Lawmaking*, 3(2). <https://pure.uvt.nl/ws/files/928961/loopholes>

Van Genugten, W. (2019). Loopholes, risks, and ambivalences in international lawmaking. 3(2), 13–41. Retrieved from <https://pure.uvt.nl/ws/files/928961/loopholes>