Egypt faces critical corruption risk across its defence institutions, with little to no access to information or scrutiny of the defence sector across all areas of risk. However, it does outlaw bribery to avoid conscription, and is taking some measures to mitigate procurement risk, albeit minimal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OECD fragile state</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Defence Budget as % of GDP*</th>
<th>1.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant defence exporter*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total armed forces personnel#</td>
<td>836,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant defence importer*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>UN Convention Against Corruption</td>
<td>Ratified in 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of arms trade 2015-2018 (US$ mil)*</td>
<td>22, Rank: 41 out of 65</td>
<td>Arms Trade Treaty</td>
<td>Not signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Budget (US$ mil)*</td>
<td>3110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SIPRI, # World Bank

**Overall Score:** F (6)  **Regional Average:** E (17)
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Middle East & North Africa: Regional Issues in Defence Integrity

Defence sectors across the Middle East & North Africa (MENA) region continue to face a high risk of corruption. At the same time, protracted armed conflicts in Syria, Libya, and Yemen persist, while public protests against corruption and authoritarianism continue in a number of countries – reflecting an overall context of insecurity and fragility. Although some governments have publically committed to stepping up anti-corruption efforts, there remains a gap between existing legislation and implementation in practice. Military institutions in the region are characterised by a high degree of defence exceptionalism, resulting in a lack of transparency that precludes oversight actors from effectively scrutinising defence budgets and policies at a time when defence spending and arms imports continue to surge. These concerns are further compounded by authoritarian governance systems seen in many MENA countries. Resurgent protests and uprisings in the region after the 2011 Arab Spring demonstrate that corruption is a central and persistent public grievance. Continuing to treat the defence sector as an exception and failing to meet public expectations of transparency and accountability could further fuel public distrust, result in a loss of legitimacy for defence institutions, and facilitate the recruitment efforts of non-state armed groups. It is therefore crucial that governments in the region disclose more information about defence spending and strategy, make decisions that serve the public interest, and rectify loopholes that allow for corruption to thrive, in turn bolstering national security and stability.
## COUNTRY SCORECARD: EGYPT

### Overall Country Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Type</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criticality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Risk</strong></td>
<td>F 6</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Critical Risk

- Q45 Chains of Command and Payment: F 0
- Q48 Anticorruption Training: F 0
- Q49 Corruption Prosecutions: F 0

### Operational Risk

- Q51 Military Doctrine: F 0
- Q52 Operational Training: F 0
- Q53 Forward Planning: F 0
- Q54 Corruption Monitoring in Operations: F 0
- Q55 Controls in Contracting: F 0
- Q56 Private Military Contractors: NS

### Procurement Risk

- Q68 Complaint Mechanisms: D 33
- Q66 Anti-Collusion Controls: E 25
- Q67 Contract Award / Delivery: E 25
- Q70 Offset Contracts: E 25
- Q73 Agents and Intermediaries: E 25
- Q59 Procurement Oversight Mechanisms: F 8
- Q65 Tender Board Controls: F 6
- Q57 Procurement Legislation: F 0
- Q58 Procurement Cycle: F 0
- Q60 Potential Purchases Disclosed: F 0
- Q61 Actual Purchases Disclosed: F 0
- Q62 Business Compliance Standards: F 0
- Q63 Procurement Requirements: F 0
- Q64 Competition in Procurement: F 0
- Q69 Supplier Sanctions: F 0
- Q71 Offset Contract Monitoring: F 0
- Q72 Offset Competition: F 0
- Q74 Financing Packages: F 0
- Q75 Political Pressure in Acquisitions: NS

### Financial Risk

- Q31 Beneficial Ownership: F 13
- Q24 Asset Disposal Controls: F 0
- Q25 Asset Disposal Scrutiny: F 0
- Q26 Secret Spending: F 0
- Q27 Legislative Access to Information: F 0
- Q28 Secret Program Auditing: F 0
- Q29 Off-budget Spending: F 0
- Q30 Access to Information: F 0
- Q32 Military-Owned Business Scrutiny: F 0
- Q33 Unauthorised Private Enterprise: F 0
- Q76 Defence Spending: F 0

### Personnel Risk

- Q43 Bribery to Avoid Conscription: B 67
- Q40 Payment System: C 58
- Q41 Objective Appointments: E 17
- Q50 Facilitation Payments: E 17
- Q35 Disciplinary Measures for Personnel: F 13
- Q42 Objective Promotions: F 13
- Q46 Military Code of Conduct: F 13
- Q47 Civilian Code of Conduct: F 13
- Q34 Public Commitment to Integrity: F 0
- Q36 Whistleblowing: F 0
- Q37 High-risk Positions: F 0
- Q38 Numbers of Personnel: F 0
- Q39 Pay Rates and Allowances: F 0
- Q44 Bribery for Preferred Postings: F 0

### Legend

- **Range of Scores**
  - A: 83 - 100  Very Low
  - B: 67 - 82  Low
  - C: 50 - 66  Moderate
  - D: 33 - 49  High
  - E: 17 - 32  Very High
  - F: 0 - 16  Critical

- **Corruption Risk**
  - Very Low
  - Low
  - Moderate
  - High
  - Very High
  - Critical

- **Key**
  - NEI - Not enough information to score indicator.
  - NS - Indicator is not scored for any country
  - NA - Not applicable
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