

# Bangladesh

## 2015 Country Summary

### Recommendations

Bangladesh's GI ranking in Band D places it in the high risk category for corruption in the defence and security sector. The country's highest scores, and lowest risk area, is Personnel (Band C). Bangladesh's highest corruption risk areas are Finance, Procurement, and Political (Band E). The Government completed a review of the GI 2015 research, which shows a willingness to open dialogue with an international NGO on defence corruption issues. To reduce corruption risk, TI suggests the following reforms of the security sector to minimize corruption risk.

#### **Enhance Independent Oversight through Parliament, Audit, and Risk Assessments**

There is some good evidence of the Government of Bangladesh's commitment to an anti-corruption agenda: the national anti-corruption strategy applies to the defence sector, and the MOD has drafted an implementation plan. The Anti-Corruption Commission is somewhat active in nationwide investigations. The Government could further build on this anti-corruption strategy to address issues of parliamentary and independent external audit oversight of the defence sector and aim to make the sector more transparent overall to ensure civilian oversight.

While there are legislative provisions for parliamentary approval of defence budgets and oversight of policies and activities, these need to be stronger in practice to be more effective. A specific parliamentary standing committee overseeing defence issues has been formed but there is little evidence of Parliament's impact on budgets, procurement decisions, or overall defence policy. We recommend that Parliament uses its prerogatives to the full, to further develop a comprehensive and robust process for defence oversight.

While a national anti-corruption plan is in place and an implementation plan for the MOD has been drafted, there is no evidence of an institutionalised and regular risk assessment process and there is little information on the effectiveness of the MOD's internal audit unit. Instituting a systematic and comprehensive risk assessments would allow for a more tailored, effective approach to preventing corruption risks in the defence sector. Publishing internal and external audit findings would also contribute to improving the transparency and effectiveness of internal audit systems.

#### **Make procurement procedures more efficient and effective**

While some laws and procedures applicable to defence procurement exist, it is unclear to what extent they are applied in practice. Availability of procurement-related information is still quite low and it is generally not clear whether classifying procurement as confidential is

always justified by reasons of national security. This lack of transparency extends to information on offset contracts: it is not clear whether offsets do occur as part of defence contracts and whether they are regulated at all. Given the likelihood of significant procurement expenditures in the near future, the MOD should consider making more information publicly available to parliament and the media and ensuring a robust audit process for procurement decisions to ensure that which will help ensure that the budget is spent on arms and equipment that actually meet Bangladesh's strategic needs.

### **Train and prepare troops for peacekeeping deployments**

With over 8,000 troops deployed in UN peacekeeping missions in 2015, Bangladesh remains the most significant contributor to the UN's peacekeeping activities. It would be beneficial to both the Bangladeshi armed forces and to UN operations if the military were to adopt a comprehensive and detailed military doctrine addressing corruption issues for peace and conflict that is publicly available; provide comprehensive guidelines and staff training on addressing corruption risks, including in contracting, whilst on deployed operations or peacekeeping missions; deploy trained professionals capable of monitoring corruption in the field who regularly report while on mission, these reports could be made available to the public, at least in summary form.

## Scorecard

Political	Defence & Security Policy	Legislative Scrutiny	1
		Defence Committee	1
		Defence Policy Debated	0
		CSO Engagement	1
		International AC Instruments	3
		Public Debate	1
		AC Policy	2
		AC Institutions	2
		Public Trust	3
		Risk Assessments	0
	Defence budgets	Acquisition Planning	1
		Budget Transparency & Detail	1
		Budget Scrutiny	1
		Budget Publicly Available	1
		Defence Income	2
		Internal Audit	1
		External Audit	2
	Other Political Areas	Natural Resources	0
		Organised Crime Links	1
		Organised Crime Policing	1
Intelligence Services Oversight		0	
Intelligence Services Recruitment		1	
Export Controls		1	
Finance	Asset Disposals	Asset Disposal Controls	1
		Asset Disposal Scrutiny	1
	Secret Budgets	Percentage Secret Spending	0
		Legislative Access to Information	0
		Secret Program Auditing	0
		Off-budget Spending in Law	2
		Off-budget Spending in Practice	2
	Links to Business	Information Classification	2
		Mil. Owned Businesses Exist	1
		Mil. Owned Business Scrutiny	2
Personnel	Leadership	Unauthorised Private Enterprise	2
		Public Commitment	2
		Measures for Corrupt Personnel	3
		Whistleblowing	1
	Payroll and Recruitment	Special Attention to Sensitive Personnel	2
		Numbers of Personnel Known	0
		Pay Rates Openly Published	3
		Well-established Payment System	4
		Objective Appointments	2
	Conscription	Objective Promotions	2
		Bribery to Avoid Compulsory Conscription	
	Salary Chain	Bribery for Preferred Postings	
		Ghost Soldiers	3

		Chains of Command and Payment	2
	<b>Values, Standards, Other</b>	Code of Conduct Coverage	2
		Code of Conduct Breaches Addressed	2
		AC Training	2
		Prosecution Outcomes Transparent	1
		Facilitation Payments	3
<b>Operations</b>	<b>Controls in the Field</b>	Military Doctrine	1
		Operational Training	1
		AC Monitoring	1
		Controls on Contracting	2
		Private Military Contractors	2
<b>Procurement</b>	<b>Government Policy</b>	Legislation	1
		Transparent Procurement Cycle	2
		Oversight Mechanisms	2
		Purchases Disclosed	2
		Standards Expected of Companies	0
	<b>Capability Gap</b>	Strategy Drives Requirements	1
		Requirements Quantified	1
	<b>Tendering</b>	Open Competition v. Single-Sourcing	2
		Tender Board Controls	1
		Anti-Collusion Controls	1
	<b>Contract Delivery / Support</b>	Procurement Staff Training	2
		Complaint Mechanisms for Firms	2
		Sanctions for Corruption	2
	<b>Offsets</b>	Due Diligence	0
		Transparency	0
		Competition Regulation	0
	<b>Other</b>	Controls of Agents	1
Transparency of Financing Packages		1	
Subsidiaries / Sub-Contractors		0	
Political Influence		2	