

France

2015 Country Summary

Recommendations

France's GI ranking in Band C places it in the medium risk category for corruption in the defence and security sector. It has the lowest score of all G7 nations. France's lowest scores are for Operations in Band E (very high risk). With over 10,000 troops deployed on international peacekeeping and stabilisation missions, we recommend that France mitigate its corruption vulnerabilities through the following reforms.

Compliance with International Instruments

One of the world's major arms exporters, France has signed and ratified the UN Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and has worked in partnership with defence companies and NGOs to achieve its ratification at the global level. France has also been a strong supporter of anti-corruption elements in the treaty. We recommend that France displays the same leadership when it comes to implementing the relevant anti-corruption provisions of the ATT. This could include putting in place mechanisms to avoid the risk of arms diversion and releasing greater information to the legislature at an earlier stage of arms procurement discussions so as to help ensure upcoming arms exports are subject to robust parliamentary approval and debate. This could also demonstrate that France is devoted to learning from and addressing the legacy of 'Karachigate' and other incidences that continue to receive widespread public attention. Intermediaries and agents are widely used for major armament sales. Our assessment found a lack of sufficient controls for defence companies' use of agents and intermediaries in the procurement cycle. There should be a clear policy on their usage, with controls to ensure the law is not circumvented. These controls should be public and well known to companies.

Corruption Reporting Mechanisms and Enforcement

We were unable to identify a defence specific anti-corruption policy or plan, and there is no evidence of independent, well-resourced, and effective institutions within defence and security tasked with building integrity and countering corruption. The most powerful institutions are external to the government such as investigative journalists and individual judges prosecuting cases. French internal audit procedures in the Ministry of Defence are systematic, yet there is no evidence that internal audit reports are subject to any parliamentary scrutiny and it is not clear how effective or comprehensive this procedure is. External auditing is performed by the Cour des Comptes, which has proven to be independent and active with their findings available to the public. However, there is a lack of evidence of the government implementing these recommendations.

To ensure proper oversight of defence spending, we recommend a more transparent process of internal audit which is appropriately resourced and subject to parliamentary scrutiny. For both internal and external audit findings, we recommend that the government become much more active in presenting evidence of implementing these recommendations.

To ensure that bribery is reported, we recommend that France take action to encourage whistle-blowing and to ensure that whistle-blowers be afforded adequate protection from reprisals, particularly in the defence and security sector. We recommend a review to ensure that effective legislation and mechanisms applicable to military and official personnel be enacted to report corruption. These laws and mechanisms should be vigorously implemented with appropriate legal measures in place to rigorously defend whistle-blowers in both the public and private sector.

Adopting a Strategic Approach to Corruption Risks on Operations

Statements by the Ministry of Defence allude to corruption challenges on operations (e.g. Afghanistan and Kosovo), but there does not seem to be specific doctrine focused on anti-corruption. We recommend that France introduces regular anti-corruption modules as part of its pre-deployment training. The Cour de Comptes has criticised the insufficient and irregular evaluation of peacekeeping costs. While some operational flexibility is of course necessary, France should ensure that regular evaluations take place.

While there is a dedicated parliamentary commission composed of four Members of Parliament from both the Senate and the National Assembly, which has special access to strategies and budget reports and can organise hearings, the commission does not have access to information on current operations. We recommend that the commission is provided with this information.

Scorecard

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

		Chains of Command and Payment	4
	Values, Standards, Other	Code of Conduct Coverage	3
		Code of Conduct Breaches Addressed	1
		AC Training	0
		Prosecution Outcomes Transparent	2
		Facilitation Payments	2
Operations		Controls in the Field	Military Doctrine
	Operational Training		1
	AC Monitoring		1
	Controls on Contracting		0
	Private Military Contractors		2
	Procurement		Government Policy
Transparent Procurement Cycle		3	
Oversight Mechanisms		2	
Purchases Disclosed		3	
Standards Expected of Companies		1	
Capability Gap		Strategy Drives Requirements	3
		Requirements Quantified	3
Tendering		Open Competition v. Single-Sourcing	2
		Tender Board Controls	2
		Anti-Collusion Controls	3
Contract Delivery / Support		Procurement Staff Training	3
		Complaint Mechanisms for Firms	3
		Sanctions for Corruption	1
Offsets		Due Diligence	0
		Transparency	0
		Competition Regulation	2
Other		Controls of Agents	2
		Transparency of Financing Packages	1
		Subsidiaries / Sub-Contractors	1
		Political Influence	3