

TABLE 6.4
ANTI-CORRUPTION AGENCIES: SOME EXAMPLES OF FOCUS

<i>Country</i>	<i>Focus</i>
Hong Kong (SAR), China	The ICAC Ordinance requires the Commissioner to investigate ‘any’ suspected corruption. The agency’s policy has been to take this literally, pursuing <i>all</i> corruption allegations without <i>a priori</i> selection criteria, although it is within the sole discretion of the Attorney General to decide which cases to prosecute. ICAC first focused on the public sector and only later started to focus its attention on the private sector. In 1974, 80% of the cases were from the public sector, today about 60% are from the private sector. ICAC has a comprehensive mandate. However, trials for minor cases are costly so there is a selection process that takes place at that level (if the offender admits then prosecution for minor cases, will be avoided).
Indonesia	Investigate, indict and prosecute corruption cases involving law enforcement officers, or government executives that have drawn the attention of the general public and/or involve loss to the state of at least 1 billion Rupiah.
Malaysia	Receive and consider any report of corrupt practices.
Republic of Korea	KICAC has no mandate to investigate. It refers all investigation to the Audit Office or the Prosecutor. If a report regarding suspected corruption involves a high-ranking official then the case is directly referred to the Prosecutor. KICAC does not deal with the private sector.
Singapore	Also, Singapore’s CPIB has authority to investigate any crime that comes to light in its corruption investigations – a power that most such agencies do not have. It investigates complaints on corruption in the public as well as the private sector.

Note: At the time of publication \$1 = IDR 9,300.
Source: Based on UNDP 2005.