



How to cite this article:

Ahmed Nassar Alnejadi, M., & Malek Afzali Ardakani, M. (2026). The Role of Administrative Law in Achieving Transparency and Accountability in Iraq and Egypt: A Comparative Legal Study. *Journal of Historical Research, Law and Policy*, 4(3), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.61838/jhrp.470>



Article history:
Original Research

Dates:

Submission Date: 07 March 2026

Revision Date: 27 April 2026

Acceptance Date: 02 May 2026

Publication Date: 20 May 2026

The Role of Administrative Law in Achieving Transparency and Accountability in Iraq and Egypt: A Comparative Legal Study

1. Mustafa. Ahmed Nassar Alnejadi¹ : Ph.D. Candidate, Faculty of Law, University of Qom, Qom, Iran

2. Mohsen. Malek Afzali Ardakani² : Full Professor, Department of Law, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Higher Education Complex for Humanities, Al-Mustafa International University, Qom, Iran | Lecturer at Faculty of Law, University of Qom, Qom, Iran

*corresponding author's email: Malekafzali@miu.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

This study examines the role of administrative law in promoting transparency and accountability in Iraq and Egypt through a comparative legal analysis of the principal constitutional, administrative, institutional, and judicial mechanisms governing public administration. The study is based on the premise that transparency and accountability are not merely principles of good governance but essential legal requirements for ensuring the legitimacy, integrity, and effectiveness of administrative action. It analyzes the legal foundations of transparency, particularly the principle of legality, access to information, protection of public resources, and the obligation of administrative authorities to act within legally defined competences and purposes. Particular attention is given to the role of oversight institutions, including the Federal Board of Supreme Audit in Iraq and the Central Auditing Organization in Egypt, as well as internal administrative oversight and anti-corruption mechanisms. The study further evaluates the role of administrative judiciary in reviewing administrative decisions, controlling discretionary authority, addressing abuse of power, and protecting the principle of legality. It also examines disciplinary and criminal accountability of public officials as complementary mechanisms for preventing misconduct and ensuring compliance with official duties. The comparative analysis shows that both Iraq and Egypt possess substantial legal and institutional frameworks capable of supporting transparent and accountable administration, but significant challenges remain in practical implementation, institutional coordination, access to information, enforcement of oversight findings, and the effective application of legal responsibility. The study concludes that strengthening transparency and accountability requires an integrated administrative framework based on proactive disclosure, independent oversight, effective judicial review, enforceable accountability, digital administrative systems, and improved coordination among competent institutions. Such reforms are necessary to reduce the gap between formal legal guarantees and actual administrative practice and to strengthen public confidence in state institutions.

Keywords: *Administrative Law; Transparency; Accountability; Iraq; Egypt; Administrative Judiciary; Oversight; Access to Information*

Introduction

Transparency and accountability have become indispensable characteristics of contemporary public administration because the legitimacy of administrative action can no longer be measured solely by whether a public authority possesses formal legal competence to act. The exercise of administrative power must also be capable of



being observed, evaluated, questioned, and, where necessary, corrected through legal and institutional mechanisms. Administrative law occupies a central position in this process because it simultaneously empowers public administration to perform governmental functions and subjects the exercise of those powers to legal limitations designed to protect the public interest. The principle of legality remains the basic normative foundation of this relationship. It requires administrative authorities to act within the powers conferred upon them and in conformity with the purposes for which those powers were granted. As explained in the literature on legality in public administration, administrative authority cannot be understood as an autonomous sphere of governmental discretion detached from legal control; rather, legality structures both the existence and exercise of administrative competence (1). This connection between legality and transparency is especially significant because secrecy, uncertainty regarding competence, and insufficient disclosure can make it more difficult to determine whether administrative bodies are acting within their lawful powers. Transparency therefore gives practical visibility to legality, while accountability supplies the consequences that follow when administrative action departs from lawful requirements. Administrative transparency also has an important preventive dimension because an administration that is expected to disclose information concerning decisions, procedures, public resources, and institutional performance operates under stronger incentives to comply with legal requirements. The relationship between transparency and anti-corruption policy has accordingly become an important subject within modern administrative law, with transparent procedures regarded as a means of reducing opportunities for concealed favoritism, arbitrary decision-making, and misuse of public resources (2). Accountability complements this function by establishing mechanisms through which administrative authorities and public officials may be required to explain their conduct and bear legal, disciplinary, or other consequences for unlawful behavior. In this sense, transparency without accountability may merely reveal irregularities without guaranteeing their correction, whereas accountability without sufficient transparency may remain ineffective because violations are difficult to identify, document, and prove. The two concepts must therefore operate together as mutually reinforcing elements of lawful and responsible administration.

The comparative experiences of Iraq and Egypt provide an especially useful setting in which to examine this relationship because both legal systems recognize important constitutional and administrative principles associated with legality, oversight, public responsibility, and the protection of public resources, while each also faces difficulties in converting formal legal safeguards into effective administrative practices. In Iraq, the post-2005 constitutional framework strengthened the legal basis for institutional oversight and provided express constitutional protection for public resources. The Iraqi constitutional approach to public funds is significant because it conceptualizes such resources as protected collective assets rather than property freely disposable by administrative authorities (3). The Constitution also recognizes the institutional position of the Federal Board of Supreme Audit, thereby establishing a constitutional foundation for independent financial and administrative scrutiny. Scholarly analysis of the Board's constitutional independence indicates that institutional autonomy is critical because an oversight body cannot effectively examine executive conduct if its operational capacity is excessively dependent on the very authorities that it is expected to supervise (4). At the same time, the Iraqi experience demonstrates that constitutional recognition does not automatically guarantee a fully transparent administrative environment. Questions concerning institutional coordination, access to public information, internal administrative oversight, the implementation of audit recommendations, and effective legal responsibility remain central to the practical realization of accountability. Iraqi scholarship on governance and administrative transparency has therefore emphasized the continued importance of translating legal concepts of transparency into institutional procedures capable of structuring routine

governmental activity (5). The role of administrative law in Iraq must consequently be examined not merely in terms of the existence of legislative provisions but also in relation to the effectiveness of procedures through which those provisions are implemented.

The Egyptian experience presents both similarities and important differences. Egypt has a long-established administrative legal tradition in which the State Council occupies a particularly important position in reviewing administrative action, protecting legality, and developing principles governing the limits of administrative discretion. The role of the State Council in confronting unlawful administrative practices illustrates how judicial review can function as a mechanism of accountability when administrative decisions are affected by illegitimate purposes, misuse of competence, or other legal defects (6). Egyptian administrative law also operates within a constitutional framework that provides relatively explicit recognition of information, public ownership, institutional oversight, and anti-corruption obligations. The constitutional treatment of public property establishes a legal connection between state administration and the obligation to preserve resources belonging to the public community (7). In addition, constitutional safeguards relating to access to information strengthen the conceptual position that official information is not merely an internal administrative asset but forms part of the relationship between citizens and public institutions (8). Yet the existence of developed legal institutions does not eliminate the practical problems that arise from administrative complexity, bureaucratic procedures, institutional fragmentation, or insufficient implementation. The Egyptian case therefore demonstrates that mature administrative institutions must also adapt to contemporary expectations regarding proactive disclosure, digital administration, performance oversight, and public participation. Transparency cannot be achieved by judicial review alone, particularly because judicial control generally occurs after an administrative dispute or contested decision has arisen. Preventive mechanisms of openness and internal control must accompany judicial remedies if accountability is to become an ordinary characteristic of administration rather than merely a corrective response to already completed violations.

The central problem addressed in this article is therefore the continuing gap between the normative promise of administrative law and the practical realization of transparency and accountability in Iraq and Egypt. Both systems contain rules, institutions, and judicial mechanisms capable of supporting transparent and accountable administration, but their effectiveness depends on how those elements interact. Oversight institutions require legal independence, access to information, adequate technical resources, and administrative cooperation. Administrative courts require sufficiently accessible procedures and meaningful jurisdiction over unlawful administrative action. Internal administrative bodies require effective disciplinary systems and organizational structures capable of detecting misconduct at an early stage. Citizens require reliable access to public information if transparency is to extend beyond relations among government institutions and become a form of societal oversight. Public officials must also operate under a clear framework of responsibility so that the misuse of administrative authority produces actual legal consequences. The institutional dimension is particularly important because contemporary oversight is no longer limited to traditional verification of accounts. Modern approaches increasingly assess performance, effectiveness, compliance, and the extent to which administrative conduct advances the purposes for which public authority and public resources were granted (9). Similarly, comparative scholarship on supreme financial oversight demonstrates that the effectiveness of audit institutions depends not only on their formal competence but also on the institutional conditions in which oversight findings are processed and implemented (10). The problem is accordingly not simply whether Iraq and Egypt possess mechanisms of transparency and accountability, but

whether those mechanisms form a sufficiently integrated legal system capable of transforming information, oversight findings, administrative complaints, and judicial rulings into effective institutional correction.

The objective of this article is to analyze how administrative law contributes to achieving transparency and accountability in Iraq and Egypt and to evaluate the relationship among the principal mechanisms through which these principles operate. Particular attention is given to the constitutional and legal foundations of transparency and accountability, the right of access to information, administrative and financial oversight institutions, internal administrative control, administrative judicial review, abuse of authority, and the disciplinary responsibility of public officials. The article also seeks to identify the principal areas of convergence and divergence between the Iraqi and Egyptian systems and to determine why formally established legal safeguards may produce different levels of practical effectiveness. Rather than treating public-fund protection as an independent field of financial law, the discussion addresses it only where it demonstrates the practical operation of transparency and accountability. Public resources are relevant because their administration is one of the areas in which secrecy, abuse of authority, weak control, and insufficient responsibility can produce particularly serious consequences. Financial administration in Iraq, for example, has increasingly incorporated concepts of financial transparency and improved institutional control (11), while the Egyptian constitutional organization of public finance reflects the broader principle that governmental expenditure must remain subject to legally structured supervision (12). These examples are important not for their technical financial content but because they illustrate how administrative law subjects government management to standards of disclosure, legality, and answerability.

Methodologically, the article adopts a descriptive, analytical, and comparative legal approach. The descriptive dimension identifies the major legal and institutional mechanisms governing transparency and accountability in Iraq and Egypt. The analytical dimension examines how those mechanisms operate in relation to legality, disclosure, institutional oversight, judicial control, and public-official responsibility. The comparative dimension identifies similarities and differences between the two systems in order to assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of their approaches. The central argument advanced is that administrative law can serve as an effective framework for achieving transparency and accountability only when formal constitutional and legislative principles are linked to functioning mechanisms of disclosure, independent oversight, judicial review, institutional coordination, and enforceable responsibility. Administrative accountability must therefore be understood as a process rather than an isolated sanction. Contemporary analyses of accountability under conditions of transparency similarly emphasize that responsibility depends on the capacity to identify administrative conduct, assess it against established standards, and impose an appropriate institutional response (13). The comparative inquiry consequently focuses on the interaction among these mechanisms rather than treating each as a separate legal institution. The study ultimately considers whether the Iraqi and Egyptian frameworks can move from a predominantly reactive model, in which violations are addressed after they occur, toward a more preventive administrative model in which openness, traceability, lawful decision-making, and continuing supervision reduce the likelihood of administrative misconduct from the outset.

Legal Foundations of Transparency and Accountability in Administrative Law

The legal foundations of transparency and accountability begin with the transformation of public administration from an authority-centered model into one constrained by the rule of law and the public interest. Traditional administrative law recognized special powers and privileges for governmental authorities because public

administration must possess sufficient legal capacity to organize public services, implement public policies, manage public resources, and respond to collective needs. However, the existence of exceptional administrative powers necessarily creates a corresponding need for safeguards against arbitrariness. The principle of legality therefore imposes a fundamental requirement that administrative powers be exercised within jurisdictional, procedural, substantive, and purposive limits. Legality is not merely a technical condition determining whether an administrative decision is formally valid; it expresses the broader constitutional idea that public authority derives its legitimacy from law and remains subordinate to law. This principle has particular relevance to transparency because legality can be effectively monitored only when administrative conduct is sufficiently visible to affected individuals, oversight institutions, and courts. The analysis of legality in public administration demonstrates that legal control is weakened when the reasons, factual foundations, procedures, or financial implications of administrative conduct cannot be identified (1). Transparency can thus be understood as the informational dimension of administrative legality: it creates the conditions in which conduct can be examined and compared with applicable legal standards. Accountability represents the consequential dimension because it determines what happens when the administration or its officials depart from those standards. This functional connection explains why modern administrative law increasingly treats disclosure, reason-giving, access to records, oversight, and review as integral elements of legitimate administrative action rather than as optional manifestations of good governmental practice.

Transparency in administrative law may be understood as the legal and institutional condition in which relevant information about governmental organization, decision-making, procedures, expenditure, contracts, and performance is made accessible to the persons and institutions entitled to scrutinize it. Transparency does not mean unlimited disclosure of every piece of government information, because legitimate legal restrictions may exist in relation to national security, privacy, confidential investigations, or other interests protected by law. Its central presumption, however, is that administrative secrecy must be legally justified rather than treated as the ordinary condition of public authority. The conceptual relationship between transparency and anti-corruption is particularly strong because opacity can create opportunities for administrative discretion to be exercised for improper purposes without timely detection. Administrative transparency therefore narrows the informational space within which favoritism, manipulation of procedures, misuse of government contracts, or improper financial conduct may occur (14). Transparency also strengthens trust between administration and society because citizens can more readily evaluate whether decisions have been taken according to identifiable procedures and legitimate objectives. The development of open administration reflects this transition from administrative secrecy toward an approach that emphasizes public accessibility and institutional answerability (15). Yet transparency must remain connected to law. Merely publishing large quantities of administrative data does not necessarily create meaningful transparency if information is incomplete, inaccessible, delayed, technically unintelligible, or disconnected from the decisions to which it relates. Administrative law must therefore define the duties of disclosure and the procedures through which citizens and institutions may obtain relevant information.

Accountability extends beyond transparency because it requires mechanisms through which administrative conduct can be examined and responsibility assigned. At its most basic level, accountability means that an administrative authority or public official must be capable of explaining conduct and may be subjected to corrective or punitive consequences when that conduct violates applicable obligations. Contemporary administrative accountability thus includes several overlapping forms. Hierarchical accountability operates within the administrative organization through the power of administrative superiors to supervise subordinate officials and

correct unlawful conduct. Disciplinary accountability applies employment-related consequences to violations of official duties. Judicial accountability subjects administrative decisions and acts to review by competent courts. Financial accountability enables specialized oversight institutions to scrutinize the collection, management, and expenditure of public resources. Parliamentary accountability may arise through legislative scrutiny of governmental administration, public expenditure, and oversight reports. Criminal responsibility becomes relevant when administrative misconduct also satisfies the elements of a criminal offense. The interaction between disciplinary and criminal responsibility is important because the same factual conduct can affect both the proper operation of public service and broader interests protected by criminal law (16). Administrative accountability should therefore not be reduced to punishment. Its broader purpose is to structure responsible public administration by establishing predictable relationships between authority, duty, supervision, justification, and consequence.

The constitutional framework of Iraq provides several foundations that support this model. The Constitution of 2005 recognizes the supremacy of law, provides specific protection for public funds, and establishes independent institutions responsible for oversight. The constitutional protection of public funds is particularly relevant to accountability because it transforms their preservation from a matter of administrative preference into a legal obligation (3). Public resources are not treated as property belonging to the officeholders who manage them; they are public assets subject to legally defined purposes and restrictions. The broader constitutional literature supports the view that the protection of public assets is closely connected to the constitutional limitation of governmental power and the obligation of state institutions to pursue the public interest (17). The Iraqi Constitution also provides a basis for supreme financial oversight by recognizing the institutional independence of the Federal Board of Supreme Audit. The Board's constitutional position is significant because it separates the oversight function from ordinary executive administration and provides a structural safeguard against direct interference by audited bodies (4). This institutional design reflects an important principle of accountability: an authority responsible for examining administrative performance must possess sufficient autonomy to investigate and report findings without being subordinated to the interests of those under examination.

The constitutional framework of Egypt similarly connects administrative legality, public resources, transparency, and anti-corruption principles. The Egyptian constitutional approach recognizes public ownership and provides legal safeguards for its protection. Constitutional analysis of public ownership emphasizes that such protection is not simply proprietary but reflects the relationship between state resources and the collective interests that those resources are intended to serve (7). Constitutional regulation of public finance also subjects the administration of state resources to legally structured processes, thereby reinforcing the principle that financial authority must remain reviewable rather than discretionary in an unlimited sense (12). Particularly important to transparency is the constitutional recognition of access to official information. The right-to-information framework represents a major conceptual shift because information held by public institutions is understood as connected to the people on whose behalf those institutions operate. Constitutional safeguards of the right to information consequently provide an important foundation for societal scrutiny of administration (8). The relationship between freedom of information and governmental performance is also emphasized in legal scholarship, which views access to official data as a mechanism capable of improving both institutional openness and public evaluation of administrative activity (18). In comparative terms, the Egyptian constitutional framework provides a relatively direct articulation of information rights, while the Iraqi system continues to present a stronger need for a comprehensive and effectively implemented legal framework specifying access procedures, obligations, exceptions, remedies, and disclosure duties.

The right of access to information constitutes perhaps the clearest point at which the abstract principle of transparency becomes an operational rule of administrative law. Citizens cannot effectively monitor public administration if they are unable to obtain the records, data, decisions, contracts, reports, and other information required to understand administrative conduct. The right to knowledge in public law is therefore associated with the premise that information generated or maintained through public authority ordinarily has a public dimension, subject to legitimate and proportionate restrictions established by law (19). Access to information enables citizens to determine how administrative decisions were made, assess whether public resources have been used according to their purposes, and obtain information necessary to challenge unlawful administrative acts. It also strengthens institutional oversight because well-organized administrative records facilitate auditing, investigation, and judicial examination. Government documentation has consequently been linked to effective oversight over public resources and administrative conduct (20). The value of information is therefore both substantive and evidentiary: disclosure informs public scrutiny, while recordkeeping provides the evidentiary infrastructure through which accountability mechanisms operate.

In Iraq, access to information remains one of the areas in which the distinction between general constitutional principles and specific administrative procedures becomes particularly important. The Iraqi legal environment contains constitutional values connected to expression, participation, oversight, and integrity, but the development of a comprehensive freedom-of-information regime has faced continuing challenges. Legal analysis of the Iraqi framework has emphasized the need for clearer regulation of access procedures, governmental duties, permissible exceptions, and mechanisms for challenging refusals (21). This issue directly affects administrative accountability. Where citizens, journalists, civil-society institutions, or even oversight bodies encounter difficulty obtaining public information, irregular administrative activity may remain concealed until its consequences become serious. Access to information is especially important in areas such as government contracts, public projects, procurement, administrative appointments, expenditure, licensing, and allocation of public benefits, because these areas frequently involve significant administrative discretion. Iraqi scholarship on governance has therefore connected stronger disclosure practices with broader efforts to improve integrity and reduce the gap between formal legal regulation and actual governmental performance (5). The development of an effective information regime requires more than a general declaration of openness; it requires clear duties of proactive publication, realistic deadlines, review procedures, narrow exceptions, record-management standards, and legal remedies against unjustified administrative secrecy.

Egypt provides a stronger constitutional basis for this right, but constitutional recognition must likewise be translated into practical procedures. The guarantee that official information belongs within the sphere of public access creates an important presumption in favor of disclosure, yet effective transparency depends upon the procedures governing the implementation of that principle. The constitutional safeguards surrounding information rights have been interpreted as strengthening citizens' capacity to participate in the scrutiny of administrative performance (8). At the same time, freedom of information must function alongside administrative rules concerning recordkeeping, reasoned decisions, institutional archives, and legally defined exceptions. The broader study of freedom of information in international instruments reinforces the proposition that access to information is closely associated with freedom of expression and the ability to seek and receive information concerning matters of public importance (22). The administrative significance of this right therefore extends beyond individual requests. Proactive publication of budgets, contracts, administrative regulations, procurement information, performance reports, and

institutional decisions can substantially reduce the dependence of transparency on individual litigation or formal applications.

The protection of public resources provides another important legal foundation for accountability because it connects administrative power with fiduciary-like obligations of lawful management. In Iraq, the constitutional protection of public funds and the legal regulation of financial administration create obligations concerning the use and control of governmental resources. Scholarship addressing public financial administration has emphasized the importance of financial planning, disclosure, control, and institutional compliance in reducing waste and improving government management (11). The management of natural resources under the Iraqi constitutional framework also illustrates the principle that economically significant public assets must be administered for collective rather than factional or private purposes (23). Egypt similarly subjects public financial activity to constitutional and institutional controls. The legal importance of these arrangements lies not in accounting detail but in the principle that the administration must be able to demonstrate how public assets have been used and whether expenditure conforms to legal purposes. Comparative scholarship on constitutional protection of public funds shows that safeguarding such resources involves an integrated combination of legal rules, oversight, and responsibility rather than a single prohibition against unlawful appropriation (24). Transparency enables financial conduct to be seen, accountability allows it to be evaluated and sanctioned, and legality provides the standard against which that evaluation occurs.

The legal foundations of transparency and accountability in Iraq and Egypt are therefore relatively substantial, but their practical importance depends on implementation. Constitutional principles can establish institutional independence, recognize information rights, protect public resources, and affirm legality, yet administrative practice determines whether those principles influence ordinary governmental behavior. A recurrent challenge in both systems is the need to ensure that disclosure duties, oversight powers, judicial remedies, and disciplinary procedures function as interconnected elements rather than isolated legal mechanisms. The principal comparative distinction lies in the configuration and maturity of particular institutions: Egypt possesses a long-established administrative judicial tradition and express constitutional treatment of information, while Iraq's constitutional framework has placed particular emphasis on the development of independent oversight structures within a newer political and administrative environment. Nevertheless, both systems confront the same fundamental legal question: whether rules that formally require transparent and accountable administration can generate consistent patterns of administrative conduct. The answer depends substantially on the institutional mechanisms through which those rules are applied.

Administrative and Institutional Mechanisms for Promoting Transparency

Administrative transparency becomes effective only when constitutional and legal principles are translated into institutions, procedures, and routine practices capable of generating, preserving, disclosing, and reviewing information about governmental activity. Administrative law performs this function by defining institutional competencies, imposing procedural duties, establishing oversight bodies, and creating channels through which administrative conduct may be examined. The administrative mechanism of transparency therefore begins inside the public institution itself. Ministries, agencies, public bodies, and other administrative entities must maintain accurate records of decisions, expenditure, contracting, appointments, and performance if external scrutiny is to be meaningful. The importance of organized government documentation is evident in the relationship between records and oversight, because reliable documentation allows administrative actions to be reconstructed and evaluated

after they occur (20). Modern transparency consequently requires administrative systems in which decision-making leaves an identifiable record showing who acted, under what authority, on the basis of which information, and for what purpose. This documentary infrastructure also supports judicial review because an individual challenging administrative action can more effectively contest a decision when its legal and factual basis can be identified. Transparency is therefore not confined to public publication. It also includes internal traceability, record integrity, institutional reporting, and the availability of reliable information to competent oversight authorities.

Access to information remains the most direct mechanism connecting administrative institutions to external scrutiny. In a transparent administrative system, citizens should not depend exclusively on exceptional disclosures or investigative leaks to understand public activity. Information should be made available through ordinary legal and administrative procedures. The concept of open administration reflects the proposition that disclosure should increasingly become an ordinary characteristic of public governance (15). This approach has preventive value because officials who know that decisions and records may be examined by citizens, auditors, courts, or other authorities are more likely to pay attention to legality and procedural regularity. The anti-corruption value of administrative transparency similarly arises from reducing environments in which decisions can be concealed or altered without effective detection (2). The right of access to information also enables more sophisticated forms of public oversight. Researchers may identify patterns in public expenditure, journalists may examine administrative contracting, civil-society organizations may evaluate the implementation of public programs, and individuals affected by administrative decisions may obtain the documentation necessary to pursue grievances or judicial remedies.

The Iraqi framework demonstrates both the importance and the limitations of this mechanism. Legal scholarship concerning freedom of access to information in Iraq identifies the need for stronger procedural regulation capable of converting broad principles of openness into enforceable administrative duties (21). The absence or insufficiency of detailed mechanisms may allow government bodies to rely on administrative custom, institutional secrecy, or broad interpretations of confidentiality when responding to requests for information. Such practices can undermine transparency even where no express intention to conceal corruption exists, because bureaucratic cultures of non-disclosure limit the capacity of citizens and oversight institutions to understand administrative activity. Governance-oriented analysis of Iraqi administration has therefore emphasized transparency as an institutional practice requiring reform of procedures and organizational behavior (5). An effective Iraqi framework should accordingly distinguish between information that may legitimately remain confidential and information that should ordinarily be available, while ensuring that confidentiality exceptions are not interpreted so broadly that they consume the principle of disclosure. The administration should also move beyond reactive access requests toward proactive publication of information that is predictably relevant to public scrutiny, particularly concerning procurement, budgets, public projects, regulatory decisions, organizational competences, and performance reports.

Egypt's constitutional recognition of information provides a stronger normative basis for administrative disclosure, but institutional effectiveness similarly depends on implementation. The constitutional treatment of the right to information supports a legal presumption that governmental information has a public character rather than belonging exclusively to the administrative authority that possesses it (8). The impact of information rights on governmental performance has also been linked to the capacity of disclosure to reduce administrative opacity and make official conduct more readily evaluable (18). Nevertheless, constitutional entitlement cannot by itself guarantee timely and usable access. Public institutions must develop procedures for identifying records, responding to requests,

publishing data, protecting legitimate confidential interests, and providing review mechanisms when disclosure is refused. Administrative modernization and digitalization can significantly strengthen this process because electronic systems make it easier to publish documents, trace decisions, preserve records, and create standardized channels for public access. Yet digital transformation must be legally structured. Simply converting paper processes into electronic form will not create transparency if data remain inaccessible, fragmented, or controlled through opaque administrative discretion.

Beyond access to information, specialized oversight institutions constitute a central mechanism for transforming transparency into organized governmental scrutiny. Supreme audit institutions are particularly significant because they possess technical competence to examine financial records, identify irregularities, evaluate compliance, and assess institutional performance. Comparative analysis of supreme oversight bodies demonstrates that their role has expanded beyond traditional verification of accounting accuracy toward broader evaluation of efficiency, legality, and performance (10). This development is important for administrative accountability because an expenditure may satisfy formal accounting requirements while still reflecting inefficient management, unlawful decision-making, or a deviation from the objectives for which public resources were authorized. Performance auditing therefore complements formal financial auditing by examining whether public institutions have used resources economically and effectively. Research on performance auditing in government institutions similarly emphasizes the transition from merely identifying numerical discrepancies toward evaluating institutional results and administrative quality (9). Modern oversight consequently connects financial transparency with administrative performance.

In Iraq, the Federal Board of Supreme Audit occupies a particularly important position within this institutional structure. Its constitutional independence provides an essential foundation for credible oversight because effective auditing requires the capacity to examine executive bodies without improper interference. The constitutional independence of the Board has therefore been regarded as directly relevant to its role in protecting public resources (4). The Board's functions extend beyond narrow accounting review and include examination of government accounts, assessment of compliance, identification of financial and administrative violations, and reporting of deficiencies requiring corrective action. The concept of supreme financial oversight in Iraq reflects the broader function of ensuring that public resources remain subject to independent scrutiny rather than being left exclusively to internal executive controls (25). The effectiveness of this model, however, depends on what occurs after an audit finding is issued. An institution that can identify violations but cannot ensure meaningful follow-up risks becoming primarily diagnostic. Audit reports must therefore be connected to administrative correction, parliamentary scrutiny, anti-corruption investigation, disciplinary proceedings, or judicial processes as appropriate.

The Iraqi oversight framework also demonstrates the importance of coordination among institutions. The detection of a financial irregularity may require technical auditing, while determining whether that irregularity constitutes corruption may require investigation by specialized integrity bodies, and imposing responsibility may require administrative, judicial, or criminal proceedings. Scholarship on combating administrative and financial corruption in Iraq emphasizes that corruption control depends upon interaction among legal and institutional mechanisms rather than isolated action by a single authority (26). This need for institutional coordination becomes especially significant where jurisdictional boundaries overlap or where one body depends on information generated by another. Administrative law should clearly define the respective roles of audit institutions, integrity bodies, internal inspection units, administrative authorities, prosecutors, and courts so that cases do not disappear within

jurisdictional gaps. Modern oversight systems are accordingly best understood as networks in which different institutions perform complementary functions. Analysis of modern administrative and financial oversight systems emphasizes that control is most effective when preventive, concurrent, and subsequent forms of oversight operate together (27).

Internal administrative oversight represents the preventive component of this network. Unlike external auditing, which may examine conduct after transactions or decisions have occurred, internal control functions continuously within public institutions. Administrative superiors, inspection units, compliance departments, and internal auditing structures can identify errors at an early stage and require correction before financial or legal consequences become more serious. Studies of internal oversight and public-fund protection highlight the importance of such mechanisms as an initial institutional barrier against irregular administration (28). Internal administrative oversight also reinforces official integrity by reminding employees that administrative action is subject to continuing supervision rather than occasional external examination (29). Its effectiveness nevertheless depends upon organizational independence and professional competence. Internal oversight loses much of its value if inspectors are directly dependent on officials whose conduct they must examine or if institutional culture discourages reporting of irregularities. Clear reporting lines, documentary obligations, protection against retaliation, and coordination with external authorities are therefore important components of credible internal control.

Egypt possesses a similarly complex institutional network centered on the Central Auditing Organization and complemented by other administrative and anti-corruption authorities. The Central Auditing Organization is the principal institution responsible for supreme financial oversight and performs an important role in reviewing state accounts, examining entities using public resources, and reporting financial and administrative irregularities. Its institutional role in the oversight of public funds demonstrates the importance of professional auditing within the broader accountability structure (30). The Organization's reports can also support parliamentary and administrative scrutiny, thereby transforming technical findings into information relevant to political and legal accountability. Parliamentary financial oversight in the Egyptian system illustrates how specialized institutional reports can provide the legislature with an evidentiary basis for examining government performance (31). The value of this institutional relationship lies in the division of functions: technical bodies generate detailed findings, while political or legal institutions determine the consequences that should follow.

Egyptian anti-corruption institutions further demonstrate the importance of coordination between technical oversight and legal enforcement. The legal framework governing anti-corruption bodies assigns different functions to entities responsible for detecting misconduct, investigating administrative violations, and imposing or pursuing sanctions. Legal analysis of Egyptian anti-corruption institutions indicates that institutional specialization can strengthen accountability when bodies exchange information and coordinate their responsibilities (32). The danger, however, is that multiple institutions may create duplication, uncertainty, or fragmented responsibility if their competencies are not sufficiently coordinated. Administrative law therefore performs a crucial organizational function by determining which institution is responsible for each stage of the accountability process and how information should move among them. The same principle applies to Iraq, where the relationship among the Federal Board of Supreme Audit, integrity institutions, internal controls, administrative authorities, and judicial bodies is critical to ensuring that detected violations produce meaningful outcomes.

Financial oversight is especially important because public expenditure and contracting are areas in which administrative discretion and economic value frequently intersect. Financial auditing can reveal unauthorized

expenditure, procedural irregularities, inefficient use of resources, or patterns suggesting corruption. The broader literature on financial oversight emphasizes that public-fund protection requires independent examination supported by legal authority to obtain records and report violations (33). Contemporary challenges, however, require oversight to move beyond traditional methods. The complexity of governmental transactions, digital financial systems, large procurement projects, and inter-institutional arrangements demands more sophisticated oversight capacities. Modern analysis of government financial oversight identifies technological and organizational complexity as factors requiring stronger professional and technical capabilities within oversight institutions (34). Digitalization can assist by making transactions more traceable and enabling systematic analysis, but it can also create new risks if oversight institutions lack access to digital systems or appropriate technical expertise.

The comparative analysis reveals that Iraq and Egypt possess substantial institutional infrastructures for transparency and accountability, yet the principal challenge lies in making the system function as an integrated chain. Information must be created and preserved by administrative institutions; disclosure mechanisms must enable access to relevant data; internal control must identify irregularities promptly; supreme oversight institutions must independently investigate and report deficiencies; anti-corruption bodies must pursue cases requiring specialized investigation; legislatures must use oversight information to examine governmental performance; and administrative or judicial mechanisms must impose appropriate consequences. A break at any point can weaken the entire accountability process. The independence of oversight institutions is therefore necessary but not sufficient. Cooperation by audited entities, enforceable access to records, timely responses to recommendations, public reporting, and meaningful follow-up are equally important. Research on the role of supreme oversight bodies in combating financial corruption confirms that institutional effectiveness is closely connected to the authority and practical capacity to ensure that findings are not ignored (35). Transparency consequently becomes institutional only when information moves through a structured legal system capable of converting disclosure into scrutiny and scrutiny into correction.

The comparative experiences also suggest that transparency should increasingly be conceived as proactive rather than merely reactive. Citizens should not have to rely exclusively on requests, complaints, or litigation to discover how public institutions operate. Administrative bodies should routinely publish organizational mandates, procedures, significant decisions, procurement information, public contracts, budgetary data, performance indicators, and oversight responses. Such publication reduces informational inequality between the administration and society and may improve internal administrative discipline by requiring institutions to organize their own information more systematically. At the same time, proactive transparency must be connected to accountability metrics. Publication becomes more meaningful when oversight reports identify whether recommendations were implemented, whether disciplinary action was taken, and whether institutional deficiencies were corrected. This transition from disclosure as a formal requirement to transparency as a continuing administrative system is essential if Iraq and Egypt are to reduce the implementation gap between law and practice.

Administrative Accountability and Judicial Oversight: A Comparative Analysis

Accountability reaches its most legally consequential form when administrative conduct is subjected to review capable of invalidating unlawful decisions, correcting institutional errors, and imposing responsibility upon public officials. Administrative law establishes several mechanisms for achieving these purposes, but judicial review occupies a unique position because it provides an external legal determination concerning the lawfulness of

administrative conduct. Administrative courts do not ordinarily replace the administration in the performance of governmental functions; instead, they examine whether administrative authorities have remained within the legal boundaries governing their competence. Judicial review therefore maintains the distinction between administrative discretion and administrative arbitrariness. An authority may possess discretion to choose among several legally permissible options, but that discretion cannot lawfully be used for purposes unrelated to the public interest or in violation of governing legal principles. The judicial review of administrative decisions consequently examines such elements as competence, form, procedure, factual and legal basis, subject matter, and purpose. Egyptian scholarship on the judicial review of legality emphasizes the role of administrative courts in ensuring that governmental decisions remain within these legal limits (36). The importance of such review to transparency and accountability lies in the fact that the administration may be required to justify its decision before an independent judicial authority, while an unlawful decision may be annulled or otherwise corrected.

The defect of abuse of authority is particularly significant because it concerns the purpose for which administrative power is exercised. An administrative decision may appear regular in form and may even have been issued by a competent authority, yet still be unlawful if the official power was used to achieve a private, political, retaliatory, financial, or otherwise improper objective. Comparative administrative-law scholarship identifies abuse of authority as a particularly serious defect because it transforms legally conferred power into an instrument serving purposes different from those intended by law (37). Judicial review of purpose therefore plays an important accountability function. It prevents discretionary powers from becoming zones of immunity and affirms that all administrative competence is functionally connected to legally defined public objectives. This control is also relevant to corruption because corrupt conduct may be concealed behind formally lawful administrative decisions. Preferential contracting, discriminatory appointments, selective licensing, or improper allocation of public benefits may not always appear as direct violations on the face of the administrative document. Review of motives, circumstances, and objective evidence can therefore be essential to identifying misuse of administrative authority.

Egypt provides a mature example of judicial control through the State Council. The Egyptian administrative judiciary has developed a substantial body of principles governing the legality of administrative decisions and the limits of discretionary power. The role of the State Council in protecting legality and combating administrative corruption demonstrates how administrative justice can function beyond individual dispute resolution and contribute to the general discipline of public administration (6). When courts annul decisions tainted by illegality or abuse of authority, they send a broader institutional message concerning the permissible boundaries of administrative power. Judicial precedents can therefore influence future administrative behavior by clarifying the standards that public authorities must follow. Egyptian scholarship regarding discretionary administrative power likewise emphasizes that discretion is legally bounded and remains susceptible to judicial review where it is exercised for improper purposes or on an unlawful basis (38). The existence of judicial scrutiny encourages administrative authorities to provide reasoned and defensible foundations for their decisions and can thereby reinforce transparency within the decision-making process itself.

The Egyptian model also illustrates an important relationship between judicial review and access to information. Effective legal challenge frequently depends upon the ability of the affected person to know the reasons for an administrative decision and obtain documents relevant to its issuance. A court cannot meaningfully evaluate allegations of illegality when essential administrative records are unavailable or when the evidentiary basis of the decision remains completely concealed. Constitutional safeguards of information rights therefore support

administrative justice by strengthening access to the materials necessary for legal challenge (8). This does not eliminate legitimate confidentiality, but it reinforces the principle that secrecy should not operate as a device for immunizing administrative action from scrutiny. Government documentation and organized records similarly support judicial accountability by preserving evidence concerning the sequence of administrative decisions and the officials involved (20). Transparency thus increases the practical capacity of administrative courts to perform their reviewing function.

Iraq has also experienced significant development in administrative judicial review. The jurisdiction of the Iraqi administrative judiciary encompasses review of administrative action through the judicial formations established under the relevant legal framework, including institutions concerned with public-employment disputes and broader review of administrative legality. Legal analysis of Iraqi administrative jurisdiction demonstrates the growing importance of judicial scrutiny as a means of enforcing the principle of legality (39). Iraqi administrative courts examine whether administrative decisions comply with the legal requirements governing competence, form, cause, object, and purpose. The judicial review of abuse of authority is particularly important because it allows courts to address situations in which administrative power is formally exercised within institutional competence but substantively directed toward unlawful ends. Iraqi scholarship specifically addressing abuse of authority as a ground for annulment recognizes it as an important mechanism for confronting concealed administrative deviation (40). The development of this jurisprudence strengthens administrative accountability by demonstrating that the possession of legal power does not authorize its use for personal or factional objectives.

Administrative judicial protection in Iraq also extends to public employment, an area directly connected to transparency, equality, and institutional integrity. Decisions concerning appointment, promotion, discipline, transfer, and other employment matters can become vehicles for favoritism or arbitrary treatment when transparent standards are absent. Judicial protection of public office therefore contributes to the broader objective of ensuring that administrative personnel decisions remain subject to legality and equality (41). This aspect of administrative justice is particularly important because public administration depends on the integrity of its personnel system. If positions, promotions, or sanctions are determined according to improper influence rather than lawful criteria, institutional accountability is weakened from within. Judicial review helps correct individual violations, but it may also encourage administrative institutions to adopt clearer procedures and documentary standards in order to withstand legal scrutiny.

Judicial oversight must nevertheless operate alongside administrative accountability rather than substitute for it. Courts cannot realistically monitor every administrative decision, financial transaction, employment practice, or public contract. Most accountability must begin inside administrative institutions through supervision, inspection, disciplinary procedures, and internal control. Administrative oversight is therefore indispensable because it operates continuously and can detect problems before they develop into formal disputes. The study of administrative oversight mechanisms identifies hierarchical control, inspection, and institutional monitoring as important means of preserving compliance within public organizations (42). Internal oversight also has a preventive function because officials who know that conduct is subject to routine review are more likely to comply with applicable procedures. Research concerning internal administrative oversight and official integrity similarly emphasizes the connection between supervision and the development of a professional administrative culture (29).

Disciplinary liability is a key component of this internal accountability structure. Public employment creates duties that are different in nature from the obligations of private individuals because public officials exercise authority and

perform functions directed toward collective interests. Failure to comply with official obligations may therefore justify disciplinary sanctions even when the misconduct does not constitute a criminal offense. Iraqi legal analysis of disciplinary liability emphasizes both the importance of sanctions and the procedural guarantees that should govern administrative trials or disciplinary proceedings (43). These safeguards are essential because accountability must itself conform to legality. An administrative system cannot credibly promote responsible government if disciplinary powers are used arbitrarily, selectively, or for retaliatory purposes. Proper disciplinary accountability therefore requires clearly defined duties, proportionate sanctions, fair procedures, opportunities to respond to allegations, and access to appropriate review.

Disciplinary sanctions also play an anti-corruption role because they provide administrative institutions with tools for addressing misconduct without waiting for criminal prosecution. Scholarship concerning disciplinary sanctions and administrative corruption highlights their preventive and corrective functions within the public service (44). An employee who violates procurement rules, disregards financial controls, conceals official information, abuses administrative authority, or fails to comply with oversight requirements may be subject to disciplinary action even where the conduct does not meet the evidentiary or substantive requirements of a criminal offense. This distinction allows the administration to protect professional standards and institutional discipline. However, disciplinary procedures should not be used to shield serious corruption from criminal investigation. Administrative and criminal forms of responsibility must remain complementary rather than mutually exclusive.

The relationship between disciplinary and criminal liability is therefore central to a comprehensive accountability system. A single act may constitute both a breach of public-service duties and a criminal offense. Bribery, embezzlement, abuse of influence, intentional damage to public property, or other serious misconduct can affect the proper operation of administration while also threatening broader social and financial interests protected by criminal law. The legal literature concerning criminal responsibility of public officials for corruption offenses emphasizes the special seriousness of crimes committed through official position because the perpetrator exploits authority granted for public purposes (45). The distinction between criminal and disciplinary accountability lies in their legal basis and objectives, but both contribute to preventing impunity. Analysis of the relationship between the two forms of responsibility confirms that disciplinary proceedings protect the proper functioning of public service, whereas criminal proceedings protect wider societal interests (16). Effective accountability requires clear procedures for referral and coordination so that administrative findings involving possible criminal conduct are transmitted to competent authorities.

The protection of public resources illustrates why this coordination is necessary. Oversight institutions may discover an irregular payment, unauthorized contract, or unexplained loss of public funds. Internal administrative review may establish that officials violated procedural duties. A specialized investigative body may then identify evidence suggesting bribery or embezzlement, while a court ultimately determines criminal responsibility. The accountability process therefore moves through several institutional stages. Criminal policy addressing offenses against public funds recognizes the importance of strong legal consequences where public office is used to harm collective resources (46). Yet effective protection depends upon the earlier mechanisms that make such conduct visible. Financial auditing, administrative documentation, internal supervision, disclosure, and judicial review are therefore part of the same accountability ecosystem.

The Iraqi and Egyptian systems both contain such mechanisms, but they differ in institutional configuration and historical development. Egypt's State Council provides a long-established center of administrative jurisprudence

and has played a significant role in defining the limits of administrative discretion. Iraq's administrative judiciary has developed within a different institutional trajectory and continues to strengthen its role in reviewing administrative decisions and protecting public employment. Nevertheless, the substantive challenges faced by the two systems are similar. Judicial review may become less effective if access to courts is procedurally difficult, litigation is excessively slow, administrative records are incomplete, or judicial decisions are not adequately implemented. Internal accountability may become ineffective when institutional hierarchies discourage reporting, disciplinary mechanisms are selectively applied, or oversight units lack independence. External oversight may identify irregularities without ensuring corrective action. Information rights may exist without practical access. The effectiveness of administrative law must therefore be evaluated through the entire chain of accountability rather than by reference to isolated institutions.

A major comparative issue concerns the relationship between administrative discretion and accountability. Modern governments require substantial discretion because legislation cannot predetermine every factual situation encountered by public administration. Excessively rigid administrative rules may reduce efficiency and prevent officials from responding appropriately to complex circumstances. Yet discretion creates opportunities for unequal treatment, favoritism, and misuse of power if its exercise is not accompanied by transparent procedures and review. The legal regulation of discretion should consequently focus not only on restricting administrative choice but also on requiring a rational connection between decisions, evidence, statutory purposes, and the public interest. Egyptian analysis of discretionary power and judicial review demonstrates how courts can preserve administrative flexibility while preventing deviation from lawful objectives (38). Iraqi jurisprudence on abuse of authority similarly demonstrates that discretionary power remains reviewable where evidence indicates that administrative authority has been diverted toward an improper purpose (40). Transparency strengthens this review because reasoned decisions and accessible administrative records make it easier to determine whether discretion was exercised legitimately.

Administrative accountability also depends on institutional culture. Legal rules can prescribe disclosure and sanctions, but officials may continue to treat information as organizational property, regard oversight as hostile interference, or resist external scrutiny. A culture of accountability requires the normalization of documentation, explanation, cooperation with auditors, implementation of recommendations, and acceptance that public power carries obligations of justification. Governance and transparency reforms in Iraqi administration highlight the importance of moving beyond formal legislation toward changes in administrative behavior (5). Comparable concerns arise in Egypt, where developed legal institutions must continually adapt to more complex administrative functions and increased expectations of public openness. Training, professional ethics, objective performance evaluation, and protection for lawful reporting of misconduct can support such cultural change. Administrative law cannot create integrity solely through sanctions; it must also structure institutional incentives that make lawful and transparent conduct the ordinary mode of administration.

Another central challenge is the effectiveness of oversight recommendations. Audit and inspection institutions frequently identify deficiencies and propose corrective measures, but accountability is weakened if administrative entities are free to ignore recommendations without explanation. Supreme oversight bodies must therefore operate within a follow-up framework that requires audited entities to respond, identify corrective actions, and explain non-compliance. Research on supreme oversight bodies and financial corruption underscores the importance of connecting detection with enforcement and institutional correction (35). Modern financial oversight likewise requires

adequate resources and mechanisms for continuing evaluation rather than isolated reports (34). Public reporting on the implementation of recommendations can further strengthen transparency because it enables legislatures, civil society, and citizens to distinguish between institutions that correct identified deficiencies and those that repeatedly fail to act.

Digital administration offers important opportunities for strengthening both transparency and accountability in Iraq and Egypt. Electronic procurement, digital budget management, electronic document systems, online publication platforms, and automated audit trails can reduce opportunities for undocumented intervention and make administrative conduct easier to trace. Digital systems may also facilitate access to information by allowing citizens to retrieve records without navigating complex administrative procedures. Yet technological reform must be integrated with legal principles. Digital opacity can be as problematic as paper-based secrecy if systems do not disclose relevant criteria, records are inaccessible, or institutional responsibility for electronic decisions is unclear. Administrative law must therefore ensure that digital transformation preserves principles of reason-giving, documentation, reviewability, and responsibility. Technology should strengthen the accountability chain rather than create new areas in which governmental decision-making becomes technically difficult to examine.

The comparative assessment consequently shows that effective accountability requires a combination of judicial independence, administrative supervision, institutional coordination, transparent information systems, and enforceable responsibility. Egypt's administrative judiciary offers a strong institutional foundation for legal review, while Iraq's evolving administrative justice system demonstrates increasing potential to control unlawful administrative conduct. Iraq's Federal Board of Supreme Audit and Egypt's Central Auditing Organization provide specialized mechanisms for financial and performance scrutiny, while internal controls and disciplinary procedures operate within public administration itself. Each mechanism addresses a different point in the lifecycle of administrative conduct. Transparency makes that conduct visible; internal oversight identifies irregularities; external audit provides independent examination; administrative proceedings impose professional responsibility; judicial review protects legality; and criminal law addresses the most serious forms of corruption. The essential task of administrative law is to ensure that these mechanisms operate coherently rather than as disconnected institutions. The greater the degree of integration among disclosure, supervision, review, and responsibility, the more effectively administrative law can transform transparency and accountability from constitutional aspirations into routine characteristics of public governance.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of Iraq and Egypt demonstrates that administrative law occupies a decisive position in the achievement of transparency and accountability because it regulates both the exercise of public authority and the mechanisms through which that authority is observed, reviewed, corrected, and sanctioned. Transparency and accountability are not separate or merely aspirational principles. They form an interconnected legal structure in which transparency provides access to the information necessary for evaluating administrative conduct, while accountability ensures that unlawful, improper, or inefficient conduct generates an appropriate institutional response. The principle of legality connects these two functions by providing the normative standard against which administrative action is assessed. A transparent administration makes its procedures, decisions, records, and use of public resources sufficiently visible to permit scrutiny, whereas an accountable administration possesses functioning mechanisms through which officials and institutions must explain their conduct and accept the

consequences of legal violations. The central conclusion of this study is therefore that the effectiveness of administrative law cannot be measured simply by the quantity of constitutional provisions, statutes, oversight bodies, or judicial institutions available within a legal system. Its effectiveness depends on whether these elements operate together as an integrated system capable of converting legal norms into ordinary administrative practice.

The Iraqi and Egyptian experiences reveal substantial areas of convergence. Both legal systems recognize that public administration must remain subordinate to law, both provide mechanisms for overseeing the management of public resources, both maintain institutions responsible for financial and administrative control, and both recognize judicial review as an essential safeguard against unlawful administrative action. The two systems also demonstrate an increasing legal concern with integrity, anti-corruption measures, institutional supervision, and responsibility of public officials. Public funds are treated not as assets available for unrestricted governmental disposition but as resources entrusted to the state for public purposes. This principle has important implications for transparency because public authorities should be able to demonstrate how those resources are managed, and it has equally important implications for accountability because unlawful expenditure, misuse, or appropriation must generate legal consequences. The constitutional and institutional frameworks of both countries therefore provide a meaningful basis upon which more transparent and accountable systems of administration can be developed.

Important differences nevertheless remain. The Egyptian administrative system benefits from a long-established tradition of administrative adjudication centered on the State Council, which has contributed significantly to the development of principles controlling discretionary authority and unlawful administrative decisions. The constitutional recognition of access to official information also creates a comparatively explicit normative basis for administrative openness. Iraq, by contrast, has experienced a more recent process of institutional and constitutional reconstruction in which independent oversight institutions and administrative judicial mechanisms continue to develop their practical capacities. The Federal Board of Supreme Audit occupies an important constitutional position, but the Iraqi system faces a particularly significant need to strengthen the practical legal framework governing access to information and to improve coordination among institutions responsible for oversight, integrity, administration, and judicial control. These differences do not imply that one system has completely achieved transparency while the other has not. Rather, they demonstrate that each country encounters implementation difficulties arising from its institutional history, administrative culture, and legal structure.

One of the most significant findings of this study is that the principal weakness affecting transparency and accountability in both systems is not necessarily the absence of legal principles but the incomplete transformation of those principles into enforceable and routine administrative practices. Constitutional recognition of transparency has limited value where information is difficult to obtain. Institutional independence has limited value where oversight reports are not implemented. Judicial review has limited value where individuals encounter excessive procedural barriers or administrative bodies fail to respond effectively to judicial rulings. Disciplinary liability has limited value where sanctions are applied inconsistently, selectively, or without sufficient procedural guarantees. The gap between law and implementation therefore represents the central challenge. Closing that gap requires attention to the institutional processes through which legal principles operate rather than repeated reliance on general declarations of integrity or anti-corruption commitments.

The right of access to information should occupy a particularly important position in future administrative reform. Transparency cannot depend entirely on the willingness of individual officials to release information. Disclosure must be governed by clear legal obligations defining the categories of information that should be proactively

published, the procedures through which additional information may be requested, the permissible grounds for refusing disclosure, the deadlines governing administrative responses, and the remedies available when information is unlawfully withheld. Iraq in particular would benefit from a comprehensive framework capable of translating the principle of access to information into an enforceable administrative right. Such a framework should operate on the presumption that disclosure is the rule and secrecy the legally justified exception. Egypt should similarly continue to strengthen the practical implementation of its constitutional information guarantees so that formal recognition is reflected in predictable administrative procedures. In both systems, exceptions based on confidentiality should be interpreted narrowly enough to protect legitimate governmental interests without creating broad zones of administrative secrecy.

Proactive disclosure should accompany individual access rights. Public institutions should routinely make available information concerning their organizational structures, legal mandates, major decisions, procurement activities, public contracts, significant expenditures, implementation of public programs, performance indicators, and responses to oversight recommendations. Proactive publication reduces the burden on citizens seeking information and reduces the administrative burden created by repetitive information requests. More importantly, it changes the institutional understanding of information by treating openness as an ordinary obligation rather than an exceptional response. Digital administration can considerably facilitate this transformation, provided that electronic systems are designed around principles of accessibility, traceability, record preservation, and institutional responsibility. Digitalization should not merely reproduce existing bureaucratic procedures in electronic form. It should be used to simplify access, strengthen audit trails, standardize procedures, reduce undocumented intervention, and make administrative performance more readily subject to evaluation.

The independence and effectiveness of oversight institutions should also be strengthened. Formal guarantees of independence must be supported by adequate financial resources, professional personnel, technical capabilities, access to administrative records, and protection from improper interference. Oversight bodies should possess the practical capacity to investigate complex government transactions and modern forms of administrative and financial misconduct. The increasing digitalization of governmental activity requires auditors and oversight officials to possess expertise in electronic records, data analysis, digital procurement systems, and other technical areas. Institutional independence should also extend to reporting. Oversight authorities must be capable of presenting findings accurately and transmitting them to the appropriate institutions without unreasonable obstruction or alteration.

Equally important is the development of systematic procedures for following up oversight findings. Every significant finding should generate an identifiable institutional response. The relevant administrative body should be required to indicate whether it accepts the finding, what corrective measures it intends to take, who is responsible for implementation, and when corrective action should be completed. Failure to implement recommendations should itself become visible to supervising institutions and, where appropriate, to the public. This process would transform oversight from a periodic reporting activity into a continuing cycle of detection, correction, evaluation, and institutional learning. It would also make it possible to distinguish isolated violations from recurring structural problems, allowing administrative reform to address the organizational conditions that repeatedly produce non-compliance.

The relationship among oversight institutions requires comparable attention. The complexity of contemporary administration means that no single institution can independently perform all functions associated with transparency

and accountability. Internal administrative controls are best positioned to detect many problems at an early stage. Supreme audit institutions possess technical expertise in examining financial and administrative performance. Anti-corruption bodies are equipped to investigate suspected corruption. Administrative authorities possess disciplinary powers over public officials. Prosecutorial and criminal institutions address conduct amounting to criminal offenses. Administrative courts review the legality of administrative decisions. Legislative bodies exercise political and financial scrutiny. These institutions should not be viewed as competing centers of authority but as components of a common accountability structure. Clear jurisdictional boundaries, lawful information-sharing procedures, and mechanisms for referral are necessary to prevent duplication and institutional gaps.

Judicial review should remain a central safeguard because administrative accountability ultimately requires an authority capable of determining legality independently from the executive administration. Both Iraq and Egypt should ensure that access to administrative justice is procedurally realistic and that individuals can challenge administrative decisions without disproportionate obstacles. Courts must be able to obtain the records necessary to evaluate contested administrative action, particularly where allegations concern abuse of power, favoritism, improper purpose, or misuse of discretion. Administrative bodies should also be required to respect and implement judicial decisions promptly. Judicial specialization in complex administrative and corruption-related disputes can further strengthen the quality and consistency of review.

The control of discretionary authority is particularly important for the future development of accountability. Public administration cannot function effectively without discretion, and administrative reform should not attempt to eliminate it. The objective should instead be to ensure that discretion remains connected to lawful purposes, objective evidence, equal treatment, and reasoned decision-making. Requiring important administrative decisions to be documented and adequately reasoned would improve both transparency and judicial review. A clear statement of reasons enables affected persons to understand why a decision was made, enables supervisory authorities to determine whether relevant considerations were taken into account, and enables courts to examine whether discretion was exercised for lawful purposes. Reason-giving should therefore be regarded as a bridge between administrative efficiency and accountability rather than as an unnecessary procedural burden.

Disciplinary accountability must likewise be strengthened while maintaining procedural fairness. Public officials should understand the duties associated with their positions and the consequences of misconduct, including failure to cooperate with lawful oversight, concealment of administrative records, abuse of authority, improper interference in public contracting, or unlawful management of public resources. Sanctions should be proportionate and consistently applied. At the same time, officials accused of misconduct must receive appropriate guarantees of defense and review. Accountability that disregards due process risks becoming another form of arbitrary administrative power and may discourage professional independence. The objective is not to create an excessively punitive public administration but to establish a credible framework in which authority and responsibility correspond.

Administrative accountability should also include positive institutional incentives. Training programs should familiarize officials with transparency obligations, information-access procedures, public-service ethics, conflict-of-interest principles, and cooperation with oversight authorities. Performance evaluation should take account of legal compliance and transparency rather than focusing solely on quantitative administrative outputs. Officials who identify serious irregularities through lawful internal channels should receive appropriate protection against retaliation. Public institutions should also treat recurring audit findings and judicial annulments as sources of

organizational learning. Where the same type of violation occurs repeatedly, the problem may arise not merely from individual misconduct but from unclear procedures, weak supervision, or structural incentives requiring reform.

The comparative experience ultimately demonstrates that the protection of public resources, the prevention of administrative corruption, and the strengthening of public confidence cannot be achieved through criminal law or anti-corruption institutions alone. These objectives require an administrative environment in which decisions are documented, relevant information is accessible, oversight institutions are independent, internal controls function continuously, courts can effectively review administrative action, and public officials know that misuse of authority will produce enforceable consequences. Transparency and accountability must therefore be incorporated into the ordinary architecture of administration rather than activated only after a scandal or serious financial violation occurs.

The future development of administrative law in Iraq and Egypt should consequently move toward a preventive model of accountable governance. In such a model, transparency reduces the opportunity for concealed misconduct, internal oversight identifies deficiencies at an early stage, external institutions provide independent verification, administrative responsibility corrects professional violations, judicial review protects legality, and criminal justice addresses the most serious forms of corruption. The strength of the system lies not in any single mechanism but in the continuous interaction among them. The most important reform objective is therefore institutional integration: information must lead to scrutiny, scrutiny must lead to findings, findings must lead to corrective action, and unlawful conduct must lead to appropriate responsibility.

Administrative law can make a decisive contribution to this process because it governs the everyday operation of the state. Constitutional principles may establish broad commitments to legality, integrity, and public responsibility, but administrative law determines how public authorities make decisions, maintain records, exercise discretion, respond to information requests, manage public resources, supervise officials, cooperate with auditors, and implement judicial rulings. Transparency and accountability become effective precisely at this level of routine administration. The ultimate challenge for Iraq and Egypt is therefore not simply to adopt additional legal texts but to build administrative practices in which openness, justification, supervision, and responsibility become normal characteristics of public power. Achieving this objective would narrow the distance between formal law and administrative reality, improve the protection of public resources, reduce opportunities for abuse of authority, strengthen institutional performance, and reinforce public confidence in the rule of law.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our appreciation and gratitude to all those who helped us carrying out this study.

Authors' Contributions

All authors equally contributed to this study.

Declaration of Interest

The authors of this article declared no conflict of interest.

Ethical Considerations

All ethical principles were adhered in conducting and writing this article.

Transparency of Data

In accordance with the principles of transparency and open research, we declare that all data and materials used in this study are available upon request.

Funding

This research was carried out independently with personal funding and without the financial support of any governmental or private institution or organization.

References

1. al-Jubouri HH. The Principle of Legality and Its Impact on Public Administration. Baghdad: Dar al-Sanhouri; 2019.
2. al-Otaibi AS. Administrative Transparency and Combating Corruption. Cairo: Center for Arab Studies; 2018.
3. al-Shukri AY. Constitutional Protection of Public Funds in Iraq. Al-Muhaqqiq al-Hilli Journal of Legal and Political Sciences. 2018.
4. Muhammad AAa-F. Constitutional Safeguards for Combating Corruption and Protecting Public Funds. Journal of Legal and Economic Research on Law. 2021.
5. Shabbar MK. Governance and Transparency in Iraqi Administration. Baghdad: Dar al-Murtada; 2023.
6. Sorour AF. The Role of the State Council in Protecting Legality and Combating Administrative Corruption. Journal of Legal and Economic Research on Law. 2019.
7. Abd al-Wahhab MRa. Egyptian Constitutional Law. Alexandria: Dar al-Jami'a al-Jadida; 2018.
8. Abd al-Tawab S. Constitutional Safeguards of the Right to Information. Cairo: Dar al-Nahda al-Arabiya; 2018.
9. Hassan IA. Performance Auditing in Government Institutions. Cairo: Dar al-Nahda al-Arabiya; 2020.
10. Shalal ZNm. Supreme Financial Oversight Bodies in Comparative Legislation. Al-Rafidain Journal of Law. 2022.
11. al-Dulaimi AF. Public Financial Administration in Iraq between Legislation and Practice. Baghdad: Dar al-Kutub al-Qanuniyya; 2021.
12. Hilmi M. The Financial System in the Egyptian Constitution. Alexandria: Dar al-Fikr al-Jami'i; 2017.
13. Hamza QAa-J. Administrative Accountability in Light of the Requirements of Transparency. Journal of Legal Sciences. 2023.
14. al-Karaawi JH. Integrity and Transparency in Public Administration. Baghdad: Sabah Library; 2020.
15. al-Din AJ. Open Administration and Combating Corruption. Alexandria: Dar al-Jami'a al-Jadida; 2021.
16. al-Saeed MH. The Relationship between Disciplinary Liability and Criminal Liability of Public Officials. Journal of Sharia and Law. 2021.
17. Alwan Aa-K. Constitutional Law and the Development of Political Systems. Amman: Maktabat al-Thaqafa for Publishing and Distribution; 2014.
18. Abdullah AAa-M. The Constitutional Right to Freedom of Information and Its Impact on Government Performance. Journal of Sharia and Law. 2020.
19. al-Bishri MA. The Right to Knowledge in Public Law. Alexandria: Dar al-Fikr al-Jami'i; 2019.
20. Nasr MM. Government Documents and Oversight of Public Funds. Mahalla al-Kubra: Dar al-Kutub al-Qanuniyya; 2019.
21. al-Mousawi HA. The Legal Framework for Freedom of Access to Information in Iraq. Risalat al-Huquq Journal. 2022.
22. Hassan SAa-H. Freedom of Information in International Instruments. Journal of Legal Research. 2021.
23. Jabr HK. Natural Resource Management under the Constitution of Iraq of 2005. Risalat al-Huquq Journal. 2020.
24. Hamoud SA. Constitutional Protection of Public Funds: A Comparative Study. Journal of Legal Sciences. 2022.
25. al-Ubaidi MAa-Z. Supreme Financial Oversight of Public Funds. Amman: Dar al-Hamid for Publishing and Distribution; 2018.
26. al-Akili AAa-A. Combating Administrative and Financial Corruption in Iraq. Baghdad: Maktabat al-Sanhouri; 2021.
27. al-Ani NA. Modern Systems of Administrative and Financial Oversight. Amman: Dar al-Thaqafa for Publishing and Distribution; 2017.
28. Yasin KM. Internal Oversight and Its Impact on the Protection of Public Funds. Journal of Legal Studies. 2018.

29. al-Shammari AAa-A. Internal Administrative Oversight and Its Impact on Strengthening Official Integrity. Kufa Journal of Legal and Political Sciences. 2021.
30. Abdullah SAa-H. The Central Auditing Organization and Its Role in Oversight of Public Funds. Alexandria: Dar al-Fikr al-Jami'i; 2017.
31. Abd al-Aziz MM. Parliamentary Financial Oversight in the Egyptian System. Journal of Legal and Economic Research. 2019.
32. al-Shadhili HM. Anti-Corruption Bodies in Egyptian Law. Mahalla al-Kubra: Dar al-Kutub al-Qanuniyya; 2021.
33. Jum'a AM. Financial Oversight of Public Funds. Cairo: Dar al-Nahda al-Arabiya; 2016.
34. Isa AAa-K. Contemporary Challenges of Government Financial Oversight. Journal of Law. 2022.
35. Mahmoud SAa-R. The Role of Supreme Oversight Bodies in Combating Financial Corruption. Journal of Legal and Political Sciences. 2020.
36. Khafaji MAa-W. Judicial Review of the Legality of Administrative Decisions. Journal of the Egyptian State Council. 2021(67).
37. Abd al-Ghani KAa-Mi. The Defect of Abuse of Authority in Comparative Administrative Judiciary. Journal of Legal and Economic Research. 2020.
38. Abd al-Hamid AM. The Discretionary Power of the Administration and the Limits of Judicial Review Thereof. Journal of Law and Economics. 2022.
39. Hamoud AH. The Jurisdiction of the Iraqi Administrative Judiciary in Reviewing Administrative Actions. Al-Muhaqqiq al-Hilli Journal of Legal and Political Sciences. 2021.
40. Muhammad KJ. Abuse of Authority as a Ground for Annulment of the Administrative Decision in the Iraqi Judiciary. Risalat al-Huquq Journal. 2022.
41. Ubayis HK. Judicial Protection of Public Office in the Iraqi Administrative Judiciary. Journal of Legal Sciences. 2023.
42. Abbas BK. Mechanisms of Administrative Oversight in Public Institutions. Al-Rafidain Journal of Law. 2020.
43. Salman HJ. Disciplinary Liability of Public Officials and Safeguards of Administrative Trial. Al-Qadisiyah Journal of Law and Political Science. 2022.
44. Sharif AM. The Role of Disciplinary Sanctions in Combating Administrative Corruption. Basra Studies Journal. 2021.
45. Abu Zaid MAa-H. Criminal Liability of Public Officials for Corruption Offenses. Police Thought Journal. 2020.
46. al-Ani SAa-K. Criminal Policy in Confronting Offenses against Public Funds. Journal of Anbar University for Legal and Political Sciences. 2023.