

УДК 342.9:343.352

Halyna LUKIANOVA

Lviv Polytechnic National University,
Educational and Research Institute of Law,
Psychology and Innovative Education,
Professor of the Administrative
and Informational Law Department,
Dr. Habil. (Law), Professor
halyna.y.lukianova@lpnu.ua
ORCID: 0000-0003-1109-9299

COORDINATION OF ENTITIES IN THE SPHERE OF ANTI-CORRUPTION: SHORTCOMINGS OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND LEGAL SUPPORT

<http://doi.org/10.23939/law2025.46.177>

© *Lukianova H.*, 2025

The relevance of the research topic of this scientific article lies in the fact that the coordination of activities of entities responsible for combating corruption serves as a fundamental factor in ensuring the effectiveness of anti-corruption policy. Proper coordination not only enables the determination of strategic objectives and delegation of functional responsibilities among anti-corruption entities but also accumulates their potential and resources to focus efforts on solving key tasks in the fight against corruption. This underscores the urgent need to establish a highly effective administrative and legal mechanism that would ensure effective coordination of anti-corruption entities. For Ukraine, an acceptable model of administrative and legal support for coordination must address modern challenges and threats, be based on democratic principles of public administration, comply with European standards, and facilitate Ukraine's integration into the legal framework of the European Union.

The scientific article focuses on identifying and analyzing the key shortcomings of the current system of administrative and legal support for coordinating anti-corruption entities. These include the lack of a systematic regulatory framework to govern the coordination of anti-corruption activities; the underestimation of the role of civil society organizations in coordination processes; and the lack of proper alignment of powers between coordination bodies. These shortcomings complicate the implementation of state anti-corruption policy, diminishing its efficiency and effectiveness. It is crucial to recognize that the absence of a clear hierarchy and procedures for interaction between bodies authorized to coordinate anti-corruption efforts is one of the key factors hindering the development of an effective management system in this area.

The study also examines the necessity of reforming the administrative and legal mechanism for coordinating entities in the context of integrating modern technologies. The introduction of electronic platforms for automating information exchange processes among anti-corruption entities can significantly enhance transparency and efficiency in their interactions. Additionally, strengthening cooperation between government bodies and civil society deserves particular attention, as it is an indispensable condition for establishing an effective anti-corruption environment.

The analyzed shortcomings are not solely organizational and legal in nature but also largely reflect broader issues in the functioning of public administration in Ukraine. Addressing these issues requires systematic reforms aimed at comprehensively updating administrative legislation, particularly by creating a clear hierarchical model of coordinating bodies that considers international standards and recommendations. Building an effective coordination system requires not only improving regulatory frameworks but also cultivating an institutional culture based on principles of transparency, accountability, and mutual responsibility among entities. Engaging the public in monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of anti-corruption entities can become a key element in increasing trust in anti-corruption policy.

Significant emphasis should be placed on strengthening international cooperation, particularly in adopting innovative approaches to coordinating anti-corruption entities. Collaboration with international organizations and the adoption of best global practices will help ensure the establishment of a sustainable and effective governance mechanism in this area.

Administrative and legal support for coordinating entities in the fight against corruption is a complex and multifaceted process that requires not only improving the regulatory framework but also a systematic approach to developing interaction mechanisms, engaging civil society, and integrating modern technologies into public administration practices.

The relevance of combating corruption in Ukraine in 2025 remains extremely high, as corruption continues to be one of the main obstacles to economic development and European integration. The conditions of martial law and the country's post-war recovery make the fight against corrupt schemes even more critical. Transparency in the distribution of international financial aid is a key factor in maintaining the trust of Western partners. Ukraine has committed to implementing anti-corruption reforms as required by the EU and the IMF, which is essential for further funding and progress toward EU membership. Effective anti-corruption efforts also impact national defense, as embezzlement in the military sector directly undermines state security. Increasing public trust in government institutions is possible only if corrupt officials are held accountable. The development of digitalized public services helps minimize human involvement in decision-making and reduces corruption risks. A major challenge remains judicial reform, as an independent and fair judiciary is crucial to eliminating impunity. Strengthening the work of the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine (NABU) and the High Anti-Corruption Court (HACC) will contribute to prosecuting top-level corrupt officials. The success of anti-corruption efforts in 2025 will determine not only Ukraine's economic and political stability but also its international reputation and prospects for full integration into the European Union.

Keywords: coordination, entities, anti-corruption, anti-corruption activities, administrative and legal support, regulatory framework, public administration, civil society, international cooperation, hierarchy of bodies, transparency, accountability, reform, regional programs, anti-corruption strategy.

Formulation of the problem. Coordination of the activities of entities involved in combating corruption serves as a fundamental mechanism that determines the effectiveness of implementing anti-corruption measures. Only synchronized and systematically integrated interaction enables not only the formulation of strategic priorities and the rational distribution of functional competences among relevant institutions but also ensures the optimal concentration of managerial resources on the most critical aspects of anti-corruption activities. This emphasizes the necessity of establishing a multi-level administrative and legal mechanism capable of ensuring a high level of institutional coordination among entities in the sphere of combating corruption.

In this context, it is crucial to develop a model of administrative and legal support that not only meets current societal challenges and global threats but also takes into account advanced technologies for combating corruption, aligns with the principles of democratic governance, and corresponds to Ukraine's

strategic course toward harmonization with the legal framework of the European Union. At the same time, ensuring an adequate level of coordination requires comprehensive consideration of both internal systemic dysfunctions of Ukrainian society and exogenous factors influencing the state of anti-corruption efforts, including Ukraine's international obligations enshrined in relevant conventions and agreements. It is worth noting that transformational processes in anti-corruption policy at the legislative level have been actively evolving for over a decade. During this period, extensive reconfiguration of the administrative and legal regulation of the prosecution service, as well as the National Agency for Corruption Prevention, has taken place. Within the framework of institutional optimization, several specialized bodies have been established, including the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine and the High Anti-Corruption Court, which provide a qualitatively new level of functional architecture for combating corruption risks.

The systemic complexity and multi-layered nature of the ongoing reforms dictate an urgent need to rethink the current system of administrative and legal support for the coordination of entities engaged in combating corruption. Special emphasis should be placed on identifying not only the structural, organizational, and regulatory deficiencies of this system but also the factors that have determined their emergence. Furthermore, it is advisable to develop effective mechanisms for addressing identified shortcomings, which requires an analysis of the resource efficiency of newly established bodies and the degree of their interaction necessary to ensure a comprehensive and systemic approach to combating corruption. Particular attention should be paid to the adaptive capacity of administrative and legal coordination mechanisms in responding to dynamic changes in the socio-economic and political-legal environment, considering contemporary challenges such as digitalization, globalization, and the increasing role of civil society in governance. Equally important is the development of integrated mechanisms for cooperative interaction between state institutions and the public sector, aimed at enhancing societal trust in anti-corruption policy. Thus, the effectiveness of administrative and legal coordination mechanisms among entities involved in combating corruption depends not only on the quality of the regulatory framework but also on the capacity of the system to adequately respond to current challenges, adapt to transformational processes, and harmonize with global standards. This underscores the urgent need for its comprehensive improvement at all levels of public administration.

Analysis of the study of the problem. The issue of deficiencies in the current state of administrative and legal support for the coordination of entities combating corruption remains insufficiently studied. Only certain aspects of this issue have been addressed in the scientific works of scholars such as A. Biletskyi, M. Buromenskyi, V. Demyanchuk, T. Yedynak, S. Zavadskyi, O. Zuban, L. Zubkova, Yu. Kovbasyuk, D. Kolesnikov, R. Melnyk, V. Mozhgovaya, O. Novikov, O. Pavlyshen, V. Pautov, Yu. Sudakov, K. Khromova, O. Yarmysh, H. Lukianova. However, the unsatisfactory effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts in Ukraine necessitates an analysis of the existing shortcomings in the current system of administrative and legal support for their coordination. In 2023, a concept was published that examines anti-corruption tools for combating corruption offenses, specifically analyzing the state of regulatory and legal frameworks for modern state anti-corruption policy in Ukraine. It emphasizes the need to update the legislative base to improve the effectiveness of entity coordination in this area. In 2024, O. Vasylenko devoted his scientific works to analyzing the regulatory and legal support for combating corruption in Ukraine, with particular attention to identifying entities involved in anti-corruption activities and evaluating their functional interaction within the existing system. In the same year, V. Denysenko, in his dissertation, thoroughly examined the administrative and legal foundations of national security, including aspects of coordination among entities responsible for combating corruption, with special attention to the synergy of intergovernmental and interinstitutional mechanisms.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of the scientific article is to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the shortcomings in the current administrative and legal support for the coordination of entities in the field of combating corruption. The article aims to identify the key problems of regulatory

frameworks, organizational interaction, and resource provision for the activities of anti-corruption bodies. Particular attention is paid to assessing the effectiveness of existing coordination mechanisms and their compliance with modern challenges and international standards. The scientific article seeks to determine the reasons for the low effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts and to propose ways to address identified shortcomings. The author aims to substantiate the need for reforming the administrative and legal system to improve the coherence of actions by entities involved in anti-corruption activities. Additionally, the article offers recommendations to enhance the efficiency of coordination in the field of combating corruption in the context of public administration reform.

Presenting main material. The current state of administrative and legal support for the coordination of entities combating corruption is characterized by complexities caused by numerous factors, such as the quality of anti-corruption and administrative legislation, economic conditions, and the professional level of officials. These factors form a complex issue that requires systematic analysis and a substantiated approach to improving coordination mechanisms.

A significant impact on the effectiveness of coordination among entities combating corruption stems from gaps in legislation, which create legal uncertainty and complicate interaction between state bodies. Insufficient attention to the professional training of officials reduces the effectiveness of anti-corruption policy implementation and creates risks of misconduct in the performance of official duties. Economic instability and financial dependency of authorities limit their ability to develop and implement strategic programs to counter corruption. The lack of clear criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of anti-corruption measures complicates the monitoring of their efficiency and the adjustment of strategies to meet societal needs. The interaction of entities combating corruption is often influenced by political factors, which may lead to conflicts of interest, lack of coordination, and delays in progress in combating corruption.

These aspects highlight the need for a comprehensive approach to analyzing and reforming the system of administrative and legal support for the coordination of anti-corruption activities.

The scholar V. A. Demianchuk considers the issues of interaction among anti-corruption entities to include: limited regulation of interaction, lack of detailed procedures for interaction, an insufficient number of regulatory legal acts governing interaction, and the absence of a mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of such interaction. The author suggests addressing these issues by introducing criteria for assessing the effectiveness of interaction and reducing political pressure on anti-corruption efforts [1, p. 100].

The issues related to the limited regulation of interaction and the insufficient number of regulatory legal acts are interdependent, as they indicate significant gaps in the formulation and implementation of measures aimed at coordinating the activities of entities involved in combating corruption. An additional complication is the unsatisfactory quality of existing regulatory legal acts in this area, which are largely of a subordinate nature and have not been adapted to the modern reforms of administrative and legal regulation, particularly concerning the activities of the Prosecutor's Office and the National Agency on Corruption Prevention. Derivative shortcomings include the absence of mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of coordination measures and the low level of detail in current provisions, as addressing these issues requires comprehensive improvement and expansion of the volume of regulatory legal acts, complemented by high-quality content that meets contemporary standards of legal drafting.

It is important to note that inadequate regulation of the coordination of anti-corruption entities not only hinders the interaction process but also creates conditions for duplication of functions and blurring of responsibilities among bodies. Moreover, regulatory uncertainty regarding interaction issues can lead to a decrease in public trust in anti-corruption policies as a whole, undermining their overall effectiveness. It should also be considered that existing subordinate acts often have a declarative nature, making their practical application at the stages of implementing anti-corruption measures nearly impossible. The lack of clear procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of coordination is a critical shortcoming that complicates the analysis of interaction results and the formulation of proposals for its improvement.

Another problem is the lack of institutional mechanisms to ensure systematic monitoring and revision of existing regulatory legal acts, taking into account changes in the socio-economic situation and the legal environment. In this regard, it would be advisable to establish specialized analytical units to coordinate the processes of developing and implementing new approaches to regulatory legal frameworks. The reform of the regulatory legal base should focus not only on its expansion but also on improving its quality by integrating innovative provisions that meet both national and international standards in the field of anti-corruption. The use of public-private partnership mechanisms in improving the regulatory framework can contribute to increasing its effectiveness and relevance to modern realities.

Thus, a systematic approach to resolving regulatory issues in the coordination of anti-corruption entities should include not only the improvement of the legislative framework but also active participation by civil society and the expert community in monitoring, evaluating, and developing new mechanisms for interaction.

The scholar K. I. Khromova believes that the mechanism for implementing anti-corruption coordination should be improved by introducing control over the execution of decisions made by coordination councils, as well as over the quality and completeness of such decisions, along with establishing accountability for improper execution or non-execution of these decisions [2, p. 7].

Administrative and legal regulation of the coordination of entities involved in combating corruption, in some cases, involves the use of flexible tools such as incentives and recommendations instead of rigid imperative approaches. In particular, these methods can be applied when organizing training activities to improve the qualifications of entities engaged in anti-corruption efforts. However, the use of such methods should not create conditions for ignoring decisions made during coordination meetings or reduce the binding nature of such decisions. One potential way to enhance the implementation of decisions by coordination bodies is to establish specialized oversight and monitoring institutions that ensure compliance with adopted decisions and the fulfillment of assigned duties in the field of anti-corruption. At the same time, a critically important aspect of the functioning of such institutions is ensuring their independence, both from other entities and from external political or administrative influence. The absence of guarantees for such independence could completely nullify their effectiveness, rendering their activities formal and ineffective.

Moreover, mechanisms of transparency must be implemented to enable public monitoring of the activities of oversight bodies and the evaluation of their effectiveness. The integration of civil society organizations into the process of monitoring the implementation of decisions by coordination councils could serve as an essential tool for increasing accountability and building trust in the results of anti-corruption activities. Additionally, attention should be given to improving mechanisms of legal liability for failure to implement or improper implementation of decisions made during coordination meetings. The introduction of a clear system of sanctions, aligned with the principles of legal certainty, could serve as an additional incentive for the proper execution of these decisions. Equally important is the development of standardized procedures for interaction between coordination councils and oversight bodies to ensure the prompt adoption and implementation of decisions. In this context, it would be worthwhile to consider international experience in establishing such procedures, particularly in countries that have demonstrated successful practices in combating corruption.

At the same time, it is necessary to assess the potential impact of introducing new oversight structures on the existing institutional system to avoid excessive administrative burdens and duplication of functions. Harmonization of the powers of all involved entities will help prevent conflicts of jurisdiction that could hinder the implementation of anti-corruption measures. Thus, the effective functioning of oversight bodies tasked with monitoring the implementation of coordination council decisions requires a comprehensive approach that includes legislative, institutional, and social dimensions. Only by ensuring the transparency, independence, and accountability of oversight bodies can a proper level of implementation of anti-corruption measures be achieved, thereby strengthening the overall effectiveness of the fight against corruption in the state.

The scholar V. O. Pautov proposes the creation of a coordination council that will align the activities of specialized anti-corruption institutions and address urgent issues related to their interaction [3, p. 203].

In modern conditions, the authority to coordinate activities in the field of combating corruption is distributed among such bodies as the Prosecutor's Office, the National Agency on Corruption Prevention, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, and the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, which defines the relevant powers at the legislative level. However, the absence of a single body responsible for continuous and uninterrupted coordination significantly complicates the establishment of effective cooperation among these entities, leading to the duplication of functions and fragmentation of efforts.

It should be emphasized that successful anti-corruption efforts are only possible through the joint actions of all public authorities, supported by active participation from civil society. Therefore, a critical task is to create administrative and legal mechanisms that ensure the consistency of coordination activities, as well as the implementation of decisions made during such coordination, in order to avoid formalism in their execution. It is evident that the current administrative and legal regulation of the coordination of anti-corruption entities has several significant shortcomings that require immediate resolution. In particular, the lack of adequate and comprehensive administrative legislation in this area creates legal gaps that hinder the effective performance of coordination functions and impede the achievement of systemic cooperation among the relevant bodies.

Additionally, the neglect of the role of civil society organizations in the coordination processes of anti-corruption entities significantly reduces the level of transparency and accountability in this work. This necessitates the development of mechanisms to involve public institutions, which would not only enhance the legitimacy of decisions made but also contribute to building public trust in the activities of anti-corruption bodies.

Another critical shortcoming is that the existing administrative legislation does not provide for clear coordination and alignment of the powers of entities involved in combating corruption. This results in conflicts of institutional competence, undermining the coherence of actions and hindering the effective achievement of the set goals.

In light of this, the reform of administrative and legal support for the coordination of anti-corruption entities must become a key priority of state policy. It should be based on the principles of comprehensiveness, inclusiveness, and efficiency, while ensuring active collaboration between government bodies, civil society, and international partners in this field.

The lack of adequate and sufficient administrative legislation regarding the coordination of activities of anti-corruption entities can be considered one of the key shortcomings of the current state of administrative and legal support for anti-corruption coordination. This deficiency has several dimensions of manifestation that are interdependent and, therefore, require a comprehensive solution.

First and foremost, this shortcoming is revealed through the absence of specialized normative legal acts that would regulate the coordination of activities of entities involved in combating corruption, apart from law enforcement agencies. The coordination of activities of the latter is carried out through the Order "On Coordination of Activities of Law Enforcement Agencies in the Field of Combating Crime and Corruption" [4] and the Regulation "On Coordination of Activities of Law Enforcement Agencies in Combating Crime and Corruption" [5].

The entities involved in combating corruption are not limited exclusively to law enforcement agencies. This category also includes civil society organizations, executive authorities, and local self-government bodies, which play a significant role in ensuring anti-corruption efforts. At the same time, the primary authority for coordinating the activities of specialized entities in the field of corruption prevention is vested in the National Agency on Corruption Prevention, while executive authorities operate within the framework of powers defined by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. However, the structure of these bodies lacks clearly designated coordination departments or units, and there are no regulatory acts that establish guidelines, timelines, methodological aspects of coordination, or expected outcomes of such activities.

The principal consequence of this organizational and legal gap is the lack of sufficient financial resources allocated for coordination activities, which are typically funded on a residual basis. Under such circumstances, coordination processes are fragmented and cover only a limited number of entities, complicating the systematic

approach to combating corruption and reducing public awareness of mechanisms to protect against corrupt practices. Addressing this issue requires the development of a new regulatory framework that would comprehensively govern the activities of entities in the field of anti-corruption coordination, including the establishment of clear timelines, responsibilities, obligations of parties, and accountability for inadequate performance or non-compliance with coordination decisions. To optimize the legal regulation of coordination activities, it is advisable to integrate the provisions of such regulatory acts with the Anti-Corruption Strategy, creating a unified conceptual foundation for the harmonized work of all entities. It is also crucial to introduce mechanisms for the regular monitoring of coordination effectiveness and its adaptation to dynamic changes in the socio-economic environment. Special attention should be paid to enhancing the institutional capacity of state authorities involved in anti-corruption activities by establishing specialized coordination units with clearly defined functional responsibilities.

In addition, an important reform direction should be the development of innovative information platforms for data exchange between entities combating corruption, which will facilitate the prompt adoption of coordination decisions. Mechanisms for the periodic involvement of civil society organizations in the development and evaluation of decisions in the field of anti-corruption coordination should also be introduced to strengthen public oversight. Finally, it is essential to ensure the creation of training programs for officials engaged in coordination activities in the field of corruption prevention to improve their professional competencies and familiarize them with modern international practices.

The next aspect of the identified deficiency in the administrative and legal support for the coordination of activities by anti-corruption entities is the insufficient level of detail in the forms of coordination. According to Article 4 of the Regulation “On the Coordination of Activities of Law Enforcement Agencies in Combating Crime and Corruption”, the forms of coordination include “coordination meetings”, as well as “joint sessions of various law enforcement agencies, interdepartmental meetings, issuance of joint orders or informational bulletins, exchange of information, implementation of coordinated measures to detect and prevent corrupt practices, joint field visits, creation of joint investigative and operational teams, leveraging opportunities for personnel training, conducting scientific research, and developing proposals to improve legal regulation” [5].

Thus, in theory, the existing forms of coordination cover both the theoretical aspects of combating corruption and practical anti-corruption measures. However, unresolved issues remain, such as determining leadership during joint operational and investigative actions, setting timeframes for joint field visits, establishing criteria for the necessity of joint actions, and defining the duration for coordinating joint scientific or educational activities. These gaps result in the extremely low effectiveness of such measures in practice.

Several documents outline the procedures for cooperation and information exchange among anti-corruption entities. These include the Memorandum of Cooperation and Information Exchange between the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine, the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine [6], as well as the Unified Principles of External Communication between the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine and the Specialized Anti-Corruption Prosecutor’s Office [7]. However, these documents are of a purely programmatic nature and lack actual legal force. Cooperation occurs outside the framework of formal coordination, which reduces its effectiveness and joint focus on combating corruption. The existence of separate acts on cooperation further complicates oversight of joint activities, making it impossible—or at least challenging—to ensure equality in cooperation among all anti-corruption entities and equal access to information for all participants.

The mechanisms for implementing forms of coordination among entities engaged in combating corruption are only partially regulated by existing legal provisions, which primarily address the organization of coordination meetings and the exchange of information. Resolving this issue could be achieved by developing separate legislative documents that would regulate the procedures for implementing each specific form of coordination. It is particularly important to ensure that all forms of coordination cover the full range of entities involved in anti-corruption activities, not just law enforcement agencies. An exception could be made for operational and investigative measures, which require specific

competencies and powers. Therefore, it would be appropriate to define a hierarchical structure for such interaction at the legislative level. Another critical aspect of the shortcomings related to the absence of a proper and comprehensive legal framework for coordinating anti-corruption activities is the issue of monitoring and oversight. Control should encompass not only the quality of decisions made during the coordination process but also their effective and timely implementation.

The scholar T. S. Yedynak aptly notes that although Ukraine has a large number of oversight and supervisory entities, they operate without proper interaction, functioning as separate, autonomous units. This lack of coordination negatively impacts public administration, resulting in duplication of efforts and inconsistencies [8, p. 4]. Oversight is an essential and integral stage of public administration, including anti-corruption policy and the fight against corruption.

One of the key tools for ensuring the implementation of decisions adopted during coordination meetings should be the presence of legal accountability. According to Article 8 of the Regulation “On the Coordination of Law Enforcement Agencies in Combating Crime and Corruption”, “the agreed resolution is mandatory for implementation by all designated agencies” [5]. However, this regulatory act does not specify the consequences of non-compliance or improper compliance with this provision. Considering the specific powers of the prosecutor, it would be appropriate to amend the Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offenses to include the relevant provision [9].

Since the legal interpretation of the prosecutor’s lawful demands is not clearly defined in legislation, it can be assumed that such demands may also extend to the implementation of coordination decisions. Within the framework of administrative and legal regulation of the activities of all entities involved in combating corruption, issues of administrative and disciplinary liability should be enshrined in a specialized regulatory act. This act should take into account the specifics of such decisions and provide a clear mechanism for monitoring their implementation. It is essential for the act to include provisions outlining the procedures for holding individuals accountable for improper execution or non-compliance with coordinated resolutions, as well as criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of their implementation.

Furthermore, it is advisable to designate a responsible entity for overseeing the enforcement of coordination decisions, granting it the authority to impose sanctions in cases of violations. This would help mitigate risks associated with a formal approach to implementing decisions and enhance the discipline of those responsible for their execution. Additionally, the possibility of public monitoring of the execution of coordination decisions by anti-corruption organizations should be incorporated to ensure transparency and build public trust in anti-corruption policies. Special attention should be given to introducing sanctions that not only incentivize compliance but also serve as a safeguard against similar violations in the future. Such an approach, combined with the detailed elaboration of legal norms, would address existing regulatory gaps and significantly improve the effectiveness of coordination activities in combating corruption.

The insufficiency and inadequacy of administrative legislation regulating the coordination of anti-corruption entities is one of the key deficiencies in the current system of administrative-legal regulation in this field. This issue manifests itself in the lack of proper control mechanisms, clearly defined legal liability, and the absence of normative regulation of various coordination forms for all authorized entities. An effective solution to this problem may be the development of a modern and comprehensive legal act that would cover all entities involved in anti-corruption activities without exception. Such a document should define the key concepts and principles of coordination, establish clear requirements for the entities performing coordination functions, provide criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of decisions, and ensure control mechanisms and legal responsibility for all parties involved. Furthermore, the new legal act should foresee procedures for regular monitoring and reporting on the implementation of coordination decisions, which would enhance transparency and accountability. Special attention should be given to regulating cooperation between state bodies, local self-government bodies, and civil society organizations to ensure the integration of efforts in the fight against corruption. The introduction of unified standards for conducting coordination activities, taking into account both national and regional specifics, would be appropriate. A separate section of the act may be devoted to legal and organizational mechanisms for responding to violations of coordination decisions, including disciplinary and

administrative sanctions. In the long term, the implementation of such normative regulation would contribute to the creation of a more effective system for coordinating anti-corruption activities and improving the overall effectiveness of public administration in this area.

An integral part of analyzing the current state of administrative and legal support for the coordination of anti-corruption entities is the neglect of the crucial role of non-governmental organizations. These organizations, being independent and objective participants in the legal system, possess sufficient legal potential to implement anti-corruption measures. The fight against corruption can be carried out through both the independent detection of corrupt activities and the provision of support to individuals whose rights have been violated as a result of corruption, as well as through monitoring and overseeing the activities of other anti-corruption entities. Expanding the influence of organizations focused on anti-corruption efforts will help shape a more conscious and responsible society and reduce the likelihood of corrupt relationships. At the same time, for greater effectiveness, their activities, like those of governmental anti-corruption bodies, must be coordinated, which should be supported and encouraged at the state level.

In studying the state of administrative and legal support for the activities of public councils at anti-corruption agencies, scholar A. V. Biletsky notes the need for the legislative establishment of the procedures for forming public councils, conducting open public oversight, and implementing decisions made after such oversight [10, p. 217]. A legislative definition of a unified procedure for the establishment of supervisory or controlling councils for all public organizations, along with the approval of requirements concerning the number of members and areas of activity, will facilitate the coordination of their work in detecting corruption and preventing it in the future. Coordinating the activities of public organizations in combating corruption will promote cooperation between them and government bodies, enhance legal education among the population, and enable the state to meet its oversight and monitoring needs without excessive funding or the creation of new bodies or territorial offices. Scholar O. V. Novikov observes that for over ten years, there has been a significant rise in the abuse of power by public organizations that carry out only formal tasks related to combating corruption or overseeing the activities of anti-corruption bodies, thereby obtaining funding from the state or international and foreign organizations. This situation negatively affects both the image of public organizations and the level of trust in them [11, p. 65].

Currently, there is a tendency for formal participation of civil society organizations in anti-corruption efforts, which is another significant drawback in the administrative and legal regulation of the coordination of their activities. This situation requires a comprehensive approach to legal regulation, including the establishment of legal liability for unlawful interference in the activities of civil society organizations that perform oversight and control functions, as well as introducing mechanisms to limit the participation of individuals connected to employees of anti-corruption agencies. Ignoring these aspects creates legal gaps that contribute to the formalization of civil society organizations' involvement, reducing the effectiveness of their activities.

The main drawback of the current administrative and legal provision for coordinating anti-corruption actors is the failure to fully realize the potential of civil society organizations in detecting and preventing corrupt practices, as well as controlling the activities of specially authorized bodies. Achieving real effectiveness in this area requires not only clearly defining the legal status of civil society organizations in anti-corruption efforts but also providing mechanisms to stimulate their active participation in anti-corruption initiatives. Only in this way can the real influence of civil society on processes aimed at reducing corruption within state structures be ensured.

Proper administrative and legal regulation should include an expanded legal framework that not only defines the legal status of civil society organizations but also specifies mechanisms for their interaction with other anti-corruption actors. In this context, it is important to establish a clear system of rights and obligations for these organizations, which would enhance their effectiveness in oversight, control, and participation in the development of anti-corruption policies. It is equally important to establish procedures to prevent abuse and ensure the transparency of their activities, thereby excluding formalism and the ineffective use of resources.

At the same time, a significant problem is the lack of harmonization of the powers of the entities coordinating the activities of anti-corruption organizations within the administrative legislation. Such inconsistency creates additional difficulties in the processes of interaction between state and civil society organizations and hinders the prompt response to corruption challenges. In this context, the development of a single legal act that would define common coordination and interaction mechanisms is necessary to ensure the effective functioning of the entire anti-corruption system. Therefore, to address the issues mentioned, it is essential to undertake a reform of the legal regulation of coordination activities in the field of anti-corruption, which would include not only strengthening administrative and legal provisions but also implementing effective mechanisms for control and legal responsibility for all participants in this process.

According to Article 11 of the Law of Ukraine “On Preventing Corruption,” the National Agency on Corruption Prevention is authorized to “coordinate, provide methodological support, and analyze the effectiveness of the activities of all bodies authorized to prevent and detect corruption” [12]. Furthermore, the National Agency on Corruption Prevention is responsible for developing the Anti-Corruption Strategy and determining the main directions of anti-corruption policy development. However, the issue of its interaction with other bodies responsible for coordinating anti-corruption activities, as well as their hierarchical subordination, is not clearly defined. For instance, according to Article 20 of the Law of Ukraine “On the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine,” the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine has the authority to “ensure the coordination of the activities of executive bodies in combating corruption” [13].

The aforementioned norm, which does not contain specific provisions regarding the mandatory adherence to the Anti-Corruption Strategy or prior coordination of plans with the National Anti-Corruption Agency, essentially deprives the anti-corruption management system of the necessary legal framework required to ensure high effectiveness and systemic action in the fight against corruption. This leads to significant gaps in the legal regulation of coordination processes, as the lack of clearly defined requirements for mandatory adherence to the strategy at both the national and regional levels greatly complicates the organization and implementation of joint anti-corruption initiatives. Furthermore, the situation is exacerbated by the absence of sufficient regulatory frameworks for coordinating the activities of law enforcement agencies, particularly the prosecutorial oversight, which negatively affects the coherence and transparency of actions in the fight against corruption at all levels of governance. This legal uncertainty and fragmentation of the law create significant difficulties in effectively formulating and executing anti-corruption plans. In such circumstances, officials responsible for fighting corruption do not always have a clear understanding of their functional duties and roles within this activity, leading to contradictions and often counterproductive approaches to addressing corruption issues. Consequently, this directly impacts the accuracy of statistical data regarding the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts, as numerous factors hindering the successful implementation of anti-corruption strategies are not taken into account, such as internal barriers and organizational shortcomings within the anti-corruption entities themselves.

Thus, it can be stated that the lack of proper legal coordination of powers among the entities responsible for coordinating anti-corruption activities is primarily due to the absence of a clearly defined hierarchical structure of the organs authorized to conduct such coordination. This leads to fragmentation of anti-corruption policy and its unsystematic implementation at various levels of public administration. To eliminate this deficiency, it is necessary to introduce a legally prescribed obligation to adhere to the Anti-Corruption Strategy at all stages of anti-corruption policy implementation and to require executive bodies to coordinate national and local anti-corruption programs in accordance with unified standards and requirements. An important step is the establishment of a specialized mechanism for holding coordination meetings at the highest level between the National Anti-Corruption Agency, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, and the Office of the Prosecutor General, which will ensure a comprehensive approach to solving the problem. The implementation of such an initiative will help eliminate legal conflicts, enhance the interaction between agencies and organizations responsible for fighting corruption, and create favorable conditions for the effective control and monitoring of anti-corruption activities.

Conclusions. As of 2025, the administrative and legal framework for coordinating entities in the fight against corruption in Ukraine requires significant modernization and systematic improvement. The low effectiveness of anti-corruption measures results from a number of issues caused by contradictions, insufficient consistency, and fragmentation within the current regulatory framework governing activities in this area. The lack of an effective mechanism for interaction between the entities involved in combating corruption leads to a negative perception of the work of anti-corruption institutions at the level of civil society, exacerbating the crisis of trust in state policy on corruption prevention.

A priority task remains the development and implementation of legislative acts that would ensure clear and comprehensive regulation of coordination measures for all entities involved in the fight against corruption, including not only law enforcement agencies but also other institutions and organizations. It is advisable not only to update the approaches to administrative and legal provision but also to detail the practical aspects of implementing various forms of coordination, as well as expanding the toolkit and methodologies aimed at increasing the effectiveness of this function. In the process of improving administrative and legal support, it is important to preserve and integrate existing achievements, particularly those related to the flexibility and structuring of coordination mechanisms that have already proven their effectiveness. Special attention should be given to the implementation of innovative methods for combating corruption that meet modern international and European standards. At the same time, a key task should be expanding the involvement of civil society organizations in coordination activities, which will contribute to increasing transparency, accountability, and the effectiveness of anti-corruption policy in Ukraine. To achieve significant improvement in the administrative and legal provision for coordinating anti-corruption entities, it is also necessary to consider new challenges, particularly the rapid digitalization of public administration and the threat of cyberattacks, which may complicate the functioning of anti-corruption mechanisms. An important aspect is the adaptation of the domestic legal system to the best practices of European Union countries, which involves not only borrowing individual norms but also implementing a systemic approach to corruption prevention and combating. In this regard, particular attention should be given to the development of integrated platforms for exchanging information between anti-corruption entities, which will allow for the optimization of communication and decision-making processes.

Additionally, it is necessary to expand monitoring and auditing capabilities of coordination measures, which will help identify and eliminate gaps in the anti-corruption policy system in a timely manner. Strengthening the role of analytical centers and independent experts, who can provide unbiased assessments of the effectiveness of anti-corruption institutions, plays an essential role in this. Moreover, mechanisms that encourage inter-agency cooperation at the horizontal level should be developed, which will minimize the duplication of functions and avoid conflicts of authority. It is also important to introduce new tools for public control, which will help increase the transparency and accountability of state actions in the fight against corruption. Another key requirement is the introduction of professional development programs for anti-corruption officials, focused on mastering modern management approaches and the use of digital technologies. Special attention should be given to the integration of sociological research into the process of evaluating anti-corruption activities, which will enable a more effective consideration of the attitudes and expectations of civil society. Finally, a strategic plan for reforming the coordination system of anti-corruption entities should be initiated, which would include phased steps and specific timelines for implementation, taking into account Ukraine's national interests and international obligations.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Дем'янчук В. А. (2018). Шляхи удосконалення рівня взаємодії між суб'єктами запобігання та протидії корупції в Україні. Правовий часопис Донбасу. № 1. С. 97–102.
2. Хромова К. І. (2016). Адміністративно-правові засади діяльності органів прокуратури України щодо протидії корупції: автореф. дис. ... канд. юрид. наук: 12.00.07 адміністративне право і процес; фінансове право; інформаційне право ХНУВС. Х., 22 с.

3. Паутов В. О. (2020). Протидія корупції, як структурна складова національної безпеки України: дис. ... канд. з державного управління: спец. 25.00.05. Київ, 236 с.
4. Про координацію діяльності правоохоронних органів у сфері про-тидії злочинності та корупції: Наказ Генерального прокуратури України від 16.01.2013 № 1. База даних “Законодавство України” / ВР України. URL: <https://cutt.ly/Hj4xyYz> (Дата звернення: 22.01.2025).
5. Про затвердження Положення “Про координацію діяльності пра-воохоронних органів по боротьбі із злочинністю та корупцією”: Наказ Генеральної прокуратури України, Міністерства внутрішніх справ України, Служби безпеки України, Державної податкової служби України, Міністерства оборони України, Державна ситна служба України, Адміністрація Державної прикордонної служби України, Державної пенітенціарної служби України від 26.04.2012 № 43/375/166/353/284/241/290/236. URL: <https://cutt.ly/Ij4vNtl> (Дата звернення: 22.01.2025).
6. Меморандум про співпрацю та обмін інформацією між Міністерством юстиції України, Національним антикорупційним бюро України та Міністерством внутрішніх справ України. URL: <https://cutt.ly/kkhRKEe> (Дата звернення: 22.01.2025).
7. Єдині принципи зовнішньої комунікації між Національним антикорупційним бюро України та Спеціалізованою антикорупційною прокуратурою. URL: <https://cutt.ly/KkhRXj> (Дата звернення: 22.01.2025).
8. Єдинак Т. С., Павлишен О. В. (2011). Контроль як функція державного управління: сутність та класифікація. Вісник Академії митної служби України. Сер. : Державне управління, № 1. С. 12–18.
9. Кодекс України про адміністративні правопорушення: Закон України від 07.12.1984 № 8073-X. База даних “Законодавство України” / ВР України. 1984. № 51. С. 1122.
10. Білецький А. В. (2017). Громадський контроль за діяльністю спеціалізованих суб’єктів запобігання корупції. Питання боротьби зі злочинністю. Вип. 33. С. 240–248.
11. Новіков О. В. (2019). Проблеми участі громадськості у запобіганні корупції в Україні. Питання боротьби зі злочинністю, Вип. 37. С. 58–72.
12. Про запобігання корупції: Закон України від 14.10.2014 № 1700-VII. База даних “Законодавство України” / ВР України, 2014. № 49. С. 3186.

REFERENCES

1. Dem'ianchuk, V. A. (2018). *Shlyakhy udoskonalennia rivnia vzaemodii mizh sub'iektamy zapobihannia ta protydii koruptsii v Ukraini* [Ways to improve the level of interaction between the subjects of corruption prevention and counteraction in Ukraine]. *Pravovyi chasopys Donbasu*, 1. P. 97–102. [In Ukrainian].
2. Khromova, K. I. (2016). *Administrativno-pravovi zasady diial'nosti orhaniv prokuratury Ukrainy shchodo protydii koruptsii: avtoreferat dys. ... kand. iuryd. nauk: 12.00.07 administratyvne pravo i protses; finansove pravo; informatsiine pravo KhNUVS* [Administrative and legal principles of the activities of the prosecution authorities of Ukraine regarding the fight against corruption: abstract of the diss. ... Candidate of Law: 12.00.07 administrative law and process; financial law; information law]. Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs. 22 p. [In Ukrainian].
3. Pautov, V. O. (2020). *Protydiia koruptsii, yak strukturna skladova natsional'noi bezpeky Ukrainy: dys.* [Counteraction to corruption as a structural component of Ukraine's national security: dissertation for a candidate of public administration degree: special. 25.00.05]. Kyiv. 236 p. [In Ukrainian].
4. *Pro koordynatsiiu diial'nosti pravookhoronnykh orhaniv u sferi protydii zlochynnosti ta koruptsii* [On the coordination of the activities of law enforcement agencies in the field of combating crime and corruption]: Nakaz Heneral'noi prokuratury Ukrainy vid 16.01.2013 No. 1. Baza danyh “Zakonodavstvo Ukrainy” / VR Ukrainy. Retrieved from: <https://cutt.ly/Hj4xyYz> (Accessed: 22.01.2025). [In Ukrainian].
5. *Pro zatverdzhennia Polozhennia “Pro koordynatsiiu diial'nosti pravookhoronnykh orhaniv po borot'bi iz zlochynnistiu ta koruptsii”* [On the approval of the Regulation “On the coordination of law enforcement agencies in the fight against crime and corruption”]: Nakaz Heneral'noi prokuratury Ukrainy, Ministerstva vnutrishnikh sprav Ukrainy, Sluzhby bezpeky Ukrainy, Derzhavnoi podatkovoi sluzhby Ukrainy, Ministerstva oborony Ukrainy, Derzhavna prykordonna sluzhba Ukrainy, Administratsiia Derzhavnoi prykordonnoyi sluzhby Ukrainy, Derzhavna penitentsiarna sluzhba Ukrainy vid 26.04.2012 No. 43/375/166/353/284/241/290/236. Retrieved from: <https://cutt.ly/Ij4vNtl> (Accessed: 22.01.2025). [In Ukrainian].
6. *Memorandum pro spivpratsiu ta obmin informatsiieiu mizh Ministerstvom iustytzii Ukrainy, Natsional'nym antykoruptsiynym biuro Ukrainy ta Ministerstvom vnutrishnikh sprav Ukrainy* [Memorandum of cooperation and information exchange between the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine, the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine]. Retrieved from: <https://cutt.ly/kkhRKEe> (Accessed: 22.01.2025). [In Ukrainian].

7. *Yedyni pryntsypy zovnishnoi komunikatsii mizh Natsional'nym antykoruptsiynym biuro Ukrainy ta Spetsializovanoi antykoruptsiynoiu prokuraturoiu* [Unified principles of external communication between the National Anti-Corruption Bureau of Ukraine and the Specialized Anti-Corruption Prosecutor's Office]. Retrieved from: <https://cutt.ly/KkhRXjt> (Accessed: 22.01.2025). [In Ukrainian].

8. Yedynak, T. S., Pavlyshen, O. V. (2011). *Kontrol' yak funktsiia derzhavnoho upravlinnia: sutnist' ta klasyfikatsiia* [Control as a function of public administration: essence and classification]. Visnyk Akademii mytnoi sluzhby Ukrainy. Ser.: Derzhavne upravlinnia, 1. P. 12–18. [In Ukrainian].

9. *Kodeks Ukrainy pro administratyvni pravoporushennia* [Code of Ukraine on Administrative Offenses]: Zakon Ukrainy vid 07.12.1984 No. 8073-X. Baza danyh "Zakonodavstvo Ukrainy" / VR Ukrainy, 51. P. 1122. [In Ukrainian].

10. Bilets'kyi, A. V. (2017). *Hromadskyi kontrol' za diial'niustiu spetsializovanykh sub'iektiv zapobihannia koruptsii* [Public control over the activities of specialized subjects of corruption prevention]. Pytannia borot'by zi zlochynnistiu, 33. P. 240–248. [In Ukrainian].

11. Novikov, O. V. (2019). *Problemy uchasti hromadskosti u zapobihannii koruptsii v Ukraini* [Problems of public participation in preventing corruption in Ukraine]. Pytannia borot'by zi zlochynnistiu, 37. P. 58–72. [In Ukrainian].

12. *Pro zapobihannia koruptsii* [On the prevention of corruption]: Zakon Ukrainy vid 14.10.2014 No .1700-VII. Baza danyh "Zakonodavstvo Ukrainy" / VR Ukrainy, 49. P. 31–86. [In Ukrainian].

Дата надходження статті: 02.01.2025 р.

Галина ЛУК'ЯНОВА

Національний університет "Львівська політехніка",

Навчально-науковий інститут

права, психології та інноваційної освіти,

професор кафедри адміністративного

та інформаційного права,

доктор юридичних наук, професор

halyna.y.lukianova@lpnu.ua

ORCID: 0000-0003-1109-9299

КООРДИНАЦІЯ СУБ'ЄКТІВ У СФЕРІ ПРОТИДІЇ КОРУПЦІЇ: НЕДОЛІКИ АДМІНІСТРАТИВНО-ПРАВОВОГО ЗАБЕЗПЕЧЕННЯ

Актуальність проблематики дослідження наукової статті полягає у тому, що координація діяльності суб'єктів, відповідальних за протидію корупції, є фундаментальним чинником забезпечення ефективності антикорупційної політики. Належна координація дає змогу не просто визначати стратегічні цілі та делегувати функціональні обов'язки між суб'єктами протидії корупції, але й акумулювати їхній потенціал і ресурси для зосередження зусиль на вирішенні ключових завдань у боротьбі з корупцією. Це зумовлює нагальну потребу у формуванні високоефективного адміністративно-правового механізму, який би забезпечував дієву координацію суб'єктів протидії корупції. Прийнятною для України може вважатися лише така модель адміністративно-правового забезпечення координації, яка відповідає сучасним викликам і загрозам, базується на демократичних засадах державного управління, враховує європейські стандарти і сприяє інтеграції України до правового простору Європейського Союзу.

У науковій статті акцентовано увагу на виявленні та аналізі ключових недоліків сучасної системи адміністративно-правового забезпечення координації суб'єктів протидії корупції, відсутності систематизованої нормативної бази, яка б забезпечувала регулювання координації суб'єктів антикорупційної діяльності; недооцінці значення громадських організацій у процесах координації; відсутності належної узгодженості між повноваженнями органів, що здійснюють координацію. Зазначені недоліки ускладнюють реалізацію державної антикорупційної політики, знижуючи її ефективність і

результативність. Важливо розуміти, що брак чіткої ієрархії та процедур взаємодії між органами, уповноваженими здійснювати координацію у сфері протидії корупції, є одним із ключових чинників, що гальмує процес формування ефективної системи управління у цій сфері.

Також розглядається потреба реформування адміністративно-правового механізму координації суб'єктів у контексті інтеграції новітніх технологій. Запровадження електронних платформ для автоматизації процесів обміну інформацією між суб'єктами протидії корупції може істотно покращити прозорість і оперативність їхньої взаємодії. Окрім того, особливого акценту потребує посилення співпраці між державними органами та громадянським суспільством, що є невід'ємною умовою для формування ефективного антикорупційного середовища.

Проаналізовані недоліки мають не лише організаційно-правовий характер, але й значною мірою відображають загальні проблеми функціонування публічної адміністрації в Україні. Для подолання їх потрібно запровадити системні реформи, спрямовані на комплексне оновлення адміністративного законодавства, зокрема створення чіткої ієрархічної моделі органів, що здійснюють координацію, з урахуванням міжнародних стандартів і рекомендацій. Розбудова ефективної системи координації потребує не лише вдосконалення нормативно-правового регулювання, але й формування відповідної інституційної культури, яка б базувалася на принципах прозорості, підзвітності та взаємної відповідальності суб'єктів. Залучення громадськості до процесів моніторингу й оцінки ефективності діяльності суб'єктів протидії корупції може стати одним із ключових елементів, які сприятимуть підвищенню довіри до антикорупційної політики. Значний акцент має бути зроблений на посиленні міжнародного співробітництва, зокрема у питаннях впровадження інноваційних підходів до координації суб'єктів протидії корупції. Співпраця з міжнародними організаціями та запозичення кращих світових практик допоможуть забезпечити формування стійкого й ефективного механізму управління у цій сфері.

Адміністративно-правове забезпечення координації суб'єктів у сфері протидії корупції є складним і багатогранним процесом, який потребує не лише вдосконалення нормативної бази, але й системного підходу до розробки механізмів взаємодії, залучення громадянського суспільства та інтеграції сучасних технологій у практику державного управління.

Актуальність протидії корупції в Україні у 2025 році залишається надзвичайно високою, оскільки корупція продовжує бути однією з головних перешкод на шляху економічного розвитку та євроінтеграції. Умови воєнного стану та відновлення країни після масштабних руйнувань роблять боротьбу з корупційними схемами ще більш критичною. Прозорість у розподілі міжнародної фінансової допомоги є ключовим фактором довіри з боку західних партнерів. Україна зобов'язалася перед ЄС та МВФ реалізовувати антикорупційні реформи, що є неодмінною умовою для подальшого фінансування та наближення до членства в ЄС. Ефективна боротьба з корупцією також впливає на обороноздатність країни, оскільки розкрадання у військовій сфері безпосередньо підриває безпеку держави. Підвищення рівня довіри громадян до державних інституцій можливе лише за умови реальних покарань для корупціонерів. Розвиток цифровізації державних послуг допомагає мінімізувати людський фактор у прийнятті рішень та зменшує корупційні ризики. Важливим викликом залишається судова реформа, адже без незалежної та справедливої судової системи неможливо подолати безкарність. Посилення роботи Національного антикорупційного бюро (НАБУ) та Вищого антикорупційного суду (ВАКС) сприятиме притягненню топ-корупціонерів до відповідальності. Успіх антикорупційної боротьби у 2025 році визначатиме не лише майбутнє економіки та політичної стабільності України, а й її міжнародну репутацію та шанси на повноправну інтеграцію до Європейського Союзу.

Ключові слова: координація, суб'єкти, протидія корупції, антикорупційна діяльність, адміністративно-правове забезпечення, нормативна база, державне управління, громадянське суспільство, міжнародна співпраця, ієрархія органів, прозорість, підзвітність, реформування, регіональні програми, антикорупційна стратегія.