INTRODUCTION
Anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and their drafts is one of the most effective measures to prevent corruption. The institution of anti-corruption expertise as a tool for preventing corruption has appeared in the arsenal of law enforcement officers relatively recently. The use of such an anti-corruption tool is provided for by several international and Russian regulatory legal acts. However, the practice of implementing such expertise in practice has shown that there are problems in the legislative consolidation of the expertise under study and the existing law enforcement practice. This is the reason for the authors' interest in analyzing this particular topic in this study, since the solution of these problems, in their opinion, will significantly improve the effectiveness of corruption prevention in the future.

METHODS
We used a complex of general scientific and private scientific methods within the framework of the study. In particular, the methodological basis of the work was the methods of dialectics as a general scientific method of cognition, as well as such private scientific methods as formal-legal, comparative-legal, historical-logical, the method of legal modeling in their various combinations, which made it possible to conceptually consider the most important theoretical and practical problems of organizing and conducting anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their projects.

RESULTS
The stability of political and other state systems directly depends on the level of corruption prevalence in the state and the presence of joint efforts of society and political elites aimed at eliminating the causes and conditions that contribute to the growth of corruption offenses.

Modern Russia is actively developing the legal concept of effectively countering the spread of corruption in society, including improving anti-corruption strategic planning regulations, which, following the documents on their implementation, constitute a reliable Russian system for combating and preventing corruption (FOMENKO, 2020).

Russia has ratified international conventions and other international legal acts in the field of combating corruption. Since their adoption, there has been an active process of implementing the provisions of the ratified acts, which undoubtedly has a positive impact on combating corruption in the country and improving the effectiveness of its anti-corruption policy.

The idea of the need for anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts at the international level was enshrined for the first time, in the United Nations Convention, which established that: “Each State Party shall endeavor to periodically assess the relevant legal instruments and administrative measures to determine their adequacy in terms of preventing and combating corruption”.
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Anti-corruption expertise in article 14 of the Model Law "Fundamentals of Legislation on Anti-Corruption Policy" was initially defined as a type of criminological expertise, the procedure for conducting of which, the status of experts and the consequences of receiving negative conclusions during such expertise were determined by the law and the regulatory legal acts of the state subjects adopted following it. In addition, the norm stipulates that the anti-corruption expertise of national laws and their drafts establishing civil, disciplinary, administrative, or criminal liability, as well as other normative legal acts and their drafts relating to the priority areas of legal regulation of anti-corruption policy, is mandatory (NAIDENKO; TIKHOMIROV; KHABRIEVA, 2010, p. 23-24).

The mechanism of examination of regulatory legal acts and their drafts on corruption in the executive authorities was first disclosed in the Concept of Administrative Reform in the Russian Federation in 2006-2010. Such expertise has been introduced since 2009 on a systematic basis. After the approval of the resolutions of the Government of the Russian Federation, Anti-corruption expertise of legal acts was defined as the activity of specialists (experts) to identify and describe corruptogenic factors related to the current legal acts and their projects; to develop recommendations aimed at eliminating or limiting the effect of such factors.

S.V. Maksimov, even before the appearance of the above-mentioned norms, noted that concerning the quality of existing and adopted normative legal acts, one of the properties of a rule of law is its uncertainty, and the Russian legal system is uncertain in its content. The law enforcement officer is omnipotent wherever he/she has a choice of the applicability of a particular norm (MAKSIMOV, 2000). This factor prompted the world community to introduce norms into anti-corruption legislation that would consolidate the institution of anti-corruption expertise. According to modern scholars and researchers,

the current anti-corruption legislation has sufficient grounds for its recognition as a full-fledged, corresponding to modern requirements of the legal framework for combating corruption. The Constitution of the Russian Federation, the federal laws "On Combating Corruption", "On Anti-Corruption Expertise of Normative Legal Acts and Draft Normative Legal Acts", "On the System of Public Service of the Russian Federation", the laws of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation on combating corruption, as well as other laws, regulations on the rules and procedure for resolving and preventing conflicts of interest, and the norms of international law on liability for corruption form a stable system of legal support for the practice of combating corruption. Therewith, despite the obvious achievements in the field of legal regulation of anti-corruption, the need for further improvement of anti-corruption legislation, its consistent development continues to remain undoubtedly relevant. (IVANOVA; ILYUSHINA, 2016, p. 127).

Scholars are unanimous in the opinion that anti-corruption expertise is an integral part of the process of effective anti-corruption activities of any modern state (SVIRIN et al., 2016; KOZLOVA et al., 2019). Its purpose is to identify corruptogenic factors and their subsequent elimination in legal acts and their drafts, which makes it possible to improve the quality of adopted normative legal acts in general and effectively counteract corruption at the stage of creating conditions for the development of this negative phenomenon in society.

The need for anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their drafts is caused by several factors. One of such arguments is given in the work of L.D. Gaukhman (2000):

the legislative power makes laws, within the framework of which officials of all branches of government and citizens are obliged to act. The limits of the powers of officials and the freedom of behavior of citizens depend on how wide this framework is. In particular, the narrower this framework, the less authority the officials have. In this regard, laws with an unambiguous understanding can be considered ideal and yet anti-corruption, which excludes the possibility of their different interpretation by officials and, as a result, the arbitrariness of the latter, which is often used for personal enrichment. (p. 3).
This quote allows fully understanding the purpose and role of the institute of anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their projects in any state.

Agreeing with the above-mentioned position, we note that the current Russian legislation in the field of anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their projects is far from perfect. For example, it does not fix the types of anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and draft legal acts, which, in our opinion, negatively affects the consistency and clarity of its perception by the law enforcement officer.

O.L. Zorin (2010), outlining several main criteria for the classification of anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their projects, highlights:

1) according to the object of implementation – preliminary and subsequent;
2) according to the place of examination - internal and external;
3) according to the subject of the event – state and independent;
4) according to the method of conducting – independent, as well as carried out within the framework of the legal examination;
5) according to the method of selection of documents for examination: total, selective, thematic, control, complex;
6) according to the results of anti-corruption expertise: mandatory and advisory.

In our opinion, it is necessary to eliminate the above-mentioned gap by fixing the types of anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their drafts in the Federal Law of July 17, 2009, No. 172-FL "On Anti-Corruption Expertise of Regulatory Legal Acts and Draft Regulatory Legal Acts", which will allow the law enforcement officer to better understand the content and mechanism of such expertise.

According to experts (BUDATAROV, 2009; KHAZANOV; BAKHTINA, 2016), to improve the effectiveness of anti-corruption analysis of regulatory legal acts, it is also necessary to clearly distinguish between legal and anti-corruption expertise by separating their subjects and tasks. The fact that legal and anti-corruption expertise should not replace or partially absorb each other is also evidenced by the requirements that are imposed on the conclusions prepared by the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation during their conduct.

Legal expertise should be understood as the activity of generally recognized legal experts aimed at assessing the compliance of the provisions of legislation and draft criminal laws with the generally recognized principles and norms defining human and civil rights and freedoms, criminal law principles and norms of a general nature (assessment of the legality of the norms of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation), as well as the expediency of criminal law protection of specific public relations and the effectiveness of the application of the provisions of the current criminal law as a whole and its institutions.

Legal expertise in scientific literature is understood as the type of expertise of regulatory legal acts, which consists in the legal assessment of the form of an act, its goals, and objectives, the subject of legal regulation, the competence of the body that adopted the act, the norms contained in it, the procedure for adoption, promulgation (publication) on the subject of compliance with the requirements of the Constitution of the Russian Federation and federal legislation; an assessment of the compliance of the act with the requirements of legal technology is also carried out, in particular, the presence of the necessary details is checked (KOCHETKOVA, 2010). Legal expertise does not exhaust all the variety of types of expertise of normative legal acts.

This type of legal expertise should be distinguished from the legal anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and draft regulatory legal acts for the purpose of conducting, which differ. Thus, legal expertise should be conducted to obtain a competent opinion on the presence or absence of elements of a crime in the act and the problems of its qualification. Legal anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and draft regulatory legal acts is carried out to identify corruptogenic factors in them and their subsequent elimination. In addition, in contrast
to the legal expertise in a criminal case, the range of subjects that can conduct anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and draft regulatory legal acts is quite extensive, and is established in Articles 3 and 5 of Federal Law No. 172-FL of July 17, 2009.

In the legal literature, it has been repeatedly noted that "corruption manifestations are most often associated with law-making and law enforcement... and deviation, violation of legal regulations, their selfish interpretation and use serves as a breeding ground for corruption" (NAIDENKO; TIKHOMIROV; KHABRIEVA, 2010, p. 1). In other words, corruption can be generated not only by the self-serving behavior of an official but also by the rule of law itself, which contains opportunities for the offense. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that "suspicious" norms can arise not only due to malicious intent but also due to the low legal qualifications of their developers.

In this regard, the literature reflects the position following which law-making legal errors are distinguished, committed unintentionally, and due to the low legal qualifications of developers, experts, state and municipal employees. The second group includes corruption factors, admitted knowingly or through negligence and giving rise to the risk of corruption manifestations (KAMENSKAYA; ROZHDESTVINA, 2010).

Special attention in the framework of this study should be paid to the characteristics of the official (state) anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their projects, conducted by the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation, prosecutor’s offices, and other authorized entities, as well as independent anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their projects, conducted by public organizations and independent experts-individuals and legal entities accredited by the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation to conduct anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their projects.

Thus, following the order of the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation, structural divisions of the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation conduct anti-corruption expertise: draft federal laws, draft presidential decrees, and draft Government resolutions developed by federal executive bodies, other state bodies and organizations - when conducting their legal expertise; draft amendments of the Government of the Russian Federation to draft federal laws prepared by federal executive bodies, other state bodies, and organizations - when conducting their legal expertise; regulatory legal acts of federal executive bodies, other state bodies, and organizations affecting the rights, freedoms, and duties of a person and a citizen, establishing the legal status of organizations or having an interdepartmental nature - upon their state registration.

The bodies of the Prosecutor's Office of the Russian Federation conduct anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts of federal executive authorities, state authorities of the subjects of the Russian Federation, other state bodies and organizations, local self-government bodies, and their officials on issues related to:

- human and civil rights, freedoms and duties;
- state and municipal property, state and municipal service, budget, tax, customs, forestry, water, land, urban planning, environmental protection legislation, legislation on licensing, as well as legislation regulating the activities of state corporations, foundations, and other organizations established by the Russian Federation based on federal law;
- social guarantees to persons who fill (have filled) state or municipal positions, positions of state or municipal service.

The Prosecutor, in the course of exercising his/her powers, following the procedure established by the Prosecutor General’s Office of the Russian Federation and following the methodology established by the Government of the Russian Federation, conducts an anti-corruption expert examination of regulatory legal acts of federal executive bodies, state authorities of constituent entities of the Russian Federation, other state bodies and organizations, local self-government bodies, and their officials.
If corruptogenic factors are identified in a regulatory legal act, the prosecutor submits a request to the body, organization, or official that issued this act to change the regulatory legal act with a proposal for a way to eliminate the identified corruptogenic factors or applies to the court following the procedure provided for by the procedural legislation of the Russian Federation. Moreover, a request to change a regulatory legal act following the law may be withdrawn by the prosecutor before it is considered by the relevant body, organization, or official.

Bodies, organizations, their officials (developers) conduct an anti-corruption examination of the regulatory legal acts (projects) adopted by them during their legal examination and monitoring of their application. In case of detection of corruptogenic factors in regulatory legal acts (projects) by bodies and organizations, taking measures to eliminate them is not within their competence, they inform the Prosecutor’s Office of the Russian Federation about it.

Another type of anti-corruption expertise is provided – independent anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts (draft regulatory legal acts).

Therewith, according to some authors, there is no experience of using such an institution abroad, since it is not particularly necessary due to the "significantly lower level of corruption than in the Russian state, as well as greater openness and transparency of the activities of state authorities" (KUDASHKIN, 2012, p. 41).

Independent anti-corruption expertise of legal acts and their drafts is one of the measures of corruption prevention in the Russian legislation, which is implemented by legal entities and individuals accredited by the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation as independent experts.

Independent expertise is carried out at the expense of independent experts. The conclusion based on the results of an independent expert examination should indicate the corruptogenic factors identified in the regulatory legal act (draft regulatory legal act) and suggest ways to eliminate them. However, such a conclusion is recommendatory, which, in our opinion, is a significant disadvantage, since it can be ignored by the subjects of the response.

Individuals shall obtain an accreditation certificate to carry out an independent examination.

Also, we consider it interesting in the context of the analysis of such activities to note that at the initiative of public organizations, the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation created the "Institute of Independent Anti-Corruption Expertise".

In general, studies on the independent anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their projects note that it is precisely to increase the effectiveness of interaction between the state and civil society institutions, strengthen public control over government bodies, and implement the principle of publicity and openness of the activities of state bodies and local self-government bodies, that the institute of independent experts authorized to conduct an expert examination of regulatory legal acts and draft regulatory legal acts on corruption (KIRILIN, 2016; KAMENSKAYA; ROZHDESTVINA, 2010) was established.

Anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts (draft normative legal acts) is carried out by the state authorities of the subjects of the Russian Federation and local self-government bodies according to the methodology. The methodology includes the basic rules for examining corruption, emphasizes the need to ensure the consistency, reliability, and verifiability of the results during the examination, and also provides a list of corruption factors.

The methodology for analyzing the corruptogenic nature of regulatory legal acts (hereinafter referred to as the Methodology) is based on checking compliance with the rules of legal technology (the formal aspect) and evaluating "defective" norms from the point of view of corruption potential (the content aspect). To do this, the entire text of the regulatory act shall be checked for the presence of corruption factors - regulatory structures and solutions that increase the risk of corruption.

The Methodology describes in detail the content of each factor and provides recommendations for its detection. This is illustrated by concrete examples. Thus, the presence of an open list of documents requested from the applicant increases the corruptibility of the
normative act and can in practice lead to corrupt relations. Corruption is also increased when the scope of rights is selectively changed (when unmotivated exceptions to the general rules are established). Thus, corruptogenic factors are classified on various grounds as follows:

1. Corruption factors related to the exercise of power as discretionary: the breadth of discretionary powers; the definition of competence according to the formula “entitled”; excessive requirements for a person to exercise the right belonging to him/her; abuse of the applicant's right; selective change in the scope of rights; excessive freedom of subordinate rule-making; legal and linguistic corruption: the adoption of a regulatory legal act of the executive authority "beyond the competence"; filling legislative gaps with the help of a regulatory legal act of the executive authority.

2. Corruption factors related to the presence of legal gaps: the presence of a gap in regulation; the absence of administrative procedures; the absence of competitive (auction) procedures; the absence of prohibitions and restrictions for state (municipal) employees in a specific field of activity; the lack of responsibility of a state (municipal) employee for offenses; the lack of control, including public control, over the state (municipal) bodies and employees; the lack of information (violation of the information transparency regime).

3. Corruption factors of a systemic nature: false goals and priorities; regulatory conflicts; violation of the balance of interests; "imposed" corruption.

4. Manifestations of corruption: formal and technical corruption; failure to adopt a regulatory legal act (inaction).

In the legislation of the subjects of the Russian Federation, the regulation of the provisions on anti-corruption expertise is carried out in various ways:

1) in anti-corruption laws – as an independent legal means of combating corruption;
2) in separate laws on anti-corruption expertise;
3) in the by-laws of the executive authorities of the subjects of the Russian Federation.

Issues of anti-corruption expertise may also be contained as an appendix to the anti-corruption law or in the laws of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation on regulatory legal acts as part of the legal expertise.

Despite the existence of a methodology for conducting anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts (draft regulatory legal acts), the issue of the quality of the conclusions prepared by independent experts and bodies, organizations (their officials) conducting the expertise of legal acts (projects) has always been acute in practice. In this regard, improving the legal and financial literacy (VOSKANYAN; VASHCHENKO, 2018) of the subjects of anti-corruption expertise is a priority task, the implementation of which will raise the anti-corruption expertise to a new qualitative level.

The President of the Russian Federation pointed to the possibility of involving interested scientific organizations and universities to participate in the anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts. This, in our opinion, can become a positive trend, which will allow not only expanding the range of subjects of anti-corruption expertise but also reaching a higher level of its implementation. As of January 15, 2021, the state register of independent experts accredited to conduct anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and draft regulatory legal acts in cases provided for by the legislation of the Russian Federation includes 437 legal entities, including such federal state educational institutions as: “Saratov State Law Academy”, “South-Western State University”, “Ulyanovsk State University”, “Kemerovo State University”, etc. As of April 15, 2021, 2,768 individuals were accredited by the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation as experts.

The accumulated experience shows that the active subjects of anti-corruption expertise are business associations that participate in the independent anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts. These are regional and municipal chambers of commerce and industry and other entities that have received accreditation from the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation as independent experts. This refers not only to the large business associations, but also to the industry associations and structures (for example, Associations of Forest Users of
the Ladoga, Pomerania, and Prionezhye regions, Associations of International Road Carriers, etc.) (EDKOVA et al., 2017).

The legal doctrine confirms the importance of anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and their projects within the framework of associations of states, at the federal level, in the regions, and at the municipal level (KRASNOPEEVA, 2006).

In this regard, E.V. Malinenko points to the special role of the state authorities of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation in conducting anti-corruption expertise. In particular, she points out that the main thing in this direction is not only to identify corruptogenic factors, but also to find ways to eliminate them, as well as to analyze the causes of these factors, the actions of civil servants involved in the development of the draft regulatory legal act, and to answer the question of what contributed to them: low qualifications of civil servants or deliberate interest (MALINENKO, 2016).

The experience of the Saratov Region is also interesting as part of the independent anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and draft regulatory legal acts. Given the lack of highly qualified specialists in the field of anti-corruption expertise, it is possible to involve experts in this process on a contractual basis. Thus, the anti-corruption department was organized under the Government of the Saratov Region to conduct anti-corruption expertise of draft regulatory legal acts, which attracts specialists of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Saratov Region to conduct anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and draft regulatory legal acts (BASOS et al., 2019).

I.S. Romanova (2014) emphasizes the role of departmental experts and quite rightly notes in this regard that they have a narrow specialization, which helps them easily understand the specific activities of their body and a large number of acts of legal regulation of a particular industry. This knowledge is necessary especially when evaluating the specific provisions of the act under study in conjunction with other regulatory legal acts. After all, if the expert is not aware of the entire layer of legal acts, such corruptogenic factors as the presence of duplicate powers, the uncertainty of the decision-making conditions, the presence of excessive requirements specified in various regulatory legal acts, and others can escape from the expert. (p. 65).

The analysis of the organization of independent anti-corruption expertise in various subjects of the Russian Federation (especially in municipalities) shows, unfortunately, the lack of unified approaches to the organization of this activity. Often, draft acts are posted on numerous departmental and municipal websites in various formats. In many cases, the procedure for registering incoming opinions, organizing work with them, and sending responses to independent experts is not fully regulated in the office management instructions and other acts. In this regard, the order of the President of Russia on the adoption of regulatory acts at the level of subjects aimed at creating the necessary conditions and infrastructure for the organization of independent anti-corruption expertise, the formation of a real mechanism for assisting independent experts in their activities, is very relevant in this area.

In addition, experts point to the problems that arise in the organization of anti-corruption monitoring at the local level, in particular, the lack of consistency in its conduct. Since the subjects do not use many forms that can show the real picture of corruption risks and lay the foundation for effective planning of organizational activities to combat corruption in the municipality (SHOROKHOV; POPOV, 2021). The results of anti-corruption monitoring are the basis for analyzing the effectiveness of measures to prevent corruption, including through independent anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and draft legal acts.

Thus, even though at present we can say that the necessary legal and organizational framework for combating corruption has been created in Russia (KOZLOVA, 2016), it is necessary to strictly monitor the quality of the unified legal space of the Russian Federation, which will allow the subjects of anti-corruption examination of normative legal acts and draft normative legal acts at the local level (including at the level of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation...
and the municipal level) to identify deficiencies expressed in the presence of corruptogenic factors, and the reasons for their occurrence more harmoniously and effectively.

**CONCLUSION**

The following conclusions were made as a result of the study:

1. Modern Russian legislation, in contrast to the legal doctrine, does not define the types of anti-corruption expertise of normative legal acts and draft legal acts. It is necessary to eliminate this gap by fixing the types of anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their drafts in the Federal Law of July 17, 2009, No. 172-FL "On anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and draft regulatory legal acts", which will allow the law enforcement officer to better understand the content and mechanism of such expertise.

2. To improve the effectiveness of anti-corruption analysis of regulatory legal acts, it is also necessary to clearly distinguish between legal and anti-corruption expertise by separating their subjects and tasks. The fact that legal and anti-corruption expertise should not replace or partially absorb each other, including the requirements that are imposed on the conclusions prepared by the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation during their conduct.

3. The question of the quality of the conclusions prepared by independent experts and bodies, organizations (their officials) examining legal acts (projects) is a cornerstone in practice. In this regard, improving the legal and financial literacy of the above-mentioned subjects is a priority task, the implementation of which will raise the anti-corruption expertise to a new qualitative level.

4. Unfortunately, the lack of unified approaches to the organization of independent anti-corruption expertise in various subjects of the Russian Federation (especially in municipalities) shows the lack of unified approaches to the organization of this activity. The analysis of this problem showed that it is necessary to strictly monitor the quality of the unified legal space of the Russian Federation, which will allow the subjects of anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and draft regulatory legal acts on the ground (including at the level of the subjects of the Russian Federation and the municipal level) to identify shortcomings expressed in the presence of corruptogenic factors, and the causes of their occurrence more smoothly and effectively.

5. In our opinion, the involvement of interested scientific organizations and universities to participate in the anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts can become a positive trend, which will not only expand the range of subjects of anti-corruption expertise but also reach a higher level of its implementation.

The results of anti-corruption monitoring are the basis for analyzing the effectiveness of measures to prevent corruption, including through independent anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and draft legal acts.

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The article was prepared with the financial support of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research in the framework of the scientific project No. 19-011-00729A "Development of anti-corruption legislation in the field of public administration" and the information support of the RLS "ConsultantPlus".

**REFERENCES**

BASOS, E.V.; ILYUSHINA, M.N.; ISHEKOV, K.A.; KAZACHKOVA, Z.M.; KIRILIN, A.V.; KOZLOVA, E.B.; MALEVANOVA, Y.V.; FOMENKO, E.V.; CHERKASOV, K.V. Anti-corruption legislation in the field of public administration: problems and prospects. Moscow; Berlin: Direct-Media, 2019, 168p.

BUDATAROV, S.M. Antikorruptionsonnaya ekspertiza pravovykh aktov i ikh proektov: poniatie, poiyadok provedeniya: Nauch. -prakt. posobie [Anti-corruption expertise of legal acts and their projects: concept, procedure: Scientific-Practical allowance]. Tomsk, 2009, p. 22-24.
EDKOVA, T.A.; IVANYUK, O.A.; SOROKO, A.V.; CHEREPANOVA, E.V.; CHERNOBEL, G.T.; Chertkov, A.N.; TIKHOMIROV, Yu.A. Participation of civil society institutions in the fight against corruption: scientific and practical manual. Moscow: Polygraph-Plus, 2013, p. 29, para. 561.

FOMENKO, E.V. Sootnoshenie ponyatii "korruptsiya i podkup": ugolovno-pravovoi analiz [Correlation of the concepts of "corruption and bribery": criminal law analysis]. Zakony Rossii: opyt, analiz, praktika, 2020, 8, p. 43-47.

GAUKHMAN, L.D. Korruptsiya i korruptsionnoe prestuplenie [Corruption and corruption crime]. Zakonnost, 2020, 6, p. 2-6.

IVANOVA, N.G.; ILYUSHINA, M.N. (Eds.). Korruptionnye riski sovremennogo zakonodatelstva i pravoprimeneniya i pravovye mehanizmy ikh preodoleniya: monografiya [Corruption risks of modern legislation and law enforcement and legal mechanisms for overcoming them: monograph]. Moscow: Yustitsiya, 2016.

KAMENSKAYA, E.V.; ROZHDESTVINA, A.A. Nezavisimaya antikorruptsionnaya ekspertiza: nauchno-prakticheskoe posobie [Independent anti-corruption expertise: scientific and practical guide]. SPS ConsultantPlus, 2010. p. 10, para. 210. Available at: http://www.consultant.ru/edu/student/download_books/book/kamenskaia_ev_rozhdestvina_ aa_nezavisimaja_antikorrumpcionalnaja_ekspertiza/. Access: August 21, 2021.

KHAZANOV, S.D.; BAKHTINA, M.S. Antikorruptsionnaya ekspertiza normativnykh pravovykh aktov kak sredstvo snizheniya korruptsionnykh riskov [Anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts as a means of reducing corruption risks]. Rossiiskii yuridicheskii zhurnal, 2016, 3, p. 59-67.

KIRILIN, A.V. Antikorruptsionnaya ekspertiza NPA: problemy pravovogo regulirovaniya i pravoprimenitelnogo praktiki [Anti-corruption expertise of legal acts: problems of legal regulation and law enforcement practice]. Yustitsiya, 2016, 3, p. 52-63.

KOCETKOVA, I.V. Slovar-spravochnik eksperta normativnykh pravovykh aktov [Dictionary-reference book of the expert of normative legal acts]. Tula: Papirus, 2011, p. 80.

KOZLOVA, E.B. Mery po populjaryizatsii antikorruptsionnogo povedeniya v ramkah obrazovatel’nogo protsesa [Measures to popularize anti-corruption behavior in the educational process]. Yustitsiya, 2016, 3, p. 37-51.

KOZLOVA, E.B.; GUREEV, V.A.; ILYUSHINA, M.N.; KAZACHKOVA, Z.M.; FOMENKO, E.V. Theoretical aspects of anti-corruption enlightenment as factor of system increase of efficiency of activity of federal executive authorities (on the example of the Federal Bailiff Service of Russia). Journal of Environmental Treatment Techniques, 2019, 7 (3), p. 383-388.

KRASNOPEEVA, E.V. Sranitelnyi analiz ugolovnogo zakonodatelstva gosudarstv SNG. Obshchaya chast: lektsii [Comparative analysis of the criminal legislation of the CIS states. General part: lectures]. Moscow: Moscow University of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, 2006.

KUDASHKIN, A.V. Antikorruptsionnaya ekspertiza: teoriya i praktika: nauchno-prakticheskoe posobie [Anti-corruption expertise: theory and practice: scientific and practical guide]. Moscow: Norma, Infra-M, 2012.

MAKSIMOV, S.V. Korruptsiya. Zakon. Otvetstvennost [Corruption. Law. Responsibility]. Moscow: Jurinfor, 2000, p. 26-27.

MALINENKO, E.V. Problemy antikorruptsionnoi ekspertizy normativnykh pravovykh aktov v subektakh Rossiiskoi Federatsii kak faktor protivodeistviya korruptsii [Problems of anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts in the constituent entities of the Russian Federation as a factor in combating corruption]. In: PANARIN, I.A. (Ed.). Aktualnye voprosy...
sovershenstvovaniya sistemy gosudarstvennogo i munitsipalnogo upravleniya v Rossi na sovremennom etape: materialy Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii [Topical issues of improving the system of state and municipal administration in Russia at the present stage: materials of the International Scientific and Practical Conference], Barnaul, Russia, February 4-5, 2016. Barnaul: AZBUKA, 2016, p. 276-277.

NAIDENKO, V.N.; TIKHOMIROV, Y.A.; KHABRIEVA, T.Y. (Eds.). Legal acts: anti-corruption analysis. Moscow: KONTRAKT, Volters Kluver, 2010.

ROMANOVA, I.S. Kompetentnost lits, provodyashchikh antikoruptsionnuyu ekspertizu normativnykh pravovykh aktov i ikh proektov [Competence of persons conducting anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their drafts]. Administrativnoe i munitsipalnoe pravo, 2014, 1, p. 65-69.

SHOROKHOV, V.E.; POPOV, P.A. Protivodeistvie korruptsii v sovremennoi Rossi: gosudarstvenny i munitsipalnyi uroven [Anti-corruption in modern Russia: state and municipal level]. Gosudarstvennaya vlast i mestnoe samoupravlenie, 2021, 1, p. 53-57.

SVIRIN, Yu.A.; PETROV, A.A.; VOLKOVA, O.N.; MATVEEVA, I.V. Corruption – as an institutional and structural element of statehood. International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 2016, 11(18), p. 11791-11806.

VOSKANYAN, R.O.; VASHCHENKO, T.V. Vliyanie finansovoi gramotnosti na kachestvo zhizni naseleniya [The impact of financial literacy on the quality of life of the population]. Obrazovanie. Nauka. Nauchnye kadry, 2018, 1, p. 122-125.

ZORIN, O.L. Pravovoi mekhanizm provedeniya antikorruptsionnoi ekspertizy normativno-pravovykh aktov v oblasti obrony: teoretiko-pravovoi aspekt [Legal mechanism for conducting anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts in the field of defense: theoretical and legal aspect]. Voennoe pravo, 2010, 2, p. 11-23.
Anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their projects in the Russian Federation

Experiência anticorrupção de atos legais regulatórios e seus projetos na Federação Russa

Experiencia anticorrupción de actos jurídicos reglamentarios y sus proyectos en la Federación de Rusia

Resumo
O artigo analisa as questões problemáticas da organização e condução da perícia anticorrupção de atos jurídicos regulatórios e seus projetos no contexto da implementação da política estadual anticorrupção. A principal abordagem para o estudo dos problemas identificados no trabalho é o desejo cientificamente orientado de utilizar um conjunto de métodos modernos relevantes de obtenção de novos conhecimentos em combinação com o uso de métodos científicos e privados gerais que permitam considerar de forma abrangente os aspectos teóricos e práticos mais importantes do impacto da perícia anticorrupção dos atos jurídicos regulatórios e seus projetos para melhorar a eficácia da prevenção da corrupção no contexto das relações jurídicas estudadas no trabalho. Foram delineadas as questões problemáticas de organização e condução da perícia anticorrupção de atos jurídicos regulatórios e seus projetos, mecanismos para melhorar a legislação interna moderna e a prática de sua aplicação na área estudada.
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Abstract
The article examines the problematic issues of organizing and conducting anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their projects in the context of the implementation of the state anti-corruption policy. The main approach to the study of the problems identified in the work is a scientifically-oriented desire to use a set of relevant modern methods of obtaining new knowledge in combination with the use of general scientific and private scientific methods that allow comprehensively considering the most important theoretical and practical aspects of the impact of anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their projects on improving the effectiveness of corruption prevention in the context of the legal relations studied in the work. The problematic issues of organizing and conducting anti-corruption expertise of regulatory legal acts and their drafts have been outlined, mechanisms for improving modern domestic legislation, and the practice of its application in the studied area have been analyzed and substantiated.
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