<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Breakdown of Cases by Country
Figure 2: Occupational Frauds by Category—Frequency

- Asset Misappropriation: 75.9%
- Corruption: 57.0%
- Financial Statement Fraud: 6.3%
Figure 3: Occupational Frauds by Category—Median Loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF FRAUD</th>
<th>MEDIAN LOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset Misappropriation</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Statement Fraud*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Financial statement fraud category had insufficient responses for median loss calculation.
Figure 4: Frequency of Fraud Schemes

- Corruption: 57.0%
- Non-Cash: 26.6%
- Cash on Hand: 19.0%
- Billing: 15.2%
- Expense Reimbursements: 11.4%
- Skimming: 11.4%
- Check Tampering: 7.6%
- Financial Statement Fraud: 6.3%
- Cash Larceny: 5.1%
- Payroll: 2.5%
- Register Disbursements: 1.3%
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**Figure 5: Initial Detection of Occupational Frauds**

- **Tip**: 39.2%
- **Internal Audit**: 25.3%
- **Management Review**: 11.4%
- **Account Reconciliation**: 5.1%
- **Other**: 5.1%
- **By Accident**: 3.8%
- **Document Examination**: 3.8%
- **Surveillance/Monitoring**: 3.8%
- **External Audit**: 1.3%
- **Notified by Law Enforcement**: 1.3%
Figure 6: Impact of Hotlines on the Top Four Detection Methods
Figure 7: Type of Victim Organization—Frequency and Median Loss

*Not-for-Profit, Government, and Other categories had insufficient responses for median loss calculation.
Figure 8: Size of Victim Organization—Frequency and Median Loss

- *10,000+ category had insufficient responses for median loss calculation.
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Figure 9: Industry of Victim Organization
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Figure 10: Frequency of Anti-Fraud Controls

- External Audit of Financial Statements: 95.9%
- Internal Audit Department: 90.9%
- Management Certification of Financial Statements: 82.4%
- Code of Conduct: 81.1%
- External Audit of Internal Controls over Financial Reporting: 80.6%
- Independent Audit Committee: 75.7%
- Management Review: 73.2%
- Hotline: 62.2%
- Surprise Audits: 81.6%
- Anti-Fraud Policy: 61.6%
- Fraud Training for Employees: 50.7%
- Proactive Data Monitoring/Analysis: 47.9%
- Dedicated Fraud Department, Function, or Team: 46.5%
- Fraud Training for Managers/Executives: 44.6%
- Formal Fraud Risk Assessments: 44.6%
- Employee Support Programs: 41.7%
- Job Rotation/Mandatory Vacation: 25.4%
- Rewards for Whistleblowers: 14.3%
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### Figure 11: Median Loss Based on Presence of Anti-Fraud Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
<th>Control in Place</th>
<th>Control Not in Place</th>
<th>Percent Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Audit of Internal Controls over Financial Reporting</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>$247,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Data Monitoring/Analysis</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Support Programs</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Certification of Financial Statements</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$363,000</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Review</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Rotation/Mandatory Vacation</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise Audits</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards for Whistleblowers</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$308,000</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud Training for Managers/Executives</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$247,000</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud Training for Employees</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$224,000</td>
<td>-22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotline</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>$304,000</td>
<td>$247,000</td>
<td>-23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Fraud Policy</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>-50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>-50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Audit Committee</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>-75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Fraud Risk Assessments</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>$363,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>-81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Fraud Department, Function, or Team</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>$463,000</td>
<td>$247,000</td>
<td>-87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit Department</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>$304,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Audit of Financial Statements</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Category had insufficient responses for median loss calculation.
## Figure 12: Median Duration of Fraud Based on Presence of Anti-Fraud Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Percent of Cases</th>
<th>Control in Place</th>
<th>Control Not in Place</th>
<th>Percent Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Audit of Internal Controls over Financial Reporting</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Rotation/Mandatory Vacation</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive Data Monitoring/Analysis</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>11 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Audit Committee</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>13 months</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Support Programs</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Fraud Risk Assessments</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud Training for Managers/Executives</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Fraud Department, Function, or Team</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud Training for Employees</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Fraud Policy</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise Audits</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotline</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Certification of Financial Statements</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards for Whistleblowers</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>13 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Review</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit Department</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Audit of Financial Statements</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Category had insufficient responses for median duration calculation.
Figure 13: Primary Internal Control Weakness Observed by CFE
Figure 14: Position of Perpetrator—Frequency and Median Loss

*Other category had insufficient responses for median loss calculation.
Figure 15: Department of Perpetrator—Frequency
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Figure 16: Gender of Perpetrator—Frequency

- Male: 90.3%
- Female: 9.7%
Figure 17: Criminal Background of Perpetrator

- Never Charged or Convicted: 94.6%
- Had Prior Convictions: 1.8%
- Charged But Not Convicted: 5.4%
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Figure 18: Employment Background of Perpetrator

- Never Punished or Terminated: 92.0%
- Previously Punished: 8.0%
- Previously Terminated: 4.0%
Figure 19: Cases Resulting in Referral to Law Enforcement or Civil Suit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Action Taken</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referral to Law Enforcement</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Suit</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 20: Recovery of Victim Organization’s Losses

- No Recovery: 59.2%
- 1–25%: 12.2%
- 26–50%: 8.1%
- 51–75%: 8.1%
- 76–99%: 8.1%
- 100%: 10.2%
Figure 21: Action Taken Against Perpetrator

- Termination: 53.5%
- Settlement Agreement: 18.9%
- Probation or Suspension: 14.1%
- Perpetrator Was No Longer With Organization: 9.9%
- Permitted or Required Resignation: 9.9%
- Other: 6.5%
- No Punishment: 4.2%