


# Corruption in Southern Africa (a US perspective)



## Introduction

The United States State Department's *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices* ("country reports") strive to provide a factual and objective record on the status of human rights worldwide. The 2021 country reports were published on 12 April 2022.

Section 4 of the country reports provides an assessment of Corruption and Lack of Transparency in Government which addresses the extent to which a country's law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials and the level of implementation of these laws.

Scores for Southern African countries published by

Transparency International in their 2021 Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) report demonstrate that Southern Africa was ranked second out of the five African regions in terms of improvements in CPI scores during 2012-2021. Individual country CPI score performance was mixed for Southern African countries in the 2012-2021 period. The country reports for Southern African countries reveal that only two Southern African countries were effectively implementing current criminal penalties for corruption by officials. Further discussion on corruption trends in Southern African countries is provided [here](#).

Details of the overview comments for Southern African countries in the 2021 country reports are provided below.

### [Angola](#)

“The law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials, and the government implemented the law effectively. The government dismissed and prosecuted cabinet ministers, provincial governors, senior military officers, and other officials for corruption and financial crimes. There were numerous reports of government corruption during the year. The Attorney General’s Office continued corruption investigations and brought criminal charges against several officials. Nonetheless, official impunity and the uniform application of anticorruption legislation remained a serious problem.”

### [Botswana](#)

“The law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials, and the government generally sought to implement

these laws effectively. Officials tasked with enforcement lacked adequate training and resources, however. Media reports of government corruption continued. During the year there were numerous reports of government corruption, including allegations tied to tenders issued by local governments for COVID-19 projects, such as renovating public facilities so that they complied with virus prevention measures, as well as in the acquisition of personal protective equipment. A 2019 poll by Transparency International found that 7 percent of those polled had paid bribes to government officials, an increase from the 1 percent who reported paying bribes in a 2015 poll.”

### Eswatini

“The law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials, and the government generally implemented the law effectively. There were isolated reports of government corruption during the year. Officials sometimes engaged in corrupt practices with impunity.”

### Lesotho

“The law provides criminal penalties for conviction of corruption by officials. The government did not implement the law effectively, and some officials engaged in corrupt practices with impunity.”

### Malawi

“The law provides criminal penalties for conviction of

corruption by officials, but the government did not implement the law effectively. Officials sometimes engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. There were numerous reports of government corruption during the year.

The government, in cooperation with donors, continued implementation of an action plan to pursue cases of corruption, reviewed how the “Cashgate” corruption scandal occurred, and introduced internal controls and improved systems to prevent further occurrences. Progress on investigations and promised reforms was slow.”

### [Mozambique](#)

“The law provides criminal penalties for conviction of corrupt acts by officials; however, the government did not implement the law effectively, and officials often engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. There were numerous reports of corruption in all branches and at all levels of government during the year.”

### [Namibia](#)

“The law provides criminal penalties for conviction of official corruption; however, the government did not implement the law effectively. Officials sometimes engaged in corrupt practices with impunity.”

### [South Africa](#)

“The law provides for criminal penalties for conviction of official corruption, and the government generally did not implement the law effectively, and officials sometimes engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. There were numerous reports of government corruption during the year.”

## Zambia

“The law provides criminal penalties for officials convicted of corruption, and the government attempted to enforce the law but did so inconsistently. Officials often engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. Although the government collaborated with the international community and civil society organizations to improve capacity to investigate and prevent corruption, anticorruption NGOs observed that, the enforcement rate was low among senior government officials and in the civil service.

According to Transparency International Zambia, the conviction rate for those prosecuted for corruption was 10 to 20 percent. The Patriotic Front government did not effectively or consistently apply laws against corrupt officials; it selectively applied anticorruption law to target opposition leaders or officials who ran afoul of it. Transparency International Zambia further reported that, during the Patriotic Front administration, officials frequently engaged in corrupt practices with impunity.”

## Zimbabwe

“The law provides criminal penalties for conviction of corruption; however, the government did not implement the law

effectively or impartially. Despite government pronouncements, there were numerous reports of government corruption during the year. Experts described the problem as “catch and release,” where the government arrested some corrupt officials, often those out of favour, without ever convicting them.”

## **Conclusion**

The country reports for Southern African countries demonstrate that only a minority of these countries are currently well placed to fight against corruption by officials. It is interesting to note that Angola and Eswatini which recorded relatively low scores in the 2021 Corruptions Perceptions Index were assessed in the country reports as enforcing criminal penalties for corruption relatively effectively.

Significant challenges in combatting corruption in Southern Africa are likely to remain until such time as the majority of countries make significant improvement in their ability to enforce criminal penalties for corruption.

---

# **Corruption in Commonwealth Africa (a US perspective)**



## Introduction

The United States State Department's *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices* ("country reports") strive to provide a factual and objective record on the status of human rights worldwide. The 2021 country reports were published on 12 April 2022.

Section 4 of the country reports provides an assessment of Corruption and Lack of Transparency in Government which addresses the extent to which a country's law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials and the level of implementation of these laws.

Scores for Commonwealth Africa countries published by Transparency International in their 2021 Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) report demonstrate that the majority of the nineteen Commonwealth Africa countries failed to increase their 2012 CPI scores during 2012-2021. The

weaknesses in the implementation of criminal penalties for corruption by officials have no doubt contributed in some way to the lack of progress in addressing corruption in a number of Commonwealth Africa countries. Further discussion on corruption trends in Commonwealth Africa countries is provided [here](#).

Details of the overview comments for Commonwealth Africa countries in the 2021 country reports are provided below.

### **[Botswana](#)**

“The law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials, and the government generally sought to implement these laws effectively. Officials tasked with enforcement lacked adequate training and resources, however. Media reports of government corruption continued. During the year there were numerous reports of government corruption, including allegations tied to tenders issued by local governments for COVID-19 projects, such as renovating public facilities so that they complied with virus prevention measures, as well as in the acquisition of personal protective equipment. A 2019 poll by Transparency International found that 7 percent of those polled had paid bribes to government officials, an increase from the 1 percent who reported paying bribes in a 2015 poll.”

### **[Cameroon](#)**

“The law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials, but the government did not implement the law effectively. There were numerous reports of government



corruption. Officials sometimes engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. The law identifies different offenses as corruption, including influence peddling, involvement in a prohibited employment, and failure to declare a known conflict of interest. Reporting corruption was encouraged through exempting whistleblowers from criminal proceedings. In addition to the laws, the National Anticorruption Agency (CONAC), Special Criminal Court, National Financial Investigation Agency, Ministry in Charge of Supreme State Audit, and Audit Bench of the Supreme Court also contributed to fighting corruption in the country. CONAC, the most prominent of the anticorruption agencies, was constrained by the absence of any legislative or presidential mandate that could empower it to combat corruption. There were reports that senior officials sentenced to prison were not always required to forfeit their ill-gotten gains.”

## Eswatini

“The law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials, and the government generally implemented the law effectively. There were isolated reports of government corruption during the year. Officials sometimes engaged in corrupt practices with impunity.”

## Gambia

“The law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials, but the government did not credibly investigate or prosecute any official accused of corruption. There were many allegations of government corruption.”

## Ghana

“The law provides criminal penalties for corruption by government officials, but the government did not implement the law effectively, and officials frequently engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. There were numerous reports of government corruption. Corruption was present in all branches of government, according to media and NGOs, including recruitment into the security services. Since the first special prosecutor took office in 2018, no corruption case undertaken by that office resulted in a conviction. When the new special prosecutor took office in August, his staff included one investigator and one prosecutor, both seconded from other offices.

The government took steps to implement laws intended to foster more transparency and accountability in public affairs. In July 2020 authorities commissioned the Right to Information (RTI) secretariat to provide support to RTI personnel in the public sector; however, some civil society organizations stated the government had not made sufficient progress implementing the law.

The country continued use of the national anticorruption online reporting dashboard, for the coordination of all anticorruption efforts of various governmental bodies.”

## Kenya

“The law provides criminal penalties for official corruption. There were numerous reports of government corruption during the year. Officials frequently engaged in allegedly corrupt

practices with impunity. Despite public progress in fighting corruption, the government continued to face hurdles in implementing relevant laws effectively. The slow processing of corruption cases was exacerbated by COVID-19 containment measures, with courts lacking sufficient technological capacity to hear cases remotely.”

## Lesotho

“The law provides criminal penalties for conviction of corruption by officials. The government did not implement the law effectively, and some officials engaged in corrupt practices with impunity.”

## Malawi

“The law provides criminal penalties for conviction of corruption by officials, but the government did not implement the law effectively. Officials sometimes engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. There were numerous reports of government corruption during the year.

The government, in cooperation with donors, continued implementation of an action plan to pursue cases of corruption, reviewed how the “Cashgate” corruption scandal occurred, and introduced internal controls and improved systems to prevent further occurrences. Progress on investigations and promised reforms was slow.”

## **Mauritius**

“The law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials, but the government did not implement the law effectively, and officials sometimes engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. There were isolated reports of government corruption during the year.”

### Mozambique

“The law provides criminal penalties for conviction of corrupt acts by officials; however, the government did not implement the law effectively, and officials often engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. There were numerous reports of corruption in all branches and at all levels of government during the year.”

### Namibia

“The law provides criminal penalties for conviction of official corruption; however, the government did not implement the law effectively. Officials sometimes engaged in corrupt practices with impunity.”

### Nigeria

“Although the law provides criminal penalties for conviction of official corruption, the government did not consistently implement the law, and government employees, including elected officials, frequently engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. Massive, widespread, and pervasive corruption affected all levels of government, including the judiciary and security services. The constitution provides immunity from

civil and criminal prosecution for the president, vice president, governors, and deputy governors while in office. There were numerous allegations of government corruption during the year.”

### Rwanda

“The law provides criminal penalties for conviction of corruption by officials and private persons transacting business with the government that include imprisonment and fines, and the government generally implemented the law effectively. There were isolated reports of government corruption during the year, particularly related to road construction projects. The law also provides for citizens who report requests for bribes by government officials to receive financial rewards when officials are prosecuted and convicted.”

### Seychelles

“The law provides criminal penalties for conviction of corruption by officials, and the government implemented the law effectively. There were isolated reports of government corruption during the year.”

### Sierra Leone

“The law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials, and the government generally implemented the law effectively. There were numerous reports of government corruption.”

## South Africa

“The law provides for criminal penalties for conviction of official corruption, and the government generally did not implement the law effectively, and officials sometimes engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. There were numerous reports of government corruption during the year.”

## Tanzania

“The law provides criminal penalties for corruption by officials, but the government did not implement the law effectively. There were isolated reports of government corruption during the year. President Hassan took several steps to signal a commitment to fighting corruption. These included surprise inspections of ministries, hospitals, and the port of Dar es Salaam, often followed by the immediate dismissal or suspension of officials.”

## Uganda

“The law provides criminal penalties of up to 12 years’ imprisonment and confiscation of the convicted persons’ property for official corruption.

Nevertheless, transparency civil society organizations stated the government did not implement the law effectively, and there were numerous reports of government corruption during the year. Officials frequently engaged in corrupt practices with impunity, and many corruption cases remained pending for years.”

## Zambia

“The law provides criminal penalties for officials convicted of corruption, and the government attempted to enforce the law but did so inconsistently. Officials often engaged in corrupt practices with impunity. Although the government collaborated with the international community and civil society organizations to improve capacity to investigate and prevent corruption, anticorruption NGOs observed that, the enforcement rate was low among senior government officials and in the civil service.

According to Transparency International Zambia, the conviction rate for those prosecuted for corruption was 10 to 20 percent. The Patriotic Front government did not effectively or consistently apply laws against corrupt officials; it selectively applied anticorruption law to target opposition leaders or officials who ran afoul of it. Transparency International Zambia further reported that, during the Patriotic Front administration, officials frequently engaged in corrupt practices with impunity.”

## **Conclusion**

The United States State Department has assessed that more than half of Commonwealth Africa countries are not effectively implementing penalties for corrupt activities. This outcome is similar to the prevailing overall trend in CPI scores reported for 2012-2021.

Considerable effort is required by Commonwealth Africa countries and their development partners in the short to

medium term to reverse the current unsatisfactory trend in implementation of penalties for corrupt activities.

---

# Southern Africa PFM digital transparency recent trends



## Introduction

Transparency of public finances is a key element of a public financial management (PFM) system enabling public scrutiny of government actions and intentions. From our September 2020 “Improving PFM digital transparency in African finance ministries” [presentation](#) we now examine recent trends in Southern Africa PFM from a digital transparency perspective by presenting data for nine Southern African countries that was identified during our examination of 45 African ministries of finance (MoFs) current use of digital platforms to promote PFM



transparency.

## **PFM transparency is important**

Transparency of public finances is achieved by providing information on PFM which is comprehensive, consistent, and accessible to users. The World Bank's September 2020 report [“Enhancing Government Effectiveness and Transparency – The Fight Against Corruption”](#) (link to be provided) has highlighted the importance of ensuring greater transparency in government operations.

## **Identifying PFM digital transparency trends**

The following statistics were prepared to help identify PFM digital transparency trends:

- Country internet usage
  
- MoF website visits during May/July 2020 and projected annualised visits for 2020
  
- Domestic and non-resident visits to MoF websites
  
- Country Facebook usage
  
- MoF Facebook page follower numbers

- Country Twitter usage
- MoF Twitter follower numbers

Penetration levels for MoF website users, Facebook and Twitter followers were subsequently identified to demonstrate the level of usage of these digital platforms and key recent PFM digital transparency trends.

## Key trends

Trends in the key PFM digital transparency indicators for the nine Southern African finance ministries with websites during the period May/July 2020 are available. These can be accessed by clicking on to the country links below:

- [Angola](#)
- [Botswana](#)
- [Lesotho](#)
- [Malawi](#)
- [Mozambique](#)
- [Namibia](#)

- [South Africa](#)
- [Zambia](#)
- [Zimbabwe](#)

A video showing Southern African country PFM digital transparency trends for key PFM digital transparency indicators is available [here](#).

An additional video showing comparative results on a PFM digital transparency indicator basis across Southern African countries is available [here](#).

## Questions?

Please contact us at [team@pfmconnect.com](mailto:team@pfmconnect.com) if you have any questions about this material.

---

**Doing Business 2015 Sub-Saharan Africa**



# Read Doing Business 2015

## Sub-Saharan Africa

Read the [Doing Business 2015 regional profile for Sub-Saharan Africa](#). Learn how easy or difficult it is for local entrepreneurs to establish and run small to medium-size businesses when complying with relevant regulations.

The quality of public financial management (PFM) in business regulatory agencies inevitably impacts on their operational performance which in turn impacts on entrepreneurs.