

Namibia's Transparency International trend - 1 Dec. 2017 **selected aspects since 1998**

In analysing the Namibian corruption trend measured by Transparency International (TI) since 1998 until 2016, the trend is constant. However, what is positive is that since 2004 as the "darkest year" with a rating of 4.1 out of 10, the trend is overall positive and slowly but surely increased with a rating of 5.3 in 2015. The exceptional low rating of 2004 could be due to the first round of the Social Security Commission corruption during 2002/2003 with reference to the kickbacks received for investment made via insurance companies and agents, incompetence and limited financial accountability. For example, Lazarus Kandara's involvement and the absence of the Chief Executive Officer for 18 months, who studied in the United States. She made the remark in court that she signed blank cheques.

Major corruption scandals that



Johan Coetzee

negatively affected Namibia's rating since 2004 include the Overseas Development Corporation (ODC), annual fish quotas, the National Defence Force and alleged Sanlam insurance representatives' corruption, City of Windhoek (Human Resources Manager and some VIP's not paying municipal fees), Avid, GIPF, corruption with the allocation of oil exploration licenses, TransNamib, the Ministry of Works and Transport, the National Housing Enterprise (first round 1998 and second round of corruption during 2014/5), the re-advertising of the Neckartal Dam tender, and the Walvis Bay harbour facilities to mention a few.

SUPPORTING THE ACC

Since 2005/6, the Anti-Corruption Commission (ACC) has been established. Based on a survey done by the ACC in 2011/12, the ACC does not seem to be effective in bringing corrupt officials to book as opposed to the ACCs of Singapore and Hong Kong.

The highest ranking official that lost his position in Namibia as a result of an ACC investigation, was a director. The big fish is not brought to book and "petty corruption" seems to be the bread and butter of the ACC.

This does not mean that the ACC is not trying and that investigating officers are not dedicated and committed. To find evidence is extremely challenging. The public, especially businessmen are complaining about the ACC but when it comes to providing evidence, they are very reluctant to come forward, even if they do

no business with the government. Such businessmen are more accountable for lack of prosecuting corruptors and corruptees than the ACC. It seems the ACC is trying its level best to get evidence for prosecution, however does not have the political backing to go with vigour for the big fish.

Given the current level of corruption and its magnitude - it is not millions at stake anymore as in 2004, but billions, e.g. the escalated Walvis Bay harbour facilities, the Neckartal Dam and the Hosea Kotako Airport - it is more likely that the TI corruption trend will be negatively effected during the following two to three years.

References

Transparency International. 1998-2016. Corruption Perception Indices.

jcoetzee@nust.na