

Corruption – A social disease



JOHAN COETZEE

Creating a framework for a Namibian Integrity Assessment

Die Republikein 16 Junie 2017

To change the corrupt Namibian society to a society that is fair, just and sustainable, key institutions and controls are needed. A framework of such institutions can guide the development of an Integrity Assessment as indicated in the table. The eleven pillars on the left hand side contain core institutions. The four columns on the right hand side include existing and proposed institutions and controls. This will require cultivating quality relations between such institutions. Controls and institutions that are absent, however, much needed, are highlighted in bold in the table. These institutions will be discussed in articles that follow.

References
Griffith Univer-

Institutions and controls for a Namibian Integrity Assessment

Core institutions	Distributed institutions and controls		Purpose	
Legislative	Oversight by legislature	Political will Frying the big fish (e.g. Singapore) Moral & transformational leaders (e.g. Gandhi)	Electoral & political processes (e.g. verified voters list & paper trail for elections)	Political stability National consensus for transformation
Executive				
Judiciary	Specialised bodies to prosecute corruption	Effective & efficient legal framework High probability of detecting corruption	Independent branches of government	Rule of law
Auditor-General	Supreme financial audit authority	Efficient accountability mechanisms (e.g. NAMFISA)		Accountability
Ombudsman	Human rights oversight			
Watchdog agencies	Anti-corruption legislation & agency for corruption coordination	Whistleblower protection Incentives & penalties for corruption (e.g. financial rewards for whistleblowers)	Oversight & regulatory mechanisms	Centralising anti-corruption coordination & control
	Corruption investigation bodies	Awareness & education, detection & prosecution		
Public service	Human resource management controls	Public service conditions	Administration & civil service	Transforming strategic institutions Identifying hot spots Reducing monopolies of SOEs & benchmarking for stimulating public service competition Regulatory quality
	Financial management controls	Pre-budget statement Citizens budget Social grants (e.g. Basic Income Grant)		
	Organisational management controls	International organisation & methods/standards		
	Guidance & training of public officials	Codes of conduct & value clarification Professional accreditation mechanisms		
Media	Transparency mechanisms (e.g. Access to Information legislation)	Media Ombudsman Regional reporting body (e.g. Media Institute for Southern Africa)	Civil society, public information & media	Information flows for transparency & accountability
Civil society	Social capital market (e.g. safety nets for street children, orphans and disabled)	Vibrant & active civil society institutions		
Private sector	Public-private partnerships	Training & transfer of capacity	Voluntary compliance	Sustainability
International actors	Transparency International, UN, Global Compact	Training & transfer of capacity New blood & innovation	International best practices	Universality

sity and Transparency International Australia. 2005. *Chaos or Coherence? Strengths, Opportunities and Challenges for Australia's Integrity Systems*. National Integrity Systems (NISA) Final Report. Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice, and Governance, Australian National Research Council Linkage Project. Transparency International (TI). 2010. *National Integrity Systems Assessment Toolkit*.
jcoetzee@nust.na