

Rwanda

2015 Country Summary

Country Recommendations

Rwanda's GI ranking in Band E places it in the second highest risk category for corruption in the defence and security sector. Rwanda's highest risk area is Financial, followed by Operations, Procurement, Political and Personnel. **High levels of secrecy and an absence of checks on the executive have created very high opportunities for corruption, contributing to state fragility.** The following issues need to be tackled urgently to reduce fragility and improve security provision:

Restore powers of oversight for defence to the legislature

- Although formal rights exist in principle for the Rwandan legislature to scrutinise defence policy under the 2003 constitution, it is clear that neither the Senate nor the Chamber of Deputies have any real influence over the executive in practice. The Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) has effectively forced out all political opposition and dominates both houses, including the Foreign Affairs, Cooperation and Security Committees in each chamber. As far as can be ascertained, neither body is provided detailed or timely information on the defence budget. Both chambers have limited authority and heavily one-sided compositions, preventing any critical debate from occurring.
- The Rwandan government must urgently restore balance to the legislature by opening the political space for opposition parties to participate more freely, and increase the legislature's powers to check and balance the executive. Parliament must be able to freely approve or veto laws on security, exercise budgetary power, and review or approve major arms procurements and decisions regularly.
- The Rwandan Parliament must also be able to turn down or amend defence policy without undue pressure from the executive. To do this, the government must release its defence policy for public consultation and debate, and ensure that the public can easily access regularly updated information on all aspects of it.

Create space for the public and civil society to safely debate defence and corruption matters

- There is no evidence of active and regular public debate in Rwanda. Extensive evidence shows a culture of self-censorship exists due to threats and harassment against members of civil society and the public. This includes the murder of a Transparency International staff member in 2013, as well as violence and threats perpetuated against critics both within the country and overseas.

- The state must urgently implement measures to legally protect CSOs and whistleblowers, and defence and security institutions must make active efforts to encourage engagement with CSOs on anti-corruption initiatives. It must also continue to revise relevant laws such as on media censorship and divisionism that have been used to suppress legitimate debate on the abuse of power.

Revise appointment and conduct mechanisms to ensure senior military personnel and government officials are accountable to the law

- Research shows key actors across the Ministry of Defence, the Rwandan Defence Force (RDF), and the National Intelligence and Security Services (NISS) are likely to have been appointed – and dismissed – on the basis of connection to the regime and influence networks. There is no information source on objective criteria for the recruitment of senior intelligence service, for example, with evidence suggesting that these positions are awarded directly by the president with no additional checks or controls.
- The government must urgently address the proximity that senior officials hold to licit or illicit business. Commercial enterprises Horizon Group and Crystal Ventures remain under the effective control of the Ministry of Defence and the RPF respectively, with no suitable scrutiny to prevent conflicts of interest. In addition, there is credible evidence the government has previously tolerated senior officers engaging in illegal mineral exploitation from eastern DRC unless it has been politically expedient to remove them. There is no evidence of public scrutiny being in place to prevent misconduct.

Scorecard

Political	Defence & Security Policy	Legislative Scrutiny	0
		Defence Committee	1
		Defence Policy Debated	1
		CSO Engagement	1
		International AC Instruments	3
		Public Debate	1
		AC Policy	2
		AC Institutions	2
		Public Trust	3
		Risk Assessments	1
	Defence budgets	Acquisition Planning	1
		Budget Transparency & Detail	0
		Budget Scrutiny	1
		Budget Publicly Available	0
		Defence Income	0
		Internal Audit	0
		External Audit	2
	Other Political Areas	Natural Resources	0
		Organised Crime Links	0
Organised Crime Policing		1	
Intelligence Services Oversight		1	
Intelligence Services Recruitment		0	
Export Controls		1	
Finance	Asset Disposals	Asset Disposal Controls	1
		Asset Disposal Scrutiny	0
	Secret Budgets	Percentage Secret Spending	0
		Legislative Access to Information	0
		Secret Program Auditing	0
		Off-budget Spending in Law	1
		Off-budget Spending in Practice	0
		Information Classification	1
	Links to Business	Mil. Owned Businesses Exist	0
		Mil. Owned Business Scrutiny	0
Unauthorised Private Enterprise		1	
Personnel	Leadership	Public Commitment	2
		Measures for Corrupt Personnel	1
		Whistleblowing	1
		Special Attention to Sensitive Personnel	1
	Payroll and Recruitment	Numbers of Personnel Known	0
		Pay Rates Openly Published	1
		Well-established Payment System	3
		Objective Appointments	2
		Objective Promotions	1
	Conscription	Bribery to Avoid Compulsory Conscription	
		Bribery for Preferred Postings	
Salary Chain	Ghost Soldiers	2	

		Chains of Command and Payment	3
	Values, Standards, Other	Code of Conduct Coverage	1
		Code of Conduct Breaches Addressed	1
		AC Training	1
		Prosecution Outcomes Transparent	1
		Facilitation Payments	1
Operations	Controls in the Field	Military Doctrine	0
		Operational Training	0
		AC Monitoring	1
		Controls on Contracting	0
		Private Military Contractors	2
Procurement	Government Policy	Legislation	0
		Transparent Procurement Cycle	0
		Oversight Mechanisms	2
		Purchases Disclosed	1
		Standards Expected of Companies	1
	Capability Gap	Strategy Drives Requirements	0
		Requirements Quantified	0
	Tendering	Open Competition v. Single-Sourcing	1
		Tender Board Controls	1
		Anti-Collusion Controls	0
	Contract Delivery / Support	Procurement Staff Training	1
		Complaint Mechanisms for Firms	2
		Sanctions for Corruption	1
	Offsets	Due Diligence	0
		Transparency	0
		Competition Regulation	0
	Other	Controls of Agents	1
Transparency of Financing Packages		0	
Subsidiaries / Sub-Contractors		1	
Political Influence		1	