



REPORT ON THE STAKEHOLDERS' CONFERENCE ON BUDGETARY CONTROL, CORRUPTION AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN AFRICA HELD AT THE LAKE VICTORIA SERENA RESORT & SPA ENTEBBE, UGANDA ON 23RD AND 24TH JULY 2014



I. INTRODUCTION

Every year, governments across the African continent prepare their budgetary statements highlighting resource allocations and areas of expenditure that are often geared towards spurring development and improving the welfare of the citizenry. Regrettably, this is not often realised at the end of the financial year and for that reason many States on the continent have remained poor with a large population sagging under the weight of poverty thereby compromising their quality of life. Inevitably, this has led to widespread deprivation of their fundamental rights and freedoms. This is in spite of the rich deposits of natural resources on the continent.

It is on this backdrop that the Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (KAS) and the Network of African National Human Rights Institutions (NANHRI) sought through this conference to draw attention to the role that effective and efficient budgetary control can play in the interrelationship between corruption and human rights in Africa. The most important issue in the context of this conference was not the amounts spent, but rather how they are

spent; who controls and monitors this expenditure; and how those responsible are held accountable.

The conference was attended by delegates from fifteen African countries, namely, Angola, Botswana, Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe. They comprised mainly of parliamentary watchdog committees; officials from state law offices; officials from the offices of budget controllers and auditors general; state watchdog agencies such as the anti-corruption units, the ombudspersons and the public protectors; State and non-state Human Rights Institutions; Civil Society; Private Sector; Academia and the media.

Opening Session

The conference began with Dr. Arne Wulff, the Director of the Rule of Law Program and Ms Kagwiria Mbogori, a member of NANHRI's Steering Committee making their welcoming remarks on behalf of the organisers.

II. KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY HON. JUSTICE HAROLD NSEKELA, IMMEDIATE FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE EAST AFRICAN COURT OF JUSTICE (EACJ)



Justice Nsekela observed that budgets have traditionally been considered the exclusive domain of technocrat economists and accountants yet government decisions on how to raise and spend money affect all citizens. He pointed out that the State should therefore spend public resources in such a way that ensures full realization of the citizens' rights and human capabilities.

In the foregoing, those who control public resources should be able to provide justifications and explanations for failure to deliver social or public services and where public resources are squandered or misused, the oversight bodies must be seen to perform their oversight functions.

He noted that whereas the citizenry of African countries expect an open transparent system of budgetary control, this will not come automatically hence the need for vigilance on the part of every citizen insofar as proper application of public resources is concerned by *inter alia* demanding transparency, accountability and robust defenses against waste and corruption.

While acknowledging many positive steps that have been undertaken, Justice Nsekela observed that a lot more remains to be done if integrity and transparency in public affairs including budgetary processes are to be achieved in Africa. He lamented that many African countries are characterized by:-

- Good legislative framework but weak implementation.
- Lack of clear separation between the implementation and oversight arms of government. The executive arm of the state and the oversight branch are often closely linked.
- Ethnicity, nepotism, cronyism and favouritism at the expense of meritocracy hence treating accountability as a personal favour to ordinary citizens.
- Failure by most civil society organizations to use existing constitutional and legislative provisions to participate in governance processes and failure to think beyond formalized consultations and workshops.

III. AN OVERVIEW OF BUDGETARY CONTROL AND CORRUPTION IN AFRICA BY PROF. PLO LUMUMBA, DIRECTOR OF KENYA SCHOOL OF LAW AND FORMER DIRECTOR OF THE DEFUNCT KENYA ANTI-CORRUPTION COMMISSION (KACC)

Spurning his notes, Prof. Lumumba delivered a stirring and inspirational address during which he pulled no punches in criticising the lack of proper budgetary control in Africa and the effect that it has on the endemic nature of corruption in Africa. Prof. Lumumba expressed the view that the incidences of corruption that flow from the failure to control budgetary activities and expenditure within budgetary limits prejudices the poor while enriching those who involve themselves in grand corruption on a wholesale scale in Africa.

He lamented that poor leadership coupled with economic mismanagement of hard-earned taxpayers' money is seemingly the norm in Africa and has led to Africa's downfall as a continent devoid of fiscal development and stable infrastructure. He regretted that typical African politicians suffer from *martyr syndrome* – as they often think their countries owe them.

He attributed the lack of public participation, power imbalance, non-inclusiveness, lack of transparency and accountability, ethnicity and above all, lack of political will as the catalysts to the widespread corruption on the continent.

He noted that whereas there was no shortage of laws in Africa, the challenge was to obey them and cited procurement laws which are increasingly becoming avenues through which public funds are being stolen in accordance with the law.



In spite of their own challenges, he commended Botswana, Mauritius and Cape Verde as some of the countries that had done well in terms of budgetary control in Africa.

IV. BUDGETARY CONTROL IN THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY BY DR. GABY SCHÄFER, PRESIDENT OF THE BUDGET CONTROL INSTITUTION OF SCHLESWIG- HOLSTEIN, GERMANY



Dr. Schäfer took participants through the system of public-sector audit in Germany in general and the structure and functioning of the budget control institution (*Landesrechnungshof*) in Schleswig-Holstein in particular.

She underlined the independent status of the budget control institution whose existence is guaranteed by the constitution and is only subject to the law.

The institution serves and assists the executive and legislative branches of the government without forming a part of either one of them and neither does it have judicial power. She pointed out that *Landesrechnungshof*'s role is more important especially in situations where parliament's influence is weak i.e. in a grand coalition arrangement.

Its main function is auditing (*revenues and expenditures, assets and liabilities, measures having a financial impact as well as levels of allocated resources*); reporting; providing advice; monitoring the budget and participating in various matters as required by the law.

In carrying out its duties the *Landesrechnungshof* has the right of physical access to any institution/agency, has the right to inspect files which audited bodies have an obligation of submitting when required to do so, and has the right to obtain data and information that it may require.

For effectiveness and in order to detect financial malpractices early enough, the *Landesrechnungshof* has adopted a modern audit philosophy that lays emphasize on timely, concurrent, early involvement, proactive, cross-sectional approach, systems-oriented and advisory approach as opposed to the classical philosophy which is mostly retrospective, employs case-by-case approach, targets individuals as opposed to systems and is often repressive.

In order to guarantee the security of tenure of the President of the institution, he/she is elected for a non-renewable term of 12 years by at least 2/3 majority vote by parliament.

The composition of the Court of Auditors is also very diverse which enhances specialization. In Schleswig-Holstein for example, the current team of 69 auditors is composed of individuals with diverse backgrounds drawn from economics, law, police/judicature, taxation, public administration, engineering, business information system, forestry/agronomy as well as school system/social services.

Since the *Landesrechnungshof* has no enforcement powers, it has identified the media as an important partner in its work. It is through the media that it disseminates its audit findings to the general public and thereby exert pressure on those responsible for managing public funds to spend in a more efficient and transparent manner, because none of them wishes to be implicated in financial impropriety.

V. HUMAN-RIGHTS BASED APPROACH TO BUDGET PROCESSES VIS-À-VIS THE REALIZATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA BY MS IDA NAKIGANDA, DIRECTOR, (RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND DOCUMENTATION), UGANDA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Drawing on her experience, Ms Nakiganda was able to identify the obligation of states to respect, protect and promote the constitutional human rights guarantee to all by giving precedence in budgeting to the needs of ordinary people rather than to those of the governing elite.



In order to achieve this, principles of human rights-based approach in the budgetary process requires implementation of national and international human rights norms and standards at the domestic level; equality and non-discrimination; empowerment of the rights holders; participation and inclusion of all stakeholders; and accountability of duty bearers at the local and national levels to comply with the legal norms and standards enshrined in human rights instruments.

She observed that a good budgetary process that conforms to the ideals of human rights based approach should be one that yields transparency, accountability, participation, stimulates growth, is sustainable and maximizes existing resources.

She pointed out differences between allocations and actual expenditures; unauthorized expenditures and leakages through misappropriation and corruption; unequal distribution of resources as some of the greatest threats to development and full enjoyment of human rights in Africa. She observed that oftentimes allocations to government Ministries, departments, Sectors and Agencies was inadequate to enable them carry out their human rights obligations but even where this was adequate, public officers lacked the capacity and knowledge to relate their specific budgets to their human rights obligations.

The chair of that session, Hon. Eddie Cross, who is a member of the Public Accounts Committee in Zimbabwe, made a passionate plea for a more proactive audit approach in Africa, to avoid situations where auditing of public funds is like a pathologist performing a post-mortem examination of a dead body – when the damage has already been done.

He pointed out that a valuable lesson can be learnt from the German system which detects problems at an early stage in the budgetary process and advises on how best public money is to be spent before decisions of a deleterious nature are made and cannot be reversed.

VI. BUDGETARY CONTROL AND ACCOUNTABILITY: THE SOUTH AFRICAN EXPERIENCE BY ADV. KEVIN MALUNGA, DEPUTY PUBLIC PROTECTOR, SOUTH AFRICA



Adv. Malunga focused on the provisions of section 217 of the South African Constitution which requires the procurement of goods and services using public funds to be based upon the principles of fairness, equity, cost-effectiveness, competitiveness and transparency. It is therefore incumbent upon the executive and legislative branches of the government of South Africa to create a system of budgetary control and accountability that accords with the five principles contained in section 217.

Adv. Malunga drew attention to the provisions of various pieces of legislation among them the Public Finance Management Act, the Municipal Public Finance Act, the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act and various financially orientated legislations relating to assets forfeiture, disclosure of financial information and the like that aim to give effect to the requirements of section 217 of the Constitution.

He explained the role and independence of the Office of the Public Protector a constitutional body created to promote *inter alia* constitutional democracy in South Africa. Whilst the constitutional mandate of the public protector relates to maladministration by state organs and in government business (with no jurisdiction over disputes in the private sector) the situation on the ground is that the public protector has increasingly been turned to by civil society organizations and individual members of the public to investigate corruption of all kinds and in particular grand corruption such as that revealed in the report concerning expenditure of public money on alleged security upgrades at the homestead of president Zuma.

It was noted that there was possible threat to the efficiency and independence of the office of public protector given that its budget is regarded as a line item in the justice department's budget. Adv. Malunga indicated that the office was handling about 40,000

cases a year and the funds allocated were insufficient as a consequence of which the public protector is required to approach treasury toward the end of each financial year when budget and funding runs out in order to carry on with its work and pay off its administrative expenses.

VII. FIGHTING CORRUPTION IN AFRICA THROUGH THE CREATION OF INDEPENDENT AND EFFECTIVE INSTITUTIONS WITH AN EYE ON THE EXPERIENCE IN SOUTH AFRICA BY ADV. PAUL HOFFMAN SC, DIRECTOR, INSTITUTE FOR ACCOUNTABILITY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

The notion of regarding corruption as a human rights violation has become established in the jurisprudence of Africa through the work of the South African Constitutional Court in the seminal judgment of its majority in the leading case of *Glenister–vs-the President of the Republic of South Africa and others* which was handed down on the 17th of March 2011. The majority of the court ruled that a failure to create and maintain an effective and independent Anti-Corruption Entity (ACE) amounts to a violation of the justiciable Bill of Rights which is chapter 2 of the South African Constitution.



In his presentation, Adv. Hoffman used four props, a carrot representing methods of inducing and educating with the intention of preventing corruption and discouraging it as a corrosive practice which is not sustainable in the 21st century. The second prop was a baton representing effective law enforcement while the third was a two meter long bamboo stick representing the “big stick” of the

Constitution itself as a means of protecting tax payers and the public at large from the ravages of corruption. The final prop used in the presentation was a small elephant brought into the room to represent the lack of political will in Africa to tackle corruption effectively.

Adv. Hoffman suggested that ordinary people in Africa and indeed everywhere else in the world desire *three Ps* i.e. lasting peace, progress that is sustainable and a more prosperous future for their children. He identified the qualities of an efficient judiciary and criminal justice administration as relating to the *three Is* of integrity, impartiality and independence, which must be brought to bear in the investigation and prosecution and adjudication of the corrupt.

In so far as the creation of effective Anti-Corruption Entities is concerned Adv. Hoffman used the acronym STIRS to identify the qualities required of such an institution;

STAKEHOLDERS' CONFERENCE ON BUDGETARY CONTROL, CORRUPTION AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN AFRICA

- Specialization - the creation of a unit dedicated to dealing with corruption and organized crime to the exclusion of all other activities. The South African experience of the Hawks.
- Training - the need to equip personnel in the anti-corruption entity with appropriate training to enable them to fight in the same weight division as well organized criminal syndicates that are continuously using novel and ingenious means to commit corruption and organized crime.
- Independence - the capacity to act without fear of the mighty, favor to the friendly and prejudice to the public.
- Resources – allocation of sufficient funding to guarantee efficient and effective functioning (this is not the experience of the public protector in South Africa at the moment)
- Security of tenure. In South Africa, the Scorpions were a mere creature of statute and not a constitutionally created ACE. It was accordingly easy for parliament to repeal the law and disband the Scorpions and create the Hawks.

The significance of the *Glenister case* to the fight against corruption is that the court insisted on effectiveness and independence and would not allow an Anti-Corruption Entity under the control of the executive. The Hawks are under the control of the executive as they are part of the police services. The remedial legislation passed by parliament in September 2013 has once again been challenged by Mr. Glenister and an important judgment in this case will follow a hearing scheduled for 19th August 2014.

VIII. THE FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION AND WASTAGE OF PUBLIC RESOURCES: THE BEST PRACTICES ON RESPONSIBLE INSTITUTION, LEGAL FRAMEWORK, REPORTING AND ENFORCEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS: BOTSWANA EXPERIENCE BY MR MATLHOGONOLO PHUTHEGO, ASSISTANT DPP AND DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON, CORRUPTION PREVENTION COMMITTEE OF THE REPUBLIC OF BOTSWANA

Mr. Phutego pointed out to the wide consultations involving all key stakeholders in the budgetary process in Botswana as a means to enabling stakeholders to understand the broader macro-fiscal content and Government strategy for achieving cost effective and sustainable spending. He noted that this is part of the new Public Finance Management Reform Programme being undertaken by the Government of Botswana aimed at enhancing transparency and ownership of the budgeting process.

As a result, expenditures under the development budget normally focus on



high return projects and where a proposed project cannot demonstrate a large net benefit to Botswana, it has to be either postponed or scaled down. Furthermore, over the project cycle, costs and benefits are often tracked so that timely adjustments are made to ensure that the project continues to justify its inclusion in the constrained budget, failure to which it is either re-prioritised or scaled down.

In the fight against corruption, Mr. Phutego shared the legal, institutional and social measures that have been undertaken by Botswana as part of its comprehensive anti-corruption policy. These include, enacting laws that facilitate more transparency; harmonising all laws dealing with the fight against corruption with the Corruption and Economic Crimes Act; ensuring Botswana enters into extradition treaties with her major trading partners; clarifying the roles played by, and creating awareness of, all stakeholders in the anti-corruption fight; facilitating effective coordination of all institutions involved in anti-corruption; advocating for preventative strategies for anti-corruption; promoting anti-corruption capacity building across the private and the public sectors; advocating for improved enforcement of anti-corruption strategies; promoting and fostering an anti-corruption culture in the society at all levels and increasing the number of anti-corruption community clubs in the country among others.

Further, Botswana has established a number of oversight agencies created by various Acts of Parliament in a bid to ensure transparent utilisation of public funds. These include the Public Procurement and Asset Disposal Board (which handles issues of registration, delisting and discipline of contractors); the Directorate on Corruption and Economic Crime (which investigates all corruption-related complaints in all public bodies); the Botswana Police Service; the Auditor General; the Parliamentary Accounts Committee; the Financial Intelligence Unit (which tackles issues of tax fraudsters and money laundering) and the Accountant General (which takes care of payments to and by Government and is responsible for monitoring fraud).

He noted that the Government of Botswana is keen to prevent corruption at all levels hence the efforts towards sensitising members of the public on the negative effects of corruption and on what measures they should put in place to prevent corruption.

Whereas Botswana's efforts were lauded, Hon. Nehemiah Modubule, the chairman of the Botswana's Public Accounts Committee raised alarm that the country seemed to be derailing under the current regime. For example, he pointed out the immunity that the president enjoys; the lack of action against senior government officials especially the ministers; widespread violation of human rights by the police; the lack of a Human Rights Commission and the lack of independence of the office of the Public Prosecutor which still operates under the control of the Attorney General, which all undermine sustainable and effective fight against corruption in Botswana.

Mr. Phutego agreed that there were some challenges the country was facing and there was need to improve in certain areas, but defended the government efforts arguing that

there were systems to fight corruption and the main challenge was implementing them due to lack of capacity. He further pointed out that all companies that were found to be corrupt have since been blacklisted.

IX. PLENARY HIGHLIGHTS

It was agreed that there is no shortage of laws in Africa but there was a great shortage of their proper implementation. The participants emphasized the need to raise awareness amongst politicians, public servants and the public in general in matters relating the Rule of Law and the importance of constitutionalism as a means of achieving peace, prosperity and progress.



Further, there is need to simplify laws and the budgetary processes to enhance transparency. There was a proposal to create audit criteria and an auditing team to see whether the necessary legal framework exist in participating countries and whether implementation of the laws against corruption is being effectively put in place.

Hon. Cross, MP (L) making his contribution

It was pointed out that it is about time African started demanding value for their money. In addition to fighting corruption, there was need to curb against wastage of public resources.

It was evident that the lack of political will across Africa in the fight against corruption was a major hindrance. In this regard, institutions created to fight corruption were challenged to stand up and push the agenda at the apex of political leadership by working closely with the non-state actors such as the civil society and the media, who can help them to understand and appreciate the actual situation on the ground.

Conversely, the non-state actors can also assist these institutions by building their capacities to effectively fight against this menace.



Mr. Kuria of the Private Sector making his contribution

The three Ps (peace, progress and prosperity), the three Is (impartiality, independence and integrity) as well as the STIRS (specialisation, training, independence, resources and security of tenure) criteria of the Anti-Corruption Entities were touted as the best way forward for Africa at this stage of its development with the ultimate aspiration of creating a sophisticated machinery such as the one presided over by Dr. Schäfer.

Quality education was identified as one of the main weapons in the fight against corruption. In order to achieve this, the plenary underscored the strong desire for more pro-poor and citizen-centred budgeting process in Africa.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following measures were recommended to facilitate accountability and entrench a strong budgetary control system in Africa,

- Establish constitutional framework and embrace political culture oriented to citizenship and rights, and which is strong on effective and dynamic citizen engagement. To this end, African Governments should put in place effective mechanisms with strong constitutional and legislative frameworks for controlling all expenditures and public borrowing without which budget discipline cannot be enforced and the Government's macro-fiscal objectives will be jeopardized. Further, African States should entrench Procurement standards in their constitutions and implement them; as well as create strong internal controls at institutional level to tame corruption and wastage.
- Create transparent systems of decision-making about budget allocation, and of budget execution. Thus, Government budgets should be planned in a manner which allows scarce budgetary resources to be allocated to strategic spending priorities.
- Build a system of issues-based political competition. African Governments should resist the temptation of political influence while implementing the annual budgets because political influence causes imbalances in resource allocation and conservatory spending which can be very damaging for the economy. Instead, they should endeavour to strengthen all budgetary implementing and oversight institutions to ensure a win-win situation in the utilization of public resources for the benefit of all. In the foregoing, efforts should be made towards building the capacities of these institutions through training and specialization
- Create a clear framework of policy goals, aligned to a vision of society with respect for social justice. To this end, the strategic spending priorities must be clearly identified and medium term expenditure allocations drawn up to reflect these priorities with quality universal education for all as a key priority area.

STAKEHOLDERS' CONFERENCE ON BUDGETARY CONTROL, CORRUPTION AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN AFRICA

- Civil society should be active and engaged in the budget process by *inter alia* accessing information, producing analysis and holding government to account. Budget processes and information should therefore be simplified and disseminated widely.
- Empower citizens to actively participate in governance issues as a whole. Therefore there is need for creation of a system of governance that advances, supports and sustains human development, assuring all stakeholders of openness and transparency. The non-state actors such as the private sector, the media, the civil society and the public in general must continuously monitor budgets to ensure that they are geared towards progressive realization of their economic, social and cultural rights.
- Build strong regional cooperation across all sectors to act as each others brother's keeper and avenues through which best practices can be shared.

XI. WAY FORWARD

At the end of the two-day conference, it was clear that there existed a strong nexus between budgetary control, corruption and human rights. It was observed that effective budget control can indeed minimize corruption and wastage of public resources and therefore enhance the realisation of human rights for the majority, if not for all citizens. Having established this link, the organisers and the delegates pledged to continue exploring possible solutions to the existing challenges and to build strong networks for continuous engagement and dialogue in search of sustainable solutions.

Already, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung and IFAISA in South Africa are working on a concept to prevent corruption which entails rating of countries in their fight against corruption which the delegates present at the conference could plug in once finalised. The idea is to create a rating agency for corruption with inspectors ranking the different countries according to how they develop in regard to corruption. The aim of the countries should then be to get a higher score so as to attract investments and funding both within and without their borders.

Closing

The vote of thanks was proposed by Ms. Flavia Mwangovya of NANHRI.

XII. LIST OF DELEGATES

NAME	DESIGNATION/ORGANIZATION & COUNTRY
Justice Dr. Emmanuel Ugirashebuja	Judge President, East African Court of Justice, Arusha - Tanzania
Justice Harold Nsekela,	Retired Judge President, East African Court of Justice

STAKEHOLDERS' CONFERENCE ON BUDGETARY CONTROL, CORRUPTION AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN AFRICA

Hon. Nehemiah Modubule	Chairman, Public Accounts Committee (PAC), National Assembly, Republic of Botswana
Hon. Eddie Cross	Member, Public Accounts Committee (PAC), National Assembly, Republic of Zimbabwe
Hon. Kwasi Cheremeh Ameyaw	Member, Public Accounts Committee (PAC), National Assembly, Republic of Ghana
Ms Agnes Odhiambo	Controller of Budget, Republic of Kenya
Adv. Kevin Malunga	Deputy Public Protector, Republic of South Africa
Dr. Gaby Schaefer	President of the Budget Control Institution of Schleswig- Holstein, Germany
Ms Kagwiria Mbogori	Chairperson, Kenya National Commission on Human Rights
Fr. Emmanuel Ntakarutimana	Chairperson, National Independent Commission for Human Rights, Republic of Burundi
Mr Matlhogonolo Phuthego	Assistant DPP and Deputy Chairperson, Corruption Prevention Committee, Republic of Botswana
Prof. PLO Lumumba	Director, Kenya School of Law Republic of Kenya
Mr. Iliyasu Yahaya Kwarbai	Head of Economic and Financial Crimes Commission, Lagos Office, Republic of Nigeria
Dr. Evaristo Da Luz	Foreign Affairs Secretary, CASA-CE, Republic of Angola
Adv. Paul Hoffman	Director, Institute for Accountability in Southern Africa (IFAISA), Republic of South Africa
Mrs. Ruth Sebatindira	President, Uganda Law Society, Republic of Uganda
Prof. Charles Manga Fombad	Professor of Law & Head of Constitutional Law Unit at the ICLA, University of Pretoria, Republic of South Africa
Prof. Gilles Cistac	Professor of Law, Eduardo Mondlane University, Republic of Mozambique
Mr. Nelson Kuria	CEO, CIC Group, Republic of Kenya
Mr. George Kegoro	Executive Director, Kenyan Section of the International Commission of Jurists
Mr. Henry Maina	Executive Director, Article 19, Eastern Africa
Ms Ida Nakiganda	Director, Research, Education and Documentation, Uganda Human Rights Commission
Prof. Jean Michel Kumbu	Professor of Law, University of Kinshasa & Good Governance Expert UNDP, Democratic Republic of Congo
Mrs Ndeye Soukeyna Ndao Diallo	Member, Senegalese Association of Female Jurists (AJS), Republic of Senegal
Ms Vanessa Mundree	Senior Investigator, Good Governance and Integrity Unit, Public Protector, Republic of South Africa
Ms Sophia Ebby	Program Officer, Coalition for Effective African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights
Ms Phephelaphi Dube	Legal Officer, Centre for Constitutional Rights, FW de Klerk Foundation, Republic of South Africa
Mr. Faustin Ndikumana	Director, Parsem , Republic of Burundi
Ms Anna Henga	Legal Officer, Legal and Human Rights Centre, United Republic of Tanzania
Ms Lizet Vlamings	Research Fellow, Foundation for Human Rights Initiative, Republic of Uganda
Mr. Thapelo Ndlovu,	Journalist, <i>Sniffdog</i> , Republic of Botswana
Mr. Matuma Letsoalo	Journalist, Mail and Guardian, Republic of South Africa
Ms Annalisa Meroro	Chief Parliamentary Clerk, Republic of Namibia
Mr. Joshua Musyimi	Director, Office of Budget Controller, Republic of Kenya
Ms Jane Diane	Office of Deputy Public Protector, Republic of South Africa

STAKEHOLDERS' CONFERENCE ON BUDGETARY CONTROL, CORRUPTION AND HUMAN RIGHTS IN AFRICA

Ms Mary Owii	Office of Budget Controller, Republic of Kenya
Dr. Arne Wulff	Director, Rule of Law Program for Sub Saharan Africa, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung
Mr. Peter Wendoh	Project Advisor, Rule of Law Program for Sub Saharan Africa, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung
Ms Flavia Mwangovya	Programs Manager, NANHRI
Ms Felicitas v. Campenhausen	Intern, Rule of Law Program for Sub Saharan Africa, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung