Africa Integrity Indicators – Country Findings

Who is Global Integrity?

Global Integrity supports progress toward open and accountable governance in countries and communities around the world. We focus on generating research and data, supporting the work of country-level reformers, and influencing global conversations on open governance. Our work covers a number of themes, with data, learning and citizen engagement at the core of everything we do. To know more about us, visit our website at www.globalintegrity.org.

What are the Africa Integrity Indicators?

In 2012, Global Integrity embarked on a five-year collaboration with the Mo Ibrahim Foundation to generate the Africa Integrity Indicators (AII), which assesses key social, economic, political and anti-corruption mechanisms at the national level across the continent. Global Integrity staff recruits and manages teams of in-country contributors in 54 countries to generate original governance data on an annual basis.

The questionnaire has 114 indicators and is divided in two main categories: Transparency & Accountability and Social Development. The Transparency & Accountability category consists of 59 indicators examining issues divided in the thematic areas of rule of law, accountability, elections, public management, civil service integrity, and access to information. The Social Development indicators category consists of 51 indicators about gender, rights, welfare, rural sector, business environment, health and education.

The rich data set is designed to be particularly fruitful in identifying both bright spots as well as areas for improvement at the country level. The years of data include 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016; the next round of research will begin later in 2016 and be published in April 2017. To access our data, visit our project website at http://aii.globalintegrity.org.

Note: Each round of research is named from its year of publication. Thus, the 2016 round of research covers the period from September 2014 to September 2015, with only sources relevant to this period of study being accepted.

Get in touch with us

Global Integrity is dedicated not only to producing high quality data, but ensuring that it is as useful as possible for reformers (both inside and outside of government) around the world. If you’re interested in working with this data to identify opportunities to support open governance efforts in your country, contact us at aii@globalintegrity.org.
Mali – Country Findings Summary

1. Transparency & Accountability

The Transparency & Accountability category consists of 59 indicators examining issues divided in the thematic areas of rule of law, accountability, elections, public management, civil service integrity, and access to information & openness. The indicators look into transparency of the public procurement process, media freedom, asset disclosure requirements, independence of the judiciary, and conflict of interest laws, among others.

The overall category score shows a slight increase, from 49 in 2015 to 55 in 2016. However, Mali remains in the “somewhat weak” area on the Global Integrity scale. In four out of the six subcategories, Mali’s aggregate scores were higher than the West African and the continental average scores.

With an aggregate score of 65, Elections became the highest performing subcategory, increasing by five points from 60 in 2015 to 65 in 2016. The subcategory, however, is still in the “moderate” area on the Global Integrity scale. The Public Management subcategory recorded the most significant score increase as a result of improved transparency in the public procurement sector; the subcategory moved up to the “moderate” area on the Global Integrity scale. The Rule of Law subcategory recorded an increase (+6) from 58 in 2015 to 64 in 2016, and the Civil Service Integrity subcategory recorded an increase (+4) from 38 in 2015 to 42 in 2016. Scores for Accountability and Access to Information & Openness decreased. The latter, with an aggregate score of 37, was the lowest performing subcategory.

Selected highlights

- Mali’s audit institution operated independently from the three branches of government, but it did not publish audit reports. Indicator 5 notes that in Mali, Law N°03-30 of August 25, 2003 establishes a supreme audit institution called the Bureau du Vérificateur Général (BVG). Indicator 6

---

1 The Global Integrity scale on the Africa Integrity Indicators website is as follows: 81-100 (Strong), 61-80 (Moderate), 41-60 (Somewhat weak), 21-40 (Weak), 0-20 (Very Weak)
reports that the BVG is legally independent from the executive and legislative branches, has the authority to audit any government account, and can refer cases directly to the prosecutor's office. The BVG is also entitled to its own budget sourced from the annual national budget. Indicator 7 reports that, over the study period, the BVG was indeed able to audit all government accounts without fear of favor, and had consistent funding. However, the total amount changed from US$8 million (4 082 826 000 FCFA) in 2014 to US$6 million (3 023 150 000 FCFA) in 2015, a decrease that the Deputy Auditor General Aboubacar Diarra attributed to the ongoing military conflict in Northern Mali. The BVG’s independence is strengthened by the appointment process of its Auditor General. Indicator 8 reports that the Auditor General is recruited following a competitive process comprising the publication of the vacancy and required qualifications for the job, the review of applications by a commission, and the forwarding of the name of the most qualified candidate to the president who then appoints him/her. The Deputy Auditor General and all BVG auditors are also recruited through a competitive process. The current Auditor General had no conflicts of interest at the time of his appointment in 2011, and he was not removed when a new administration took power in 2013. However, indicator 9 reports that over the study period, the BVG only published its annual report although it conducted audits and produced 12 audit reports. The published annual report was first presented to the president during an official event in August 2015, then released online, with a small number of paper copies sent to relevant government offices.

- **Legal frameworks to ensure accountability remained strong, but there was a significant implementation gap.** Since the adoption of law No15 of May 27, 2014, Mali has a specific law that criminalizes corruption as a specific offense (indicator 10). That law also creates and mandates an independent body to receive and investigate cases of alleged public sector corruption, Office Central de Lutte contre l'Enrichissement Illicite (OCLEI), as noted in indicator 11. However, the research revealed a contrasting picture between the in law and in practice indicators. On the one hand, the decree that would enable the enforcement of the Law N°015 of May 2014 and that would have allowed the OCLEI to receive and investigate allegations in practice, had not been signed by the president until the end of the study period (indicator 12). Indicator 14 reveals that, as a result, the OCLEI was not staffed during the study period, and instead, allegations of corruption against senior level politicians and/or civil servants of all levels were still investigated by the judicial system. Courts proved to be ineffective because conflicts of interests and personal loyalties between judges and
politicians impeded the processing of corruption cases. **Indicator 13** reports that allegations were also investigated by the Auditor General whenever they pertained to institutional mismanagement, or by the country’s three economic and financial prosecution units (Pôle Économique et Financier) whenever allegations concerned individuals. The units are located within the first instance courts of Bamako, Kayes and Mopti. This gap between the law and the practice extends to the accountability of the police. **Indicator 17** notes that the law established the national human rights commission (CNDH) in 2009, tasking it to receive and investigate complaints of human rights violations, including abuse of force and police misconduct. But **indicator 18**, which assesses the responsiveness of the CNDH’s complaint mechanism earned a low score of 25, as in practice, the CNDH takes weeks to complete investigations, even if it receives allegations of police misconduct and does start some investigations from its own initiative.

- **Citizens faced difficulties accessing financial records of state-owned companies.** On the other hand, access to public procurement information presented a mixed picture. **Indicator 25** notes that in Mali, major public procurements involve competitive bidding and bids are published on the website of the procurement service, the Direction Générale des Marchés Publics (DGMP). Published information includes the scope, the specifications, and terms of the proposed contract, and the criteria by which the bids are evaluated. However, there are cases where the winning bidders do not meet the criteria. **Indicator 26** reports that once bids are awarded, citizens can access relevant documents such as the full contract, proposals, execution reports, and financial audits from either the DGMP website or in paper form from the DGMP archives service. While access is granted within 24 hours in the latter case, available information is not always complete. In contrast to citizens’ access to procurement information, indicators **29** and **30** respectively report that citizens cannot access the financial records of state-owned companies. Moreover, although Mali has been a member of the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), citizens still cannot access the financial records associated with natural resources exploitation (gas, oil and mining).
2. Social Development

This category covers seven subcategories, including rights (civil society space and minority rights), gender, business environment and infrastructure, rural sector, welfare, health, education, and civil registration. Because the Social Development portion of the research only includes a small number of questions per each topic area, we only provide the scores for each individual indicator and don’t provide aggregated category or subcategory scores. However, the individual indicators themselves contain a wealth of information across a breadth of topics, a select few highlights of which are noted below.

Selected highlights

• Citizens were generally free to assemble, but NGOs operated in a hostile environment. In Mali, citizens were generally able to freely associate with their peers to express dissent in public settings, and during the study period, many rallies and demonstrations were held in the country. However, a case was reported in which four people died after a protest against the UN peacekeeping mission was repressed (indicator 67). Non-profit organizations are only granted NGO status after three years of operations. During the study period, the government placed no barriers for the registration of new NGOs, and NGOs that are already in existence did not face any obstacles in their operations, as reported in indicator 68. However, indicator 70 notes that an NGO called Yalimane Dagakane was harassed with unwarranted sanctions in retribution for its work in the Yalimane administrative district. Also indicator 69 reports that many NGO employees were harmed in relation to their work; this includes assassinations by armed and terrorist groups, holdups and attacks against humanitarian convoys, causing the death of at least one person.

• Customary laws continue to restrict women’s equal rights to land and non-land property ownership, inheritance, divorce petition, independent travel and access to employment opportunities and benefits. Indicator 77 notes that although Law 06-049 of September 5, 2006 guarantees equal land access rights to men and women, customary laws in many ethnic groups limit women’s ability to buy, own and sell land. Such is the case in the Bambaras, Buwa, Peulh, Senoufo, Miniankas and Sonrhaïs tribal groups. Also despite equal rights being guaranteed by the Family Code, customary laws in these ethnic groups impose restrictions on women’s ability to buy, own and sell non-land property (indicator 78), and on their right to inherit on equal terms with men (indicator 79). As for divorce petition rights, indicator 80 reports that the Family Code provides for equal rights for men and women, but in virtually every community in Mali, women face tougher requirements than men to have their divorce claims heard by traditional authorities. Indicator 82 notes that in these communities, women are not free to travel alone and are required to be accompanied when going out of their family home. Indicator 83 reports that the Constitution of 1992, the Labor Code of 1992 and the National Gender Policy of 2010 all guarantee women’s equal access to employment opportunities and benefits in the workplace. Yet, in some communities such as the Buwas and Miniankas in the Ségou, Sikasso and Koulikoro regions, women are restricted to certain occupations and can, for instance, not plow land. In communities of the northern part of the country, women cannot engage in pastoralist activities.
• **Women’s representation in the highest echelons of the three branches of government is comparatively very low.** Out of 29 cabinet members, there are only three women (10%). Mali, thus, earned a score of 25 on indicator 85, significantly lower than both the West African average of 62 and the continental average of 60. Women’s representation in the highest courts is also low, as there are only three women out of 54 judges (5.5%) in the Constitutional Court, the Supreme Court and the High Court of Justice. Mali’s score of 25 on indicator 86 is significantly lower than the regional average of 50 and the continental average of 56. Finally, indicator 87 reports that there are only 14 women among the 147 members of the legislature (10%). The country thus earned a 25 score, which is lower than the regional average of 38 and the continental average of 56.

• **The National Institute of Statistics (INSTAT) shows uneven capacity in regards to the collection of statistics on youth unemployment, poverty and infrastructure.** Through the household survey Enquête Modulaire et Permanente auprès des Ménages (EMOP), INSTAT has collected annual statistics on poverty since 2011. **Indicator 92** reports that data for the last EMOP conducted from April 2014 to March 2015 were published online during the study period. The 100 score earned by indicator 92 stands in contrast to the 0 score of **indicator 91**, which notes that the quarterly data on unemployment INSTAT produced in partnership with the National Observatory for Employment and Training (ONEF) was not disaggregated by age. It also did not contain any figures on youth unemployment. ONEF was launched in 2013 and only became operational in 2015; at the time of the research, it was conducting quantitative surveys on unemployment. **Indicator 93** notes that the INSTAT does not collect and publish data on infrastructure, and while some agencies keep limited data, these pertain to expenses rather than the state of the infrastructure.

*The above findings capture selected highlights and are not an exhaustive analysis of the collected data. We encourage interested users to access our website [here](#) for detailed comments and sources for 114 individual indicators.*