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.
Mauritius – 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 scored showed a slight decrease by two points, from 63 in 2015 to 61 in 2016 (“moderate” on the Global Integrity scale).\(^1\)

Aggregate score of all six subcategories were higher than the Southern African and the continental averages. Rule of Law was the highest performing subcategory with an aggregate score of 78, and closely followed by the Civil Service Integrity subcategory with an aggregate score of 75 (both in the “moderate” area on the Global Integrity scale). The three subcategories Accountability (56), Elections (55) and Public Management (53) earned aggregate scores in the 50 range. With a score of 47, Access to Information & Openness was the lowest performing subcategory (“somewhat weak” on the Global Integrity scale).

Selected highlights

- **The judiciary enjoyed a high degree of independence.** Mauritius’ Constitution of 1968 guarantees a separation of powers among the three branches of the government (indicator 1), and during the study period, judges operated free from executive or legislative influence. For instance, in June 2015, the Intermediate Court found the Minister of Technology, Communication and Innovation, who is also the leader of the ruling party, guilty on corruption charges (indicator 2). This led to the resignation of the Minister from office. Appointments of judges also support the

---

\(^1\) 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)
independence of the judiciary. Candidates are screened and recommended by the Judicial and Legal Service Commission, headed by the Chief Justice, and appointments are based on seniority among candidates from lower courts or the State Law Office (indicator 3), as was the case with the appointment of puisne judge Aruna Narain in July 2015. Once appointed, judges are reported to have security of tenure; no judges were removed during the study period. Judges routinely provide formal reasoning for their judgments, and as noted in indicator 4, rulings of the Supreme Court are easily accessible on the website of the Court. While most rulings can be found online, those that are not can be obtained upon request at the Registry of the Supreme Court. Next to Ghana, Kenya and Namibia, Mauritius was one of the only four countries to earn a 100 score on all four indicators assessing the independence of the judiciary.

- **The National Audit Office (NAO) exercised its mandate without any restrictions, but only released one report per year.** The Constitution of 1968 establishes the NAO's mandate to audit all public accounts (indicator 5). Despite the fact that the NAO cannot refer cases directly to the Prosecutor’s Office, and is required by law to submit its reports first to the Minister of Finance (indicator 6), it did not shy away from highlighting irregularities. For instance, in its annual report for 2014, it was critical about expenditures made in different public departments, such as the Mauritius Police Force and the National Development Unit (indicator 7). As noted in indicator 8, appointments to the NAO are merit-based and carried out by the independent Public Service Commission, which further reinforces the independence of the Office. The Director of the NAO, Kwee Chow Tse Yuet Cheong, was appointed in November 2013, and held the position of Deputy Director (1995-2013) prior to the appointment. The Director can only be removed on specific grounds through a hearing by a panel of three judges. In contrast to the high scores of indicators 7 and 8, indicator 9 received a 0 score, as the NAO has published only one report per year. Once submitted to the Minister of Finance, reports of the NAO are transmitted to the National Assembly and made public thereafter. The annual report for the year ending in December 2013 was published only after the general elections of December 2014. The annual report for 2014 was made available on the Office's website in September 2015.

- **In the absence of an access to information law, obtaining information from most public institutions is challenging for citizens.** As reported in indicator 41, Mauritius does not have an access to information law, which makes it difficult for citizens to effectively request public information in practice (indicator 42). However, certain types of records are accessible online. For instance, the National Assembly makes legislative documents available on its website and citizens are able to access order papers, bills, voting records and transcripts of all parliamentary debates. Indicator 43, therefore, earned a 100 score as opposed to the low scores of indicators 41 and 42. Annual financial records of certain state-owned companies, such as the Central Electricity Board or the State Trading Corp., are also publicly available once they have been tabled at the National Assembly (indicator 29). Records of other state-owned companies can be requested at a fee of less than US$2 at the registrar of companies.
According to indicator 30, while Mauritius lacks large-scale resource exploitation such as gas, oil and mining, they do allocate fishing rights to foreign entities, and yet the financial records of such fishing rights are not made available to citizens. Citizens are also not able to access asset declarations of public officials (indicators 45 and 47, as such a requirement does not apply to all public officials and the law does not oblige disclosures to be made public (indicators 44 and 46). Information on private donations that political parties receive are also out of reach for citizens (indicator 51), as parties do not open up their books, and no law requires the publication of such records (indicator 50).
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 able to associate freely during the study period and NGOs did not face any obstacles in their operations.** According to indicator 68, NGOs were able to organize and get registered freely. No reported cases existed of NGO employees being killed, imprisoned, physically threatened or harmed (indicator 69), and no NGO was shut down or harassed with unwarranted administrative burdens as a retribution for their work during the study period (indicator 70). The private sector is a significant contributor to NGOs through corporate social responsibility (CSR) funding, and whereas criteria for such funding had been strict in the past, the government began to ease the relevant guidelines in early 2015. Citizens also generally enjoyed a high degree of freedom of association. However, in one incident, an independent candidate for the 2014 elections, Percy Yip Tong, faced hurdles in holding a meeting during the campaign, despite holding permission to do so (indicator 67).

- **The country has an effective mechanism to receive and investigate complaints of discrimination based on ethnic background, religion or sexual orientation.** Mauritius’ Constitution and its Equal Opportunities Act of 2008 protects ethnic and religious minorities, and guarantees their right to main and develop essential elements of their identity (indicators 71 and 73). The legal framework to protect LGBT citizens is weaker, as no law provides for an overall right to protect citizens from discrimination based on sexual orientation, and only includes provisions on limited remedies (indicator 75). However, in practice, the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC) has been active in receiving and investigating cases of discrimination of ethnic, religious and sexual minorities. The EOC was established in 2012 under the Equal Opportunities Act of 2008 and receive cases of discrimination, as well as provide guidelines to public and private bodies on the prevention of discrimination. An Equal Opportunities Tribunal was further set up in 2013 to which the Commission can transfer cases that could not be resolved based on mutual agreement. During the study period, the EOC investigated various complaints of ethnic discrimination in relation to recruitment and promotion practices (indicator 72). It also investigated a complaint against the Blood Donors Association and the Ministry of Health and Qualify of Life in regards to a section of its questionnaire which permanently disqualifies a donator who engaged in homosexual activities. Following the EOC’s recommendations, the Association agreed to adjust its policy and reframe the question. Mauritius scored a high score of 75 on indicator 76, and is the only country having scored above a 50 of all countries covered by the research.
Women's representation was low in parliament and the presidential cabinet, but relatively high within the highest branch of the judiciary. Only three women were among the 24 members (12.5%) of the national cabinet. 

Indicator 85, thus, earned a 25 score, which was below both the Southern African average of 67 and the continental average of 60. Eight out of 69 members of the National Assembly were women (11.6%), translating into a 25 score for indicator 87. The regional average on this indicator was 71 and the continental average 56. A gender quota has so far only been taken into consideration once for the municipal council elections of June 2015, following an amendment to the Local Government Act. Female representation was comparatively higher within the highest echelon of the judiciary. Out of a total of 22 judges in the Supreme Court of Mauritius, ten were women (45.5%). Indicator 86 earned a 100 score, which stood significantly above the continental average of 56 and close to the regional average of 73.

Mauritius has strong statistical capacity for data on youth unemployment and infrastructure. Data on poverty is collected less frequently. Statistics Mauritius collects and publishes statics on youth unemployment on a quarterly basis through its Labour Force report (indicator 91). The data is available on its website for free, and are further disaggregated by gender and education level. Statistics on infrastructure, such as roads, transport, electric grids and telecommunications, are also made available through the Annual Digest of Statistics (indicator 93). During the study period, editions from 2014, 2013 and 2012 were accessible for free on the website. Data on poverty is collected less frequently, and the latest ones available are from 2012 and 2007. Statistics Mauritius collects such data every five years through reports, such as the Poverty Analysis, Poverty Map and Relative Development Index (indicator 92). At the time of the research, the Ministry of Social Integrity and Economic Empowerment was also developing the ‘Social Register of Mauritius’, a database on those with a monthly income under Rs 6000 (about US$ 160) in Mauritius or Rs 5000 (about US$ 135) in Rodrigues Island, and thus classified as ‘poor’.

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