

# Corruption & Peace Operations

## Risks and recommendations for Troop Contributing Countries and the United Nations

Corruption is a key driver of conflict and instability and poses a direct threat to the successful implementation of peacekeeping mandates. As the Report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations recognises, corruption provides financing for organised criminal groups, leads to violent extremism and public unrest, and can undo years of peacekeeping efforts.

Recently allegations of sexual abuse by foreign military forces in CAR have demonstrated that gross misconduct by peacekeeping troops continues to challenge missions and must be addressed by the peacekeeping community. While sexual abuse is the most visible form of misconduct, any act that undermines a mission's credibility, including corruption, must be seen as a threat.

Transparency International's recently launched Government Defence Anti-Corruption Index demonstrates that the top 25 Troop Contributing Countries (TCCs) do not adequately control corruption in both their national defence establishments and in UN peace operations. Out of the top 25 TCCs, 5 are placed in band 'F' (critical corruption risk), 11 are in band 'E' (very high risk) and 6 are in band 'D' (high risk), showing critically high levels of corruption vulnerability in their national defence establishments. Only one TCC, Italy, scores Band C (moderate risk). See page four for detailed results.

While corruption risks for military forces in home countries can differ substantially from those in mission contexts, TCCs also do not take steps to control corruption in operational environments, including UN peace operations. 10 out of the top 25 TCCs are in band 'F' for preparing their troops to control corruption and behave with integrity in military operations, 8 are in band 'E' and 5 are in band 'D'.

The UN has rules and regulations governing both staff and financial resources, as well as related guidance to prevent and control misconduct and corruption. The UN also has several oversight bodies tasked with promoting a culture of compliance and integrity, including the Board of Auditors (BOA), Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) and the Independent Audit Advisory Committee (IAAC). However, our research demonstrates that, notwithstanding the UN's continuing efforts, both it and TCCs need to take more systematic action to reduce corruption risk in international missions.

### What is needed?

The findings of the Government Defence Anti-Corruption Index have highlighted the following key challenges that need to be addressed:

**Weak appointment, selection and promotion processes of troops in all of the top 25 TCCs:** Patronage and political allegiance to ruling parties appear to be important deciding factors for recruitment into the armed forces in countries including Bangladesh, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Morocco, Rwanda, and South Africa. Favouritism, nepotism and bribery are

important factors in Burkina Faso, Ghana, Niger and Senegal. In Niger, for example, the Djema ethnic group tend to be favoured by the military, and in Togo, approximately 80% of the officers are from the Kabye ethnic group whilst they only constitute 23% of the population.

Peacekeeping missions can be seen by some as lucrative opportunities for better remuneration and promotion. With few measures in place to prevent corruption in appointments, promotions and selection in most of the top TCCs, there is a risk that corruption and patronage relationships influence troop selection to UN peacekeeping missions.

**No doctrine on corruption as a strategic threat to operations:** None of the top 25 TCCs have military doctrine that addresses corruption as a strategic threat to operations. Some of the armed forces in these countries have good awareness of the negative effects of corruption in the governance and performance of the armed forces. In Ethiopia, for example, ethics and anti-corruption officers are allocated to each army division, coordinated under the Ethics Directorate of the Ministry of Defence. However, in none of the top 25 TCCs is corruption explicitly recognised as a threat to the success of military operations, including UN peacekeeping.

**Insufficient anti-corruption training and guidance provided to troops prior to deployment:** None of the top 25 TCCs has anti-corruption training for troops and commanders before they deploy on operations. There are general ethics courses provided to the armed forces in approximately 40% of the top 25 TCCs. However, these training courses do not deal with the complexities of UN operational environments. In Egypt, Pakistan, Cameroon, Morocco, Brazil, Rwanda, Nepal and Senegal, no known anti-corruption training courses are offered to troops.

**Trained corruption monitors are not deployed to the field:** None of the top 25 TCCs follow best practice in deploying anti-corruption monitors to missions. A few countries such as Bangladesh and Niger give jurisdiction to entities such as the Military Police or the Intelligence Services to monitor criminal behaviour; however, this is not regular practice and usually does not cover corruption offences in UN peace operations. At the mission level Conduct and Discipline Teams have developed training and raised awareness of the issues, and OIOS has been responsible for investigating serious allegations that represent a major risk to a mission, which include corruption. Notwithstanding existing rules covering specific issues such as procurement, the potential damage that corruption can inflict is frequently overlooked due to a lack of awareness of the threat, the shortage of guidance and the limited training available.

**Severe limitations in addressing breaches to military code of conduct:** Because the UN relies on TCCs to discipline their own troops for offences committed during a UN peace operation, it is vital that TCCs have systems in place to deal with corruption by their troops. It is encouraging to note current attempts to strengthen the process through naming TCCs and providing information on action taken in relation to SEA incidents in CAR<sup>1</sup>. However, in approximately 40% of the top 25 TCCs, there is no evidence that other breaches of codes of conduct such as engaging in corrupt activities are addressed by the armed forces. Where there is some information available to the public, for example, in Benin, Brazil, Cameroon, India, Niger, Senegal, South Africa and Morocco, there is considerable inconsistency and lack of effectiveness in enforcement. In most cases, offenders are

---

<sup>1</sup> Statement by ASG Banbury 29 January 2016, "UN officials name countries whose troops are accused of sexually abusing minors in Central African Republic," UN News Centre:  
<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=53120#.VvwJBelrLIU>

simply redeployed elsewhere rather than brought to court. Where there are high profile cases of prosecution of armed personnel for corruption, such as in China, they are often politically motivated.

**UN reimbursements to TCCs are not regulated in a transparent manner:** Off-budget income, including UN reimbursement for troop contributions, is common in all 25 top TCCs. However, the use of these funds is not transparently regulated. For example, in India, if off-budget income were added to the published national budget, it would have brought total Indian defence spending to 1.3 times the official budget in 2005 and 1.4 times in 2010. In Indonesia, off-budget expenditure accounts for around 20 per cent of the defence budget. However, there is no publication or scrutiny of defence income other than the central government's allocation, including UN reimbursement. This lack of transparency creates a risk of diversion and misuse.

## Recommendations

**Transparent and objective systems for troop selection for UN peacekeeping:** TCCs should establish independent, objective, meritocratic and transparent systems for selecting troops to deploy on UN peace operations. This should include strong formal appraisal processes with independent oversight.

The UN should also analyse and take account of the level of corruption awareness of troops when recruiting for peacekeeping missions.

**Transparency, Accountability and Counter-Corruption (TACC) measures should be integrated into doctrine, policy and plans by all TCCs:** While development of doctrine and training within TCCs is clearly a national responsibility the UN should take the lead by clearly identifying corruption as a strategic threat to operations and developing training that can be made available to training institutions; in addition regular and comprehensive anti-corruption training should be an integral part of pre-deployment and induction training. Transparency International has developed a pre-deployment course called 'Operational Transparency Accountability and Counter-Corruption Training' (OPTACC) that could be easily adopted and used by all TCCs.

The UN should roll out formal anti-corruption training to troop, police and civilian contingents. E-learning resources should be considered.

Both the UN and TCCs should deploy anti-corruption experts on UN peace operations to monitor corrupt behaviour and to report back to relevant law enforcement officials to take appropriate actions.

**Effective, consistent and transparent approach to dealing with breaches to military code of conduct, including corruption offences:** TCCs should effectively and consistently apply disciplinary measures when breaches to their military code of conduct, such as corruption offences, occur. Furthermore, TCCs should publically report on such disciplinary measures.

**Transparency in regulating UN reimbursements:** TCCs should ensure that comprehensive information on the use of UN reimbursement is published and scrutinised by parliament and other relevant oversight bodies. TCCs should also ensure that expenditure related to UN reimbursement is effectively and transparently audited by independent institutions.

## The Government Defence Anti-Corruption Index (GI) - Results of the top 30 TCCs

RANK- TROOP CONTRIBUTION	COUNTRY	TOTAL MILITARY & POLICE CONTRIBUTION TO UN OPERATIONS	GOVERNMENT DEFENCE ANTI-CORRUPTION INDEX (GI) OVERALL BAND	GI SCORE FOR CORRUPTION CONTROL IN MILITARY OPERATIONS
1	Bangladesh	8,496	D	35%
2	Ethiopia	8,296	E	45%
3	India	7,798	D	35%
4	Pakistan	7,643	E	15%
5	Rwanda	6,077	E	15%
6	Nepal	5,344	-	-
7	Senegal	3,475	E	10%
8	Ghana	3,198	D	25%
9	China	3,045	E	15%
10	Nigeria	2,954	E	15%
11	Burkina Faso	2,906	F	15%
12	Indonesia	2,854	D	20%
13	Egypt	2,809	F	20%
14	Tanzania	2,324	E	25%
15	Morocco	2,308	F	20%
16	South Africa	2,131	D	30%
17	Niger	2,055	E	15%
18	Togo	1,804	F	15%
19	Jordan	1,617	E	15%
20	Benin	1,490	D	25%
21	Uruguay	1,446	-	-
22	Cameroon	1,371	F	20%
23	Burundi	1,241	E	15%
24	Kenya	1,231	D	25%
25	Brazil	1,231	E	20%
26	Chad	1,203	F	10%
27	Italy	1,087	C	35%
28	Malawi	961	E	19%
29	Mongolia	947	-	-
30	Zambia	938	E	5%