



UGANDA POLICE FORCE
ANTI - CORRUPTION STRATEGY
2017/18-2021/22

Aligned to the JLOS Anti-corruption strategy

UGANDA POLICE FORCE ANTI – CORRUPTION STRATEGY

With Support from



*Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.*

Contents

FOREWORD	4
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	6
CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND	8
1.0 Introduction.....	8
1.1 Situational analysis	10
1.2 Definition of Corruption	12
1.3 The Police Mandate	15
1.4 Forms of corruption in the UPF	16
1.5 Factors influencing corruption in UPF.....	17
CHAPTER 2: EXISTING LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK TO FIGHT CORRUPTION IN UGANDA	21
2.0 Introduction.....	21
2.1 NRM Ten Point programme	21
2.2 The Constitution of Uganda, 1995	21
2.3 Anti-corruption Amendments Act 2013.....	22
2.4 The Leadership Code (Amendment) Act, 2017	22
2.5 The Inspectorate of Government Act, 2002	23
2.6 The Access to Information Act, 2005	23
2.7 The Whistleblowers Protection Act, 2010	24
2.8 The Local Government Act, Cap 243 (Amended)	24
2.9 The Uganda Police Act, 2006	24
2.10 The Budget Act, 2001	25
2.11 The Public Finance Management Act, 2015	25
2.12 The Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Act, 2003	27
2.13 The National Anti-Corruption Strategy (2014 –2019).....	27
2.14 JLOS Anti-Corruption Strategy	28
CHAPTER 3: THE UPF ANTI – CORRUPTION STRATEGY	30
3.0 Introduction.....	30
3.1 Goal and objectives.....	30
3.1.1 Strategic Objectives, Interventions and Indicators.....	31

CHAPTER 4: IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION 38

4.0 Introduction.....38

4.1 Implementation38

A. Implementation at National Level.....39

4.1.1 Police Authority39

4.1.2 Police Council.....39

4.1.3 IGP39

4.1.4 Directors.....39

4.1.5 Finance Committee40

4.1.6 Heads of Departments/Specialized units.....40

B. Implementation at Regional Level.....40

4.1.7 Regional Police Commanders40

C. Implementation at District Level41

4.1.8 District Police Commanders41

4.1.9 Individual officers41

4.1.10 Cooperation with external partners42

4.2 Implementation Matrix43

4.3 Monitoring and Evaluation50

4.3.1 Data Collection and information dissemination.....50

4.3.2 Institutional framework and roles on M&E51

4.3.3 Evaluation51

4.3.4 Impact assessment.....52

FOREWORD

The Uganda Police Force (UPF) is mandated by the 1995 Constitution of the Republic of Uganda among other things, to fight crime in Uganda which includes acts of Corruption. The Uganda Police Force (UPF) Anti-Corruption Strategy is a framework to guide the protracted fight against corruption in the Police. The Strategy is anchored to the National Anti-Corruption Strategy's principle of ZERO TOLERANCE TO CORRUPTION to enhance good governance. It is also aligned to the JLOS Anti-corruption Strategy.

This Strategy is not an isolated intervention but rather a part of a broader Government effort to address the vice and is critical in the enhancing the image of the UPF.

Over the years, UPF has tried its best to fulfill this mandate but there has been persistent allegation of corruption in reports like the 1999 Judicial Commission of Inquiry by Justice Julia Ssebutinde, IGG Integrity Survey II & III, Transparent International Global Corruption Barometer 2010 and the UBOS National Service Delivery Survey of 2016. These allegations affect our effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy in service delivery. This state of affairs cannot continue and UPF is determined to fight corruption among its rank and file and one of the measures we have undertaken is to come up with this Strategy.

For the implementation of the strategy, the existing Police structures like Police Authority, Police Council, Directorates, Departments and

Specialized Units will be relied upon together with Police officers and others stakeholders.

Monitoring and Evaluation mechanism has been put in place to ensure that set objectives are achieved without deviation. This will ultimately lead into annual and periodic evaluations to assess the impact of the interventions.

I commend the JLOS Secretariat specifically Musa Mudozi for their technical input and the UPF team composed of; AIGP Ochom O. Edward, SCP Ocaya James, SCP Ezati, SCP Nanding Christine, CP Gumisiriza Edson, CP Luvuma Samuel, CP Dr. John Kamya, ACP Byamugisha Benedict, SSP Mugume Julius, SSP Babwetera Charles, SSP Mulondo Eriphaz, SSP Twinamasiko Denis, ASP Mugumya Melexedec, ASP Diba Moses Andrew and AIP Anguzu David that put this piece of work together as we move towards ZERO TOLERANCE TO CORRUPTION.



J.M Okoth-Ochola (Esq.)

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AIGP	Assistant Inspector General of Police
CBO	Community Based Organization
CID	Criminal Investigation Directorate
CPC	Chief Political Commissariat
DEI	Directorate of Ethics and Integrity
DMC	Dangerous Mechanical Condition
DPC	District Police Commander
DPP	Directorate of Public Prosecution
GBC	Global Corruption Barometer
HRD	Human Resource Development
HRLS	Human Rights and Legal Services
HRM	Human Resource Management
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IGG	Inspector General of Government
IGP	Inspector General of Police
JLOS	Justice, Law and Order Sector
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDALG	Ministries, Departments, Agencies and Local Governments
MoFPED	Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development
NACS	National Anti-Corruption Strategy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIS	National Integrity Survey
PAC	Policy and Advisory Committee
PF	Police Form
PPDA	Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Authority
PSU	Professional Standards Unit
RP&D	Research, Planning and Development
RPC	Regional Police Commander
RSA	Resident State Attorney
SID	Special Investigation Division
SPC	Special Police Constable

SWAP	Sector Wide Approach
TV	Television
UBOS	Uganda Bureau Of Statistics
UPF	Uganda Police Force
VIPPU	Very Important Persons Protection Unit

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND

1.0 Introduction

Corruption impacts on development outcomes. It undermines accountable and effective institutions, prevents access to basic public services and holds back economic growth. It is now widely recognized that aspects of corruption can have a critical impact on domestic governance and development efforts.

In Uganda corruption is extremely widespread, perceived to be highest in local government, tax authorities and the police (Afrobarometer, 2008, pp. 23-24). While various integrity systems exist to tackle this, implementation is considered to be extremely weak (Global Integrity, 2009). Social and cultural norms are such that loyalty to personal, religious and family ties takes precedence over objectivity and transparency (TI, 2003, p. 17). Corruption and deviant behavior within the Police undermines its moral authority to enforce law and order, which is its primary mandate.

Over the years the image of UPF has been tainted with allegations of corruption both perceived and real; this has eroded public trust and confidence thereby affecting service delivery. In this regard, a number of initiatives have been employed by the Force including establishment of the Professional Standards Unit, Directorate of Human Rights and Legal Services, Anti-Corruption division under CID, Compliance Unit, Alert squad, and Rectification campaign in order to address the vice. This Strategy complements the above efforts by streamlining the fight against

corruption. It reinforces the police paradigm; what police stands for is what this strategy enforces. The development of this Strategy has been through a broad-based concerted consultative process involving police officers at districts, regions, specialized units, directorates and relevant stakeholders.

The Strategy will be imbedded in the Force at two levels i.e. at the core level where we have mainstream anti-corruption enforcement and external complementary level where we have support departments such as Procurement, Human Resource Management, and ICT and their policies. This Strategy heavily relies on the tone at the top both at national and district levels as an asset to influence and shape the culture of integrity and anti-corruption values within the UPF. It contains an action plan for its implementation detailing key objectives, interventions and indicators. Also it recognizes the external environment in the public and other Government Agencies, policy and legislation in the context within which Police operates. It is expected that there will be co-operative and complementary support from not only the public by whistle blowing and shunning the corruption vice but also other agencies such as DPP, IGG, DEI, etc. and existing legal frameworks such as the 1995 Constitution of Uganda, Anti-Corruption Act 2012, and the Leadership Code Act.

The Strategy is envisaged for a period of five years (2017/18-2021/22) in a three phased manner; short, medium and long term. In the short term, there will be dissemination of the Strategy, creating awareness, mobilization of resources, training, setting rules, development of tools, error tolerance,

stakeholder engagements and collaboration, annual evaluations. In the medium term, the Strategy seeks to establish structures and assigning roles and responsibilities for enforcement feedback mechanisms, customer care mechanisms, automation of MIS, and mid-term review Long term activities will include consolidation of systems, final evaluation and impact assessment.

It's hoped that the implementation of this strategy will go a long way in rebuilding the ethics and integrity of individual officers, image of UPF as an institution, enhance public trust, and improve service delivery in a transparent and accountable manner.

1.1 Situational analysis

The Uganda Police Force was established in 1906 by the colonial government as an instrument to enforce colonial law and order. Right from its inception, it was used as an instrument of suppression and coercion of the indigenous people, especially those who were resisting the policies and ideology of the colonial masters. At attainment of independence in 1962, the colonial police was turned into the national police of the independent Uganda without necessarily taking into consideration the interests of the local people.

The political, economic and social crises that unfolded during the post-independence Uganda (1962-1986) also affected the image of the Force. The police was used by the then regimes to suppress the people, conduct

arbitrary arrests and sometimes committed acts of torture, cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment. Acts of extortion and bribery were not uncommon during the turbulent times. Public accusation of acts of corruption and unprofessional conduct by police officers and other law enforcement agencies existed and it became normal to pay for any police services rendered. These corrupt tendencies still exist as indicated in the following reports among others;

The 1999 Judicial Commission of Inquiry into Corruption in the Uganda Police Force chaired by Justice Julie Ssebutinde unearthed acts of corruption in the Police.

The Inspector General of Government's National Integrity Surveys (NIS, II (2003), and NIS III (2008) indicated that police is among the most corrupt Government departments in Uganda with a perception rating of 66% and 88.2% respectively.

The IGGs 2nd Annual Report on Corruption Trends in Uganda Using Data Tracking Mechanism (Nov. 2011) indicated that bribery had gone worse in the UPF.

The Transparency International's Global Corruption Barometer (GCB) 2010 also ranked the UPF among the leading corrupt Government institutions.

In the UBOS National Service Delivery Survey of 2016, 75% of the respondents reported that Police was the most corrupt public institution.

Despite the above mentioned reports, the JLOS 2013/2014 Performance Report, highlighted improvement in reliability of UPF policing services; the best in East Africa. The International Competitiveness Report 2014 of the World Bank ranked UPF at 95th in the world and 20th in Africa. Further to this, the National Service Delivery Report 2016 indicates that there was a decrease in the proportion of respondents that reported making payments for services to the Uganda Police from 62% to 52% in 2008 and 2015 respectively.

However, it should be noted that this manifestation of perceived deviant and corrupt behavior of Police Officers is not an isolated problem in Uganda. Research reveals that these patterns are evident in most policing institutions worldwide and it takes strategic approaches that are tailored to suit the context and circumstances to bring such deviance under control. Thus the current state of affairs cannot be left unattended as it tarnishes the image of the police, erodes public trust and compromises the chain of administration of criminal justice since police is the first point of entry in criminal matters.

1.2 Definition of Corruption

Corruption has been generally understood to mean “abuse of entrusted authority for illicit gain”.¹ This broad definition includes “any conduct or behavior in relation to persons entrusted with responsibilities in public

¹ OECD (2012), International Drivers of Corruption: A Tool for Analysis, OECD Publishing.

office which violates their duties as public officials and which is aimed at obtaining undue gratification of any kind for themselves or for others”.²

According to the Anti-Corruption Act, a person commits the offence of corruption if he or she does any of the following acts—

- i) the solicitation or acceptance, directly or indirectly, by a public official, of any goods of monetary value, or benefits, such as a gift, favour, promise, advantage or any other form of gratification for himself or herself or for another person or entity, in exchange for any act or omission in the performance of his or her public functions;
- ii) the offering or granting, directly or indirectly, to a public official, of any goods of monetary value, or other benefit, such as a gift, favour, promise or advantage or any other form of gratification for himself or herself or for another person or entity, in exchange for any act or omission in the performance of his or her public functions;
- iii) the diversion or use by a public official, for purposes unrelated to those for which they were intended, for his or her own benefit or that of a third party, of any movable or immovable property, monies or securities belonging to the State, to an independent agency, or to an individual, which that official has received by virtue of his or her position for purposes of administration, custody or for other reasons;
- iv) the offering or giving, promising, solicitation or acceptance, directly or indirectly, of any undue advantage to or by any person who directs or works for, in any capacity, a private sector entity, for himself or

² JLOS Anti-Corruption Strategy, 2012.

herself or for any other person, for him or her to act, or refrain from acting, in breach of his or her duties;

- v) the offering, giving, solicitation or acceptance directly or indirectly, or promising of any undue advantage to or by any person who asserts or confirms that he or she is able to exert any improper influence over the decision making of any person performing functions in the public or private sector in consideration of the undue advantage, whether the undue advantage is for himself or herself or for any other person, as well as the request, receipt or the acceptance of the offer or the promise of the advantage, in consideration of that influence, whether or not the supposed influence leads to the intended result;
- vi) the fraudulent acquisition, use or concealment of property derived from any of the acts referred to above;
- vii) the participation as a principal, co-principal, agent, instigator, accomplice or accessory after the fact, or in any other manner in the commission or attempted commission of, or in any collaboration or conspiracy to commit, any of the acts referred to in this section;
- viii) any act or omission in the discharge of his or her duties by a public official for the purpose of illicitly obtaining benefits for himself or herself or for a third party; or
- ix) neglect of duty.

The Inspectorate of Government Act 2002 defines corruption as “abuse of public office for private gain and includes but is not limited to embezzlement, bribery, nepotism, influence peddling, theft of public funds

or assets, fraud, forgery, causing financial or property loss, and false accounting in public affairs.”

Corruption is therefore known to take the form of bribery, embezzlement and diversion of funds, nepotism, forgery, fraud, extortion, abuse of power, conflict of interest, insider trading, abuse of privileged information, withholding of information/lack of transparency.³

Overall, the Uganda legislation provides a wide conceptual definition of corruption that extends beyond public office and includes the private sphere, targeting both the perpetrators and beneficiaries, the instrumentalities and also the benefits derived from acts of corruption.

1.3 The Police Mandate

The Uganda Police Force is established under Article 211 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995 (As amended). Its functions are stipulated in Article 212 to include protection of life and property, preservation of law and order, prevention and detection of crime and cooperating with the civilian authority and other security organs established under the Constitution and with the population generally. The Police Act Cap 303 also adds more functions of UPF to include the protection of other rights of the individual, maintaining security in Uganda, ensure public safety and order, and to perform services of a military force and to perform any other functions assigned to it under the Act.

³ THE ANTI CORRUPTION ACT, 2009

UPF is part of the Justice Law and Order Sector (JLOS) that was created under the Sector Wide Approach (SWAP) adopted in 1998 by the Government of Uganda. In the Sector, the Police is one of the major institutions to which acts of corruption should be reported, investigated and those found culpable charged in Courts of Law.

1.4 Forms of corruption in the UPF

The UPF is plagued within its rank file with corruption occurring at different levels and manifested in various forms. The manifestations of corruption range from petty to grand forms of corruption. While most incidents are individually orchestrated, there have been some cases of syndicated corruption that involve more than one individual. These acts are spread across the chain of service, from road traffic enforcement to criminal investigations, among others. Corruption in the UPF is manifested through the following forms;

- 1) Payment for police bond which is supposed to be free.
- 2) Facilitation demands from the public to do police work e.g. fuel, airtime, etc.
- 3) Bribery: Sometimes, there is negotiation between the bribe taker and giver for any service rendered.
- 4) Payment made to police officers to torture people, so as to extract information.
- 5) A syndicate within the justice system i.e. UPF, DPP, Courts, Prisons, to influence the course of justice.

- 6) Wrongful arrests/blackmail and over detention for monetary gains.
- 7) Collusion with criminals e.g. witchdoctors, robbers, who pay police to provide security or to divert police.
- 8) Accepting payments so as to criminalize or settle civil disputes beyond police mandate.
- 9) Abuse of power by police.
- 10) Influence peddling, sectarianism and/or nepotism in recruitment and deployment to specific units e.g. Traffic, VIPPU, CID, Parliamentary Police, and secondment for attachment, by government officials and politicians.
- 11) Insider dealings in procurement of goods and services.
- 12) Conflict of interest.
- 13) Embezzlement of funds.
- 14) Causing financial loss.
- 15) False accounting.

1.5 Factors influencing corruption in UPF

The unique nature and working conditions of the police pre-dispose them to the risk of corruption. However there exists a dilemma of a rational mind when faced with corruption temptations in terms of “need” versus “greed” driven corruption. The consultative process identified the major causes of corruption as follows;

1. **Broad discretionary police powers:** Powers to arrest, detain, search, investigate and take suspects to court. An individual police officer may fail to fulfill his responsibility like arrest, gather sufficient evidence and

hence present incomplete file to court. Such an investigator has capacity to destroy the case. The situation is made worse by misuse of police powers by arresting before investigations. All these breed ground for corruption.

2. **Red tape/bureaucracy in the justice system:** Administration of criminal justice is so costly in terms of time and number of institutions involved with unique processes. In addition, where there are no justice centres the institutions are far apart. This coupled with the public perception of corrupt tendencies at the different level of criminal justice; people find it more convenient to bribe the police so as to avoid the perceived corruption chain.
3. **Limited knowledge of laws and rights by the public:** Some proportion of the population is ignorant about the laws prescribing their rights and procedures on access to justice, including the provisions on corruption. Some police officers take advantage of the unsuspecting public and use this loop hole to demand for bribes.
4. **Poor welfare of police personnel:** The salary of police officers cannot meet their basic needs across the month. The situation is made worse by the fact that majority of the officers are not accommodated and they end up using the meager pay for rent, medical care, pay schools fees etc. They therefore resort to corruption driven by “need” to make ends meet.
5. **Inadequate facilitation for official work:** Generally there is insufficient provision of basic policing resources such as fuel, transport, stationery, airtime, ICT equipment, etc. Officers are required to work

without fail, deliver results, and yet they are not adequately facilitated as ordinarily expected, save for a few senior officers. This state of affairs leaves officers with no option but to demand for logistical facilitation from the public and this provides a blurred opportunity to ask for bribes in form of buying papers, fuel, transport, etc.

6. **Non-adherence to existing standards and policies:**

The UPF has standard guidelines and policies on recruitments, training, placements, promotions and discipline. However there is weak adherence to these guidelines that has resulted into nepotism, favoritism, comradeship/patronage and intrigue. Some Police Officers find themselves working in a station/unit for over five years and yet the policy requires officers to be transferred after every five years. Overstay in a unit makes officers susceptible to corrupt acts because they become familiar and interwoven in a series of activities at a particular place. This creates opportunity for interaction and therefore can easily be approached by corrupt minded members of the society. Some Officers do not want to be deployed to work in particular areas that are considered “dry” because of the limited opportunity for legitimate and illegitimate benefits, and as such one has to bribe his/her way out to a “wet” one.

7. **Undue influence in executing police duties:** Some superiors demand that subordinates act in a manner contrary to the prescribed standards. It is also manifested by interference from political and civil leaders. This is often referred to as “orders from above”.

8. **Breakdown of societal morals and ethics:-**

There is high moral decay in society leading to willingness to give bribes; people openly condone corrupt methods of wealth accumulation. This puts pressure on police officers compelling them to resort to corruption to meet society's expectations.

CHAPTER 2: EXISTING LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK TO FIGHT CORRUPTION IN UGANDA

2.0 Introduction

The fight against corruption has been part and parcel of the Government Policy since the 1986 revolution and a number of policies, regulations and frameworks have been put in place to this endeavor. These are instruments from which Government institutions such as the Uganda Police Force and the Office of the Director of Public Prosecution (ODPP) derive their mandates of investigation and prosecution of the offenders. Needless to say, these instruments domesticate international treaties and conventions on corruption. This Strategy was developed based on International (SDGs), Regional (EAC Vision 2050), national (NRM Manifesto 2016-2021, NDP II, Uganda National Ethical Values policy,) and institutional frameworks (JLOS Anti-Corruption Strategy, 3rd National anti-corruption strategy) in place to fight corruption.

2.1 NRM Ten Point programme

Point No. 7 of the National Resistance Movement/Army ten point programme calls for the elimination of corruption and misuse of power in Africa.

2.2 The Constitution of Uganda, 1995

This is the supreme law of Uganda to which all other policies, regulations and legislation are subject. Particularly, Article 17 (i) of the 1995

constitution gives the citizen duties and obligations to combat corruption and misuse or wastage of public property. Also objective XXVI (iii) under the National Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy states that all lawful measures shall be taken to expose, combat and eradicate corruption and abuse or misuse of power by those holding political and other public offices. The constitution further establishes the different organs and institutions of Government and gives guidance on the Leadership Code of Conduct, as well as on accountability and integrity in the administration of public affairs.

2.3 Anti-corruption Amendments Act 2013

This is an Act which provides for the effective prevention of corruption in both the public and private sector by defining corruption, setting offenses and penalties, outlining the powers of the Inspector General of Government and the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, and related matters. The Act also provides for the confiscation of the properties of those convicted of corruption.

2.4 The Leadership Code (Amendment) Act, 2017

This is an Act which provides for a minimum standard of behavior and conduct for leaders; to require leaders to declare their incomes, assets and liabilities; to put in place an effective enforcement mechanism and to provide for other related matters.

2.5 The Inspectorate of Government Act, 2002

This is an Act to, inter alia, promote and foster strict adherence to the rule of law and principles of natural justice in administration; foster the elimination of corruption, abuse of authority and public office; to take necessary measures for the detection and prevention of corruption in public offices; promote fair, efficient and good governance in public offices; enforce the Leadership Code of Conduct; investigate the conduct of any public officers as necessary, including law enforcing agents and the state security Agencies.

2.6 The Access to Information Act, 2005

This Act operationalizes Article 41 of the Constitution which stipulates that; Every citizen has a right of access to information in the possession of the State or any other organ or agency of the State except where the release of the information is likely to prejudice the security or sovereignty of the State or interfere with the right to the privacy of any other person.

The purpose of this Act is

- a) to promote an efficient, effective, transparent and accountable Government;
- b) to give effect to article 41 of the Constitution by providing the right of access to information held by organs of the State, other than exempt records and information; Act 6 Access to Information Act 2005
- c) to protect persons disclosing evidence of contravention of the law, maladministration or corruption in Government bodies;

- d) to promote transparency and accountability in all organs of the State by providing the public with timely, accessible and accurate information; and
- e) to empower the public to effectively scrutinize and participate in Government decisions that affect them.

2.7 The Whistleblowers Protection Act, 2010

This is an Act which provides for the procedures by which individuals in both the private and public sector may in the public interest disclose information that relates to irregular, illegal or corrupt practices; to provide for the protection against victimization of persons who make disclosures; and to provide for related matter.

The Regulations for this Act are in place to facilitate the enforcement of the law.

2.8 The Local Government Act, Cap 243 (Amended)

This is an Act which gives effect to the decentralization and devolution of functions, powers and services; to provide for decentralization at all levels of local Governments. The Act aims to ensure good governance and democratic participation in, and control of, decision making by the people; to provide for revenue and the political and administrative setup of local governments; and to provide for election of local councils.

2.9 The Uganda Police Act, 2006

This Act establishes the Uganda Police Force, whose functions include; protecting life and property; preserving law and order; preventing and

detecting crime; and cooperating with the civilian authority and other security organs. Schedule one of the Police Act establishes the code of conduct of police officers. Section 2 of the Police disciplinary code of conduct specifies that a member of the Force shall (among others)—

- i) not use the authority of his or her office for undue gain;
- ii) not take away the liberty or rights of any person without reasonable cause;
- iii) not convert property of any person or any property which comes into his or her custody by virtue of his or her office;
- iv) not receive any undue gratification for services he or she is expected to render by virtue of his or her employment;
- v) not compromise law enforcement on account of relationship, patronage or any other influence.

2.10 The Budget Act, 2001

This is an Act which provides for and regulates the budgetary procedure for a systematic and efficient budgetary process and for other matter connected with the same.

2.11 The Public Finance Management Act, 2015

This is an Act to provide for fiscal and macroeconomic management. It is the principle law for public finance management that provides for a wide spectrum of functions and mandates. The Act provides for the charter of fiscal responsibility; to provide for the budget framework paper; roles of the Minister and the Secretary to the treasury in the budgeting process;

Virements, multiyear expenditures, supplementary budgets and excess expenditure; contingencies fund; consolidated fund and commitments against the consolidated funds; bank account management, management of expenditure commitments, raising of loans by the minister, management of government debt, authority to receive monetary grants and assets management; to provide for the roles of accounting officers; to establish accounting standards and audit committees; to provide for in-year reporting; to provide for the preparation of annual accounts and for the accounting for classified expenditure. The Act also establishes the petroleum fund and the collection and deposit of revenues into and the withdrawal of revenue from the petroleum fund and for the management of the Petroleum Revenue Investment Reserves; to provide for the role of Bank of Uganda in the operational management of the petroleum; to provide for the Investment Advisory Committee; to provide for the financial reports, annual reports and annual plans of the petroleum fund and the Petroleum Revenue Investment Reserve and to provide for the sharing of royalties. This Act repeals the Public Finance and Accountability Act, 2003 and provide for connected matters.

2.12 The Public Procurement and Disposal of Public Assets Act, 2003

This Act applies to all public procurement and disposal activities. In addition, it applies to all public finances originating from the Consolidated Fund and related special finances expended through the capital or recurrent budgets, resources in the form of counterpart transfers or co-financing or

any finances of a similar nature within the context of development co-operation agreements for the implementation of national programmes, and procurement or disposal of works, services, supplies or any combination.

2.13 The National Anti-Corruption Strategy (2014 –2019)

The National Anti-Corruption Strategy (NACS) is a five-year planning framework for the Inter Agency Forum (IAF) designed to make significant impact on building the quality of accountability and reducing the levels of corruption in Uganda. The Strategy’s dual focus is on institutional reforms and operational reforms with a view to scale down corruption in Uganda. The Strategy;

- a) Provides a national framework to guide policies and programmes of Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) and Local Governments (LGs).
- b) Offers an over- arching framework/approach to combatting corruption in Uganda within a five year period.
- c) Seeks to ensure that systems of accountability work for the benefit of the people and relate to each other properly.

The NACS is set within the Zero Tolerance to Corruption policy proposition as a guiding policy declared by the President of the Republic of Uganda in 2006.

The government adopted the NACS to harness effective political leadership in the fight against corruption, increase public demand for

accountability and uphold national values and for the effective enforcement of anti-corruption measures.

2.14 JLOS Anti-Corruption Strategy

The JLOS Anti-Corruption Strategy is a Sector framework designed to enable planning in order to make significant impact on reducing corruption among the JLOS Sector institutions as well as building and strengthening the quality of accountability in the country as a whole. The vision of the Strategy is “a corruption free society, the rule of law and respect for human rights.” The Strategy specifically targets the staff and systems within the JLOS in order to contribute to the NACS vision of zero tolerance for corruption and to contribute to efficient and effective service delivery. The Strategy aims at promoting the implementation of international and national anti-corruption obligations and commitments of Uganda. The successful implementation of the strategy is based on three objectives, which include;

1. To enhance the sector capacity to prevent corruption;
2. To strengthen the sector to detect, investigate and adjudicate corruption;
3. To promote and enforce effective mechanisms for punishment of those found culpable for acts of corruption.

The UPF Anti-Corruption strategy will reinforce the above legal frameworks and feeds into the National and JLOS Anti-Corruption Strategies which emphasize ZERO TOLERANCE TO CORRUPTION.

CHAPTER 3: THE UPF ANTI – CORRUPTION STRATEGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter highlights the objectives, interventions and the roles of different key players and stakeholders to curb corruption in UPF.

In view of the above, the Uganda Police Force should be free of corrupt practices for it to be able to play its role of fighting all forms of crimes, including corruption. Police Management is committed to achieving this and is determined to take any possible measures to fight the vice amongst its rank and file.

The Uganda Police Force Anti-corruption Strategy is therefore a framework designed to enable planning in order to make a significant impact on eliminating corruption in the institution as well as building and strengthening the quality of accountability in the country as a whole. The Strategy will specifically target the staff of the UPF, both police and civilian, and is anchored to the **National and JLOS Anti-Corruption Strategic vision of ZERO TOLERANCE TO CORRUPTION to enhance good governance.**

3.1 Goal and objectives

The overall goal of the UPF Anti-corruption Strategy is to strengthen the institution`s capacity to deal with corruption amongst its rank and file, and to strengthen the virtues of *integrity* and *transparency* within the institution with a view of improving service delivery and therefore building public trust.

3.1.1 Strategic Objectives, Interventions and Indicators

Strategic Objective 1: Put in place a framework for the prevention of corruption.

This objective seeks to identify forms of corruption in the Institution and design strategies to prevent their occurrence.

Strategic Interventions:

1. Re-design and review police forms and books such as PF18 (release on bond) to have a watershed with the wordings **“Police Bond is Free”**. The emphasis should also be that the release on bond is only done by DPC, OC CID or OC Station.
2. Ensure adequate and equitable allocation of resources to enhance service delivery by mobilizing more resources and promoting transparency at all levels of management.
3. Review, operationalize existing UPF policies and empower committees that handle issues related to finance and procurement, promotions, training, recruitment and placements.
4. Improve the welfare of police personnel and their families by involving them in wealth creation projects, provision of better accommodation, medical care and transport to improve their livelihoods.
5. Enhance salaries and other entitlements harmonized with remunerations in other MDAs in line with the cost of living.
6. Improvement on information and communication mechanism through intensive sensitization of police, strengthening PRO’s office and empowering the public to report corrupt practices.

7. Strengthen supervision, mentoring, coaching and inspection functions to ensure that the police standard operating procedures are complied with; for instance ensuring that civil cases don't enter into the system.
8. Proper identification of uniformed and non-uniformed UPF staff through embroidering names on all uniforms and wearing of job cards by non-uniformed personnel save for intelligence staff.
9. Decentralize and integrate the automated Personnel Management Information System to fill the information gap about record of service of the personnel.

Indicators

- i. No. of police forms and books redesigned and adopted in all Units.
- ii. % of the population who have paid bribes for police services.
- iii. Quarterly % increment in resources allocated to units.
- iv. No. of policies reviewed and operationalized.
- v. Level of compliance by committees to set standards and procedures.
- vi. No. of police personnel benefiting from welfare schemes.
- vii. No. of welfare schemes that are positively enhancing police personnel's wellbeing.
- viii. The level of compliance to police personnel's entitlements.
- ix. Standard communication manuals developed.
- x. No. of corruption complaints from the public reported.
- xi. Level of implementation of recommendations by countrywide inspections.
- xii. % of illegal detentions in police custody.

- xiii. % of police personnel who wear nametags and job cards at work.
- xiv. Automated Personnel Management Information System decentralized and integrated.

Critical factors

- i. Good will from the public to file complaints.
- ii. Commitment and ownership by UPF management.
- iii. Self-restraint and adherence to existing laws and regulation.

Strategic Objective 2: Put in place mechanisms to detect corruption and punitive measures for those involved.

This objective will establish key structures within the institution to ensure that cases of corruption are detected, reported, investigated and offenders punished.

Strategic Interventions:

1. Empower the Economic Fraud and Anti-Corruption Division of CID to handle corruption cases and ensure that they are prosecuted before the Anti-Corruption Court.
2. Enhance capacity of Police Disciplinary Courts to try officers found to have committed corruption related disciplinary offences and dispose them off in 3 months.
3. Strengthen the complaint handling mechanisms through installation of suggestion boxes, toll free lines, use of social media platforms, production of IEC materials, proper documentation of complaints, etc.
4. Usage of ICT platforms such as CCTV cameras to detect corruption tendencies.

5. Advocate for legislation of more deterrent punishments for perpetrators of corruption for instance;
- a) Deterrent imprisonment.
 - b) Payment of heavy fines by the offenders.
 - c) Refund of the extorted funds.
 - d) Timely follow up and implementation of Auditor General's recommendations that relate to corruption

Indicators

- i. % of corruption cases reported by the public against Police personnel that are prosecuted.
- ii. No. of officers trained in the investigation of corruption.
- iii. % of reported corruption related offences in the disciplinary courts concluded in time.⁴
- iv. No. of officers trained to handle police disciplinary court procedures.
- v. Standard sentencing guidelines developed.
- vi. Coverage of operational complaints handling tools by category.
- vii. Proportion of received corruption complaints concluded.
- viii. No. of police units with CCTV cameras in use.
- ix. No. of police units with forensic kit.
- x. No. of corruption legislations recommended by police for review.

Critical factors

- i. Increased budget support for Anti-Corruption activities.

⁴ Time stipulated in Police Standing Orders

- ii. Active stakeholder participation.
- iii. Reduction in “Need” factors that motivate corruption.
- iv. Enhanced supervision and oversight.
- v. Independence of disciplinary courts.
- vi. Commitment from police leadership at all levels.

Strategic Objective 3: Promote transparency and Accountability in order to enhance public trust and confidence.

The Objective is aimed at ensuring that there is transparency and accountability for any action or omissions by police officers.

Interventions

1. Enhance independence of the Procurement and Finance Committee to oversee budget performance.
2. Timely feedback on progress of reported cases.
3. Empower programme holders to strengthen budget planning and implementation functions.
4. Strict adherence to the existing legal frameworks e.g. Public Finance Management Act and PPDA Act to ensure efficiency in resource utilization.
5. Regular inspections by the Inspectorate Department to ensure compliance to existing policies and regulations.
6. Promote access to information such as through the development of client charters to empower police personnel on their duties and public on their rights.

7. Promote professionalism, ethical conduct and respect for human rights.
8. Implementation of the leadership code through Declaration of Income, Assets and Liabilities by UPF officers of the rank of Inspector of Police and above using the Online declaration system (IG-ODS)

Indicators

- i. % of Annual work plan implemented.
- ii. Level of involvement of programme holders in budget planning and implementation.
- iii. No. of audit queries raised.
- iv. Level of compliance to M&E recommendations.
- v. No. of Inspectorate Reports.
- vi. Client charter developed.
- vii. Customer care Strategy developed.
- viii. Coverage of feedback platforms in place.
- ix. Proportion of officers trained in customer care related courses.
- x. % of police personnel trained on tailored management courses.
- xi. Level of compliance to the 48hr detention rule.
- xii. % of officials that have declared assets

Critical Factors

- i. Adherence to Public Finance and Management Act 2015 and PPDA Act 2003.
- ii. Public Support.
- iii. Adherence to Police Standing Orders (PSO).

iv. Adherence to the Leadership Code Act

It's hoped that if critical factors prevailed, the different interventions will achieve the set objectives to propel UPF towards ZERO TOLERANCE TO CORRUPTION.

CHAPTER 4: IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, focus is put on the modus operandi to achieve the set objectives, ensuring that there are no deviations and there are clear methods to assess the impact.

The implementation will be driven internally, but there are some external processes and Actors such as MoFPED, Courts of Law, and Directorate of Ethics and Integrity, which are part of the chain that have a fundamental bearing on its success. Implementation will largely cover the roles of each player from top management to the lowest rank and external stakeholders. Their inputs, activities and planned outputs are summarized in an implementation matrix.

The process will also be guided by a monitoring and evaluation framework to ensure that interventions are executed to the letter with limited deviations.

4.1 Implementation

This Strategy is an integral part of the UPF system and execution of its mandate, and should not be viewed as an added-on responsibility or framework. The implementation will be done through the existing police structures from national level, down to regional and district levels. Feedback and data relating to the identified indicators will be communicated upwards from the posts and stations to the national level.

A. Implementation at National Level

4.1.1 Police Authority

The Police Authority will ensure that Government buys into the UPF Anti-corruption Strategy and avail resources for its implementation. It will also ensure that due process in administration of corruption related litigations for Officers are followed fairly.

4.1.2 Police Council

Being the policy making body, the Police Council will ensure full implementation by passing other complementary policies and regulations. The Council will provide policy oversight for implementation of this Strategy and therefore receive and consider semi-annual or annual implementation reports.

4.1.3 IGP

IGP's leadership role as CEO is pivotal in shaping the culture and conduct of Officers towards responsible decision making, management of discretion and ultimately the fight against corruption. The IGP will also lead in mobilization and guide on allocation of resources and provide strategic guidance for overall implementation of this Strategy. The Strategy also relies on IGP's office as an asset in setting the tone and conduct of responsible policing and therefore shaping the culture in the Force.

4.1.4 Directors

Directors are the decentralized version of the IGP. Directors will play the function of integrating issues of anti-corruption, ethics and integrity into the complementary process that support police work. Those in the

mainstream (core) must ensure that frontline implantation of this Strategy is realized. They should guide regular and timely reporting by their Directorates to emphatically and explicitly make mention of what activities are being undertaken in promoting integrity, fighting corruption and inculcating a culture of responsible policing during Policy and Advisory Committee (PAC) .

4.1.5 Finance and Procurement Committee

The Finance Committee will provide resources for implementation of the Strategy and guide on proper usage of the resources.

4.1.6 Heads of Departments/Specialized units

The generic units handle day today activities of the Strategy like community policing, investigations, enforcement of discipline, *barazas* and training. They all need to pick the principle of this strategy and entrench them in their processes. However there are some specific departments such as the PSU and Police Training Schools which by the nature of their mandate have a driving force in helping UPF realize the required momentum. These units will be required to have an upfront role in the fight against corruption.

B. Implementation at Regional Level

4.1.7 Regional Police Commanders

RPCs are a point of reference in overseeing policing in the regions and manage public complaints against corrupt officers. They shall play a pivotal role of ensuring that the Strategy is implemented at that level and using

existing structures at the regions such as PSU and regional police management committees to monitor and enforce compliance.

C. Implementation at District Level

4.1.8 District Police Commanders

The first point of interaction between the public and police is majorly at police stations and posts. DPCs play a major role in administration of policing at district/divisional level and therefore will ensure that this Strategy is mainstreamed into their activities at district, stations and posts. They will have the primary role of ensuring proper conduct in the context of anti-corruption and regular reporting. Together with their district police management committees they will have the responsibility of bringing the police in their district closer to this Strategy and ultimately ensuring that officers are always sensitized and reminded of their role in fighting corruption and encouraged to be role models.

4.1.9 Individual officers

The Officers are the central and primary targets of the Strategy. It's the role of every police officer to desist, stop and report corrupt tendencies. They will be expected to communicate feedback on anti-corruption related matters upwards through their respective unit heads up to the national convergence point. Each officer should live an exemplary life in the fight against corruption. It should be impressed upon each officer to be an ambassador in this crusade within the Force and the public generally.

4.1.10 Cooperation with external partners

The Strategy shall be implemented through a multi-stakeholder approach, drawing on the involvement and active participation of other Government institutions, non-State actors and the public. This is in line with the Constitutional (Art 17(i)) imperatives that make the fight against corruption a responsibility of all persons in Uganda.

Other concerned players like the, Directorate of Ethics and Integrity, Political leaders, IGG, RDCs, JLOS institutions, Chain Link Coordination Committees, CBOs media and NGOs will be involved by UPF in the fight against corruption.

4.2 Implementation Matrix

Key output	Interventions	Indicators	Responsibility
Objective 1: To put in place a framework for the prevention of corruption in UPF			
Framework in place to prevent corruption.	Re-design and review police forms and books that expose officers to corruption tendencies such as PF18 (release on bond) to have a watershed with the wordings “Police Bond is Free” . The emphasis should also be that the release on bond is only done by DPC, OC CID or OC Station.	i) No. of police forms and books redesigned and adopted in all Units. ii) % of the population who have paid bribes for police services.	R, P & D
	Ensure adequate and equitable allocation of resources to enhance service delivery by mobilizing more resources and promoting transparency at all levels of management.	i) Quarterly % increment in resources allocated to units.	DIGP

Implementation Matrix

	Review, operationalize existing policies and empower committees that handle issues related to finance and procurement, promotions, training, recruitment and placements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) No. of policies reviewed and operationalized. ii) Level of compliance by committees to set standards and procedures. 	<p>R, P & D</p> <p>DIGP</p>
	Improve the welfare of police personnel and their families by involving them in wealth creation projects to improve their livelihoods.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) No. of police personnel benefiting from welfare schemes. ii) No. of welfare schemes that are positively enhancing police personnel's wellbeing. 	<p>Welfare & Prod</p> <p>Welfare & Prod</p>
	Enhancement of salary and provision of entitlements such as accommodation, medical care and transport.	i) The level of compliance to police personnel's entitlements.	C/PM
	Improvement on information and communication mechanism through	i) Standard communication manuals	PRO

Implementation Matrix

	<p>intensive sensitization of police, strengthening PRO's office and empowering the public to report corrupt practices.</p>	<p>developed.</p> <p>No. of corruption complaints from the public reported.</p> <p>ii) Number of corruption complaint cases handled</p>	
	<p>Strengthen supervision, mentoring, coaching and inspection functions to ensure that the police standard operating procedures are complied with; for instance ensuring that civil cases don't enter into the system.</p>	<p>i) Level of implementation recommendations by nationwide inspections.</p> <p>ii) % of illegal detentions.</p>	<p>DIGP HRA CID</p>
	<p>Proper identification of uniformed and non-uniformed UPF staff through embroidering names on all uniforms and wearing of job cards by non-uniformed personnel save for intelligence staff.</p>	<p>i) % of police personnel who wear nametags and job cards while on duty.</p>	<p>L&E</p>

Implementation Matrix

	Decentralize and integrate the automated Personnel Management Information System to fill the information gap about record of service of the personnel.	i) Automated Personnel Management Information System decentralized and integrated	ICT
Objective 2: To put in place mechanisms to detect and fight corruption and punitive measures for those involved.			
Improved technical capacity of officers to handle corruption cases	Empower the Economic Fraud and Anti-Corruption Division of CID to handle corruption cases and ensure that they are prosecuted before the Anti-Corruption Court.	<p>i) % of corruption cases reported by the public against Police personnel that are prosecuted.</p> <p>ii) No. of officers trained in the investigation of corruption.</p>	<p>CID</p> <p>HRD</p>

Implementation Matrix

Enhanced disciplinary court system	Enhance capacity of Police Disciplinary Courts to try officers found to have committed corruption related disciplinary offences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) % of reported corruption related offences in the disciplinary courts concluded in time. ii) No. of officers trained to handle police disciplinary court procedures. iii) Sentencing guidelines developed. 	<p>HRA HR and LS</p>
Mechanisms to detect and fight corruption in place.	Strengthen the complaint handling mechanisms through installation of suggestion boxes, toll free lines, use of social media platforms, production of IEC materials, proper documentation of complaints, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Coverage of operational complaints tools by category. ii) Proportion of received corruption complaints concluded. 	<p>HRA</p>

Implementation Matrix

	Usage of ICT platforms such as CCTV cameras to detect corruption tendencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) No. of police units with CCTV cameras in use. ii) No. of police units with forensic kit. 	ICT
	Advocate for legislation of more deterrent punishments for perpetrators of corruption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) No. of corruption legislations recommended by police for review. 	HR&LS
Objective 3: To promote transparency and accountability in order to enhance public trust and confidence.			
Improved budget performance and value for money.	Enhance independence of the Procurement and Finance Committee to oversee budget performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) % of Annual work plan implemented. 	DIGP
	Empower programme holders to strengthen budget planning and implementation functions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Level of involvement of programme holders in budget planning and implementation. 	DIGP

Implementation Matrix

	Strict adherence to the existing legal frameworks to ensure efficiency in resource utilization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) No. of audit queries raised. ii) Level of compliance to M&E recommendations iii) No. of Inspectorate Reports. 	DIGP
Increased public trust and confidence in policing services.	Promote access to information and customer care.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Client charter developed. ii) Customer care Strategy developed. iii) Coverage of feedback platforms in place iv) Proportion of officers trained in customer care related courses 	CPC PRO
	Promote professionalism, ethical conduct and respect for human rights.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) % of police personnel trained on tailored management courses. 	HRD HR&LS

Implementation Matrix

		ii) Level of compliance to the 48hr detention rule.	
	Operationalize the Leadership code Act through declaration of assets and liabilities by Police Officers) Number of officials that have declared assets and liabilities through IG-ODS	

4.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

This frame work will be used to continuously assess progress on the implementation of the Strategy. To operationalize it, a survey will be conducted to set a baseline on which progress will be compared.

4.3.1 Data Collection and information dissemination

The UPF information system on anti-corruption will draw on a number of information sources. This will include:-

- Specifically designed qualitative and quantitative user surveys.
- Extended data gathering related to specific UPF out puts on anti-corruption and;
- Existing national surveys carried out by UBOS in collaboration with other government and non-government institutions/sectors that gather data directly relevant to this M&E plan. These could take the

form of user and public perception on service delivery and integrity surveys. This approach is aimed at creating synergy between various related data gathering and survey efforts.

- R,P&D Directorate will prepare periodic progress/performance reports against the work plan activities and anti-corruption indicators.

Dissemination of information is key to the success of the fight against corruption. M&E data and documentation will be available through semiannual and annual reports that will be circulated by R,P&D to all Directorates and Departments within UPF.

4.3.2 Institutional framework and roles on M&E

R, P&D will be the pivot for managing the M&E function and reports to PAC. The Directorate shall:-

- Lead the process of UPF M&E on anti-corruption.
- Undertake periodic collection of data on performance indicators.
- Act as the main point of contact for UPF for purposes of M&E on anti- corruption.
- Establish and maintain M&E documentation and;
- Prepare and submit semiannual progress reports and annual performance reports.

4.3.3 Evaluation

UPF will undertake an annual evaluations of anti-corruption strategies being implemented to allow stakeholders to reflect on successes and

failures and identify changes and refinements that need to be put in place to ensure results are met at all levels of the results chain.

4.3.4 Impact assessment

Impact assessment plays an important role in proving the effectiveness of interventions as well as improving the effectiveness and efficiency of implementation and redefining priorities.

UPF will use impact assessment to generate an understanding of the effectiveness of existing interventions on anticorruption in generating the desired outputs, outcomes and impact and therefore guide decision making. This will be done at the end of planned implementation period.



From Colonial Policing to Community Policing

Uganda Police Headquarters Naguru

Plot 42/49, Katalima Road, P.o Box 7055, Kampala Uganda

Fax: +256-414-343531/255630. General Lines: 256-414-343532/233814/231761/254033

Toll Free: 0800-199-699, 0800-199-499. Website: <http://www.upf.go.ug>