



NAMIBIA

TRANSPARENCY ASSESSMENT 2018

The Citizens' Analysis of Government Openness

INTRODUCTION

Sadly, we have to issue yet another annual transparency report lamenting the lack of an access to information (ATI) law in Namibia. Each year, the Ministry of Information and Communication Technology (MICT) issues promise after promise that a bill will be tabled, but it never happens. It has now become difficult to believe government's public commitment to legislating the right of access to information, because it persistently fails to do so. The ministry's failure to table a bill is further intensified by the fact that ministry officials are unable to provide a plausible reason for their inability to do so.

It is important to note that government and civil society have been partners in this journey towards greater transparency since the launch of the ACTION Campaign in July 2012. Aimed at raising awareness on ATI as an enabling human right, and lobbying for a legislative and policy environment that fosters ATI, the campaign was successful in fostering a partnership between government, civil society, the media and development partners.

In as much as this is an annual assessment of how citizens experience accessing information from public institutions, it also serves as civil society's reflection on the ATI environment. Since 2013, the Transparency Assessment has been an overview of all the work that has been done towards achieving the goals set by the ACTION Campaign. Thanks to the commendable work by the African Platform on ATI (APAI), the goal to have 28 September recognised as International Day for Universal Access to Information by the international community was achieved in 2015. Namibia is one of the few countries that officially commemorates this day. A major objective, which was for more Namibians to be aware of their human right of access to information and how it can enable them to access other human rights, was also achieved.

Further, with the support of development partners, government has made good strides in capacitating public institutions' understanding and performance with regard to their respect of the public's right to know. As development partners, UNESCO Namibia and *fesmedia* Africa have been instrumental in this journey, and for that we are thankful. However, it is time to achieve the ultimate goal, which is an access to information law, now – no more excuses. Greater pressure must be placed on government for the tabling of an access to information law.

The disappointment that comes with writing yet another report that does not celebrate the passing of an ATI law is assuaged by the fact that we can once again report an improvement in public institutions' performance with regard to their accessibility and responsiveness to the public's demand for information.

We re-assessed the best and worst performers of last year. The Ministry of Justice improved its performance, while the Communications Regulatory Association of Namibia (CRAN) scored a lot lower this year. This highlights the fact that

a citizen's experience with a public institution can differ, depending on various factors, and that an institution can improve its performance once it is held accountable. It is important that public institutions do not lower their standards or quality of work once a good precedent has been set.

It is an undeniable fact that the lack of access to information is an impediment to media freedom. This was highlighted when the weekly *The Patriot* newspaper had to defend an urgent court action by the Namibian Central Intelligence Service (NCIS) in April, to prevent them from publishing an article on corruption at the institution. The High Court dismissed the bid with costs, arguing that the NCIS was established to serve the state and thus remains accountable to the judiciary. However, the NCIS thereafter lodged an appeal with the Supreme Court, arguing that the High Court erred when it found that government was trying to get an interdict that would have prevented *The Patriot* from publishing allegations about corrupt activities. They also argued that the High Court did not take into account the purpose of the 1982 Protection of Information Act and the Namibia Central Intelligence Service Act of 1997. Government's legal team argued that the presiding judge, Harald Geier, did not make a judicial interpretation of the provisions of these laws, on which government relied in their bid to prevent the publication of the article. The case was still sub-judice at the time of going to press.

It does not happen often but, as with this court case, government relies on outdated laws that do not adhere to the free expression principles espoused by our Constitution. Hence our consistent calls for the repeal of these and other laws that do not serve the best interest of the Namibian people and their right to free expression, access to information and media freedom.

Presidential and National Assembly elections will be held next year, during which tensions will be heightened and, as with previous years, we can expect an increase in attempts to censor or threaten media freedom. Another law that may be more explicitly applied during this time is the Namibian Broadcasting Act (No. 9 of 1991), which grants the information minister wide discretion and powers to interfere with the broadcaster's independence. The NBC is already censored in regard to how they provide news and information. During election periods, it becomes a clear proponent of the ruling party through the way it provides coverage. NBC has an equal free airtime policy for all participating political parties, however, a lot of the election coverage happens outside of these allocated slots and this is when the discrepancy becomes glaringly obvious.

Citizens deserve unbiased information about all participating parties, in addition to analyses provided by experts from various stakeholder and interest groups. Just as important, the citizen's voice should be at the forefront of the discourse.

Information and communication technology (ICT) continue to enhance the public's access to information. Thanks to the establishment of the Internet Society of Namibia Chapter, Namibian youth now have a platform where they can articulate their views and realise their dream internet.

RATIONALE AND RESEARCH PARAMETERS

The consistent work of stakeholder groups towards the realisation of a Namibian society in which citizens can fully enjoy their right to access information is paying off. Public officials are more engaging, friendly and responsive to public requests for information, and all surveyed institutions have websites and social media accounts.

The research was conducted from 26 July to 17 August 2018. Institutions were given 21 days to respond to requests for information. Eight institutions were studied, including the Golden Padlock and Golden Key recipients of 2017. The research included the study of their responses to requests for information and evaluated websites and social media platforms, in particular Facebook and Twitter.

The objective of the study was to measure the openness as well as the difficulties faced by public institutions in providing information to the public. The study looked at whether the sampled offices made available the information without questioning the intentions of those requesting it.

The following public institutions were surveyed:

1. Communications Regulatory Association of Namibia (CRAN)
2. Ministry of Justice (MoJ)
3. Ministry of Health and Social Services (MHSS)
4. National Assembly (NA)
5. Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR)
6. Road Fund Administration (RFA)
7. NamPower
8. Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment Creation (MLIREC)

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

Category 1: Website analysis

- Most websites were updated, well-maintained and user-friendly.
- Most institutions have active social media accounts.
- Most institutions and their followers are not very interactive, there is limited two-way communication.

Category 2: Requests for information

- Most institutions displayed openness in allowing access to public information.
- Most institutions were helpful and transparent.
- Most institutions acknowledged the receipt of the request for information. There were quite a number of same-day responses.
- The NA called the researcher to ensure their response was received and was sufficient.

DETAILED FINDINGS

1. Communications Regulatory Association of Namibia (CRAN)

CATEGORY 1: WEBSITE

www.cran.na/index.php

CRAN's website is up to date, informative, and well-organised. They have active Facebook and Twitter accounts, with which, however, their followers seldom interact.

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Does this website contain up-to-date information?	.			
2. Does the website contain the following:				
a) A description of its powers, as well as data on the organisational structure, the functions and the responsibilities of the administration?	.			
b) A list of laws, Acts etc issued within the scope of its powers?	.			
c) Reports, policies, programmes?	.			
d) Budget and expenditure?		.		
e) Information about procurement procedures and/or signed contracts?	.			
f) Vacancy and employment procedures?	.			
g) The address, telephone numbers and working hours of the institution?	.			
h) The contact details of specific public officials?	.			
i) A mechanism to request and receive a response to electronic messages and requests for information?		.		

Total Score: 16/20

CATEGORY 2: REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

The following questions were sent to CRAN:

- How does CRAN's mandate contribute to the achievement of Vision 2030?
- Access to the internet is increasingly regarded as a human right; who are CRAN's main partners in working towards achieving access to the internet for all Namibians?
- Which CRAN programmes are aimed at ensuring public awareness of the various options available for access to the internet, e.g. community networks?
- What is CRAN's 2018 budget for internet-related projects?

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Is there an official designated to take and respond to information requests?	.			Public Relations Officer (PRO)
2. Did the institution reply within 21 days?		.		
3. Did the institution respond to the request for information?		.		
4. Does the authority publish their procedures for dealing with information requests?		.		
5. Did the institution provide all of the information requested?		.		
6. Does the institution provide written reasons for the refusal of information?			.	The PRO indicated that he was out of the country.
7. Did the institution disclose information about its operations, budgets, structure etc?		.		
8. Did the authority provide information without questioning the aims and motivations of the applicant?		.		

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
9. Did the institution acknowledge your request for information within 7 days?	.			
10. Was the information received clear and understandable?		.		

Total Score: 5/20

2. Ministry of Justice (MoJ)

CATEGORY 1: WEBSITE

www.moj.gov.na/home

The website contains up-to-date information and is informative with relevant content. The MoJ has an active Facebook account but their followers seldom interact with their posts.

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Does this website contain up-to-date information?	.			
2. Does the website contain the following:				
a) A description of its powers, as well as data on the organisational structure, the functions and the responsibilities of the administration?	.			
b) A list of laws, Acts etc issued within the scope of its powers?			.	The website provides law reforms, but not acts.
c) Reports, policies, programmes?	.			
d) Budget and expenditure?		.		
e) Information about procurement procedures and/or signed contracts?		.		
f) Vacancy and employment procedures?	.			
g) The address, telephone numbers and working hours of the institution?			.	Working hours are not displayed.
h) The contact details of specific public officials?	.			
i) A mechanism to request and receive a response to electronic messages and requests for information?	.			There is a Government Communication System on the website.

Total Score: 14/20

CATEGORY 2: REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

The following questions were sent to the MoJ:

- Does the ministry collaborate with peer ministries in other SADC member states and if so, in what way?
- What are some of the relevant regional instruments that speak to regional collaboration in the area of justice?
- What are some of the challenges faced by the ministry in the execution of this area of work?
- What is the ministry's 2018 budget for regional cooperation and how is this determined?

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Is there an official designated to take and respond to information requests?	.			Senior Public Relations Officer
2. Did the institution reply within 21 days?	.			Same-day response
3. Did the institution respond to the request for information?	.			
4. Does the authority publish their procedures for dealing with information requests?		.		
5. Did the institution provide all of the information requested?	.			

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
6. Does the institution provide written reasons for the refusal of information?			•	At first, the MoJ refused to give information because they requested further details. The information was made available after the researcher's affiliation with Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA) was indicated.
7. Did the institution disclose information about its operations, budgets, structure etc?	•			
8. Did the authority provide information without questioning the aims and motivations of the applicant?		•		
9. Did the institution acknowledge your request for information within 7 days?	•			
10. Was the information received clear and understandable?	•			

Total Score: 15/20

3. Ministry of Health and Social Services (MHSS)

CATEGORY 1: WEBSITE

www.mhss.gov.na

The MHSS has a comprehensive, updated and informative website. They have an active Facebook account that is updated regularly with low correspondence from followers. They do not have a Twitter account.

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Does this website contain up-to-date information?	•			
2. Does the website contain the following:				
a) A description of its powers, as well as data on the organisational structure, the functions and the responsibilities of the administration?	•			
b) A list of laws, Acts etc issued within the scope of its powers?	•			
c) Reports, policies, programmes?	•			
d) Budget and expenditure?			•	Information about funds are provided.
e) Information about procurement procedures and/or signed contracts?			•	No signed contracts provided.
f) Vacancy and employment procedures?	•			
g) The address, telephone numbers and working hours of the institution?			•	Working hours are not displayed.
h) The contact details of specific public officials?	•			
i) A mechanism to request and receive a response to electronic messages and requests for information?		•		

Total Score: 15/20

CATEGORY 2: REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

The following questions were sent to the MHSS:

1. What is the ministry's mandate and how does it relate to Vision 2030?
2. How important is community health to the ministry and what measures are implemented to ensure that communities have access to health services?
3. Sexual reproductive health of the youth continues to be a challenge, in particular with matters relating to teenage pregnancy. Is there a sexual and reproductive rights component to the ministry's programmes?
4. What is the ministry's 2018 budget for sexual and reproductive health and what are the factors that influence this year's budget allocation?

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Is there an official designated to take and respond to information requests?	.			Acting Public Relations Officer
2. Did the institution reply within 21 days?	.			
3. Did the institution respond to the request for information?	.			
4. Does the authority publish their procedures for dealing with information requests?		.		
5. Did the institution provide all of the information requested?	.			
6. Does the institution provide written reasons for the refusal of information?	.			
7. Did the institution disclose information about its operations, budgets, structure etc?	.			
8. Did the authority provide information without questioning the aims and motivations of the applicant?	.			
9. Did the institution acknowledge your request for information within 7 days?			.	The institution responded on the 7th day after researcher sent a reminder.
10. Was the information received clear and understandable?	.			

Total Score: 17/20

4. National Assembly (NA)

CATEGORY 1: WEBSITE

www.parliament.na

The NA's website has relatively useful content. It has been updated, although information that is more useful could be added. They fall under the Parliament of Namibia, which has active Facebook and Twitter accounts with which they correspond with followers.

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Does this website contain up-to-date information?	.			
2. Does the website contain the following:				
a) A description of its powers, as well as data on the organisational structure, the functions and the responsibilities of the administration?	.			
b) A list of laws, Acts etc issued within the scope of its powers?	.			
c) Reports, policies, programmes?	.			
d) Budget and expenditure?		.		
e) Information about procurement procedures and/or signed contracts?		.		
f) Vacancy and employment procedures?		.		
g) The address, telephone numbers and working hours of the institution?			.	No working hours are provided.
h) The contact details of specific public officials?	.			
i) A mechanism to request and receive a response to electronic messages and requests for information?	.			Contact form

Total Score: 13/20

CATEGORY 2: REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

The following questions were sent to the NA:

1. Is there a body/organ that allows for the NA and the National Council to collaborate on matters of common interest?
2. What capacity-building initiatives are available for MPs?
3. Who are the NA's main partners in this regard?
4. What is the NA's annual operations budget and do MPs have influence on it?

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Is there an official designated to take and respond to information requests?	.			Public Relations Officer
2. Did the institution reply within 21 days?	.			Same-day response
3. Did the institution respond to the request for information?	.			
4. Does the authority publish their procedures for dealing with information requests?	.			
5. Did the institution provide all of the information requested?	.			
6. Does the institution provide written reasons for the refusal of information?	.			
7. Did the institution disclose information about its operations, budgets, structure etc?	.			
8. Did the authority provide information without questioning the aims and motivations of the applicant?	.			
9. Did the institution acknowledge your request for information within 7 days?	.			
10. Was the information received clear and understandable?	.			

Total Score: 20/20

5. Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR)

CATEGORY 1: WEBSITE

www.mfmr.gov.na

The MFMR's website has regulations, policies, and laws relevant in the operations of the Ministry, however, there is room for improvement. They have a Facebook account that is not very active and no Twitter account.

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Does this website contain up-to-date information?	.			
2. Does the website contain the following:				
a) A description of its powers, as well as data on the organisational structure, the functions and the responsibilities of the administration?	.			
b) A list of laws, Acts etc issued within the scope of its powers?	.			
c) Reports, policies, programmes?	.			
d) Budget and expenditure?		.		
e) Information about procurement procedures and/or signed contracts?		.		
f) Vacancy and employment procedures?		.		
g) The address, telephone numbers and working hours of the institution?			.	Working hours are not displayed.
h) The contact details of specific public officials?		.		
i) A mechanism to request and receive a response to electronic messages and requests for information?		.		

Total Score: 9/20

CATEGORY 2: REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

The following questions were sent to the MFMR:

1. What is the ministry's mandate and how does it fit into Vision 2030?
2. The fishing quota continues to be a controversial issue; how does the ministry ensure that the public's views are considered during policy-making processes?
3. Access to information is an important aspect of democratic governance; what measures does the ministry have to ensure that the public has access to information on its programmes?
4. What is the ministry's 2018 budget for external communication and what are the factors that influence this year's budget allocation?

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Is there an official designated to take and respond to information requests?	.			Public Relations Officer
2. Did the institution reply within 21 days?		.		
3. Did the institution respond to the request for information?		.		
4. Does the authority publish their procedures for dealing with information requests?		.		
5. Did the institution provide all of the information requested?		.		
6. Does the institution provide written reasons for the refusal of information?		.		
7. Did the institution disclose information about its operations, budgets, structure etc?		.		
8. Did the authority provide information without questioning the aims and motivations of the applicant?		.		
9. Did the institution acknowledge your request for information within 7 days?		.		
10. Was the information received clear and understandable?		.		

Total Score: 2/20

6. Road Fund Administration (RFA)

CATEGORY 1: WEBSITE

www.rfanam.com.na

The RFA's website is relatively efficient, updated and informative. They have a Facebook account but do not interact much with their followers and do not have a Twitter account.

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Does this website contain up-to-date information?	.			
2. Does the website contain the following:				
a) A description of its powers, as well as data on the organisational structure, the functions and the responsibilities of the administration?	.			
b) A list of laws, Acts etc issued within the scope of its powers?	.			
c) Reports, policies, programmes?	.			
d) Budget and expenditure?		.		
e) Information about procurement procedures and/or signed contracts?		.		
f) Vacancy and employment procedures?	.			
g) The address, telephone numbers and working hours of the institution?	.			
h) The contact details of specific public officials?		.		
i) A mechanism to request and receive a response to electronic messages and requests for information?	.			Contact form

Total Score: 14/20

CATEGORY 2: REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

The following questions were sent to the RFA:

1. What is the RFA's mandate and how does it fit into HPP?
2. How does the RFA work together with the RA? Is there a collaborative body which meets on a regular basis?
3. What measures are implemented to ensure accountability and transparency at the RFA?
4. What is the RFA's budget for road construction in 2018 and which regions received the biggest budget allocation?

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Is there an official designated to take and respond to information requests?	.			Public Relations Officer
2. Did the institution reply within 21 days?		.		
3. Did the institution respond to the request for information?		.		
4. Does the authority publish their procedures for dealing with information requests?		.		
5. Did the institution provide all of the information requested?		.		
6. Does the institution provide written reasons for the refusal of information?		.		
7. Did the institution disclose information about its operations, budgets, structure etc?		.		
8. Did the authority provide information without questioning the aims and motivations of the applicant?		.		
9. Did the institution acknowledge your request for information within 7 days?	.			Same-day response
10. Was the information received clear and understandable?		.		

Total Score: 4/20

7. NamPower

CATEGORY 1: WEBSITE

www.nampower.com.na

The website will not open on some computers or devices as it has security listings. The website, however, is well-maintained, informative and user-friendly. They do not have any social media accounts except for a NamPower Convention page.

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Does this website contain up-to-date information?	.			
2. Does the website contain the following:				
a) A description of its powers, as well as data on the organisational structure, the functions and the responsibilities of the administration?	.			
b) A list of laws, Acts etc issued within the scope of its powers?	.			
c) Reports, policies, programmes?	.			
d) Budget and expenditure?		.		
e) Information about procurement procedures and/or signed contracts?	.			
f) Vacancy and employment procedures?	.			
g) The address, telephone numbers and working hours of the institution?			.	Working hours are not displayed.
h) The contact details of specific public officials?		.		
i) A mechanism to request and receive a response to electronic messages and requests for information?	.			Contact form

Total Score: 15/20

CATEGORY 2: REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

The following questions were sent to NamPower:

1. What is NamPower's mandate and how does it fit into Vision 2030?
2. Rural electrification is one of NamPower's major projects; what are some of the challenges you face in this regard?
3. Who are NamPower's most important stakeholders in the rural electrification project?
4. What is NamPower's 2018 budget for rural electrification?

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Is there an official designated to take and respond to information requests?	•			Public Relations Officer
2. Did the institution reply within 21 days?	•			Same-day response
3. Did the institution respond to the request for information?	•			
4. Does the authority publish their procedures for dealing with information requests?	•			
5. Did the institution provide all of the information requested?		•		The researcher was referred to the website and to the Head of Rural Electricity.
6. Does the institution provide written reasons for the refusal of information?	•			
7. Did the institution disclose information about its operations, budgets, structure etc?		•		
8. Did the authority provide information without questioning the aims and motivations of the applicant?			•	Not all questions were answered.
9. Did the institution acknowledge your request for information within 7 days?	•			
10. Was the information received clear and understandable?	•			

Total Score: 15/20

8. Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relations and Employment Creation (MLIREC)

CATEGORY 1: WEBSITE

www.mol.gov.na

The website is up to date, useful and helpful. They do not have a Twitter account and their Facebook account is dormant.

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Does this website contain up-to-date information?	•			
2. Does the website contain the following:				
a) A description of its powers, as well as data on the organisational structure, the functions and the responsibilities of the administration?	•			
b) A list of laws, Acts etc issued within the scope of its powers?	•			
c) Reports, policies, programmes?	•			
d) Budget and expenditure?		•		
e) Information about procurement procedures and/or signed contracts?		•		
f) Vacancy and employment procedures?	•			
g) The address, telephone numbers and working hours of the institution?			•	Working hours are not displayed.
h) The contact details of specific public officials?	•			
i) A mechanism to request and receive a response to electronic messages and requests for information?		•		

Total Score: 13/20

CATEGORY 2: REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

The following questions were sent to the MLIREC:

1. What is the ministry's mandate and how does it fit into Vision 2030?
2. Does the ministry share the 'Social Welfare' mandate with the Ministry of Health and Social Services? Which programmes overlap and how?
3. What are some of the challenges faced by the ministry in ensuring social welfare?
4. What is the ministry's 2018 budget for social welfare?

n = 20	Yes	No	Partial	Additional Information
1. Is there an official designated to take and respond to information requests?	•			Public Relations Officer
2. Did the institution reply within 21 days?			•	The institution responded the next day with feedback on where to find the information.
3. Did the institution respond to the request for information?		•		
4. Does the authority publish their procedures for dealing with information requests?		•		
5. Did the institution provide all of the information requested?		•		
6. Does the institution provide written reasons for the refusal of information?			•	Referred the researcher to another institution regarding some of the questions.
7. Did the institution disclose information about its operations, budgets, structure etc?		•		
8. Did the authority provide information without questioning the aims and motivations of the applicant?	•			
9. Did the institution acknowledge your request for information within 7 days?	•			
10. Was the information received clear and understandable?			•	The researcher was referred to the website and to the Ministry of Poverty Eradication and Social Welfare.

Total Score: 9/20

SUMMARY

Institution	Website	Request for information	Total score
1. Communication Regulatory Association of Namibia	16	5	21
2. Ministry of Justice	14	15	29
3. Ministry of Health and Social Services	15	17	32
4. National Assembly	13	20	33
5. Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources	9	2	11
6. Road Fund Administration	14	4	18
7. NamPower	15	15	30
8. Ministry of Labour, Industrial Relation and Employment Creation	13	9	22

RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS

There is definite improvement in the performance of public institutions concerning the provision of access to information to citizens. This is evident in the quality and efficiency of their websites and the level of their social media interaction, even though there is very little two-way communication. The improvement is most notable in their responses to requests for information.

THE MOST SECRETIVE PUBLIC INSTITUTION IN NAMIBIA

The Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources receives the 2018 Golden Padlock Award. Even though they have a well-functioning website, not all sections are regularly updated. This was particularly concerning as this is the year during which new fishing rights applications were received. They also did not respond to our request for information and displayed no interest in doing so.

THE MOST OPEN PUBLIC INSTITUTION IN NAMIBIA

The National Assembly receives the 2018 Golden Key Award. It out-performed last year's recipient, CRAN, with 12 points. Their website has relatively useful content and is updated regularly. The public relations officer at the National Assembly was helpful and friendly; he even called the researcher to ensure that the information provided was accurate and sufficient.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Government must continue its drive to build the capacity of its institutions to best serve the public's right to know as it is having a positive impact. For the first time since the start of this study, only one public institution ignored our request for information. That is this year's Golden Padlock recipient, the Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources.

We call upon stakeholders to continue playing their part in creating an environment that is responsive to the public's human right to access information. Most importantly, we need a law that will enhance the right of access to information of the public, the media, civil society and academia. Civil society needs to step-up its advocacy and lobbying efforts so that the 2019 Transparency Assessment can finally tell the world that Namibia has an ATI law.