



POSITION PAPER

Political finance

Executive summary

As the influence of money in politics increases worldwide, there is a growing awareness among election stakeholders including state authorities, political parties, media and civil society of the need for political finance reform, encompassing both political party finance and campaign finance. However, while regional and international standards require states to adopt measures to ensure transparency in political finance, in order to promote a level playing field for elections and prevent political corruption, the development of regulatory frameworks, as well as their effective implementation and enforcement, remain a global challenge.

During the 30 July 2018 Harmonised election, the Zimbabwe Election Support Network (ZESN) and other observer groups reported a number of concerns related to political finance. These included: uneven access to sources of political party funding, the absence of a regulatory framework for political finance, the misuse of state resources and vote-buying. These issues exacerbated what was already an uneven playing field for political competition. In response to these findings, observer groups have suggested a series of recommendations that could help to address these issues, should there be the political will to do so. With three years until the next election, it is an appropriate time to consider recommendations that may require legislative changes. As the broader electoral reform agenda begins to take shape, issues of political finance reform should be part of the discussion.

This position paper aims to draw on international and regional experience and good practice to distill lessons for Zimbabwe in the area of political finance. It addresses regional and international standards for political finance, the relevant national legislation, key considerations for political finance reform, including special measures for women and the need to protect fundamental freedoms, and mechanisms for ensuring transparency and accountability. The paper suggests that as Zimbabwe has almost no regulatory framework for campaign finance, there are a number of positive measures it could take, in line with

the findings and recommendations of observer groups following the 2018 elections (see annex for specific observer recommendations): "An obvious first step could be to provide transparency in the existing system of public funding for political parties. This would require a reporting mechanism to be established and an oversight body to be assigned responsibility for monitoring political party compliance with the requirements and enforcing any sanctions.

"At the same time, for Zimbabwe to comply with its international and regional commitments, it should also consider developing a regulatory framework for campaign finance, including mechanisms for reporting, monitoring and enforcement, including the appointment of an oversight body. Such a framework would allow authorities to effectively monitor the existing provisions that prohibit foreign funding of political parties as well as the spending limit for political parties.

"Further provisions to limit campaign finance could also be considered, including limits on the individual contributions as well as a system of public disclosure of political contributions.

"Given the prevalence of misuse of state resources and vote buying in elections, as reported by observer groups, it would be useful to adopt provisions that clearly define what behaviour is permitted and prohibited during the election period. Such provisions could send an important signal to the public that there is no impunity for such practices and establish a basis for impartial enforcement. Civil society and media also have a role to play in discouraging such practices.

Further provisions to limit campaign finance could also be considered, including limits on the individual contributions as well as a system of public disclosure of political contributions.



Such reform measures could help promote a level playing field and enhance public confidence in the electoral process as a whole. Finally the paper makes a number of practical recommendations to election stakeholders for next steps in pursuing political finance reform:

- “ Convene an inclusive roundtable to consider the current Zimbabwean political finance system, as well as other relevant experiences from the region.
- ” Agree on a set of priority reforms related to political finance and develop an advocacy campaign.
- ” Identify opportunities to engage key decision-makers such as the Minister of Justice, Chair of the ZEC, and MPs on this issue and explain why it is crucial for transparency and accountability in the political system.

- ” Form a committee to draft possible amendments for the priority issues.
- ” Liaise with domestic and international election observer groups on the degree to which their recommendations have been addressed in this area and genuine progress has been made.

ZESN and its partners remain committed to improving the electoral process and further the democratic development of Zimbabwe as a whole.

It pledges to support the broader electoral reform process, as well as specific reform related to political finance through offering its experience and expertise.

Introduction

Political parties and candidates need money to support their ongoing activities as well as to run election campaigns. Such funding, which may be provided by the government as well as by private donors, allows political parties and candidates to express their views to the voters during an election in order to attract votes. While money is needed for political party activities and campaigns, it can also have a negative effect on democratic governance as well as on election integrity. In particular, unregulated or poorly regulated funding for parties and campaigns can result in an uneven playing field for elections, and also allows the potential for corruption of the process.

Around the world, the increased impact of money in politics can be seen. Election outcomes can be influenced by an incumbent's abuse of state resources, as well as by parties and candidates spending vast sums on their campaigns. According to the Kofi Annan Foundation, in many countries, citizens increasingly have the sense that powerful interests are buying political influence that give them access to power and decision-making¹.

These trends have led to growing global awareness of the need to address political finance, in particular by promoting transparency and accountability.

Political finance encompasses both political party finance and campaign finance². Political party finance includes the funding and expenses of political parties for their ongoing routine activities throughout the electoral cycle.

Campaign finance refers to the contributions and expenses of candidates and political parties specifically for electoral purposes. To ensure a transparent and fair campaign finance system for elections, both routine political party financing and campaign financing during the elections must be considered.

Political finance expert Magnus Ohman has identified the main problems related to political finance in Africa as: the uneven playing field between the government and other political parties; abuse of state resources; clientelism; vote-buying; illicit funding, including related to organised crime; dependency on foreign funding; and issues caused by a largely cash-based system.

At the same time, Ohman notes that African countries generally have lower levels of political finance regulation than other parts of the world, and there have been few changes to regulatory frameworks in recent years³.

¹ Kofi Annan Foundation (KAF), Report of the Global Commission on Elections, Democracy and Security, Geneva, 2012, p. 33.

² OSCE ODIHR, Handbook for the Observation of Campaign Finance, Warsaw, 2015, p. 15.

³ Ohman, Magnus, The state of political finance regulations in Africa, International IDEA, Stockholm, 2016, p.3.



Where regulatory frameworks for political finance are in place, they are frequently rendered ineffective by a lack of compliance on the part of candidates and political parties, as well as a lack of enforcement by oversight bodies, usually the electoral management body (EMB). For example in Nigeria, while there are some spending and reporting requirements, oversight and enforcement of the rules during recent elections have not been sufficient⁴. This is in part because while the Independent National Election Commission is responsible for oversight, it lacks administrative sanctioning power.

In Zimbabwe, political parties that reach five per cent of the vote in an election are provided with public funding for their ongoing activities. However, there are no mechanisms for providing transparency in how these funds are spent, as there are no reporting requirements. The law does regulate who is permitted to make private financial contributions - i.e. citizens, permanent residents, companies, and associations⁵. As for campaign finance, while there are spending limits, there are no requirements to report spending, so it is not possible to know if they have been exceeded.

Statement of the Problem

During the 30 July 2018 Harmonised Elections in Zimbabwe, the Zimbabwe Election Support Network (ZESN) and other observer groups reported a number of political finance issues. These included:

"The misuse of government resources. ZESN reported that the ruling party ZANU-PF unfairly benefited from the misuse of government resources, such as vehicles, helicopters and state media, resulting in an uneven playing field. ZANU-PF also had access to government venues for campaigning⁶.

The Zimbabwe International Election Observation Mission (ZIEOM) commented that ZANU-PF campaigned with little differentiation between the State and the party, and pointed out that the Electoral Act does not address the use of state resources for campaigning purposes.

It further commented that 'ZANU-PF's reliance on government school buildings, supplies, personnel, and vehicles during the campaign exacerbated the resource disparity among ruling and opposition parties'⁷. The EU EOM similarly reported the 'extensive use of state resources and advantage of incumbency across the country'⁸.

"Vote-buying. ZESN reported vote-buying during the pre-election period, while ZIEOM commented that 'the distribution of food aid or agricultural inputs such as seeds, fertilizer, and livestock, through the Presidential Inputs Scheme was commonly used as a method of influencing or coercing voters in rural areas'⁹.

The Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission (ZHRC) similarly criticised the government's distribution of food aid and Presidential Farming Inputs for political purposes during the election period¹⁰.

"Absence of a regulatory framework. ZESN cited the lack of legislation that effectively regulates the use of political parties' campaign finances. It further pointed out that 'with no legal requirement to disclose the source of party funding, and no auditing and accountability requirements, it is difficult to determine other sources of party funding. . . and the uses to which the funds are put'¹¹.

The EU EOM also noted the complete lack of reporting requirements and transparency mechanisms and the fact that 'neither ZEC nor any other independent authority is mandated to oversee respect for campaign finance provisions'¹².

"Uneven access to sources of political party funding. ZESN noted that only ZANU-PF and MDC-T qualified for public funding, and even so, the MDC Alliance faced funding challenges.

The EU EOM noted that 'there was a huge disparity in campaign financing and, ZANU-PF dominated all forms of campaigning across the country, including through billboards, posters, distribution of regalia, rallies and road shows'¹³. It further noted that independent candidates are not entitled to any public funding.

⁴ EU EOM to Nigeria, Final report on the General Elections 2019, p.24.

⁵ COTRAD Zimbabwe, 'Political Party and Campaign Finance in Zimbabwe', blog, 10.07.2019.

⁶ ZESN, Report on the 30 July 2018 Harmonised Elections, Harare, p. 42.

⁷ International Republic Institute/National Democratic Institute, ZIEOM Final Report, Washington, October 2018, p. 32.

⁸ EU EOM to Zimbabwe, Final report - Harmonised elections 2018, October 2018.

⁹ ZIEOM Final Report, p. 32.

¹⁰ ZHRC, Final Report on the Zimbabwe Harmonised Election, p. 29.

¹¹ ZESN Report, p. 45.

¹² EU EOM to Zimbabwe, p.23.

¹³ EU EOM to Zimbabwe, p. 23.



Legal Framework

International and regional standards

While no definitive international consensus exists on what constitutes best practice regarding political finance¹⁴, there is growing awareness of the need for transparency in the funding of parties and candidates in the fight against corruption. Article 7 (3) of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC) calls on countries to 'consider taking appropriate legislative and administrative measures... to enhance transparency in the funding of candidatures for elected public office and, where applicable, the funding of political parties'¹⁵. Regional instruments offer more detailed guidance in this area, including in Africa. The African Union Convention on Combatting and Preventing Corruption (AUCC) highlights the importance of transparency in political finance and urges its members to adopt measures to 'proscribe the use of funds acquired through illegal and corrupt practices' and to 'incorporate the principle of transparency' in their national legislation.

While not legally binding, the SADC Principles and Guidelines Governing Democratic Elections also urges transparency and oversight in both political party funding and campaign spending according to national legislation¹⁶ as well as the impartial use of public assets and funds for election campaigns¹⁷.

National legal framework

The law relating to political finance in Zimbabwe is the Political Parties Finance Act of (2001). The law

parties. Section 3 of the Act sets a threshold of five per cent of the vote in previous general elections as a condition for political parties to access public funding, which is allocated according to the number of votes cast for the party's candidates. Independent candidates are not entitled to public funding.

Section 6 of the Political Parties Finance Act prohibits foreign funding of political parties, but it does not provide for any accounting mechanism to demonstrate compliance with this provision, nor does it designate an oversight body responsible for its enforcement. Contrary to good practice for transparency in political finance, there are no reporting requirements for the use of public funding by political parties provided for in the Act.

In terms of campaign finance, Section 93 of the Electoral Act provides that a spending limit may be proscribed, and the Electoral (Amendment) Regulations of 2013 specify an amount of 500,000 USD. However, there are no reporting requirements or transparency mechanisms to allow for the implementation of this provision. Neither the ZEC nor any other authority is designated by the law to provide oversight of campaign finance, including income and expenditures. This lack of any regulatory framework for political finance does not provide for transparency or accountability in the conduct of election campaigns by political parties and candidates, and does not promote a level playing field in elections.

Key considerations from other contexts

International good practice and regional standards suggest that there should be transparency in political finance systems, as well as a regulatory framework for promoting fairness and preventing corruption. There are a number of relevant considerations for stakeholders considering political finance reform. These include:

Public financing of political parties:

Public financing of political parties is generally considered to be a positive measure for promoting the development and ongoing activities of political parties, as well as their ability to reach citizens. The rationale behind public financing is that if parties are resourced by the state, then they are less likely to engage in political corruption to allow them to function. While thresholds are seen as necessary to ensure that parties have a certain level of support in order to receive funding, a relatively high threshold may prevent other parties from

developing and may instead benefit the parties already in parliament. Over half (59%) of countries in Africa provide direct public funding to political parties, including for example in Algeria, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Togo, and Tunisia, in addition to Zimbabwe¹⁸.

As such support of political parties comes from the public budget, there should be transparency in the way that the political parties use this money, in line with international and regional commitments. Political parties are typically required to submit reports on their expenditures that are financed through public funding. Nearly three-quarters of African countries require political parties to regularly report on their finances; only Botswana, Central African Republic, Chad, Libya, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe do not¹⁹.

¹⁴ KAF, p. 35.

¹⁵ UN Convention Against Corruption (2003), art. 7.3.

¹⁶ African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption (2003), art. 10(a) and art. 10(b).

¹⁷ SADC Principles and Guidelines Governing Democratic Issues (rev. 2015), art. 13.2.6.

¹⁸ Check, N. et al, 'Integrity of political finance systems in Africa', International IDEA and Africa Institute of South Africa, 2019, p.16.

¹⁹ International IDEA, Political Finance Database, 2018 available at <https://www.idea.int/data-tools/data/political-finance-database>.



Ideally such reports are submitted to an oversight body and made available to the public. In some cases, there are conditions for the public funding of political parties - e.g. their compliance with financial reporting requirements, or their efforts to promote women's participation. In Kenya, for example, allocation of the Political Parties Fund is based on the number of party candidates from target groups including women that ran in the previous elections²⁰.

Limits on campaign contributions:

Fundraising of financial and in-kind contributions from private donors can be a key source of financing for election campaigns. In South Africa, for example, political parties are becoming increasingly reliant on private sources of income; an academic study showed that while nearly half of party income came from public funding in 1994, by 2009 this dropped to less than 15% of party income²¹. Such donations allow citizens at the grassroots level to support a political party or candidate's campaign. In the United States and the United Kingdom, for example, widespread access to the Internet has enabled parties and candidates to fundraise small amounts from a wide range of supporters, demonstrating their popularity and building a solid network of core support.

Private contributions can also, however, lead to political corruption if large sums of money are provided by donors with special interests who politicians later reward with political favours. Limits on individual campaign contributions can reduce the possibility of corruption or the purchase of political influence²². While it is considered good practice globally for countries to limit the amount of financial or in-kind contributions (quantitative limits) to a political party or candidate, either specifically for an election campaign or more generally, this is less common in Africa²³. Kenya has very high contribution limits while Nigeria has more modest ones²⁴. Qualitative limits on contributions are more common, however, including bans on donations from foreign interests (as in Zimbabwe), anonymous sources, corporations, and state bodies. Any limits should be clearly defined in law and be realistic to allow parties and candidates to run effective campaigns. They should also be enforced fairly and impartially. Any limits on private donations should also apply to third-party involvement in election campaigns - when an organisation or person spends money in favour or against an election campaign, for example on political advertising, rather than giving money directly to the campaign itself.

Limits on campaign expenditures:

As election campaigns become increasingly expensive, it becomes more important to counter the notion that certain candidates or political parties can 'buy' the election, which erodes public confidence in their elected officials as well as democratic governance more broadly. Campaign spending limits can reduce the advantages of larger or better-funded parties, and promote a more level playing field. However, only 19% of African countries limit political party spending, while 31% of African countries limit candidates' spending²⁵.

Maximum spending limits for candidates or political parties should be defined in law and should be clear on what is considered to be a campaign expense, and during which period the limitations apply. While this often coincides with the official campaign period, in some contexts contestants spend large amounts just prior to the official campaign. Obviously, campaign spending limits can only be effective within a political finance system with reporting and disclosure requirements, compliance by political actors, and oversight by relevant bodies (see below).

Campaign finance reporting and disclosure:

In order for political finance regulations to be effective, financial reporting requirements should be put in place. Such reporting can promote accountability, transparency and public confidence in the election process, as well as in democratic institutions more generally.

Reporting requirements vary - some countries require parties and candidates to disclose their assets at the beginning of the campaign, while others require regular interim reports on income and expenditure during the campaign and final reports after the elections²⁶. 53% of African countries require political parties to report on their campaign expenses, while party finance reports are made public in 41% of countries²⁷.

The law should specify precisely how and when political parties and candidates should report on contributions and expenditures. It should also specify requirements for disclosure of this information to the public, for example on the Internet, while also balancing this with any privacy concerns about donors' identities. South Africa recently passed a bill obliging political parties to disclose all sources of funding and authorizing the electoral commission to without funding from those parties that do not submit audited financial statements the previous year²⁸.

²⁰ EU EOM to Kenya, Final report on the General Elections 2017, p.46.

²¹ Calland, R., 'South Africa' in P. Norris and A. Abel van Es (Eds.), *Checkbook Elections*, Oxford, 2016, p. 151.

²² OSCE ODIHR, p. 29.

²³ Ohman 2016, p. 43.

²⁴ Ohman 2016, p. 43.

²⁵ Check 2019, p.17.

²⁶ OSCE ODIHR, p. 38.

²⁷ C

²⁸ Check 2019, p. 19.



According to Ohman, political finance in many African countries is generally characterised by weak compliance with reporting requirements. He notes that in countries that have reporting requirements, including Botswana, Ghana, Kenya, and Nigeria, parties frequently refuse to submit the necessary financial reports at all or file their reports late, with no penalties²⁹. There are a number of possible reasons provided for the low level of compliance, including legitimate concerns of opposition parties not wanting to reveal their donors for fear of reprisal, a lack of capacity within parties, and the fact that no penalties are expected for non-compliance.

Oversight and Enforcement:

Another crucial element for the effective implementation of political finance regulations is the oversight body. Responsibility for monitoring that reporting provisions are complied with and that any limits are not exceeded should rest with an independent and professional regulatory body, which may be the EMB.

This body should also explain the requirements to political actors, as well as how to comply with the law. Should there be any campaign or party finance violations, the regulatory body should impose sanctions, which should be done on a non-discriminatory basis. Sanctions should be proportionate to the gravity of the violation, and there should be an appeal to the decision available. In Africa, according to Ohman, it is frequently the case that no one institution has clear responsibility for oversight of campaign and political party finance, again rendering any reporting requirements ineffective.

Ohman points to Rwanda and South Africa as two of the only African countries whose oversight bodies have shown some level of activity to address political finance³⁰. He further notes that effective oversight requires political will, a clear mandate, and administrative capacity to implement it. In Ghana, for example, election commissioners admitted to election observers that the election commission lacked the capacity to enforce the law in relation to campaign and party finance³¹.

Abuse of state resources:

Abuse of state resources can be defined as undue advantage obtained by certain candidates or parties (usually the incumbent) through use of their official positions in order to influence the outcome of the elections³².

Examples of state resources that are often misused during elections include the use of government vehicles for campaigning and public employees campaigning during working hours, sometimes under pressure. Legislation should regulate the use of state resources, including what is permitted and what is prohibited. However, legislation alone is generally not sufficient to address the problem without the efforts of the media and civil society to monitor use of state resources during the election period and bring any violations to light. Abuse of state resources is a serious problem for many elections in Africa, as well as in other parts of the world. This is particularly of concern in countries where one political party or leader has been in power for many years, such as in Russia or Uganda, for example. In both cases, election observer missions have repeatedly commented that the state and the ruling party are not clearly differentiated from one another. Such cases further entrench the incumbent party making alternations in power even less likely.

Women's participation:

Access to campaign funds can be a significant obstacle for women candidates. This can be due to the internal democratic functioning of political parties, which may not prioritise their candidacies, or because they are lesser known among potential donors and are not considered to be competitive candidates. Temporary special measures, as suggested in the Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), can address these issues, for example by waiving or lowering candidate fees for women, providing media time at a lower cost, or by setting aside public funding for women candidates. Political parties can also take voluntary measures to assist women candidates with campaign finance issues.

Fundamental freedoms:

While regulatory frameworks for political party and campaign finance can contribute to a level playing field during elections and broader public confidence in democratic institutions, they should be implemented in such a way that fully respects fundamental freedoms, in particular the freedom of association and freedom of expression. Political parties and candidates should be able to access sufficient funding to effectively communicate their campaign messages to voters, so that they can make an informed choice at the ballot box. At the same time, any regulations should be enforced on an impartial basis, with no subject enforcement of the rules.

²⁹ Ohman 2016, p.5.

³⁰ Ohman, p. 9. Based on information taken from the Money, Politics and Transparency dataset, a joint initiative of Global Integrity, the Electoral Integrity Project and the Sunlight Foundation. See <http://moneypoliticstransparency.org>.

³¹ EU EOM to Ghana, Final report on the Presidential and Parliamentary Elections 2016, p.21

³² OSCE ODIHR, p. 20.



Lessons for Zimbabwe

Given that Zimbabwe has almost no regulatory framework for campaign finance, there are a number of steps it could take to remedy this, as the recommendations of observer groups from the 2018 general elections demonstrate.

These recommendations, from ZESN and other domestic and international observer groups, provide a starting point for discussion of campaign and political party finance reforms and a list of them can be found in the Annex.

An obvious first step could be to provide transparency in the existing system of public funding for political parties. This would require a reporting mechanism to be set up where political parties report their expenditures on a periodic (e.g. annual) basis.

It would also require an oversight body, such as the Ministry of Justice, to be assigned responsibility for monitoring political party compliance with the reporting requirements and enforcing any sanctions for non-compliance. Political parties would need to be capacitated for reporting, and a mechanism would be needed to disclose reports to the public. Such a step could help to enhance public confidence in political parties.

At the same time, for Zimbabwe to comply with its international and regional commitments, it should also consider further developing a framework for regulating campaign finance.

Such a framework would provide a basis for controlling the growing influence of money in politics, as well as curbing the potential for corruption in the political system. A regulatory framework for campaign finance would allow authorities to effectively monitor the existing provisions that prohibit foreign

funding of political parties as well as the spending limit for political parties currently set at 500,000 USD. For this monitoring to be effective, periodic reporting of expenditures by candidates and parties during the election period would need to be introduced, with oversight responsibilities assigned to a government body such as the ZEC.

Further provisions to limit campaign finance could also be considered, including limits on the individual contributions that can be made to candidates and parties. These contributions, at least over a certain threshold, should also be reported by candidates and political parties on a periodic basis.

A system of public disclosure of political contributions (while addressing any privacy concerns) would shine a light on where the money in politics comes from and could enhance public confidence in the political system, especially if authorities are seen to enforce requirements for reporting and disclosure.

Given the prevalence of misuse of state resources and vote buying in elections, as reported by observer groups, it would also be useful to consider adopting provisions that clearly define what behaviour is permitted and prohibited during the election period.

While such provisions by themselves may not be effective in addressing the problem, given its scope, it could send an important signal and serve as the basis for more rigorous enforcement of the rules.

As lessons from other contexts have shown, media and civil society can also play an important role in curtailing such behaviour through their own investigations and monitoring efforts.

Further provisions to limit campaign finance could also be considered, including limits on the individual contributions that can be made to candidates and parties.



Conclusions and Recommendations

As the observer reports from the recent general elections highlight, Zimbabwe is not currently meeting its international and regional commitments in the area of political finance. Problems such as inequitable access to funding sources, misuse of state resources, and vote-buying further exacerbates the uneven playing field during elections, and particularly disadvantages women candidates, as well as those from other vulnerable groups. A lack of reporting requirements, oversight, and transparency in the system means even those very few existing provisions cannot be implemented effectively, and instead there is a situation where it appears to citizens that anything is permissible.

At the same time, while Zimbabwe lacks a regulatory and legal framework for political finance, global experience demonstrates that such a system cannot be effective without the necessary political will. Authorities and political parties at all levels need to understand and support the idea of regulating political finance for a system to be effectively developed and implemented. An oversight body must have the capacity and resources to monitor and enforce regulations, while the political parties must have the capacity and willingness to comply with regulations by submitting regular and timely reports.

Three years prior to the next general elections in Zimbabwe, it is an opportune moment for stakeholders to discuss ways to address political finance issues, as well as broader election reforms. Steps discussed above would require legal changes and would need to be initiated soon in parliament to allow for an inclusive and thorough public dialogue to take place.

Should Zimbabwe take meaningful steps in this direction, it could serve as an example to others in the region and beyond, as well as contributing to accountability and transparency in the electoral process as a whole.

Recommendations to election stakeholders for next steps in pursuing political finance reform include:

- " Convene an inclusive roundtable to consider the current Zimbabwean political finance system, as well as other relevant experiences from the region.
- " Agree on a set of priority reforms related to political finance and develop an advocacy campaign.
- " Identify opportunities to engage key decision-makers such as the Minister of Justice, Chair of the ZEC, and MPs on this issue and explain why it is crucial for transparency and accountability in the political system.
- " Form a committee to draft possible amendments for the priority issues.
- " Liaise with domestic and international election observer groups on the degree to which their recommendations have been addressed in this area and genuine progress has been made.

ZESN and its partners remain committed to improving the electoral process and further the democratic development of Zimbabwe as a whole. It pledges to support the broader electoral reform process, as well as specific reform related to political finance through offering its experience and expertise.



Bibliography

1. African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption (2003).
2. Check, N. et al, 'Integrity of political finance systems in Africa', International IDEA and Africa Institute of South Africa, 2019.
3. COTRAD Zimbabwe, 'Political Party and Campaign Finance in Zimbabwe', blog, 10.07.2019.
4. Electoral Institute for Sustainable Democracy in Africa, 'Zimbabwe Campaign finance regulation', African Democracy Encyclopedia Project, updated 2006.
5. EU Election Observation Mission, Final report - Republic of Zimbabwe - Harmonised elections 2018, October 2018.
6. EU EOM to Kenya, Final report on the General Elections 2017, January 2018.
7. EU EOM to Nigeria, Final report on the General Elections 2019, June 2019.
8. International IDEA, Funding of Political Parties and Election Campaigns: A Handbook on Political Finance, Stockholm, 2014.
9. International Republic Institute/National Democratic Institute, ZIEOM Final Report, Washington, October 2018.
10. Kofi Annan Foundation (KAF), Report of the Global Commission on Elections, Democracy and Security, Geneva, 2012.
11. Masunungure, Eldred, 'Regulation of Political Parties Zimbabwe: Regulation, Finance and Other Support', prepared for ZESN, University of Zimbabwe, August 2006.
12. Money, Politics and Transparency dataset, a joint initiative of Global Integrity, the Electoral Integrity Project and the Sunlight Foundation, available at <http://moneypoliticstransparency.org>.
13. Ohman, Magnus, The state of political finance regulations in Africa, International IDEA, Stockholm, 2016.
14. OSCE ODIHR, Handbook for the Observation of Campaign Finance, Warsaw, 2015.
15. SADC Principles and Guidelines Governing Democratic Issues, rev. 2015.
16. UN Convention Against Corruption, 2003.
17. Zimbabwe Election Support Network, Report on the 30 July 2018 Harmonised Elections, Harare, 2019.
18. Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission, Final Report on the Zimbabwe Harmonised Election, 2019.