



FOURTH SESSION – NINTH PARLIAMENT

FIRST REPORT

**OF THE PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE ON LANDS, AGRICULTURE, WATER, FISHERIES AND
RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

ON

**THE CASE OF THE ELUSIVE US\$28.2 MILLION DISBURSED BY THE RESERVE BANK OF
ZIMBABWE (RBZ) TO THE GRAIN MILLERS ASSOCIATION OF ZIMBABWE (GMAZ) FOR
WHEAT IMPORTS**

Presented to Parliament: 4th of November, 2021 by the Chairperson;
Hon Justice Mayor Wadyajena, MP

(S.C 2, 2021)

ORDERED IN TERMS OF STANDING ORDER No. 18:

- (1) At the commencement of every session, there must be as many committees to be designated according to government portfolios as the Standing Rules and Orders Committee may deem fit.
- (2) Each select committee must be known by the portfolio determined for it by the Standing Rules and Orders Committee.

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF PORTFOLIO COMMITTEES S.O 21

Subject to these Standing Orders, a Portfolio Committee must-

- (a) examine expenditure administration and policy of government departments and other matters falling under their jurisdictions as Parliament may, by resolution determine;
- (b) consider and deal with all Bills other than a Constitutional Bill and statutory instruments or other matters which are referred to it by or under a resolution of the House or by the Speaker;
- (c) consider or deal with an appropriation or money Bill or any aspect of an appropriation or money Bill referred to it by these Standing Orders or by or under resolution of this House;
- (d) monitor, investigate, enquire into and make recommendations relating to any aspect of the legislative programme, budget, policy or any other matter it may consider relevant to the government department falling within the category of affairs assigned to it, and may for that purpose consult and liaise with such department; and
- (e) consider or deal with all international treaties, conventions and agreements relevant to it, which are from time to time negotiated, entered into or agreed upon.

On Thursday 11 October 2018, the Speaker announced that the Committee on Standing Rules and Orders nominated the following members to serve on the Portfolio Committee Lands, Agriculture, Fisheries, Water and Rural Development:

1. Hon J.M. Wadyajena (Chairperson) (ZANU-PF) & GOKWE NEMBUDZIYA
2. Hon. Chibangu G - (ZANU-PF) & PR MASHONALAND CENTRAL)
3. Hon. Chidamba S. (ZANU-PF) & MAZOWE CENTRAL
4. Hon. Chikwama B. (ZANU-PF) & GUTU EAST
5. Hon. Dube P. (MDC-T) GWANDA CENTRAL
6. Hon. Dutiro P. (ZANU-PF) & GURUVE SOUTH
7. Hon. Houghton J. R. (MDC-T) KARIBA
8. Hon. January S. (MDC-T) PR MASH CENTRAL
9. Hon. Kachepa N. (ZANU-PF) & MUDZI NORTH
10. Hon. Karumazondo T. (ZANU-PF) & MARAMBA PFUNGWE
11. Hon. Kashambe M. T. (ZANU-PF) & SEKE
12. Hon. Kashiri C. (ZANU-PF) & MAGUNJE
13. Hon. Maj. Gen. (Rtd) Khumalo S. S. (ZANU-PF) & TSHOLOTSHO NORTH
14. Hon. Mguni (ZANU-PF) & MANGWE
15. Hon. Mafuta V. S. (MDC-T) PR MASH WEST
16. Hon. Makonya J. (MDC-T) PR MANICALAND

- 17.Hon. Mamombe J. (MDC-T) HARARE WEST
- 18.Hon. Masiya D. (ZANU-PF) & CHIREDDI EAST
- 19.Hon. Masuku E. (ZANU-PF) & MAT NORTH
- 20.Hon. Masuku P. (MDC-T) & NKETA
- 21.Hon. Brig,Gen.(Rtd) Mayihlome L. ((ZANU-PF) & ZANU-PF) & UMZINGWANE
- 22.Hon. Mlambo M. (MDC-T) & CHIPINGE EAST
- 23.Hon Moyo L. (MDC-T) PR HARARE
- 24.Hon. Mugweni C. (ZANU-PF) & MAZOWE NORTH
- 25.Hon. Muponora N. (ZANU-PF) & MT DARWIN NORTH
- 26.Hon. Musikavanhu D.A. (ZANU-PF) & CHIREDDI WEST
- 27.Hon. Ncube O. (ZANU-PF) & PR MAT NORTH
- 28.Hon. Nhambo F. (ZANU-PF) & PR MASH CENTRAL
- 29.Hon. Nyabani T. (ZANU-PF) & RUSHINGA
- 30.Hon. Porusingazi E. (ZANU-PF) & CHIPINGE SOUTH
- 31.Hon. Seremwe B. (ZANU-PF) & MT DARWIN WEST
- 32.Hon. Sewera J. (ZANU-PF) & MUREWA WEST
- 33.Hon. Sithole G.K. (MDC-T) CHITUNGWIZA NORTH
- 34.Hon. Sithole J. (MDC-T) MAKOKOBA
- 35.Hon. Tekeshe D. (MDC-T) MAKONI CENTRAL
- 36.Hon. Zhou T. (ZANU-PF) & MBERENGWA NORTH

Hon. Justice Mayor Wadyajena to be the Chairperson.

FOREWORD

This report is presented against a background of high-profile corruption revelations in a number of sectors involving both senior members of the Government and eminent members of society, and asserts that Parliamentary Portfolio Committees, as one of the primary expressions of the people's will, also have a primary duty to fight corruption and table well investigated reports that help other Arms of the State to secure outright convictions.

The Constitution of Zimbabwe sanctions the State to adopt and implement policies and legislation that develop efficiency, competence, accountability, transparency, personal integrity and financial probity in all institutions and agencies of government at every level and in every public institution and, for its part, Parliament is assigned the role of oversight to ensure compliance therein. This assertion is emboldened by section 119 within the Constitution which provides that Parliament has power to ensure compliance with the Constitution of the land and for that purpose, ALL institutions and agencies of the State and government at EVERY LEVEL are accountable to it. Consequently, Parliament has a crucial role to play in promoting good governance by exposing, combating and eradicating all forms of corruption and abuse of power by public officials and political elite.

The fight against corruption presents a myriad of challenges as its beneficiaries and masterminds have an infinite base of resources to evade justice, be it politically or legally. Additionally, on account of the economic transformation the country is undergoing and the austerity this has entailed, opportunities open up even for Members of Parliament themselves to aid in the corruption by receiving bribes and inducements for favorable reports or to 'see, hear and say nothing'.

The citizenry is not blind to these affairs and has an entrenched perception that grand corruption is perpetrated by the political elites who are themselves some of the biggest beneficiaries of this brazen corruption, with institutions now being perceived in bad light, known more for the '*catch and release*' of perceived 'big fish', and their failure to adequately protect whistleblowers. This leaves the well-meaning and ethical participants of these processes exposed, demoralized and distrusting of national institutions and systems of justice. Under these conditions, it proves difficult to incentivize whistleblowers, who are instrumental in alerting authorities of corrupt activities in the public and private spheres. Their fear of exposure and subsequent victimization arises from a perception that they will not be afforded the protections to which they are entitled. It is in this

context that this Committee has diligently sought to investigate the mystery and suspected impropriety surrounding the US\$28.2 million disbursement by the Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe to the Grain Millers Association of Zimbabwe (GMAZ) for wheat imports.

The pursuit of truth is not without its costs. As Chairperson, members of my Portfolio Committee and myself have come to learn, directly, some of the consequences of seeking to advance justice. We have endured a campaign of cyber-bullying, intimidation, mudslinging and smearing in local broadsheets, digital and broadcast media, all intended to damage our credibility. These despicable efforts have been spearheaded by both GMAZ as a body and by one of the individuals at the center of this probe, Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara, following their highly contentious testimonies which commenced in 2019.

Notwithstanding, the Committee pursued its mission steadfastly, never backing down in the face of intimidation and threats. It is my most sincere hope, as Chairperson, that none of the persons who participated in this process will become victims or collateral damage of the rot we seek to uncover, as this report tackles and exposes well organized syndicates that bleed the economy of our country.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, Zimbabwe has been the unfortunate victim of adverse effects of climate change. In 2019, the eastern parts of the country were ravaged by Cyclone Idai, severely slowing down the national economy, and more broadly, we have experienced devastating successive droughts that have threatened national food security. The population has, at a number of points, been on the verge of starvation on this account, and had to rely heavily on imports for necessities such as maize, wheat and other crucial commodities.

In response to some of these events, the Government of His Excellency, Cde ED Mnangagwa, developed a dedicated facility under the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development administered by the Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe to allocate the scarce foreign currency at a rate of 1 United States of America Dollar To 1 Zimbabwe Dollar. This facility was meant to allow the importation of crucial commodities using the controlled bank rate, making products like bread affordable to the majority of the citizenry, particularly the economically disadvantaged while guaranteeing stability in the bread industry.

1.1 In spite of this government intervention, the country went on to experience shortages of bread. This is one of the factors that motivated the necessity for this inquiry. Other factors included the lack of clarity of the exact nature and extent of GMAZ participation in this facility. Specifically, the question of whether GMAZ held a clear mandate in the administration and allocation of the US\$28.2 million. Thirdly, disturbing reports of unfair and murky distribution of wheat allocations to a selected few Millers and finally, the persistent well publicized demands by GMAZ, which bordered on threats, for more forex allocations brought to bear the question of the nexus between GMAZ and the Government.

These issues gave basis for the pursuit of an investigation by means of oral and written submissions of evidence by related stakeholders.

In accordance with its mandate to examine the administration and policies of the Ministry of Lands, Agriculture, Water, Fisheries and Rural Resettlement, and matters falling under its jurisdiction, the Committee embarked on an enquiry to establish the extent of these claims. To this end, in launching its investigations, the Committee set out to achieve the following objectives:

- i) To determine if indeed GMAZ received forex allocations from the Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe between the years 2017 and 2019 at rate of 1ZWL:1US\$
- ii) To establish whether the forex allocations were used for the purposes for which they were disbursed; and
- iii) To ascertain if GMAZ itself imported any wheat into the country.

This Committee Report is a culmination of observations emanating from the investigation. It presents:

- a) Background on forex allocations for the wheat industry;
- b) An outline of issues linked to the failure by GMAZ to import wheat into the country;
- c) Disclosure of efforts by GMAZ, Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara, Drostky and Rubaya and Chatambudza Legal Practitioners to try and manipulate legal processes to derail investigations and to blackmail the Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee;
- d) Summary and outcomes of oral evidence gathered;
- e) Committee findings;
- f) Recommendations and;
- g) Conclusion.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Zimbabwe's agricultural sector is critical in providing livelihoods to approximately 70% of the population, contributing between 10% and 15% of GDP and providing 40% of export earnings and supplying 63% of agro-industrial raw materials. (GoZ, 2011; Zimstat, 2012).

It is therefore a critical strategic cog in the design of strategies and policies around economic growth, poverty reduction, food security and overall national prosperity.

Wheat is the second most important food security crop in Zimbabwe after maize and has become a staple crop given the high demand for bread by the urban population. Wheat farming is a major cropping activity, contributing about 4% to the GDP of Zimbabwe (RBZ, 2009). The immediate wheat products are flour, the main ingredient for making bread and other confectionaries consumed daily by mostly urban Zimbabweans, and wheat bran which is mainly used in the stock-feeds manufacturing sector. Since domestic produced wheat has poor quality for bread making because it is too soft, hard wheat imports are required to improve the glistening of the local wheat product.

The wheat value chain is comprised of 1) input suppliers 2) farmers, 3) traders, 4) millers and 5) consumers and the structure varies from being dominated by monopolies selling to several farmers in the input markets, to many farmers selling to GMB and the major millers. Local production of wheat has been decreasing over years on account of the perception that it is simply not profitable enough and therefore traders also import wheat flour to satisfy domestic demand. At every level of the value chain, there is competition with imports creating a significant import bill for the national government.

2.2 VISION 2030

The constitution of government under the new dispensation on 24 November, 2017 provided renewed hope for a better life for all Zimbabweans premised on a vision for realisation of rapid economic growth and development. The national development blueprint seeks to fundamentally transform Zimbabwe to an upper middle income economy, with a per capita Gross National Income of over US\$5000 in real terms by 2030, from the current US\$1 440. It also seeks to reduce the Poverty Rate, to under 25 percent of the population from 62.5 percent (2012), consistent with upper middle income economies. Revitalization of the agricultural sector through a number of interventions around land utilization, farmer incubation, financing, agri-marketing and several others all work towards this end.

Ultimately, vision 2030 demands the creation of a self-sufficient and food surplus economy that will see the re-emergence of Zimbabwe as the 'Bread Basket' of Africa.

2.3 TSP

Vision 2030 will be realized through the Transitional Stabilisation Programme (2018-2020) and two successive Five-Year National Development Strategies; NDS1 (2021-2025) and NDS 2 (2026-2030). The main goal of TSP was stabilizing the economy and creating a solid foundation for the Medium Term Plans, namely NDS1 and NDS2. To date, notable progress has been made in the implementation of the TSP, including fiscal consolidation, exchange rate stability and a number of achievements in various pillars.

2.4 NDS1

Zimbabwe's next step towards Vision 2030 is the Five-year National Development Strategy of 2021-2025 (NDS1). The NDS1 is the successor to the TSP and will be underpinned by 5 annual National Budgets. The NDS1 contains strategies, programmes & projects aimed at eradicating poverty and promoting sustainable livelihoods of the poor, women and youth empowerment and providing support to people living with disabilities, in line with Vision 2030. The emphasis of the NDS1 is on Bold Strategies that will change the status quo.

The NDS1 aims to build on the successes realised under the TSP, as well as addressing the TSP challenges and unfinished business, particularly consolidating macroeconomic stability. With respect to Food Security and Nutrition Security (a key thematic area), the major objectives under Food Security and Nutrition Security are to improve food self-sufficiency and to retain the regional breadbasket status; increase food self-sufficiency from the current level of 45% to 100%; reduce food insecurity from the high of 59% recorded in 2020 to less than 10% by 2025; increase maize production from 907 629 tonnes in 2020 to 3 million tonnes by 2025; and increase beef production from 49 115 tonnes in 2020 to 110 000 tonnes by 2025.

In light of the central place that agriculture occupies both traditionally and in the future of national development, transparency and accountability across this sector is vital, in particular in the implementation of all government policy. This enquiry, then, is of strategic national importance, and outcomes drawing from it will have lasting national ramifications.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

In undertaking this enquiry, the Committee adopted traditionally used methodologies by Parliament that foster the highest levels of transparency and therefore contribute to the report's overall credibility and reliability.

3.1 Oral Evidence Sessions

The Committee held oral evidence sessions on the 19th of March, 2019 with the following key stakeholders:-

Mr. T. Musarara -	Chairperson Grain Millers Association
Mr. G. Murdock -	Grain and Oil Seed Traders Association
Mr. C. Nheta -	National Foods, Vice Chairperson GMAZ
Mr. O. Zvamaunganira-	Managing Director, Manica Zimbabwe
Mr. M. Dzomba -	Millers from Matabeleland Region
Mr. U. Khamal -	General Manager, Blue Ribbon Foods

3.2 Written Submissions

The Committee received written submissions and communications from;

1. The Governor of the Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe;
2. The Commissioner General of the Zimbabwe Revenue Authority;
3. Metbank;
4. Ecobank;
5. Drostky Private Limited;
6. Grain Miller's Association of Zimbabwe;
7. Wintertons Legal Practitioners; and
8. Rubaya and Chatambudza Legal Practitioners.

4.0 ORAL SUBMISSIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE INITIAL MEETING

4.1 GMAZ Executive

The Executive and some members of GMAZ appeared before the Committee on 19 March, 2019.

The Chairperson of GMAZ, Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara, informed the Committee that GMAZ was a fully constituted body, availed its constitution and further stated that GMAZ received from RBZ an

amount of US\$26.2 million (Twenty Six Million, Two Hundred Thousand United States Of America Dollars). He further informed the Committee that they had brought with them proof of how the funds were utilized and submitted what he termed 'acquittal documents' for the US\$26.2m allocated to GMAZ by RBZ.

4.1.2 The Chairperson of GMAZ, Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara highlighted to the Committee that his Secretariat was in South Africa attending a Fortification Conference and could not avail some of the requested documentation to the Committee on time. The Committee rescheduled the meeting to the 2nd of April, 2019 to allow GMAZ the opportunity to compile and submit all requested information.

4.1.3 Parliament went on an unscheduled recess and GMAZ was accordingly notified of the postponement of the meeting to a later date which was to be announced. It must however be noted that despite prior warning of the postponement, GMAZ turned up on the 2nd of April without invitation and held a press conference addressed by Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara and their attorney, Advocate T. Magwaliba, on the precinct of Parliament, just outside the Senate Chamber. Several questions arose as to how they were able to access Parliamentary premises without requisite security clearances.

5.0 Meeting with GMAZ members

The Committee held oral evidence hearings with GMAZ Members to clarify what they received under the US\$28.2 million allocation from the Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe

WITNESSES

1. Grain Millers Association of Zimbabwe (GMAZ)

Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara – GMAZ Chairperson

Mr. M. Dzomba – Vice Chairman GMAZ and CEO Blue Ram Milling

Mr. G. Chaunza – PR GMAZ

Mrs. L. Vheremu – General Manager

2. **Blue Ribbon Foods**

Mr. U. Khamal - General Manager

3. **National Foods**

Mr. M. Lashbrook – CEO

4. **Continental Millers**

Mr. N. Kulumuzi - Managing Director

GMAZ presentation

The Chairperson commenced the meeting (*excerpts as captured by Parliament's Hansard Recording*) by inquiring from Mr Tafadzwa Musarara if they (Chairperson and Mr Tafadzwa Musarara) shared any type of relationship to which Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara responded by saying;

MR. MUSARARA: No, we do not have relationships outside this Committee.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Have I ever sought a bribe from you?

MR. MUSARARA: From me? No, you have not.

This was meant to address various media reports that emanated from Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara suggesting that the Chairperson had a personal gripe with Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara and that this placed him in conflict and compromised his ability to conduct his duties fairly.

GMAZ confirmed that they had imported all wheat in their name. They presented letters from five milling companies confirming receipt of wheat delivered by GMAZ. Mr Tafadzwa Musarara proceeded to present Bill of Entries, several letters on GMAZ letterhead and various banker's communications claiming that all acquittals were done in accordance with the law and all funds were accounted for.

The other five GMAZ members who attended the meeting confirmed that they received the wheat from GMAZ after paying funds into a local GMAZ account.

LETTER FROM GMAZ REQUESTING RECUSAL OF THE COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON FROM PROCEEDINGS

GMAZ, through its lawyers, wrote a letter to the Clerk of Parliament making two requests, citing unfair treatment and bias;

- 1) The recusal of Hon. J.M. Wadyajena from Chairing the inquiry; and
- 2) Termination of Hon. J.M. Wadyajena's membership of the Committee.

5.1 Letter from Parliament

The Clerk of Parliament responded to Mr Tafadzwa Musarara seeking evidence and information on the unfair treatment and bias.

5.1.2 Clerk's meeting with Mr Musarara

The Clerk of Parliament, Counsel to Parliament and GMAZ and their lawyers held a roundtable meeting to discuss their request to have Hon. J.M. Wadyajena recused from the Committee and they were advised that since they had brought in fresh allegations of conflict of interest, it was incumbent upon them to furnish Parliament with proof of the said conflict of interest, or at least substantiate the allegations in order for Parliament to take action.

5.1.3 Letter from Wintertons Legal Practitioners (Wintertons)

GMAZ legal practitioners Wintertons wrote to Parliament stating that their client would not avail themselves before the Committee unless the Chairperson was recused.

5.1.4 Parliament Response

It must be noted the Committee spent almost a year in back and forth communication with GMAZ showing and expressing their unwillingness to appear before the Committee. Parliament wrote several letters of invitation to Mr Tafadzwa Musarara who stated unequivocally that he would not appear before the Committee. The Committee resolved to invoke provisions of the Standing Orders which were duly approved by The Head of Parliament, Advocate J.F. Mudenda and dispatched officers from the Zimbabwe Republic Police to deliver summonses at Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara's known places of location, stating that he was legally required to avail himself before the Committee.

7.0 HIGH COURT APPLICATION

After being served with summonses, Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara instructed Rubaya and Chatambudza Legal Practitioners to make an urgent High Court application seeking authority for their client to appear before the Committee in the company of a legal practitioner of their choice.

Clerk of Parliament and Counsel to Parliament held a round table meeting with his lawyers and a position was agreed that Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara would be able to attend to the oral evidence session in the company of any legal representation of his choice. The meeting resolved to the withdrawal of the High Court application as it no longer served any purpose.

21 May 2020

Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara appeared before the Committee representing Drostky Private Limited, a company he had earlier advised the Committee that he both owned and that was responsible for importing the wheat on behalf of the GMAZ millers.

In attendance was Advocate Lewis Uriri instructed by a legal practitioner from Rubaya and Chatambudza Legal Practitioners. At the very beginning of the hearing, Mr Tafadzwa Musarara indicated that he had held a meeting with the Clerk of Parliament who assured him that his lawyers would be able to respond to issues on his behalf.

Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara presented a letter from the Clerk of Parliament. After a careful perusal of the letter, Committee interpreted it differently from Mr Tafadzwa Musarara and his legal team.

OBSERVATIONS

Counsel to Parliament attended the meeting of the 21st of March 2020 and interpreted the letter which clearly stated that Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara was permitted to bring with him any lawyer but stated clearly that “he will be responsible for responding to all issues raised by the Committee” while he was also at liberty to consult his legal team on any subject matter.

Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara and his legal team chose to abstain from the meeting and elected to proceed with the court application which they had misrepresented to the Clerk of Parliament being that it was agreed this application would be withdrawn before Committee meeting.

FINDINGS

1. Throughout the enquiry, Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara demonstrated an unwillingness to assist the Committee in its investigations, obfuscating and outrightly refusing to produce documentation pertinent to this inquiry.
2. Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara notified the Committee that GMAZ had imported wheat valued at US\$26.2 million yet RBZ advised and availed documents to the Committee that the accessed funds totaled US\$28.2 million.
3. The Zimbabwe Revenue Authority (ZIMRA) wrote to the Committee and clearly stated that for a period between January 2018 and May 2020, GMAZ did not import any wheat into Zimbabwe "...Please be advised there are no wheat imports for GMAZ in our records for the mentioned period of January 2018 to August 2019..." (direct quote from ZIMRA letter.)
4. After being provided with confirmation letters from ZIMRA, Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara later conceded to the Committee that in actual fact, GMAZ never imported any wheat but that it was a private company that he owns in his personal capacity called Drostky Private Limited that imported the wheat instead. His previous statements which were given under oath were then revealed to be perjurious which itself is contempt of parliament.
5. ZIMRA further advised the Committee that for a period between January 2018 and May 2020, Drostky imported wheat totaling US\$24.2 million into the country but it must be highlighted that Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara had advised the Committee that his private entity Drostky, was in the business of importing its own wheat like other Millers and when asked to provide evidence in any form that the US\$24.2 million belonged to GMAZ's RBZ funds, he failed to provide the evidence and also failed to provide evidence of the authority by regulatory authorities to use third parties.
6. The Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe provided the Committee with proof that GMAZ authorized its local bankers Metbank and Ecobank to transfer US\$28.2 million as advance payment to Holbud of United Kingdom for wheat purchase and there are no acquittals for any portion of those funds. This makes whole amount of US\$28.2 million unaccounted for.
7. The Reserve Bank of Zimbabwe further submitted acquittals totaling US\$24.2 million. The

acquittals listed Drostky as the Consignee on the Bills of Entry not GMAZ whom they had given the funds to.

8. There was no resolution of GMAZ authorizing Mr. Musarara to use his company Drostky as a vehicle to import wheat on behalf of Wheat Millers and additionally, the Committee noted invoices from Holbud clearly indicated GMAZ as the customer, not Drostky.
9. The Committee noted that Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara drafted and wrote letters on behalf of all millers as evidenced by the letters which confirmed millers received their wheat allocations in full. When Committee inquired why all letters from the various companies bore an uncanny resemblance, the representatives advised the Committee that GMAZ called and simply gave them written letters for their signatures and letterheads.
10. The Committee was left bewildered as to how GMAZ could successfully complete all international telegraphic transfers of US\$28.2 million to Holbud, but then fail to receive the goods in their name. The Committee asked National Foods and other millers what they benefited in using Drostky (a competitor) instead of their own name but failed to get clear answers from all millers and none were able to confirm that they mandated Mr. Musarara to use his personal company.
11. The violation of our tax laws (Tax evasion, Tax returns, income tax, VAT returns from January 2018-March 2020) can not be ruled out given the inconsistencies in the account of the US\$28.2 million..
12. Despite changing his story and now insisting Drostky imported wheat for US\$24.2million on behalf of GMAZ, Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara failed to provide the proof of a Ministerial waiver or instrument authorizing such transaction so it was not considered a sale to other millers.
13. Asked to explain the difference in numbers, Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara attempted to claim part of the money was for previous debt yet RBZ released funds for advance payments and bank transfers completed by GMAZ clearly indicated the funds were advance payments against current invoices.
14. The use of Drostky (Private) Limited to transact GMAZ business indicates a serious lack of

corporate governance within the ranks of GMAZ. It appears, Mr. Musarara might have abused his position of Chair of the same to use his company without the relevant consent by all stakeholders. No resolutions were availed to prove otherwise.

15. The Ministry of Finance entrusted with the national purse failed and/or neglected to bring GMAZ and its Chairperson to account. Why has it taken Parliament to unravel the misappropriation of funds yet they had all the information before them to take appropriate action against GMAZ. There is a real possibility of externalization of foreign currency here by the GMAZ Chairperson.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Zimbabwe Republic Police and Zimbabwe Anti-Corruption Commission must investigate the GMAZ transaction, and ascertain the whereabouts of the US\$28.2 Million which was not accounted for by Mr Tafadzwa Musarara and GMAZ.
2. ZACC must investigate circumstances that led to Drostky being the vehicle used to import wheat on behalf of Wheat Millers and additionally, when GMAZ processed Telegraphic Transfers to Holbud from its own accounts with the invoices from Holbud clearly indicating GMAZ as the customer, not Drostky.
3. ZIMRA must investigate the tax affairs of Drostky and GMAZ including instituting a lifestyle audit on Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara for a period between January 2018 and March 2020 zeroing on the US\$28.2 million availed by RBZ. ZIMRA must report to the Committee within 60 days of tabling this report;
4. The ZRP must investigate, take appropriate action where there are anomalies and issue a statement within 30 days of this directive on progress regarding the externalization of funds meant for wheat purchases by GMAZ;
5. The Law Society of Zimbabwe must investigate Rubaya and Chatambudza Legal Practitioners for unethical conduct in trying to deceive the High Court of Zimbabwe by purportedly withdrawing a matter (HC2407/20) that had already been dismissed by a High Court Judge; and
6. Parliament must charge the GMAZ Chairperson for contempt in that he deliberately lied under oath to defeat the objective of the Committee's inquiry. This is to ensure that the sacrosanct oversight role of Parliament is respected.

CONCLUSION

The promises that the Government makes to citizens of Zimbabwe, as well as the confidence the citizens hold in the government cannot be taken for granted and must be honoured and safeguarded, always. This inquiry brought to light damning evidence of misrepresentation, manipulation, externalization, embezzlement, forgery, perjury, theft, contempt of Parliament, dishonesty among other serious crimes committed by Mr Tafadzwa Musarara, the Executives of the Grain Millers Association of Zimbabwe, Drostky and their attorneys, Rubaya and Chatambudza against the people of Zimbabwe.

JMW

The institutions created to fight corruption must be seen to be transparent, honest and just but are themselves not doing nearly enough to protect the interests of the citizens and the nation. Furthermore, it is these very institutions that are accused by citizens of shielding suspected perpetrators of corruption by demanding an unreasonable threshold of proof from whistleblowers, while failing to perform their role as the investigators, and while it is a well-known fact that corruption is often a web of complexities and opaque machinations.

In conclusion, now that the Committee has done its work and laid bare irrefutable proof of misleadings by Mr. Tafadzwa Musarara and GMAZ, Zimbabweans expect the responsible authorities to take bold and decisive actions in response. In order to restore the confidence of the nation that the fight against corruption is real and not just a game of 'catch and release', related and consequent investigations and prosecutions must result in clear penalties to indicate that crime at the people's expense is simply not to be tolerated and is not in keeping with values of the New Dispensation. The onus, therefore, now sits with these authorities to prove to the nation that our corruption fighting agencies are not captured by the very cartels we seek to root out.

Presented to Parliament: 4th of November, 2021 by the Chairperson;
Hon Justice Mayor Wadyajena, MP

JMW