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ABSTRACT

Over the years, the concept of good governance, which guided the study has become the mantra for donor partners, the Global West and some NGOs, as an ideal way of addressing the perennial problems facing developing countries. Good governance eventually became a precondition for aid in Africa in an attempt to propel African leaders to respect human rights, implement economic reforms, ensure alternation of power in a free and fair election, among others. Among other things, African leaders adopted the AU and its constitutive Act in 2002, which as part of its aim is to promote democratic principles and institutions, popular participation and good governance, as well as sustainable development in Africa. Accordingly, the most significant and striking task that came with the creation of the AU and the adoption of its Constitutive Act is the mandate it has been given to promote democracy and good governance in Africa. The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), the AU’s accompanying development paradigm has become a prerequisite for good governance. The peer review mechanism, the African Peer Review (APR), was incorporated into the dual efforts of NEPAD and the AU to monitor African Heads of State in an effort to ensure sound governance of their colleagues. The APRM’s ultimate objective is to establish good governance in Africa, which is considered by NEPAD to be the sine qua non for development in Africa. Thus, this research aims to explore the APRM’s efficacy in promoting good governance practices and development in Africa, with much focus on Ghana. The research employed a qualitative method, and more precisely a case study approach, in apprising the APRM. This research uses semi-structured, flexible interview guide as an instrument for data collection, with a sample size of ten. The main finding of this research is that the peer review process through the APRM has ensured the promotion of good governance in Africa, paving the way for ‘open governance’ and inputs from citizens. The peer review mechanism offers a chance for participating nations to become conscious of the strengths and weaknesses of their policy making, governance institutions and procedures, and to share best practices of administrative, political, and financial management. It offers a forum for dialogue, peer learning, and regional and continental cooperation in which the challenges facing African countries, both individually and collectively, can be tackled. Nonetheless, the APRM has encountered some challenges which has impeded its efficiency and effectiveness. These limitations include; the APRM’s voluntary nature, issues with the APRM’s national and continental structures, absence of adequate financing, the lack of political will, and leadership crisis in Africa. It is essential for the APRM to address these barriers in order to achieve its complete potential. The research provides a number of suggestions for this purpose, which would make the APRM more efficient if implemented.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Research Problem

Is Africa the ‘hopeless continent’ where life is getting worse as depicted by Bloom & Sachs (1998: 207-208) or the continent where life is getting better as posited by the African Development Bank (2011)? Mills and Herbst (2012) note the enormous economic successes Africa had achieved over the years. They posit that, the African continent possesses plentiful economic resources compared to any other continent in the global system (Mills and Herbst, 2012). Paradoxically, in many countries, the continent is languishing in poverty, evidenced by severe hunger, disease and ignorance (Buhelezi, 2007). Africa, sometimes referred to as the ‘forgotten continent’ have been plagued with corruption, unemployment, civil strife and terror because of dictators and citizens who are poor and desperate to earn a living (Awung, 2011). The growth prospects of the new politically independent African States were high in the late 1950s and early 1960’s. African nationalist leaders strived hard to kick out the colonizers. Massive demonstrations, protests, strikes, civil disobedience, petitions, negotiations, and boycotts were resorted to as tactics to gain independence. Now, when independence finally came, these leaders had to contend with a politically and economically underdeveloped continent.

By 1990, many Africans had become unhappy with the corrupt, inefficient, repressive and dictatorial structures of governance that prevailed in the post-colonial era (Appiah, 2015). At the heart of attempts by multilateral and bilateral donors to attenuate corruption in developing countries, the acceptance of the practice of democracy and good governance as an essential
condition for financial aid, increasingly emerged chiefly among African countries in the early 1990s (Khorram-Manesh, 2013). With the adoption of democracy, political inclusiveness in Africa became more pronounced. In Africa, this period seemed to mark a new dawn of hope (Appiah, 2015). Thus, majority of African countries went from authoritarian rule to multi-party democracy (Adejumobi, 2000).

It has come to light that good governance and democracy in all societies, including third world countries, Africa in particular, are not merely desirable but vital requirements for economic growth. Currently, democracy stands as the most dominantly practiced political ideology in Africa and in the world at large. Samuel Huntington argues that, contemporary democracy definitions could be divided into three separate categories: source of authority to the government or government, served purposes, or government constituent procedures (Huntington 1991:6). Democracy in simple terms, is a system of governance where a leader is held accountable for his or her actions and inactions through periodic elections. Therefore, power is vested in the people who rule either directly or through freely elected representatives. Good governance on the other hand, according to Allen (2000) has been described by the late UN General Secretary Kofi Annan as:

“Good governance comprises the rule of law, effective state institutions, transparency and accountability in the management of public affairs, respect for human rights, and the participation of all citizens in the decisions that affect their lives”

Coined together, ‘democracy and good governance’ can basically be described as a political regime centered on a liberal-democratic polity model that guarantees human rights and equal opportunity, coupled with a reliable, incorruptible and responsible government. Todaro and Smith
(2009) stress that democracy as well as economic growth will go hand in hand in the long run, while Oslon (1993) adds that steady democracy offers room for economic growth. Knutsen (2010) argues that in Africa the inclination of dictatorial regimes to choose poor policies is compounded by the generally weak institutional structures of the state. Hence, with empirical studies indicating that democracy, globally induces economic development, Africa must embrace democracy (Knutsen, 2010).

Over the years, a couple of new initiatives were adopted and implemented by Africa’s political leadership to address apparently perennial problems of poverty, underdevelopment, poor governance, corruption, instability, and political deterioration, with the overall goal of accelerating development in the continent (Mbadlanyana, 2014). The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) adopted in 2001 and ratified in 2002 by African Heads of State, is one of the most important initiatives in this regard. This initiative is a combination of the African Recovery Millennium Action Plan, the Omega Plan and the New Compact with Africa. In adopting NEPAD, African Heads of State and Government agreed, “on the basis of a common vision and shared conviction, that they have a pressing duty to eradicate poverty and to place their countries, both individually and collectively, on a path of sustainable growth and development, and at the same time to participate actively in the world economy and body politic” (NEPAD, 2015). NEPAD is a ‘large concept’ as well as a framework for best practice. Also, NEPAD is an avenue for significant capital flows, both in terms of assistance and trade, and an effort to establish a growth alliance based on good governance (Waal, 2002).

NEPAD features sector specific programmes such as the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Plan (CAADP), Programme for Infrastructural Development in Africa (PIDA), and the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) (Vickers, 2017). Among the sector specific
programmes incorporated in NEPAD, arguably, the APRM is the most touted policy adopted by Africa’s Heads of States. As rightly put by Herbert and Gruzd (2008), the APRM is arguably the most forward-looking and audacious element in the NEPAD. Accordingly, APRM is a distinctive, mutually accepted tool directed at promoting the implementation of measures, norms and procedures leading to political stability, strong economic growth, sustainable development and enhanced sub-regional and fiscal consolidation through the exchange of knowledge and strengthening of effective and good practices, including identifying deficiencies and assessing of requirements for capacity building (NEPAD, 2015). Thus, to achieve the objectives and outcomes of NEPAD, among other reasons, Africa’s member states have decided to subject their nations to peer review, using a distinctive and creative APRM initiative (hope, 2005). The APRM was intended to show, on a country-by-country basis, the public structures, legislation and capabilities that need to be altered, reformed and developed.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

The APRM, a ground-breaking project of NEPAD, has been hailed by the Global North and many in Africa as a remedy for the woes facing the continent. As at 2014, 34 countries had signed the APRM MOU, thereby acceding to be reviewed by their colleagues (NEPAD, 2015). These countries included: Ghana; Algeria; Angola; Benin; Burkina Faso; South Africa; Cameroon; Chad; Republic of Congo; Djibouti; Egypt; Ethiopia; Equatorial Guinea; Sierra Leone; Gabon; Gambia; Kenya; Liberia; Malawi; Mali; Mauritania; Mauritius; Mozambique; Namibia; Niger; Lesotho; Nigeria; Rwanda; Sao Tome and Principe; Senegal; Sudan; Tanzania; Togo; Tunisia; Uganda; and Zambia. Herbert (2004) postulates that none of NEPAD’s concepts, ranging from gigantic infrastructure initiatives to healthcare reforms or stronger trade deals, has as much capacity as the APRM to bring about the positive change Africa has longed for. The peer review method was
structured to monitor all phases of government, legislature, the judicial system, as well as the private sector.

Historically, African states had regarded each other’s sovereignty as sacrosanct as enshrined in the charter of the Organization of African Union (OAU), now the African Union (AU), a stance that permitted oppressive governments to thrive at the cost of the well-being of their people (Appiah, 2015). The OAU’s solemn concern at birth in 1963 was to free Africa from the bondage of colonialism. Although its goals included promoting global collaboration, having due regard to the United Nations (UN) Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR its main goals were the rapid decolonization of Africa, uniting Africa and protecting the territorial boundaries of African states (Akokpari, 2004). Therefore, the OAU was not mainly an organization of good governance. The OAU could not intervene or meddle in the affairs of member states due to its charter provisions. However, the adoption of the AU’s Constitutive Act presented an invigorating point for the continent, as the Act’s Article 30 gives the AU the legitimate right to debar unconstitutional regimes from democracy and good governance (AU, 2000). Hence, the Constitutive Act entreat African countries to pursue good governance principles.

The ushering in of the APRM, notwithstanding some constraints, presented a bracing counterpoint to the ideals of the Constitutive Act. Again, just like any other policy adopted by the OAU/AU, NEPAD and its APRM were met with some level of skepticism as to whether the APRM and NEPAD would bring about some changes due to the fact that the very rulers who independently and on the whole, are accountable for wrecking their nations’ economy as well as promoting corruption, are the same individuals who are supposed to willingly avail their governance structures to be peer reviewed. Nonetheless, 17 years have elapsed since the APRM was instituted.
What this research seeks to do is, to assess the usefulness of the APRM in promoting good governance and development in Africa, with much emphasis on Ghana.

### 1.3 Research Questions

1. What are the tenets of the APRM?

2. How relevant has the APRM been in the promotion of good governance and development in Africa particularly Ghana?

3. What are some of the challenges of the APRM in enhancing good governance and development in Africa and Ghana and how can these challenges be addressed?

### 1.4 Objectives of the Research

1. To discuss the tenets of the APRM.

2. To examine the relevance of the APRM in the promotion and enhancement of good governance and development in Africa, particularly Ghana.

3. To interrogate the challenges the APRM has faced in promoting good governance and development in Africa and Ghana and how these challenges can be addressed.

### 1.5 Rationale of the Research Study

Africa’s political leaders have generally agreed on a common vision and belief that they have an urgent obligation to annihilate poverty as well as to place their countries on the path of sustainable growth and development both individually and collectively. This vision and shared conviction could be accomplished by promoting democracy and good governance, which are considered sine qua non to development. Hence, the APRM adopted as part of NEPAD, seeks to ensure that, African leaders collectively promote good governance across Africa. In view of this, the particularity of this study is to analyze the APRM process, as well as examine the successes and challenges of the APRM, and how the challenges can be addressed.
1.6 Scope of the Study

The aim of the research is to analyze the promotion of good governance in Africa, which is intrinsically linked with development, with much focus on the APRM. At the heart of this investigation, the tenets of the APRM and how it has impacted governance in Africa would be analyzed, with much focus on Ghana. Thus, the study would consider the period Ghana availed itself to be peer reviewed, that is, 2002 to 2018.

1.7 Conceptual Framework

This section examines the concept of good governance, which guides this study. The concept of good governance arose mainly due to poor governance practices that have been marked by corruption, irresponsible governments, and absence of regard for human rights. The ‘good governance’ concept, which was introduced in the early 1990s as a benchmark for the World Bank, has become a mantra for both donor organizations and donor nations to make aid conditional base on the receiving government’s performance (Nanda, 2006). The proponents of the concept of good governance includes the Bretton Woods Institutions, precisely, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund as well as other UN agencies as a perquisite for economic growth in most developing countries (Nanda, 2006: 271).

It would be appropriate to understand firstly what ‘governance’ is before exploring what ‘good governance’ means. There is no accepted definition of governance agreed by all. Governance, in common usage, is usually equated with “government” or “the act or process of governance” (Gisselquiest, 2012). The UNDP (1997), defines Governance as the exercise of economic, political and administrative authority for the management of affairs of a country at all levels, which, completes mechanisms, processes and institutions through which the interests, legal rights,
obligations and differences of citizens and groups are articulated. Also, the IMF defines governance as the process through which public institutions conduct and manage public affairs (UNDP, 2007: 128).

Likewise, as indicated by Hyden and Court (2002:14), the term governance can be characterized by two essential approach, one that considers governance as pertaining to the idea of conducing public affairs, and the other that considers governance to be an activity of overseeing and managing open undertakings. In like manner, the World Bank (2010) defines the term governance as the standard of the rulers, commonly inside a given arrangement of principles. Furthermore, Kooiman (1993) affirms that governance is about purposeful action, which is the result of all involved parties’ interacting attempts. Kooiman (1993:258) contends that, governance is a tedious procedure that isn't restricted to government, however, includes other social actors with an end goal to accomplish their objectives and interests.

In spite of dialectal differences, these definitions of ‘governance’ all points out three mutual elements which point to a minimal comprehension of governance as; a process, exercising power or authority, and managing a community’s collective affairs. During the 1980s, the utilization of the term governance became prominent as a result of economic reforms, with its accentuation on the procedure and way of accomplishing the idea of sustainable development (Tripathi, 2017: 16968). The notion of governance was also discussed in the context of global governance, especially after the fall of socialism and the emergence of a new world order dominated by liberal philosophy and values. Meanwhile, organizations such as the IMF, NGOs, the United Nations and its agencies, the World Bank and international media had been quick to pick up the term and use it in a variety of ways. Together with its derived term, ‘good governance’, governance has since
become a buzzword in the vocabulary of polity and administrative reform in developing countries at the mercy of support from international development agencies *ibid*.

What then is ‘good governance’? table 1.0 gives example of definitions by the proponents of the term good governance including the UN, multilateral development banks, and the European Union.

Table 1.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The United Nations (UN)</th>
<th>Governance is regarded as “good” and &quot;democratic&quot; in the “society of countries” to the extent that the political institutions and processes of a country are open. Its political establishments refer to arms of government including the legislature, judiciary and its respective ministries. Its procedures incorporate key operations such as elections and legal processes, which must be regarded as free of corruption and accountable to its citizens. A state’s ability to attain this standard has become a key measure of its reliability and respect in the global world Good governance encourages equity, involvement, pluralism, openness, accountability, and the rule of law in an efficient, effective, and lasting way. We see free, honest and regular elections, law-making representative parliamentary offices and independent judiciary for the interpretation of such legislation in the exercise of these values. Corruption, crime and poverty, all of which undermine democracy, safety, involvement and basic liberties, are the biggest obstacles to healthy governance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| World Bank | We have formed a stronger understanding of what enables governments to operate efficiently and attain financial strides over the last half-century. In the development society, we have a term for it. We call it good governance. It is fundamentally a fusion of transparent and responsive institutions, robust... |
competencies and abilities, and a basic desire to do the right thing. These are the elements that ensure a state to provide its citizens with services effectively. — Paul Wolfowitz, President of the World Bank, Jakarta, April 11, 2006.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African Development Bank</th>
<th>Good governance is explained in different terms. Governance is &quot;a process that refers to how power is exercised in managing a nation's affairs and its relations with other nations,&quot; with reference to the 2000 Bank Group Policy on Good Governance, key aspects of good governance includes: transparency, accountability, participation, combating corruption and encouraging a robust legal and judicial structure.</th>
<th>Source: AfDB, <em>Governance Strategic Directions and Action Plan Gap 2008-2012</em> (2008), p. 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>‘Good governance’ implies laws, procedures and behaviors that affect the exercise of powers at European level, particularly with regard to openness, involvement, responsibility, effectiveness and consistency. Five elements support good governance, which are: transparency, accountability, openness, effectiveness and consistency. Every principle is essential to create more democratic governance. They promote the Member States’ democracy and rule of law, but apply to all levels of government–global, European, domestic, national, and regional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 1.0, the various definitions of good governance by the Intergovernmental Organizations show some clear similarities, and also some differences. These definitions collectively highlighted at least these seven core components: (1) representation and democracy; (2) rule of law; (3) human rights; (4) government administration effectiveness and effectiveness; (5) accountability and transparency; (6) equity and inclusiveness (7) Free and Fair elections. These definitions despite the differences, however collectively provide a comprehensive illustration of what good governance is. In addition to the above definitions, various scholars have also tried to explain what good governance is. Good governance, according to Johnston (2004) is “the competent management of the resources and affairs of a country in a way that is open, transparent, accountable, fair and responsive to the needs of people”. Furthermore, according to Landell-Mills & Serageldin (1991), Good governance means the presence of the rule of law, the protection of human rights, honest and effective government, accountability, transparency, predictability and openness.

In the 1990s, the concept ‘good governance’ arose as a ‘slogan’ for all problems recognized in Africa including mismanagement, corruption, human rights abuses, arbitrary legislation, inadequate financial policies among others. As Amuwo (2000) good governance became the most favorite donor organization notion. Countries need to practice good governance to qualify for assistance, which means implementing economic reforms in orthodoxy: trade liberalization, liberalization of foreign direct investment inflow, reorienting priorities for public spending to areas
with both elevated financial yields and privatization and the withdrawal of government from coxswaining their economy (Amuwo, 2000).

Good governance, initially after independence remained elusive in Africa. Among other things, the OAU was put in place to speed up Africa's decolonization process and promote development and cooperation between African states. But the organization probably left the path of promoting good governance until its demise in 2002. In this context, the AU, unlike its predecessor, the OAU, explicitly recognizes among its founding principles; Respect for democratic values, human rights, the rule of law and good governance (AU, 2000). The AU and its accompanying development paradigm, NEPAD, are now recognized as an important element for economic growth, as well as ensuring sound governance. A mechanism for peer review, known popularly as the African Pair Review Mechanism, has been incorporated into the dual ingenuities of NEPAD and the AU in which African leaders monitor their peers in order to ensure good governance.

The concept nonetheless, has been critiqued by some scholars. Ali (2015) argues that, the concept ‘good governance’ is a poorly specified concept. He explains this by posing the question that should Rwanda be considered well governed, or poorly governed due to its economic advances or democratic deficits, which has clear implications for development assistance in the region? On the one hand, many observers note the progress Rwanda has made since the 1994 genocide in economic and management reforms. On the other hand, as regards to democracy and respect for civil and political rights, many other observers focus on the problematic nature of Rwanda's recent record. There is therefore easy disagreement between donors on the basis of working definitions of good governance as to which countries should be classified as well - governed and which are poorly governed. Hence, unless development practitioners can first identify what they are trying to measure, they cannot argue convincingly that they have measured it.
Also, Landman and Larizza (2010) argue that, Despite the consistency of EU policy’s overarching goals on democracy, good governance, and human rights, there remains a degree of conceptual confusion and omission of terms that make policy documents opaque, especially as to how aid modalities and cooperation will lead to the desired results. More attention needs to be paid to how the EU defines democracy, good governance and human rights, which can in turn lead to precise ways of measuring and monitoring these concepts.

Furthermore, Bollen (1993) points out that, ‘good governance’ lacks differentiation. That is, there is no distinction between this and other related concepts, particularly liberal democracy, which is the most problematic of these. There are unclear differences in the more political governance approach described above between ‘liberal democracy’ and ‘good governance’. Hence, both imply; democracy and representation, respect for human rights, the rule of law, government accountability and certain institutions, such as free and fair elections, legislative bodies, well-functioning parties and groups. It would appear that, although some donors have been timidly tearing away from the ‘liberal’ label and cultural imperialism with which they have sometimes been associated, a good shorthand way of describing ‘good governance’ as defined by the UN, European Commission, and many bilateral donors seems to be liberal democracy plus development.

Despites these critiques, the concept is of relevance to the research because it provides basic explanation to the core aim of the APRM and what it intends to accomplish. The APRM’s ultimate objective is to establish good governance in Africa, which is considered by NEPAD to be the sine qua non for development in Africa. Hence, the concept explains how African leaders can achieve this objective.
1.8 Literature Review

This section reviews relevant literatures on good governance, development and the extent to which good governance has and can help translate to development in Africa. The review of such works will be based on the following thematic areas; Governance in Africa, Democracy and Good Governance in Africa, Development in Africa and the Nexus between democracy, Good Governance and Development in Africa. The articles reviewed in this section is of essence to the research because they help explain what governance means to Africa. Also, the articles reviewed explains how Africa has traversed the path of ‘good governance’ while linking it to development.

1.8.1 Governance in Africa

Ake (2001) in his book “Democracy and development in Africa”, indicates that African countries obviously have sandwiched among different types of regime. He points out that, there have been instances of movement between military dominance and civil dominance; a mixing up of the monarchical government system; and a change between parliamentary, presidential and hybrid governing systems. According to Oluwole & Bissessar (2012), in pre-independent Africa, the colonial institutions, especially the judiciary, provided controls and balances to curb excessive leadership and prevented the reaching of the Schelling threshold. However, the battle for power and the desire to hold onto power for life became the prevailing objectives of many African leaders as soon as they became independent after the 1960s and 1970s (Oluwole & Bissessa, 2012: 9).

Meredith (2005) also in his work points out that there was great prestige and honor for the first generation of African nationalist leaders. Among these were; Julius Nierere of Tanzania (1961–1985), Kwame Nkrumah (186–1954) of Ghana, Modibo Keïta of Mali(1960–1968), Léopold Senghor of Senegal (1960–1980), Houphouët–Boigny of Côte d'Ivoire (1960–1993), Sékou Touré

Meredith (2005), further notes that the decolonization of Africa in the 1960s was subjected until the early 1990s to a stifling Cold War influence, hence, to this end, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Libya, Somalia, Angola, Namibia, Egypt and South Africa's political history has been subjected to the Cold War era dynamics. Meredith’s (2005) argues that, from the euphoria of liberation in the 1950s and 1960s, to the violent obscurity of dictators and civil wars, the African continent crisscrossed until the 1990s when the road to true democracy and good administration began to be clear. Patrick, Olusola and Alaba (2016), in their work observe that, there is no doubt that the end of the Cold War and the subsequent emergence of a ‘New World Order’ in the 1990s produced major impacts on the world system. Obviously, African states were not exempted from the post-Cold War radical and transformative impacts as previous autocratic military and one-party genre regimes that had dotted the continent less than a decade after independence in the 1960s began to collapse (Patrick et al, 2016). As a result of an upsurge of dissatisfaction with poor economic management, corruption, expediency, nepotism, cronyism and violence, most African leaders were forcibly ousted from their positions (Meredith, 2005). Overall, the wave of democratization that swept away authoritarianism in Africa was largely the result of internal and external forces
pressure on states (Patrick et al, 2016). Adetula (2011) notes that, African governments were under considerable pressure from the neoliberal world order, which later set the road to reform which culminated in various forms of liberal democratic transition. He again notes that, in addition to the external pressures, it is plausible that the internal pressures opened the path to political reforms in the 1990s.

1.8.2 Democracy and Good Governance in Africa

Adetula (2011) in his work opines that the initial euphoria for liberal democracy's possible global success was short-lived. The global number of elected governments has seen significant growth, but many new democracies–most of which are from Africa–have been labeled ‘incomplete democratic transitions’ and ‘illiberal democracies’ by the West (Adetula, 2011). Lynch & Crawford (2011) also in their work note that, early optimism about this ‘second independence’ or ‘virtual miracle’ had waned after a decade of political liberalization. Wani and Suwirta (2015) opine that, democratic movements have supported constitutional and political changes and reforms in numerous African countries which require elections and civil, economic, social and political liberties. They point out that, in Sub-Saharan Africa, there were around 44 elections between 1996 and 2006, with approximately 26 presidential and twenty-eighth parliamentary elections in Africa between 2005 and 2007 (Wani & Suwirta, 2015).

In spite of the establishment of constitutions, legislators and electoral systems, the democratic ‘tests’ reported unimpressive outcomes in several African states (Adetula, 2011). Also, Olusola and Alaba (2016) further postulate that, the pathologies of illiberal democracies, corrupt and benevolent political regimes have had and continue to have far-reaching socio-political and economic consequences for the welfare of citizens in Africa. Hence, poverty has been consolidated, reflecting corruption’s wasteful resources and distorted investment. Likewise,
Chronic tax drain continue to dissipate essential resources for direct and indirect investment, as a result of capital flight *ibid*. Lynch and Crawford (2011: 277) demonstrate that, regrettably, there was no total removal of military rule from African politics by the ‘third wave’ of democracy that swept the continent. Indeed, fifty attempted coups were conducted in Sub-Saharan Africa, of which thirteen succeeded, between 1990 and 2001. Lynch and Crawford (2011: 277) illustrate the various successful coups across the continent with examples. They cite that, there were successful coups in Guinea Bissau in 1999, 2003, and in 2009, President Vieira was murdered by soldiers. Authoritarian rule and military intervention have also continued to hit Mauritania. Accordingly, Mauritania’s return to liberal democracy in 2007 ended with another coup in August 2008, after a military coup in 1992, 1997 and 2003 *ibid*. In 2008, when Captain Moussa Dadis Camara captured power in a bloodless coup following the murder of Lansana Conte, Guinea also experienced military occupation.

1.8.3 Development in Africa

As postulated in Meredith’s (2005) work, the African Independence Honeymoon had been short, though memorable. African leaders, who ran the crest of popularity, pursued the task of development and nation-building with energy and enthusiasm; embarked on ambitious plans, bright young men rose up quickly (Meredith, 2005). The author argues that, the awful promises of nationalist politicians in favor of power, promise of education, medical care, employment and land for all had raised the sense of euphoria to a still greater level. Heidhues (2013) explains that, Africa’s growth prospects looked great at independence in the early 1960s. Development indicators in Nigeria and Ivory Coast were better than those in Indonesia, as well, Congo, Ghana and Uganda were comparable to those of South Korea. (Heidhues, 2013: 339). The author however notes that, since the late 1970s, the gap between Asian and African development growth has
slowed down and widened despite huge development aid quantities (US$ 500 billion since 1960). Per capita GDP was stagnating in Africa, global trade was declining, and limited variety of primary commodities dominated African exports (Heidhues, 2013: 339).

Ake (2001) posits that, the main problem in Africa was not that development had failed, but because development was not part of the plans of the rulers who replaced the colonizers. He explains this by indicating in his work that, colonialism’s political legacies do not promote an endogenous strategy for development. During the colonial era, the idea of oppression, indifference, coercion seems to have continued to prevail in the post-independence experiences of most African states. Ukwandu and Jarbandhan (2016) note that, several decades after independence, most countries in Africa still remain a part the world’s least developed country. Accordingly, thirty-three African countries were regarded as Least Developed Countries (LDCs) as at 2010. The key characteristics of these states were absence of inclusive development, poverty and underdevelopment, absence of fundamental necessities such as water and electricity, lack of employment opportunities and decent shelter (Ukwandu & Jarbandhan, 2016). Ake (2001) points out that, development in post-independent Africa had been designed as a distinct process, independent from politics, culture and institutions, thus, there had been no political development.

Heidhues (2013) establishes that, in the late 1970s, African countries started to decrease by the major social and economic indicators. Agricultural output dropped, leading to huge imports of foodstuffs, investments and savings rates were small during this time, while Africa’s foreign debt was growing from 5.4 trillion dollars in 1970 to 41.3 trillion dollars in 1980 (Heidhues, 2013: 400). The Author adds that, industry as well as production had decreased. Ukwandu and Jarbandhan (2016) attribute these economic challenges Africa was facing to the fact that, some politicians while in authority acquire all the benefits of economic growth, without changing the lives of the
public. Hence, the authors in their work note that the focus of development in Africa should be on enhancing opportunities for people living in poverty, reducing poverty, improved healthcare, improving education quality, reducing child mortality, among other things.

1.8.4 The Nexus between Democracy, Good Governance and Development in Africa

Since the late 1980s, international debate on development and international cooperation in Africa has been dominated by good governance (Wani & Suwirta, 2015). Knutsen (2011) postulates that, empirical research shows that, globally, democracy does not stagnate growth, but rather decreases growth rates fluctuating, as well, encourages increase in incomes and human capital. He notes that, the regular contention among policy analysts is that democracy is appropriate for economic growth in already wealthy nations with elevated state capability, but more authoritarian government may be required in poorer nations with fragile state institutions. Also, Ukwandu and Jarbandhan (2016) hypothesize that, there is a general agreement that development will occur after the minimum good governance requirements are met by a developed or developing country.

Knutsen (2011), however, argues that, despite the skeptic arguments about the need for more authoritarian government in states with weak institutions, there are great hypothetical and empirical study, as to why majoritarian rule or democracy benefits African economies, and more so, in nations with already weak institutions. He explains his argument by noting that Botswana and Mauritius are Africa’s most impressive economic success stories. The author points out that, despite Botswana and Mauritius were poor and had bleak development prospects following decolonization, these two democratic countries have had Africa’s most impressive economic success stories. The author points out that, with the practice of good governance, poverty has been reduced in Costa Rica, from 55% to 18%;
in El Salvador, from 65% to 34%; and in Colombia, from 57% to 44%. Thus, the authors opine that in Sub-Saharan Africa, employment creation rates could increase significantly if Africa's political leaders replicate the same initiatives as that of South America, specifically that of Costa Rica.

Knutsen (2011) further argues that, in Africa, the inclination of dictatorial regimes to choose bad policies is aggravated because the institutional structures of the state are generally weak. Thus, the author argues that, some African rulers who exploit their individual countries at the peril of the wider economy could do so due to weak institutional structures. Ukwandu and Jarbandhan (2016) in addition explain that, poor governance, hungry industry captains and political leaders who live in laps of luxury neglect the concerns of the poor. The revolving strategy, with a particular attention on employment opportunities and poverty alleviation, should undeniably be focused on good economic policies (Knutsen, 2011). Issues of the poor in Africa are generally overlooked or relegated to the periphery of economic growth and opulence, which is in direct contrast to the events in advanced countries *ibid*.

The articles reviewed above are of essence to the research because they provide an in-depth historical antecedence to the governance and development structure of Africa’s pre independence and post-independence. Ake (2001) and Oluwole & Bissessar (2012) work for instance provide a historical view of how Africa has experienced a switch in various regimes. They explain how the colonial political institutions have shaped the post-independence experiences in African countries. Also, Adetula, (2011), Wani and Suwirta (2015), Meredith (2005), Patrick, Olusola and Alaba (2016) and Lynch & Crawford (2011) works are relevant to the research because they explained how the third wave of democratization that swept Africa despite the significant number of elected governments, had been ‘incomplete’. They explain how democratization has produced
unimpressive results due to corruption and the thirst for power. Ukwandu and Jarbandhan (2016) and Knutsen (2011) work are also relevant to the research because most African leaders have now come to recognized that democracy and good governance are essential for successful economic growth, and sustainable development. Thus, the authors work explains how the development paradigm pursued by most African countries post independent had led to a zilch. They also explain the connection between democracy, good governance and development which has been advocated by most intergovernmental organizations including the Bretton Woods institutions to be the path for Africa’s development.

1.9 Sources of Data

Both secondary and primary data sources of data would be used in this study. The primary data were collected from the sampled respondents through an interview, with the assistance of audio recorders. The secondary data sources would include journals, research papers, official documents on the APRM and papers presented by scholars. In order to improve the validity and reliability of the findings, the secondary information would complement the primary data especially in chapter three.

1.10 Methodology

There are a range of social research methods and techniques available. Some of them are quantitative, others qualitative. The choice and implementation of techniques will depend on the purpose and goals of the research, the nature of the research, and the primary research concepts and prospects. Each approach provides a special and exclusive viewpoint that more readily highlights certain elements of reality, and generates an outcome of some applications that is better adapted than others.
Accordingly, a qualitative method was chosen to define and analyze the APRM. As Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen and Namey (2005: 1) put it, “the power of qualitative research is its capacity to provide complicated textual descriptions of how individuals experience a particular research problem”. Designing qualitative research requires a naturalistic, interpretive approach to the world. Thus, qualitative researchers investigate stuff in their natural environments, trying to understand natural meanings of events. The reason why qualitative research design was adopted for this study was because the nature of the research involved other techniques rather than mechanical numbers, such as interpretations, inferences and views. Also, the essence of using a qualitative research design was to acquire expert opinions. Hence, the need to generate detailed answers from the respondents informed the use of in-depth interviews as a qualitative research method.

Likewise, the research adopted a case study approach to interrogate the APRM. According to Sturman (1997: 61) "a case study is a general term for exploring a person, group or phenomenon." A case study is therefore a detailed summary of an individual case and its interpretation, that is, the definition of the case and the incidents, as well as a description of the process of discovery of these characteristics, which is the research process itself (Mesec 1998: 45).

### 1.10.1 Sampling Methodology, Sample Size and Target Population

According to Frey, Carl, & Gary (2000:125), a sample is a “subgroup of a population”. In simple terms, a sample is basically a selected subset of a population that reflects the entirety of the population. In this study, a sample size of ten (10) respondents is utilized. The target population consisted of professionals and members who have worked with the APRM Ghana Governing Council as well as resource persons at the APRM Continental Secretariat, with the ability to make a well-informed contribution to the research. Also, due to limited time frame for which the research
was undertaken, a larger sample size could not be used. In this regard, the interviewees included two officials from the APRM Ghana Secretariat (Mrs. Winifred Asare and Mr. Kofi Marrah) and four former members of Ghana’s APRM Governing Council (Prof. Henrietta Mensa-Bonsu, Prof. Miranda Greenstreet, Mr. Nutifafa D. K. Kuenyehia and Dr. S. K. B. Asante). Additionally, four resource persons from the APRM Continental Secretariat were included in the interviewees.

1.10.2 Collection of Data
Documentaries, comments, as well as interviews and observations were selected on a validated process. The selection of tertiary and specific institutions for enquiry and collection of data was to ensure dependability and validity of the data due to participants’ position in these institutions. The researcher also looked out for consistency in the salvage of information through observation and interviews.

1.10.3 Analysis of Data
Data management is essential in every qualitative study due to the quantity of information generally gathered at the data collection phase (Creswell, 2009). Consequently, the researcher structured the data for efficacy and efficiency reasons under straightforward and well-defined sub-themes. The data gathered were transcribed, analyzed and interpreted with the qualitative approach. Also, the collected information was scrutinized in a manner that did not alter the respondents’ meanings and positions due to precision and bias avoidance.

1.10.4 Ethical Considerations
Research ethics is of utmost importance. Creswell (2013) therefore, proposes that ethical issues should be anticipated before and during the study to enable the researcher determine them in each phase of the study. The researcher thus, requested the consent and approval of all interviewees. In
addition, all respondents got a copy of the interview guide in advance to avoid surprise. The purpose of the research was explained and the respondents’ confidentiality strictly maintained. Interviewees’ views and statements have not been ignored, nor quotations and proof falsified or fabricated.

1.10.5 Limitations
The fieldwork was an exciting one involving participants from different social backgrounds. However, the challenge was getting appointment with various individuals who were members of Ghana’s APRM Governing Council as well as experts at the APRM Continental Secretariat. Thus, due to the time constraint, it became impossible for the researcher to interview most of the former members of Ghana’s APRM Governing Council (including Miranda Greenstreet, Mr. Nutifafa D. K. Kuenyehia and Dr. S. K. B. Asante) as well as the experts at the APRM Continental Secretariat.

1.11 Arrangement of Chapters
The study would be in four Chapters.

Chapter One constitutes the introduction.

Chapter two discusses the AU and its constitutive Act, NEPAD, and the APRM.

Chapter three assesses the successes, challenges and the future of the APRM in promoting good governance and development.

Chapter four analyses the research findings, conclusions and recommendations.
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CHAPTER TWO

THE GENESIS OF THE AU, NEPAD AND THE APRM

2.1 Introduction

This chapter centers on the AU Constitutive Act and its role in promoting good governance and development in Africa. The chapter begins with a historical background to the formation of the OAU and its Charter, and an appraisal of the AU and its constitutive Act as well as its role in promoting good governance and development in Africa. The chapter further examines the genesis of NEPAD and its structures. Likewise, the adoption of the APRM and how it is structured is examined.

2.2 The Genesis of the AU and its Constitutive Act

2.2.1 Historical Antecedence of the OAU

Any reflection on Africa’s present state requires some historical awareness. The OAU was established in 1963 as a result of a compromise between two opposing political ideologies by the 32 then independent African states (Appiah, 2007: 27). A further 21 members gradually joined, reaching a total of 53 by the time of the launch of the AU in 2002 (AU Handbook, 2019). Although before the creation of the OAU, different Member States agreed that African integration was vital, they however had different ideologies on how to achieve African unity (Appiah 2007). They were therefore split into camps; the Casablanca group pushing for instant unification of the African continent and the Monrovia group pushing for a gradual approach. However, they were willing to set aside their disagreements and concentrate on African Unity, thus influencing the OAU charter. Williams (2007) opines that the creation of the OAU was a key moment in the normalization process on the continent. The primary aims of the OAU were, among other things, to remove the
remaining remnants of colonialism and apartheid; to encourage unity and solidarity among African
countries; to coordinate and intensify development cooperation; to protect Member States’
sovereignty and territorial integrity *ibid*.

However, the OAU sailed on rough waters by its fifteenth anniversary, hereafter, the only question
that united the OAU was the major factor in South Africa’s birth apartheid (Packer & Rukare,
2002). As the first organization of its kind created by Africa, the OAU faced severe challenges to
the achievement of its objectives (Appiah, 2007). Packer and Rukare (2002: 366) postulates that,
otherwise, the OAU was weak and discordant by the West Sahara disputes (involving Algeria,
Morocco, Mauritania and France), the Shaba rebellions (invading Zaire), the Benin invasion and
the Ogaden war on Somalia. In general, the organization was seen as failing and not acting as a
pan-African agency against international intervention in serious conflicts inside Africa *ibid*. Again,
Akokpari (2004) opines that the OAU’s inability to tackle the present issues facing Africa was not
random, hence, the abolition of the cold war, the powers of globalization, the dominance of neo-
liberalism, the associated events of rebel groups and collapsed states, the dangers of domestic and
global terrorism, and the deepening of the financial crisis in Africa and its marginalization in the
global environment are among the novel problems that which the largely old-fashioned institutions
of the OAU could not adequately address. Due to these factors, in the 1990s, African leaders had
to discuss the need to modify the structures of the OAU to reflect the challenges of the changing
world.

On 9 September 1999, a Declaration was issued at the Assembly of Heads of State and
Government, calling for the establishment of an African Union to speed up, amongst other things,
the process of unification of the continent, and to address social, economic and political challenges
posed by globalization. (Appiah, 2007: 28). Following the September 1999 decision by its
predecessor, the OAU established a new continental organization, the AU, was formally launched in Durban, South Africa in July 2002 to build on its work (AU Handbook, 2019). According to the AU handbook (2019), the creation of the AU had shifted the emphasis of African development and inclusion, from supporting the release from colonialism and apartheid.

2.2.2 Creation of the AU and its Constitutive Act

According to Akokpari (2004), the AU was born out of the conviction that African peace, good governance and development cannot be promoted through the OAU. Among other things, the fundamental weakness in the OAU was reflected in the failure of the organization to save Africa from its socio-economic doldrums or catalyze democracy (Akokpari, 2004). Thus, the principles of the OAU have been improved upon in the adoption of the AU and its Constitutive Act (Appiah, 2007). Four summits preceding the official launch of the African Union and its Constitutive Act were held, namely: the Sirte Summit (1999), which accepted the Sirte Declaration calling for the establishment of the AU; the Lomé Summit (2000), which implemented the AU Constitutive Act; the Lusaka Summit (2001), which drafted the roadmap for the execution of the AU; and the Durban Summit (2002), which initiated the AU Summit. (AU Handbook, 2019). Within one year of the Sirte Declaration, the Constitutive Act was drafted, published and completed (Packer & Rukare, 2002).

The AU's Constitutive Act included both the OAU and the AECs’ goals. However, it introduced fresh aspects and values, including: more involvement by the African people in the Union’s operations, the right to intervene in member countries subject to the Assembly’s judgment of serious conditions such as war offences, genocide and crimes against mankind, an area from which the OAU shielded away from (Appiah, 2015). Some African governments misused this principle of non-interference as enshrined in the OAU Charter as a ‘blank check’ in order to repress their
people, recalling the principle of non-interference in order not to be held responsible by their colleagues for poor governance (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004). With the adoption of the AU and its constitutive Act, Africa’s continental structures have moved away from this non-interference culture to a culture of non-indifference. Hence, in the case of war crimes, gross human rights abuse and genocide, the AU Constitutive Act explicitly allows the organization to intervene (AU, 2000).

Also, a significant number of the OAU structures, including all treaties and conventions, and NEPAD had been carried forward into the AU. Appiah (2007: 28) notes that principles such as the non-alignment and anti-colonialism have been improved in the AU Constitutive Act and the addition of new principles such as the establishment of a common African defense policy, the promotion of gender equality and the condemnation and rejection of unconstitutional governments. Hence, African leaders seems to have learnt from their past experiences that peace, security, democracy and good governance, human rights and a well-managed economy are necessary conditions for a sustainable development.

Gottschalk postulates that (2012: 13), both the Abuja Treaty (1991) and the AU Constitutive Act (2000) may be the world’s most far-reaching attempts to diffuse standards. The Abuja Treaty and the AU envisage RECs as implementing bodies as well as the main economic integration organizations. Although the AU initially intended to include five regions (North, West, East, Central, South), it recognized more and overlapped regional organizations, namely ECOWAS (West Africa), SADC (Southern Africa), ECCAS (Central Africa), COMESA (Eastern and Southern Africa), EAC (East Africa), IGAD (Horn of Africa) and the North African Arab Maghreb Union (AMU) (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004: 2). The Abuja Treaty proposes that the institutions, procedures, human rights values and other EU standards, be granted wholesale
imports, which the AU Constitutive Act reiterates (Gottschalk, 2012: 13). However, there is no such mechanism in the AU as the latest process of accession to the European Union, which requires European states to meet a set standard before they become members *ibid*. Unlike the AU, for a country to be admitted into the EU, the first step is to ensure that the country meets the key accession criteria. The key accession criteria of the EU were defined mainly in 1993 at the Copenhagen European Council and are therefore referred to as the ‘Copenhagen criteria’ (Maniokas, 2004). Hence, countries wishing to join the EU must have; stable bodies which ensure democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and the protection of minorities, a working market economy and EU market forces capacity, and must adhere to the goals of the political, economic and monetary union of the EU (Maniokas, 2004).

### 2.3 An Appraisal of the AU constitutive Act and the Promotion of Good Governance and Development

Among other things, the Constitutive Act of the AU (2000), which officially created the organs of the AU, establishes the objectives of promoting democratic values and institutions, good governance and popular participation, as well as the preservation of ‘human and citizens’ rights under the African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights and other appropriate human rights instruments. The AU’s objective is to encourage, inter alia, democratic values and institutions, common participation and good governance, according to Article 3(g) of the AU Constitutional Act. Article 4 (m) further notes that one of the AU’s main principles is respect for the principles of democracy, human rights, the rule of law and good governance. To achieve these goals set up in the Constitutive Act, the AU has developed a specific institutional set-up, the Peace and Security Council, which systematically and firmly addresses conflict prevention and unconstitutional government changes (Appiah, 2015).
In line with Article 5(2) of the Constitutive Act (2000), the Security and Peace Council of the AU was established. The Council has a broad mandate ranging from promoting peace, security and stability in Africa to creating a sustainable development environment. This mandate covers conflict prevention, the building of peace and reconstruction after conflict. It also has a mandate in the field of promoting democracy and demonstrates that democracy, security and peace are intrinsically linked (AU Handbook, 2019). Hence, the most significant and striking task that came with the creation of the AU and the adoption of its Constitutive Act is the mandate it has been given to promote democracy and good governance in Africa. In addition, in relation to democratic support, the promotion of human rights and humanitarian issues, the Department of Political Affairs of the AU Commission has a strong mandate in ensuring good governance in Africa (AU Handbook, 2019). The Department of Political Affairs focuses on the prevention of violence and conflicts in elections in Africa and carries out preventive action throughout the electoral cycle to address the root causes of conflicts in Africa *ibid*. Hence, the role of the Department of Political Affairs is to foster good governance, democracy, respect for human rights and openness in African countries.

Again, NEPAD, the AU’s accompanying development paradigm has become a prerequisite for good governance, amongst other things. The peer review mechanism, the African Peer Review (APR), was incorporated into the dual efforts of NEPAD and the AU to monitor African Heads of State in an effort to ensure sound governance of their colleagues (Waal, 2012). The NEPAD program is a pledge made by African leaders based on a common vision and common conviction and an AU program to eradicate poverty and promote sustainable development in Africa, by promoting regional and continental integration, to stop the marginalization of Africa in global processes and improve its full and profitable integration into the global system (AU Handbook,
African leaders considered the NEPAD program in 2001 a long-term vision of a development program that was developed by Africans and led by Africans.

Nonetheless, while many Africans welcomed the AU and its Constitutive Act and its ambitious plan to promote good governance and democracy, others had seen the Constitutive Act as a further “decorative” plan drawn by desperate dictators who seek new resources and assistance from an increasingly skeptical international community under the hegemonic domination of the United States (Appiah, 2015). This skepticism is due to the fact that as a mechanism to induce African leaders to embrace democracy and good governance, it became a prerequisite for aid and assistance. Thus, some Africans had perceived the AU’s agenda for democracy and good governance as a façade or a smokescreen.

2.4 The Genesis of NEPAD

The inspiring speeches of President Thabo Mbeki on the need for a Renaissance in Africa culminated on 11th July, 2001 with the approval of the New African Initiative (NAI) from the Summit of the OAU, which emanated from the merger of President Mbeki’s Millennium Partnership for African Recovery Program (MAP) and President Wade’s Omega Plan (Waal, 2012). Thus, NEPAD was adopted based on the fact that three separate development programs, initiated between 2000 and 2001, were amalgamated (NEPAD, 2012). The first was the Multi-African Recovery Partnership (MAP), created by the President of South Africa, Thabo Mbeki, with the main goal of tackling the debt of Africa (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004). The MAP was supported both by President Abdelaziz Bouteflika of Algeria and President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria. The other was the Senegalese President Abdoulaye Wade's Omega plan. The Omega plan was concerned with educational projects and building regional infrastructure, which was supported
by French African countries (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004). The third was the Global Compact for Africa Recovery (GCAR) launched in 2000 by the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), based in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (NEPAD, 2012). The idea of peer review was introduced by the GCAR ibid. The combination of such programs culminated in the New African Initiative (NAI) in July 2001 at the AU Summit in Lusaka, Zambia. At its meeting in Abuja, Nigeria, on 23 October 2001 the Heads of State and the Implementation Committee agreed on NEPAD, completed a policy paper and accepted the structure for NEPAD.

Designed and developed by a key African leadership group, NEPAD is a comprehensive integrated development strategy that addresses the continent's main social, economic, and political priorities (NEPAD, 2012). It involves African leaders’ dedication to African people and the international community to put Africa on a road to sustainable growth, accelerating the continent's integration into the global economy ibid. The NEPAD Agency (Planning and Coordinating Agency), based in South Africa, is primarily responsible for facilitating and coordinating the implementation of priority continental and regional programs and projects, mobilizing resources and partners in support of the implementation of priority programs and projects in Africa, conducting and coordinating research and knowledge management (AU Handbook, 2019).

NEPAD, however, preceded the creation of the AU in 2002 and was adopted as the socio-economic program of the AU only later (Grimm, Nawrath, et al, 2009). NEPAD membership is therefore identical to the AU membership, even though NEPAD has maintained its headquarters at Midrand, South Africa and is physically separated from the Addis Ababa AU offices ibid. Also, the NEPAD Agency was asked to quickly monitor the implementation and follow-up of major continental developments programs and framework programs including the Agenda 2063 and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), following its implementation at the 24th Ordinary Session of the AU
Assembly, which was held in Addis Ababa in Ethiopia in June 2015 (AU handbook, 2019). In addition, the NEPAD Agency is also widely used as a mechanism for supporting African development efforts by international financial institutions, the UN agencies and Africa's developing partners.

NEPAD was seen as a moral agreement between African nations and the G8, under which the former sorted to enhance governance and encourage democracy through political reforms and market-friendly financial policies, while the latter undertakes to help African nations dedicated to excellent governance, human rights advancement, eradication of poverty and financial development (Akokpari, 2004). Waal (2002: 469) notes that, one of the strengths of NEPAD was its timeliness with regard to main contributors namely; The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Group of Eight (G8). A variety of like-minded countries, including Canada, Britain, the Scandinavian and Netherlands, heavily affected the thinking behind NEPAD ibid. Hence, an "improved partnership" program developed by the G8 at the Kananaski (Canada) Summit in June 2002 provided such help (Akokpari, 2004). Assistance from the Group of 8 countries was to take the form of growth aid, that is, assistance in institution-building, enhancing education, health care, fighting HIV/AIDS, and providing access to Western economies. Akokpari (2004), with reference to the ‘The Economist (2002: 44)’ points out that the NEPAD scheme was anticipated to raise an annual assistance of $64 billion for Africa if the G8 was to fulfill its duty.

NEPAD initially faced critical challenges in the midst of the sea of expectations and optimism that began its implementation in 2001 (Tawfik, 2015). A common topic of concern was the debate about whether or not NEPAD represented a step forward. Since the beginning, the NEPAD framers acknowledged that previous efforts to develop projects across the continent had not been possible
because of highly questionable leadership and lack of ownership of the initiatives (NEPAD, 2012). Some critics, nonetheless, have defined NEPAD as a ‘neo-liberal’ economic requirement and a structural adjustment that they themselves have put in place (Kajee, 2006). According to Kajee (2006), NEPAD was initially viewed as a continuation of failed policies of the IMF and other previous blueprint adopted by African leaders, redecorated and presented as inspired and led by Africans. The African Civic Society Declaration which was endorsed by members of about forty African social movements, women and youth organizations, trade unions, religious organizations, NGOs, and others initially rejected the NEPAD policy document in July 2002 *ibid*. They claimed that inadequately participatory was the process by which NEPAD was taken and thus, served as a catalyst for this refusal. Overtime, however, NEPAD has experienced some modifications with many civil society organizations in favor of NEPAD’s political elements, especially the insistence of NEPAD on democracy, accountability and strong democratic governance. In the wake of the abatement of the cold war, the new global forces unleashed highlighted good governance and human rights, hence the timing of NEPAD was promising in terms of good governance.

### 2.4.1 Structure of NEPAD

A number of organs run NEPAD at different layers. The AU Assembly’s 14th Ordinary Session (Decision 283 of February 2010) outlines the main characteristics of NEPAD governance structures (AU Handbook, 2019). These include the NEPAD Heads of State and Government Orientation Committee (HSGOC), the Steering Committee, the Secretariat, and special task teams (NEPAD, 2012). HSGOC is an AU Assembly sub-committee responsible for providing political leadership and strategic guidance on the NEPAD program and reporting its recommendations for endorsement to the Assembly.
NEPAD’s Steering Committee acts as the intermediary between the HSGOC and the NEPAD Agency that oversees the NEPAD Agency’s activities. The Committee comprises the Heads of State and Government's personal representatives on the HSGOC. Also, the Steering Committee is responsible for developing terms of reference for identified programs and projects and it oversees the secretariat. The NEPAD Secretariat is a small professional team based in Midrand, South Africa's Development Bank (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004). It performs liaison and coordination functions; administration and logistics. It also works outsources to lead agencies and/or continental experts on technical details.

However, in February 2010, the AU Assembly's 14th Ordinary Session endorsed NEPAD’s integration into the AU structures and processes, including the establishment of the NEPAD Agency as the AU’s technical body to replace the NEPAD Secretariat (AU Handbook, 2019). Again, in January 2017, the Assembly proposed the transformation of the NEPAD Agency into an African Union Development Agency (AUDA) as part of the AU's institutional reform. The 31st Ordinary Assembly Session endorsed this recommendation in July 2018. At the February 2019 Assembly Summit, the Assembly requested that the AUDA Statute be submitted for adoption *ibid*.

### 2.5 An Overview of the APRM

The APRM was established in 2003 as an instrument for AU Member States. It is to voluntarily monitor their governance performance by NEPAD’s Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee (HSGIC) (AU Handbook, 2019). The APRM is regarded as a unique, mutually accepted tool aimed at encouraging measures, norms and procedures leading to political stabilization, strong financial growth, viable development and increased sub-regional and continental economic inclusion by exchanging experiences and enhancing effective and best
practices, including identifying shortcomings (NEPAD, 2012). Thus, the APRM’s concept is to mutually assess the quality of governance on a voluntary but standardized basis in four fields—democratic and political governance, financial governance and management, corporate governance, and socio-economic growth (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004: 4).

According to Mangu (2014), the APRM’s task was to guarantee that member countries’ strategies and procedures comply with accepted principles, codes, and norms of political, financial, and corporate management. He adds that the APRM’s main aim was to promote and create accountable management through a method of self-assessment and positive peer dialog to promote the implementation of measures, norms and procedures that contribute to political stabilization, strong financial growth, viable development and enhanced sub-regional and regional financial inclusion by exchanging experiences and strengthening financial inclusion (Mangu, 2014). Member States agreed to separately evaluate their adherence with Africa and global management obligations by acceding to the APRM.

Also, according to Akokpari (2004: 253), the APRM was seen as a radical move from previous practices when pledges to ensure good governance were made by just signing multilateral agreements as was the case with the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights (1981); the African Charter on Popular Development Participation (1990); the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (1990). Akokpari (2004: 253) further postulates that the APRM, on the other hand, is African countries’ very first effort to subject their governments to a surveillance system administered by fellow African nations. In this respect, the APRM provided new possibilities to strengthen democracy, to guarantee that the democratic foundation transcends the small limits of private law, patron-client relationships, or ethno-religious affairs. The APRM
offered that an Independent Panel of Eminent Persons (IPEP) be established to be accountable for the review and evaluation method *ibid*.

The APRM had been operating as an autonomous agency since its creation in March 2003 under a memorandum of agreement signed by Member States. In June 2014 however, the AU Assembly decided to integrate the APRM as an autonomous body into the AU system. The Assembly welcomed progress on implementing the Integration Decision in January 2018 (AU Handbook, 2019). Also, the AU Assembly welcomed efforts in January 2017 to revitalize and broaden the APRM’s role. Among other events, the January 2018 Assembly again welcomed measures made to place the APRM as an early warning instrument for conflict avoidance in Africa in the sense of alignment and synergy between the APRM, the African Governance Architecture and the African Peace and Security Architecture. According to the AU Handbook (2019), 37 Member States of the AU joined the APRM in August 2018. 22 Member States were reviewed and the second review was scheduled for Uganda in October 2018.

### 2.5.1 Structure of the APRM

The APRM Basic Document (AHG/235 (XXXVIII) Annex 2), authorized by the NEPAD Heads of State and Government and Implementation Committee and supported by the July 2002 African Union (AU) Summit in Durban, South Africa, provides for four separate organizational components of the APRM (NEPAD, 2003: 1.1). Figure 2.0 illustrates the APRM structure at both the national and continental level.

![Fig 2.0](http://ugspace.ug.edu.gh)
The first institutional element is the Committee of Heads of State and Participating Government (the APR Heads of State Forum), which is the APRM’s largest decision-making body with general accountability for the APRM (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004). The Heads of State Forum of the APRM includes Heads of State and of Government of the member countries of the AU who willingly opted to join the APRM (Hope, 2005: 292). The tasks of the APRM Heads of State Forum include, but are not restricted to:

1. selecting the APR Panel and its Chairperson
2. reviewing, accepting and having possession of nation peer evaluation records
3. transmitting to peer-reviewed nations the suggestions of the APR Heads of State Forum
4. exerting peer stress to impact improvements in nation exercise as suggested
(5) to persuade growth partners to provide technical help to eliminate capability gaps as suggested by nation peer review reports

(6) to transmit peer review reports to relevant AU buildings

(7) to publicize nation peer review reports and related media releases through the APR Secretariat.

The Eminent Persons Panel (APR Panel) is the next organizational element of the APRM (NEPAD, 2003). This is an autonomous agency that supervises the daily workings of the peer review system and guarantee that the method is credible and integral. Also, the APR Panel supervises the evaluation method of the APRM in order to ensure system consistency, consider review accounts and create suggestions to the APR Forum (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004). The APR Panel’s tasks include, but are not restricted to

(1) monitoring the APRM method, including offering guidance to nation assessment managers to ensure the autonomy, professionalism and legitimacy of the system

(2) recommending suitable African organizations or people to perform technical reviews

(3) preparing and adopting nation peer review papers, including their suggestions

(4) submitting to the APR Heads of State Forum all nation peer review papers with suggestions on steps that could be adopted to help the nations assessed in improving their management and socio-development efficiency.

The third organizational element is the APR Secretariat, which through the APR Panel provides the secretarial, organizing and administrative assistance facilities (NEPAD, 2013). The functions of the APR Secretariat include;
(1) providing the APR Panel with secretarial and administrative assistance functions under the direct supervision of the Panel Chairperson

(2) organize regional networks and conferences to exchange experiences and best practices with regard to good governance and sustainable development.

(3) ensuring comprehensive documentation of the APR Secretariat.

The ultimate organizational element is the APR Teams, which will carry out the real technical evaluations that will represent the peer review of the nation (NEPAD, 2013). Credible and technically competent institutions such as the AfDB, UNECA, and the UNDP had been chosen to assist with some of the technical peer review evaluations (Hope, 2005: 292). UNECA assists in the technical evaluations of economic governance and management, while, for example, the AfDB assists with banking and financial standards. The APR Panel is supposed to pick other reliable and technically qualified organizations or people to conduct peer review evaluations in the fields of political leadership, corporate governance, and socio-economic growth (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2004).

2.6 Conclusion

Chapter two has provided a brief history of the OAU and its Charter as well as the AU and its Constitutive Act. The chapter further appraised the AU and its role in ensuring good governance and development in Africa. Also, the various policy documents, which give birth to NEPAD, and the various leaders who championed it was explained. In addition, the APRM, which is one of the initiatives born out of NEPAD has been explained as well as its structures.
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CHAPTER THREE

ASSESSING THE APRM’S RELEVANCE IN PROMOTING GOOD GOVERNANCE 
AND DEVELOPMENT IN GHANA AND AFRICA

3.1 Introduction

This section starts by introducing some of the tenets of the APRM. The concept of peer review, mandate, purpose, principles, participation, as well as the process of the APRM are discussed in detail. The chapter further explores the achievements of the APRM and its role in promoting good governance and development in Africa. The APRM just like any other blueprint adopted by Africa has faced some challenges. Some of these critical challenges that have engulfed the APRM are explored. The chapter concludes by examining the future prospect of the APRM.

3.2 Tenets of the APRM

3.2.1 The Peer Review Concept

The African Peer Review (APR) is one instance of the numerous peer reviews in global and regional organizations. According to Hope (2005: 289), the concept of peer review was pioneered by the OECD. Thus, the technique of peer review used in assessing the efficiency of its Member States has been used effectively by the OECD since its establishment as an organization more than four decades ago *ibid*. The OECD (2003) defines ‘Peer Review’ as the systematic review and evaluation by other countries (peers), designated organizations, or a mixture of states and designated organizations of a state’s performance. In an interview, Mrs. Asare, the Principal Programme Officer at Ghana’s APRM Secretariat opined that, peer review has to do with an organized evaluation of the performance of a state by other states in an attempt to assist the state being reviewed to improve its governance and polices, adopting best practices as well as
conforming to accepted norms. According to the Director for Operations at Ghana’s APRM Secretariat, Mr. Marrah, one of the interviewees, the aim of a peer review is to enhance the policy making of the reviewed State, that is, embrace best practice and respect established standards, values, codes and other accepted undertakings.

Peer reviews are mostly performed on the basis of topics or subjects. This include economics, government, education, health, environment, among others. Within one or more of these subject fields, a state can be examined against a broad spectrum of codes and compliance norms, likewise, several nations can be examined simultaneously with regard to a specific topic, for example, Combating Corruption for Sustainable Development (Hope, 2005). In the OECD, peer review rationale is to guarantee that the organization’s member states’ policies and procedures are consistent with accepted values, principles and norms (OECD, 2003). Findings and suggestions from peer review thus assist nations enhance their policies and implement good governance practices. Peer review results allow nations to compare policy experiences and to determine global best practices leading to the implementation of informed policies. The method also enables a shared knowledge base to be developed that benefits all nations by identifying the best policy that works (Pagani, 2002:9).

Grimm and Gyimah-Boadi (2008) assert that, peer reviews have effects beyond peer levels, consequently, separate stakeholders in a country could take advantage of the state’s outcomes and potential commitments in reaction to such reviews to put pressure on the government. Thus, peer reviews are ultimately intended to enhance the policy making of the State under review, to implement best practices and to meet defined norms, values, codes and other agreements. Accordingly, the interviewees disclosed that, peer review assessments and evaluations are performed in a non-adversarian way, relying strongly on the mutual understanding and
comprehension between the reviewee and the reviewers and on their common confidence in the process (Field Interview, 2019). Peer reviews do not normally involve punitive penalties or decisions, however, it can lead to embarrassment or adverse market responses like reduction in investment rates. Hope (2005: 291) opines that the use of the peer reviews and the resulting recommendations is not intended to punish or isolate countries, hence, the core aim is to assist each state identify its own weaknesses and find ways and means to tackle the weaknesses.

The APR, unlike other peer review initiatives, is an African-led innovation, which represents an audacious reform strategy to build capable countries with viable governance and sustainable development. The experts interviewed alluded that, the APR is distinguished by the fact that, although the concept and design are European, operations as well as the processes are largely African (Field Interview, 2019). Consequently, the APR draws strongly on the capacity and/or knowledge of Africa. Prof. Henrietta Mensa-Bonsu opined that, Africa’s political leaders were tired of foreigners and the West dictating how Africa should be governed (Field Interview, 2019). Western imperialists have used a variety of mechanisms at different stages, including SAP, aid, investment and, in some cases, direct condemnation as instruments for reforms in Africa. The APR thus, is a break away from the previous ‘neo-liberal’ policies imposed on African leaders. With the adoption of the APR concept, African leaders had the opportunity to access their own governance structures. Mrs. Asare also asserted that, when a country agrees to avail itself to be peer reviewed, the country is obliged to improve its governance in accordance with the goals and work towards the agreed standards (Field Interview, 2019). Again, the country must be open to internal political dialog as well as with other participating states.

As indicated, the APR is a voluntary project, totally reliant on the good will of the countries in Africa. Notwithstanding, states can either accede or remain out, and even those who accede to the
initiative can withdraw if it proves to be exasperating (Akokpari, 2004). The experts interviewed, elucidated that as at 2019, out of the 52 African countries, 38 have acceded to the APRM. 22 of the 38 countries had undergone their first review, out of which, only one country has had their second review (Field Interview, 2019). These 38 countries included: Ghana, Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, South Africa, Cameroon, Chad, Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Equatorial Guinea, Sierra Leone, Gabon, Gambia, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Niger, Lesotho, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, and Zambia. The 22 countries who have undergone the review included; Algeria, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Mali, Mauritius, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia.

3.2.2 Mandate of the APRM
According to the APRM Base Document (2003), the APRM’s mandate is to ensure that participating states’ practices and policies are consistent with the agreed standards, codes and ideals of political, economic and corporate governance in the Declaration on Democracy, Economic, Political and Corporate Governance. Accordingly, the APRM is the mutually accepted tool used by participating member states to monitor themselves.

3.2.3 Purpose of the APRM
According to the APRM Base Document (2003), the main aim of the APRM is to promote the implementation of measures, norms and procedures leading to political stability, strong economic growth, sustainable development and enhanced sub regional and regional economic integration by exchanging insights and strengthening effective and best practices, including the identification of shortcomings and the assessment of capacity building requirements. This aim or purpose,
according to Mrs. Asare has been achieved by the APRM. In her words, “out of the recommendations made in the APRM reports, countries who underwent the review have put in place structures to improve their governance as well as address the issues raised in the report” (Field Interview, 2019). However, Prof. Henrietta Mensa-Bonsu opined differently. In her view, the APRM was not serving its purpose. She postulated that, at one stage the APRM served its objective, but with the shift in leadership tide in Africa, most rulers are not committed to the APRM. In her words “The very rulers who gave birth to the APRM are no longer in the corridors of power, hence a tidal change in political governance in Africa, making the APRM unattractive” (Field Interview, 2019).

3.2.4 Principles of the APRM

According to the APRM Base Document (2003), The technical competence, credibility and freedom of political manipulation of each review activity undertaken under the remit of the APRM initiative must be the guiding principles of the mechanism.

3.2.5 Participation in the APRM Process

The APRM is open to all African Union member states that wish to subject their country to peer review (APRM Base Document, 2003; Field Interview, 2019). Following the adoption of the African Union’s Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance, countries wishing to participate in the APRM have to inform the NEPAD Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee Chairperson (APRM Base Document, 2003). This will require the submission and facilitation of regular peer reviews and will be driven by accepted parameters for good political governance and good financial and corporate governance ibid.
3.2.6 The APRM Process

The experts interviewed pointed out that the APRM process entails five stages (Field Interview, 2019). The review is carried out when a country formally avail itself to the APRM and express interest, when early warning signs indicate that an APRM Member State is facing an imminent political, financial or social crisis, when follow-up reviews are due to be carried out every two to four years and at the unique request of an APRM Member State (Field Interview, 2019; APRM Base Document, 2003). The evaluation method involves national questionnaire-based self-evaluations, expert review teams and on-site visits by expert review teams consulting officials from government, private sectors and civil society, active plenaries, country review reports and APR Panel of Eminent Personal Program of Actions.

In order to achieve mutually agreed objectives and to conform to agreed norms, standards and ethics on economic, political and corporate governance in the Declaration on Democracy, Policy, Economic and Corporate Governance, the APRM Base Document points out that the process would involve regular reviews of participating countries’ policies and practices (APRM Base Document, 2003). The APRM Base Document (2003) further indicates that, the peer review method should encourage Member States to take serious account of the effect of national strategies, not only on national political stability and economic growth, but also on neighboring nations. Hence it will foster mutual accountability and good practice compliance. The five states of the APRM are as follow;

3.2.6.1 Stage one

The correspondents interviewed indicated that at stage one, the APRM Secretariat begins with the preparation of a background study on the country’s governance and growth, while a comprehensive
domestic consultation procedure allows the nation to prepare self-evaluation on a comprehensive questionnaire and draft Program of Action (Field Interview, 2019; APRM Base Document, 2003). Thus, both the continental APRM and the national level are involved in the initial preparation. The country that is supposed to be reviewed has the primary task of developing a Program of Action. According to Mr. Marrah, this is an activity plan for the self-evaluation process proposed by the country's APRM implementing body (Field Interview, 2019). The Program of Action is based on the results of a sample questionnaire given by the APR Secretariat in Midrand through a comprehensive, participatory country self-assessment (Field Interview, 2019).

The APR Secretariat in Midrand is provided with the self-assessment draft and Program of Action on measures to resolve important gaps and deficits in the country under review. A background document is then prepared in accordance with the country’s studies and data available in the four sectors being reviewed by the APRM Secretariat (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2008). Hence, this stage involves a thorough assessment of the country's governance and development setting. In the words of Mrs. Asare, “key problems of governance and growth are evaluated at the first stage in areas such as political representativeness, institutional efficiency, financial management and governance” (Field Interview, 2019).

3.2.6.2 Stage Two

The assessment prepared in Stage One informs this phase. In this stage, the Review Team is expected to visit the country under review where its priority undertaking is to conduct the widest possible variety of discussions with the government, parliamentarians, political parties as well as representatives of civil society organizations, including trade unions, academia, industry players, professional organizations, media, among others (APRM Base Document, 2003; Field Interview,
The aim of the stakeholder consultation is to communicate with and consult many state and non-governmental stakeholders throughout the nation. Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi (2008) note three objectives for the stakeholder consultation, which are, providing data on the APR process, discussion of the Program of Action proposal prepared in stage one and, discussing other problems and steps with stakeholders. Stage two ends by recommending modifications to the Program of Action Draft if required.

3.2.6.3 Stage Three

The third stage has to do with the team report preparation (Field Interview, 2019). The report is produced by formal and informal sources on the grounds of the briefing material provided by the APRM Secretariat and the in-country information provided during wide consultations, as well as discussions with all stakeholders. The report is then evaluated against the appropriate economic, political, and corporate governance commitments made and the drafted Program of Action (APRM Base Document, 2003). Therefore, at this phase, the review team put together a country report on the basis of documents prepared for the APRM mission, a country-self-evaluation and draft action program report and the results of the review team during the country visit. Once the report has been drafted, the APRM Secretariat will forward the report to the national government of the country under review for consideration in order to provide the government the chance to respond to the results of the APRM team.

3.2.6.4 Stage Four

The fourth stage begins with the submission of the team report by the APRM Secretariat to the participating Heads of State and Government (Field Interview, 2019). At this point, the panel backed by the APRM Secretariat takes over the process, reviews the report, and makes policy
reform recommendations. The report is then forwarded to the APRM Forum, including the suggestions. The Forum debates the report and informs the national institutions in the country under review of the measures considered necessary (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2008). The support and aid to the nation under review are then requested by other participating governments, which are not specified in more detail. At the same time, it is urged development partners to help the country under review to correct the remaining issues. This phase ends when the Participating Heads of State and Government take into account and adopts the final report, including their decision in this respect (Field Interview, 2019: APRM Base Document, 2003).

According to the APRM Base Document (2003), If the government of the country under review shows a demonstrable willingness to rectify the deficiencies identified in the report, then it will be the responsibility of the participating governments to provide what assistance they can, as well as to urge donor agencies and other government to aid the country being reviewed. The APRM Base Document (2003) further indicates that, if the government under review however, does not provide the necessary political will, the participating states should first do all they can to engage in constructive dialogue, offering technical and other suitable assistance in the process. This stage ends when the APRM Heads of State Forum, in which the chairperson communicates the decisions and recommendations to the government under review (Hope, 2005).

3.2.6.5 Stage Five

The APR Country Report and the National Program of Action are published in the fifth and final stage, and they are presented to the AU, the Pan-African Parliament, the regional economic community, the African Human and People's Rights Commission and the other relevant bodies (Field Interview, 2019; APRM Base Document, 2003; Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2008). The
release of these documents is scheduled to be published six months after the first consideration of the Report by the APR Forum and may therefore continue until the final APRM study is published one year after completion of the evaluation (APRM Base Document, 2003). This publication officially concludes the first cycle of the APR process and implements reforms.

Hence, in order to allow national stakeholders that participated in the national country processes to monitor the implementation of the strategies to address concerns raised in the report and discuss in detail the Program of Action, the report is released to the public for review. According to Mrs. Asare, the review is repeated every 3-5 years to follow through on the progress towards the Program of Action goals, and to produce a new five-year report and strategy (Field Interview, 2019).

3.2.7 Funding of the APRM

The experts interviewed alluded that, the activities of the APRM is financed by individual countries who have acceded to the APRM (Field Interview, 2019). The APRM Base Document (2003) also notes that, Funding for the Mechanism will come from assessed contributions from participating member states. According to Mr. Marrah, the APRM panel and Secretariat are mostly financed through contributions from member states and AU funds from African individuals, corporations and institutions (Field Interview, 2019). Also, it is anticipated that each participating country contributes USD 100,000 per year although in practice, this is not always the case (Grimm & Gyimah-Boadi, 2008). The APRM Base Document (2003) specifies that, the APRM will be implemented with resources mainly from Africa, while external funding partners are not prohibited. Hence, the APRM mechanism for financing its activities stresses the significance of African states’ self-reliance.
3.3 Achievements of the APRM

Seventeen years has elapsed since the APRM was adopted. Has the initiative brought about changes in the way African governments touted it as a ground-breaking initiative? Has the initiative been able to prove that African leaders have moved away from the culture of indifferent and have indeed opened up their government to be peer review by their peers?

The APRM has since its inception made significant strides both nationally and in terms of the number of countries acceding to it, the rolling out of structures, the institutions as well as the deepening of the review process. Also, the experts interviewed, pointed out that the APRM has opened up the political arena for citizens to participate in policy discussions, encouraged domestic dialog and stimulus for innovation, clarified complicated issues, strengthened advocacy for excellent governance and better service delivery (Field Interview, 2019).

As indicated, 38 out of the 52 African countries have acceded to the APRM, 22 of the 38 countries had undergone their first review, out of which, only one country (Kenya) has had its second review. This signifies a major milestone for Africa. Given Africa’s history and the resulting catastrophic impacts of poor governance, lack of openness and rampant corruption, acceding to the APRM reflects a cultural shift in African leaders’ thinking and a significant milestone in the continent’s political growth and history (Hope, 2005: 296). Table 3.0 provide details of the countries that have acceded to the APRM
Table 3.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date of Accession</th>
<th>Peer Review Reports</th>
<th>Progress Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>9 March 2003</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Country Review Report</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>8 July 2004</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>31 March 2004</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Country Review Report</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>9 March 2003</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Country Review Report</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>3 April 2003</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>26 January 2013</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Country Review Report</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Congo</td>
<td>9 March 2003</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; July 2007</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Country Review Report</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>9 March 2004</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>9 March 2003</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} Country Review Report</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>29 Jan 2014</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>14 March 2003</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>28 Jan 2018</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>9 March 2003</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} Country Review Report</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} 2\textsuperscript{nd} 3\textsuperscript{rd} 4\textsuperscript{th} 5\textsuperscript{th} and 6\textsuperscript{th} Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>9 March 2003</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} &amp; 2\textsuperscript{nd} Country Review Report</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>8 July 2004</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} Country Review Report</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>29 January 2011</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>8 July 2004</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>28 May 2003</td>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} Country Review Report</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>30 January 2008</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>9 March 2003</td>
<td>1st Country Review Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>28 Jan 2017</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>14 July 2012</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>9 March 2003</td>
<td>1st Country Review Report &amp; 1st 2nd &amp; 3rd Progress Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome &amp; Principe</td>
<td>28 January 2007</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>9 March 2004</td>
<td>1st Country Review Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>8 July 2004</td>
<td>1st Country Review Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>1st Country Review Report</td>
<td>1st 2nd &amp; 3rd Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>9 March 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>22 January 2006</td>
<td>1st Country Review Report</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>26 May 2004</td>
<td>1st Country Review Report</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>29 June 2008</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>26 Jan 2013</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>9 March 2003</td>
<td>1st Country Review Report</td>
<td>1st 2nd &amp; 3rd Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>22 Jan 2006</td>
<td>1st Country Review Report</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: https://www.aprm-au.org/map-areas/ July 15, 2019

Table 3.0 points out that, the pace of reviews has accelerated following a slow beginning in 2003. The countries who underwent the review have examined nearly every facet of governance by their own people, African experts and eventually fellow heads of state; they have produced frank evaluations of actual issues; and they have established action programs to address governance gaps (Field Interview, 2019; Gruzd, 2009). Also, while variations in the extent of civil society
involvement had emerged in individual states, the APRM’s involvement of civil society has become more accepted.

3.4 Feats of the APRM in Promoting Good Governance and Development in Africa

3.4.1 Open Governance and Transparency

The acceptance of the APRM process shows to what extent African political leaders have opened up to governance transparency, accountability and good habits. The APRM mechanism is also a demonstration of how African governments can rely on funds from development partners. Hence, the APRM process has witnessed some results, as some African leaders have embraced the initiative. In the words of Prof. Henrietta Mensa-Bonsu, “the APRM has been able to draw attention to some of the deficit in governance which had allowed for corruption, human right abuses and other bad practices to flourish in Africa” (Field Interview, 2019).

Amos Sawyer in an interview with Africa Renewal Magazine (2015: 20) touted some progress of the APRM. According to him, Four or five critical problems were identified in the 2006 assessment of Kenya in the 2007-2008 electoral violence report, which had returned to haunt the nation (Africa Renewal Magazine, 2015). Hence, if the Kenya APRM country report recommendations in 2017 were implemented, there were indication that the 2007-2008 electoral violent could have been prevented. Also, he indicated that the issue of xenophobia was captured in the South Africa Country Review Report, which the government initially denied. The South African government felt the APRM Governing Council was wrong at many sticking points. The Governing Council of the APRM, however, stuck to their report and it passed through. Later on, South African government was caught up with the xenophobia problem, unfortunately after it blew up in 2008. This illustrates that, the 2007 South Africa APRM report warned against the xenophobic conflicts
that arose in May 2008 in South Africa. Thus, the APRM reports acted as an early warning system of imminent threats to the continent's peace and stabilization.

Again, Prof. Michael Chege, Chairman of the APRM Governing Council-Kenya, in Kenya’s review documentary (2016) pointed out that, through the review process, the country got very good advice on political governance and corporate governance and some have manifested into laws which have been enacted by parliament, which led to Kenya’s second review in January 2017. Bing-Pappoe (2007: 15-16) asserts that Ghana’s country review mission in drafting its Country Review Report, visited and held conferences in several regional capitals, including Ho (Volta and Eastern areas), Cape Coast (Central and Western areas), Wa (Upper West, Upper East and Northern areas) and Kumasi (Ashanti and Brong-Ahafo areas), to meet with regional stakeholders. During these conferences, the team leaders evaluated, among other factors, the amount of broad involvement, the role of national stakeholders in decision-making, and region-specific difficulties.

Also, in the words of Prof. Henrietta Mensa-Bonsu:

“\textit{The APRM has reaffirmed African countries who have undergone the review process long-established knowledge and readiness to safeguard and encourage constitutional and political rights, particularly Ghana's. The APRM also provides African countries with the possibility to reinforce their governance structures and systems. Thus, the mechanism allows governance in Africa to be benchmarked by joint African and global standards as well as provides the opportunity for citizens of the countries who have availed themselves to be peer reviewed to be involved in the assessment of how they are governed}” (Field Interview, 2019)
3.4.2 The Establishment of the District Oversight Committee by District Assemblies in Ghana

Mrs. Asare also pointed out that, Ghana for instance took the APRM further to the district level, which led to the establishment of the District Oversight Committee (DOC) in the various Assemblies across the country (Field Interview, 2019). The DOC is a group of individual volunteers comprising of several groups including Trade Unions, Teachers, Market Associations, Hairdressers Associations, Drivers Unions, Persons with Disability, among others. The DOC is a means of monitoring the Program of Action implementation at the district level. Hence, the ordinary citizen is given the opportunity to have a stake in the implementation of various policies at the local level. Mrs. Asare added that, the APRM monitor the Work of the DOC through the National Commission for Civic Education (NCCE) who are ex-officio members heading the DOC (Field Interview, 2019).

3.4.3 The District Governance Performance Assessment adopted by Ghana

Mrs. Asare asserted that through the reports from the DOC, the APRM National Secretariat prepares a District Governance Assessment Report (DGAR) (Field Interview, 2019). The DGAR is intended to evaluate and track progress in Ghana’s governance and service delivery. The DGAR is therefore performed through a study that combines a sample household study, focus group conversations, and specialist interviews. Mr. Marrah said the DGAR took place in Ghana from 2009-2015 (Field Interview, 2019). Also, according to the experts interviewed, the DGAR evaluation measures the status of the relationship between the state and the citizenry by concentrating on the status of local governance and public service delivery at the local level (Field Interview, 2019). Thus, it captures citizens’ voices on important problems of local governance and public service delivery. Hammed & Kabo (2013) point out that Ghana’s annual progress report for 2007 highlighted the successful stories of the Ghanaian tax authorities and the reduction of
corporate and withholding fees, which have improved the operational revenues of companies and enhance access to the key social issues and has resulted in a series of measures including the ratification of the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights.

1.10.6 Implementing the Peer Review Reports and the Annual Progress Reports

Mrs. Asare postulated that the various African governments who underwent the review process had inculcated most of the recommendations made in their Annual Progress Report in their development agendas (Field Interview, 2019). She indicated that, Ghana for instance, during President Kufuor’s tenure opted for HIPIC because the APRM had recommended that the country was highly indebted (Field Interview, 2019). Accordingly, in 2003 the Government chose to create the Highly Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) Fund, a tool to decrease the country's poverty and debt load. Ghana spent a great deal on debt servicing with its economic resources, as a result, little revenue was left for social sector investment (Abebrese, 2011). Ghana’s primary creditors at the time, agreed to lift their debt over a period by entering the HIPC initiative, so that revenue can be used for social sector investment in reducing poverty (Abebrese, 2011). In order to decrease its debt to a viable level, HIPC assisted Ghana decrease its debt by around 30% by 2006 (Osei & Quartey, 2011). In 2007, Ghana’s GDP was rebased making it a low-middle revenue country of more than $1300 per capita (Osei & Quartey, 2011).

Also, the APRM has resulted in concrete reforms in Ghana, including; a new Ministry of Chieftaincy and Culture, an upper limit on the amount of magistrates in the Supreme Court, a lower cabinet under President Kufuor, the adoption of the Whistleblower Act, the Disability Act, the introduction of the Freedom of Information Bill, the establishment of a NEPAD School Feeding Programme and NEPAD e-schools (Field Interview, 2019). The adoption of the Whistleblower Act and the introduction of the Freedom of Information Bill was an assurance to
the public that the government is transparent and accountable. Also, the setup of the Ministry of Chieftaincy and Culture was to help to deal with chieftainship problems and to empower the chiefs to bring financial prosperity and political maturity to their people (APRM-Ghana Annual Progress Report, 2006).

The APRM-Ghana Annual Progress Report (2006) points out that, the Judicial Council under Kufuor’s Administration, released a declaration stating that the Council had a protocol stipulating that the number of judges of the Supreme Court will not exceed 13. Again, the APRM- Ghana Annual Progress Report (2006) reported that, The Kufuor administration paid reparations to approximately 2,000 Ghanaians who under former governments suffered various human rights abuses. USD 1.5 million in payments was part of the National Reconciliation Commission’s recommendations formed in 2001 to address violations of human rights committed under various governments since Ghana gained independence in 1957. Under Act 715 of the Disability Act, special desks for the registering of unemployed individuals with disabilities are to be created at different work centers nationwide. The APRM-Ghana Progress Report (2006) indicates that, the government have the obligation of providing the registered individuals with equal access to work through the district assemblies in their districts.

The NEPAD School Feeding Program was launched in 2005 under President Kufuor’s administration, which aimed at addressing both hunger and encourage higher enrolment rates in primary schools. The NEPAD School Feeding Programme was an undertaking of pillar three of the Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP), one of NEPAD’s sector specific programs aimed at promoting development in Africa (Abebrese, 2011). In addition, the NEDAP School Feeding Program was instituted as part of Ghana’s efforts to meet the MDG’s targets on hunger, poverty and universal primary education (Grebe, 2015). Under this initiative,
children in deprived government primary schools and kindergartens receive one warm, nutritious lunch a day, prepared with locally grown food stuffs. Thus, Abebrese (2011: 9) asserts that the objectives of the NEPAD School Feeding Programme was to increase education enrollment, participation and retention, decrease starvation and malnutrition, and increase national food production.

According to Grudz (2009), Rwanda also made some fundamental reforms to its business environment from the APRM and integrated its Program of Action into its Strategy for Economic Development and Poverty Reduction. Also, from the APRM review process, Kenya pointed out laws passed on witness protection and public procurement, new funds to foster the development of youth and women, and a draft national land policy created through consultation (Grudz, 2009). Issues flagged by the APRM in South Africa, such as unregulated private funding to political parties and parliamentary floor crossing, were planned for reform (Grudz, 2009).

### 3.5 Challenges of the APRM

#### 3.5.1 Voluntary Participation

As rightly explained, the APRM is a self-monitoring system, in which Member States of the African Union have to willingly accede to. This institutional provision is, however, problematic. With the APRM being the most innovative and critically significant aspect of NEPAD, making its membership voluntarily somehow defeats the holistic approach of the NEPAD. Voluntary involvement in the APRM undermines African leaders’ commitment to the principles of good governance as set out in the NEPAD. It is ridiculous that African leaders make a collective commitment to promoting socio-economic growth and promising good political and economic governance, but oppose the tool that is intended to assist them enhance governance. Thus,
collective attempts to enhance governance are undermined by voluntary involvement. Also, Akokpari (2004: 253) postulates that, the challenge with the membership of the APRM being voluntary is how, for example, a regime that persists in violations of human rights and bad governance practices can be reformed if it withdraws from the APRM or simply refuses to accede to the APRM.

Therefore, the APRM lacks certain compulsion elements. The process does not have clear ways to compel deviant states to reform. This rather loose set-up, with no apparent internal mechanisms of coercion, failed to force some African countries to enter the APRM. This has also accounted for some Members states of the APRM, though acceding to the initiative, have not undergone the review progress. Hence, as evidenced in table 3.0, out of the 37 member states of the APRM, as much as 15 are yet to undergo the peer review process, though most of such countries acceded to the APRM as far as 2003-2004. Although the growing number of the APRM membership is an achievement, the mere addition of more members without any serious commitment to reform dilutes the overall mechanism’s effectiveness.

3.5.2 Political Will
The APRM's success or failure relies on the political will of member states to enforce the APRM programs. The APRM expect African leaders to conduct their affairs in an honest, democratic, efficient, and transparent manner and voluntarily submit to peer review and implement policies that may be unpopular. Akokpari (2004) explicates that historically, only the global creditor community, using the menace of suspension of assistance and the use of the impact of their home governments by international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), was efficient in spawning reversals in African countries’ national, even foreign, policies. The APRM on the other hand which is touted as a home-grown initiative meant to induce good governance, has been met with political
resistance from some African countries who stand to lose without countervailing support from those who might gain from the initiative. Though as indicated, 22 of 37 Member States have undergone the rigorous review process, follow-up and implementation of recommendations however, have failed. Gruzd & Turianskyi (2018) postulate that most countries have not implemented their National Program of Action, and where the APRM set up early warnings, flagging Kenya's potential for electoral violence, Mozambique's instability and South Africa's xenophobia, there was a lack of political will to address these clefts at the highest level.

Also, the experts interviewed indicated that the inability of heads of state and government to be active at the APRM forum has been a major challenge. Only 10 Heads of State participated in the January 2018 Forum conference of 37 Member States. However, this was the highest average participation in latest forums since only a few were held after 2010 due to lack of interest in the forums by member states. This is as a result of a change in leadership tide in Africa. Hence, most of the leaders who adopted the APRM and were committed to the initiative are no longer in power. The effective and efficient working of the initiative, including fair and detailed ‘peer reviews’ and implementation of the Programme of Action, is not achievable without political engagement to the APRM at the level of Heads of State.

3.5.3 Funding

The experts interviewed alluded that, the major challenge confronting the APRM both at the continental and national level is financial constraint. The APRM is financed from participating countries’ contributions, while sought, donor financial assistance is not regarded the primary source of financing. The APRM Secretariat has struggled for years to have Member States pay their minimum $100,000 annual subscriptions, which went up to $200,000 in 2016 (Field Interview, 2019). This contribution does not include financing the country-level APRM
procedures. This money, according to Bing-Pappoe (2007), is used to fund the operations of the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons and the Continental APRM Secretariat. In addition, an “APRM Trust Fund” has been created, to be managed by the UNDP, in which donors and African nations can put their economic assistance. To obtain the desired outcomes, sufficient funds would be needed to guarantee that all APRM mandates are financed. A nation needs an outlay of adequate human, material, and economic assets for a method as broadly advisory as the APRM (Field Interview, 2019). Gruzd & Turianskyi (2018) assert that at the 10th anniversary of the APRM, donor funds had been depleted and dues had not been paid by Member States. Therefore, while self-financing would guarantee the African ownership and leadership of the APRM, many African nations have failed to make such contribution.

### National and Continental Structures

Between 2010 and 2015, the continental APRM was plagued with leadership crisis, with no leader in the helm of affairs. Gruzd & Turianskyi (2018) asserts that, the APRM came to a halt around its 10th anniversary with allegations of financial mismanagement at the Secretariat and questions about the absence of a permanent Chief Executive Officer (CEO). Also, Mr. Marrah asserted that, the lack of a CEO at the Continental APRM Secretariat at Midrand affected the functions of the APRM, as within that period, no country underwent review, as well, only three countries acceded to the APRM (Field Interview, 2019).

At the national structure level, Ghana for instance had its initial Governing Council made up some eminent persons. President Kufuor, the first president to accede to APRM constituted the first Governing Council, made up of eminent persons. However, under the erstwhile Mahama administration, the new Council was constituted base on institutional representation. Also, it took the National Democratic Congress (NDC) under President Mahama more than two years to
reconstitute the new Governing Council, which was done on institutional representation (Field Interview, 2019). According to Prof. Henrietta Mensa-Bonsu, the second Governing Council was made up of ex-officio members who due to their busy schedule hardly made it to meetings and this affected the effectiveness of the Governing Council (Field Interview, 2019). She also asserted that, she was the only female on the Governing Council and that was because she was the Director for the institution she represented and not for gender representation (Field Interview, 2019). She further indicated that some members had to resign from the Governing Council including herself because their tenure of office of the institutions they represented had elapsed (Field Interview, 2019). According to Mr. Marrah, Prof. Kwesi Botwey, for instance, had to resign as the chairperson of NDPC because his government had lost power, he represented the NDPC on the council (Field Interview, 2019).

### 3.5.5 APRM as a Donor-Imposed Agenda

The APRM and NEPAD as a whole have been criticized as a donor-imposed development plan repackaged under supposed African ownership (Olukushi, 2002:9). Olukushi (2002), asserts that, NEPAD in premised on the view that the tenets of good governance are upheld by Africa, in return, the Global West offer more support, debt alleviation and market opening.

Also, the NEPAD document has committed African leaders to respecting ‘global norms of democracy’ that include multi-party democracy, market liberalization, political pluralism and fair, open and democratic elections organized periodically so that individuals may choose their leaders (NEPAD, 2001). Thus, the choice of ‘global democratic norms’ poses the question of the absence of other democracy principles such as African values to guide the growth of African countries. Historically, African leaders’ efforts towards political reform have turned out to be a
‘smokescreen’ as they seem to react to pressure from donors and global lending organizations, leading to ‘convenient democracies’ that do not address Africans’ genuine political reforms.

Some African leaders, on the other hand, have adopted the strategy of ‘wait and see’. What this mean is that, most African countries were reluctant to accede to the APRM, accounting for only three countries acceding to it at its birth. Also, as indicated, 14 African countries have not acceded to the APRM as at 2018, while 15 countries have acceded, yet have not undergone the review process. Although there may be a variety of reasons for not participation, it can be argued that some African leaders seem to consider the APRM as a scorecard and fear that the review mechanism might threaten their state sovereignty through the imposition of governance or an ‘unseen hand’ on governance by outside parties. In Africa, the APRM is therefore suffering from the absence of wide buy-in, despite the imperatives for good governance (Field Interview, 2019).

3.5.6 African Leadership

African leadership mainly did not produce the strategic vision for political stabilization and socio-economic growth and effectiveness of governance required. Instead, African rulers have exercised government power, using it for their own private gains (Gruzd & Turianskyi, 2018). The practice has resulted in the growth of leadership crisis that undermines the ability of the state to perform its fundamental duties including the provision basic life necessities such as safety, food, shelter, and healthcare. As a consequence, despite the richness of the continent in natural resources, Africans suffer from all kinds of ills, including hunger, wars, illnesses, and pervasive poverty. Accordingly, the nature of Africa's political leadership indicates that merely institutionalizing APRM does not ensure that good governance principles are respected as described in the Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance (Hope, 2015).
Although the principles and values of good governance contained in the Declaration have been generally accepted, many African rulers continue to manipulate their constitutions and political procedures in ways that undermine good governance, peace and financial growth. They are unwilling to engage in governance organizations, including the APRM. It is as a result of this behavior, that more than half of the AU Member States are yet to undergo the review process.

3.6 The Future Prospects of the APRM

Mrs. Asare asserted that, the APRM was sustainable and was not going away anytime soon (Field Interview, 2019). The experts interviewed indicated that, the APRM had been integrated into the AU and now serves as an early warning instrument for the AU. Hence, a significant prospective input of the APRM to domestic, regional and continental politics has to do with its use as an early warning mechanism to avert domestic crises and its ripple effect in neighboring states and, in some instances, throughout Africa. The APRM concept as described in the APRM Base Document obviously indicated this (ECA, 2011:13). The importance of the APRM, as well as the forecast of the imminent domestic catastrophe, was demonstrated in the Country Review Report of both Kenya and South Africa which foresaw the 2007 general elections violence in Kenya and the outbreaks of xenophobic assaults in South Africa.

The experts interviewed also asserted that the APRM has been mandated to monitor the Agenda 2063 and the Sustainable Development Goals (Field Interview, 2019). On the event of the Golden Jubilee of the AU, Africa’s Heads of Government and State recognized past accomplishments and challenges and rededicated itself to the Pan African dream which long for a coordinated, prosperous and serene Africa, driven by its very own citizens and plating the role to a dynamic power in the global scene. This led to the birth of the AU’s ‘Agenda 2063’. Hence, the APRM is
tasked by the AU with an extra mandate to track the governance aspects of the AU's 50-year development plan, Agenda 2063, as well as the 17 Sustainable Development Goals of the UN. The APRM is to provide enhanced progress reports on the Agenda 2063 and SDGs, with focus on SDG 16 and 17, and Agenda 2063 aspirations 3 and 4.

SDG 16 aims “to encourage viable growth in peaceful and inclusive communities, provide access for all to judiciary, and create efficient, responsible and inclusive institutions at all levels” as reflected in Agenda 2063 in Aspiration 3 (UN General Assembly 2015; AU, 2015). Agenda 2063 Aspiration 3 seeks to promote an Africa of good governance, democracy, respect for human rights, justice and the rule of law (AU 2015: 5). SDG 17 also focusses on promoting development alliances and reflects aspiration 7 in Agenda 2063 (UN General Assembly, 2015; AU, 2015). Agenda 2063, aspiration 7 talks about Africa being a strong, united and influential global player and partner (AU, 2015: 9-10). Accordingly, the APRM has the additional obligation to shed light on African countries’ domestic experiences in integrating the SDGs in their National Development Plans (NDPs) and monitoring their execution.

Also, according to Gruzd & Turianskyi (2018), the spark that marked the APRM’s resurgence was the appointment of South African Professor Eddy Maloka in January 2016 as the CEO of the APRM continental secretariat. He rejuvenated the APRM with his Three Rs’ approach, which is; reinvigorating, restoring, and re-energizing an initiative that crumbled with fatigue, mismanagement, and stagnation (Gruzd & Turianskyi, 2018). Mr. Marrah also asserted that the current CEO of the APRM has revitalized the APRM by introducing new perspectives to the scheme including; increasing the APRM Secretariat personnel in Midrand, initiating an ambitious 2016-2020 Strategic Plan, lobbying for more countries to be reviewed annually and for the reviews to be cheaper and faster and actively encouraged non-members to accede (Field Interview, 2019).
3.7 Conclusion

The important role played by the APRM as a NEPAD program focusing on good governance cannot be overemphasized, as NEPAD and the AU’s achievement depends on it. Although the APRM encountered some challenges as indicated, it has launched a process of dialogue which was alien to Africa, including how to address issues of governance and development, among public organizations, civil societies and industry players. Moreover, the APRM Guidelines have shown that the execution and tracking of the Program of Action arising out of the peer review process has encompassed the inputs from various stakeholders. The APRM initiative has thus, created and reinforced in the long term, the culture that is crucial to consolidate democracy and better governance in Africa for common involvement in decision making.
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CHAPTER FOUR
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the research findings, provides conclusions from the study, and makes some recommendations.

4.2 Summary of the Research Findings

The objective of this research was to ascertain the significance of the APRM in encouraging good governance and development in Africa. The study used qualitative research methods that included; purposeful sampling, semi-structured interviews, and procedures involving systematic and concurrent data collection and data analysis. Due to the unique nature of the research, purposive sampling method was used to pick few and appropriate experts for the research.

The research outlines and explains some of the tenets of the APRM. The concept of peer review, mandate, purpose, principles, participation, as well as the process of the APRM are discussed in detail. The funding of the APRM is also discussed in detail. The activities of the APRM are financed by individual countries who have acceded to the APRM. In addition, an “APRM Trust Fund” has been created, to be managed by the UNDP, in which donors and African nations can put their economic assistance.

The study reveals that the APRM has since its inception made significant strides both at the continental and national level. The APRM has opened up the political arena for citizens to participate in policy discussions, encouraged domestic dialog and stimulus for innovation, strengthened advocacy for excellent governance and better service delivery. At 2018, 38 out of the
52 African countries had acceded to the APRM. 22 of the 38 countries had undergone their first review, out of which, Kenya has had its second review. Thus, the countries that underwent the review examined nearly every facet of governance by their own people, African experts and ultimately fellow heads of state, which produced frank evaluations of actual issues and the setup of the Program of Action to address gaps in governance.

The research further points out that the APRM has induced good governance in Africa, particularly in Ghana. In Africa, various countries that underwent the review process have included the Program of Action and the Annual Progress Report in their development strategies. The APRM has also served as early warning mechanism prompting countries like South Africa and Kenya of emerging violence. In Ghana, through the APRM concrete reforms occurred under the erstwhile Kufuor administration including; a new Ministry of Chieftaincy and Culture, an upper limit on the amount of magistrates in the Supreme Court, a lower cabinet under President Kufuor, the adoption of the Whistleblower Act, the Disability Act, the introduction of the Freedom of Information Bill, the establishment of a NEPAD School Feeding Programme and NEPAD e-schools.

The research also discusses some of the challenges of the APRM, which have affected its efficiency and effectiveness. These challenges include; the APRM’s voluntary nature, issues with the APRM’s national and continental structures, absence of adequate financing, the lack of political will, and leadership crisis in Africa.

The research identifies that, the APRM has been tasked with monitoring the Agenda 2063 and the Sustainable Development Goals, with much focus on SDG 16 and 17, and Agenda 2063 aspirations 3 and 4. The APRM is tasked by the AU with an extra mandate to track the governance aspects of
the AU’s 50-year development plan, Agenda 2063, as well as the 17 Sustainable Development Goals of the UN.

4.3 Conclusion

In a nutshell, the APRM is an African governance tool developed in 2003 to monitor and assess African countries’ political, economic and corporate governance. It is mainly designed to encourage political stability, high economic growth, sustainability and accelerated continental economic integration through policies, norms and procedures. The concept of setting up an African surveillance system originated as an answer to the issues and difficulties of governance facing the continent since independence and the consequent political instability and underperformance of the economy.

The research analyzed the APRM’s capacity to tackle critical political governance problems in Africa. The analyses and suggestions in this study have highlighted the APRM’s major limitations. These include the APRM’s voluntary nature, issues with the APRM’s national and continental structures, absence of adequate financing, the lack of political will as well as leadership crisis in Africa. The APRM’s uniqueness lies in its broad participatory process, enabling people to participate in their country’s governance and public affairs surveillance.

The study however in its assessment of the APRM, does not pretend to be exhaustive. The study concludes that, further research on a number of problems is needed to further elucidate the multiple problems facing the APRM in its efforts to promote governance, and bring political stability and economic development in Africa.
4.4 Recommendations

The study suggests the following recommendations based on the study findings:

For the APRM in Ghana, it is recommended that;

The government should institutionalize the APRM organizations by supporting the National APRM Governing Council and Secretariat through a parliamentary act, rather than relying on Ghana's accession to NEPAD and APRM treaties at African level, as is now the situation. This will ensure that, irrespective of the government in power, they remain committed to the APRM.

The Ghana government must also deepen the national APRM’s Governing Council’s independence and ensure higher continuity by selecting its representatives for fixed terms of office. The Governing Council’s membership should be staggered so that at least half of its membership is changed at regular intervals. The membership should also not be based on institutional representation, but rather experienced and eminent persons should be appointed to serve on the council.

In addition, the government should put in the Public Domain as quickly as feasible the Ghana Country Self-Assessment Report and all its supporting documents. Likewise, organize workshops and seminars for stakeholders to assess, what suggestions they have for tracking the execution of the National Program of Action. This would intend enhance ownership and creating consciousness among stakeholders and the citizenry.

For the APRM at the continental level, it is recommended that;

Financing of the APRM must be negotiated and determined, depending on a country’s financial ability. Hence, the APRM must avoid the one-fits-all model, where regardless of an African
country’s economic growth and resources, it is tasked to contribute resources because it cut across. While the values and principles of good governance are universal, it is necessary to recognize and consider the cultural and social, political and economic differences that are characteristic of African countries. It is also imperative for African leaders to commit financial resources to supporting these projects. African leaders cannot continue to depend on donors for their initiatives.

Likewise, the AU must make the benefits of NEPAD projects conditional upon accession to the APRM. This will involve a state to acknowledge peer review to engage in a specific NEPAD project. Indeed, peer review is essential because some collective initiatives may require harmonization of standards and practices. This will further compel African states to accede to the APRM.

In addition, the AU should implement the APRM at the Regional level, rather than centralizing the mechanism. This would ensure that various leaders are committed to the initiative. If implemented at the REC level, peer reviews may be more acceptable and efficient for African nations. All African States belong to one or two RECs and the feeling of belonging to these regional blocs seems to be more pronounced than continental structures. The RECs could be more efficient in ensuring that the peer review is carried out in all member states, as they have the authority to impose penalties, if need be. Regionalizing the APRM, however, may be costly, since it needs human, financial, technical resources.
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6 Appendix ‘A’: Interview Guide for Staff at Ghana’s APRM Secretariat

Introduction

This interview guide is designed to solicit views on the topic: The Agenda for Good Governance, and Development in Africa: An assessment of the Relevance of the African Peer Review Mechanism. My name is Wisdom Korsitse, a Master of Arts (MA) student of the Legon Center for International Affairs and Diplomacy, University of Ghana. This study is conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of MA in International Affairs and Diplomacy.

I would be very grateful if you could volunteer and assist me by way of providing the relevant information needed to complete this research work. This interview is purely for an academic purpose; thus, confidentiality is strongly upheld.

Thank you very much and I am looking forward to your support to enable me to complete this study successfully.

Thank you, and I look forward to receiving your assistance to enable me to effectively finish my dissertation.

Contact Details

Tel: +233548846632  Email: wkorsitse@gmail.com

Interview Questions
1. In your view, what is Peer Review?

2. How are other Peer Reviews different from the African Peer Review?

3. What is the Africa Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)?

4. In your view, is the APRM serving its purpose?

5. Can you give a brief description of what the APRM process entails?

6. How relevant has the APRM been in promoting good governance and development in Africa?

7. What are some of the successes of the APRM?

8. What are some of the challenges facing the APRM?

9. Have these challenges (identified in Q. 6) been addressed? If yes, how have they been addressed? If no, how can they be address?

10. In your view, what is the future prospect of the APRM?

7 Appendix ‘B’: Interview Guide for Members of Ghana’s APRM Governing Council

Introduction

This interview guide is designed to solicit views on the topic: The Agenda for Good Governance, and Development in Africa: An assessment of the Relevance of the African Peer Review Mechanism. My name is Wisdom Korsitse, a Master of Arts (MA) student of the Legon Center for International Affairs and Diplomacy, University of Ghana. This study is conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of MA in International Affairs and Diplomacy.

I would be very grateful if you could volunteer and assist me by way of providing the relevant information needed to complete this research work. This interview is purely for an academic purpose; thus, confidentiality is strongly upheld.
Thank you very much and I am looking forward to your support to enable me to complete this study successfully.

Thank you, and I look forward to receiving your assistance to enable me to effectively finish my dissertation.

**Contact Details**

Tel: +233548846632   Email: wkorsitse@gmail.com

**Interview Questions**

1. What is the Africa Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)?
2. In your view, is the APRM serving its purpose?
3. How relevant has the APRM been in promoting good governance and development in Africa?
4. What were some of the key issues the review process in Ghana sort to address?
5. Was the review process in Ghana comprehensive enough (did it capture all the key issues stated in Q.5)?
6. What are some of the successes of the APRM?
7. What are some of the challenges facing the APRM?
8. Have these challenges (identified in Q. 6) been addressed? If yes, how have they been addressed? If no, how can they be address?
9. In your view, what is the future prospect of the APRM?