

United Nations Expert Group Meeting on

**Promoting Partnerships in Support of African  
Peer Review Mechanism Implementation**

15-16 November 2007  
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Organized by the Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (OSAA)

## **Acknowledgements**

The United Nations Office of the Special Adviser on Africa expresses its sincere thanks and appreciation to the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) for facilitating the hosting of the meeting at its facilities in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and in particular to the Under-Secretary-General and Executive Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Abdoulie Janneh for graciously placing staff and services at its disposal.

It also wishes to thank the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)-Addis for the logistical support provided on the ground. It further wishes to thank the African Peer Review Mechanism Secretariat in Midrand, UNECA-Addis, UNDP-New York and the UN Peacebuilding Support Office-New York (Strategic Planning) for the substantive support provided to OSAA in preparation for the meeting.

Finally it wishes to thank all participants for their contribution towards making the meeting a success.

## **Table of Contents**

- I. Executive Summary**
  - II. Introduction**
  - III. Session One: Overview of key issues**
  - IV. Session Two: Country presentations – Ghana, Rwanda, Algeria**
  - V. Session Three: Country presentations – Kenya, Mauritius, South Africa**
  - VI. Session Four: Strengthening governance in APRM participating countries**
  - VII. Session Five: Regional and other partnerships**
  - VIII. Summary and Recommendations**
- Annexes:**
- 1. Programme**
  - 2. List of participants**

## **I. Executive Summary**

The United Nations Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (OSAA) organized an Expert Group Meeting on the theme “Promoting Partnerships in Support of African Peer Review Mechanism Implementation”, from 15-16 November 2007 at the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The main objectives of the meeting were to provide a forum for the sharing of experiences and best practices by countries which had undertaken the peer review or were well advanced in the process, and to identify ways in which the international community, including the donor community and the UN system, could best contribute to the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) process.

The meeting brought together some 30 experts and representatives from government, civil society, including academia, and the private sector of African countries, African regional and sub-regional organizations involved in the APRM process, as well as UN strategic partners of the APRM.

The deliberations focused on the impact of the African Peer Review Mechanism process on strengthening governance and development prospects in participating countries, as well as the role of the international community in supporting the implementation process.

The main outcome of the meeting was a broad set of recommendations agreed to by participants stipulating the following:

- While recognizing that participating African countries must take ownership of the APRM process, there is nevertheless a role for international development partners to play in supporting the implementation of National Development Programmes incorporating the APRM National Programmes of Action.
- In providing support to the APRM, partners should consider channeling their contributions through national, regional and sub-regional African institutions and using trust funds on the basis of the principles of the African Peer Review Mechanism. These principles include no conditionality, freedom from interference and the streamlining and expediting of donor processes.
- Development Partners’ contributions should be used to support national priorities as identified in the National Development Programmes incorporating the APRM Programmes of Actions.
- In giving support, emphasis should be given to the following areas:
  - Institutional Development
  - Management Development
  - Technical Skills Development

- Multilateral and bilateral development partners and national actors should support the development of a vigorous advocacy strategy to help deepen the knowledge and awareness of the APRM.
- Development partners could promote the APRM by communicating the review findings, and helping to build capacity and knowledge management tools.
- International development partners' efforts are needed to support capacity building of Civil Society Organizations and to finance and facilitate African private-sector dialogue.
- The role of the African Diaspora should be emphasized; the Diaspora should be the target of advocacy efforts as well as initiators of advocacy efforts to broaden and deepen the awareness and support of the broadest African Diaspora community.

The meeting received substantive and logistical support from the Office of the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and from UNDP, as well as from the APRM Secretariat in South Africa.

## **II. Introduction**

In keeping with its mission of promoting international support for durable peace and sustainable development in Africa, the United Nations Office of the Special Adviser on Africa (OSAA) convened an Expert Group Meeting on “*Promoting Partnerships in Support of African Peer Review Mechanism Implementation*” on 15-16 November 2007 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

The mandate of OSAA includes global advocacy in favour of and promoting international support for the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), an African-led framework for Africa’s renewal. The promotion of good governance is amongst NEPAD’s priorities, together with the promotion of peace and security, as preconditions for growth and development. In line with its advocacy and analytical responsibility for NEPAD implementation, OSAA reports on the implementation of the African Peer Review Mechanism through the annual reports of the United Nations Secretary-General to the General Assembly on the implementation of NEPAD and on the Causes of Conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa.

The objectives of the two-day Expert Group Meeting were to:

1. Provide a forum for the sharing of experiences and best practices by countries which have undertaken the peer review;
2. Identify ways in which the international community, including the donor community and the UN system, can best contribute to the APRM process; and
3. Contribute to increased collaboration of UN system partners in support of Africa’s development.

The meeting was attended by some 30 participants, including Members of National APRM Governing Councils of Kenya, Algeria, Rwanda, Ghana, South Africa, Ethiopia, and Mauritius, representatives of the APRM Secretariat, APRM strategic partners of UNDP and UNECA, UN Peacebuilding Support Office, ECOWAS and IGAD Secretariats, African civil society organizations, independent experts from academia, and African private sector organizations.

Deliberations were adjudged a large success by all participants and were centered on the impact of the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) process on strengthening governance and development prospects in participating countries, as well as the role of the international community in supporting the implementation process.

### **Opening Remarks by Mr. Abdoulie Janneh, Under-Secretary-General and Executive Secretary, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa**

In his opening remarks, Mr. Abdoulie Janneh noted that the Economic Commission for Africa was particularly pleased to welcome OSAA’s organization of this Expert Group Meeting focusing on the most topical governance initiative in Africa today, the African

Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). He underscored the role of the APRM in the promotion of good governance in Africa, pointing out that the APRM is recognized globally as the crowning jewel of the NEPAD initiative - a plan by Africans to improve governance by identifying weaknesses, setting benchmarks, and monitoring progress in attaining them. It is a unique initiative because no other region in the world has attempted to implement such a comprehensive, wide-ranging peer review mechanism that covers all the dimensions of governance - democratic and political, economic and management; corporate, socio-economic and developmental.

He expressed continued support from UNECA for the APRM process in providing technical and human support, facilitating peer learning through workshops, and developing a database on gender mainstreaming. He pointed out, however, that one of the critical issues facing the successful implementation of the APRM is the mobilization of internal and external resources in support of the implementation of the APRM Programmes of Action (PoA), without compromising the integrity of the initiative as an African-owned and African-led process. This issue is extremely important because it defines the parameters of partnerships with external actors in the implementation of the APRM.

In accordance with key APRM principles of African ownership and leadership, countries are expected to take primary responsibility for funding the identified priority governance improvements under the National Programmes of Action. While donors could supplement where there are financing gaps, this should be done in ways that do not compromise the principles of the APRM. The challenge is how the APRM should receive assistance from outside Africa yet still keep the concept local.

He expressed the view that the Expert Group Meeting was a good opportunity for an in-depth look at the practical challenges facing the APRM, especially as more countries moved forward in implementing the APRM process and the resulting Programmes of Action. He challenged the participants to debate vigorously and honestly, with the aim of coming up with solid proposals on how the APRM can win the financial support of the international community and still maintain its African-owned identity and integrity.

### **III. Session One: Overview of key issues**

In his presentation, Professor Michelo Hansungule applauded the innovation of the APRM concept by African leaders, who were previously thought to be unconcerned about the internal affairs of other African countries. He regarded the APRM as the most ambitious and innovative initiative to have come out of Africa since decolonization. Hansungule noted that it was far-sighted and that although it still had institutional, legal and mechanical problems, the idea behind it had no precedent in post-colonial governance in Africa.

He was of the view that one of Africa's greatest problems since independence was governance and that the APRM aimed to address governance deficits in African countries. It was a far-sighted mutually agreed instrument for self-monitoring by the

participating states. It was a mechanism adopted by African leaders to enable them to govern their nations better. Through the APRM, states would be pushed to pursue policies and practices that conform to the agreed political, economic and corporate governance values, codes and standards contained in the Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance.<sup>1</sup>

Professor Hansungule noted, however, that even as African States gradually embraced the initiative, the concept and institutions were initially developed by the leaders in closed door sessions and then handed to the public for acceptance. Subsequently, progress had since been made and civil society organizations were now endorsing the APRM process because the mechanism has been viewed as offering the best opportunity to dialogue with the state and its representatives on the issue of governance.

He outlined the various sources from which the APRM gets its legitimacy, in particular the base document and the guidelines. He noted that the APRM is a living document, noting a reference in the Base Document that “the Conference of participating countries shall review the APRM once every five years”. In this regard, a meeting was held in November 2007 to address issues and proposals for a revision of the instruments and base documents.

He raised concerns about the independence of the National Governing Councils and focal points, which are under the authority of the Executive in some countries. He also pointed out that the APRM is little known in a number of African countries, including among the intelligentsia. He therefore called for increased publicity to increase awareness of the APRM and urged everyone to act as its ambassadors.

According to Hansungule, the APRM can become a valuable tool for civil society to engage in the setting of priorities and for holding governments accountable. For civil society to fully benefit from this potential, the APRM process must encourage a free flow of information. The representative of Rwanda concurred that a key role of civil society is to monitor the implementation of the Programmes of Action.

### **Key discussion points:**

Professor Hansungule’s presentation elicited a vigorous response from participants covering a number of issues, as follows:

#### **Civil Society Participation in the APRM Process**

A participant noted that the APRM was conceived by the Heads of State and Government and civil society was not initially consulted. Civil society has subsequently come on board. This top down approach is still haunting the process and some civil societies even question the African authenticity of the APRM. It was argued that this should not be an issue since the Heads of State and government were initiators and are the leaders in the

---

<sup>1</sup> AHG/235/XXXVIII, Annex 1

implementation of the Programme of Action (POA). The concept should not be presented as a problem but should now be looked at in terms of innovation in governance.

### **Legality of APRM**

APRM was conceived from a Declaration by the Heads of States, and its establishment is not based on any international law, nor is its 'mother' Organization, NEPAD. Some argued that the APRM needs legitimacy not legality, thus have asserted that institutionalizing and domesticating the APRM would ensure the continuity of APRM. Others considered that the legality of the APRM should be established in order to withstand constitutional challenges and changes of government. Legalizing the APRM would also minimize future questions about the independence of National Governing Councils.

### **Publicity of the APRM**

After reviewing five countries, the APRM has been publicized from national to district levels, as exemplified in Ghana and Rwanda. Greater public awareness of the APRM should be encouraged in all reviewed countries.

### **Role of Partners**

It was agreed that although there was a need to include civil society, Government plays the major role in acceding to the Mechanism, providing resources and implementing the national programmes of action. It was recommended that citizens in the Diaspora be part of the partnership, as evidenced in Ghana.

### **Resources**

It was underscored that governments have primary responsibility for mobilizing resources to implement the national programmes of action, but it was noted that some countries were not able to secure the necessary resources to implement their respective programme of action and therefore needed to secure funding from partners. It was recommended that the APRM should respect the existing policies and standards. Moreover, support to projects should be coordinated in order not to duplicate what national programmes are doing. A participant made the point that for the process to be truly African-owned, Africa itself must provide an adequate level of resources. It also was noted that APRM resources are sometimes not specifically budgeted for but instead are grafted onto the national budgets. It was decided that funding could be sought for new activities and national budgets could be supported by strategic partners in implementing the APRM Programmes of Action.

### **Role of the Civil Society and leadership of the APRM**

A participant pointed out that the APRM was an innovation and involved a learning process in which there were no experts. He questioned the necessity of civil society

involvement at the inception of the APRM and in its implementation stage and observed that “civil society organizations were not necessarily representative”. Since the APRM is review of government, government must be central in the process. Government accedes, signs the Memorandum of Understanding, provides resources, creates partnerships, reviews policies and even implements the Programme of Action. Clearly, therefore, government takes the lead in political terms and in building capacity at all levels.

At the African Governance Forum VII (2007), it was agreed that:

- The state must continue to fulfill the central role as an agent of development and perform its oversight and regulatory duties
- Democratic practices must be inclusive
- Service delivery must be strengthened
- Partnership creation at the national and external levels should be emphasised

### **Other Partnerships**

It was suggested that apart from civil society there is a need to look at other domestic partnerships. Partnership with traditional leaders is thought to be very important, as there are countries where traditional chiefs play a key role in governance. Traditional institutions should be partners too, and their participation in APRM should be encouraged.

### **Independence of the National Governing Council and the Focal Point**

Although National Governing Councils should be independent, they should not be totally separate from the government which is needed as a key partner, *inter-alia*, to allocate resources to its functioning. Participants agreed that instead of looking at independence of the National Governing Councils, emphasis should be on empowering them.

## **IV. Country Presentations**

An important segment of the meeting was devoted to the sharing of experiences and best practices by each of the five (5) countries which had to date undertaken the peer review - Ghana, Rwanda, Algeria, Kenya and South Africa, as well as two (2) which were at various stages in the process – Mauritius and Ethiopia.

### **a) Ghana:**

Political commitment to the APRM process is a key ingredient to its success. Achieving political commitment was not a main challenge in Ghana because the Government was deeply committed to the APRM and allocated resources to the process. However, there were other challenges:

**Capacity constraints:** This challenge was addressed by cultivating a strong linkage between the National Governing Council and political policy input. Ghana had training programmes for the APRM and harmonised the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and Millennium Development Goal programmes, in addition to involving district service committees and national civic education programmes

**Funding:** Although a constraint, Ghana secured APRM funding from government consolidated funds and also received complementary donor funds.

**Creating ownership and popular participation:** Sensitising the population about the APRM was a challenge. However, Ghana employed a range of civic education programmes, TV programmes, seminars and journals, to raise awareness of the APRM at the grassroots level.

**Post APRM Review Implementation challenges** include Programme of Action implementation, design, costing and harmonising the APRM Programme of Action with existing national development programmes, and monitoring.

**Emphasis on the role of the civil society:** For the APRM to succeed, governments must demonstrate political will, listen to civil society and incorporate their input in the process. The APRM should therefore allow civil society concerns and voices to be heard to complement the central role of government in the development dialogue. The government must also develop an independent process to win the trust and ensure participation and ownership by civil society.

**Part of the value of the APRM is its potential to bring about** improvements in security and job creation and an increase in local and foreign investments. The lessons learned thus far are that efficient management of programmes and leadership structures is important, as is political commitment to the process; and that the early engagement, education and sensitisation of the populace is also important.

**The expected role of the international community and partners is that they will** pay due attention to the assessment of the APRM, support National Programmes of Action, coordinate their support, promote policies that allow free flow of foreign capital, and honour their pledges to expedite development in Ghana.

#### **b) Rwanda:**

A background of the APRM process was presented and various challenges identified, including human capacity constraints and inadequate guidance from the continental Secretariat and APRM panel, as well as challenges associated with Programme of Action implementation.

**The benefits of the APRM review included the opportunity to objectively** evaluate government using agreed international benchmarks, as well as to increase citizen participation in the process. In Rwanda, civil society was included in governmental

decision-making processes and the evaluation of ongoing national initiatives. In general, Rwanda's government views the APRM as an opportunity to showcase its post-conflict progress and success in creating an inclusive democracy.

**Rwanda has learned that** the role of the media was instrumental in the promotion of the process. The allocation of adequate resources was important, as well as an inclusive process and strong political will to facilitate Programme of Action implementation. The in-country triangular partnership between the media, civil society and government, as well as regional and sub-regional partners, bilateral and multilateral partners and APRM strategic partners, all played important roles in the process.

**The role of the international community in the post-review process was important in many respects, not least of which included** budget support, especially on stand-alone activities, as well as its support of NEPAD development projects in infrastructure and agriculture. It also facilitated the sharing of best practices, supported countries during the peer review process and enhanced the capacity of APRM/NEPAD national secretariats.

#### **c) Algeria**

Algeria highlighted that its National Governing Council had 99 members, encompassing civil society, government, private sector, political parties, gender, and youth. The National Governing Council carried out household surveys using questionnaires, television, radio and mass distribution. Both civil society and government participated in the process. However, they had several challenges, including scepticism on the part of citizens as to whether the evaluation process would serve them or the government; how to set up an inclusive, balanced and independent national commission; and how to formulate the questionnaire.

**Algeria's recommendations are that** there is a need to support countries implementing the Programme of Action through capacity building; the requisite political will and commitment of heads of state and government should be sustained; the self-assessment process should be shortened to take place within six months; APRM needs partnership with the rest of the world; and there should be extensive dialogue between government and the public during the APRM process.

### **V. Session Three: Country presentations**

#### **d) Kenya**

Kenya had 33 members in its National Governing Council, chosen from among government, civil society organizations, parliament and political parties. Sensitisation was done throughout the country. Civil society organizations led much of the process in which there was extensive use of local languages. During the development of the Programme of Action, the views of civil society were incorporated and even at the implementation level, civil society was involved. Kenya presented its first annual progress report (July 2006 – June 2007). To date, there have been some challenges in

implementing the Programme of Action, such as capacity building and the lack of donor urgency, as well as the need to develop linkages with national projects and to coordinate donor funding.

**Lesson learned included the value** of private sector, government and civil society partnering in order to chart a way forward for development and to share ideas from all stakeholders and sectors. Recognition of the need for partnerships with international community is vital, but the international community should not try to come with “all the answers”. The international community could support the building of the capacity of civil society organizations.

**Kenya believes the best way to advance the APRM process is to** sustain dialogue between civil society, government and other stakeholders, and to re-establish the National Governing Council which had been disbanded.

#### e) Mauritius

A background to the Mauritius APRM process was presented. Structures such as the National Governing Council, steering committees, national focal point and team of consultants are in place. Various activities such as sensitisation of the public and private sectors have been undertaken. The media, women, political parties and NGOs have been involved, and a self assessment report was expected by the end of 2007.

**The key recommendation was that** political commitment and financial commitment should go hand and hand for the process to succeed. The key benefit to date had been that the APRM process had provided a valuable opportunity for dialogue between civil society and government.

#### f) South Africa

Mr. Moemedi Kepadisa made a presentation on the APRM process in South Africa. He stated that the South African National APRM process involved various government departments, civil society organizations, parliamentarians, women, youths, and research institutes that helped produce the self assessment report. Mr. Kepadisa outlined the role of Parliament and innovative approaches undertaken by provincial governing councils, as well as the convening of a validation conference after questionnaires had been analyzed.

He told the participants that civil society was very active and has been supportive of the process. The process engaged people in the local provinces through television, radio, newspapers and songs. Each province had its own Programme of Action.

Eighteen best practices were identified in the South African process, and these should be emphasised and shared. Mr. Kepadisa also pointed out that crosscutting issues such as violence and crime were also identified during the review as well as other weaknesses, and that these areas were of great concern to the South African government.

The South African Representative informed the gathering that the South Africa Programme of Action and its costing had been fully developed. Discussions were ongoing as to how best to integrate it within South Africa's existing institutional structures and budget.

**g) Private sector:**

The primary interests of the private sector in the APRM are economic growth, political stability and integration. The private sector has been active in Kenya, Mauritius and Rwanda. But the private sector has sometimes been unclear as to how to become engaged in the APRM process. They also want to have a clearer understanding of the difference between NEPAD and APRM. The private sector appears not to have been as heavily involved in the APRM process as civil society has been. But the private sector is well integrated in national technical teams and would now like to be further involved in APRM, for example in technology implementation or in monitoring and evaluation.

Given that the APRM should remain African-owned, the role and participation of the indigenous private sector is of utmost concern. It was noted that NEPAD was supposed to fast track development on the continent, but some participants felt that that had not happened. The private sector needs to be more involved in the APRM dialogue and in addressing governance issues such as corruption, as well as in resource mobilisation.

It was agreed that the private sector is a beneficiary of the APRM, as good governance creates an enabling environment for investment, including foreign investment, and operations.

**Key discussion points from presentations of countries and private sector were that** strong political will is a *sine qua non* for the APRM's success as evidenced in Ghana; capacity constraints have been a major impediment in reviewed countries with the exception of Algeria; Government empowerment of the civil society enhances APRM success, as evidenced in Ghana. There is need for more transparent dialogue between CSOs and government. External assistance should not necessarily impede African ownership of the APRM but this should be done with caution. The activities of APRM should be decentralized to local levels.

Foreign investors could assist in the implementation of Programmes of Action. The APRM and UNECA should partner to implement the Kigali AGFVI recommendations. Private Sector would like APRM to push for the elimination of corruption and insecurity. The APRM Secretariat can benefit from objective criticism. All political parties and also traditional rulers ought to participate fully in the APRM process. The perception that the review is between peers at the top and not at the grassroots level, should change.

**Lessons learned from the country presentations include the importance of** raising awareness among citizens, and the need for a clear communication strategy. There is need for mobilisation of both internal and external resources for the APRM process. APRM cannot be de-linked from NEPAD given that countries that have acceded to

APRM derive benefit from NEPAD projects which are enhancing corporate governance. The APRM processes are sufficiently flexible to suit differing country contexts.

## **VI. Session Four: Strengthening governance in APRM participating countries**

### **a. Presentation: *Update on the African Peer Review Mechanism and Emerging Lessons*, By Dr. Afeikhena Jerome, Coordinator, Economic Governance and Management, APRM Secretariat**

Dr. Afeikhena Jerome gave an update on the APRM process and emerging lessons. He noted that 4 years on, the APRM has won acclaim worldwide. To date, the process has generated a great deal of interest and has been embraced in a very positive way by donors, strategic partners and those African states that have acceded to it. The credibility of the APRM remains high, based on, *inter alia*, the Reports so far delivered, and there is strong confidence in the members of the APRM's oversight committee and the Panel of Eminent Persons. With the APRM, Africa is showcasing Africa's innovative thinking in governance.

Notwithstanding the positive progress registered by the APRM, a number of challenges still require attention. The implementation of an enormous and complex undertaking such as the APRM has been fraught with financial, capacity, procedural, operational and political challenges, both at the national and continental levels. The most urgent issues include the need to align the APRM instruments to the specific circumstances of each country; the importance of building and strengthening capacity both at national and continental levels so as to better manage the Mechanism; the urgency of credible data bases that would provide reliable information for informed decisions; and mobilization of the requisite resources for fulfilling the APRM mandate and implementing the National Programmes of Action emanating from the process.

He identified areas in which the process can be supported, such as assistance to countries in implementing their Programmes of Action, financial support to the Continental Secretariat, and continued support by strategic partners.

### **b. Presentation: *The Ties that Bind: APRM and Building the Capable State in Africa* By Ejeviome Elobo Otobo, Director, Strategic Planning – Peacebuilding Support Office, United Nations.**

In his presentation, Mr. Ejeviome Otobo indicated that the rationale of his presentation was to explore the linkages between the themes of the last two meetings of the African

Governance Forum (AGF)<sup>2</sup> - AGFVI held in 2006 on implementation of the APRM: challenges and opportunities, and AGFVII held in 2007 on building the capable state in Africa.

He argued that a capable state is a precondition for implementing the APRM, but conversely, a rigorous commitment to the APRM process can contribute to developing State capacity, provided there is a willingness and ability to make a commitment to the process and to achieve the desired outcomes.

He noted that components of the APRM such as democracy and good political governance, economic governance and management, corporate governance, and socio-economic development are prerequisites for peace, security, growth and development.

Mr. Otobo identified different types of states ranging from “capable” states to “fragile” states. He observed that capable states perform their duties effectively while fragile ones are unable to provide basic services or deliver functions to the citizens. Capable states would refer to those governments that can perform the basic functions of the State including exercise of territorial control, the provision of safety and security, the capacity to manage public resources and deliver basic services and the ability to protect and support ways in which the poorest people can sustain themselves.

After presenting the dynamics of capable and fragile states, he noted that both the capable state and the APRM seek to achieve effectiveness and ability to deliver a range of services, perform independent functions, banish poverty, and help the citizenry live healthy lives and overcome development traps.

He then classified African states by two main criteria; one based on the peace-development spectrum and another based on development traps. On the peace-development spectrum, he identified four categories: those still in conflict; those emerging from conflict; those whose democratic stability is racked by disruptive political tensions and undermined by weak institutions and governance practices; and those where democratic consolidation is buttressed by stable economic growth.

He noted that capable states and the APRM ultimately seek to achieve the same thing: first, to be strong and effective and deliver a range of services to their people; secondly, to be independent and able to perform the State’s functions with a fair amount of policy autonomy, policy space and technical expertise; and thirdly to be rich economically and in so doing banish poverty, have sustained growth and be able to offer their people long and healthy lives, and overcome the development traps.

---

<sup>2</sup> The African Governance Forum (AGF) was launched in 1997 in the context of the UN System-wide Special Initiative on Africa (UN-SIA). The primary objective is to bring together African leaders, representatives of the private sector, civil society organizations and their stakeholders in Africa to exchange views and experiences on major challenges and opportunities to the promotion of good governance in Africa. Several such forums/meetings have been held since its inception.

Finally, he identified the type of support a country would require from the international community depending on its category. He noted, for example, that countries emerging from conflict, or fragile states need support in terms of reconstruction, support for security, governance and institution building. On the other hand, countries whose economic growth and democratic stability are on a steady course need encouragement through aid, trade and investment. In conclusion, he said that international support of APRM is needed in institutional development and in the provision of leadership skills through development of technical and management skills.

There was vigorous debate on this classification which was well received. However some reservation was expressed by a few participants about the possibility of stereotyping countries using such methodology.

## **VII. Session Five: Regional and Other Partnerships**

### **a) UNDP**

The UNDP Representative, Mr. Musinga Timothy Bandora, said that UNDP had partnered with the APRM from its inception and since then had provided financial, advocacy and logistical support for its operation.

He noted that the APRM is an important tool of promoting governance; the willingness of governments to submit to peer scrutiny should be appreciated. It is the foundation for improving governance. The APRM is now well established in Africa; the total populations of the 27 APRM countries of Africa constitute about 75% of Africa's citizens.

He indicated that UNDP supports national structures, self-assessment, capacity building and helping countries mobilise resources. At the continental level, UNDP was mandated to manage the APRM trust fund and is involved in advocacy at the continental and national levels.

Appreciating the importance of the APRM, Mr. Bandora noted that the APRM has provided an opportunity for partnership, because it is African driven and owned. UNDP support provides an important plank for strengthening governance in Africa over the long term. Through the APRM, UNDP has an opportunity to support peace and security which are necessary ingredients for sustaining economic development of Africa.

### **b) UNECA**

Mr. Kojo Busia from UNECA echoed the statements of the Executive Secretary in regard to the UNECA's support to the APRM. He said that UNECA focuses on domestic accountability. The issue is how to domesticate accountability in African countries and suggested a process of selecting the members of National Governing Councils and incorporating the views of civil society organizations (CSOs). He said that in the APRM,

the Government negotiates with CSOs which had never happened before the advent of APRM. This negotiation deepens domestic accountability within Africa. He also pointed to the increased public participation as a very positive sign for Africa.

Mr. Busia observed that the APRM calls for reforms within governments, and yet reforms do not come easily. He said that pressure groups also urge governments to deliver, but domestic accountability is often missing. It is the APRM that is facilitating domestic accountability. He further said that many government programmes aim at preventing corruption; but previously it was difficult to engage citizens in prevention. The APRM is now bridging this gap.

However, he cautioned that strategic partners should take care in providing support to countries participating in the APRM process. He elaborated that citizens should not look at strategic partners as if they are assisting government alone, and leaving out its citizens. He challenged participants to devise ways in which the support of external donors could be accessed without compromising the domestic accountability of the people.

#### **c) ECOWAS**

Dr. Remi Ajibewa presented a paper on ECOWAS and said that the main agenda of ECOWAS was to promote good governance and democracy, which were necessary ingredients for sustainable socio-economic development. He said ECOWAS promoted peace and stability, and in the process had developed a conflict management model suited to the continent. Moreover, in an effort to promote the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), ECOWAS promotes sustainable development through trade, infrastructure, peace and security within its region, which form part of the objectives of NEPAD and APRM.

To this effect, ECOWAS supported APRM, and encouraged ECOWAS members to accede to APRM. He reported that about 50% of ECOWAS members have acceded to APRM. He said that the reasons behind some ECOWAS members not acceding to APRM were basically due to civil conflicts within their countries and lack of sensitisation by the continental Secretariat about the benefits of acceding to APRM.

He said ECOWAS places a high premium on political governance, democracy, human rights and the rule of law, as stipulated in the 1991 ECOWAS. He noted that the 2001 additional Protocol makes a provision for election monitoring and observation in member countries. It is in accordance with these principles that ECOWAS supports governance and democracy, the core areas of APRM which it urges its members to accede to.

#### **d) South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA)**

Mr. Ross Herbert of SAIIA provided some perspectives on consensus building among stakeholders in the APRM process. In a philosophical presentation, Mr. Herbert questioned where the value added by APRM should be placed – whether at the level of

Heads of State or at the local level? He advised and encouraged wide participation in the APRM, as the guidelines demand. He also questioned who does the peer learning; is it the Heads of State or the citizens? He again advised that the whole population should be engaged.

On implementation of the Programmes of Action, Mr. Herbert questioned how implementation is managed and evaluated. He recommended that the Ministry of Finance should be engaged so that POA could be funded from within the national budget.

He further advised that Programmes of Action should be placed among the top Government priorities, if APRM was to be given the importance it deserved. It has been found that some policies have been affirmed but have not been funded. He cautioned that it was useless to draw up Programmes of Action, which were not going to be funded.

In his concluding remarks, Mr. Ross recommended that there was need to support management of APRM plan as well as Programmes of Action formulation. He also recommended that research should be made on best practices and published for the benefit of the public. Lastly, Mr. Ross said that the Programmes of Action evaluation should be managed by competent Auditors.

### **Suggestions and recommendations arising from presentations of Partner Institutions:**

#### **a) Regional Interactions:**

Participants noted that there were no regional relationships in discussing APRM. It is important to learn from one region to another. This would enrich knowledge and experience-sharing. Website implementation as a way of sharing ideas could also be very important.

#### **b) Funding from UNDP and other donors:**

It was noted that some donors such are skeptical about supporting basket funds or the APRM Trust Fund; it was further noted that on occasion it was difficult to secure funds from UNDP in time, due to bureaucratic constraints.

#### **c) Holding APRM meetings with Heads of States summits.**

Participants were concerned about holding APRM meetings on the margins of AU Summits. They said that holding APRM during the summit gives less prominence to APRM and the public tends to link APRM with Heads of State. But Dr. Kouassi, the Executive Director, explained that it was most ideal and appropriate to hold APRM in the margins of summits when Heads of State would be available to review.

#### **e) Institutionalising APRM and NEPAD in school curriculum:**

Participants noted that SAIIA was the only institution in Africa which undertook research about the APRM. They questioned whether SAIIA shared its findings with participating countries. They recommended that the APRM and NEPAD should be incorporated in the University curricula to increase public awareness and gain grass root support.

## **Wrap-up of Presentations from Partner Institutions :**

In a wrap of presentations from Partner Institutions, the UNDP representatives pledged continued support to APRM, despite concerns expressed by some participants that UNDP funds are difficult to access. UNDP observed that challenges such as communication, capacity at all levels, aligning National Programmes of Action with other national programmes, rationalising Programmes of Action would remain problematic.

UNECA also reiterated its continued support to APRM, while ECOWAS will also support APRM in promoting peace and security as well as sustainable development. SAIIA called for a compilation of all best practices for research and public information purposes.

## **Summary and Recommendations:**

**In the wrap-up, the following broad recommendations were agreed by the meeting:**

- While recognizing that participating African countries must take ownership of the APRM process, nevertheless there is a role for international development partners to support the implementation of National Development Programmes incorporating the APRM National Programmes of Action.
- In providing support to the APRM, partners should consider channeling their contributions through national, regional and sub regional African institutions and use Trust funds on the basis of the principles of the African Peer Review Mechanism. These principles include no conditionality, freedom from interference and the streamlining and expediting of donor processes.
- Development Partners' contributions should be used to support national priorities as identified in the National Development Programmes incorporating the APRM Programmes of Actions.
- In giving support, emphasis should be given to the following areas:
  - Institutional Development
  - Management Development
  - Technical Skills Development
- Multilateral and bilateral development partners and national actors should support the development of a vigorous advocacy strategy to help deepen the knowledge and awareness of the APRM.
- Development partners could promote the APRM through making objective communication of its findings, and helping to build capacity and knowledge management tools.

- International development partners' efforts are needed to support capacity building of Civil Society Organizations and to finance and facilitate African private-sector dialogue.
- The role of the African Diaspora should be emphasized; the Diaspora should be both the object of advocacy efforts as well as initiators of advocacy efforts to broaden and deepen the awareness and support of the broadest African Diaspora community.

**Closing remarks:**

In her closing remarks, Ms Cheryl Larsen, on behalf of the UN Office of the Special Adviser on Africa, expressed her thanks and appreciation to participants for their active and substantive interventions. She, in particular, thanked Prof. Michelo Hansugule for his stimulating background paper. She also thanked the APRM Secretariat, APRM strategic partners UNDP and UNECA, ECOWAS, the UN Peacebuilding Support Office, the private sector and the various presenters from government and civil society who shared their country experiences, as well as the Rapporteur and the Chairpersons of the various sessions of the meeting.

## Annex 1

### United Nations Office of the Special Adviser on Africa

#### **Expert Group Meeting on “Promoting Partnerships in Support of African Peer Review Mechanism implementation” Addis Ababa, Ethiopia – 15-16 November 2007**

### Programme

#### Thursday, 15 November 2007

08:00 – 09:00 Registration

#### OPENING SESSION

09:00 – 09:10 **Welcome Remarks – UN Office of the Special Adviser on Africa**

09:10 – 09:30 **Opening Address:  
Mr. Abdoulie Janneh, Under-Secretary-General and  
Executive Secretary, UN Economic Commission for Africa**

#### **SESSION ONE: Overview of key issues**

**Chair:** Professor S. K. B. Asante, International Consultant/Council Member  
National APRM Governing Council, Ghana

**Presenter:** Professor Michelo Hansungule, Professor of Law  
Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria

**Discussant:** Mr. Musinga T. Bandora, Senior Governance Adviser  
United Nations Development Programme

09:30 – 10:00 Presentations

10:00 – 11:00 Discussion

11:00 – 11:15 Tea/Coffee break

#### **SESSION TWO: Country presentations**

**Moderator:** Mr. Kojo Busia, Officer-in-Charge, APRM Support Unit  
United Nations Economic Commission for Africa

**Presenters:** Ghana – government and civil society  
Rwanda – government and civil society  
Algeria – government and civil society

11:15 – 12:00 Presentations

12:00 – 13:00 Discussion

13:00 – 14:30 Lunch

**SESSION THREE: Country presentations (continued)**

**Moderator:** Mr. Musinga T. Bandora, Senior Governance Adviser  
United Nations Development Programme

**Presenters:** Kenya – government and civil society  
Mauritius – government and civil society  
South Africa – government and civil society  
Representatives of the private sector

14:30 – 15:45 Presentations

15:45 – 16:00 Tea/Coffee break

16:00 – 17:00 Discussion

**Evening:** Dinner

**Friday, 16 November 2007**

**SESSION FOUR: Strengthening governance in APRM participating countries**

**Moderator:** Dr. Francis Appiah, Secretary General  
APRM National Governing Council for Ghana

**Presenters:** Dr. Afeikhena Jerome, Coordinator  
Economic Governance and Management, APRM Secretariat  
Mr. Ejeviome Otobo, Director, Strategic Planning  
Peacebuilding Support Office, United Nations

09:00 – 10:00 Presentations

10:00 – 11:00 Discussion

11:00 – 11:15 TEA/COFFEE BREAK

**SESSION FIVE: Regional and other partnerships**

**Moderator:** Dr. Bernard Kouassi, Executive Director  
APRM Secretariat

**Discussants:**           **Strategic Partners (UNDP/ECA)**  
                                  **African regional economic communities (ECOWAS)**  
                                  **Other partnerships - South African Institute of International**  
                                  **Affairs (SAIIA)**

11:15 – 12:15           Presentations

12:15 – 13:30           Discussion

13:30 – 15:00           LUNCH

**SESSION SIX:           Summing Up**

**Chair:**                   **Mr. Ejeviome Otobo, Director, Strategic Planning**  
                                  **Peacebuilding Support Office, United Nations**

15:00 – 16:30           Discussion of draft report - Rapporteur

**CLOSING SESSION**

**Chair:**                   **UN Office of the Special Adviser on Africa, United Nations**

16:30 – 17:00           Adoption of conclusions and recommendations for final report

17:00 – 17:30           Closing Remarks



## Annex II

**Expert Group Meeting on Promoting Partnerships in Support of  
African Peer Review Implementation  
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia  
15-16 November 2007**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

|    | <b>Name</b>                 | <b>Organization</b>                                      | <b>Designation</b>                                                  | <b>Address</b>                                                                            | <b>E-mail</b>                                                                  |
|----|-----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | Ms. Fauziya ABDI ALI        | NEPAD Kenya Secretariat                                  | APRM Programme Coordinator                                          | P.O. Box 46270-00100, Nairobi, Kenya                                                      | <a href="mailto:fauziya@nepadkenya.org">fauziya@nepadkenya.org</a>             |
| 2  | Mr. Dotun AJAYI             | African Business Roundtable, ECOWAS Commission           | Regional Manager (West Africa)                                      | Asokoro, Abuja, Nigeria                                                                   | <a href="mailto:dotajayi@yahoo.com">dotajayi@yahoo.com</a>                     |
| 3  | Mr. Aderemi Isola AJIBEWA   | ECOWAS Commission                                        | Principal Programme Officer (Political Affairs)                     | 101 Yakubu Gowon Crescent, Asokoro, P.M.B. 401, Abuja, Nigeria                            | <a href="mailto:remiajibewa@yahoo.co.uk">remiajibewa@yahoo.co.uk</a>           |
| 4  | Mr. Francis APPIAH          | National African Peer Review Mechanism Governing Council | Executive Secretary                                                 | P.M.B. 13, Kanda – Accra, Ghana                                                           | <a href="mailto:francisappiah@yahoo.co.uk">francisappiah@yahoo.co.uk</a>       |
| 5  | Prof. S.K.B. ASANTE         | National African Peer Review Mechanism Governing Council | International Consultant/Council Member                             | P.O. Box LG. 161, Legon, Ghana                                                            | <a href="mailto:sasante32@yahoo.com">sasante32@yahoo.com</a>                   |
| 6  | Mr. Gideon BADAGAWA         | Private Sector Foundation Uganda                         | Director, Policy Advocacy                                           | P.O. Box 7683, Kampala, Uganda                                                            | <a href="mailto:gbadagawa@psfuganda.org">gbadagawa@psfuganda.org</a>           |
| 7  | Mr. Musinga Timothy BANDORA | United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)              | Senior Governance Adviser                                           | One UN Plaza, DC1-2412, UNDP, New York                                                    | <a href="mailto:musinga.t.bandora@undp.org">musinga.t.bandora@undp.org</a>     |
| 8  | Ms. Daisy Rani BRIGEMOHANE  | National Economic and Social Council                     | Assistant to the Secretary-General                                  | 10 <sup>th</sup> Fl. Victoria Building, St. Louis and Barracks St., Port Louis, Mauritius | <a href="mailto:d.brigemohane@nesc.intnet.mu">d.brigemohane@nesc.intnet.mu</a> |
| 9  | Mr. Kojo BUSIA              | UNECA                                                    | Officer-in-Charge, APRM Support Unit                                | P.O. Box 3001, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia                                                      | <a href="mailto:kBusia@uneca.org">kBusia@uneca.org</a>                         |
| 10 | Amb. Patrice Eugene CURÉ    | Ministry of Foreign Affairs                              | Ambassador, Special Representative of Prime Minister for NEPAD/APRM | 5 <sup>th</sup> Fl. Government Centre, Port Louis, Mauritius                              | <a href="mailto:pcure@mail.gov.mu">pcure@mail.gov.mu</a>                       |

|    |                            |                                                      |                                                            |                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                        |
|----|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11 | Ms. Sharon HABA            | National University of Rwanda                        | Senior Lecturer                                            | B.P. 117, Butare, Rwanda                                              | <a href="mailto:shaba@nur.ac.rw">shaba@nur.ac.rw</a><br><a href="mailto:sharonhaba@yahoo.com">sharonhaba@yahoo.com</a>                                 |
| 12 | Mr. Filmon HAILU           | Office of the Prime Minister, Ethiopia               | Economic Affairs Expert                                    | Addis Ababa, Ethiopia                                                 |                                                                                                                                                        |
| 13 | Prof. Michelo HANSUNGULE   | University of Pretoria, South Africa                 | Professor of Human Rights Law                              | Plot 14 Minni Str. Sunnyside, 0002 Pretoria, South Africa             | <a href="mailto:michelo.hansungule@up.ac.za">michelo.hansungule@up.ac.za</a><br><a href="mailto:michelo_h@yahoo.com">michelo_h@yahoo.com</a>           |
| 14 | Mr. Ross HERBERT           | South African Institute of International Affairs     | Research Director, Governance and APRM Programme           | P.O. Box 31596 Braamfontein 2017, South Africa                        | <a href="mailto:ross.herbert@wits.ac.za">ross.herbert@wits.ac.za</a>                                                                                   |
| 15 | Mr. Afeikhenja Theo JEROME | African Peer Review Mechanism, Midrand, South Africa | Economist, Coordinator, Economic Governance and Management | P.O. Box 1234, Halfway House, Midrand 1685, South Africa              | <a href="mailto:afeikhenaj@nepad.org">afeikhenaj@nepad.org</a>                                                                                         |
| 16 | Mr. Aimable KABANDA        | NEPAD APRM Secretariat                               | NEPAD-APRM Focal Point                                     | P.O. Box 15, Kigali, Rwanda                                           | <a href="mailto:kabx68@yahoo.com">kabx68@yahoo.com</a>                                                                                                 |
| 17 | Ms. Fatima-Zohra KARADJA   | Algerian CNG/APRM                                    | Director/President                                         | 08 Rue Yahia Belhayet Hydra, Alger, Algeria                           | <a href="mailto:aansedi@yahoo.fr">aansedi@yahoo.fr</a>                                                                                                 |
| 18 | Mr. Ferdinand KATENDEKO    | African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)                 | Research Analyst                                           | P.O. Box 1234, Midrand, Johannesburg, South Africa                    | <a href="mailto:ferdinandk@nepad.org">ferdinandk@nepad.org</a>                                                                                         |
| 19 | Mr. Moemedi KEPADISA       | South Africa National Governing Council              |                                                            | Pretoria, South Africa                                                |                                                                                                                                                        |
| 20 | Ms. Mumbi KIHEREINI        | Kenya Private Sector Alliance                        | Economist, Private Sector Development Advisor              | Shelter Afrique Building, Mamlaka Rd. Nairobi                         | <a href="mailto:mumbikiereini@yahoo.com">mumbikiereini@yahoo.com</a>                                                                                   |
| 21 | Mr. Bernard KOUASSI        | African Peer Review Mechanism Secretariat            | Executive Director                                         | 1 Samrand Avenue, Samrand Building, Centurion, Pretoria, South Africa | <a href="mailto:bkouassi@aprm-international.org">bkouassi@aprm-international.org</a><br><a href="mailto:bkouassi@hotmail.com">bkouassi@hotmail.com</a> |
| 22 | Mr. Ahmed MOHIDDIN         | UNECA                                                | Consultant                                                 | Addis Ababa, Ethiopia                                                 |                                                                                                                                                        |
| 23 | Ms. Thabisile MSEZANI      | South Africa National Governing Council              |                                                            | Pretoria, South Africa                                                |                                                                                                                                                        |
| 24 | Ms. Grace ONGILE           | NEPAD Kenya Secretariat                              | Chief Executive Officer                                    | Liaison House, State House Ave, Box 46270-00100, Nairobi, Kenya       | <a href="mailto:gongile@nepadkenya.org">gongile@nepadkenya.org</a><br><a href="mailto:grace.ongile@gmail.com">grace.ongile@gmail.com</a>               |
| 25 | Mr. Ejeviome OTOBO         | Peacebuilding Support Office                         | Director, Strategic Planning                               | United Nations Headquarters, New York                                 | <a href="mailto:otobo1@un.org">otobo1@un.org</a>                                                                                                       |
| 26 | Ms. Janelle PLUMMER        | World Bank                                           | Governance Adviser                                         | The World Bank, Ethiopia                                              | <a href="mailto:jplummer1@worldbank.org">jplummer1@worldbank.org</a>                                                                                   |
| 27 | Amb. El-Haouès RIACHE      | Ministry of Foreign Affairs                          | Ambassador                                                 | MAE/MDCAMAF-EL MOURADIA Algiers, Algeria                              | <a href="mailto:riache@hotmail.com">riache@hotmail.com</a>                                                                                             |

|                             |                           |                                                        |                                                                      |                                                                      |                                                                        |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 28                          | Ms. Messeret TILAYE       | Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)      | Programme Manager, Political Affairs                                 | P.O. Box 2653, Djibouti, Djibouti                                    | <a href="mailto:messeret.tilaye@igad.org">messeret.tilaye@igad.org</a> |
| 29                          | Mr. Al-Hajj Murigu YUSSUF | National Muslim Leaders Forum                          | Vice Chair                                                           | P.O. Box 11769, 00400, Nairobi, Kenya                                | <a href="mailto:yussufmurigu@justice.com">yussufmurigu@justice.com</a> |
| <b>ORGANIZERS – UN OSAA</b> |                           |                                                        |                                                                      |                                                                      |                                                                        |
| 30                          | Ms. Cheryl LARSEN         | United Nations Office of the Special Adviser on Africa | Chief, Coordination, Advocacy and Programme Development Unit (CAPDU) | Room S-760E<br>United Nations Secretariat<br>New York, NY 10017, USA | <a href="mailto:larsenc@un.org">larsenc@un.org</a>                     |
| 31                          | Ms. Willa LIBURD          | United Nations Office of the Special Adviser on Africa | Economic Affairs Officer/Project Coordinator                         | Room S-760F<br>United Nations Secretariat<br>New York, NY 10017, USA | <a href="mailto:liburd@un.org">liburd@un.org</a>                       |