NEPAD: A Mechanism for Stimulating Development and Operationalizing Good Governance Standards.

Dr. Kheira Bacha
Tlemcen University (Algeria) *bacha.dr.2022.bachi@gmail.com*

DOI : https://doi.org/10.63939/JAAS.2025-Vol8.N25.189-214

Abstract:

NEPAD is a fundamental transformation of Africa's development, embodying an integrated strategy for the advancement of the continent through the application of innovative methodologies for sustainable development and the promotion of good governance.

The analysis of this initiative is critical to understanding its impact on changing Africa's development tra jectory and its ability to improve governance systems as a fundamental pillar of development. The importance of studying this issue in the light of the continent's growing economic and societal difficulties requires a careful assessment of the extent to which African development projects are achieving their desired goals.

Keywords: NEPAD **;** Africa's development**;** sustainable development **;** good governance.

Introduction

The dawn of the twenty-first century witnessed a renewed commitment by African leaders to address the continent's developmental challenges through indigenous solutions. The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), launched in 2001, represented a paradigm shift in Africa's approach to development challenges, positioning itself as "Africa's development blueprint" designed by Africans for Africans (Baimu, 2002). NEPAD emerged at a critical juncture in African history, following decades of structural adjustment programs and increasing recognition of the importance of governance in the development process.

This research paper examines NEPAD as both a developmental framework and a mechanism for operationalizing good governance standards across the African continent. It interrogates the fundamental premise that underpins NEPAD: that development and governance are inextricably linked, and that Africa's development requires not only economic reforms but also political transformation toward more accountable, transparent, and participatory governance systems.

The significance of this research lies in its contribution to understanding how regional initiatives like NEPAD navigate the complex terrain of promoting development while simultaneously establishing governance standards. By examining the institutional architecture, implementation mechanisms, and practical outcomes of NEPAD, this paper seeks to provide insights into the effectiveness of regionally-led governance and development initiatives.

The central research questions guiding this study are:

1. How does NEPAD conceptualize the relationship between development and governance?
2. What mechanisms has NEPAD established to promote good governance standards?
3. To what extent has NEPAD succeeded in operationalizing these standards across diverse national contexts?
4. What challenges and limitations have emerged in NEPAD's implementation?

The paper employs a mixed methodological approach, combining documentary analysis of NEPAD's foundational texts and reports with case studies of implementation in selected African countries. This approach allows for both an examination of the initiative's conceptual frameworks and an assessment of its practical outcomes.

1. Theoretical Framework: Development and Governance Nexus

1.1 The Evolution of Development Theory and Governance

The relationship between governance and development has evolved significantly in development discourse over the past several decades. Early development theories in the post-colonial era focused predominantly on economic growth, capital accumulation, and industrialization as pathways to development, with limited attention to governance structures (Rostow, 1960). By the 1980s, however, the apparent failure of purely economic approaches to deliver sustainable development outcomes led to increased attention to institutional factors, including governance[116].

[116] *North, 1990*

The concept of "good governance" gained prominence in the 1990s, promoted by international financial institutions like the World Bank and IMF as a prerequisite for effective development. This concept encompasses principles of transparency, accountability, rule of law, and participation[117]. Critics, however, have noted that these governance standards often reflected Western liberal democratic norms rather than indigenous African governance traditions[118].

1.2 African Perspectives on Development and Governance :

African scholarship has contributed significantly to reconceptualizing the development-governance nexus. Scholars like Claude Ake (1996) argued that development in Africa must be understood not merely as economic growth but as a process of social transformation that increases people's capacity to realize their potential. This perspective emphasizes the importance of participatory governance that respects local contexts and knowledge systems.

The concept of "developmental states" has also gained traction in African development discourse, drawing inspiration from the experiences of East Asian economies where strong state institutions guided development processes[119]. This approach emphasizes the importance of capable and autonomous state institutions in steering development, while also recognizing the need for these institutions to be accountable to citizens.

[117] *World Bank, 1992*
[118] *Mkandawire, 2007*
[119] *Mkandawire, 2001*

1.3 Regional Integration and Development

Regional integration theory provides another important theoretical lens for understanding NEPAD. Neofunctionalist approaches suggest that integration in one sector creates pressures for integration in related sectors, leading to spillover effects[120]. In the African context, regional integration has been viewed as a strategy for overcoming the limitations of small domestic markets and enhancing bargaining power in the global economy[121].

NEPAD can be situated within these theoretical frameworks as an initiative that seeks to harmonize governance standards across the continent while promoting regional integration as a development strategy. It represents a significant attempt to operationalize governance principles within a development framework designed by and for Africans.

2. NEPAD: Historical Background and Institutional Architecture :

2.1 Origins and Evolution of NEPAD :

NEPAD's origins can be traced to the transformation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) into the African Union (AU) at the turn of the millennium. This transition reflected a shift in continental priorities from anti-colonial struggle toward addressing development challenges [122]. The initiative emerged from the convergence of several development plans, including the Millennium Partnership for Africa's Recovery Program (MAP) developed by South

[120] *Haas, 1958.*
[121] *Asante, 1997.*
[122] *Olukoshi, 2002.*

Africa, Nigeria, and Algeria, and the OMEGA Plan proposed by Senegal[123].

The formal adoption of NEPAD occurred at the 37th Summit of the OAU in July 2001, with the initiative officially launched in October of the same year. NEPAD was positioned as "a holistic, comprehensive integrated strategic framework for the socioeconomic development of Africa"[124], reflecting a commitment to addressing Africa's marginalization in the global economy through African-led solutions.

2.2 NEPAD's Institutional Structure :

NEPAD established a distinctive institutional architecture designed to coordinate implementation across the continent. At the apex is the Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee (HSGIC), comprising representatives from the five initiating countries (South Africa, Nigeria, Algeria, Egypt, and Senegal) and ten additional countries representing different regions[125]

The NEPAD Secretariat (later transformed into the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency and eventually into the AU Development Agency-NEPAD) serves as the technical body responsible for coordinating programs and mobilizing resources. Specialized technical committees address priority sectors including infrastructure, agriculture, environment, human development, and market access[126].

[123] *Adesina, 2004 .*
[124] *NEPAD, 2001, p. 1.*
[125] *NEPAD, 2001.*
[126] *Ekwealor, 2013*

In 2010, NEPAD was fully integrated into the AU structure, becoming the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency. This integration aimed to enhance coordination between NEPAD and other AU institutions and strengthen implementation capacity.[127]

2.3 NEPAD's Development Priorities :

NEPAD identified several priority sectors for intervention, reflecting a comprehensive approach to development:

- ✓ **Infrastructure Development:** Including transportation, energy, water, and information and communication technology [128]
- ✓ **Agriculture and Food Security:** Focusing on increasing productivity and reducing hunger through initiatives like the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP)[129]
- ✓ **Environmental Sustainability**: Addressing climate change, desertification, and natural resource management [130].
- ✓ **Human Capital Development**: Emphasizing education, health, and skills development to enhance productivity and well-being
- ✓ **Science and Technology**: Promoting innovation and technological adaptation to support economic transformation [131].
- ✓ **Regional Integration and Trade:** Facilitating cross-border trade and harmonizing policies to create larger markets[132].

[127] *Turianskyi, 2017*
[128] *Kumo, 2012.*
[129] *Kolavalli et al., 2010.*
[130] *NEPAD, 2003*
[131] *NEPAD, Juma, 2011*
[132] *Draper, 2010 .*

These priorities reflect NEPAD's multidimensional approach to development, recognizing the interconnected nature of economic, social, and environmental factors in sustainable development.

3. Good Governance in the NEPAD Framework :

3.1 Conceptualizing Governance within NEPAD

NEPAD's approach to governance represents a significant innovation in African regional initiatives. The framework explicitly acknowledges governance as a critical factor in Africa's development, stating that "Africa undertakes to respect the global standards of democracy, which core components include political pluralism, allowing for the existence of several political parties and workers' unions, fair, open, free and democratic elections periodically organized to enable the populace choose their leaders freely"[133]

NEPAD's governance agenda encompasses both political and economic dimensions. Political governance focuses on democratic processes, human rights, and conflict prevention, while economic governance emphasizes public financial management, corporate governance, and anti-corruption measures[134] This holistic approach reflects an understanding that development requires both political stability and sound economic management.

3.2 The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)

The most innovative governance instrument established under NEPAD is the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), launched in 2003 as a

[133] *NEPAD, 2001, p. 17.*
[134] *Hope, 2005.*

voluntary self-assessment tool for African states[135]. The APRM represents an unprecedented commitment to peer accountability, with participating countries agreeing to periodic reviews of their governance performance across four thematic areas:

- ✓ Democracy and Political Governance
- ✓ Economic Governance and Management
- ✓ Corporate Governance
- ✓ Socio-economic Development

The APRM process involves multiple stages, including country self-assessment, external review by a team of experts, peer review by participating heads of state, and the development of a National Programme of Action to address identified shortcomings [136]. This process aims to promote mutual learning and accountability while respecting national sovereignty.

3.3 Relationship Between Governance Standards and Development Objectives :

A distinctive feature of NEPAD is its explicit linking of governance standards to development objectives. The framework operates on the premise that good governance creates an enabling environment for development by reducing uncertainty, enhancing investor confidence, and ensuring more efficient resource allocation [137].

This linkage is operationalized through conditionality mechanisms, with access to certain NEPAD resources and endorsements contingent on governance performance. For example, the

[135] *Gruzd, 2014*
[136] *Grimm & Nawrath, 2007*
[137] *Akokpari, 2004*

NEPAD Infrastructure Project Preparation Facility prioritizes projects in countries demonstrating commitment to governance principles[138]

However, NEPAD also recognizes the developmental aspects of governance, acknowledging that capacity constraints may limit governance performance in some contexts. Consequently, the framework includes provisions for capacity building and technical assistance to help countries strengthen governance institutions [139].

4. NEPAD's Implementation: Case Studies and Analysis :

4.1 Regional Implementation Patterns :

NEPAD's implementation across Africa has been characterized by significant regional variation. In West Africa, countries like Ghana and Senegal have demonstrated strong commitment to NEPAD principles, integrating them into national development plans and actively participating in the APRM process [140]. East African countries have shown particular enthusiasm for NEPAD's regional integration initiatives, including infrastructure development corridors [141].

Southern Africa, led by South Africa as a key NEPAD architect, has seen relatively robust implementation across multiple sectors, particularly in infrastructure and agriculture [142]. Implementation in Central and North Africa has been more uneven, constrained by political instability in some countries and varying levels of commitment to the governance agenda [143]

---

[138] *Ndulu et al., 2005.*
[139] *NEPAD, 2007*
[140] *Déme, 2005*
[141] *Mutai, 2011.*
[142] *Landsberg, 2012*
[143] *Matlosa, 2014).*

4.2 Sectoral Implementation Analysis :

4.2.1 Infrastructure Development

NEPAD's Presidential Infrastructure Champion Initiative (PICI) has facilitated several major cross-border infrastructure projects, including the North-South Corridor linking eight countries in Eastern and Southern Africa[144]. The Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa (PIDA), developed jointly by NEPAD, the African Union Commission, and the African Development Bank, provides a strategic framework for priority infrastructure investments[145]
Implementation challenges in the infrastructure sector include financing constraints, with most projects requiring public-private partnerships or external funding, and coordination difficulties across national boundaries[146]. Nevertheless, NEPAD has succeeded in raising the profile of infrastructure development as a continental priority and mobilizing resources for key projects.

4.2.2 Agricultural Transformation

The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), NEPAD's flagship agricultural initiative, has achieved notable success in several countries. Rwanda, for example, has significantly increased agricultural productivity and reduced poverty through CAADP-aligned policies[147]. The initiative has also succeeded in increasing agricultural spending in participating countries, with several meeting the target of allocating 10% of national budgets to

[144] *NEPAD, 2015*
[145] *Ndulu, 2006.*
[146] *Foster & Briceño-Garmendia, 2010*
[147] *Byamugisha, 2013*

agriculture[148]. Implementation challenges include capacity constraints at local levels, coordination difficulties between ministries, and vulnerability to external shocks like climate change and market fluctuations [149]. The effectiveness of CAADP has also varied considerably across countries, reflecting differences in institutional capacity and political commitment.

4.2.3 Governance Implementation through the APRM :

As of 2024, 41 African countries have voluntarily joined the APRM, with more than 23 completing at least one full review cycle [150]. The process has generated comprehensive governance assessments and action plans in participating countries, creating a wealth of documentation on governance challenges and reform priorities.

Evidence suggests that the APRM has had tangible impacts in some contexts. In Kenya, for example, APRM recommendations contributed to constitutional reforms enhancing judicial independence and decentralization[151]. In Ghana, the APRM process facilitated policy reforms in public financial management and anti-corruption measures[152].

However, implementation of National Programmes of Action has been uneven, with limited follow-up mechanisms and resource constraints hindering progress [153]. The voluntary nature of the mechanism also means that some countries with significant governance challenges have opted not to participate.

---

[148] *Badiane et al., 2011*
[149] *Kolavalli et al., 2010*
[150] *APRM Secretariat, 2023.*
[151] *Gruzd, 2014.*
[152] *Bing-Pappoe, 2010*
[153] *Jordaan, 2006*

4.3 Country Case Studies :

4.3.1 South Africa: NEPAD Leadership and Domestic Implementation :

As a key architect of NEPAD, South Africa has demonstrated strong rhetorical commitment to the initiative. The country has integrated NEPAD principles into its National Development Plan and actively promoted the initiative in international forums[154]. South Africa has also committed substantial resources to NEPAD implementation, hosting the secretariat and contributing to financing mechanisms.

However, domestic implementation has faced challenges, including inconsistency between South Africa's promotion of NEPAD governance standards abroad and governance challenges at home [155]. This has sometimes undermined South Africa's credibility as a NEPAD champion.

4.3.2 Rwanda: NEPAD as a Framework for Post-Conflict Development :

Rwanda provides an instructive case study of NEPAD implementation in a post-conflict context. The country has actively embraced NEPAD principles, particularly in agricultural transformation through CAADP and infrastructure development[156]. Rwanda has also participated enthusiastically in the APRM process, using it to showcase governance reforms and attract development partners.

---

[154] *Landsberg, 2012*
[155] *Adebajo & Landsberg, 2003*
[156] *Besada et al., 2013*

Rwanda's experience illustrates both the potential and limitations of NEPAD. While the country has achieved impressive economic growth and poverty reduction, questions remain about political pluralism and civic space, highlighting tensions between different aspects of NEPAD's governance agenda [157].

4.3.3 Nigeria: Navigating Implementation in a Complex Federal System

As Africa's largest economy and a NEPAD founder, Nigeria offers insights into implementation challenges in large, diverse, federal systems. Nigeria has established dedicated institutional structures for NEPAD implementation, including a national NEPAD secretariat and focal points across federal ministries[158].

However, implementation has been constrained by coordination challenges between federal and state governments, capacity limitations, and governance issues, particularly corruption[159]. Nigeria's experience highlights the importance of aligning regional initiatives with domestic political realities and institutional arrangements.

5. Critical Assessment of NEPAD's Effectiveness

5.1 Achievements and Positive Impacts

NEPAD has achieved several notable successes in its two decades of operation. First, it has succeeded in establishing governance as a legitimate topic for regional discussion and cooperation, breaking with

[157] *Zorbas, 2011*
[158] *Adesina, 2004*
[159] *Adogamhe, 2008* .

earlier norms of non-interference in domestic affairs[160]. The APRM, in particular, represents an innovative approach to promoting governance standards through peer pressure rather than external conditionality.

Second, NEPAD has mobilized significant resources for development projects, particularly in infrastructure and agriculture. The initiative has attracted support from international partners, including the G8, European Union, and multilateral development banks, generating new financing for priority sectors[161]

Third, NEPAD has contributed to policy harmonization across countries in key sectors, facilitating regional integration and coordination. CAADP, for example, has promoted alignment of agricultural policies across participating countries, creating a framework for knowledge sharing and mutual learning[162]

5.2 Persistent Challenges and Limitations

Despite these achievements, NEPAD faces significant challenges that limit its effectiveness. Resource constraints remain a major obstacle, with many NEPAD programs dependent on external funding rather than sustainable African resources[163]. This dependency creates vulnerability to shifting donor priorities and potentially undermines African ownership.

Implementation capacity represents another persistent challenge, with many countries lacking the institutional infrastructure and technical expertise to effectively implement NEPAD programs[164].

---

[160] *Engel, 2010 .*
[161] *Jakobeit, 2006.*
[162] *Kolavalli et al., 2010.*
[163] *Chabal, 2002 .*
[164] *Adogamhe, 2008 .*

This is particularly evident in fragile states and post-conflict contexts, where governance institutions may be weak or contested.

Political will varies considerably across the continent, with some leaders demonstrating strong commitment to NEPAD principles while others engage more superficially[165]. This inconsistency limits the initiative's transformative potential and creates implementation gaps between policy commitments and practical action.

5.3 The Gap Between Design and Implementation :

A recurring theme in NEPAD's trajectory is the gap between ambitious institutional design and practical implementation. While NEPAD has established sophisticated frameworks and structures, these do not always translate into effective action on the ground[166]. This implementation gap reflects both capacity constraints and the challenge of securing sustained political commitment across diverse national contexts.

The voluntary nature of key NEPAD mechanisms, particularly the APRM, creates additional implementation challenges. While voluntarism respects sovereignty and may enhance ownership, it also means that countries with the most serious governance challenges may opt out of review processes[167]

6. NEPAD's Evolution and Future Prospects :

6.1 Institutional Transformation and Integration with the AU :

NEPAD has undergone significant institutional evolution since its establishment, culminating in its transformation into the African Union Development Agency (AUDA-NEPAD) in 2018. This transformation

[165] *Taylor, 2005 .*
[166] *Adogamhe, 2008*
[167] *Jordaan, 2006.*

aimed to strengthen NEPAD's implementation capacity and enhance coordination with other AU institutions [168]

The integration of NEPAD into the AU architecture offers opportunities for greater coherence in continental development initiatives but also raises questions about maintaining NEPAD's distinctive focus on governance-development linkages (Tieku, 2004). As NEPAD becomes more fully incorporated into AU structures, balancing institutional integration with programmatic distinctiveness represents an ongoing challenge.

6.2 Alignment with Global Development Frameworks :

NEPAD has actively sought alignment with global development frameworks, initially with the Millennium Development Goals and subsequently with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the African Union's Agenda 2063[169]. This alignment enhances coherence between continental and global initiatives but also raises questions about the distinctiveness of NEPAD's approach.

The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and subsequent international agreements on development cooperation have influenced NEPAD's approach to partnerships, with increasing emphasis on mutual accountability and results-based management[170]. These global norms have shaped NEPAD's operational modalities and partnership strategies.

6.3 Future Directions and Reform Possibilities :

Looking ahead, several potential reform directions could enhance NEPAD's effectiveness as a mechanism for stimulating development and operationalizing governance standards:

---

[168] *Turianskyi, 2017.*
[169] *Adejumobi, 2006*
[170] *Zimmermann & Smith, 2011..*

- ✓ **Strengthening Implementation Mechanisms**: Enhancing monitoring and evaluation systems to track progress and identify implementation bottlenecks more effectively[171]

- ✓ **Enhancing Domestic Resource Mobilization:** Reducing dependency on external funding by strengthening African financing mechanisms, including through innovative financing instruments and public-private partnerships[172]

- ✓ **Deepening Civil Society Engagement**: Expanding opportunities for civil society participation in NEPAD processes to enhance accountability and broaden ownership beyond government elites [173].

- ✓ **Tailoring Approaches to Context:** Developing more differentiated approaches that account for varying levels of state capacity and different starting points in terms of governance and development

- ✓ **Strengthening Linkages Between Governance and Sectoral Programs**: Creating more explicit connections between governance assessments and sectoral initiatives to ensure that governance improvements contribute to development outcomes[174].

[171] *(Adejumobi, 2006).*
[172] *Landsberg, 2012.*
[173] *Mkandawire, 2007.*
[174] *Hope, 2005*

7. Conclusion :

This analysis of NEPAD as a mechanism for stimulating development and operationalizing good governance standards reveals a complex picture of achievement and limitation. As an institutional innovation, NEPAD represents a significant advancement in African regional cooperation, establishing frameworks for addressing the interlinked challenges of governance and development through African-led solutions.

NEPAD's most distinctive contribution lies in its explicit recognition of the governance-development nexus and its creation of innovative mechanisms like the APRM to promote governance standards through peer accountability rather than external conditionality. This approach respects sovereignty while creating avenues for mutual learning and pressure for reform.

In practical implementation, NEPAD has achieved notable successes in mobilizing resources for priority sectors, particularly infrastructure and agriculture, and in establishing governance as a legitimate focus for regional cooperation. However, persistent challenges related to resource constraints, implementation capacity, and varying levels of political commitment have limited the initiative's transformative impact.

The gap between institutional design and practical implementation remains a central challenge for NEPAD, reflecting broader tensions in regional integration initiatives that must navigate diverse national contexts and political economies. As NEPAD continues to evolve within the AU architecture, addressing this implementation gap will be crucial to realizing its potential as a

mechanism for promoting sustainable development and good governance across the African continent.

Future research on NEPAD would benefit from more systematic empirical assessment of its impact on governance and development outcomes, as well as comparative analysis with other regional integration initiatives. Such research could contribute to both scholarly understanding of the governance-development nexus and practical efforts to enhance the effectiveness of regional cooperation in promoting sustainable development.

References :

1. Adebajo, A.Landsberg, C. (2003). South Africa and Nigeria as regional hegemons. In M. Baregu. C. Landsberg (Eds.), From Cape to Congo: Southern Africa's evolving security challenges (pp. 171-203). Lynne Rienner.

2. Adesina, J. O. (2004). NEPAD and the challenge of Africa's development: Towards the political economy of a discourse. Society in Transition, 35(1), 125-144.

3. Adejumobi, S. (2006). Governance and poverty reduction in Africa: A critique of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs). In A. G. Obiozor . O. C. Eze (Eds.), Africa and the challenges of development (pp. 71-92). Nigerian Institute of International Affairs.

4. Adogamhe, P. G. (2008). Pan-Africanism revisited: Vision and reality of African unity and development. African Review of Integration, 2(2), 1-34.

5. Akokpari, J. K. (2004). The AU, NEPAD and the promotion of good governance in Africa. Nordic Journal of African Studies, 13(3), 243-263.

6. Ake, C. (1996). Democracy and development in Africa.Brookings Institution Press.

7. APRM Secretariat. (2023).Status of APRM implementation in participating countries. African Peer Review Mechanism.

8. Asante, S. K. B. (1997).Regionalism and Africa's development: Expectations, reality and challenges. Macmillan.

9. Badiane, O., Odjo, S. Ulimwengu, J. (2011). Emerging policies and partnerships under CAADP: Implications for long-term growth, food security, and poverty reduction. IFPRI Discussion Paper 1145. International Food Policy Research Institute.

10. Baimu, E. (2002). The African Union: Hope for better protection of human rights in Africa?African Human Rights Law Journal, 2(2), 299-326.

11. Besada, H., Whelan, J., & Tok, E. (2013). Rwanda's APRM review: A pathway to comprehensive governance. Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 31(2), 268-286.

12. Bing-Pappoe, A. (2010). Reviewing Africa's peer review mechanism: A seven country survey. Partnership Africa Canada.

13. Brixiová, Z., Ndikumana, L.Youm, K. (2011). Modernizing development finance for the 21st century: Public-private partnerships in mobilizing resources for development. In E. Aryeetey, S. Devarajan, R. Kanbur, & L. Kasekende (Eds.), The Oxford

companion to the economics of Africa (pp. 433-440). Oxford University Press.

14. Byamugisha, F. F. K. (2013). Securing Africa's land for shared prosperity: A program to scale up reforms and investments. World Bank.

15. Chabal, P. (2002). The quest for good government and development in Africa: Is NEPAD the answer? International Affairs, 78(3), 447-462.

16. Déme, O. (2005). Between hope and skepticism: Civil society and the African Peer Review Mechanism. Partnership Africa Canada Discussion Paper. Partnership Africa Canada.

17. Draper, P. (2010). Rethinking the (European) foundations of sub-Saharan African regional economic integration: A political economy essay. OECD Development Centre Working Paper No. 293. OECD Publishing.

18. Ekwealor, C. T. (2013). The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD): An empirical analysis of the conditions of success. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of KwaZulu-Natal.

19. Engel, U. (2010). The African Peer Review Mechanism revisited: The APRM as a power resource and legitimation tool. In U. Engel & J. G. Porto (Eds.), Africa's new peace and security architecture: Promoting norms, institutionalizing solutions (pp. 127-148). Ashgate.

20. Foster, V. Briceño-Garmendia, C. (Eds.). (2010). Africa's infrastructure: A time for transformation. World Bank.

21. Grimm, S., & Nawrath, K. (2007). The African Peer Review Mechanism – Lessons from the pioneering phase. DIE Working Paper. German Development Institute.

22. Gruzd, S. (2014). The African Peer Review Mechanism: Development lessons from Africa's remarkable governance assessment system. SAIIA Research Report 15. South African Institute of International Affairs.

23. Haas, E. B. (1958). The uniting of Europe: Political, social, and economic forces 1950-1957. Stanford University Press.

24. Hope, K. R. (2005). Toward good governance and sustainable development: The African Peer Review Mechanism. Governance, 18(2), 283-311.

25. Jakobeit, C. (2006). Implementing NEPAD: A critical assessment. The African Development Perspectives Yearbook, 11, 143-159.

26. Jordaan, E. (2006). Inadequately self-critical: Rwanda's self-assessment for the African Peer Review Mechanism. African Affairs, 105(420), 333-351.

27. Juma, C. (Ed.). (2011). The new harvest: Agricultural innovation in Africa. Oxford University Press.

28. Kolavalli, S., Birner, R., Benin, S., Horowitz, L., Babu, S., Asenso-Okyere, K., Thompson, N. M. Poku, J. (2010). Institutional and public expenditure review of Ghana's Ministry of Food and Agriculture. IFPRI Discussion Paper 01020. International Food Policy Research Institute.

29. Kumo, W. L. (2012). Infrastructure investment and economic growth in South Africa: A Granger causality analysis. African Development Bank Working Paper Series No. 160. African Development Bank.

30. Landsberg, C. (2012). Towards a post-apartheid South African foreign policy review. In C. Landsberg J.-A. van Wyk (Eds.), South African foreign policy review (pp. 1-27). Africa Institute of South Africa.

31. Matlosa, K. (2014). Pan-Africanism, the African Peer Review Mechanism and the African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance: What does the future hold?South African Institute of International Affairs Occasional Paper No. 190. South African Institute of International Affairs.

32. Mkandawire, T. (2001). Thinking about developmental states in Africa. Cambridge Journal of Economics, 25(3), 289-314.

33. Mkandawire, T. (2007).Good governance': The itinerary of an idea. Development in Practice, 17(4-5), 679-681.

34. Mutai, H. K. (2011). Regional trade integration strategies under SADC and the EAC: A comparative analysis. SADC Law Journal, 1(1), 81-97.

35. Ndulu, B. J. (2006). Infrastructure, regional integration and growth in sub-Saharan Africa: Dealing with the disadvantages of geography and sovereign fragmentation. Journal of African Economies, 15(Supplement 2), 212-244.

36. Ndulu, B., Chakraborti, L., Lijane, L., Ramachandran, V., & Wolgin, J. (2005). Challenges of African growth: Opportunities, constraints, and strategic directions. World Bank.

37. NEPAD. (2001).The New Partnership for Africa's Development. NEPAD Secretariat.

38. NEPAD. (2003).Action plan for the environment initiative. NEPAD Secretariat.

39. NEPAD. (2007).Governance in Africa's development: Progress, prospects and challenges. NEPAD Secretariat.

40. NEPAD. (2015).Presidential Infrastructure Champion Initiative (PICI) report. NEPAD Agency.

41. North, D. C. (1990).Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. Cambridge University Press.

42. Olukoshi, A. (2002). Governing the African political space for sustainable development: A reflection on NEPAD. In NEPAD: A new path? Heinrich Böll Foundation.

43. Rostow, W. W. (1960).The stages of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto. Cambridge University Press.

44. Taylor, I. (2005). NEPAD: Towards Africa's development or another false start? Lynne Rienner.

45. Tieku, T. K. (2004). Explaining the clash and accommodation of interests of major actors in the creation of the African Union. African Affairs, 103(411), 249-267.

46. Turianskyi, Y. (2017).Evolution not revolution: A critical analysis of the APRM reform process. South African Institute of International Affairs.

47. World Bank. (1992).Governance and development. World Bank.

48. Zimmermann, F. Smith, K. (2011). More actors, more money, more ideas for international development co-operation. Journal of International Development, 23(5), 722-738.

49. Zorbas, E. (2011). Aid dependence and policy independence: Explaining the Rwandan paradox. In S. Straus L. Waldorf (Eds.), Remaking Rwanda: State building and human rights after mass violence(pp. 103-117). University of Wisconsin Press.