

CAN THE APRM BE AN EFFECTIVE TOOL TO MONITOR AGENDA 2063 AND THE SDGs?

TERENCE CORRIGAN & STEVEN GRUZD



FEBRUARY
2017

*African perspectives.
Global insights.*

SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) has a long and proud record as South Africa's premier research institute on international issues. It is an independent, non-government think tank whose key strategic objectives are to make effective input into public policy, and to encourage wider and more informed debate on international affairs, with particular emphasis on African issues and concerns. It is both a centre for research excellence and a home for stimulating public engagement. SAIIA's occasional papers present topical, incisive analyses, offering a variety of perspectives on key policy issues in Africa and beyond. Core public policy research themes covered by SAIIA include good governance and democracy; economic policymaking; international security and peace; and new global challenges such as food security, global governance reform and the environment. Please consult our website www.saiia.org.za for further information about SAIIA's work.

GOVERNANCE AND APRM PROGRAMME

SAIIA's Governance and African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) programme aims to place governance and African development at the centre of local and global discussions about the continent's future. Its overall goal is to improve the ability of the APRM to contribute to governance reforms, institutions and processes. The programme focuses on: Enhancing meaningful and authentic participation of non-state actors in Country Self-Assessment Review (CSAR) and National Programme of Action (NPOA) processes; increasing knowledge among key decision-makers of the need for Country Level Institutions to be functional, have political support and enjoy legitimacy; increasing the capacity and functionality of official APRM institutions; and contributing to the identification of critical issues for governance reform in Africa through the APRM.

SAIIA gratefully acknowledges the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), which generously supports the Governance and APRM Programme.

PROGRAMME HEAD Steven Gruzd, steven.gruzd@wits.ac.za

© SAIIA FEBRUARY 2017

All rights are reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or utilised in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information or storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. Opinions expressed are the responsibility of the individual authors and not of SAIIA.

Please note that all currencies are in US\$ unless otherwise indicated.

Cover photo ©
<http://www.flickr.com/photos/catdonmit/2330348036>

ABSTRACT

Monitoring and evaluation has emerged as a central concern in development thinking. Both the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the AU's Agenda 2063 represent responses to Africa's developmental deficits, with much overlap between them. They will need a robust mechanism to trace the progress that is being made, and this study explores whether – rather than attempting to construct a new system – Africa's home-grown governance evaluation system, the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), might be able to fulfil this role. A number of factors make the APRM a natural monitoring tool for the other two initiatives. Each is substantively about governance, and deals with similar subjects. Indeed, the priorities of Agenda 2063 fed into the SDGs, and the APRM has made cooperation between itself, Agenda 2063 and the SDG initiatives a strategic priority. The three initiatives also share broad ideological outlooks, are comprehensive in the scope of their activities, are geared for the long term, envision broad-based participation and seek to engender cross-border cooperation. In broad terms, they are all committed to a democratic, participatory governance framework and developmentally oriented policies. However, there are a number of hindrances to the APRM's fulfilling this role – at present, these arguably render it incapable of taking on the extensive and ongoing monitoring responsibilities that the other initiatives demand. The APRM has proven larger, more complex and more expensive than its founders realised. It has been slow in conducting reviews, and has not established a consistent set of indicators that would allow for measuring across countries and over time. Nevertheless, the APRM is a recognised brand and is institutionalised as part of the African Governance Architecture. To take on the monitoring of Agenda 2063 and the SDGs it would need to resolve its administrative weaknesses, secure adequate funding and conduct reviews on an ongoing basis. There is also a need to design a continental system of data gathering and analysis to enable precise measurements of progress in meeting the various developmental goals. These are significant challenges, but they describe the necessary rejuvenation of the APRM required for it to become the monitoring tool for the continent's developmental endeavours.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

TERENCE CORRIGAN holds a BA (Hons) in Political Science from the University of KwaZulu-Natal and is currently a Research Fellow at the South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) in its Governance and African Peer Review Mechanism Programme, a Policy Fellow at the Institute of Race Relations and a Communications Specialist at Massyn Media.

STEVEN GRUZD holds an MSc in International Relations from the London School of Economics and Political Science and a BA (Hons) in International Relations from the University of the Witwatersrand. He became head of SAIIA's Governance and the African Peer Review Mechanism Programme in May 2008, and rejoined SAIIA in this capacity in October 2013.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

APRM	African Peer Review Mechanism
CEO	chief executive officer
CRR	Country Review Reports
ICT	information and communications technology
NPoA	National Programme of Action
SAIIA	South African Institute of International Affairs
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals

INTRODUCTION: WHY GOVERNANCE MATTERS

In a press release issued on 2 February 2017, the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) Secretariat noted that the AU Assembly of Heads of State and Government at the 28th AU Summit on 30–31 January 2017 had ‘decided to extend the mandate of the APRM to include tracking of the implementation and oversee[ing the] monitoring and evaluation of the Continent’s key governance areas ... [T]he AU Assembly welcomed the resolution to reposition the APRM to play a monitoring and evaluation role for the African Union Agenda 2063 and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals Agenda 2030.’¹

The press release quoted APRM Secretariat Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Eddy Maloka as saying, ‘We are ready to take on this new exciting role. We are encouraged by the confidence the AU Assembly has in the APRM in entrusting us with such an important task.’ He concluded with a ‘pledge to execute the expanded mandate with utmost dedication and commitment’.

This paper examines the implications and practicalities of this important decision.

It is often claimed that what cannot be measured cannot truly be said to exist. This is emblematic of the challenge posed by big developmental initiatives. Fine-sounding rhetoric may disguise a hollow lack of any real progress; to guard against this, evidence of progress (or regression) must be collated, and courses of action may be evaluated or altered.

Over the past two decades a number of initiatives have sought to do precisely this. They try to measure governance with varying degrees of comprehensiveness, for varying purposes. The Economist Democracy Index and the Mo Ibrahim Foundation’s Ibrahim Index of African Governance have attempted to measure the quality of governance with a particular eye on the state of democratisation, and present their data in statistical – quantitative – terms. The World Bank’s Worldwide Governance Indicators draw on the institution’s formidable statistical databases to present a qualitative picture of governance, with a leaning towards the facets of greatest importance to economic management. The Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative has sought to open up dealings around resource appropriation, particularly in regard to mining, oil and gas. The Open Government Partnership relies less on quantitative data and more on qualitative reporting.

Arguably the most comprehensive is the APRM – the African continent’s home-grown, voluntary governance evaluation system, which seeks to prompt general, although not precisely defined, reforms towards good governance in participating states.

1 APRM (African Peer Review Mechanism) Secretariat, ‘APRM on the Verge of Transformation: The AU Assembly Decision to Expand the APRM Mandate’, Press Release, 2 February 2017, <http://www.aprm-au.org/viewNews?newsId=150>, accessed 2 February 2017.

Enter Agenda 2063 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). These are vast, ambitious, potentially game-changing visions. Agenda 2063 is the AU's grand development plan for the continent over the next five decades. Its scope is monumental – seeking in effect to create a continental state, based on democratic and inclusionary politics, rising standards of living and broadly enjoyed economic prosperity.² The SDGs are an initiative of the UN, and seek to ensure that the entire population of the world enjoys minimum standards of living, built upon a foundation of adequate social and economic services and environmental protection by the year 2030 (the SDGs are also known as Agenda 2030).³

Both initiatives will challenge the capacities of Africa's countries to deliver on them. Their large remits demand a formidable commitment of resources – monetary, human and political. To become reality, they demand that countries formulate good policy foundations, both in terms of overall trajectories (for example, development plans) and in respect of individual goals (for example, achieving better health outcomes, or stimulating employment). They will – perhaps most importantly – demand thorough, sustained and long-term attention. Agenda 2063 has a 50-year time horizon, something that cynics might consider unrealistic or even a deliberate ploy to avoid any accountability for its outcome.

These initiatives are in many respects closely linked. Agenda 2063 predates the SDGs and, indeed, helped to inform them, as African countries were extremely active in the formulation of the SDGs through various UN processes. Both deal with development challenges, and both recognise the importance of getting the governance dimensions right. This is explicitly set out in some of the goals they espouse. Agenda 2063, for example, envisages Africa attaining high levels of development, which in turn would require appropriate policies in respect of education, healthcare, environmental protection and the economy (with the latter being increasingly driven by value-adding activity and industrialisation). Participation by governments and other influential stakeholders – especially business and civil society – is critical to ensuring that the necessary resources are available and the initiatives undertaken are legitimate. It also wants to see 'an Africa of good governance, democracy, respect for human rights, justice and the rule of law',⁴ which will in turn depend heavily on capable institutions.

The APRM, for its part, is fundamentally about governance. It seeks to promote precisely the environments within which the SDGs and Agenda 2063 hope to be realised. Its foundational document spelt this out clearly:⁵

The primary purpose of the APRM is to foster the adoption of policies, standards and practices that lead to political stability, high economic growth, sustainable development and accelerated sub regional and continental economic integration through sharing of

-
- 2 AU Commission, *Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want*, Framework Document. Addis Ababa: AU Commission, September 2015.
 - 3 UN, *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015, A/RES/70/1.
 - 4 AU Commission, *op. cit.*, Aspiration 3.
 - 5 OAU (Organization of African Unity), 'New Partnership for Africa's Development, The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)', AHG/235, 8 July 2002, para. 3.

experiences and reinforcement of successful and best practice, including identifying deficiencies and assessing the needs for capacity building.

The SDGs and Agenda 2063 require monitoring of their progress. This is not only a case of observing changes in socio-economic indices but also one of analysing the interventions undertaken to achieve them. In this regard the APRM is a promising match for the SDGs and Agenda 2063. Its Strategic Plan for the period 2016–2020 specifically envisages its playing such a role. It remarks: ‘Both the AU Agenda 2063 and the 2030 SDGs have a bearing on [the] APRM’s work, and the APRM Strategic Plan should allow AU member states to adopt and adapt a common tracking framework based on APRM tools for progress monitoring in respect of national programmes of action.’⁶

Although the details for achieving this are thin, the concept of using the APRM as a monitoring and support tool for the other processes makes intuitive sense. The APRM was, after all, specifically conceived as a tool for policy reform. Crucially, too, the normative assumptions underlying the three initiatives are compatible (discussed below).

This paper aims to analyse the complementarities between the three initiatives, and to assess the viability of using the APRM as a monitoring tool for the others. Can the APRM not only analyse the relevant data but also contribute to these initiatives, creating a vibrant, rights-oriented and developmentally focused culture? Can the APRM, the SDGs and Agenda 2063 be aligned so as to make composite monitoring possible? The following section explores the conceptual matches between the APRM, the SDGs and Agenda 2063. Thereafter, hindrances to achieving this are explored. Finally, the evidence is assessed, and recommendations on the feasibility of employing the APRM in this way are advanced.

INTEGRATING THE APRM INTO THE SDGS AND AGENDA 2063

Ideally, the APRM would function closely with the SDGs and Agenda 2063, acting largely as an information-gathering and analysis process, but one that not only measures progress but also analyses the successes and failings of processes, and suggests alternatives. Indeed, the APRM intends to do so. Its five-year strategic plan for 2016–2020 envisages ‘repositioning, re-energizing and intensifying commitment to APRM’s mandate’.⁷ It goes on to describe this process in the following terms:⁸

The major focus will be in repositioning the APRM as an instrument for monitoring and supporting attainment of the AU Agenda 2063 and the global 2030 Sustainable Development Goals. In the First Ten-Year Implementation Plan of Agenda 2063, the APRM is expected to contribute to the goals relating to the adoption of democratic values, practices, universal principles of human rights, justice and the rule of law, as well as the creation of capable institutions and transformational leadership.

6 APRM, *APRM: A Vision and Plan for the Future, Draft Strategic Plan 2016–2020*, 2016, p. 16.

7 APRM Secretariat, *Strategic Plan 2016–2020*, October 2016, p. 2, para. 12, <http://aprm-au.org/publications>, accessed 6 February 2017.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 7.

Elsewhere, the Strategic Plan identifies cooperation with the SDGs and Agenda 2063 as a key priority in the coming years.⁹

With the APRM's having decided on this path, it is instructive to examine in more detail the various factors that make it a natural complement to the SDGs and Agenda 2063.

NORMATIVE CONGRUENCE

As has been alluded to above, the APRM shares a normative framework with the SDGs and Agenda 2063. While any 'development' initiative would strive for improved living standards, profound questions of values arise when looking at matters beyond this. All three acknowledge the importance of governance to the development process, and argue that a democratic dispensation offers the most appropriate political system to achieve developmental goals. In so doing, they implicitly reject authoritarian development philosophies, or 'development from above'.

A large element of the APRM's mandate is geared explicitly towards fortifying democracy, participation, accountability and the rule of law. The first thematic area in its questionnaire is headed 'Democracy and Good Political Governance', and guides extensive and detailed analyses of these concepts as they exist in participating countries.¹⁰

These concerns are matched closely in Agenda 2063, which lists as one of its aspirations 'an Africa of good governance, democracy, respect for human rights, justice and the rule of law'.¹¹ It foresees a continent in which citizens participate in governance in a multi-party environment, where responsive institutions channel their demands, where human rights are respected and where impartial law is upheld by competent judiciaries.

In its Strategic Plan the APRM makes a direct connection between its own point of departure and that of Agenda 2063. It comments that 'the APRM has consistently highlighted the case for transformative governance. That persistent call for transformational change is embodied in the African Union Agenda 2063, which is a combined Vision and an Action Plan for the next 50 years that comprises seven aspirational goals for the Continent. Several Agenda 2063 goals are central to the mandate of the APRM'.¹²

For their part, the SDGs embody an equivalent commitment. Goal 16 calls on countries to 'promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels'.¹³ Within this goal, there are discrete requirements for participatory institutions and

9 *Ibid.*, p. 22.

10 APRM, *Revised Country Self-Assessment Questionnaire for the African Peer Review Mechanism*. Midrand: APRM Secretariat, 2012, pp. 7–24.

11 AU Commission, *op. cit.*, pp. 12–13.

12 APRM, 2016, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

13 UN, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

processes, the rule of law and combating discrimination.¹⁴ It seeks to foster a democratic and participatory ethos, for example, in calling for participatory governance and planning in urban centres.¹⁵

A LONG GAME

Both the SDGs and Agenda 2063 envisage progress being made over an extended period of time. The SDGs' horizon is 2030, while Agenda 2063 looks towards the eponymous date, 50 years from its promulgation in 2013. The APRM is in its conception a long-term process. Base reviews were meant to be followed up by subsequent reviews (although this has not in fact happened yet. Kenya is expected to be the first to undergo a second review, in 2016/2017, a decade after its initial review). The APRM has established a continental infrastructure to guide this process, as well as national level structures (in various states of operation) to implement it. Even where these structures have fallen into disuse, the APRM has at least created a conceptual framework and a precedent for the repeated evaluation of governance on multiple autonomous but interlinked levels.

The APRM is, in a sense, an institutionalised system (albeit imperfectly so). It need not be created from scratch and shares the aspirations for longevity of the SDGs and Agenda 2063.

To this conceptual compatibility can be added a pragmatic one: multiple processes imply multiple monitoring and reporting programmes. This in turn implies duplication. Could African countries, their capacity often badly stretched, not benefit from consolidating reporting frameworks into one system? The APRM is clearly a system focused on information collation and reporting, and might be an ideal support for under-capacitated national institutions.

COMPREHENSIVENESS OF COVERAGE

There is considerable thematic overlap between the different initiatives. While all three deal with governance broadly, their specific concerns substantively mirror one another. The APRM can also point to, for example, a special concern for the rights of women, which is reflected in both of the others. The APRM has a strong focus on social inclusion and fostering accountable institutions, which matches the 16th SDG and Agenda 2063's contention that Africa needs to build 'accountable leadership and responsive institutions'.¹⁶

The APRM has proven its mettle as a diagnostic tool. APRM reviews are carried out in terms of a standardised self-assessment questionnaire. A lengthy document, 105 pages in total, its inquiries are divided into four thematic areas: democracy and political

Even where these structures have fallen into disuse, the APRM has at least created a conceptual framework and a precedent for the repeated evaluation of governance on multiple autonomous but interlinked levels

14 *Ibid.*, pp. 25–26.

15 *Ibid.*, pp. 21–22.

16 AU Commission, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

governance; economic governance and management; corporate governance; and broad-based sustainable socio-economic development. Each of these is in turn divided into several broad objectives, which are then interrogated in terms of more detailed questions, and each question has indicators associated with it. The APRM's remit is very broad, and it covers virtually every aspect of governance in its questionnaire (with nothing preventing anything not so covered from being interrogated).

The APRM Country Review Reports (CRRs) that have been produced out of the various national review processes are extensive, taking in both qualitative and quantitative data. While their bulk does not make them user-friendly (and for this reason they have not captured the public imagination), they have found their way into research and policy conversations. Indeed, in a number of instances – such as electoral violence in Kenya, xenophobic violence in South Africa and ethnic clashes in Uganda in 2009 – CRRs had predicted problems that arose.

The APRM, in other words, has established a reputation for quality data collation. In some places – such as Algeria, Ghana and Kenya – it has also incorporated primary data gathering in its reviews. A broad mapping of the inquiries of the APRM, the SDGs and Agenda 2063 shows that there is a great deal of common ground between them in terms of the content they interrogate. This comparison is presented in the Appendix.

Could the APRM then be adapted to gathering the information needed to track socio-economic process for the SDGs and Agenda 2063, as well as the views of the public about the progress being made?¹⁷

Possibly, but doing so will mean altering and enhancing current arrangements. At the moment the central obstacle to doing so is the failure of the APRM to produce regular and frequent reports on the countries participating in it (this is canvassed in more detail below). Since the SDGs and Agenda 2063 are time-bound, it is imperative that any monitoring system be able to deliver timeous reports on all countries within its remit. At present the APRM has not demonstrated the ability to do so. The closest that it has come to conducting regular reviews have been implementation reports, prepared by the participating countries. These are meant to analyse the progress countries have made on addressing the issues identified in their review processes and to which their National Programmes of Action (NPOAs) committed them. But these have tended to lack detail or any independent verification. They are unlikely to be sufficient for the monitoring task.

Methodologically, to track progress on the SDGs in particular the APRM would need to be able to collate and present its findings in a consistent, comparable, quantitative format. This would greatly aid in monitoring developments germane to the SDGs and Agenda 2063 over time. This would in turn probably require some core capacity to be developed within the continental structures. Encouragingly, to improve its data-gathering capacity the APRM Secretariat is currently working with the Mo Ibrahim Foundation and the New

Since the SDGs and Agenda 2063 are time-bound, it is imperative that any monitoring system be able to deliver timeous reports on all countries within its remit. At present the APRM has not demonstrated the ability to do so

17 Given the importance attached to democratisation and broad participation, monitoring public opinion is likely to be a key part of Agenda 2063's success.

Partnership for Africa's Development Agency. Collaborations of this nature might assist in developing a model for the APRM to accelerate the pace and frequency of its reviews and standardise the outputs.

PARTICIPATION

Broad participation by non-state actors is a key principle of the APRM process, even if the actual quality of participation has varied. It is worth noting that while other processes also seek to be participatory, the particular home-grown and African character of the APRM is a powerful moral and political symbol. It foregrounds the importance that governance reform in Africa needs to place on the participation of ordinary citizens.

Both the SDGs and Agenda 2063 envisage inclusive processes, involving ordinary citizens in achieving these goals. A UN report surveying the post-2015 development agenda, entitled *The Road to Dignity by 2030*, notes: 'Member States have emphasised that sustainable development must be inclusive and people-centred.'¹⁸ These ideas – the broad notion of 'people-centred' processes – appear repeatedly in both the SDGs and Agenda 2063.

For example, in relation to the first SDG ('End poverty in all its forms everywhere') poor and vulnerable people are to be capacitated to participate in their own development. Dealing with the fifth SDG, ('Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls') requires opening up opportunities for participation in governance, the economy and so on. The sixth SDG ('Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all') seeks to involve local communities in managing water resources. The 15th ('Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss') likewise demands the involvement of communities in managing environmental resources. The 16th ('Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels') envisions broad participation in governance. In their outcomes the SDGs foresee a society in which people are better educated, healthier, more secure and more prosperous.

Likewise, Agenda 2063 recognises 'the need for people-centred development and gender equality, which places the African people at the centre of all continental efforts, to ensure their participation in the transformation of the continent, and to build caring and inclusive societies'.¹⁹ It lays considerable stress on establishing institutions that

18 UN, *The Road to Dignity by 2030: Ending Poverty, Transforming All Lives and Protecting the Planet*, Synthesis report of the Secretary-General on the post-2015 agenda. New York: UN, 2014, p. 10, http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/reports/SG_Synthesis_Report_Road_to_Dignity_by_2030.pdf.

19 AU Commission, *op. cit.*

make popular participation in governance and development possible. The enhanced involvement of women is particularly strongly sought. It notes:²⁰

Increasingly the role of the African state is seen to consist of providing the requisite environment that would enable various societal actors to effectively play their respective roles in engendering the development of their polities. Little wonder there has been so much interest among various stakeholders about the need to encourage the emergence of developmental states in Africa, superintended by a transformative and visionary leadership, imbued with the determination to address Africa's inter-locking challenges of participatory democracy and development.

'All stakeholders', Agenda 2063 intends, are to be involved in realising its goals.

The 'people-centred' or 'participatory' approach has much to commend it. Development is increasingly understood as being foremost a matter of the wellbeing of people, and it follows that development endeavours must track what is acceptable to them, prioritising in accordance with their wishes.

In the South African Institute of International Affairs' (SAIIA) experience the APRM has demonstrated its ability to drive participatory processes. While this is intended in the design of the APRM, the extent to which it has actually happened has been uneven. SAIIA's assessment of the Rwandan process, for example, was that it was tightly controlled by the country's government and not conducive to dealing with some thorny governance issues. Elsewhere – where strong civil societies exist, and where they are consciously mobilised – APRM processes have accepted and benefited from the inputs of broad swathes of society. This is an experience that could be brought to bear on the others. It should be noted, however, that considerable room exists for developing and describing best practice for participation. While research groups have attempted to develop guidelines and analyse processes that occurred, little comparable attention has been given by the APRM structures. Some systematic examination of this would be useful if the APRM is to be used to assess progress on the SDGs and Agenda 2063.

INTEGRATION AND COOPERATION

Agenda 2063, the SDGs and the APRM all adopt an integrative philosophy; that is, they move away from a 'silo mentality', which treats good governance as a separate attribute to development. Good governance and development are regarded as part of an integrated, mutually dependent process.

All three endeavours seek to promote integration and cooperation across regions.

This is arguably the central ambition of Agenda 2063, and features strongly in the SDGs as part of the development process.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 65.

This is also an important goal of the APRM, and here it can potentially offer the institutions and practices it has established as a practical contribution. The APRM is a continental initiative. It is intended to bind countries together specifically for developmental purposes, encouraging their cooperation with one another.

Peer learning is explicitly envisaged by the APRM and holds a privileged position in its makeup. While there is some debate in APRM circles about the extent to which this has happened, the concept is solid. It is not clear – and has not been publicly discussed – how deeply the APRM has in fact contributed to peer learning, but discussions between SAIIA researchers and officials within the APRM system confirm that elements of it are indeed happening. For example, Algeria is said to have offered help to Uganda in developing its hydrocarbons sector. In the public domain, the CRRs, for example, identify best practices that might give ideas to others. This has great potential for the SDGs in particular, where countries with similar conditions may be confronting similar problems.

Indeed, the experience of cooperation through the APRM framework on these projects might have the collateral impact of stimulating the APRM, making it a forum for embarking on creative, cross-border solutions.

The experience of cooperation through the APRM framework on these projects might have the collateral impact of stimulating the APRM, making it a forum for embarking on creative, cross-border solutions

BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE MONITORING

In theory, the APRM is well placed to act as a co-driver of the SDGs and of Agenda 2063. But it would be naïve to ignore some of the very real limitations. The APRM system has itself recognised this, addressing these candidly in its Strategic Plan. It sums up its thinking thus:²¹

A close examination of the state the APRM finds itself in today reveals a number of challenges that have been encountered over the past few years in particular. The challenges are many and varied; they include waning political support for the Mechanism, lengthy review process and excessively long review reports, cumbersome questionnaire, widespread non-compliance on the part of many members with their financial obligations, internal management failures, poor coordination among different APRM organs, absence of a chief executive officer for the Secretariat with full mandate to run the institution for nearly eight years, and the onset of a sense of loss of direction for some time.

If the APRM can be yoked to the SDGs and Agenda 2063 as a monitoring tool, one macro-challenge needs be confronted. The APRM is a long, cumbersome process. It is expensive (with in-country costs of up to \$3 million, quite apart from annual membership fees that have been increased to a minimum of \$200,000 from 2017). Its initial promise to speedily complete base reviews and then repeat them as regularly as every two years has not come to pass. This inertia will need to be overcome – or reviews accelerated substantially at a bare minimum – if the APRM is to step into this role. It would need to be able to increase the pace at which it carries out reviews, do more of them, and get them completed more rapidly.

21 APRM, 2016, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

The specific conceptual and technical obstacles include:

- **The sheer size and scope of the APRM.** The APRM has proven itself to be a large, complex process. The resources required for the process and the timeframes have been noted above. Consultation on the myriad issues involved has been a logistical challenge, to put it mildly. This has resulted in APRM review processes taking years to complete. The outputs have been the large CRRs which, while rich in information, lack clear narratives or indexes and are simply not user-friendly. This is one reason why the APRM has failed to enter popular, mainstream conversation on governance in most countries. It also works against the APRM's acting as a review mechanism for the SDGs and Agenda 2063, which would require current, easily accessible information, provided at regular and frequent intervals.
- **The lack of NPoA budgeting and implementation.** This is highlighted in the APRM Strategic Plan, which notes that this leg of the APRM process was not dealt with in sufficient detail when the process was designed, while implementation reports essentially require that governments' analyses be accepted at face value: 'These reports are for the most part prepared by the Governments concerned, without civil society participation prominent earlier in the process, and have often been submitted late; there is currently no real capacity in the APRM Secretariat for independent monitoring of their content.'²² In effect, the lack of attention and rigour in relation to NPoA implementation means that the APRM process has foregone a wonderful opportunity for public visibility.
- **The lack of firm, consistent and quantifiable indicators.** Despite the APRM Questionnaire's having been revised in 2010/2011, its indicators to measure governance and development are less robust and refined than those of either the MDGs and now the SDGs or Agenda 2063. The APRM could learn from these systems on the importance of adopting clear indicators that mark progress towards the achievement of ultimate goals. This is not about replacing the reviews, but perhaps supplementing them – which would allow for shorter follow-up timeframes and more regular reporting.
- **The political dimensions and contestation.** For example, some of the hurdles it has faced have been who would be included on the National Governing Councils (the bodies that manage national-level processes), how the consultations would be conducted and how the CRRs would be compiled and edited. This has added to the time required for the process; sometimes – as in Kenya – grinding it to a halt. If these issues are not adequately addressed they risk undermining the credibility of the process, the reports it generates and the plans of action these may produce. Given the emphasis in both the SDGs and Agenda 2063 on public support and participation, such a mistake could prove serious for its success.

²² APRM, 2016, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

- **Occasionally indifferent political commitment by participating countries' leadership.** On the most basic level, some countries – such as Angola – have made virtually no progress in getting their reviews underway. Others – such as Rwanda, Ethiopia and even to an extent South Africa – have proceeded with reviews while seeking to control their outcomes. Many others took years from accession to start the process. The APRM simply did not become a priority. More concerning is that after the first reviews were completed, most participants seemed to lose interest. Attendance at the Forum of Participating Heads of State and Government has been poor and, as far as SAIIA is aware, no public attempt has been made to hold peer countries accountable for their commitments in terms of their NPOAs. Monitoring the SDGs and Agenda 2063 will be a long-term, resource-demanding process. Without staunch political support the APRM is unlikely to be able to perform the repeated monitoring that these initiatives demand.
- **A lack of funding.** While details of the funding received by the continental APRM authorities are sparse, what is in the public domain suggests that most countries have failed to honour their annual minimum subscription of \$100,000 (as it was then), that overall the process had leaned heavily on foreign donors (who have declined radically since the first few years) and that what was being contributed was far short of the planned expenditure.²³ Information on national level processes is fragmentary, but with reviews costing as much as \$3 million, they represent a substantial commitment for countries with meagre revenues and other competing priorities. The upshot is that the resources to undertake reviews and any of the other supplementary activities are largely not available. It should be noted that recently, the CEO of the APRM Secretariat has said that its financial position is improving – although no supporting evidence of this has been made public. The operating expenses of the APRM Secretariat are about \$10 million annually, with a considerable shortfall even if all 35 countries were to pay their arrears (amounting to some \$14 million) or their revised minimum annual fees of \$200,000. Without a significant infusion of funding at both national and continental levels, it is doubtful whether the APRM could undertake the sustained evaluations that the SDGs and Agenda 2063 demand.
- **Administrative weaknesses.** While this is difficult to quantify, as it involves the internal workings of the organisation, the APRM Secretariat lacked a permanent CEO for seven years, during which time it seems little movement on reviews took place. In addition, there have been allegations of impropriety and maladministration levelled against certain officials (not least at some members of the Panel of Eminent Persons, whose remit is to ensure the integrity of the process). These must be dealt with if the APRM is to up the tempo of its reviews and contribute to the monitoring of other initiatives.

23 APRM Secretariat, *APRM Annual Report 2011*. Midrand: APRM Secretariat, 2011, pp. 26–27; APRM Secretariat, *Annual Report 2012*. Midrand: APRM Secretariat, 2012, p. 33; APRM Secretariat, *APRM Annual Report 2013*. Midrand: APRM Secretariat, 2013, p. 73.

As part of the AU system or the African Governance Architecture, the APRM is a natural fit for Agenda 2063. It is perhaps less so for the SDGs

Beyond that, there are questions about how well the APRM is fulfilling some of its mandated roles. For example, peer learning is potentially one of the most important functions it could play, but it is debateable just how much of this has taken place. Likewise, political pressure on recalcitrant states – to rectify their governance failings – seems not to have been applied. Rwanda, Algeria and Uganda are all states with well-recognised democratic failings, some of which are noted in the respective reports, but there is no public evidence of which SAIIA is aware that peer states have sought to push them towards reform.²⁴ The APRM Strategic Plan supports this contention by noting that ‘the tone of the meetings of the Forum of the African Peer Review Mechanism, made up of the Heads of State or Government of all States participating in APRM ... could be made more robust’.²⁵

It is reasonable to say that governments have been wary of the APRM, as it provides a fulsome opportunity for critics to have their say. This was probably always going to be the case, but might have been mitigated had the APRM been able to bring in notable and defined benefits (as Trevor Manuel once remarked).²⁶ The record on this has not been particularly good, and thus the incentive to participate has declined. The APRM has not thus far conducted any systematic review of its impact (although there is some anecdotal evidence). Countries have submitted reports on their implementation of the NPoA, but it is notable that very little branding of reforms as being inspired by the APRM has taken place. Conversely, little resource mobilisation has been directly attributed to the APRM.

The APRM is also a voluntary initiative. Not all African countries are involved. While this has the advantage (theoretically) of limiting participation to committed countries – although not all that have joined are really committed in any event – it would not be able to deal with all countries.

MOVING FORWARD

To use the APRM as a tool to advance the SDGs and Agenda 2063, the hurdles listed above would need to be overcome. A number of specific interventions would be necessary to do so.

INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION AND INSTITUTIONAL REACH

As part of the AU system or the African Governance Architecture, the APRM is a natural fit for Agenda 2063. It is perhaps less so for the SDGs. However, it does not include

24 Maybe a point to note here is that at the outset there was some confusion as to whether the APRM would be a full-bodied governance review process or confine itself to socio-economic questions. Perhaps this dynamic was never properly dealt with, and we are seeing a variant of it in action.

25 APRM, 2016, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

26 Herbert R & S Gruzd, *The African Peer Review Mechanism: Lessons from the Pioneers*. Johannesburg: SAIIA (South African Institute of International Affairs), 2008, p. 108.

many of Africa's states, as only 35 out of 54 have joined the APRM. To the extent that the SDGs and Agenda 2063 might wish to interact with 'Africa', the APRM would be at a disadvantage.

The logical response is to argue that what counts is coverage of individual countries, since they are ultimately the ones that will have to take the decisions and the responsibility for progress. Therefore, if the APRM can assist them foremost – and the larger community as a bonus – then it will have achieved its purpose. Indeed, there are any number of regional or political communities that also have an interest in and claim on development processes, so a lack of buy-in from some African countries is not in itself really a valid argument.

The APRM must therefore be promoted as a part of the African SDG/Agenda 2063 project, rather than as a seamless, comprehensive overlay.

One course of action that Africa's leaders might find beneficial is to propose a new, continent-wide system of data gathering, limited to socio-economic factors. Such a system would be comprehensive (with associated implications for integration and cooperation) but would not engage much with politics, certainly not the normative underpinnings. In other words, it would seek information but be weak on accountability.

This is a seductive idea, but could be countered by pointing out that irrespective of its weaknesses, the APRM has an identifiable brand and some experience in this work. It would not need to be built from scratch. Also, it makes no sense to degrade the importance of accountability, since that is inherent in both the SDGs and Agenda 2063 – unless, of course, that is meant as so much rhetoric and not to be taken seriously.

Finally, the APRM has assembled a massive trove of data. Talk of turning this into a knowledge centre needs to be converted into action – of which there is little sign at present. It could prove a rich developmental resource, with an obvious tie-in to the SDGs and Agenda 2063. The APRM could also learn from the way the other two systems have developed robust indicators.

GETTING REVIEWS MOVING

In order to perform the task envisaged here, the APRM has to radically improve the frequency of its reviews. This would require action at both national and continental level, but arguably more so at the former. The need to commit the funds and other resources alone is a large undertaking. But if the APRM is to fulfil these monitoring and analytical tasks, they will need to be provided.

The large-scale, comprehensive base review model will not be feasible for regular reviews. However, more limited but still participatory and in-depth reviews could be. Their subject matter might be limited to certain themes, which would themselves be tied to the SDGs and goals within Agenda 2063. Since there is a great deal of overlap in the aims and aspirations of the three programmes, this should be relatively easy to do.

The involvement of UN agencies – again, in view of the SDGs – would assist in giving these APRM reviews (perhaps rebranded ‘APRM Development Reviews’) the prominence and political priority they deserve, especially if they build on measurable development indicators. A stronger connection between the APRM and the SDGs might assist states in mobilising resources for development, if they are seen to be reducing overlap and promoting synergies. However, countries should not accede to the APRM and expect a flood of resources for development. Practice has shown this seldom to be the case.

MEANINGFULLY INVOLVING CIVIL SOCIETY

As has been noted above, the APRM has the unique feature of being accessible to all stakeholders – again, in theory, and again, certainly imperfectly. But this is a bold experiment in participation and needs to be protected and nurtured. Given the extent of Africa’s developmental deficits and governance deficiencies, it is important that the perspectives of ordinary citizens be canvassed and understood. As has been noted above, the achievement of the SDGs/Agenda 2063 requires that more than simple data be monitored. Reaching these goals requires an understanding of the efficacy of policy interventions, and the manner in which they are impacting on the continent’s people.

In this area, probably more so than any other, the case for the APRM is strong. It has a track record of such engagement. Indeed, this is intrinsic to its brand.

The potential contribution of information and communications technology (ICT) for mobilisation and data collation should not be underestimated. Online surveys, virtual communities and so on can gather inputs and data and alert large numbers of people to pressing issues. Properly applied, this could simplify and accelerate the necessary but cumbersome consultation process. The APRM is considering the use of technology to speed up and streamline reviews, an avenue that should be explored. The introduction of clear, universal benchmarks, milestones and indicators into the APRM monitoring process would assist in objectively assessing progress and identifying areas for corrective action.

In several countries – such as Zambia and South Africa – civil society was extremely active in steering and shaping the APRM (with mixed success). Civil society groups so engaged should agitate for the APRM to take up this role.

THE APRM’S PERSPECTIVE

As noted above, the APRM’s Strategic Plan for the period to 2020 recognises the problems that it confronts. It also pledges to confront and deal with them. To this end, it has devised a plan of action with eight broad elements. These are:

- **Advocacy and communication:** this will focus on promoting shared normative values, outreach to and cooperation with constituencies (including civil society) and integrating the APRM into the AU system;

- **Review and implement the APRM core mandate:** this concerns among other things conducting missions (it is implied, although not explicitly stated, that this will entail accelerating the pace and regularity of reviews), reviewing governance challenges on the continent, conducting impact assessments of its work and being recognised as the monitoring agency for Agenda 2063 and the SDGs;
- **Financial management and resource mobilisation:** the APRM will embark on campaigns to raise funds, ensure that subscriptions are paid timeously and in full, enhance its financial management and exhibit more transparency in regard to its finances;
- **Human resource and capacity development:** align human resource matters to those of the APRM, understand the skills and staffing needs and address them;
- **Development of monitoring and evaluation framework and systems:** establish a system to probe the quality of national and continental APRM work;
- **Enhancement of research and development capacity and improvement of tools:** this envisages establishing partnerships with researchers and institutes, improving the quality of reviews, investigating compliance with NPoAs and establishing a Knowledge Hub to share data;
- **Intra-APRM coordination and harmonisation:** improve the linkages and information flow between various components of the APRM system; and
- **Integration of the APRM into AU structures, universal accession and enhanced APRM relevance to African regional integration:** this seeks to complete the process of integration into the AU and to achieve universal accession by all AU states to the APRM.

This programme implies a comprehensive attempt to deal with the APRM's failures. If achieved it would go a considerable distance to dismantling the barriers identified above. While it is commendable that the APRM has committed itself to undertaking this raft of actions, some healthy scepticism is necessary. These are ambitious plans, and each part depends on progress in the others. Success is far from assured. For example, while enhancing the frequency and quality of reviews is a capital idea, it will depend on raising funds. That the plan calls for increasing revenue is good – but there is no guarantee that participating states will in fact be willing to make these funds available after having failed to do so for years. Nor is it a foregone conclusion that other donors will be enticed to support the APRM. The conversion of the APRM's long and cumbersome questionnaire into an ICT-enabled survey and research tool is one possible means to fast-track reviews to explore in the medium term. Another might be to partner with research institutes or multilateral agencies to develop and track a set of developmental indicators. A third – provided the resources could be marshalled – might be to maintain a comprehensive, up-to-date database of indicators that are collated by other institutions (the World Bank, World Economic Forum and so on). This would help establish the APRM as a true centre of knowledge; African scholars and governance practitioners would be invited to contribute commentary on such data as it is released.

There is also the possibility that the course of action chosen may prove to be misplaced. Universal accession to the process, for example, could be very difficult to achieve. It might also be ill-advised, drawing a large number of uncommitted states into the system – which might turn out to be a weight on the process.²⁷

Achieving this will demand perseverance and patience on the part of the APRM system. Equally important, civil society and an engaged research community need to press their own demands for the revival of the APRM.

CONCLUSION

As a monitoring mechanism for the SDGs and Agenda 2063, the APRM has a great deal to recommend it. It is an established brand (albeit a somewhat shop-worn one) and is located within a normative framework that matches closely with those of the others. It has also developed a track record of data gathering and diagnosis.

Whether it can move from a theoretical complementarity to performing the practical business of governance assessment is, however, in doubt. Another key question is how the APRM can practically support the development imperative of the SDGs and Agenda 2063. It will need to undergo substantial reform and revitalisation if this is to be possible.

There must be a rejuvenation of political commitment. At both a national and continental level, countries involved in the APRM must commit to participating actively. A basic commitment would be for heads of state to attend meetings of the APRM Forum. Equally important, budgets must make provision for the financial costs of membership, as well as maintaining domestic APRM institutions even when reviews are not in progress. Official APRM structures must likewise be active and visible in advocating for the benefits of the process.

Commitment must be shown not only by governments and official structures but also by activists and researchers seeking the revitalisation of the process. Following the aphorism that accountability must be demanded, activists wishing to see the APRM in operation need to make a case for it.

Beyond revitalisation, the APRM would need to be made much more robust. Its virtues notwithstanding, it has not shown the operational ability thus far to meet the challenges of a monitoring role for the SDGs and Agenda 2063. It would require an enormously enhanced APRM system to conduct frequent and regular reviews of multiple countries, produce reports timeously and ensure that progress and regression can be followed. The APRM could do well to learn how progress is tracked and evaluated. Returning to the UN's methodology on the MDGs and SDGs and the discussions with the Mo Ibrahim Foundation would be useful steps to consider how the evaluation framework of the

Commitment must be shown not only by governments and official structures but also by activists and researchers seeking the revitalisation of the process

27 See Corrigan T, 'Why the African Peer Review Mechanism Must Remain Voluntary', SIIA Policy Briefing, 130, March 2015.

APRM could or should be amended or expanded to enhance its ability to actively monitor development progress, of which governance is an integral part.

Assuming the APRM can be revitalised and enhanced, the not inconsiderable task of integrating it with Agenda 2063 and the SDGs will need to be faced. The APRM would need to negotiate the terms of interaction with the other initiatives, and then decide on a suitable structuring of the enquiries. Would it undertake monitoring on behalf of the individual countries, or for the AU? Would it establish a separate SDG unit, or would the SDG monitoring be undertaken as standard APRM reviews?

If all of this proves possible, the APRM will step into a role far more ambitious than that of governance review and promotion, for which it was initially designed. Its place in Africa's developmental history would be assured.

APPENDIX

This table reflects only the broader divisions of the various documents. It is possible to find more specific matches and divergences. This will need to be addressed through further analysis. Interestingly, the SDGs and Agenda 2063 match each other on many specific issues, with both calling for a 2030 completion date.

Concept	APRM	Sustainable Development Goals	Agenda 2063
Poverty	<p>The APRM regards poverty as a central, cross-cutting issue. Many of its investigations have some relevance to poverty alleviation or elimination. Specifically addressed in</p> <p>Thematic area: Socio-economic development:</p> <p>Objective 3: Alleviate poverty, unemployment and inequality (this objective calls for an analysis of the state of poverty in participating countries and of the work done to combat it. It also has a question focussing on the conditions of feminised poverty)</p>	<p>Goal #1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere (including raising incomes so that none are forced to subsist on less than \$1.25 a day, assisting communities to help themselves out of poverty, and paying particular attention to the conditions of vulnerable groups, especially women)</p>	<p>Goal 1: A high standard of living, quality of life and wellbeing for all citizens:</p> <p>Priority: End poverty and eliminate hunger and malnutrition;</p> <p>Priority: Affordable social security and protection for all (key in this area is raising the per capita income tenfold between 2013 and 2063)</p>
Food security	<p>Thematic area: Economic governance and management:</p> <p>Objective 1: Design and implement economic policies for sustainable development</p> <p>Thematic area: Socio-economic development:</p> <p>Objective 1: Promote and accelerate broad-based sustainable socio-economic development;</p> <p>Objective 3: Alleviate poverty, unemployment and inequality (there are specific and extensive inquiries about food security and rural development)</p>	<p>Goal #2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture (including eliminating hunger, increasing the capacity of people to feed themselves, helping small farmers to double production, removing distorting protectionist barriers, and building adequate infrastructure in rural areas)</p>	<p>Goal 1: A high standard of living, quality of life and wellbeing for all citizens:</p> <p>Priority: End poverty and eliminate hunger and malnutrition</p> <p>Goal 6: Modern agriculture for increased production, productivity and value addition:</p> <p>Priority: Increased agricultural production;</p> <p>Priority: Increased agricultural productivity is anchored in a world-class research infrastructure</p>

Concept	APRM	Sustainable Development Goals	Agenda 2063
Health	<p>Health tends to be dispersed in various parts of the questionnaire, being one of a number that are collectively enquired after, but should be individually answered.</p> <p>Thematic area: Democracy and political governance:</p> <p>Objective 8: Promotion and protection of the rights of vulnerable groups, including internally displaced persons, refugees and persons with disabilities</p> <p>Thematic area: Socio-economic development:</p> <p>Objective 1: Promote and accelerate broad-based sustainable socio-economic development;</p> <p>Objective 3: Alleviate poverty, unemployment and inequality</p>	<p>Goal #3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages (including reducing infant mortality and the disease burden, increasing healthcare coverage, improving environmental conditions and improving the institutional capacity of countries to handle health threats)</p>	<p>Goal 3: Healthy and well-nourished citizens:</p> <p>Priority: Citizens enjoy long and quality healthy lives;</p> <p>Priority: Nutritional status of citizens is acceptable by international standards</p>
Education	<p>Thematic area: Democracy and political governance:</p> <p>Objective 7: Promotion and protection of the rights of children and young persons;</p> <p>Objective 8: Promotion and protection of the rights of vulnerable groups, including internally displaced persons, refugees and persons with disabilities</p> <p>Thematic area: Socio-economic development:</p> <p>Objective 1: Promote and accelerate broad-based sustainable socio-economic development;</p> <p>Objective 3: Alleviate poverty, unemployment and inequality;</p> <p>Objective 4: Progress towards gender equality, in particular equal access to education for girls at all levels</p>	<p>Goal #4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all (including commitments to universal completion of primary and secondary education by 2030, skills acquisition, opportunities for adult education, and the provision of teachers and education infrastructure)</p>	<p>Goal 2: Well-educated citizens and skills revolution underpinned by science, technology and innovation:</p> <p>Priority: Literate, creative and adaptive citizenry;</p> <p>Priority: Skills revolution for the 21st century, global competitive environment (a particular stress is placed on competence in the sciences)</p>

Concept	APRM	Sustainable Development Goals	Agenda 2063
Gender	<p>This is a cross-cutting issue and finds expression throughout the questionnaire. Specific inquiries are found in:</p> <p>Thematic area: Democracy and political governance:</p> <p>Objective 6: Promotion and protection of the rights of women</p> <p>Thematic area: Economic governance and management:</p> <p>Objective 1: Design and implement economic policies for sustainable development</p> <p>Thematic area: Corporate governance:</p> <p>Objective 4: Ensuring that organisations treat stakeholders fairly and equitably;</p> <p>Objective 5: Ensuring that organisations act as good corporate citizens</p> <p>Thematic area: Socio-economic development:</p> <p>Objective 4: Progress towards gender equality, in particular equal access to education for girls at all levels</p>	<p>Goal #5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls (including removing all forms of discrimination, improving the social and life circumstances of women, ensuring sexual and reproductive rights, using ICT to empower women, and adopting policies that further gender equality)</p>	<p>Goal 15: Full gender equality in all spheres of life:</p> <p>Priority: Empowered women and girls and equal access and opportunity in all spheres of life;</p> <p>Priority: Ending all forms of violence and discrimination (social, economic and political) against women and girls and ensure full enjoyment of all their human rights</p>
Youth	<p>Thematic area: Democracy and political governance:</p> <p>Objective 7: Promotion and protection of the rights of children and young persons</p>	<p>This is surprisingly little examined. References are made to youth employment (Goal #8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all)</p>	<p>Goal 16:</p> <p>Priority: Empowered youth and children with access and opportunity in all spheres of life, especially education, health and employment</p>

TABLE 1 MAPPING THE COMMONALITIES BETWEEN THE APRM, SDGS AND AGENDA 2063			
Concept	APRM	Sustainable Development Goals	Agenda 2063
Water and sanitation	<p>Water issues are addressed, although largely from the point of view of service provision. These should be read in conjunction with the material associated suggested as dealing with environmental protection below.</p> <p>Thematic area: Economic governance and management:</p> <p>Objective 1: Design and implement economic policies for sustainable development;</p> <p>Objective 3: Alleviate poverty, unemployment and inequality</p>	<p>Goal #6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all (including achieving universal access to water and sanitation services by 2030, and improved management of water resources)</p>	<p>In the Africa of 2063, universal access to potable water and sanitation services will exist.</p> <p>Goal 4: Modern and liveable habitats:</p> <p>Priority: Every citizen has affordable and sustainable access to quality basic necessities of life</p> <p>Goal 7: Environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient economies and communities:</p> <p>Priority: Water security for domestic, agricultural and industrial use assured</p>
Energy	<p>Thematic area: Economic governance and management:</p> <p>Objective 1: Design and implement economic policies for sustainable development</p> <p>Thematic area: Socio-economic development:</p> <p>Objective 1: Promote and accelerate broad-based sustainable socio-economic development</p>	<p>Goal #7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all (including ensuring universal access to reliable, modern forms of energy by 2030, expanding infrastructure, and increasing energy efficiency and clean energy)</p>	<p>Agenda 2063 is very aware of the need for the continent to establish a reliable power grid, although where targets for energy are set, they tend to focus on the need for more renewable energy.</p> <p>Goal 7: Environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient economies and communities:</p> <p>Priority: Renewable energy (wind, solar, hydro, bio, geothermal) as the main source of power for households, businesses and organisations</p>

TABLE 1 MAPPING THE COMMONALITIES BETWEEN THE APRM, SDGS AND AGENDA 2063			
Concept	APRM	Sustainable Development Goals	Agenda 2063
Economic growth and employment	<p>Thematic area: Economic governance and management:</p> <p>Objective 1: Design and implement economic policies for sustainable development;</p> <p>Objective 6: Develop and implement trade and investment policies that promote economic growth</p> <p>Thematic area: Corporate governance:</p> <p>Objective 4: Ensuring that organisations treat stakeholders fairly and equitably;</p> <p>Objective 5: Ensuring that organisations act as good corporate citizens</p> <p>Thematic area: Socio-economic development:</p> <p>Objective 1: Promote and accelerate broad-based sustainable socio-economic development</p>	<p>Goal #8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all (including sustained per capita economic growth, innovation, environmentally sustainable economic activities, upskilling and labour rights)</p>	<p>Goal 5: Transformed economies and jobs:</p> <p>Priority: Accelerated and inclusive economic growth and macroeconomic stability;</p> <p>Priority: Accelerated manufacturing is the generator of decent jobs;</p> <p>Priority: Opportunities for transitioning from idleness, vulnerable/informal sector jobs to formal sector jobs expanded;</p> <p>Priority: Expanded ownership, control and value addition (local content) in extractive industries;</p> <p>Priority: Diversified economy for increased resilience to external economic shocks;</p> <p>Priority: Economic development is driven by science, technology and innovation</p>
Infrastructure	<p>Thematic area: Economic governance and management:</p> <p>Objective 1: Design and implement economic policies for sustainable development</p> <p>Thematic area: Socio-economic development:</p> <p>Objective 1: Promote and accelerate broad-based sustainable socio-economic development</p>	<p>Goal #9: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialisation and foster innovation (upgrade and expand stock of infrastructure)</p>	<p>Goal 9: World-class infrastructure criss-crosses Africa:</p> <p>Priority: Communications infrastructure connectivity (road, rail, air, marine, voice, electronic) with neighbouring states and beyond is in place</p>

TABLE 1 MAPPING THE COMMONALITIES BETWEEN THE APRM, SDGS AND AGENDA 2063			
Concept	APRM	Sustainable Development Goals	Agenda 2063
Inequality and social cohesion	<p>The APRM deals with inequality within societies, but not really with inequality between different societies.</p> <p>Thematic area: Democracy and political governance:</p> <p>Objective 3: Prevention and management of intra- and inter-state conflicts</p> <p>Thematic area: Socio-economic development:</p> <p>Objective 3: Alleviate poverty, unemployment and inequality</p>	<p>Goal #10: Reduce inequality within and among countries (income growth and upliftment of bottom 40%, the upliftment of vulnerable groups, a voice for them in governance, as well as cooperation between countries with special attention to the needs of the least developed)</p>	<p>Calls for reducing inequalities stress the urban/rural divide, gender and income category.</p> <p>Goal 1: A high standard of living, quality of life and wellbeing for all citizens:</p> <p>Priority: End poverty and eliminate hunger and malnutrition</p> <p>In addition, Goal 17 has a bearing on this, seeing Africa as an equal partner in the world. Goal 17: Africa as a major partner in global affairs and peaceful coexistence:</p> <p>Priority: Continental and international treaties, protocols and conventions that will make Africa a major partner in global economic prosperity fully adhered to;</p> <p>Priority: Partner in global development</p>
Urban life	<p>Very little on this specifically, although in theory many of the inquiries could be adapted to a specific concern with city life.</p> <p>Thematic area: Socio-economic development:</p> <p>Objective 1: Promote and accelerate broad-based sustainable socio-economic development</p>	<p>Goal #11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable (upgrade living conditions in cities by 2030, provide reliable public transport, ensure urban economic growth, and foster sensitivity to environmental challenges)</p>	<p>Goal 1: A high standard of living, quality of life and wellbeing for all citizens:</p> <p>Priority: End poverty and eliminate hunger and malnutrition</p> <p>Goal 4: Modern and liveable habitats:</p> <p>Priority: Human settlements are modernised</p> <p>Goal 7: Environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient economies and communities:</p> <p>Priority: Renewable energy (wind, solar, hydro, bio, geothermal) as the main source of power for households, businesses and organisations</p>

TABLE 1 MAPPING THE COMMONALITIES BETWEEN THE APRM, SDGS AND AGENDA 2063			
Concept	APRM	Sustainable Development Goals	Agenda 2063
Sustainable use	Alluded to and implied in various places, although not as specifically as the SDGs do. See 'Environmental protection' below for the closest match	Goal #12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns (ensure sustainable use of resources, promote innovation, move away from incentives to use fossil fuels)	Goal 7: Environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient economies and communities: Priority: Societies produce and consume goods and services in a sustainable manner
Climate change	Thematic area: Corporate Governance: Objective 5: Ensuring that organisations act as good corporate citizens Thematic area: Socio-economic development: Objective 1: Promote and accelerate broad-based sustainable socio-economic development	Goal #13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts (combatting climate change and adapting to its impacts)	This is referenced repeatedly in the document, but in its list of goals it is dealt with as part of broader environmental goals. Goal 7: Environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient economies and communities: Priority: Climate-resilient, low-carbon production systems in place and significantly minimising vulnerability and natural disasters; Priority: Renewable energy (wind, solar, hydro, bio, geothermal) as the main source of power for households, businesses and organisations
Environmental protection	Thematic area: Economic governance and management: Objective 1 especially: Design and implement economic policies for sustainable development Thematic area: Corporate governance: Objective 4: Ensuring that organisations treat stakeholders fairly and equitably Thematic area: Socio-economic development: Objective 1: Promote and accelerate broad-based sustainable socio-economic development	Goal #14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development Goal #15: Protect, restore and promote the sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss (these objectives call for time-bound interventions to secure the future of terrestrial and marine environments, including their rehabilitation where degraded, and the involvement of local communities in achieving these goals and benefiting from these resources)	Goal 7: Environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient economies and communities: Priority: Biodiversity, including forests, genetic resources, land, coastal and marine ecosystems conserved and used sustainably; Priority: Water security for domestic, agricultural and industrial use assured; Priority: Climate-resilient, low-carbon production systems in place and significantly minimising vulnerability and natural disasters; Priority: Renewable energy (wind, solar, hydro, bio, geothermal) as the main source of power for households, businesses and organisations

Concept	APRM	Sustainable Development Goals	Agenda 2063
Democracy and human rights	<p>Thematic area: Democracy and political governance:</p> <p>Objective 1 especially: Entrenching constitutional democracy and the rule of law;</p> <p>Objective 2: Upholding the separation, checks and balance of powers;</p> <p>Objective 3: Prevention and management of intra- and inter-state conflicts;</p> <p>Objective 4: Promotion and protection of civil and political rights as enshrined in African and international human rights instruments;</p> <p>Objective 5: Ensuring accountable, efficient and effective public service delivery at the national and decentralised levels</p>	<p>Goal #16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels (including participation, accountability, democracy, peaceful conflict resolution, the rule of law, equal official protection for all, and security)</p>	<p>Goal 10: Democratic values, practices, universal principles of human rights, justice and the rule of law entrenched:</p> <p>Priority: Democratic values and practices are entrenched;</p> <p>Priority: Respect for human rights, justice and rule of law</p> <p>Goal 11: Capable institutions and transformative leadership in place at all levels:</p> <p>Priority: Development management institutions in place and functioning effectively and are at the service of the people;</p> <p>Priority: Participation in all aspects of local governance and capacity to manage disasters in place</p> <p>A key aspiration is to be an 'Africa of good governance, democracy, respect for human rights, justice and the rule of law'. It notes that achieving these are among Africa's current priorities</p>
Peace and security	<p>Thematic area: Democracy and political governance:</p> <p>Objective 3: Prevention and management of intra- and inter-state conflicts</p>	<p>Goal #16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels (including participation, accountability, democracy, peaceful conflict resolution, the rule of law, equal official protection for all, and security)</p>	<p>Goal 12: Peace, security and stability is preserved:</p> <p>Priority: Entrenched culture of peace;</p> <p>Priority: Security and safety for all citizens are assured;</p> <p>Priority: Appropriate contribution in defending the continent, including peacebuilding, is made by all</p>

TABLE 1 MAPPING THE COMMONALITIES BETWEEN THE APRM, SDGS AND AGENDA 2063			
Concept	APRM	Sustainable Development Goals	Agenda 2063
Resourcing development and self-reliance	<p>Thematic area: Socio-economic development:</p> <p>Objective 1: Promote and accelerate broad-based sustainable socio-economic development;</p> <p>Objective 3: Promote sound public finance management</p>	<p>Goal #17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalise the global partnership for sustainable development (including references to resource mobilisation, domestic and foreign)</p>	<p>Recognises the importance of shifting from a dependence on aid to domestic financing. It calls for a resource mobilisation strategy to be put in place to ensure that this happens. It envisages some support from the African diaspora and securing resources through combating illicit financial flows. It also moots a possible Agenda 2063 implementation tax.</p> <p>Goal 18: Africa takes full responsibility for financing its development:</p> <p>Priority: Capital markets fully developed;</p> <p>Priority: Optimal, transparent fiscal systems that lead to public sector revenue maximisation are in place;</p> <p>Priority: Aid dependency is history</p>
Integration/ pan-Africanism	<p>Thematic area: Economic governance and management:</p> <p>Objective 5: Accelerate and deepen regional integration in the monetary, trade and investment domain</p>	<p>Although the SDGs imply cooperation, little in this regard is specifically to be examined</p>	<p>Agenda 2063 adopts a highly ideological approach to integration that goes beyond the pragmatic.</p> <p>Goal 13: Pan-Africanism is fully entrenched:</p> <p>Priority: Values and ideals of pan-Africanism realised; African cultural renaissance is eminent;</p> <p>Priority: Cultural values respected and practiced by all;</p> <p>Priority: Cultural institutions in place to develop capacity for the promotion of culture and micro cultural businesses; citizens who are well informed of Africa's past, present and steeped in African language and literature</p>

SAIIA'S FUNDING PROFILE

SAIIA raises funds from governments, charitable foundations, companies and individual donors. Our work is currently being funded by, among others, the Bradlow Foundation, the UK's Department for International Development, the Konrad Adenauer Foundation, the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, the World Bank, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, the Open Society Foundations, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Oxfam South Africa and the Centre for International Governance and Innovation. SAIIA's corporate membership is drawn from the South African private sector and international businesses with an interest in Africa. In addition, SAIIA has a substantial number of international diplomatic and mainly South African institutional members.



Jan Smuts House, East Campus, University of the Witwatersrand
PO Box 31596, Braamfontein 2017, Johannesburg, South Africa
Tel +27 (0)11 339-2021 • Fax +27 (0)11 339-2154
www.saiia.org.za • info@saiia.org.za