

Terence Corrigan

Fourth Draft

2 November 2008

Socio-economic problems facing Africa: Insights from six APRM Country Review Reports

Introduction

Central to the African Peer Review Mechanism Process (APRM) – and in common with any of the previous attempts at continental reform – is the question of how poverty can be alleviated and the socio-economic conditions of Africa's people can be improved. It makes a firm attempt, in line with the New Partnership for Africa's Development (Nepad) initiative but somewhat in a departure from previous plans, to link governance with development and economic growth. To this end, the APRM emphasises 'Socio-economic development' as one of the four broad thematic areas that must be interrogated in the course of the process. The hope is that this interrogation – carried out in separate but linked phases by the in-country stakeholders and by the pan-African Country Review Mission – will either identify strengths and weaknesses in the countries' efforts to deal with socio-economic challenges, or at least shine some light on them and perhaps encourage some new thinking.

Parameters

The focus of this paper is on the problems facing countries. Problems lend themselves to better and more empirical observation than ideas about solutions, and the commonalities between the problems facing different countries can more readily be identified than putative solutions. Therefore, while the achievements of the countries and the recommendations of the Panel of Eminent Persons will receive some attention, they will not be discussed in the same detail as the problems.

Little distinction has been made between the material in the Country Review Reports drawn from the Country Self-Assessment Reports and that produced by the Country Review Mission (CRM) itself. The rationale is that if material from the CSAR was included in the report without an explicit refutation, it was accepted as having been agreed to by the CRM.

Dealing with six reports written by different teams means that there is not perfect consistency in the issues raised. Indeed, these reports deal with six different countries and the issues they face are not identical. In preparing this paper, attempts were made to categorise things: this would allow common or related problems to be analysed. Ultimately, what has been attempted in this paper is to identify the common problems facing Africa in broad strokes, and to provide some analysis and discussion to a reasonable degree of detail, rather than splitting the problems into a more extensive list from the outset.

In the same vein, the question could be raised as to what makes an issue ‘common’? There is no sharp answer to this, and the particular circumstances of one country will probably not exist in others. However, a problems experienced in one country might have parallels or lessons for others. The dislocation caused by Rwanda’s genocide may not have a direct parallel in another country, but the problems may be ‘common’ to the extent that other countries have had to deal with other ‘dislocation’ issues – migration, refugees etc.

Finally, to the extent that the recommendations of the report have been considered, they have with one or two exceptions been sourced only within the Socio-Economic Development section. Other recommendations germane to the material presented here may well exist in other sections, but this was outside the immediate purview of this study. An attempt has been made to identify all the solutions (in the Socio-Economic Development section) relevant to the issue under review.

The countries concerned

The APRM reports that have thus far been produced are for six countries: Algeria, Benin, Ghana, Kenya, Rwanda and South Africa. While all of these are participants in the APRM process and are members of the African Union, they also exhibit some profound differences, which can be expected to influence the problems that each of them face. This is briefly illustrated by the table below which records some socio-economic indicators from the latest available Human Development Report, published by the United National Development Programme.¹

Country	HDI index (2005)	Life expectancy at birth (2005)	GDP per capita PPP \$ (2005)
Algeria	0.733	71.7	7 062
Benin	0.437	55.4	1 141
Ghana	0.553	59.1	2 480
Kenya	0.521	52.1	1 240
Rwanda	0.452	45.2	1 206
South Africa	0.674	50.8	11 110
Developing Countries	0.691	66.1	5 282
Sub-Saharan Africa²	0.493	49.6	1 998
Least Developed Countries	0.488	54.5	1 499
World	0.743	68.1	9 543

Source: United Nations Development Programme

The information in this table shows a considerable spread in the indicators. For context, Algeria, Ghana, Kenya and South Africa are classed as having a medium level of human

development, while Benin and Rwanda are regarded as having a low level. None of these countries has a high level. This status is largely the province of countries in Europe and North America, along with several in South America, Asia, the Middle East and a handful of island states. Only one African country – Mauritius – is in this category. That said, only one of the states – Algeria – has an average life expectancy that matches the average life expectancy for developing countries and for the world. Algeria's life expectancy not only far exceeds that of the other states listed here, but also several of the states in the high level group. Its GDP per capita is respectable. South Africa has a GDP per capita which not only comfortably exceeds its peers, as well as the average for the world, developing countries and sub-Saharan Africa, but a number of states with a high-level of development. This has no relationship to its life expectancy, which is exceeded here even by Benin – the poorest in the list – and by the life expectancy for the least developed countries.

These countries have all emerged from some form of trauma in the past. These traumas have included terrorism in Algeria in the 1990s, economic decline in and periods of authoritarian rule in Ghana and Benin, highly corrupt one-party rule in Kenya, apartheid in South Africa and the genocide in the 1990s in Rwanda. This was coupled with generally poor governance and unsuccessful economic policies. This, then, is the background to the APRM assessments, and to the common problems facing Africa. Overcoming such legacies and setting countries on the path to prosperity and encouraging competent governance is what the New Partnership for Africa's Development (Nepad), and the APRM were concerned with.

It should, however, be noted that despite the existence of common problems, profound differences between the countries should not be forgotten. South Africa has developed an industrial and technological economy whose size and sophistication is quite unique in Africa. Kenya has also developed an industrial sector and is a major tourism destination. It is, however, still recovering from the post-election violence in December 2007 and January 2008 (it has been noted that the conditions which created these events were in fact identified by the relevant APRM Country Review Report – please see the accompanying paper on Democracy and Political Governance by Yarik Turianskyi.) Rwanda, Benin and Ghana by contrast are predominantly agricultural and extractive economics. Algeria is unique among the six countries, being located on the Mediterranean, with an Arab cultural orientation, and closely linked to France.

The Millennium Development Goals

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were intended as targets to be achieved for development in the world as a whole, but with special emphasis on the poorer countries. In tandem with what was seen as a renewed emphasis on accelerating development in Africa, they are useful accompaniments to the APRM reports, and they are referenced in these reports. They are standards against which development progress can be measured. The likelihood that countries will meet them can be debated. For its part, one of the reports argues that that the “MDGs are indeed achievable, but not with a business-as-usual attitude. The authorities need to act differently and rapidly in favour of rural areas, urban slums and especially women and children living in these areas.”³

The specific goals are listed below⁴:

Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger

- Reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day
- Reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger
- Achieve universal primary education
- Ensure that all boys and girls complete a full course of primary schooling
- Promote gender equality and empower women
- Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005, and at all levels by 2015

Reduce child mortality

- Reduce by two thirds the mortality rate among children under five. Improve maternal health
- Reduce by three quarters the maternal mortality ratio
- Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
- Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS
- Halt and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases

Ensure environmental sustainability

- Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes; reverse loss of environmental resources
- Reduce by half the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water
- Achieve significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers, by 2020

Develop a global partnership for development

- Develop further an open trading and financial system that is rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory.

Includes a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction—nationally and internationally

- Address the least developed countries' special needs. This includes tariff- and quota-free access for their exports; enhanced debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries; cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous official development assistance for countries committed to poverty reduction
- Address the special needs of landlocked and small island developing States
- Deal comprehensively with developing countries' debt problems through national and international measures to make debt sustainable in the long term
- In cooperation with the developing countries, develop decent and productive work for youth
- In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries
- In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies—especially information and communications technologies

The issues

The issues tackled in the six reports can be divided into two broad groups:

1) Process issues: this includes observations about the manner in which the reports were compiled, and the limitations of this process; as well as overarching considerations in putting the reports together. To some extent, it is instructive that certain considerations seem to be absent.

2) Content issues: these are the issues directly addressed by the reports. These would, for example, relate to health and education. The choice of issues is to a significant extent guided by the APRM's questionnaire. This is a hefty document which requires that countries provide answers to a wide range of queries on various political and socio-economic topics. Its goals are to provide some structure to the review.

The Questionnaire has the following broad 'objectives' in its socio-economic thematic area, which is the subject of this investigation (these 'objectives' are divided into 'questions', and further subdivided into 'indicators' which provide a greater level of granularity):

Objective 1: Promotion of self-reliance in development and capacity-building for self-sustaining development

Objective 2: Acceleration of socio-economic development to achieve sustainable development and poverty eradication

Objective 3: Strengthening of policy delivery mechanisms and outcomes in key social development areas, including education for all health and combating HIV/AIDS and other communicable diseases

Objective 4: Ensuring affordable access to water, sanitation, energy, finance (including microfinance), markets, ICT, shelter and land to all citizens, especially the rural poor

Objective 5: Promotion of gender equality in all critical areas of concern, including education for girls at all levels

Objective 6: Encouraging broad-based participation in development by stakeholders at all levels

Process issues

Political factors: The political dimensions of the socio-economic issues discussed received relatively little direct analysis. The existence of a particular policy is seen as evidence of the political will to address problems, and as a minimalist position, this is a defensible one to take. However, African governments are frequently accused of adopting policies to please donors, or to comply with some governance commitment, but with limited will to seeing them through.

There seems to be reluctance in the reports to investigate or comment on political drivers of policy, although these may well be key to understanding a particular policy direction, or a policy's success or failure. One should be cautious in imputing motives for this to the review team, and it should be recorded that the political considerations behind policy are frequently not articulated by governments or are in fact different from what is claimed (one might describe these as ulterior motives). Political motivation is extremely difficult to quantify.

In fairness, the reports do at times take issue – though circumspectly – with some of the political dynamics. For example, the report on South Africa notes that “there continues to be some denial that HIV and AIDS is real, even among high-ranking public officials.”⁵

Data: A constant issue throughout the reports is that information on particular problems is lacking. This creates obvious difficulties for any research effort aiming to understand a given problem. Data gaps are not specific to any particular content, but suggest an overall situation in which important phenomena are not understood. Some examples of this are:

- **Child trafficking in Kenya:** “Child trafficking and the treatment of child offenders are other areas of concern. Though there are no data on the trafficking of children to help determine the magnitude of the problem in the country, it is believed that Kenya is the centre for child recruitment, transit and receiving in the East African region.”⁶
- **Employment and economic matters:** in this respect, the contribution of women to the Kenyan economy is not well recorded or understood (“There is little or no understanding of either the actual contribution of women to the economy or the real impact of the few initiatives on the ground in support of women”, although the report goes on to note that Kenya’s statistical authorities are working on compiling such information).⁷ In the Benin report, it is noted that a lack of understanding of employment retards development efforts (“Employment is a major concern and, unfortunately, its profile is still not well known so that effective measures aimed at finding lasting solutions could be taken, especially for the benefit of the youth and women, who are the main victims of unemployment”⁸).
- **Education in Algeria:** the report noted that “the output of the system is low”. After describing some problems, such as drop-outs, it notes that “The CRM was unable to obtain accurate data to assess the situation in quantitative terms, but there is good reason to have concerns in this regard”.⁹
- **Poverty:** how poverty should be defined and measured, and what its magnitude is, is not completely understood. For instance, the Benin report notes that: “Meetings with stakeholders in the prefectures visited revealed that poverty is a basic concern, and that prefectures still lack complete information to understand the phenomenon and contribute to the search for viable solutions to eradicate it, or at least to mitigate it through local initiatives.”¹⁰ In the Rwanda report, similar concerns are noted: “The Ministry of Finance, however, pointed out that poverty statistics after 2000 are speculative, and that one cannot be certain that poverty indicators are indeed rising”.¹¹ In South Africa, the report said: “Due to inadequate data on poverty, the CRM was unable to confirm the poverty trends.”¹² In South Africa, the reliability of poverty statistics – and other data – was widely debated (see the Economic Governance and Management thematic area).¹³
- **HIV prevalence:** In the Rwanda report, the lack of reliable statistics of HIV infection was noted, and it was noted that the process of establishing a statistical authority was underway.¹⁴
- **Policy impact:** The Benin report notes that: “The CSAR indicates that Benin has laws and institutions that cater for water, sanitation, energy, finance, ICTs and land, and efforts are being made in each of these sectors. However, policies and strategies are adopted whose impact on the populations cannot be easily assessed.”¹⁵

The recommendations in the country reports accordingly placed a great deal on emphasis on establishing reliable data. Ghana’s report, for example recommends the following: “Consider the urgency of gathering good data and statistics, which are important for understanding problems and tracking performance in many areas of socio-economic governance and

development” and “In light of the above, make a concerted effort to re-energise and reform the Ghana Statistical Services.”¹⁶

Content issues

Poverty: Poverty is arguably the dominant problem to which all others relate. A striking point is that the definition of poverty is contentious. For example, the Algeria report notes that:

“Algeria’s poverty profile is still not clearly defined despite abundant documentation on the subject and an impressive mechanism to this end. Poverty remains a very controversial issue, with some people even going so far as refusing to recognise its existence in Algeria. However, on the basis of discussions held in the wilayas, it appears that poverty can be seen in:

- increased criminality;
- the reappearance of begging (in particular in the West and the South);
- recourse to the informal sector to supplement income;
- “squatting” in cities; and
- clandestine immigration towards the North.”¹⁷

While this is an example specific to Algeria, it should be noted that the concept of poverty is not without disagreement. Other reports do not dwell on this to the extent, although the South African report notes that government and civil society have different interpretations of poverty.¹⁸ Indeed, there have been furious debates in the media about the trends in respect of poverty: for instance, the South African Institute of Race Relations published a report arguing that poverty (described as those living on less than US\$1 a day) had actually increased since 1994), while the government and the ruling party denied this and argued that this was not an accurate measure of poverty in any event.¹⁹ Its programme of action calls for a clear definition of poverty.²⁰

Of especial concern is that poverty appears to be increasing, despite – in certain instances – some impressive economic growth. For instance, poverty has been rising in years prior to the APRM process in Kenya,²¹ Benin²² and Rwanda.²³ This was to some degree linked to the policies which informed these efforts. The Kenyan report, for instance, contends that “Kenya has no long-term vision document for development” (although at the time of writing a concept paper was being prepared).²⁴ Measures taken to ensure macro-economic stability in Benin reduced the available resources for poverty alleviation.²⁵ On the other hand, some reports, such as Algeria’s, noted that spending was increasingly directed towards welfare and poverty reduction.²⁶

Unemployment is a significant problem and contributor to poverty. This point was made in the reports on Ghana,²⁷ Kenya,²⁸ and South Africa.²⁹ This implies the imperative of encouraging job creation as a central element of economic policy. In the South African report, South Africa’s policies were taken to task for missing a “comprehensive approach to addressing unemployment in the long run”,³⁰ although it does note the emphasis that is being placed on growth in particular sectors. Algeria, by contrast, was complimented: “The country has put in place important mechanisms for job creation and a social security system that can hardly be rivaled by countries of similar standing in Africa, and even by developed countries. The CRM met with a number of stakeholders in the capital and in the wilayas who confirmed

their appreciation of such initiatives. The objective of these mechanisms is to mitigate the effects of unemployment among, in particular, the category of first-time temporary job seekers, by contributing to improving qualifications and cushioning side-effects of national economic reforms on social welfare. The establishment of these mechanisms constitutes a case of good practice that must be recognised and highlighted.”³¹

Severe poverty is associated with inequality. In Kenya, it was noted: “Associated with the problem of wide-spread poverty is the issue of high levels of inequality. Poverty is an urban, rural and provincial phenomenon. Nyanza Province had a poverty incidence of 64.6 % while that of the Central Province was 31.1 %. Generally, five of the eight provinces have recorded poverty incidences of over 57 %. According to the CSAR, the bottom 10 % of Kenyan households control less than 1% of the total income while the top 10 % of households control 42 %. This can be interpreted to mean that for every one Kenyan shilling (Kshs) earned by the former households, the latter earns more than Kshs 56. This ranks Kenya among the top five most unequal countries in the world. ”³² Of South Africa, it was noted that: “The distribution of income and wealth in South Africa is among the most unequal in the world ... South Africa has a long distance to traverse on the transformation front, but the vision, will and resources are there to move the country forward. Poverty is not just about the income poor; it is also about people’s lost creativity and potential to contribute to society. It is about the denial of access to opportunities and choices to lead a decent life; achieve a better standard of living; have more freedom, dignity and self respect – things that matter most for human existence”.³³

While the other countries under review did not have income inequalities as stark as those of Kenya and South Africa, there were repeated comments made about regional and gender inequalities – no doubt a factor in the countries’ poverty profiles (see below).

The table below shows measures of inequality for the relevant countries as determined by the United Nations Development Programme in its 2007/2008 *Human Development Report*:³⁴

Country	Share of income and expenditure		Gini index ³⁵
	Richest 10%	Poorest 10%	
Algeria	26.8%	2.8%	35.3
Benin	29.0%	3.1%	36.5
Ghana	30.0%	2.1%	40.8
Kenya	33.9%	2.5%	42.5
South Africa	44.7%	1.4%	57.8
Rwanda	38.2%	2.1%	46.8

Source: United Nations Development Programme

Underlining that Africa is not a unified entity, the prospects of fulfilling the MDGs on poverty were variable: for example, unlikely in Kenya (in all sectors part from education),³⁶ but likely in Algeria.³⁷ Ghana’s report argued that it had made “remarkable progress” towards realising the MDGs, but cautioned that significant challenges remained and it was likely that some would not be met. These included halving the proportion of people in extreme poverty,
 © SAIIA 2008 **DRAFT: DO NOT QUOTE OR CITE WITHOUT PERMISSION** 8

achieving universal education and reducing child mortality.³⁸ The Ghana report made a call for that country to work energetically towards fulfilling the MDGs as they are “critical to Ghana’s own agenda for growth and prosperity”.³⁹ The South Africa Country Review Report noted that an implementation report indicated considerable achievement in working towards the goals, although meeting them would entail “more than doubling of effort” in the coming years.⁴⁰ It further called for the country fully to integrate the MDGs into its planning.⁴¹

Recommendations

Algeria: The Country Review Report called for greater understanding of the phenomenon of poverty. It encourages the government to pursue growth policies, with emphasis on “pro-poor growth” that creates employment. Future planning should aim for diversification.⁴²

Benin: The Benin Report called for “pro-poor growth” with the following description: Benin should carry out “economic growth on a structured and expanded basis in order to reduce poverty through massive investment and job creation”.⁴³

Ghana: The Country Review Report on Ghana calls for balancing sound macro-economic policies with the need for social outcomes (such as reducing poverty), educating citizens to act accordingly (through such values as thrift and hard work) and using “coordinating councils” to bring together stakeholders to develop the sort of “shared growth” that is envisaged.⁴⁴

Kenya: Kenya should “accelerate the implementation” of its poverty reduction initiatives, and create the mooted youth fund to create employment.⁴⁵

Rwanda: The key recommendation was that Rwanda should make a “high-level commitment” to the MDGs, including poverty eradication.⁴⁶

South Africa: The report makes a rather broad suggestion that South Africa should “develop a long term strategic plan that exploits the nexus of growth, employment, poverty reduction, income and wealth redistribution, and systematically reduces social grants while emphasizing empowerment and considering sustainability issues”.⁴⁷ This is a very expansive vision, and would be wonderful if it could be brought to fruition, although no advice is given as to how this can be achieved.

Infrastructure: An overarching problem facing the countries reviewed – and indeed, countries throughout Africa and beyond – is the existence and quality of the national infrastructure. Indeed, this is a key determinant of whether a country is “developed” or not. Infrastructure is a rather vague term, but in this context it is intended to refer to physical assets – the roads, buildings and bridges that enable the countries institutions, economy and systems to function effectively.

The reports deal with this matter in different ways, sometimes indirectly, and not in a consolidated fashion. Infrastructure is also dealt with throughout the report, and the comments here refer primarily – though not exclusively – to the material on infrastructure found in the Socio-economic section.

The reports on Benin⁴⁸ and Kenya⁴⁹ stress the negative impact that poor infrastructure has on economic activity (the Rwanda report is somewhat less specific, but notes that good infrastructure is important for development⁵⁰). The Kenya report sets out some historical

background, noting that colonial settlement policies had benefitted parts of the country at the expense of others, and that “this underdevelopment remains largely unaddressed in formal policies or practice”.⁵¹ This comment has at least some degree of applicability to all of the former colonies in Africa – compounded by subsequent policies that prioritised service provision to key constituencies, in particular, to the cities.

Besides Kenya, regional infrastructural disparities are noted in the reports on Ghana⁵² and South Africa.⁵³ In Ghana, rapid migration to the cities (again, a common phenomenon) places enormous stress on urban infrastructure.⁵⁴ The same was observed in Benin.⁵⁵

Financing infrastructural development appears in some of the reports. Ghana’s report indicates that such development tends to rely on external development assistance,⁵⁶ although some stakeholders had indicated that “funds should have gone to income-generating activities instead of infrastructure development projects.”⁵⁷ South Africa’s growth and development policy (the Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa) stressed the inadequacy of infrastructure a brake on investment and proposed “massive investments” to deal with this.⁵⁸ Algeria was complimented on having made “spectacular progress in education in terms of numbers, infrastructure and services since independence in 1962”,⁵⁹ as is referred to as a vast “construction site”.⁶⁰ Its ability to do so is, however, buoyed by the hydrocarbon sector, which is vulnerable to price movements.⁶¹

Recommendations

Benin: While not dressing infrastructure holistically in this section, there are recommendations with some bearing on the infrastructural backlogs. For example, one calls for Benin to mobilise people to assist in installing water points⁶²; another calls for building health facilities.⁶³

Ghana: Little is recommended about infrastructure as a discrete concept on its own, although some recommendations of relevance are made, such as taking (undefined) steps to stem migration to the urban areas.⁶⁴

Kenya: As with other countries, the Socio-Economic Development Section of the Country Review Report does not address infrastructure as a discrete, coherent entity, rather alluding to it under several separate headings, for example encouraging the upgrading of the physical assets in the education system.⁶⁵

Rwanda: Presumably touching on infrastructure, a somewhat unclear recommendation calls on the government to “maintain its impetus to ensure that access to basic amenities is not restricted to the urban areas”.⁶⁶

South Africa: Infrastructure is a broad, ‘cross-cutting’ issue, and as such recommendations geared towards particular service areas are applicable: the report calls for a variety of relevant actions, including the rehabilitation of farm schools, building clinics and promoting rural development in part to stem the tide of rural-urban migration.⁶⁷

Land: Not surprisingly, given the widespread reliance of people in Africa on farming,⁶⁸ questions of land – access to land, and security in landholdings – features prominently in the APRM country reports (in common with other issues, land is dealt with in more than one section, being seen both as a political issue and one of development). All reports noted to

© SAIIA 2008 *DRAFT: DO NOT QUOTE OR CITE WITHOUT PERMISSION* 10

some degree that land was a potential source of conflict. A key problem is the overlapping systems of ownership and user rights, where traditional and modern governance systems coexist or even contradict each other. Without proper security, investment becomes difficult on many levels: with poor or discriminatory tenure rights, building a dwelling or being assured of a place to live for the rest of one's life is not always possible. Moreover, land is a principle source of collateral, and without satisfactory land rights, its value in this respect is reduced.

The Ghana report notes that: "Ghana has a peculiar and complex land tenure system that reflects the country's unique traditional political organisations such as chieftaincies, the socio-cultural differences and divergent regional traditions. Insecurity of tenure is endemic and has a bearing on both poverty reduction and economic growth."⁶⁹ The report calls for policy reforms to harmonise land laws.⁷⁰ The Kenya report notes that "the issue of land has been, and will continue to be a very contentious one in Kenya",⁷¹ and notes that "the land question has manifested itself in many ways, including fragmentation, the breakdown in land administration, disparities in land ownership and poverty."⁷² In Kenya, attention was also drawn to the variety of land laws, "some of which are incompatible" with one another.⁷³

In Algeria, the Country Review Report noted that different ownership systems for land existed.⁷⁴ Alluding to the question of unsatisfactory data, the report notes: "The complexity of the rural land system is such that it was difficult for the CRM to assemble documentation providing a full picture of the situation. The lack of clarity surrounding the status of land could give rise to various kinds of conflict. It is acknowledged that Algeria's poor performances in agriculture originate mainly from the constraints around the question of land."⁷⁵

In Benin, as in Algeria, "the mission could not get a global picture of the situation describing all aspects of the problem in rural areas."⁷⁶ It went on to say that: "The absence of information is the cause of disputes in the country's land tenure system. It is generally agreed today that the poor performance of Benin's agriculture (agricultural extension, introduction of new varieties, etc.) is partly due to constraints on land."⁷⁷

In Rwanda, related pressures of population growth, the return of displaced people, and agrarian economy and environmental degradation were discussed. Rwanda is the most densely populated country in Africa. The report noted: "It is worth recalling that Rwanda has been known to face a serious predicament of rapid population growth, dependence on agriculture and subsistence farming, and land pressure as potential threats to the livelihood and survival of millions of rural dwellers in the country. Searching for alternative livelihoods would be useful."⁷⁸ Given the extreme dependence of Rwandans on agriculture, and the country's troubled history, land and ethnic issues can easily become mixed and generate conflict.

In South Africa, past racial policies have created a skewed pattern of land ownership, and the report noted the land reform policy of the government. It called attention to the slowness of the process, and was somewhat critical of the policy: "attention needs to be focused on the

unresolved policy contradictions arising from the dominance of land market promotion objectives over and above mass securitisation of tenure. In this regard, the authorities may need to depart from entrenched norms already known to have limited results.”⁷⁹ The call here would seem to be for expropriation and downgrading property protections. Elsewhere, however the report states: “any ill-thought attempt to grab land in South Africa can adversely affect the thriving agricultural sector.”⁸⁰ This is a key policy issue in South Africa, and recently proposed legislation on expropriation has been “shelved”. Disputes around this piece of legislation related to the extent to which it would facilitate land reform or alternately undermine investment by threatening property protections. This concern calls to mind the following observation by World Bank officials, which deals with the experience of redistributive measures across the world: “Although redistributive policies have the potential to benefit the poor both directly and indirectly, they will do so only if redistribution does not jeopardise investment – this may be one explanation for the observation that, in the past, redistributive policies such as land reform have often failed to help the poor.”⁸¹

The need for effective, coherent laws and policies is highlighted in the various reports, with, as noted in the case of South Africa, some criticism of policy. In Rwanda, it was noted a new land law had been passed and that registration of landholdings was underway – certainly a necessary step to coherent regulation of land.⁸²

Recommendations:

Algeria: The Algeria report calls for legislation to establish a monitoring mechanism to ensure justice, transparency and equity in relation to land allocation.⁸³

Benin: The report called for land laws to be reviewed and for a “specialized institution to facilitate and ensure justice, transparency and equity in access to land in both rural and urban areas”.⁸⁴

Ghana: The Ghana report calls for continuing the ongoing process of harmonising the country’s land laws. It makes some nebulous suggestions about reducing land disputes and to enhance access to land through the 15-year land administration policy. How these goals will be achieved is not spelt out.⁸⁵

Kenya: The Socio-Economic thematic area in the Kenya report remarkably contains no specific recommendations about land access. It makes a tangential remark about providing farmers with information about market conditions,⁸⁶ and in the sections on cross cutting issues it discusses the question of land, with a hope that a new policy on land will be adopted expeditiously.⁸⁷

Rwanda: The relevant Country Review Report offers an important although somewhat imprecise recommendation about facilitating land registration at district level (through training and undefined “capacity” building), as well as continuing to conduct research on alternative livelihoods to reduce the demand for land. This latter point is crucial for the whole continent, though the recommendation inadvertently exposes the difficulty of the issue: no solution is offered, merely a call for more research, which the report says is already in progress. This highlights the fact that there are no “magic bullet” solutions or even obvious solutions to the problems that Africa faces.

South Africa: Probably building on the tension inherent in the report between wanting to expedite redistribution and understanding the potential for destabilising the economy if it is

not performed properly. The result is vague, shifting the responsibility to come up with substantive solutions to the country's stakeholders: "explore innovative and creative ways of accelerating land reform".⁸⁸

Implementation: Kenya's report could be speaking for many countries in Africa with the following comment: "A frequently encountered problem, and perceivably the greatest challenge to Kenya's democracy, is the poor implementation of policies and programmes. Kenya is well serviced with a body of laws, programmes, commissions and agencies that could make for the best-governed democracy in Africa. However, these policies and programmes have so far been poorly implemented. There are many reasons for the poor implementation record, some of which are interlinked. These include the lack of political will to implement the policies; the donor syndrome, whereby some policies are hoisted on Kenya so as to qualify for aid; a weak resource base and capacity constraints in institutions hoisted to implement these policies; and the exclusion of critical stakeholders and institutions in some cases. Others are poor coordination of efforts by institutions involved in policy formulation and implementation, including the government, civil society organisations and the private sector; budgetary problems, including lack of transparency and accountability, and poor governance."⁸⁹

While policies exist – and are at times commended by the reports – the countries are frequently let down in the implementation. This problem is cross-cutting, and features prominently in all the reports, with the exception of the report on Algeria, and is to a large extent a function of the general dearth of skills. This problem almost certainly has its roots deep in the troubled educational systems (as described above), but the actual loss of trained skills is highlighted, especially in the health sector, through attrition (death or retirement), through emigration or simply through leaving the profession (or the public sector, which caters for most of the population). For example, "in the decade up to 2003, Ghana lost over 30% of its trained health personnel."⁹⁰ South Africa faces a medical "brain drain", which aggravates the existing shortages of health professionals, particularly in the rural areas.⁹¹ The report on Rwanda noted that efforts to register land were hampered by "insufficient human resources and skills."⁹²

Broader, less specific 'capacity problems' (which are clearly largely problems of skills, although probably also of finances and other resources), are identified elsewhere. The Ghana report devotes a section of its cross-cutting issues chapter to this (noting that the relevant government is taking this problem seriously).⁹³ In Kenya it was noted that some projects have proven ineffective ("inability to target the beneficiaries, insufficient involvement of stakeholders, lack of resources and poor monitoring and evaluation systems" as examples of this) have never gone beyond the planning stage.⁹⁴ A combination of a shallow skills pool and young institutions in Rwanda means that "projects that have been identified are not being implemented and put into operation".⁹⁵ In Benin, 'poor results' of programmes has been ascribed to a lack of participation in implementing them.⁹⁶

Difficulties in coordination of various activities, and general inefficiency and poor administration, were another factor. Lack of proper coordination was noted in Benin⁹⁷ and in South Africa.⁹⁸ In addition, other problems raised in South Africa, such as "institutional

inefficiency: in regard to sanitation,⁹⁹ and corruption in the social security system,¹⁰⁰ certainly speak to issues facing many other African countries.

Recommendation:

Infrastructure is a wide-ranging concept and recommendations under other headings (health or education, for example) may very well relate to infrastructure as it is broadly defined. It is also likely found in other sections. What follows is a selection of material relating to infrastructure, but is not exhaustive in the broadest definition of the concept.

Ghana: The Ghana report suggests that the country take such actions as it can to improve the efficiency of its policies and initiatives, without raising costs unduly. Among the suggestions are “reorganising and reallocating facilities, redistributing funds and refining processes and procedures”, part of which is monitoring implementation.¹⁰¹

Kenya: The Country Review Report, among its “Overarching Issues”, deals with “Implementation Gaps”. It calls for greater political will, mobilising stakeholders, and for stakeholders to demand accountability from the government.¹⁰²

South Africa: The Country Review report calls for skills and ‘capacity’ improvement (with a special focus on local government) as well as “vigourously (improving) integration and coordination of the planning and management of socio-economic development”.¹⁰³

Gender: Gender issues are a key focus of the entire APRM process, and receive repeated, detailed emphasis throughout. (In the South African case, this went as far as rewriting the country’s CSAR after its public validation to reflect, among various other things, a gender perspective.) Gender is identified as one of the cross-cutting issues in APRM, and as such, matters germane to it are spread throughout the report. This section attempts to tease out a few key points identified in the Socio-Economic Development section:

The report makes very clear that women in the countries reviewed generally have a lower social status than men. At its most basic level, the cultures of these countries generally subordinate women to men. Culture as a cause of gender inequality is explicitly or obliquely mentioned in all the reports: Ghana,¹⁰⁴ Kenya,¹⁰⁵ Algeria,¹⁰⁶ Benin,¹⁰⁷ Rwanda¹⁰⁸ and South Africa.¹⁰⁹

Gender inequality is manifested in various ways:

- **Work:** Women tend to be concentrated in particular professions, usually the less-skilled and less well remunerated ones. For example, in the Ghana report quotes the country’s CSAR: “in many respects, Ghanaian women have made important strides in the public service ... But, in other ways, the position of women has not changed much. The bulk of women employees have remained at the lower end of appointments, specifically in clerical jobs.”¹¹⁰ A similar situation was observed in Benin.¹¹¹ In Algeria, although women were making great strides in education (see below) and were becoming increasingly prominent in certain high-status professions, there were allegations of widespread discrimination in the private sector. Algerian women were also prominent in informal work.¹¹² In South Africa, the private sector was likewise identified as an area in which women were “under-represented”.¹¹³

- **Access to resources:** Presumably linked to traditional governance systems and to cultural norms, women tend to not have access to the economic and social resources that men do. For example, the Ghana, Kenya and Benin reports note that they find it difficult to own land, or to obtain credit or capital.¹¹⁴ The Kenya report that they have “less access to social services and productive resources compared to men.”¹¹⁵ In Algeria, it was noted that health issues of specific concern to women were not given “sufficient consideration”.¹¹⁶
- **Legal protection:** The legal systems in Africa are not coherent. Traditional systems of governance exist alongside modern constitutional systems. Within the modern constitutional system, obsolete laws may exist. These problems feature prominently with respect to gender issues. The various reports detail how women are treated differently from men, with regard to inheritance,¹¹⁷ and how women may themselves be inherited by a deceased husband’s relatives.¹¹⁸ In the Rwanda report, a law is referred to that requires a woman to live where her husband chooses to live.¹¹⁹ The Algeria report looks at this issue in detail, as it examined the country’s constitution (which guarantees gender equality), but coexists with a Family Code (despite its revision in 2005) that contains some discriminatory provisions.¹²⁰ Legal provisions surrounding family were most likely to disadvantage women. South Africa was a little different in that its report did not identify legal areas in which women were disadvantaged – reflecting achievements in changes to the country’s legislative framework, which have extended at least formal equality to women in all important areas.
- **Violence:** Violence against women was a common feature throughout the reports. In Algeria there was – at the time of writing – no law on domestic violence (although there were such provisions in the Family Code)¹²¹; In Ghana, a law on this matter had not been enacted¹²². In South Africa, the report linked violence against women to the poor state of the country’s social structure and noted that: “many cases of domestic violence go unreported or are struck off the court roll even when reported, because some women refuse to testify out of fear for their safety.”¹²³

It should also be noted that the reports tended to be quite positive on some gender issues. Governments were regarded as taking gender seriously, and having made appreciable strides in dealing with gender discrimination and disadvantage.¹²⁴ Ministries and organizations dedicated to gender equality have been established, for example in Kenya¹²⁵ and in South Africa. In Algeria and South Africa, women actually constitute a majority of those enrolled in higher education.¹²⁶ In Rwanda, “gender mainstreaming” is given high priority. Women hold – as of 2004 – 10 of the 19 positions of minister of state, and nearly half of parliamentary seats.¹²⁷ The reports tended to suggest more or aggressive action to expedite gender equality, such as affirmative action programmes.¹²⁸ It should be noted that although such programs are increasingly commonplace nowadays, their records are mixed, and the economic costs – both direct costs and opportunity costs – can be quite substantial.¹²⁹ Such caveats or concerns are not raised in the reports.

Recommendations:

Algeria: The Country Review Report calls for policy changes (including a “proactive policy for the promotion of gender equality”) as well as sensitization and practical measures such as a literacy campaign.¹³⁰

Benin: The relevant report calls for “translating the Government's political will into concrete actions by making gender equality a national priority and a prerequisite for sustainable development”, sensitizing people and implementing an “aggressive positive discrimination policy in favour of women”. It also called for a literacy campaign focused on women.¹³¹

Ghana: The Country Review Report calls for a law on gender violence to be passed, for cultural impediments to women’s advancement to be addressed, and for affirmative action programmes. It also recommends establishing benchmarks to monitor the attainment of gender equality and setting up the “institutional machinery” to monitor the move towards meeting these objectives.¹³²

Kenya: The report on Kenya calls for a “gender sensitive” approach to monitoring development programmes, outlawing discrimination, working against cultural practices that undermine women and enacting various laws, among them laws on affirmative action and domestic violence.¹³³

Rwanda: The report urged the Rwandan government to consider reporting the status of women to the UN Commission for CEDAW; “operationalise” the Gender Monitoring Office; and build capacity in women’s councils to ensure that women’s needs are met in community projects.¹³⁴

South Africa: The Country Review Report calls for protection for women from violence, the establishment of mechanisms to monitor and deal with abuse. It further promotes “proactive” measures to ensure more female involvement in the private sector. The report furthermore recommends changes to the cultural relations that underlie the problems that women face. This latter point is probably very necessary, but no concrete steps are proposed, and indeed, it would be very difficult to find any firm suggestions as to how a culture might be transformed, except over a very long period, possibly several generations – raising, in turn, the question of the practicability of the suggestion. It should also be noted that culture and its association with asocial behaviour is a sensitive and contentious point, particularly in a society like South Africa with its divided past.¹³⁵

Water and sanitation: For people heavily dependent on agriculture, a water supply is of the utmost importance. Water is also, of course, a necessary element for life, and a supply of potable water is crucial for any population. Common problems include inadequate infrastructure and the unsatisfactory reach of the supply system to particular constituencies. The Ghana report pointed out that while over 70% of urban people have access to pipe-borne water, only 16% of rural people did.¹³⁶ In Kenya, only some 32% of households have access to piped water.¹³⁷ The Kenya report also noted that significant disparities exist between social groups – rich and poor – and between the various regions.¹³⁸ Rwanda exhibits similar disparities in regard to water, with access to “safe” water at 40% of rural people and 60% of urban people.¹³⁹ Benin follows the same pattern, with around two thirds of rural people not having access to drinking water, and “enormous disparities” existing between regions.¹⁴⁰ However, the Beninese government was reported to be confident that it would meet the Millennium Development Goal targets as it was steadily increasing its ability to install water points.¹⁴¹ In Algeria, similar disparities were reported, with urban areas better served than their rural counterparts; and that the water supply in some places is erratic. Algeria is in a position to expand its water infrastructure as it is doing with desalination plants and dams.¹⁴² (Ghana’s report, by contrast, notes that its urban water utility by contrast is reportedly unable to invest any more.¹⁴³) The Algerian report also draws attention to competing claims on water resources (home users vs irrigation), a source of some dissatisfaction.¹⁴⁴ The relevant report

recommends that the Algerian government should “ensure that competing needs of domestic water users and agricultural users do not lead to situations of conflict, especially by establishing judicious management systems and processes that take into account genuine needs according to the category of user.”¹⁴⁵

Water access is very briefly touched on in the South African report, affirming that 92% of the population has access to an improved water supply. It adds that the situation is not ideal, as many people depend on unsafe water sources (streams, stagnant pools etc).¹⁴⁶

The reports of South Africa and Rwanda make an additional comment, that collecting water is an activity that consumes much valuable time (in this they certainly speak for other countries).¹⁴⁷ Piped water – better yet, piped water to people’s homes – would free this time up for other activities.

The related matter of sanitation, the lack of proper disposal systems carries the risk of contamination and disease. In South Africa, “extensive lack of sanitation facilities also leads to the contamination of water sources, creating further problems for safe water provision.”¹⁴⁸ In Benin, sanitation problems are related to rapid urbanisation and an inability to cater for the increased numbers: “Sectoral studies in the domain have highlighted some problems regarding rapid urbanization. They are hazardous urbanization, deficient town management due to the absence of community management capacities and necessary financial resources to adequately meet the increasing need for services, and insufficient sanitation facilities for rain water, evacuation of used water and solid waste.”¹⁴⁹

Recommendations:

Algeria: The relevant country report makes two recommendations regarding water: steps should be taken to prevent conflict between domestic and agricultural users and water resources should be protected from pollution.¹⁵⁰

Benin: The Country Review Report on Benin calls for mobilizing the population to participate in programmes to implement water supply projects, as well as improving the ability of councils to install and manage water supply systems. Sanitation should be tacked by according it more importance by “the development of prevention and organization of services”.¹⁵¹ It is not, however, entirely clear how all of this will be achieved, although part of the plans for councils include providing suitable skills training.

Kenya: The Kenya report has no specific recommendations on water in the Socio-Economic Development section, although it “noted” that the government of Kenya had made access to water a priority.¹⁵²

Ghana: Ghana’s report has a set of general recommendations which are applicable to several of the socio-economic issues. It advised: “Set quantitative targets, design explicit policies and measures, and plan detailed timing to achieve the objectives in the area of socio-economic development.” The country should consider the areas where progress has been most disappointing, and making use of coordinating councils comprising the various stakeholders to help steer projects.¹⁵³

South Africa: The recommendations proffered are vague and general calling for improvement in the capacity for service delivery at local level – municipalities frequently being to some extent dysfunctional, and encouraging payment for services.¹⁵⁴

Environment: Environmental concerns have become more prominent in recent years, particularly given Africa’s apparent vulnerability to climate change. Environmental concerns are tackled in the Corporate Governance section, but as a broad development issue, the impact of environmental degradation is highlighted in the reports. In Kenya, it is noted that “declines in per capita arable land and water supply, together with the degradation of soils, forests, grasslands and water quality”, are “making life increasingly difficult for the rural poor, thus accelerating rural-urban migration”.¹⁵⁵

The Algeria report – drawing on an earlier report – expresses similar concern about the degradation of water sources: “It stresses, in particular, the degradation of water resources caused by the obvious weakness in environmental management and the control of water pollution. It notes the existence of non-functioning water purification plants, hence uncontrolled discharges of unpurified urban polluted water, land scrubbing and drainage water containing agrochemical products (phosphate, nitrate, etc.) in the sources of water intended for consumption.”¹⁵⁶ It also noted that industrialization had resulted in environmental degradation, as planning did not take environmental protection into account, and that such degradation was costing the country some 7% of GDP.¹⁵⁷ How this figure is calculated is not made clear.

Algeria and Rwanda has the additional problem of populations crammed into relatively small areas (Algeria because this most habitation is along a relatively narrow coastal strip¹⁵⁸). Kenya has a similar problem to the extent that most of that country is not arable.

Moreover, environmental degradation as a result of the exploitation of natural resources for commercial or subsistence purposes was noted with respect to firewood collection in Benin¹⁵⁹ and in Rwanda¹⁶⁰ and tree felling for charcoal in Kenya.¹⁶¹

The Ghana report does not dwell on environmental issues, although it does mention environmental sustainability as a development consideration.

Recommendations:

Algeria: The Algeria report does not make specific recommendations about the environment, although environmental concerns are dealt with in reference to protecting water resources.

Benin: Benin should improve the capacity of its environmental protection agencies, and communicate with businesses about care for the environment.¹⁶²

Ghana: Although the Socio-Economic section of the Country Review Report discusses the environment, it does not make substantive recommendations in this section.

Rwanda: Unless one factors in a recommendation that Rwanda should implement the MDGs, there is no specific recommendation concerning the environment in this section.

South Africa: The country should ‘prioritise’ environmental protection.¹⁶³

Education: ‘Human capital’ is now routinely listed as a precondition for economic growth and development. A well functioning education system is of paramount importance. Unfortunately, despite some successes in funding the education of children from poor backgrounds¹⁶⁴ and in getting larger numbers of children to attend school, the APRM process identified some severe weaknesses in the systems of the countries under review.

The most notable problem was the unsatisfactory quality of education provided. This was a factor addressed in many of the reports, and covered a wide range of experiences. In South Africa, the CSAR questioned the “appropriateness” of school materials and the CRM noted “inadequate preparation” as an explanation for high drop out rates in tertiary institutions.¹⁶⁵ Declining quality of education was noted in Kenya and Ghana, linked to pupil-teacher ratios, “the quality of instruction”, favouritism in awarding bursaries and poor infrastructure.¹⁶⁶ The Algeria and Benin reports noted that teachers were not satisfactorily trained.¹⁶⁷ The implication of all this was that children were attending school, but were not being skilled for participation in the economy. The South African report was quite blunt about this: “The issue of unemployment, which is a recurring theme in this Report, also has some roots in the school curriculum. The CRM confirmed that many young graduates cannot find jobs. Commendably the government has realized that the curriculum needs to be revised to allow for entrepreneurship. To this end, vocational schools are being recapitalized. The government noted the lack of resilience in many institutions that resist these types of change.”¹⁶⁸

Related to the above, pupils frequently dropped out of school, or did not progress from primary school to the higher levels. This was dealt with in various degrees of specificity, but was clearly a problem.¹⁶⁹ In South Africa, there were indications that this was due to problems in paying fees (although this was not officially allowed).¹⁷⁰ A similar situation was identified in Benin.¹⁷¹

In some instances, schools were inaccessible, as pupils would need to walk long distances to reach them.¹⁷² A limited number of places was available in schools, particularly in the higher educational levels.¹⁷³

Gender considerations were brought out strongly, although progress had been made with respect to girls’ education.¹⁷⁴ The dominant concern was that girls were less likely to be educated than boys. The interesting exception to this was Algeria, where girls outnumbered boys at the higher end of the educational spectrum.¹⁷⁵

In terms of the Millennium Development Goals, Benin was on track to achieve a targeted 96% primary school enrolment ratio in 2006.¹⁷⁶

Recommendations:

Algeria: Algeria should concentrate on the quality of its education, particularly in terms of teacher quality and ensuring equal opportunity for all and taking measures to prevent drop-outs.

Benin: The Country Review Report makes three recommendations. These are important (improving quality of instruction, improving enrolment, promoting the education of girls), but contain little by way of practical guidance as to how these goals will be realized.

Ghana: As previously noted above Ghana's report has a set of general recommendations which are applicable to several of the socio-economic issues. It advised: "Set quantitative targets, design explicit policies and measures, and plan detailed timing to achieve the objectives in the area of socio-economic development." The country should consider the areas where progress has been most disappointing, and making use of coordinating councils comprising the various stakeholders to help steer projects.¹⁷⁷

Kenya: The Kenya report calls on the government to arrest the deterioration of educational standards (recruiting teachers and providing infrastructure), ensuring that busarries are provided to those who need them, and providing alternative models of education to communities (such as nomads) in need of it.¹⁷⁸

Rwanda: Rwanda is advised to build more schools to "increase enrolment to full capacity".¹⁷⁹

South Africa: The Country Review Report made 11 recommendations under the discussion of education. These were of varying degrees of specificity, but focused on improving the physical environment of schools and the quality and relevance of education. These included integrating practical skills training into primary and secondary schools; improving access to tertiary education; and establishing a monitoring unit to ensure "accountability between schools, the government and communities".¹⁸⁰

Healthcare: A key indicator of people's living standard and an area of great concern to the Millennium Development Goals. In Africa, HIV features prominently in health considerations. This issue is addressed in each report. South Africa, for example, was said to have one of the highest rates in the world¹⁸¹, although the exact magnitude of the disease is not fully understood.¹⁸² While the report does draw attention to some of the social problems generated by AIDS (notably the growing number of orphans), the report does not examine the developmental consequences of the pandemic – particularly as it is hitting the economically active part of the population very hard, and is proving a particular challenge in denuding the labour force of skills. This has been observed elsewhere in Africa.

The Ghana report similarly mentioned that country's relatively less serious problem (around 3% of the population between 15 and 49 were thought to be infected), and noted that "some measures have been taken to address the issue of HIV/Aids, prominent among which is the recognition of the developmental relevance of the disease and the need to combat it with a holistic approach."¹⁸³ In Benin, the magnitude of the disease was also relatively low, but growing and concentrated in the same age range as in Ghana.¹⁸⁴ The report described these increases as "alarming".¹⁸⁵ In Algeria the prevalence was lower, although discussion about the subject was "taboo".¹⁸⁶ Kenya dealt with it at some length, explicitly noting that "the HIV/AIDS pandemic has been a major constraint on Kenya's socio-economic development process", and AIDS was declared a national disaster.¹⁸⁷ In Rwanda, prevalence was estimated at around 13.5%.¹⁸⁸

HIV infection should not obscure other health challenges, such as malaria and tuberculosis. Tuberculosis is particularly aggravated by HIV.¹⁸⁹ Malaria in Rwanda is on the increase continues “to be the leading cause of morbidity for children under five years of age and the general population at large.”¹⁹⁰ It is likewise increasing in Kenya.¹⁹¹

Infant and perinatal mortality was identified as a concern in Algeria,¹⁹² Rwanda,¹⁹³ and in Benin.¹⁹⁴

The health infrastructure experienced varying degrees of difficulty across the countries. Long distances need to be travelled to reach clinics and medicines may not always be available in abundant supplies.¹⁹⁵ Disparities in access to healthcare exist in Benin (urban-rural, and regional).¹⁹⁶ Health insurance coverage was unsatisfactory, which is not surprising given the poverty that afflicts most African countries.¹⁹⁷

The reports note that the various countries have striven to improve the healthcare of their populations. For example, anti-retroviral medication is now being supplied to many people in these countries,¹⁹⁸ while there was praise for policy.¹⁹⁹ However, there was concern in some reports that the ongoing problems placed the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals in danger.

Recommendations:

Algeria: The Country Review Report recommended that reproductive health be given emphasis, as well as taking measures to reduce HIV.²⁰⁰

Benin: The relevant report calls for an expanded infrastructure of facilities, through building more clinics, involving local stakeholders (including traditional healers) in the healthcare provision system, and fighting HIV. There is little guidance as to how this should be done (indeed, all governments would at least claim to be fighting HIV, and it is not clear what policy of implementation changes are advocated). The report does include an actionable item in calling for sampling of people’s opinions of social programmes to ensure improved service.²⁰¹

Ghana: As noted above Ghana’s report has a set of general recommendations which are applicable to several of the socio-economic issues. It advised: “Set quantitative targets, design explicit policies and measures, and plan detailed timing to achieve the objectives in the area of socio-economic development.” The country should consider the areas where progress has been most disappointing, and making use of coordinating councils comprising the various stakeholders to help steer projects.²⁰²

Rwanda: Rwanda should establish a uniform policy of health insurance; update its health laws; make a greater effort to sensitise the public about HIV/Aids; and provide more resources to build antiretroviral centres, especially in rural areas.²⁰³

South Africa: Health is well canvassed in the recommendations – the focus is on improving the services available to underserved communities (hence the call for the building of more clinics, and for provisioning them). It also calls for action on HIV, including combating

stigma, better data collection (requiring doctors to indicate HIV as a cause of death) and ensuring a satisfactory supply of drugs.²⁰⁴

Entrepreneurial opportunities: In discussing socio-economic issues, a central consideration is the degree to which people are in a position to ensure their own well-being. To speak of entrepreneurial opportunities would refer to such aspects as access to finance and markets. It is a broad category, overlapping to a significant extent with the Economic Governance and Corporate Governance chapters.

Much economic activity in Africa is of an informal nature, and this was reflected in the reports. In Ghana, the size of the informal sector was indentified by stakeholders as a problem, and it would be desirable to formalise it.²⁰⁵ The reported noted that it is not “self-evident” what should be done, particularly insofar as a government action was concerned (it suggested “education, allowing adequate freedom of contract, and efficiently enforcing laws and contracts”²⁰⁶ – pointing towards the imperative of a sound and consistent legal and institutional framework). In Benin, the informal sector is likewise prominent, often as a survival mechanism for those afflicted by poverty.²⁰⁷

Actual physical access to markets is limited in Ghana and Benin by poor infrastructure.²⁰⁸ The Rwanda report noted in brief that good infrastructure was important and named some initiatives in this regards, but did not describe the severity of the problem.²⁰⁹

Access to finance is difficult, especially for small businesses and particularly rural ones in Ghana, as rural banks are a small part of the overall banking sector.²¹⁰ Other sources of finance include NGOs, credit unions etc.²¹¹ In Kenya, access to finance is a large retarding factor for businesses.²¹² There was also scepticism from some stakeholders as to the ability of the Kenya government to enhance access to microfinance.²¹³ Farmers in Kenya complained that the cost of inputs made their products uncompetitive. The government has taken note of these concerns and has taken some steps to address these concerns. However, it commented that these actions have not been properly communicated to the general population.²¹⁴ Algeria was making a transition from a socialist to a market economy, and its banking system was termed “ineffective”, and was not making a great contribution towards SMEs.²¹⁵ South Africa’s financial sector was described as “well-developed”, although women and young people had trouble accessing credit.²¹⁶

Recommendations:

Benin: To find recommendations on this matter, one should consult the Cross-cutting Issues section; this recommends a recognition of the importance of the informal sector and that measure should be taken to ensure that it operates as a complement to the formal sector. This would include providing assistance as required to the informal sector.²¹⁷

Ghana: Ghana’s recommendations on this issue are somewhat roundabout fashion, calling for the state-led developmental model to be opened up and to encourage more involvement by the private sector. Savings and the consequent mobilisation of domestic capital should be encouraged. There should also be involvement from business in providing infrastructure and human resource development.²¹⁸

Kenya: The report said that the Kenyan ministry of agriculture should provide farmers with market information.²¹⁹

Rwanda: An important recognition is the need to research alternative means of livelihood other than farming.²²⁰ This will be crucial to Rwanda's long-term viability. It also called for the reform of outdated laws, specifically mentioning laws regarding markets.²²¹

External dependency: As the world's poorest region overall, Africa is a major recipient of aid from donors. This is frequently seen as undermining the autonomy of African countries and their development efforts. The APRM reports examine this phenomenon. Weak internal capacity and the non-availability of resources are the primary spurs for reliance on donors.²²² The figures given in the reports for donor contribution to developments efforts are substantial: some 70% of development expenditure in Kenya,²²³ 60% in Benin,²²⁴ and between 83% and 100% in Rwanda (depending on year)²²⁵ was sourced from donors.²²⁶ Since giving aid is a political decision, so is stopping it, and countries that rely on aid risk seeing needed funds drying up. A counterargument, not found in the reports, but made forcefully by the Kenyan economist James Shikwati, is that aid severely distorts economic activity in the recipient societies, and actually hold back economic activity.²²⁷

Another factor that makes countries dependent – outlined in Kenya's report²²⁸ – is reliance on world markets for primary products. Such products are vulnerable to rapid change in prices.

South Africa and Algeria were not as dependent on aid as the other countries. Of Algeria, the report stated: "Algeria remains politically autonomous in the formulation and implementation of its policies and programmes for socio-economic development. It constitutes a good practice as far as this exercise is concerned."²²⁹ South Africa was commended thus: "The CRM is impressed with South Africa's prudent funding of the national development programme, which is almost exclusively locally funded."²³⁰

Central to ensuring greater country ownership of participation is "domestic resource mobilisation", a large element of which is tax. The report on Kenya makes the following point, which is broadly applicable to all countries: "As a mark of a country's autonomy, self-reliance in development is better achieved through the establishment of a broad tax base; it is therefore important for all Kenyans to understand the significance of taxation and the generation of revenue."²³¹

However, the Rwanda report draws attention to the constricted room for manoeuvre that exists for some countries, noting that it has a very limited tax base and still suffers from the dislocation of the genocide.²³²

Recommendations:

Algeria: The Algeria report recommended continuing to strengthen the national autonomy in the development process.²³³

Benin: The Country Review Report calls for “real ownership” of the country’s development efforts “at all levels”, and reducing external dependency “notably by investing more in social developing and strengthening the production capacity”.²³⁴

Ghana: The Ghana Report does not recommend on this issue in detail, except to the extent that it calls for more domestic resource mobilisation.²³⁵

Kenya: The Country Review Report called on Kenya to mobilize more domestic resources, and to this end it suggested a civic education programme on paying taxes.²³⁶ This is a very good idea, but would require considerable political will, as taxes would imply that ordinary citizens would relinquish funds that they might have been able to use for discretionary spending.

Rwanda: The Rwanda report does not offer any firm recommendations on this issue, although – of tangential relevance – it calls for the improvement of capacity of people and institutions involved in development work.

South Africa: As South Africa was not a significant recipient of aid, there were no recommendations for it to consider. Indeed, a ‘Best Practice’ was identified in the degree to which it was funding its own development efforts.²³⁷

Housing: In terms of housing, the problems overall concerned scarcity or non-availability of housing, with individual countries adding their particular textures to the overall issues. Urbanisation is a particular contributory factor. In Ghana, it was noted that rural housing is not an enticing prospect for developers, while a rapidly growing urban population is increasingly unable to afford accommodation.²³⁸ This report also suggested that although there had been much research into rural-urban migration, Ghanaian policy did not appear to factor this in very strongly and to have a strategy to deal with it.²³⁹ In Algeria, rapid urbanisation since independence has made formulating appropriate policies for urban development, although housing as such has received attention.²⁴⁰ In South Africa, despite extensive government funding, “stakeholders stressed that increased migration and urbanisation have resulted in an insatiable demand for subsidised formal housing. With low levels of delivery, the backlogs may be growing even as delivery increases.”²⁴¹

In Rwanda, “poverty and the previous absence of land law” were retarding access to housing.²⁴²

The Kenyan report noted that persistent housing shortages have resulted in expanding informal settlements, and Kibera in Nairobi is supposedly the largest slum in Africa.²⁴³ Slow processing of building applications – which might be interpreted as a capacity issue – difficulties in getting credit and costly building materials retard housing provision in Ghana, Kenya and Rwanda.²⁴⁴ In Algeria, the government has been extensively involved in housing provision, and the authorities “have shown themselves to be effective in considering the needs of the most disadvantaged”.²⁴⁵ The Algerian report noted another interesting phenomenon, that the architecture of some of the housing provided was not appropriate to the culture and lifestyle of the beneficiaries, which led to the latter “rejecting” the offerings – and that this needs to be addressed in future.²⁴⁶

Underlining that housing is not just about buildings, but about a system of related factors, the Rwanda report recommended that alternatives to land-based livelihoods should be explored.²⁴⁷

Recommendations:

Algeria: The report on Algeria calls for a “permanent funding mechanism” for social housing, as well as vigilance in allocating housing to ensure that all people benefit from peace and economic growth.²⁴⁸

Benin: Surprisingly, this section of the Benin report does not make recommendations about housing, although it may have done so tangentially through recommendations on land (the Benin report discusses housing within the context of urban land), recommending “justice, transparency and equity” in access to land.²⁴⁹

Ghana: This is another area in which a generic solution is proffered: “Set quantitative targets, design explicit policies and measures, and plan detailed timing to achieve the objectives in the area of socio-economic development.” The country should consider the areas where progress has been most disappointing, and making use of coordinating councils comprising the various stakeholders to help steer projects.²⁵⁰

Kenya: The Country Review Report called for a “comprehensive strategy”, with all stakeholders, to resolve the country’s housing problems.²⁵¹

Rwanda: The Socio-Economic Development section of the Rwanda report does not recommend on housing per se, but does recommend resolving the land related issues (such as registration, which have a direct bearing on housing).²⁵²

South Africa: The Country Review Report does not make recommendations on South Africa’s housing issues, but several recommendations have some tangential relevance to them: trying to stem migration to the cities through rural development (this would reduce the demand for urban housing), and improving the capacity of local authorities to provide services (this would improve the efficiency and fairness in allocation of available public housing).²⁵³

Disparities: A problem that has been central to a great deal of instability in Africa has been the phenomenon whereby the benefits of government policy or the rewards of economic activity have accrued to certain groups but not to others. This may or may not be intentional, but it can breed considerable resentment. It is also undesirable from the point of view of equal citizenship rights.

Disparities along gender lines featured very prominently and have merited their own section elsewhere in this paper. Likewise, income and wealth inequalities have been addressed in the section on poverty. Across the reports, disparities between urban and rural populations, and between different regions were much in evidence. Urban centres tended to be better developed than their rural counterparts. The Ghana report drew attention to “wide urban/rural and regional disparities in the distribution of dividends of socio-economic development in the country, with the three northern regions and some parts of coastal Ghana lagging far behind the rest of the country (e.g. in poverty eradication, provision of basic services, and core welfare indicators, like water, electricity, health care, roads, nutrition and education)”.²⁵⁴ Another comment was that there were legitimate concerns that political loyalties were

influential in determining who received development funds.²⁵⁵ This succinctly sums up the sort of issues that all the countries face.

The Kenya report noted that “regional and ethnic inequalities” have arisen from “historic imbalances in the provision of resources²⁵⁶ – a process that goes back to the colonial state. Algeria’s report dwelt at some length on that country’s “spatial, geographic and demographic imbalance”, which tilts towards the north.²⁵⁷ Regional disparities were recorded in Benin²⁵⁸ and in Rwanda.²⁵⁹

In South Africa, rural poverty remains a significant problem, and disparities in the levels of wellbeing between racial groups is a notable feature.²⁶⁰

Recommendations:

Benin: The Country Review Report has little specific to recommend, although it does call for promoting “ownership” of the development efforts “at all levels” (presumably equally in all areas).²⁶¹

Ghana: The Ghana report devotes a fair amount of space to recommendations on this issue: “Pay serious attention to equity issues, particularly with respect to gender and region. Ameliorating the North-South disparities seems particularly urgent.” It warns that these disparities could be politically destabilising. It also calls for incentives to for investments, development and skilled migration to the depressed northern regions.²⁶²

Rwanda: The Country Review Report calls for incentives to be provided for people to work “in the districts”²⁶³, presumably referring to underserved rural areas.

South Africa: The Country Review Report does not make recommendations on this issue, although disparities between the races are canvassed in various forms throughout the report. The Socio-Economic Development area contains a recommendation that calls for growth that among other things reduced inequality.²⁶⁴

Participation: Involvement of potential beneficiaries, “democratisation” and “ownership” of development processes is increasingly seen as an important part of a successful project. Participation is the subject of a question in the Socio-economic section of the APRM Questionnaire. All of the countries reviewed appeared to be in favour of broad participation and had some means to ensure this. The extent to which this was successful was another matter.

For example, processes and institutions have been established to enable people, communities or interest groups to discuss aspects of governance or policy. In Ghana these include the National Economic Dialogue and Stakeholder’s workshops.²⁶⁵ In Kenya, they included the Constituency Development Fund and the National Economic and Social Council (the country was credited with strong political will to promote public participation).²⁶⁶ In Algeria, it is the National Economic and Social Council.²⁶⁷ In Benin, the Economic and Social Council was named.²⁶⁸

The efficacy of these mechanisms is rather less certain. In Ghana, public sector representatives acknowledged that “there is room for improvement”.²⁶⁹ In Kenya, comments about strong political will notwithstanding, feelings existed that “lawmakers have yet to appreciate the importance of public participation”²⁷⁰, and that communities did not feel that they were properly consulted on initiatives.²⁷¹ Poor consultation as cited as a reason for poor project implementation, and that Kenyans do not appreciate that participation both a right and duty.²⁷² In Algeria, the quality of participation was criticised. Citizen participation and “democratisation of the process of socio-economic development is weak, if not totally absent”²⁷³, and development was seen largely as the preserve of government.²⁷⁴ Algeria also suffers from the aftereffects of its socialist governance and development model, which was heavily centralized. This continues to exercise an influence, and is a brake on participation.²⁷⁵ Participation tends to be limited to “consultations”, which in some instances are heavily dependent on the Wali (provincial governor).²⁷⁶

In Benin, participation was deemed by stakeholders to be “inadequate”.²⁷⁷ Although the CSAR evidently believed that its efforts were successful (the adjective “massive” was employed to describe participation), and although the Country Review Mission complimented Benin on the will demonstrated, it noted that participation was not yet at an optimal level.²⁷⁸

In Rwanda, attempts were made to devolve ownership of projects to local communities.²⁷⁹ The practice of Umuganda – in terms of which everybody does voluntary community work – was another expression of popular involvement.²⁸⁰

Underscoring that part of the initiative for public participation rests with the government, the Kenya report notes: “For a culture of participation to persist in Kenya, politicians, officials, and experts need to accept, support or at least tolerate effective forms of participation of rural people and the disadvantaged in development, especially at the grassroots.”²⁸¹ This indicates that to make participation a reality, governments must at the very least not obstruct citizens attempting to participate. The Benin report has a complementary note that “it is becoming even clearer today that poor governance is often as a result of the fact that governments shun the much needed dialogue with the society, which quite often poses the problem of legitimacy.”²⁸²

Recommendations:

Benin: The Country Review Report calls for “real ownership of development efforts to be accorded to all stakeholders.”²⁸³

Ghana: The Country Review Report recommended involving all stakeholders in development efforts, through coordinating councils and resource mobilisation. It also recommends paying particular attention to the disparities in region and gender across Ghana.²⁸⁴

Kenya: The Country Review Report says that the government should help to strengthen self-help groups and that Kenya should “accelerate the adoption and implementation of a sustainable bottom-up planning system to encourage participatory development”.²⁸⁵ It elsewhere says that measures must be taken to assist ordinary people to become involved in their governance and development: this would entail guidelines in public participation, soliciting inputs from civil society on budgets and encouraging inputs on projects.²⁸⁶

Rwanda: The recommendation under the relevant objective – objective six of the section, which deals with participation – fits somewhat untidily with the overall objective. It reads: “The CRM recommends that the Government engages extensively in capacity building at the local level and continues to find sustainable means of funding projects at local levels.”²⁸⁷

South Africa: Among the recommendations germane to this area are involving the legislature in the development process, building consensus with other development stakeholder and encouraging civil society to develop its own capacity to carry out development functions.²⁸⁸

Energy: A reliable, affordable supply of electricity is an important aspect of a comfortable standard of living in the modern world, and also a prerequisite for sustainable and successful economic growth.

The reports indicate that this vision is still a long way off for some of the countries. In Rwanda, for instance, only 6-8% of households were connected to the electricity grid, and traditional sources of fuel were used for heating and cooking. This was a “significant constraint”.²⁸⁹ Benin had a severe problem with its electricity supply, with outages hitting its capital city, and a relatively small proportion of the population being supplied with electricity.²⁹⁰ In Ghana, disparities between urban areas and their rural counterparts were emphasised (75% vs 16%).²⁹¹ In Kenya, electricity is also more readily available to urban residents than those in rural areas, and electricity supplies are subject to interruption. Plans for rural electrification have been stalled by insufficient funding.²⁹²

Algeria would appear to be the exception, having succeeded in increasing the production of electricity from around 600 MW to 6740 MW, since independence. Plans are underway for further expansion.²⁹³ It should, however, be noted that Algeria is an energy producer. South Africa has gone from being a country with an energy surplus to one “approaching a deficit”.²⁹⁴ This clearly foreshadowed the “blackouts” that the country experienced from 2006 to 2008, despite the reluctance of the government to acknowledge that there was an energy problem.²⁹⁵

The use of wood and other natural material for fuel has an environmental downside which was expressed in the Kenya report: “Firewood, charcoal and biogas are the major sources of energy used in many parts of Kenya. Wood fuel accounts for about 70% of the energy consumed, and electricity counts for 9%. Should this trend continue the effect on environment and therefore on sustainable development for future generations will be disastrous.”²⁹⁶

Recommendations:

Algeria: The Algeria report does not address energy in this section; the report seems to suggest that Algeria is progressing well, so perhaps it was felt that there was no need to do so.

Benin: A policy of the diversification of energy sources should be followed.²⁹⁷

Ghana: This is another area in which a generic solution is proffered: “Set quantitative targets, design explicit policies and measures, and plan detailed timing to achieve the objectives in the area of socio-economic development.” The country should consider the areas where progress

has been most disappointing, and making use of coordinating councils comprising the various stakeholders to help steer projects.²⁹⁸

Kenya: The report says that Kenya should “accelerate the energy sector reform programme to ensure an adequate supply of energy”.²⁹⁹

Rwanda: The Rwanda report calls for the reform of outdated laws, specifically citing energy.³⁰⁰

South Africa: There is only one recommendation mentioning electricity in this section, a general one that consumers should pay for services – which is related to electricity, given South Africa’s history of non payment for utilities.³⁰¹

Telecommunications: A system of communications – of concern here is principally telephone and internet services – is essential for a modern economy. Deficiencies in this sector were widely apparent, although not all reports dealt with this sector in equal detail. On the most basic level, access to communications was unsatisfactory. In the Benin report, for instance, the following was noted: “Benin seems to be lagging far behind in information and communication technologies. With the obsolete equipment of “Benin Telecom S.A.”, the number of telephone lines per thousand inhabitants in the biggest city is only 41.6, whereas the average cost of a phone call is among the highest in the region. The number of personal computers per thousand inhabitants is only 3.7. It is, therefore, urgent for Benin to quickly modernise its telecommunication network, and extend its optic-fibre cable network to the cities in central Benin. This would contribute to the creation of new jobs.”³⁰² The Kenya report makes a similar point: “However, major impediments to the quick penetration of ICT in the country still exist. These include inadequate infrastructure backbone and ancillary facilities such as electricity, telephones and financial services and ICT skills.”³⁰³ Access to the internet is particularly restricted. The problems of access are particularly acute in rural communities. This was mentioned in relation to Benin³⁰⁴, South Africa³⁰⁵ and Kenya.³⁰⁶

On the other hand, all reports appreciated the importance of ICT, and there was discussion – or at least mention – of the relevant planning.³⁰⁷ The role of mobile telephony was raised, if taken as a whole, somewhat ambivalently. While it was expanding access to telephone services,³⁰⁸ it was also seen by some as expensive.³⁰⁹

Recommendations:

Benin: The report made no recommendations on telecommunications in the Socio-Economic Development section.

Ghana: This is another area in which a generic solution is proffered: “Set quantitative targets, design explicit policies and measures, and plan detailed timing to achieve the objectives in the area of socio-economic development.” The country should consider the areas where progress has been most disappointing, and making use of coordinating councils comprising the various stakeholders to help steer projects.³¹⁰

Kenya: Kenya should “articulate a comprehensive strategy” for human resources development; manage the change that would come with e-government; and ensure universal access to ICT.³¹¹

South Africa: The report on South Africa made no recommendations on telecommunications in the Socio-Economic Development section.

Conclusion

Using the APRM reports as a set of guides, it is apparent that extensive hurdles remain to be overcome. For the most part, the visible problems – lack of healthcare, inadequate education, unsatisfactory infrastructure – are offshoots of unstable economies. This is particularly the case for Ghana, Benin, Rwanda and Kenya, but even significantly true of the economically stronger countries, South Africa and Algeria. In the latter cases, viable economies carry the problems inherited from political instability and ideological economic management. The result of all of this has been severe distortions in the provision of social services and the infrastructure that supports it.

The consequences of this situation have been a survivalist mentality of sorts: relying on foreign economic support, the informalisation of economic activity, the continued preferencing of particular constituencies and the interruption or degradation of the socio-economic fabric. The ultimate outcome has been widespread poverty.

It is not, however, correct to say that the problems identified all stem from a lack of funding, although this is clearly a major part of the problem. Factors rooted in culture and tradition, particularly in respect of the role of women, have hamstrung the realisation of a great part of these societies' potential. The problem of inadequate skills is further compounded by the inability of countries to retain their skilled personnel. The after-effects of authoritarian or dysfunctional political systems linger and hinder creative participation by populations.

Of particular concern is the difficulties experienced in implementation of what might otherwise be competently conceived plans. Skills or capacity problems play a prominent role in this area, but clearly such factors as corruption and lack of political will are evident too. These are needs to be more carefully examined.

¹ United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 2007/08*, New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007, pp. 229-232

² Excludes Algeria

³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 210

⁴ Available online at <http://www.undp.org/mdg/>, retrieved 12 November 2008

⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 815, p. 255

⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 218

⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 236

-
- ⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 734, p. 244
- ⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 918, p. 267
- ¹⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 767, p. 253
- ¹¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 387, p. 119
- ¹² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 770, p. 242
- ¹³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 315, p. 131; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 354-355, pp. 140-141
- ¹⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 401, p. 124
- ¹⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 815, p. 258
- ¹⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 48, p. 111
- ¹⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Algeria*, para 889, pp. 258-259
- ¹⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 761, p. 240; para 770, p. 242
- ¹⁹ See, for example, "SA Poverty levels double in a Decade", *Mail and Guardian*, 12 November 2007, available online at <http://www.mg.co.za/article/2007-11-12-sa-poverty-levels-double-in-a-decade>, retrieved, 10 November 2008; Mbeki TM, "The Truth will Prevail", *ANC Today*, Vol 7 No 45, 16-22 November 2007, available online at <http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/anctoday/2007/at45.htm>, retrieved 10 November 2007; Kane-Berman J, "Analysing the Poverty of the President's Attack", *Business Day*, 22 November 2007
- ²⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, Programme of Action
- ²¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 216
- ²² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 932-934, pp. 296-297
- ²³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 387, p. 119
- ²⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 221
- ²⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 938, p. 297
- ²⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 872, p. 256; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, para 373, p. 115
- ²⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 10
- ²⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 208

-
- ²⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 891, pp. 274-275
- ³⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 777, p. 244
- ³¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 893, pp. 259, 260
- ³² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 216
- ³³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 899-890, p. 276
- ³⁴ United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 2007/08*, New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007, pp. 282-284
- ³⁵ A score of zero denotes absolute equality, while a score of 100 denotes absolute inequality.
- ³⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 210
- ³⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 878, p. 257
- ³⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 40-41, p. 109
- ³⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 48, p. 111
- ⁴⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 784, p. 245
- ⁴¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 786, p. 247
- ⁴² African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Democratic People's Republic of Algeria*, para 897, pp. 263-264
- ⁴³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, p. 258
- ⁴⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 34, p. 108
- ⁴⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 220
- ⁴⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 391, p. 121
- ⁴⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 786, p. 247
- ⁴⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 2.8, p. 5
- ⁴⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 209
- ⁵⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 412, p. 110
- ⁵¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 46

-
- ⁵² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 39, p. 109
- ⁵³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 840, p. 261
- ⁵⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 44, p. 110
- ⁵⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 835, p. 272
- ⁵⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 27, p. 106
- ⁵⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 39, p. 109
- ⁵⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 765-767, pp. 241-242
- ⁵⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 3.56, p. 18
- ⁶⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 857, p. 252
- ⁶¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 135, p. 324
- ⁶² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 848, p. 276
- ⁶³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 814, p. 268
- ⁶⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 48, p. 111
- ⁶⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 228
- ⁶⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 422, p. 129
- ⁶⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 822, p. 257; para 860, p. 265
- ⁶⁸ The Rwanda report stated that 91% of Rwandans depend on farming, Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, para 437, p. 135
- ⁶⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 10, p. 123
- ⁷⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 11, p. 123
- ⁷¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 230
- ⁷² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 245
- ⁷³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 231
- ⁷⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 963, p. 278; para 992, p. 286 ; para. 1119, p. 318

-
- ⁷⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 993, p. 286
- ⁷⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 828, p. 270
- ⁷⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 844, p. 274
- ⁷⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 420, p. 129
- ⁷⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 905, p. 277
- ⁸⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 858, p. 205
- ⁸¹ Deninger K and L Squire, "Economic Growth and Income Inequality: Reexamining the Links", available online at <http://www.worldbank.org/fandd/english/0397/articles/0140397.htm>, retrieved 10 November 2008
- ⁸² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 421, p. 129
- ⁸³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 994, p. 287
- ⁸⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 848, p. 276
- ⁸⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 69, p. 116
- ⁸⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 234
- ⁸⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 246
- ⁸⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 860, p. 265
- ⁸⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 242
- ⁹⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 9, p. 102
- ⁹¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 810, p. 254
- ⁹² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 384, p. 119
- ⁹³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 4
- ⁹⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 217
- ⁹⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 373, p. 115
- ⁹⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 748, p. 249
- ⁹⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 757, p. 251

-
- ⁹⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 755, p. 239
- ⁹⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 828, p. 259
- ¹⁰⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 760, p. 240; the Kenya report also references “pervasive corruption”, Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 27
- ¹⁰¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 56, pp. 112-113
- ¹⁰² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 243
- ¹⁰³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 756, p. 239
- ¹⁰⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 73
- ¹⁰⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 235; p. 237
- ¹⁰⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People’s Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1009, p. 289, para 1026, p. 295
- ¹⁰⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 857, p. 278; para 917, p. 294
- ¹⁰⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 390, p. 121
- ¹⁰⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 865, p. 266
- ¹¹⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 71
- ¹¹¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 871, p. 282
- ¹¹² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People’s Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1017-1019, p. 293
- ¹¹³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 864, p. 266
- ¹¹⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 74; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, pp. 248-249; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 843, p. 274
- ¹¹⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 235
- ¹¹⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People’s Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1022, p. 294
- ¹¹⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 235; Algeria, para 1021, p. 294; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 843, p. 274
- ¹¹⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, pp. 248-249

-
- ¹¹⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 424, p. 130
- ¹²⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 837, p. 246
- ¹²¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, p. 296
- ¹²² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 79 (the report urged the law to be enacted)
- ¹²³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 867, p. 267
- ¹²⁴ See, for example, Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 7, p CONC, which acknowledges the country's political will; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 234, which mentions a series of achievements
- ¹²⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 248
- ¹²⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1091, p. 312; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 863, p. 266
- ¹²⁷ *Independent Review Report on the Progress and Prospects of Gender Mainstreaming in Rwanda, 1999-2005*, p. 28
- ¹²⁸ See, for example, Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1030, p. 296; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 79
- ¹²⁹ See, for example, Sowell T, *Preferential Policies: A International Perspective*, New York: William Morrow and Company,
- ¹³⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1030, pp. 233-234
- ¹³¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 878, p. 283
- ¹³² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 80, p. 118
- ¹³³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 237
- ¹³⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 429, p. 132
- ¹³⁵ An example of this is to be found in Mbeki T "Dislodging Stereotypes", *ANC Today*, Vol 4, No 42, 22-28 October 2004, available online at <http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/anctoday/2004/at42.htm>, retrieved 10 November 2008
- ¹³⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 61
- ¹³⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 229
- ¹³⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 231
- ¹³⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 411, p. 127

-
- ¹⁴⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 817, p. 270; para 831, p. 271
- ¹⁴¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 832, p. 271
- ¹⁴² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 968, p. 278
- ¹⁴³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 61
- ¹⁴⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 969, p. 279
- ¹⁴⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 994, p. 286
- ¹⁴⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, paras 825, 825, p. 258
- ¹⁴⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 826, p. 258; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 411, p. 127
- ¹⁴⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 828, p. 259
- ¹⁴⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 835, p. 272
- ¹⁵⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, para 994, p. 286
- ¹⁵¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 848, p. 276
- ¹⁵² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 231
- ¹⁵³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 69, pp. 115-116
- ¹⁵⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 860, p. 265
- ¹⁵⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 221
- ¹⁵⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 971, p. 279
- ¹⁵⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 865, p. 255
- ¹⁵⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1113, p. 316
- ¹⁵⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 770, p. 256
- ¹⁶⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 419, p. 129
- ¹⁶¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 227
- ¹⁶² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 670, p. 230

¹⁶³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 756, p. 239

¹⁶⁴ See Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 789, p. 248

¹⁶⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 804, p. 251

¹⁶⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 53; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 222

¹⁶⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 904, p. 256; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 95, p. 261

¹⁶⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 805, p. 251

¹⁶⁹ For example, Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 904, p. 265; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 406, p. 124

¹⁷⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 795, p. 249

¹⁷¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 790, p. 260

¹⁷² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 405, p. 124; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 799, p. 250

¹⁷³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 219

¹⁷⁴ For example, Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 54, p. 112; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 781, 783, p. 259;

¹⁷⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 902, p. 265

¹⁷⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, p. 254

¹⁷⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 69, pp. 115-116

¹⁷⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 228

¹⁷⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 410, p. 126

¹⁸⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 812, p. 254

¹⁸¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 822, pp. 256-257

¹⁸² The report quotes a UNAIDS estimate that some 5.3m people were infected in 2005, Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 927, p. 281

¹⁸³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 13

-
- ¹⁸⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 786, p. 260
- ¹⁸⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 808, p. 266
- ¹⁸⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007,
- ¹⁸⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 210
- ¹⁸⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 393, p. 122
- ¹⁸⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 221
- ¹⁹⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 393, pp. 121-122
- ¹⁹¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 227
- ¹⁹² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 831, p. 247
- ¹⁹³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 394, p. 122
- ¹⁹⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 807, p. 265
- ¹⁹⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 810, p. 254
- ¹⁹⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 806, p. 265
- ¹⁹⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, XYZ; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 394, p. 122
- ¹⁹⁸ For example, Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 393, p. 122
- ¹⁹⁹ For example, Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 221
- ²⁰⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 938, p. 275
- ²⁰¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 814, p. 268
- ²⁰² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 69, pp. 115-116
- ²⁰³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 410, p. 126
- ²⁰⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 822, pp. 256-257
- ²⁰⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 46
- ²⁰⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 47

-
- ²⁰⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 947, p. 299
- ²⁰⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 64, p. 114; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 824, p. 270; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 229
- ²⁰⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 412, p. 127
- ²¹⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 62, p. 115
- ²¹¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 63, p. 115
- ²¹² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 230
- ²¹³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 230
- ²¹⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 232
- ²¹⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 979, pp. 282-283
- ²¹⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 849-850, p. 262
- ²¹⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 953-956, p.300
- ²¹⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 48, p. 111
- ²¹⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 234
- ²²⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 422, p. 130
- ²²¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 381, p. 118
- ²²² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 15
- ²²³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 213
- ²²⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, p. 249
- ²²⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 371, p. 113
- ²²⁶ The methodology used to make these estimates is not specified, so it may be possible for different calculations to arrive at different conclusions.
- ²²⁷ Shikwati J, "For God's Sake, Please stop the Aid!", Interview with *Der Spiegel*, 7 April 2005, available online at <http://www.spiegel.de/international/spiegel/0,1518,363663,00.html>, retrieved 10 November 2008
- ²²⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 213

-
- ²²⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 849, p. 251
- ²³⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 747, p. 237
- ²³¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 214
- ²³² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 371, p. 113
- ²³³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 863, p. 254
- ²³⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report on the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 759, p. 252,
- ²³⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 34, p. 108
- ²³⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 215
- ²³⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, p. 237
- ²³⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para. 57
- ²³⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 45
- ²⁴⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 954, p. 278
- ²⁴¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 842, p. 262
- ²⁴² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para. 414, p. 127
- ²⁴³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 228-229
- ²⁴⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para. 58; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 228-229; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para XYZ
- ²⁴⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 973, p. 281
- ²⁴⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, para 975, p. 282
- ²⁴⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 422, p. 130
- ²⁴⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, para 994, pp. 286-287
- ²⁴⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report on the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 848, p. 276
- ²⁵⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 69, pp. 115-116

-
- ²⁵¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 234
- ²⁵² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 422, pp. 129-130
- ²⁵³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 860, p. 265
- ²⁵⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 15
- ²⁵⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 39
- ²⁵⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, pp. 26-27
- ²⁵⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 828, p. 246
- ²⁵⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 737, p. 244
- ²⁵⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 376, p. 116
- ²⁶⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 690, p. 225
- ²⁶¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, 759, p. 252
- ²⁶² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 89, p. 120
- ²⁶³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 391, p. 121
- ²⁶⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 786, p. 247
- ²⁶⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 85, p. 119
- ²⁶⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 238
- ²⁶⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1035, p. 298
- ²⁶⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 888, p. 285
- ²⁶⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 85
- ²⁷⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 237
- ²⁷¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 238
- ²⁷² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, pp. 214, 238
- ²⁷³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1047, p. 302

-
- ²⁷⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1037, p. 298
- ²⁷⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1045, p. 301
- ²⁷⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 1041, p. 300
- ²⁷⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 731, p. 244
- ²⁷⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 884, p. 284
- ²⁷⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, p. 117
- ²⁸⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 431, p. 133
- ²⁸¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 239
- ²⁸² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 887, p. 285
- ²⁸³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 759, p. 252
- ²⁸⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 48, p. 111; para 34, p. 108 ; para 89, p. 120
- ²⁸⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 215
- ²⁸⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 239
- ²⁸⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 435, p. 134
- ²⁸⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 786, p. 247; para 883, p. 271
- ²⁸⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 411, p. 127
- ²⁹⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 820, p 269; para 837, pp. 272-273
- ²⁹¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 59, pp. 113-114
- ²⁹² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, pp. 229, 231
- ²⁹³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 948-952, p. 276
- ²⁹⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 848, p. 263
- ²⁹⁵ See, for example, Le Roux M "Mbeki: There is no Electricity Crisis", *Mail and Guardian*, 30 March 2007, available online at <http://www.mg.co.za/article/2006-03-30-mbeki-there-is-no-electricity-crisis>, retrieved 10 November 2008; "Electricity Shortage a National Emergency: Erwin", *The Citizen*, 25 January 2008
- ²⁹⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 231

-
- ²⁹⁷ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 848, p. 276
- ²⁹⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 69, pp. 115-116
- ²⁹⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 234
- ³⁰⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 381, p. 118
- ³⁰¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 860, p. 265
- ³⁰² Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 609, p. 213
- ³⁰³ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 233
- ³⁰⁴ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 842, p. 274
- ³⁰⁵ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of South Africa*, May 2007, para 852, p. 264
- ³⁰⁶ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 233
- ³⁰⁷ For example, Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 65, p. 115; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 956, p. 278; para 987, p. 284; Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Rwanda*, November 2005, para 413, p. 127
- ³⁰⁸ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria*, June 2007, para 987, p. 284
- ³⁰⁹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Benin*, January 2008, para 842, p. 274
- ³¹⁰ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, para 69, pp. 115-116
- ³¹¹ Panel of Eminent Persons, African Peer Review Mechanism, *Country Report of the Republic of Kenya*, May 2006, p. 234