

U4 Expert Answer



The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)

Query:

How does the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) operate?

In particular:

- *Can civil society be involved in the APRM?*
- *What is published?*
- *What is the process of review and how much are NGOs involved?*
- *Are country visits involved?*
- *How is it funded?*

Also, what is Egypt's historical position on the APRM? Is it supportive of the process?

Purpose:

We are working on the UNCAC review mechanism and are looking for comparisons.

Content:

Part 1: Overview of the APRM

**Part 2: The APRM in Practice:
Evidence of Impact**

Part 3: Further Reading

Summary:

The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) was set up by the African Union as a voluntary governance self-monitoring system within the framework of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD). Originating from and 'owned' by African countries, it provides an opportunity for civil society participation and public dialogue on governance issues. The review process includes country self-assessments based on a questionnaire, expert review teams, and on-site visits by expert review teams who consult with government, private sector and civil society representatives. The process also involves active plenary discussions, revision and publication of country reports and action plans. In spite of early evidence of positive impact, the APRM still faces major challenges of human, financial,

Authored by: Marie Chêne, U4 Helpdesk, Transparency International, mchene@transparency.org

Reviewed by: Robin Hodess Ph.D., Transparency International, rhodess@transparency.org

Date: 22 June 2009

U4 Expert Answers provide targeted and timely anti-corruption expert advice to U4 partner agency staff

www.U4.no

technical and political nature. Major weaknesses include the lack of an effective follow up mechanism to monitor the implementation of recommendations and the limited level of civil society participation in many countries.

Part 1: Overview of the APRM Process

Background

The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) is a mutually agreed instrument voluntarily acceded to by the Member States of the African Union (AU) as an African self-monitoring mechanism. The APRM has been developed to monitor participating countries' progress towards adopting and implementing the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)'s priorities and programs.

NEPAD was adopted by the African Union (AU) at its inaugural summit in 2001 as the official strategic policy framework for accelerating economic co-operation and integration among African countries. As such, NEPAD inaugurated a new approach by linking poverty reduction and development to issues of a political nature such as democracy, human rights and corruption. The document outlining NEPAD mentioned "*setting up mechanisms for reviewing progress in the achievement of mutually agreed targets and compliance with mutually agreed standards*".

In July 2002, the Durban AU summit supplemented NEPAD with a Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance. This Declaration also committed participating states to establish the APRM to promote adherence to and fulfilment of its commitments. The Durban summit adopted a document setting out the stages of peer review and the principles by which the APRM should operate. In March 2003, the NEPAD Heads of State and Government adopted a Memorandum of Understanding on the APRM, which operates as a treaty and came into effect as soon as six countries voluntarily acceded. Countries not acceding to the document are not subject to review. Of the current 53 AU members, 29 have already acceded to the APRM.

Beyond compliance monitoring, the overarching goal of the APRM is to encourage participating states to adhere to policies, standards and practices that promote political stability, economic growth and

sustainable development, as well as sub-regional and continental economic integration. By signing the Memorandum of Understanding with the APRM Panel, each participating country voluntarily commits to undergo an assessment of the state of its national governance standards and practices and then draw on the common experiences of its peers in improving upon those standards and practices.

The African Peer Review Mechanism at a Glance

Methodology: Self-assessment, expert panel and peer review

Scope of the Review: 91 indicators in 4 areas

Rate of Monitoring: Each country reviewed every 2/4 years

In-Country Visits: Yes, with consultation with government, civil society and private sector

APR Panel meetings per year: Approximately 6

Civil society participation: In seminars, conferences and advisory group

Follow up: Continuous self-reporting on progress in steering group

Publication of reports: Yes, country reports and action plans

Technical assistance: In theory, yes

Current staffing: 6 coordinators and 6 assistants to the APRM Secretariat

Estimated cost: 100,000 USD pledged by state

Funding: Mostly contributions by member Countries

Participating Countries: 29

Peer reviewed countries: 9

Published reports: 6

(As of September 2008)

What Makes the APRM Unique?

The APRM constitutes one of the most ambitious and innovative governance exercises undertaken in Africa and provides important opportunities for public dialogue. Its approach is unique in both its scope and breadth, because the concept of peer reviews by states challenges, to some extent, the principle of state sovereignty that historically prevails on the continent.

- The process is fully inspired by, originates from and is owned by African countries. African ownership and leadership are core principles that characterise the APRM and

ultimately underpins the effectiveness of the process. The APRM is based on a voluntary commitment by Heads of State to submit their country to periodic country reviews by their peers, promoting engagement and cooperation with other African states. For concerns of ownership, the APRM is ideally funded directly by participating states, who assume full ownership of the process. External funding can be sought when a country has generated a comprehensive Programme of Action.

- In principle, the APRM does not operate as a governance watchdog or rating agency that excludes or punishes poorly performing countries, but as a support mechanism for States firmly committed to enhancing their governance practices. Such an approach can only be successful if the process is voluntary and largely non-antagonistic, with no conditionality attached.
- The process is democratic and requires participating countries to involve their citizens in assessing the strengths and weaknesses of their country's governance systems. Each country designs its own review process based on shared core standards and principles. The process is also intended to be transparent, accountable and participatory.
- The preparedness of participating governments to engage civil society as well as foreign experts in assessing national performance is an unprecedented and major achievement. For the first time, civil society is given an active role in African governance systems.

Organisation and Process

The APRM's organisation and process are outlined in a 17 page [document dated 9 March 2003](#) that presents the mandate, structure and role of the various APRM bodies, details the five stages of the review process, and provides guidelines for the financing of the various structures and procedures of the APRM.

Structures

The APRM is composed of a set of bodies that support and coordinate the implementation of the review process both at the continental and national levels. At the continental level, APR structures include the Committee of Participating Heads of State and Government (APR Forum), the Panel of Eminent Persons (APR Panel), and the APR Secretariat. At country level, each country is required to establish a national coordinating structure as well as a national focal point to ensure smooth coordination and communication between the various APR institutions.

Forum of heads of State and Government of Participating Countries

The highest decision-making body in the review process is the APR Forum, which is composed of all heads of state and government of participating countries. The APR Forum considers and makes recommendations for the review reports on the member states and authorises the publication of the APRM reports. It is also responsible for the nomination and selections of members to the African Peer Review Panel of Eminent Persons (APR Panel).

The Panel of Eminent Persons

The APR Panel is the executive body of the APRM, in charge of directing and managing its operations. It leads and oversees the country review processes and provides ad-hoc guidance to the country teams to ensure the integrity of these processes. The Panel is ultimately responsible for the contents of the report. The APR Panel is composed of five to seven Africans of "*high morale stature and committed to the ideals of Pan Africanism*", who have distinguished themselves in areas relevant to the work of the APRM such as political governance, macro-economic management, public financial management and corporate governance. They are nominated by participating countries, short-listed by a Committee of Ministers and appointed by the APR Forum to reflect a regional, gender and cultural balance.

The APR Secretariat

The APR Panel is supported in its operation by a secretariat based in South Africa, in charge of providing "*secretarial, technical, coordinating and administrative support*" to the APRM process. It is headed by an

executive director who is supported by a team of experts in the four review areas. Among other functions, the secretariat maintains an extensive database on political and economic development in participating countries, prepares background documents for the peer review teams, and tracks performance of individual countries. The APR Panel is also responsible for constituting APR Country review teams to conduct the country visits, whose composition is intended to ensure a “balanced, technically competent and professional assessment of the reviewed country”.

APR Focal Point

At the national level, each country is required to set up a national mechanism to play a communication and coordination role and serve as a liaison between national and continental structures. The form and profile of the focal point is left to the discretion of the participating countries, but it is recommended that it should be composed of high level officials reporting directly to the Head of State or Government and with access to all national stakeholders.

National Coordinating Structure

Each country is also required to set up a national coordinating structure, often in the form of National Governing Councils, in which key stakeholder groups are represented, including government, civil society and the private sector. This body is responsible for conducting the country's self assessment through a “broad based and all-inclusive” consultation of key stakeholders in the public and private sectors. Countries have a relative margin of discretion as to how they implement this requirement.

Review Process

According to the various official documents, APRM reviews can be conducted in four major situations: 1) when a country officially accedes to the APRM process (base review); 2) follow up reviews which are meant to be conducted every two-four years; 3) upon a special request by an APRM member state; and 4) at any moment when early warning signs suggest an impending political, economic or social crisis in an APRM member state.

The APRM covers 91 indicators in four focus areas: (1) Democracy and Political Governance; (2) Economic

Governance and Management; (3) Corporate Governance; and (4) Socio-Economic Development. The APRM is not specifically conceived as a review process for anti-corruption conventions in Africa, although the criteria include questions about corruption and transparency and element of monitoring of government anti-corruption activities and performance against convention requirements.

The review process includes country self-assessments based on a questionnaire, expert review teams, and on-site visits by expert review teams who consult with government, private sector and civil society representatives, active plenary discussions, revision of country reports and action plans by APR Panel of Eminent Persons. Specifically, the review process involves five major steps.

Stage 1: Country Self Assessment Review and Report

The APR Secretariat starts by preparing a background report on the reviewed country's state of governance and development, while the country prepares a self-assessment based on a detailed questionnaire and a draft plan of action through a broad national consultation process.

During this initial stage, the country sets up the required structures and prepares its roadmap to produce a Country Self-Assessment Report (CSAR) and a draft Programme of Action (POA). Consistent with the APRM principle of national ownership, there are no strict directives for the country to adhere to other than the requirement to engage with the broadest possible spectrum of national stakeholders in a manner that is left to the discretion of each member country.

The CSAR and POA are submitted to the APR Secretariat for consideration, who in turn begins preparations for the official Country Review Mission visit (CRM). During this visit, the accuracy and quality of the country's self-assessment process is evaluated. The Secretariat can decide that specific issues require more in depth assessment before moving to the second stage of the process. The Secretariat compiles an Issue Paper based on the self-assessment questionnaire and the POA.

Stage 2: Country Review Mission

A consultation team is constituted by the APR Panel, led by a member of the Panel and composed of experts in the four governance areas. The Review team visits the country and conducts consultations with the widest range of stakeholders, including government, political parties, parliamentarians and civil society. The input of civil society representatives is explicitly encouraged at this stage of the process, including consultations with the media, academia, trade unions, business and professional bodies.

Stage 3: Compilation of a Country Report

At this stage of the process, the review team compiles a country report based on the background materials prepared for the mission by the APR Secretariat, the Country-Self Assessment Report & draft Programme of Action and the findings of the review team during the country visit. Once the report has been drafted, the APR Secretariat forwards the report to the country's national government for consideration to provide an opportunity to react to the APR team's findings. The government comments are appended to the draft.

Stage 4: Submission to the APR Forum

The review team's report and the final POA compiled by the Government are sent to the APR Panel. If the APR Panel is satisfied with the report, the report is presented with a finalised POA by the Head of State of the reviewed country at the next meeting of the APR Forum, the African Union Summit or NEPAD steering committee meeting. Once the report has been tabled and adopted by a meeting of the APR Forum, the report must be made available to the general public for review within six months.

Stage 5: Report made available to the Public

The report is released to the public for scrutiny after a period of six months, with the view to enable national stakeholders who participated in the national country processes to monitor the implementation of strategies to address concerns that have been raised in the report and are detailed in the Programme of Action. The review is repeated every three to five years to monitor progress towards the objectives outlined in the POA, and develop a new report and strategy for the next five year period.

Civil Society Participation

The APRM provides opportunities for civil society participation at three main levels, in the national governing councils that drive the process at country level, through the APR panel, and in the country review teams which are interdisciplinary teams of experts from academia and the private sector. While civil society engagement is explicitly recommended by the APRM official documents, the nature and extent of participation is left at the discretion of each participating state and greatly varies across countries.

Funding

The APRM Panel and Secretariat are funded by member state contributions as well as funds sourced by the AU from African individuals, business and institutions while all funding for a country's self-assessment is the responsibility of the National Government. The 9 March 2003 APRM background document requires a five year business plan to be developed for all APRM related operations and a budget estimate to be submitted to the APRM Forum for approval.

The APRM funding mechanism emphasises the importance of self-reliance of African states. Each participating country is expected to contribute USD 100,000 per year, although this is not always the case in practice. While external funding partners are not prohibited, APRM documents specifically state that the APRM will be implemented with resources coming predominantly from Africa. Ideal external partnerships are described as those that clearly respect African ownership of the APRM and all its processes.

According to [UNDP figures](#), at the continental level, the APRM is funded primarily by participating African Member States. As of 31 December 2006, the total financial contributions received from Member States represented 62 per cent of the total contributions since the inception of the APRM, while bilateral and multilateral development partners contributed the balance of 38 per cent. According to more recent figures from the [Institute of Security Studies](#), African countries contributed to almost three quarters of the current total funds available for the reviews. In order to provide for the participation of the international community, UNDP established a basket account that became operational in 2005.

Part 2: The APRM in Practice: Evidence of Impact

The APRM is credited as an unprecedented landmark globally, a unique opportunity and one of the most important and innovative reforms for Africa in recent years. Since its first mention in NEPAD's official documents in 2001, the APRM has made considerable progress in terms of participation and review process.

Level of Implementation

Levels of participation indicate the relevance and appropriateness of the APRM approach for African countries. Participation in the APRM is open to all member states of the African Union. Monitoring began in 2005 and twenty nine countries have voluntarily acceded by signing the Memorandum of Understanding - representing about 75% of the continent's population. Member countries include Algeria, Angola, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mozambique, Nigeria, Republic of Congo, Rwanda, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Uganda and Zambia. (<http://www.aprm-international.org/>).

The pace of reviews has also increased since the early days of implementation. As of September 2008, nine countries had been "peer reviewed", including Ghana, Rwanda, Kenya, South Africa, Benin, Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Algeria, and Uganda, and six reports have been made publicly available.¹ Other countries such as Mozambique, Lesotho, Egypt, Gabon and Mauritius are at an advanced stage of review and these processes should be completed in the course of 2009.

Country Experiences with the APRM

Egypt

Beyond being a participating country currently under review, there is little indication of Egypt's actual level of commitment to the process. Egypt acceded to the

¹ Public reports include Ghana, Rwanda, Algeria, South Africa and Benin

APRM in March 2004 and was due for review in late 2006 through 2007, according to the proposed timetable. The APRM team subsequently visited the country to review the country's progress in implementing the NEPAD priorities in December 2007. As required by the review process, consultations were carried out with public officials, political parties, parliamentarians and civil society including the media, academia and business.

Ghana

Ghana was one of the first countries to be peer-reviewed in January 2006. The Ghana self-assessment process is often referred to as exemplary in view of its strong emphasis on civil society engagement. The governing council for the self assessment process was composed of a small group of distinguished individuals working through independent research institutions. This model allowed for freeing the process from political manipulation and promoting strong involvement of citizens and civil society groups, leading to the production of a robust self-assessment and detailed plan of action that was subsequently adopted by the government. Three civil society consultations were organised to consider and validate the report. The Ghana National APRM Governing Council has been given the responsibility for monitoring the implementation of the national POA. Since the report was adopted by the APR Forum, Ghana has submitted two progress reports on its implementation of the programme of action. (http://www.afrimap.org/english/images/report/AfriMAP_APRM_Ghana_EN.pdf).

The report praises Ghana for holding successful multiparty elections and a number of institutions such as the People's Assembly, in which Ghanaians are able to directly question the president. But the report also highlights shortcomings. These include the large size of the cabinet, the fact that many ministers are sitting members of Parliament, and political interference in judicial cases.

South Africa

South African experience with the APRM process was not as exemplary in terms of civil society engagement in the process, as indicated by a 2007 South African Institute of International Affairs' report. The initial National Governing Council set up by the government was predominantly staffed by senior ministers, until the Country Support Mission team urged government to set

up a more representative structure to drive the APRM process. Several important organisations experienced in advising on policy issues were excluded from the process at the outset and their submissions and recommendations largely ignored. While technical support agencies involving research institutes were appointed along the way to compile technical reports for each of the four APRM focus areas, final recommendations were extensively revised and condensed without consultation before being submitted to the APRM Secretariat in 2006. The government refused to let the public see the changes. (http://www.saiia.org.za/images/stories/pubs/sops/saia_sop_02_odoi_20080626_en.pdf).

The report was finally released to the public in 2007 and contains both the APRM panel assessment report, the reply of the government to the report and discussion of the APR forum. The report identifies strengths of the SA model, including a political environment conducive to political debate and one of the most progressive constitutions as well as good practices such as multi-purpose community centres or black economic empowerment charters. The report also raised concerns on major challenges of racism, xenophobia and gender-based violence and inequities facing the country.

Uganda

Uganda acceded to the APRM process in 2003 and the government set up a National APRM Commission to drive the process, composed of various stakeholders including civil servants, members of parliament, faith based organisations, and the private sector. Umbrella organisations were appointed to represent civil society on the APRM Commission. The process of compiling the country self-assessment report was only launched in 2007 due to difficulties of mobilising resources, setting-up the necessary institutions and the 2006 elections. Data for the draft country assessment was generated through public hearings, focus groups and submitted memoranda. The process was, however, characterised by a general lack of information among the public on the implementation of the process. Draft assessments were not shared with members of civil society and the validation meetings were conducted in a manner that did not provide opportunities to provide meaningful comments on the report's contents. (http://www.saiia.org.za/images/stories/pubs/sops/saia_sop_02_odoi_20080626_en.pdf).

The report was officially launched by President Yoweri Museveni in March 2009 and praised Uganda for facilitating regional peace and stability, for making progress towards poverty reduction as well as liberalizing the political field as shown by free media and civil society. (http://m.africanews.com/article.php?country=uganda&news_id=19209).

Evidence of Impact

Although the APRM is still at an early stage of implementation, there are early signs of impact in terms of governance gains from countries that have inaugurated the process and engaged on reforms. A paper by the [South African Institute of International Affairs](#) indicates areas where the APRM has demonstrated its potential value, both in terms of governance gains and identification of emerging issues.

Diagnostic Value of the APRM

Recent developments in reviewed countries have demonstrated the strength of the mechanism as an early warning system for emerging issues and potential crisis. For example, the APRM report for Kenya had anticipated potential political unrest before ethnic related violence broke out in 2007, while the South Africa report had warned against xenophobic tensions that erupted in South Africa in May 2008. Other country reports that have been made publicly available also highlight common challenges across the continent, including managing diversity, curbing corruption, and strengthening accountability institutions. The diagnostic strength of the mechanism makes it a promising tool to identify key areas of intervention and set priorities for reform.

Governance Gains

The first countries that pioneered the review process have started to implement their Programmes of Action (POA) and have taken concrete steps to address some of the issues identified in the country reports. Although it is still early to judge the actual impact of current programme of reforms, this suggests that the APR can substantially contribute to promote governance gains. For example, as a direct outcome of the review process, Ghana reduced the size of the Cabinet and passed a long-awaited bill to protect whistleblowers and promote access to information. Rwanda reformed its business environment and various governance indicators indicate progress made in terms of control of

corruption, government effectiveness and transparency of the regulatory frameworks. (<http://www.u4.no/helpdesk/helpdesk/query.cfm?id=164>). Kenya also passed laws on witness protection and public procurement following the completion of the review process.

Development gains

Beyond governance issues, evaluation of the APRM suggests positive outcomes towards supporting the achievement of development goals. A [2008 paper commissioned by the UN's High Level Task Force on the implementation of the right to development](#) assessed the APRM from a right to development perspective. The review established that the APR makes a useful contribution especially with regard to ensuring respect for international commitments. The paper also stressed that, even if not entirely achieved in practice, the level of citizen participation in the review process comes closer to the ideals of right to development criteria in terms of process than any other similar mechanism.

Limits of the Process

In spite of these positive developments, the process continues to face major challenges of political, process and operational nature.

Political Challenges

Although the APRM is not supposed to be a scorecard, it identifies flaws and weaknesses of political processes. As the APRM looks at politically sensitive issues, it provides many governments with incentives to control the process, for example by appointing allies in the various peer review institutions, country teams or national coordinating bodies.

In addition, while the APR Forum composition may provide high level political back up for the whole process, it potentially has also obvious limitations. African heads of states and governments have demonstrated reluctance to challenge the state sovereignty's principle and criticise each other. (http://www.iss.co.za/static/templates/tmpl_html.php?no_de_id=1931&slink_id=3945&slink_type=12&link_id=3893).

Operational Challenges

However, the experience of the pioneer countries undergoing the review process has highlighted the challenges involved for both governments and civil society. As the peer review mechanism is complex, the rules are not always clear and insufficient training and technical advice has been provided to the countries under review. This monitoring mechanism also faces major challenges of human, financial and technical resources. At the continental level, the rate of accession is challenging the capacity of the administrative support system in place, with 20 states currently awaiting review. At the country level, the pace of completing the review cycle has been very slow in many countries, with major variations across countries: while the process took between 8 and 14 months in pioneer countries such as Kenya, Ghana or South Africa, other countries have been especially slow in setting up their APRM national structures and completing their self assessments. It has taken some countries (such as Uganda) several years to complete the process, even after receiving the country review mission.

Lack of Progress Monitoring

One of the biggest challenges and major weakness of the mechanism is the lack of effective follow-up. There are not sufficient resources and capacities to monitor the implementation reports of the countries that have already completed the review process. APRM is complex, demanding and time and resource intensive. The operational challenges involved are likely to stretch the APRM structures' capacity when it comes to managing the evaluation process of almost 30 countries. While the APR provides for periodic reviews every 3 to 5 years, it is unlikely that the 'pioneer' countries will be peer reviewed a second time before all participating countries have completed the first round of evaluations.

Another issue of concern relates to the challenge of enforcement. Countries need to develop adequate financial, human and institutional capacity to effectively implement the recommendations and monitor progress of achievements.

Limits of Stakeholder Participation

In theory, the APRM represents a valuable opportunity for civil society to get critical issues on to the national agenda. In practice, however, as illustrated in the

above-mentioned country examples, the level and extent of participation greatly varies across countries depending on the government's political will to truly and meaningfully engage all stakeholders in the review process.

One of the biggest areas of concern in this regard relates to the appointment and composition of the governing councils. Civil society involvement very much depends on how each country interprets the concept of civil society participation, as official documents are relatively ambiguous in this regard. Ghana, for example, which is often cited as a model of a participatory APRM review process, chose to interpret it in a narrow way by creating an independent structure for the assessment process. However, although the quality of the technical and professional input by the research institutes in charge of the process was highly regarded, local civil society groups did not consider their contribution as an instance of civil society engagement (http://www.afrimap.org/english/images/report/AfriMAP_APRM_Ghana_EN.pdf).

Other areas of concern with regard to civil society engagement is the stage at which participation takes place, as well as who is invited to participate. Experience indicates that, in most cases, civil society is invited to participate after decisions have been made about the process and governing structures, providing few opportunities to influence the shape of the process overall. (Please see: http://www.saiia.org.za/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=802:the-african-peer-review-mechanism-lessons-from-the-pioneers&catid=3:books&Itemid=137).

Transparency of the Process

Experience from countries that submitted early on to the review process shows that, in many instances, there was no substantive consultation beforehand. In addition, little information about implementation plans and the appointment of national governing councils was provided. Reports also point to the lack of public information about what actually takes place when the president of the peer-reviewed country discusses the country review report with other heads of state. Country experience reviews recommend putting greater emphasis on providing access to information about the conduct of the APRM, as well as on ensuring the publication of the self assessment report at national level.

Lessons Learnt from the Pioneers

The South African Institute of International Affairs published in 2008 a comprehensive assessment of the implementation of the APRM in five 'pioneer' countries,² drawing lessons to maximise the potential benefits of the process. Based on feedback from participants in the reviews, the study identifies a number of recommendations to promote a more constructive review process, including:

- Assert presidential leadership. If the Head of State fully supports the process, the process is more likely to be implemented in a rigorous, open and candid way at the lower level.
- Commit publicly to a set of fair principles that all pledge to uphold in the conduct of the process.
- Consult civil society before making decisions on the process and governing structures.
- Choose eminent and non-partisan council members.
- Allow non-government leadership of the National Governing Council.
- Make the Governing Council process transparent.
- Include the media on the National Governing Council and regularly brief the media.
- Allow enough time for consultation at all stages of the process.
- Make full draft available to enable meaningful validation and post-draft texts on the internet.
- Circulate the Country Self Assessment Report and Programme of Action.
- Circulate the final country report as soon as it is presented to the Heads of State.

² The review is based on case studies of Ghana, Rwanda, Kenya, Mauritius and South Africa.

Part 3: Further Reading

Comparative assessment of anti-corruption conventions' review mechanisms (2008)

Monitoring processes currently in operation in connection with several anti-corruption conventions involve, to some degree, a combination of monitoring methods including self-assessments, expert reviews, peer reviews, country visits and the publication of a report with recommendations for improvement. They also provide avenues for promoting dialogue and discussions with countries under review. The comparative assessment of current review mechanisms indicates that an effective monitoring system requires a serious commitment by governments, adequate resources and expertise, an independent secretariat, and should provide for civil society participation and access to information and documents. Follow-up mechanisms to assess progress made on the review recommendations such as for the OECD and GRECO mechanisms are essential to promote actual changes. <http://www.u4.no/helpdesk/helpdesk/query.cfm?id=163>

The African Peer Review Mechanism: Lessons from the Pioneers (2008)

This book provides an in-depth study of the APRM, by analysing the evolving peer review process in the first five reviewed countries. It combines in-depth analysis of the APRM rules with an evaluation of the political and social dynamics. Drawing on extensive interviews across the continent, it offers sound recommendations to strengthen the process and deepen public participation.

http://www.saiia.org.za/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=802:the-african-peer-review-mechanism-lessons-from-the-pioneers&catid=3:books&Itemid=137

Assessing South Africa's APRM: An NGO Perspective (2008)

This report documents the efforts of the Open Democracy Centre (ODAC) to participate in the APRM review process and promote issues of whistle-blowing and access to information.

http://www.saiia.org.za/images/stories/pubs/sops/saiia_sop_03_odac_20080626_en.pdf

Civil Society Participation in Uganda's APRM Process (2008)

This report assesses Uganda's experience with the APRM process from a civil society participation perspective.

http://www.saiia.org.za/images/stories/pubs/sops/saiia_sop_02_odoi_20080626_en.pdf

Ghana and the APRM: A critical Assessment (2007)

This review was commissioned by the Africa Governance Monitoring and Advocacy Project of the Open Society Institute's network of Africa foundations. It analyses the extent to which the Ghana process of self assessment for the APRM respected principles of openness, participation, transparency and accountability laid out in the APRM founding documents.

http://www.afriMAP.org/english/images/report/AfriMAP_APRM_Ghana_EN.pdf

Influencing APRM: A Checklist for Civil Society (2007)

This document investigates ways to help civil society make the most of the APRM process. It provides practical tools for understanding and engaging with the APRM such as a breakdown of the key APRM structures and stages, information on how it is institutionalised and monitored, and advice on strategies for influence, including use of the media and influencing the country review. www.aprmtoolkit.co.za/.../mm_SAIIA_APRM_Civil_Society_Checklist_23May07_20071114_en_01.pdf