

GHANA AND THE APRM: A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

Adotey Bing-Pappoe

June 2007



Africa Governance Monitoring and Advocacy Project (AfriMAP)



AfriMAP

AfriMAP is a project of the Open Society Institute's network of African foundations. The Open Society Institute, a private operating and grant-making foundation, aims to shape

public policy to promote democratic governance, human rights, and economic, legal and social reform.

OSI was created in 1993 by investor and philanthropist George Soros to support his foundations in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, and the emerging network in Africa. The Soros foundations network today encompasses more than 60 countries, and includes the Open Society Foundation for South Africa, the Open Society Initiative for East Africa, the Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa and the Open Society Initiative for West Africa.



OSIWA

The Open Society Initiative for West Africa (OSIWA) supports and promotes public participation in democratic governance, the rule of law, and respect for human rights by awarding

grants, developing programs, and bringing together diverse civil society leaders and groups. OSIWA seeks to promote open society and to consolidate democratic principles and practices through increased public participation and the creation of a strong institutionalized rights framework. OSIWA seeks to play an active role in encouraging open, informed dialogue about issues of national importance.

Copyright © 2007 Open Society Initiative for West Africa (OSIWA)
ISBN 978-1-920051-76-1

Designed and produced by Compress
www.compress.co.za

For further information, contact:
AfriMAP, Braamfontein Centre, 23 Jorissen Street, Johannesburg, South Africa
info@afriMAP.org www.afriMAP.org
Open Society Initiative for West Africa (OSIWA), BP 008, Dakar-Fann, Senegal
www.osiwa.org

Contents

SUMMARY	1
THE NEW PARTNERSHIP FOR AFRICA'S DEVELOPMENT AND THE AFRICAN PEER REVIEW MECHANISM	6
IMPLEMENTING THE APRM IN GHANA: THE PROCESS	8
ACCESSION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL STRUCTURES	8
The Ministry of Regional Cooperation and NEPAD and the APRM Governing Council	8
Financing the APRM	9
PREPARING FOR THE COUNTRY SELF-ASSESSMENT	10
Appointing the technical research institutes	10
Public education and consultation by the NAPRM-GC	10
RESEARCH ACTIVITIES BY THE TECHNICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTES	12
General survey methodology	12
Methodology of individual TRIs	13
ADOPTION OF THE COUNTRY SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT AND DRAFT PROGRAMME OF ACTION	14
THE COUNTRY REVIEW MISSION AND SUBMISSION OF THE COUNTRY REVIEW REPORT	15
MONITORING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NPOA	17
Implementation	17
Monitoring	17
Key NPOA outputs	18
THE APRM IN GHANA: ISSUES AROUND CIVIL SOCIETY INVOLVEMENT	19
THE APRM AND THE CONCEPT OF CIVIL SOCIETY	19
CIVIL SOCIETY AND POLITICAL CULTURE IN GHANA	19
APRM PROVISIONS FOR CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENT	21
The APRM National Governing Council	21
Appointment of the TRIs	21
Awareness-raising and consultation	24
Monitoring implementation of the NPOA	24
Independent assessment by civil society groups	25
FAILURE TO PUBLISH THE COUNTRY SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT	26
CLOSING COMMENTS ON THE APRM IN GHANA AND AFRICA	27
RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE FUTURE CIVIL SOCIETY INVOLVEMENT IN THE APRM PROCESS	29
CHRONOLOGY – SOME KEY MOMENTS IN THE GHANA APRM PROCESS	30
METHODOLOGY	

Preface

African states have undertaken a growing number of commitments to respect good governance since the African Union (AU) replaced the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) in 2002. By the Constitutive Act of the AU, member states are bound to promote human rights, democratic principles and institutions, popular participation and good governance. More specific commitments in relation to good governance are included in the framework of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM).

In becoming one of the first four countries to open itself to the critical examination of the APRM, and the first to complete the process, Ghana contributed to the process of giving a practical form to the mechanism, which many other states have since adhered to. In fact, Ghana's APRM implementation has been held out as a model for other countries to follow. For that reason, an evaluation is needed of the extent to which the preparation of Ghana's self-assessment report really lived up to the requirements of participation and inclusiveness established by the official guidelines for countries submitting to peer review. This report attempts that evaluation, and sets out the lessons that can be drawn from the Ghana process.

This review is one of series commissioned by AfriMAP, the Africa Governance Monitoring and Advocacy Project of the Open Society Institute's network of Africa foundations. The report – which was written by and represents the views of Adotey Bing-Pappoe, an independent consultant – analyses the extent to which the Ghana process of self-assessment for the APRM respected the criteria of effectiveness and credibility defined by the APRM founding documents, in particular the extent to which it was open, participatory,

transparent and accountable. Based on interviews with many of the participants, the report reviews the strengths and weaknesses of the process, including both the independence and standing of the Governing Council and the technical research institutes that carried out the research, but also the lack of feedback to civil society participants into how their inputs were used. Though the report concludes that the Ghana process did indeed have many strong points, it also draws out important lessons for other countries to follow.

AfriMAP hopes that this report will both assist to strengthen the monitoring of Ghana's implementation of the programme of action adopted as the culmination of the APRM review

process, and also assist other countries as they prepare their own APRM self-assessments, and the continental APRM Secretariat itself.

Ozias Tungwarara
Director, Africa Governance Monitoring and Advocacy Project
– AfriMAP

Summary

Overview

In March 2003, Ghana signed the Memorandum of Understanding acceding to the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). In January 2006, President John Kufuor became the first African leader to be peer reviewed. Between these two dates, but starting mainly in March 2004, with the appointment of Ghana's APRM Governing Council, the country undertook a self-assessment in political governance, economic management, corporate governance, and socio-economic development, the four APRM themes. Alongside this self-assessment, Ghana produced a programme of action to address the shortcomings that had been discovered, not necessarily in the performance of the government, but more systemically in the procedures and performance of state and non-state institutions. The resulting self-assessment report and programme of action, and the process that produced them, were then subjected to an independent evaluation by a panel of eminent African persons who submitted their own report in June 2005 to the African leaders who had also signed up to the APRM, known as the APR Forum. It was to the findings of this country review report, presented by the panel of eminent persons, that President Kufuor addressed himself, in January 2006.

The Ghana APRM self-assessment process stood out not only because Ghana was a pioneer, but also because the Ghana model – a small group of distinguished individuals appointed as a governing council for the process, working through reputable independent research institutions to deliver the country self-assessment report and the programme of action – has been held out as an example for the other countries entering the process. This model delivered flexibility of operation, absence of political manipulation, involvement

by civil society groups and ordinary citizens, a robust self-assessment and a detailed programme of action, which the government adopted and is implementing through its various specialised ministries and agencies. Nevertheless, many civil society groups in Ghana feel that a more critical view should be taken of their country's performance.

Despite the strong emphasis on civil society involvement, in practice many civil society groups felt that the balance between public awareness-raising and meaningful consultation was not sufficiently weighted in favour of meaningful consultation. There were three main civil society consultation events to consider or validate the country self-assessment report. But the way these meetings were conducted left many participants with the sense that though those consultations may have been broad they were not sufficiently deep. There was no mechanism for those involved to satisfy themselves that their comments on what became the final draft of the country self-assessment report and programme of action – to all intents and purposes the heart of the country's peer review process – had been taken into account. This feeling did not appear to be mitigated by the fact that four independent institutions (three of them civil society) were commissioned to conduct the surveys and analysis for the assessment report. The Governing Council, which quite rightly is the central organiser, is felt not to have left enough space for others to make meaningful input.

The APRM represents a new departure in African governance. It is the first working framework to help improve governance within the countries of the continent and to help promote collective action among them. To take root however, it needs to succeed in mobilising a critical mass of the population into sustained effort conceptually, strategically and operationally.

Thus the thrust of this report is to examine how the APRM was conducted in Ghana, but to be mindful in so doing of how the lessons learnt in Accra and Kumasi may be applied, with suitable modification, in Algiers and Oran, Dakar and Thiès, Nairobi and Mombasa, Lusaka and Kitwe, Pretoria and Johannesburg.

With this in mind, this report recommends that the government of Ghana takes further steps to regularise the status and composition of the Ghana National APRM Governing Council, which has now been given responsibility for monitoring the implementation of the national programme of action. Such regularisation could include formalisation of its modus operandi by an act of parliament, with members appointed by a transparent public service appointments system and given staggered terms of service, so that continuity is preserved. For its part, the Governing Council should take steps to ensure that the country self-assessment report, which is still embargoed (unlike the country review report prepared by the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons) is published immediately. Also, it should take a moment to pause and seek feedback from all stakeholders about the way the country self-assessment process was managed, and incorporate the findings into its design of the next phase of the APRM journey. Civil society organisations, who for the most part are already monitoring those aspects of the programme of action that relate to their particular mission objectives, should find ways to share this information more effectively with one another and engage collectively with this process.

Ghana's APRM experience also has lessons at the continental level. There is a need to make the APRM questionnaire more user-friendly as an instrument for soliciting the opinions of both experts and non-experts. It could in addition provide greater flexibility for assessing views not just on the process, but also the strategy of government; that is, not just how African governments are taking their people with them, but also where they are taking them. The APRM Forum should, in the spirit of the NEPAD Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance and the new Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance, take steps to ensure that governments undertaking an APRM self-assessment engage civil society as partners during the process. There should be a greater emphasis on ensuring access to information about the conduct of the APRM, in particular insisting on the need to publish the country self-assessment report at national level, but also by providing more information about what actually takes place when the president of the country being peer reviewed discusses the country review report with the presidents of other participating countries. Once a critical mass of countries has completed

the process, a review of lessons learnt should be undertaken by the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons. Once such a stage has been reached, it should be easier to organise regular events for stakeholders at both regional and continental level to share and advise on good – and bad – practice.

The APRM in Ghana

The country self-assessment process in Ghana was led by the National APRM Governing Council (NAPRM-GC), a group of seven distinguished individuals given the independent authority to run the process. There was opposition from civil society to the manner of their appointment: as individuals rather than representatives of a range of interest groups. Nevertheless there was general recognition that each had considerable standing and was distinguished in his or her respective field. They were and are supported by a secretariat headed by a chief executive with recognised expertise in public administration. The NAPRM-GC and its secretariat appointed the technical research institutes (TRIs) that carried out the research and drafted the four thematic sections of the country self-assessment report; conducted country-wide public education programmes; convened the various stakeholder meetings that launched the process and validated the final research products before they were submitted to the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons; and hosted the APRM Country Review Mission.

The four TRIs appointed by the Governing Council were all non-governmental research organisations recognised in Ghana as leaders in their fields. They were clearly competent to carry out the work, and in no sense could be described as subservient to government. All of those involved in the project for the TRIs confirmed that there was no interference from any quarter in their research. Nonetheless, because the criteria by which they were chosen were not made public, and because the terms of their contracts with the Governing Council meant that they were not free to share the results of their research, this engendered a certain sense of exclusion among some civil society groups.

The task of delivering on the public awareness-raising, stakeholder consultation, the country self-assessment, and programme of action was carried out in three broad stages using pre-field, field, and post-field methodologies. The first of these, the pre-field methodology, comprised in-house research or literature review; education, awareness-raising, and the creation of ownership among ordinary Ghanaians; harmonising and coordinating methodological approaches among technical review teams; identifying stakeholders;

recasting the questionnaire into a survey instrument; data gathering and analysis. The second, the field methodology, involved interviews with government and independent state officials and with civil society groups, and finally sample surveys of ordinary Ghanaians. The third and last, the post-field methodology, involved a range of activities such as having the material produced by the TRIs assessed by independent experts appointed by the Governing Council; and validation exercises by various stakeholders to determine that the findings of the TRIs conformed with what those knowledgeable about the various thematic areas thought were realistic. The national programme of action (NPOA) was derived and collated by the TRIs from observations, comments, and suggestions made by various respondents, with additional input from civil society groups. These two sets of documents – the findings from the TRIs and the NPOA – were consolidated, under the supervision of the Governing Council, into one document, the Ghana Country Self-Assessment Report (CSAR). A copy of the Ghana CSAR and NPOA was presented to President Kufuor in March 2005, while another was sent to the APRM Secretariat in South Africa.

The TRIs employed broadly similar research techniques, involving desk research; adaptation of the APRM questionnaire for use in the field; interviews of representatives of government and public institutions and of advocacy groups; focus groups and interviews of ordinary citizens and grassroots organisations; and review of the research product by technical experts. Nevertheless, because of their different sample size and subject matter, there were significant variations. The Ghana Centre for Democratic Development (CDD), responsible for the theme democracy and good political governance, used the services of an advisory panel of 12 people, to supervise the conduct of a household survey of 1 200 people. Similarly, the Institute of Statistical Social and Economic Research (ISSER), which conducted the survey on socio-economic development, used a sampling framework whereby they took data from around 1 000 people. They sample-surveyed at least 20 people in each of two districts, in each of Ghana's ten regions, a total of around 400 people; conducted focus group discussions with a similar number; and then spoke to about 200 individuals from government, independent state institutions, and civil society. The Centre for Policy Analysis (CEPA) and the Private Enterprise Foundation (PEF), who dealt with economic management and corporate governance respectively, interviewed around 600 people, but from a narrower cross-section of society: primarily government, civil society groups, and independent experts.

One challenge faced by the TRIs was that the NAPRM-GC's sensitisation efforts ran concurrently with the research for the self-assessment report. Public outreach was concentrated in the period from May to September 2004; meetings were held throughout the country, and were directly attended by more than 1 000 people, in addition to media and other outreach. Nevertheless, it did sometimes happen that those responsible for conducting interviews found that those they wanted to interview had not yet heard of the APRM process; in at least one case, interviewers were withdrawn until an awareness-raising exercise had been conducted.

In addition to general sensitisation and detailed research, four important events were convened by the NAPRM-GC during the APRM process at which a broad range of civil society groups had the opportunity to make inputs to and comment on the conduct of the self-assessment process as a whole and the draft reports. These were the initial stakeholders' workshop held in May 2004; a meeting convened in February 2005 at which the draft thematic self-assessment reports were presented; a 'national validation meeting' held during the Country Review Mission of the APRM Panel in April 2005; and finally a further validation meeting held in June 2005, attended by the chair of the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons.

The February 2005 validation meeting, attended by about 50 people from a range of sectors, heard presentations of the draft reports for each of the four APRM themes – democracy and good political governance, economic governance and management, corporate governance, and socio-economic development. Participants had the opportunity to make comments on the presentations, but although they were given summaries of the various reports at the meeting, they had not received any documentation before the meeting to enable them to digest the contents more thoroughly. In addition, they were not given any feedback on how their inputs had been used. Minutes or reports of this or the other meetings are not publicly available, and the country self-assessment report itself, submitted to the APRM Panel and the government of Ghana, has yet to be published.

There is some indication that the request to the TRIs to include a programme of action within the scope of their work came some time later in the process. The cost of the NPOA was worked out by the various ministries and technical agencies of government with the appropriate expertise. The fully costed report was submitted to the APRM Secretariat in May 2005; the effort involved meant that this was after the other elements of the country self-assessment report had already been sent.

The APRM panel's April 2005 Country Review Mission was led by Dr Chris Stals, the member of the Panel of Eminent Persons responsible for monitoring the Ghana process. It held meetings with a wide range of actors in different parts of the country and collected independent information to cross-check the country self-assessment report and finalise the panel's own country review report – the document that is presented to the APR Forum. The repeat visit in June 2005, led by the chair of the panel, Marie-Angelique Savane, had not been scheduled in the initial calendar, and was apparently designed specifically to allow discussion of the programme of action, which had not been costed at the time of the country review mission, with civil society groups. Again, no minutes or report of these two meetings are available.

Since the Ghana Country Review Report was examined and adopted by the APR Forum, Ghana has submitted two progress reports to the APRM Secretariat on its implementation of the programme of action, showing that some important measures recommended in the NPOA have been taken. A process of harmonising the NPOA with other national development agendas, including the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy, has also been undertaken. The NAPRM-GC has also put in place some structures to ensure monitoring of the NPOA at district level, and conducted a household survey in late 2006, focusing on questions relevant to the four APRM themes. There is some question, however, as to whether the steps now being taken by the Governing Council in its progress reports are in fact those that would have been taken if its first choice monitoring and evaluation framework had proceeded as planned. At least two TRIs indicated that they were waiting for the Governing Council to inform them that the funds required to design and implement a monitoring and evaluation framework of choice have been made available.

Challenges relating to civil society involvement in the Ghana APRM process

The first challenge relating to civil society engagement in the APRM process arises from the nature of the documentation itself. The various documents establishing the APRM at continental level have subtle but important differences in the way that they define civil society and how it should be involved in the APRM processes at national level; in some contexts, civil society (broadly defined) is described as a partner in the process of developing the programme of action; in others, government is only enjoined to consult widely with all

relevant stakeholders. The ambiguities in these documents leave important issues up to the government of each country to decide. Even though in Ghana the government created quite an independent structure for the APRM, the Governing Council appears to have preferred to use the more narrow definition of involvement.

Although the criteria for appointing the individual members of the Governing Council were indeed made public, the fact that they were not seen as representatives of different stakeholder groups appears to have contributed to the development of a certain distance between them and civil society. However, the lesson from elsewhere on the continent suggests that a Governing Council composed wholly of civil society organisations can produce its own problems. There is a balance to be found here. One of the recommendations attempts to address this issue.

The high quality of the civil society research institutions that conducted the research on which the self-assessment was based, and their independence in carrying out this task, was one of the great strengths of the APRM process in Ghana. However, their involvement in the self-assessment process was not regarded by civil society groups as an instance of civil society engagement in the process, at least not as they understand engagement, but rather as a professional and contractual relationship, in which the TRIs were service providers rather than independent interlocutors.

Finally, it would appear that issuing closed rather than open invitations to participants in the various consultation fora, and the fact that draft documentation was not circulated in advance of the meetings to enable those invited to develop a view on the matter to be discussed, served to undermine civil society confidence in the degree of involvement welcomed by the Governing Council. On the other hand, there was poor attendance by civil society groups at some of these meetings, with some organisations not attending at all, or else the heads sending relatively junior staff to represent them, especially for second and later invitations, rather than attending themselves.

The aim of the APRM is to promote political stability, growth, sustainable development, and integration. This means that it provides Africa with an opportunity, hitherto unavailable, to foster in a systematic way the development of collective strategies at regional and continental levels in pursuit of broad development goals. The recommendations below are intended to help make those outcomes more likely.

Recommendations

For the APRM in Ghana it is recommended that:

The government should:

1. Further institutionalise APRM institutions by underpinning the Ghana NAPRM Governing Council and Secretariat by an act of parliament, rather than, as is now the case, resting them on Ghana's ascension to the NEPAD and APRM agreements at African level.
2. Deepen the independence of the NAPRM-GC and provide for greater continuity by appointing its members for fixed terms of office, staggered so that a given proportion (say a quarter or a third) is replaced at regular intervals.

The Ghana NAPRM-GC should:

3. Place the Ghana Country Self-Assessment Report and all its supporting documentation into the public domain as soon as possible.
4. Commission an independent survey for all stakeholders to establish (a) how they regard the Ghana country self-assessment exercise just completed, (b) what suggestions they have for monitoring implementation of the NPOA; and act on these findings.

Civil society groups should:

5. Take steps to share with one another the findings they make during the process of monitoring the NPOA.
6. Explore ways to mobilise more effectively to engage collectively with the APRM.

For APRM at a continental level it is recommended that the appropriate authorities should:

7. Amend the various documents establishing the APRM so that they are uniform in their treatment of important organs and procedures, and more prescriptive in the standards they require of participating governments, including a framework for governments to publish the country self-assessment reports.
8. Encourage and monitor governments' engagement with civil society as partners during the APRM self-assessment process and development of the programme of action.
9. Aim to conduct a comprehensive review of the conduct of the APRM, once a critical mass of countries have completed the review, perhaps at some point during 2008, with a view to evaluating and implementing its lessons.

10. As part of the review to amend the APRM questionnaire to make it more user-friendly, better able to get opinion about strategic goals, and to include bands for key performance indicators.

The New Partnership for Africa's Development and the African Peer Review Mechanism

The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) is a strategic framework setting out a 'vision for Africa's renewal'. NEPAD's founding document was formally adopted by the 37th summit of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) in Lusaka, Zambia, in July 2001. Though it had independent origins, NEPAD is now a programme of the African Union (AU) the successor to the OAU. It has its own secretariat based in South Africa to coordinate and implement its programmes. Successive AU summits have proposed the greater integration of this secretariat and NEPAD in general into the AU processes and structures.

NEPAD's four primary objectives are to eradicate poverty, promote sustainable growth and development, integrate Africa in the world economy, and accelerate the empowerment of women. It is based on underlying principles of a commitment to good governance, democracy, human rights and conflict resolution; and the recognition that maintenance of these standards is fundamental to the creation of an environment conducive to investment and long-term economic growth. NEPAD seeks to attract increased (primarily external) investment, capital flows and funding, providing a framework for development predicated on new partnerships at country, regional and international levels. There has been some comment, however, that NEPAD's current approach places more weight on the new partnership between Africa and the world, than it does on the new partnership between or within African countries.

NEPAD is governed by a Heads of State and Government Implementation Committee (HSGIC), which finalised the policy framework adopted at Lusaka in October 2001. The HSGIC comprises three states for each region of the African Union, with President Obasanjo (Nigeria) as the first elected chair, and Presidents Bouteflika (Algeria) and Wade

(Senegal) as deputy chairmen. The HSGIC reports to the AU Assembly of Heads of State and Government. There is also a steering committee, comprising 20 AU member states, to oversee projects and programme development.

In July 2002, the Durban AU summit supplemented NEPAD with a Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance. According to the Declaration, states participating in NEPAD 'believe in just, honest, transparent, accountable and participatory government and probity in public life'. Accordingly, they 'undertake to work with renewed determination to enforce'; among other things, the rule of law; the equality of all citizens before the law; individual and collective freedoms; the right to participate in free, credible and democratic political processes; and adherence to the separation of powers, including protection for the independence of the judiciary and the effectiveness of parliaments.

The Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance also committed participating states to establish an African Peer Review Mechanism (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 HSGIC, meeting in Abuja, Nigeria, adopted a memorandum of understanding (MoU) on the APRM. This MoU effectively operates as a treaty. It entered into effect immediately in Abuja, when six states agreed to be subject to its terms; as of May 2007, 26 countries had acceded. Those that do not are not subject to review. The March 2003 meeting also adopted a set of 'objectives, standards, criteria and indicators' for the APRM.

The meeting agreed to the establishment of a secretariat for the APRM, also based in South Africa, and the appointment of a seven-person 'panel of eminent persons' to oversee the conduct of the APRM process and ensure its integrity.

The APRM Secretariat, functioning by late 2003, developed a questionnaire based on a wide range of African and international human rights treaties and standards to guide participating states' self-assessments of their compliance with the principles of NEPAD. Its questions are grouped under four broad thematic headings: democracy and political governance, economic governance and management, corporate governance, and socio-economic development. The questionnaire was formally adopted in February 2004, in Kigali, Rwanda, by the first meeting of the APR Forum, made up of representatives of the heads of state or government of all states participating in the APRM. At this point, the formal process of peer review was ready to start: the meeting identified the first four countries to undergo review as Ghana, Kenya, Mauritius and Rwanda.

Each country to be reviewed is assigned to one of the seven eminent persons, who consider and review reports, and make recommendations to the APR Forum. The seven 'eminent persons' are: Marie-Angelique Savane (Senegal), chairperson; Adebayo Adedeji (Nigeria); Bethuel Kiplagat (Kenya); Graça Machel (Mozambique); Mohammed Babes (Algeria, replacing the original Algerian appointee, Mourad Medelci); Dorothy Njeuma (Cameroon); and Chris Stals (South Africa). At the national level, participating countries establish a national focal point and a national coordinating committee to drive the review process and liaise with the APR Secretariat.

The APRM documents identify five stages in the review process. The first and most important is that of self-assessment. A country support mission from the APRM Secretariat, led by the assigned eminent person, visits the participating country to ensure a common understanding of the rules, processes and principles of the APR. The team liaises with the country focal point and organises working sessions and technical workshops with stakeholders; the eminent person signs a memorandum of understanding with the government on modalities for the country review mission. The country then begins its self-assessment report, based on the APR questionnaire. The country is also expected to formulate a preliminary plan of action based on existing policies, programmes and projects. The self-assessment is supposed to involve the broad participation of all relevant stakeholders, including civil society organisations as well as government ministries and departments.

Secondly, a Country Review Team – also led by the eminent person and made up of representatives of the APR Secretariat and of the APRM partner institutions, which include the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA), the African Development Bank and other institutions – visits the country to carry out broad consultations, clarify any issues that may require discussion, and help to build national consensus on the way forward.

During stage three, the country review team drafts a report on the country, based on the information it has gathered during its review mission and on independent issues papers developed by the APR secretariat, and shares its findings with the government. Based on the self-assessment report and the country review team's report, the country finalises its programme of action outlining policies and practices for implementation. In the fourth stage, the country review team's report and the plan of action are presented at the APR Forum by the eminent person and the country's head of state or government for consideration by the other participating heads of state and government. Finally, after the report and NPOA have been considered by the APR Forum, it is tabled at the AU Summit, before being made public.

The core of the APRM, however, is the period after the country self-assessment report has been completed and the country review report and programme of action made public. It is the period between one cycle of self-assessment and country review and the next. For the APRM is supposed to be a never-ending cycle of assessment and implementation. Once every five years, the countries that have undergone the country self-assessment are supposed to undertake the whole exercise again, and come up with a new programme of action.

Implementing the APRM in Ghana: The process

Accession and establishment of national structures

Ghana was among the first tranche of countries that acceded to the APRM. It declared its intention to do so in November 2002 and on 9 March 2003 signed the memorandum of understanding (MoU) establishing the African Peer Review Mechanism, at the meeting of the NEPAD HSGIC in Abuja, Nigeria, at which the MoU and several other core documents for the APRM were adopted. By so doing the government affirmed, among other things, that it would:

- 'Adopt the declaration on democracy, political, economic and corporate governance [AHG/235(XXXVIII) Annex I].
- Accept the principles of the African Peer Review Mechanism [AHG/235(XXXVIII) Annex II], and committed ourselves to their implementation.
- Contribute fully to the funding of the African Peer Review Mechanism in order to affirm the African ownership of the mechanism.
- Take all necessary steps to facilitate the development and implementation of a National Programme of Action to improve our performance in the areas of governance and socio-economic development as stipulated in the Base Document of the African Peer Review Mechanism.
- Ensure the participation of all stakeholders in the development of the National Programme of Action including trades unions, women, youth, civil society, private sector, rural communities, and professional associations.

- Sign the Memorandum of Understanding on Technical Assessments, and the Country Review Visit following consultation with all stakeholders.¹

The purpose of this paper is to examine the extent to which these undertakings, especially with respect to civil society participation, have been adhered to.

The Ministry of Regional Cooperation and NEPAD and the APRM Governing Council

In March 2002, the UN Development Programme (UNDP) provided the funds for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to engage Dr Francis Appiah, at the time head of department of the School of Public Administration at the University of Ghana Business School, to set up and head a new NEPAD Secretariat within the ministry. In May 2003, President John Agyekum Kufuor appointed Dr Kofi Konadu Apraku as head of a new Ministry of Regional Co-operation and NEPAD, following Ghana's accession to the APRM. Dr Appiah then became the national technical adviser on NEPAD, based in the new ministry. He played an important role in helping to establish the National APRM Governing Council (NAPRM-GC),² and when in March 2004 it became the 'focal point' for the African Peer Review Mechanism in Ghana, he was appointed its executive secretary and chief consultant. He

1 Memorandum of Understanding establishing the African Peer Review Mechanism, 9 March 2003, NEPAD/HSGIC/03-2003/APRM/MoU. Available at <http://sites.dbsa.org/aprm/index3.php>.

2 Author's interview with Professor Adjepong, chairperson of the Ghana APRM National Governing Council.

and his staff formed the secretariat for the Governing Council, and moved out of the ministry into separate premises.³

President Kufuor formally inaugurated the seven-person Ghana National APRM Governing Council on 18 March 2004, a year after the establishment of the Ministry of Regional Cooperation and NEPAD.⁴ The legal basis of the NAPRM-GC was set out by the attorney-general in a letter to its members where he explained that the government's membership of NEPAD and the APRM provided the authority for their operations. The NAPRM-GC was created as an autonomous body and placed outside the orbit of its 'parent' ministry.

During the period before the Governing Council was established, Dr Appiah announced that its members would be appointed as individuals. This produced something of a furore among civil society groups, who felt that members of the council should represent a range of constituencies. As a result, the formal announcement was postponed for three months.⁵ Nonetheless, when the members of the NAPRM-GC were eventually announced by President Kufuor, they were appointed in their individual capacities, on the basis of their experience and distinction in their respective fields.⁶

Most were retired but one or two were still in active service.⁷ Notwithstanding their credentials, the fact that they were appointed as individuals and without open consultation on who should constitute the members of the Governing Council or on its structure was the cause of some negative comment.⁸

Initially, the NAPRM Governing Council's contact with the government was directly to the president. However, its chairman asked President Kufuor to appoint a liaison person close to the presidency through whom the Governing Council could engage with the president and the government. Mrs Chenery Hesse, chief adviser to the president and one time deputy director of the International Labour Organisation, was appointed in this role.

In April 2006, the Ministry of Regional Cooperation and NEPAD were merged with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. However, the other structures established for the APRM in Ghana remain in place.

Financing the APRM

All countries that accede to the APRM are required to make a minimum annual contribution of US\$100 000 to help finance the activities of the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons and the APRM Secretariat, based in South Africa. In addition to this, governments are responsible for financing the National Governing Councils and their secretariats. The members of the Ghana NAPRM-GC are not paid; however, the costs of setting up the Governing Council, its secretariat, and its programmes were to be met by government. The government provided the required funds to undertake the necessary tasks. The total costs of the Ghana APRM process from the inauguration of the NAPRM-GC to the preparation of the country self-assessment report were approximately \$1.5 million.⁹ The Ghana government called on financial support from a number of external agencies, including the governments of the United Kingdom and Germany, to assist with these expenses. Two staff of the secretariat are

3 Profile of Dr Francis Appiah on the Ghana APRM website, <http://www.naprm-gc.org/home.php>

4 Dr Francis Appiah explained that the criteria for choosing the members of the Governing Council were: I. Non-state actors, i.e. appointees are not state officials, II. Professional competence, III. Integrity, objectivity, impartiality and independence in public domain, IV. Command of public rectitude, V. Capacity to stand up for public scrutiny in respect of APRM findings, VI. Capacity to engage Parliament, Executive, Judiciary and civil society and to enlist their participation, and VII. Sentiments and symbolisms in respect of: Ethnic and regional balance, Religious representation, Academic representation, Civil society advocacy, Gender balance, Legal representation, and International organisations' review experience. Paper on 'Ghana's experience and lessons learnt in the implementation of the APRM' presented at the NEPAD Colloquium 9-11 December 2004, Cotonou, Benin (available at <http://www.ces-benin.org/even/nepad/nepad.php>, and on <http://www.naprm-gc.org/home.php>).

5 Author's interview with Dr Francis Appiah, executive secretary, Ghana APRM Secretariat.

6 The Chairman was Rev. Prof. S.K. Adjepong, former vice chancellor of the University of Cape Coast and currently principal of the Methodist University College. The other members appointed were Amb. Alex Ntim Abankwa, a retired diplomat and former head of Ghana's mission to the European Union, who has worked with all governments of Ghana since independence; Prof. Samuel K. Botwe Asante, an international consultant and former principal regional adviser to the UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA); Most Rev. Dr Bishop Paul Bemile, Catholic Bishop of Wa and director of the Inter-region Dialogue; Prof. Miranda Greenstreet, the former director of the Institute of Adult Education of the University of Ghana, and chair of the Coalition of Domestic Election Observers in the Ghana 2001/2004 elections; Mr Nutifafa Kuenyehia, a former chair of the Ghana Bar Association and the National Media Commission; and Ms Gloria Ofori-Boadu, a former executive director of the International Federation of Women Lawyers (FIDA) in Ghana and currently president of the Women's Assistance and Business Association (WABA).

7 *African Peer Review Mechanism: Country Review Report of the Republic of Ghana*, June 2005, p.5 (hereafter Ghana – APRM Country Review Report).

8 Author's interview with Dr Appiah. See also Eric Albert Opoku, 'Effective Stakeholder Participation in APRM Process for Promotion of Democratic Governance: A Case Study of Ghana', UNDP Oslo Governance Centre, December 2006, p.26; and Steven Gruzd, 'An Independent View on Ghana's APRM', *Daily Graphic* (Accra) 19 June 2006.

9 Author's interview with Dr Appiah.

supported by the UNDP Ghana office.¹⁰ The accounts of the APRM Governing Council and secretariat are audited by the auditor-general.

Preparing for the country self-assessment

The country self-assessment process in Ghana may be divided into two broad areas of activity, each with its sub-divisions. The first consists of the activities of the NAPRM-GC, and the second the activities of the technical research institutes (TRIs) appointed to carry out the research that would constitute the country self-assessment report.

The NAPRM-GC was responsible for conducting public awareness-raising and sensitisation activities among stakeholders and also consulting them to ensure their effective participation in the development and validation of the country self-assessment report and programme of action. The technical research institutes were responsible for ensuring that they surveyed, analysed, and reported on the views of Ghanaians on the nature of political governance, economic management, corporate governance, and socio-economic development in Ghana.

Appointing the technical research institutes

One of the first tasks of the NAPRM-GC was to decide how to undertake the country self-assessment. The NAPRM-GC determined that the task should be undertaken by four expert institutes, and having decided who these should be, approached them to conduct the self-assessment exercise in their respective areas of competence. The bodies selected were the Centre for Democratic Development (CDD) for democracy and good political governance; the Centre for Economic Policy Analysis (CEPA) for economic governance and management; the Private Enterprise Foundation (PEF) for corporate governance; and the Institute for Statistical, Social and Economic Research (ISSER) for socio-economic development. All four organisations have a track record of quality research and publications and are widely recognised within Ghana as among the leaders in their respective fields.

ISSER, the oldest of the four institutes, was set up in its present form as an institute for social and economic research in 1969, having previously existed as the Institute of Statistics of the University of Ghana since 1962. CEPA was established in 1993 as an independent, non-governmental think-tank by Joe Abbey, an economist and one-time minister of finance and economic planning. It provides analysis and perspectives on economic policy issues on Ghana and the developing world. PEF was set up in 1994 by four business bodies (the Association of Ghanaian Industries, the Ghanaian National Chamber of Commerce, the Ghana Employers Association, and the Federation of Associations of Ghanaian Exporters) to undertake policy research and advocacy, contract management and services, institutional capacity development and training, and promotion of technology based industries. Finally, CDD was set up in 1998 to promote discussion on matters of governance and its relationship to development. It has conducted a number of investigations into aspects of the Ghanaian political architecture, and its attendant processes, including election monitoring.

Once appointed, the TRIs, working closely with the NAPRM-GC and one another, agreed that while each would lead on the section of the questionnaire relevant to their specific expertise, they would share information from their findings to enable the others conduct their part of the exercise. This process led, with approval from the Panel, to the questionnaire being recast to render it better capable of eliciting the information outlined in the specific questions received from the continental APRM Secretariat.¹¹

Public education and consultation by the NAPRM-GC

The NAPRM-GC was responsible both for public education and outreach activities aimed at gaining substantive inputs to the process by informing Ghana's citizens about the APRM, and also for ensuring effective consultation of a broad range of civil society groups, in order to gain their advice and support for the APRM process. To facilitate its public awareness and consultation activities, the Ghana NAPRM-GC employed a stakeholder liaison officer to engage with civil society groups and the wider public.

National stakeholder workshop

The members of the Country Support Mission from the APRM Panel arrived in Ghana in May 2004 to formally start Ghana's APRM process. At a signing ceremony held on 24 May, Minister of Regional Cooperation and NEPAD,

10 Dr Francis Appiah, 'The APRM Process - The Experience of Ghana', paper delivered at the Third Conference of the African Evaluation Association, 1-6 December, Cape Town South Africa, (the reference on the Ghana Governing Council web site, and the title of the speech give no indication of the year in which it was delivered). Ghana APRM website: <http://www.naprm-gc.org/home.php> (click on "speeches" then on "2nd speech").

11 Author's interviews with members of the Ghana APRM National Governing Council and the technical research institutes.

K.K. Apraku signed the 'Memorandum of Understanding on the Technical Assessment Mission and the Country Review Visit of the APRM' on behalf of the government of the Republic of Ghana. Dr Chris Stals, member of the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons, signed on behalf of the panel.¹²

Over the next few days (27–29 May), a national stakeholder workshop, organised by the NAPRM-GC, was held at Akosombo, about two hours drive from Accra, for various stakeholder groups, including civil society, and attended by members of the country support mission. The author understands that approximately 200 people attended. In addition to signing the MoU, the purpose of the support mission was to assess the state of Ghana's preparedness to commence the self-assessment stage of the APRM process. Much of the meeting was taken up in discussing the nature of the questionnaire and the amendments required to be made to it to make it better suitable for use in the Ghanaian context.¹³

Main consultation events organised by the NAPRM-GC:

- A National Stakeholders Workshop 2004, at Akosombo, 27–29 May 2004
- Deliberations on the National Self-Assessment Report and NPOA, at the Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA), 10-13 February 2005
- National Validation Meeting during the Country Review Mission, at GIMPA, 4-11 April 2005
- A validation meeting attended by the chairperson of APRM Panel of Eminent Persons, Madam Marie-Angelique Savane, at the Regency Hotel in Accra, 8 June 2005

Public education about the APRM

Even before the NAPRM-GC was set up or the Ministry of Regional Cooperation and NEPAD established, what was then the Ministry of Economic Planning and Regional Co-operation, in collaboration with UNDP, conducted a workshop for parliamentarians on NEPAD and the APRM on 10 December 2002, and another for media practitioners two days later on 12 December.

After the May 2004 national stakeholder workshop at Akosombo, the NAPRM-GC commenced a programme of sensitisation and awareness-raising events around the country, which ran mainly from June to September 2004 and included nine regional stakeholders' fora.¹⁴ After an interruption during the campaigning and run-up to general elections on 7 December 2004, some events continued into early 2005. In total, substantially more than one thousand people attended these meetings, with a large representation from the state sector.¹⁵

Table 1: Participants at the APRM sensitisation fora, May 2004 to April 2005¹⁶

Region	Male	Female	Total
Upper West Region	54	8	62
Upper East Region	72	16	88
Northern Region	89	16	105
Brong Ahafo Region	84	14	98
Ashanti Region	94	33	127
Eastern Region	104	25	129
Western Region	55	5	60
Volta Region	117	30	147
Security Services	59	20	79
TUC and trade associations	33	9	42
Physically challenged (disabled)	57	24	81
Youth groups	113	67	180
NCCE and the media	23	4	27
Total	954	271	1 225

The meetings had a standard format. A welcome address by the leader of the region or institution hosting the meeting was followed by presentations by the chairman of the Ghana NAPRM-GC or his representative, on NEPAD and the APRM in general; by members of the governing council on each of the four thematic areas of the APRM; and finally by Dr Appiah, the executive secretary to the NAPRM-GC, on the details of implementing the APRM in Ghana. A question and answer session followed this, after which participants broke into four 'syndicates' or discussion groups, which mirrored the four thematic areas of the APRM, to consider the themes in greater detail. At the end of the syndicated

12 APRM Support Mission to Ghana – May2004 – Communiqué, available at [http://sites.dbsa.org/aprm/index3.php?filename=APRM Support Mission to Ghana](http://sites.dbsa.org/aprm/index3.php?filename=APRM%20Support%20Mission%20to%20Ghana).

13 Africa Peer Review Mechanism Report of Support Mission to Ghana 24-29 May, 2004. Hard copy provided by Ghana APRM Secretariat.

14 Ghana NAPRM-GC web page: [http://www.naprm-gc.org/home.php/publications/1st RSforum report and 2nd RSforum report](http://www.naprm-gc.org/home.php/publications/1st%20RSforum%20report%20and%202nd%20RSforum%20report).

15 Based on an analysis of Ghana NAPRM Governing Council web site: [http://www.naprm-gc.org/home.php/publications/1st RSforum report and 2nd RSforum report](http://www.naprm-gc.org/home.php/publications/1st%20RSforum%20report%20and%202nd%20RSforum%20report).

16 Opoku, op cit, p.26.

discussions a plenary event was organised for people to report back on the main points made during the group discussions. The aim of these meetings was to introduce the Governing Council members to the public, identify and educate regional stakeholders about the APRM process, prepare the ground for the technical teams to administer the APRM questionnaires, and ensure that the APRM was non-partisan and free from political manipulation.¹⁷

The process of promoting public awareness continued well into 2005. For example, an event was held in February 2005 in Dodowa in Southern Ghana, on the theme 'Democracy and good Political Governance' by the national APRM Secretariat, in collaboration with the National Commission for Civic Education (NCCE). At the time the *Daily Graphic* reported that similar events would be repeated in every region.¹⁸

Research activities by the technical research institutes

General survey methodology

Running parallel to the sensitisation activities of the NAPRM-GC, the four TRIs set about the task of establishing the views of different strata of the Ghanaian population. All the TRIs received the questionnaire in April 2004. First drafts of the reports were completed in September 2004 and the texts submitted to the NAPRM-GC in January 2005.

Mainly because of their different subject areas, and hence the need to sample from different segments of the population, each of the TRIs used slightly different methods to determine their sample and collect their data. The general format however was for each to go through a three-stage process.

The first of these, the pre-field methodology, comprised in-house research or literature review; education, awareness-raising, and the creation of ownership among ordinary Ghanaians; harmonising and coordinating methodological approaches among technical review teams; identifying stakeholders; recasting the questionnaire into a survey instrument; data gathering and analysis. The second, the field methodology, involved interviews with government

and independent state officials, and civil society groups, and finally sample surveys of ordinary Ghanaians. The third and last, the post-field methodology, involved a range of activities such as having the material produced by the TRIs assessed by independent experts appointed by the Governing Council; and validation exercises by various stakeholders to determine that the findings of the TRIs conformed with what those knowledgeable about the various thematic areas thought were realistic.¹⁹ This last may be described as a reality check on the findings, not by way of sampling but by way of informed opinion.

The most common forms of participation in the field research were 'panel' or group interviews, mainly of government officials and non-state actors with expert knowledge. Another was sample surveys of individual citizens. For groups of individuals, focus group discussions were employed. When dealing with organised groups, such as unions, 'syndicated group discussions'²⁰ were employed and the results fed into the process. Memoranda were elicited from identified groups, such as trade unions or teachers' associations, after they had taken their members through education and sensitisation on the APRM.

The TRIs consulted about 5 000 people in total, but by slightly different methods.²¹ Each sought information both from 'elite voices' from the government, publicly funded, and non-governmental organisation (NGO) sectors, and also from the general public. However, because of their different subject areas (political governance, economic management, corporate governance, and socio-economic development) the balance between elite and mass surveys was different for each TRI. All the members of the TRIs spoken to affirmed that they had total autonomy with respect to their choice of whom to interview, and did not experience any interference from any quarter.²²

The TRIs met on a regular basis with the NAPRM-GC during the questionnaire development phase to ensure consistency. Given the overlapping nature of the questionnaire and to prevent duplication, there was agreement on who would

17 Report on Ghana NAPRM-GC Sensitisation activities. http://www.naprm-gc.org/Misc/Documents/1st_RSForum.pdf (neither the web site nor the title of the documents gives any indication as to when the various sensitisation events occurred).

18 Article by Donald Ato Dapatem, *Daily Graphic*, 10 February 2005, p.12.

19 Ghana – APRM Country Review Report, p.137, Ghana Programme of Action (GPOA).

20 The NAPRM-GC uses the term *syndicate* to mean the same thing as a workshop type meeting.

21 Ghana – APRM Country Review Report, p.137, GPOA.

22 Author's interviews with Daniel Armah-Attoh and Joseph Asunka, programme officers, Ghana Centre for Democratic Development; Samuel Cudjoe, contract services manager, PEF, now programme officer APRM Secretariat; Abena Oduro, senior lecturer, Department of Economics, University of Legon, Ghana; Dr Peter Quartey, research fellow, Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research, University of Ghana Legon; Cynthia Addoquaye Tagoe, senior research assistant, Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research, University of Ghana, Legon.

approach which agency for information. The data collected was then shared between all four TRIs. Where the survey involved group consultations, the interviewers were expected to take down what, in their view, constituted the considered and settled view of the group, while also taking note of minority opinions.

To control for quality in the area of democracy and good governance, expert and competent civil society groups were invited to undertake specialist technical reviews. For more technical focus areas expert individuals were commissioned on a consultancy basis to conduct internal peer reviews of the documents produced by the technical teams.

Methodology of individual TRIs

CDD, responsible for the thematic area democracy and good governance, engaged the services of a 12-member civil society advisory body to help them to carry out their task.²³ They conducted two surveys, one based on a household sampling framework of 1 200 people provided by the Ghana Statistical Service; and the other an elite survey of about 200 interviewees.²⁴ The mass survey was carried out over two weeks during the month of August, and provided information about the views of ordinary citizens on governance issues. The elite survey, more so than the household survey, provided input for the programme of action. Also providing some input to the programme of action were the findings from in-house research. Their in-house research focused on the list of codes and standards which participating countries are audited for as part of the APRM process, to establish the extent to which they have incorporated ratified protocols into domestic law. During the survey CDD, like ISSER, found that sometimes the citizenry had not yet been visited by the public awareness-raising teams.

CEPA, with the mandate to examine the quality of economic governance, focused on a group of about 200 contacts. The main categories within this group were government officials,

the private sector, informed individuals, district assemblies (the principal local government structure in Ghana), trade unions, and some (estimated five) civil society organisations. The questionnaire was modified to make it more relevant to the Ghanaian situation. All the interviews were conducted face-to-face, by four people from CEPA. The main civil society groups spoken to were the Integrated Social Development Centre, the Institute for Democratic Governance, and the Ghana Union of Traders Associations (GUTA) all in Accra; the Centre for Development of People (CEDEP) in Kumasi; and the Social Enterprise Development Foundation (SEND) based in northern Ghana. Those that conducted the survey for CEPA spent about two months collecting the data they required. As might be expected, they found that there was a certain amount of previous knowledge about the APRM within their target group, but they could not be certain that this was as a result of the secretariat's sensitisation programme.²⁵

PEF, responsible for corporate governance, broke down the questionnaire into sections suitable for the attention of specific stakeholders, such as corporations, public institutions, and civil society groups. Overall they spoke to about 600 people, but excluded the informal sector.²⁶ The following table gives the proportion of different social segments approached by PEF as part of the country assessment.

23 Author's interview with Daniel Armah Attah and Joseph Asunka of CDD. The members of the advisory body were: Superintendent Avorgah, Dr Nicholas Amponsah, Nii Osah Mills (legal practitioner), Ms Esther Ofei Aboagye (executive director, Institute of Local Government Studies), Ms Nana Oye Lithur (United Nations Commission for Human Rights), Ms Sena Gabianu (retired public servant), Mr George Sarpong (executive secretary, National Media Commission), K.B. Asante (retired career diplomat), Ben Assorrow, Prof. Kofi Quashigah (Law Faculty, University of Ghana), Ms Bernice Sam (executive secretary, Women in Law and Development (WILDAF)), Dr Kwesi Anning (head, CPRMD Dept., Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre), and Prof. Kwame Boafo-Arthur (Political Science Dept., University of Ghana).

24 Author's interview with Daniel Armah Attah and Joseph Asunka of CDD.

25 Author's interview with Abena Oduro, Core Fellow, CEPA, now senior lecturer Department of Economics, University of Ghana.

26 Author's interview with Samuel Cudjoe, contract services manager, PEF, and now programme officer at the Ghana APRM Secretariat.

Table 2: PEF interviewees – target and actual

Grouping	Target	Achieved	% achieved	% of total achieved
Trade and business associations	40	25	62,50	4,02
Civil society organisations	20	13	65,00	2,09
Trade unions	5	2	40,00	0,32
Corporations (MN and SMEs)	230	206	89,57	33,12
Workers (unionised and non-unionised)	100	99	99,00	15,92
Community members	400	238	59,50	38,26
Regulators	15	8	53,33	1,29
Experts	20	18	90,00	2,89
Ministries, departments, and agencies	10	6	60,00	0,96
Audit and law firms	10	7	70,00	1,13
Total	850	622	73,00	100,00

Source: PEF section of the Ghana self-assessment report, p. 124. Final column added by author.

The table shows that, using PEF’s definition of civil society, the percentage of respondents from this sector constituted just over 2 per cent of those it interviewed. A less restrictive definition which included trade unions, trade and business associations, workers (unionised and non-unionised) and community members, would take the percentage of civil society interviewees to over 60 per cent.

An assumption was made that the national unions represented their members in the regions, and therefore those in the regions were not surveyed separately. Five regions – Western, Greater Accra, Ashanti, Brong Ahafo, and Upper West – were surveyed in this way for ‘group opinions’ from such bodies as regional trade unions and other membership organisations.

ISSER’s sampling for research on socio-economic development involved taking the views of about 1 000 people, divided into three broad groups. The first group was sample-surveyed taking a minimum of 20 respondents from two districts in each of Ghana’s 10 regions. One of the districts chosen in each region had to be a high-performing district with respect to socio-economic development and the other a low-performing district. The criteria for high and low-performing included school enrolment and educational performance at Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE) taken after nine years of primary and junior secondary

school attendance, ability to generate own resources, and high economic output.²⁷ In the eastern region, for example, the two districts chosen were New Juaben and Birim North.²⁸ In addition, about two focus group discussions (of about 15 to 20 people) were held per region. In one instance the survey team decided to withdraw to allow the sensitisation process to take place before returning to undertake the survey.²⁹ The final category of interviews was those conducted with members of the elite in government ministries and agencies, and NGOs meaning that a minimum of around 800 respondents were interviewed or consulted in total.

Adoption of the country self-assessment report and draft programme of action

Once the initial versions of the thematic country self-assessments had been prepared, the NAPRM-GC appointed four individuals as technical experts, one for each thematic area, to review and assess the work carried out by the TRIs. The Ghana Country Review Report records a number of events organised to validate the self-assessment report and the NPOA:

- Stakeholder validation of the draft reports and NPOA presented by the technical review teams, during a national validation exercise convened by the NAPRM-GC from 10 to 13 February 2005 at the Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA)
- Revisions to the Country Self-Assessment based on the proceedings of the national validation workshop
- In-house ministerial review by government officials from the Ministry of Regional Cooperation and NEPAD
- Review of the draft self-assessment report and programme of action by a government-appointed team of experts at a retreat in Elmina on 18-20 February 2005
- Review by a team of government ministers
- Review by a parliamentary select committee on APRM matters
- Review by the Trades Union Congress³⁰

Some 50 people (of 200 invited) attended the ‘validation meeting’ on 10-13 February 2005, at which the draft reports by the TRIs were presented and participants invited to contribute to the formulation of a programme of action based on their findings. Those present included ‘some governmental and non-governmental organisations, members of the

27 Author’s interview with Dr Peter Quartey, research fellow, ISSER,

28 Author’s interview with Cynthia Addoquaye Tagoe, senior research assistant, ISSER.

29 Author’s interview with Dr Peter Quartey, research fellow, ISSER.

30 Ghana – APRM Country Review Report, p.141, GPOA.

Governing Council, staff of the NAPRM-GC secretariat and the TRIs. The non-governmental organisations represented included Institute of Democratic Governance (IDEG), African Security Dialogue and Research (who were quite critical of the process in Ghana) Children's Rights International, Association of Ghana Industries, Ghana Employers' Association, Ghana National Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, the Office of the President, Ministries of Regional Cooperation and NEPAD, Foreign Affairs, Environment & Science, Food and Agriculture, as well as the National Commission for Civic Education, Ghana Armed Forces, Ghana Statistical Service, Ghana Investment Promotion Centre and CHRAJ'.³¹

The programme of action thus seems to have had input from at least two sources: the TRIs and participants at the validation meeting.³² Two members of TRIs indicated that the request for a programme of action came as an additional request from the Governing Council, when they were near to completing the data collection exercise.³³ It was therefore derived from the observations, comments, and suggestions made by the various respondents, and was collated.

The final consolidated country self-assessment report (CSAR) and a draft programme of action were presented to the government on 18 March 2005, and in the same month to the APRM Secretariat in South Africa.³⁴ The draft programme of action had still to be costed by the technical ministries and agencies that had the appropriate technical expertise, which delayed its final submission to May 2005.³⁵ When it was costed, the NPOA totalled \$5,5 billion over five years.

The country review mission and submission of the country review report

After the draft country self-assessment report had been submitted, a 16-member country review team from the APRM Panel and Secretariat arrived in the country to conduct an assessment of the process. The purpose of the country review mission was to provide an opportunity for the team 'to discuss the draft programme of action that the country has drawn up to improve their governance and socio-economic development, to provide positive reinforcement for the sound aspects, and to address identified weaknesses

and shortcomings in the various areas of governance and development'.³⁶ As usual, the team was led by Dr Chris Stals, accompanied by experts from a range of continental institutions.³⁷ From 4 to 16 April 2005 they travelled around the country and met with a range of stakeholders.

Perhaps the most important of their meetings was the national validation meeting organised in Accra at GIMPA, towards the end of their stay. However, the Ghana APRM secretariat, though requested to, was not able to provide a participants list for this meeting, nor a report of what had transpired.³⁸

In addition, the members of the Country Review Mission engaged in a number of activities including:

- Holding working sessions with the NAPRM-GC and the technical teams to discuss the 'Issues Paper' on Ghana prepared by the APRM Secretariat on the basis of independent information and the initial draft CSAR and NPOA
- Attending a workshop for the Trade Union Congress, academia and non-governmental organisations to discuss the CSAR and evaluate the extent to which Ghanaians had been included in the review process
- Attending meetings with representatives of specific sectors, including the Serious Fraud Office, the Commission for Human Rights and Administrative Justice, the Office of the Auditor-General, and ministries, departments and agencies
- Paying visits to various regional capitals, including Ho

36 Ghana – APRM Country Review Report, p.11.

37 Other members were Dr Bernard Kouassi (executive director), Ms Evelynne Change (coordinator: corporate governance), Mr Dalmar Jama (research analyst: corporate governance), all from the continental APRM Secretariat; Mr Sudir Chuckun (coordinator: multilateral relations and policy), from the NEPAD secretariat; Mr Seward M. Cooper (chief counsel and head of the Good Governance Unit) and Prof. Claudius Dele Olowu (principal governance expert, public administration), both from the African Development Bank; Ms Zemenay Lakew (senior programme coordinator, AU-NEPAD Support Unit), UNDP; and Dr Okey Onyejekwe (senior regional adviser), UNECA. The seven independent consultants were Prof. Ahmed Mohiddin (director, 21st Century Africa Foundation), Prof. Michelo K. Hansungule (Professor of Human Rights Law, Centre for Human Rights, University of Pretoria, South Africa), and Mr Alfred Mubanda (former UNDP resident representative in Ghana and former minister of state for foreign affairs of Uganda) all for democracy and good political governance. Dr Afeikhena T. Jerome (consultant and senior lecturer, Department of Economics, University of Ibadan, Nigeria) and Dr Omotunde Johnson (consultant on economic issues and former International Monetary Fund resident representative in Ghana) worked on economic governance and management issues. Ms Gertrude Takawira (former country director, South and Eastern African Trade Information and Negotiating Institute [SEATINI] and managing consultant, Governance and Development Services, Zimbabwe) was responsible for corporate governance; and Prof. L. Adele Jinadu (executive director, Centre for Advanced Social Science, Port Harcourt, Nigeria) focused on socio-economic development.

38 See appendix on methodology.

31 Opoku, op.cit., p.27.

32 Author's interviews with the TRIs and with some members of civil society who attended the February 2005 validation meeting.

33 Authors' meeting with Samuel Cudjoe and Dr Peter Quartey.

34 Ghana – APRM Country Review Report, p.7, section 23.

35 Author's interview with members of TRIs.

(Volta and Eastern regions), Cape Coast (Central and Western regions), Wa (Upper West, Upper East and Northern regions) and Kumasi (Ashanti and Brong-Ahafo regions), to meet with regional stakeholders. In the course of these meetings, the team members were able to assess, amongst other things, the level of broad-based participation, the role of regional stakeholders in decision-making, and region-specific challenges

- Attending a workshop in Accra with Members of Parliament (MPs). The workshop allowed for open deliberations on the APRM in-country processes and the role of Parliament as a legislative and oversight institution
- Meetings with Ghana's development partners
- Holding a meeting with the deputy minister for finance and the deputy governor of the Bank of Ghana to discuss macroeconomic policy and management in Ghana³⁹

Meanwhile, the government too was examining the country self-assessment report. In a series of meetings, one of them chaired by President Kufuor, the report was closely examined and approved by the cabinet, with a commitment to implement the programme of action.⁴⁰

After the departure of the Country Review Mission team, the chairperson of the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons, Marie-Angelique Savane, made a special visit to Accra, accompanied by Dr Stals, to conduct her own assessment of the Ghana APRM process. This meeting had not been provided for in the APRM schedule of visits by Panel members, but according to the Ghana Country Review Report was undertaken to allow the chair to assess the nature of the NAPRM-GC's engagement with civil society, and to discuss the costed NPOA.⁴¹ She had the opportunity to meet with a number of stakeholders on 8 June 2005.⁴² The Country Review Report records that: 'In interactions with Ghana following the CRM, including a visit by the chairperson of the Panel, the leader of the country review process, the Secretariat, and the Panel have satisfied themselves that the NPOA:

- has been designed by all stakeholders in Ghana and that all have participated actively in the self-assessment process;
- covers the important gaps and deficiencies identified in the extensive APRM process;
- provides satisfactory indications of costs and time frames;
- elaborates on monitoring and implementation responsibilities;

39 APRM Ghana Country Review Report, pp.9-10.

40 Author's interview with Professor Adjepong.

41 Author's interviews with Professor Adjepong and Dr Appiah.

42 Ghana APRM Secretariat 'Ghana's Journey Through The African Peer Review Mechanism', *Daily Graphic*, 4 November 2005.

- represents a firm commitment from all stakeholders; and
- is fully endorsed by the government, which unreservedly accepts its share of responsibility for the implementation of the programme.⁴³

The APRM Panel prepared its Ghana Country Review Report on the basis of the self-assessment report submitted to it, the NPOA, the APRM Secretariat's issues paper and the findings of the Country Review Mission. This report was submitted to the government of Ghana on 18 March 2005.⁴⁴ A letter of 10 June 2005 from the Ghana NAPRM-GC on behalf of the government responded to a number of points of concern. On 19 June 2005, the APRM Panel submitted the Ghana Country Review Report and national programme of action to the APRM Forum.

For the media in Ghana, this was the end of the Ghana process, and they took it that Ghana had been peer reviewed. A press conference by Professor Adjepong explained that this was not in fact the case and that Ghana would be reviewed in August 2005.⁴⁵ The confusion arose because the Base Document of the APRM says that 'The Fourth Stage begins when the Team's report is submitted to the participating heads of state and Government through the APRM Secretariat. The consideration and adoption of the final report by the participating heads of state and Government, including their decision in this regard, marks the end of this stage.'⁴⁶ And it goes on: 'Six months after the report has been considered by the heads of state and Government of the participating member countries, it should be formally and publicly tabled in key regional and sub-regional structures such as the Pan-African Parliament, the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, the envisaged Peace and Security Council and the Economic, Social and Cultural Council (ECOSOCC) of the African Union. This constitutes the fifth and final stage of the process.'⁴⁷

As things turned out, President John Kufuor did not address the issues contained in the Ghana APRM Country Review Report with his peers until 22 January 2006, during a meeting of the APRM Forum held in Khartoum, Sudan. It would seem that the procedure set out in the Base Document has been slightly modified to allow for the head of state of the country being peer reviewed to respond to the country review report presented by the APRM Panel. Nevertheless,

43 APRM Ghana Country Review Report, p.125, paragraph 18.

44 Author's interview with Ambassador Abankwa.

45 *Daily Graphic*, 25 June 2005.

46 The APRM Base Document, section 23 <http://sites.dbsa.org/aprm/index3.php>.

47 The APRM Base Document, section 25.

the Ghana Country Review Report, including the programme of action, was placed in the public domain by the continental APRM Secretariat on 6 October 2005.

Monitoring the implementation of the NPOA

To kick off the public awareness-raising for implementing the programme of action, the Governing Council organised two launch events for the Ghana Country Review Report and programme of action, one for the general public on 18 April 2006 at the Accra International Conference Centre, and another for the diplomatic community and international organisations on Friday, 5 May 2006, at the Golden Tulip Hotel, Accra. In addition it published 7 000 copies of the country review report for distribution to individuals and public and private institutions within the country.⁴⁸ With attention now on the manner of implementing the NPOA, President Kufuor asked the members of the NAPRM-GC to continue with their APRM oversight responsibilities and to supervise its implementation.⁴⁹ The Governing Council and Secretariat thus remain in place. This is not the case in Kenya, for example, where the National APRM Governing Council was disbanded.

The NPOA identifies the agencies responsible for each of its constituent activities. The government had taken steps to harmonise the budget of the NPOA with the other elements of its development agenda. The estimated cost of \$5,5 billion included some projects already budgeted for. Some of the additional funds would be provided by government and some from external sources.

Implementation

The programme of action provided details of the expected outputs, outcomes, costs and implementing agencies, on a project-by-project basis, thus making it relatively easy to monitor. A crucial stage in the implementation process is that the NPOA should be fully harmonised with Ghana's existing development strategy framework. The other programmes concerned are the Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS II), the Results Matrix of Development Partners, and the Multi-Donor Budget Support Matrix, as well as the

objectives of the Millennium Development Goals.⁵⁰ In line with its brief, the Governing Council now participates in the consultative group formed by government to harmonise all governance programmes.⁵¹ The end result should be that these various programmes are reflected first in the medium-term expenditure frameworks and then in annual budgets. The government of Ghana has undertaken to take the required action not only to integrate the NPOA with the country's existing development framework but also to make available the funds required to implement it. In the words of the Ghana Country Review Report, the NPOA 'is fully endorsed by the government, which unreservedly accepts its share of responsibility for the implementation of the programme'.⁵² In this context, the task of the Governing Council will be to monitor the steps being taken in this regard, and the degree of success they enjoy. Once the funds are available in the intended quantities for the intended projects, at the scheduled times, then their task is to ensure effective monitoring of the NPOA.

Monitoring

The NAPRM-GC has formed a strategic partnership with the National Commission on Civic Education, a constitutional body, to develop a framework for monitoring and evaluating the programme of action. To this end they have worked on 'building the capacity of district level civil society organisations in participatory M&E, and in the use of such tools as the Citizen Report Cards'.⁵³

The secretariat to the NAPRM-GC organised at least one workshop to explore the issues involved in developing a monitoring and evaluation framework.⁵⁴ The TRIs were approached as part of this exercise, and indicated what it would cost for them to participate. In the meantime, the secretariat of the Governing Council is proceeding on the basis of its own efforts, and is complying with the reporting requirements. Ghana, more than in line with its requirement

48 Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the Implementation of the Ghana National Programme of Action for the Period January – June 2006, p.12.

49 Ibid., p. 8.

50 Bartholomew Armah, 'Towards Policy Coherence: Integrating APRM with Existing Processes (MDGs and PRS)', paper presented at the APRM Continental conference 'Africa's Bold March to Capture the 21st century – The role of the APRM', 8-10 May 2007, Accra, Ghana.

51 It is known as the Consultative Group on Pillar III – Governance and Civic Responsibility. Reference – Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the Implementation of the Ghana National Programme of Action for the Period January – June 2006, p.14.

52 APRM Ghana Country Review Report, p.125.

53 Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the Implementation of the Ghana National Programme of Action for the Period January – June 2006, p.14.

54 Author's interview with Cynthia Addoquaye Tagoe. The workshop took place at the Greenland Hotel in Swedru, where a broad range of stakeholders were present, together with representatives of the TRIs.

to make an annual report, has to date sent progress reports every six months.⁵⁵

The Governing Council reports that it conducted desk-based research, and also conducted a household survey of 1 200 citizens from 20 districts in all the ten regions between 3 October 2006 and 10 December 2006, using enumerators trained by the NCCE. A survey 'checklist was also developed for use during the focus group discussions that were held with identifiable groups – traditional authorities, youth groups, etc'.⁵⁶ Focus group discussions were held with various stakeholder groups including traditional authorities (chiefs and queen mothers), youth groups, district assembly members and civil society organisations across the ten regions of Ghana. Personal interviews were also held with 32 experts in various fields, economics, governance, finance, gender and child issues.⁵⁷ Finally, 'information collected from all sources was subjected to a strict validation process at both the community level and at the national level. All stakeholders were given an opportunity to make inputs into whatever issue that is raised'.⁵⁸

To secure civil society input, the Governing Council has contracted four designated civil society organisations to act as lead agencies to monitor the activities of the civil society sector within their respective areas of expertise. Two of the four are CDD for democracy and good political governance, and PEF for corporate governance. The former 'collaborates with umbrella institutions like the Ghana Anti-Corruption Coalition, The Ghana Integrity Initiative, the SEND Foundation, ISODEC, the Institute for Democratic Governance, etc' and the latter with 'the Institute for Directors, Association of Ghana Industries, Ghana Chamber of Mines, Institute of Chartered Accountants, Ghana Association of Bankers, Association of Garages, etc' to 'interact with their constituents and with the population at large in monitoring the progress made towards implementation of the NPOA'.⁵⁹

At least one of the TRIs informed the author that they had been approached by the Governing Council to assist with developing a monitoring and evaluation framework for the

NPOA. They had indicated what it would cost for them to participate and were awaiting to be informed by the Governing Council when the money became available.⁶⁰ Another TRI said that they had applied to the African Development Bank, with the support of the government, to be able to monitor the implementation of the NPOA on matters of democracy and good governance.⁶¹

Key NPOA outputs

According to the progress reports, among the key elements of the NPOA already implemented are:⁶²

- The Local Government Service Act has been passed, and the Local Government Service Council has been instituted, though the Local Government Service is yet to be operational.
- The Criminal Code of 1998 has been amended to criminalise harmful widowhood rites and ritual servitude.
- The law on female genital mutilation (FGM) has been strengthened and presented to Parliament.
- The law prohibiting human trafficking has been passed and 120 child protection volunteer teams established to serve as watchdogs for children.
- The Disability Act, 2006 (Act 715) has been passed.
- The Whistleblowers Act, 2006 (Act 720) has been passed.
- The Freedom of Information Bill has been revised and submitted to the Minister of Justice and Attorney-General for consideration.
- The Domestic Violence Bill received a second reading in Parliament.⁶³
- The Institute of Chartered Accountants – Ghana has declared that all Ghanaian companies and businesses should adopt International Accounting Reporting from 1 January 2007.
- Overly restrictive legislations such as the Industrial Relation Act of 1965, which hindered trade union activities, have been repealed with the passage of the Labour Act 2003 (Act 651).
- The Insurance Bill has been proofread and gazetted and corrections are being effected.

55 Author's interview with Samuel Cudjoe, programme officer, Ghana APRM Secretariat. The progress reports are available online, at the site of the Ghana National APRM Governing Council: <http://www.naprm-gc.org/home.php>.

56 Ghana National APRM-GC, Annual Progress Report 2006, pp.3-4.

57 Ibid., p.4.

58 Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the Implementation of the Ghana National Programme of Action for the Period January – June 2006, p.11

59 Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the Implementation of the Ghana National Programme of Action for the Period January – June 2006, p.9.

60 Author's interview with Dr Peter Quartey.

61 Author's interview with Daniel Armah-Attoh and Joseph Asunka, programme officers, CDD.

62 Ghana National APRM-GC, Annual Progress Report 2006, pp.vii-xiv.

63 This bill was passed by Parliament on 21 February 2007 and signed into law by President Kufuor shortly thereafter.

The APRM in Ghana: issues around civil society involvement

The APRM and the concept of civil society

The various APRM documents use the concept of civil society slightly differently in different contexts. For example, the APRM Base Document states: 'In Stage Two, the Review Team will visit the country concerned where its priority order of business will be to carry out the widest possible range of consultations with the Government, officials, political parties, parliamentarians and representatives of civil society organisations (including the media, academia, trade unions, business, professional bodies).'⁶⁴ In the 'Organisation and Process' document, however, the description of civil society is broadened: 'The APR Team will interact and consult extensively with government officials, parliamentarians, representatives of political parties, the business community, representatives of civil society (including media, academia, trade unions, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), community-based organisations (CBOs), rural communities and representatives of international organisations.'⁶⁵ However in the MoU establishing the APRM, adopted in Abuja in 2003, governments are asked to 'ensure the participation of all stakeholders in the development of the national programme of action including trade unions, women, youth, civil society, private sector, rural communities, and professional associations'.⁶⁶ The concept of civil society

being used here is clearly narrower than in the previous documents.

For the purposes of this report civil society is regarded as the range of associations between individuals that occupy the social space between the household or homestead and the state, that are freely entered into, self-defined, and self-governed, within existing legal parameters. Among these associations are: business associations, trade unions, community-based groups, membership advocacy based organisations, non-membership advocacy organisations, and faith-based organisations. More often than not the founders of these bodies come from the same ranks as the ruling elite. Sometimes though, they are formed by those lower down the social ladder, who, by associating, have been able to increase their leverage in ways not otherwise possible, even within a liberal representative democracy. The relationship of civil society groups with the state changes over time, embracing such diverse roles as an 'established' body, with an imperative to support and protect the state, a contractor to the state, and even as a countervailing power to the state. The flavour of a society's political system rests, in part, on the density and relative balance between these different kinds of civil society organisations.

Civil society and political culture in Ghana

Civil society in Ghana has had a complex relationship with the various governments that have been in power since independence. Among the factors that have influenced the

64 APRM Base Document, section 19.

65 APRM Organisation and Process document: NEPAD/HGSIC-3-2003/APRM/Guideline/O&P9 March 2003 section 7.8.

66 Memorandum of Understanding establishing the African Peer Review Mechanism, 9 March 2003, <http://sites.dbsa.org/aprm/index3.php?>

relationship have been the pluralistic character of society, the level of activism among the main social groups, the primacy of constitutional provisions relating to freedom of association, and the political culture.

Ghana has not had a history of significant divides based either on faith or ethnicity. However it has had in its 50 years of independence two significant sources of division: socio-economic and ideological. The policies of the government of Ghana's first president, Kwame Nkrumah, was a source of what one may term ideological pluralism. Nkrumah was the foremost proponent of social democracy, statism, and Pan-Africanism. His policies generated a counterperspective and position. Thus the Ghanaian elite was home to two very distinctive ideas about how society should be organised. This meant that any government in power was invariably confronted with a well-organised and historically rooted countertendency. These opposing views were not always expressed by political activity but sometimes by civil society organisations. In this regard the trade union movement on the one hand, and the Ghana Bar Association on the other, have at particular moments in Ghana's history taken on this role vis-à-vis the incumbent government or regime.

Two particular aspects of Nkrumah's government were the areas of education and state participation in the economy. He oversaw a major expansion in educational opportunity. Two new universities were created and, along with the pre-established University of Legon, produced a stream of well-educated graduates. The primary and secondary school systems were similarly financed from state resources. Over a number of years, the size of Ghana's educated elite grew. One outcome of this was the possibility of fragmentation within this group. The first independence government also pursued a policy of direct state participation in the economy which resulted in a number of state-owned companies operating in all sectors of the economy. The performance of the Ghanaian economy, especially during the 1970s, became another source of social pluralism. Inequality increased, while economic performance declined. During the 1980s, the trend towards a 'participatory' or large state was reversed and a programme of divestiture was set in train that continues to this day. One of the social consequences of this move was a massive shrinking in levels of employment in government and the public sector. The unemployment that ensued was a source of increased social stratification. But by shrinking government employment it forced alternative coping mechanisms.⁶⁷ While the trend in socio-economic development during the early years was towards expanding the numbers in the elite, the tendency in later years also involved growing differential between the different social

groups, especially during periods of economic prosperity. That trend has continued into the present when, despite growth, extreme poverty has increased.⁶⁸

The anti-colonial struggle in Ghana took a decisive turn towards greater involvement of the general population when Kwame Nkrumah's party, the Convention People's Party (CPP), mobilised the 'veranda boys' – the lowly paid and unemployed – to participate in the struggle for independence. When the CPP came to power it adopted an interventionist approach to social mobilisation. It sought to affiliate a range of organisations to the party and attempted to co-opt workers, women's and youth groups, among others. A second period of grassroots activism was born when Jerry Rawlings came to power by military coup in 1981, and called for the creation of people's and workers' defence committees throughout the country. Both these periods spurred countervailing forces, who opposed the call for power to be exercised from below. In time, the regime of Rawlings abandoned the attempt at popular mobilisation. In the process, however, two trends had developed. On the one hand the Rawlings regime had stirred up hostility within a certain section of the elite, who through their professional associations agitated and worked to minimise and indeed resist some of the measures the regime introduced. It had one main argument, and that was the right to freely associate. On the other hand there was the section of the intellectual elite that had been initially drawn towards Rawlings, but for various reasons had become disillusioned. It too was of the view that it was now important to allow space for civil society to freely express itself. The result was that when the 1992 constitution that would guide a new democratic Ghana was being drafted during the last days of the military government, the two wings of the ideological divide were ready to allow space for freedom of expression and autonomous mobilisation of civil society.

Thus the 1992 constitution came to enshrine a number of key freedoms, including freedom of association and expression, and non-discrimination on grounds of religion, gender, disability and ethnicity. The current political dispensation is the first in Ghana's history which is underpinned by the assumption that the default position of social organisation is one of freedom of association, expression, non-discrimination, etc. President Kufuor's New Patriotic Party (NPP) government, which comes from a tradition that is not statist, can be expected to have less difficulty adhering to these tenets of the constitution. That this is not altogether easy in practice may be deduced from the fact the process of making these freedoms meaningful is not without

67 Giovanni Andrea Cornia, Richard Jolly, and Frances Stewart, *Adjustment with a Human Face, Vol II*, Clarendon Press, 1987, pp.93-125.

68 UN Population Fund, *State of Ghana Population Report 2003*, UNFPA, 2004, 'Population, Poverty and Development', pp.21-21.

struggle. Perhaps the most notable recent instance is the current debate around a freedom of information act. The government is giving every indication of wishing to introduce such an act, but also argues that it is not straightforward.⁶⁹ One of the reasons for this is the character of the Ghanaian political landscape: the high level of ideological pluralism in the country, the density of civil society groups, the highly educated and competent character of the protagonists on each side, and its history of activism.

APRM provisions for civil society engagement

Although the MoU establishing the APRM requires governments to 'ensure the participation of all stakeholders in the development of the National Programme of Action including trade unions, women, youth, civil society, private sector, rural communities, and professional associations',⁷⁰ the guidelines developed to assist governments during the course of the APRM enjoins them to 'define, in collaboration with stakeholders, a roadmap on participation in the APRM, which should be widely publicised...'⁷¹ It is contended that choosing one or other of these approaches would make a difference in how one engaged with civil society. In the event, the NAPRM-GC appears to have decided to work with civil society in the sense outlined in the MoU, rather than that contained in the guidelines. If the latter approach had been adopted, the nature of the Ghana process is likely to have been somewhat different.

The APRM National Governing Council

Perhaps the first salvo fired by civil society in its engagement with the government during the Ghana APRM process was in response to the announcement by Dr Francis Appiah, during a workshop organised by the South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA) in November 2003, about the appointment of the members of the Ghana NAPRM-GC. The reaction from the audience was such that the announcement of the decision was delayed by three months. The civil society groups present 'were openly angry with their government,

dismissing claims that wide consultation had occurred'.⁷² Whether during the three months that the announcement of its members was delayed, meaningful consultations with civil society and other stakeholders were undertaken is not clear; but when the announcement came, the membership of the National Governing Council consisted of individuals who, although of standing, did not include anyone who was seen by civil society as representing them. Given this, the reaction to the announcement was less objectionable than it perhaps might otherwise have been. In addition to their recognised social distinction, the members of the Ghana APRM-GC were collectively vested with the authority to act as the APRM focal point for the country. This meant that they could communicate directly with the APRM Panel and Secretariat, without having to go through the government. They did not have to swear allegiance to the president, and agreed that they should feel free to exercise their power as they best saw fit.⁷³ In the words of one of them, they all felt that they had 'reputations to protect'.⁷⁴

Appointment of the TRIs

The second such moment was over the appointment of the TRIs. The four bodies chosen, though competent, were hand-picked by the Governing Council. Since there were a number of possible alternatives many wondered about the basis on which the choice was made. The issue was not so much a matter of confidence in the TRIs but more about confidence in the way the Governing Council had chosen to proceed.⁷⁵ By appointing not individuals, or indeed government agencies to undertake the country self-assessment exercise, as it might have done, the NAPRM-GC could be forgiven for thinking that its action might be seen by some as an instance of civil society involvement. Civil society however did not see it that way and, certainly, did not feel that it was engaging in the process as a partner. The APRM process was rather hiring civil society groups as consultants, than consulting civil society as an independent voice.

Awareness-raising and consultation

Sequencing sensitisation and evaluation

The third moment of civil society engagement was in the area of public awareness-raising and consultation. It was in this area that civil society seemed to have the greatest number of issues with the process adopted by the NAPRM-GC. The first point was that the public awareness-raising

69 The president was reported by the Ghana News Agency on 17 May 2007 as saying that freedom of information was a potentially dangerous weapon that needed to be planned for, while the attorney-general was reported by the *Daily Dispatch* as saying that 'Ghana has not reached a stage where it needs and can successfully implement a Freedom of Information Law'. The formulation suggested less than whole-hearted endorsement of the idea of a freedom of information act.

70 Memorandum of understanding establishing the African Peer Review Mechanism, 9 March 2003, paragraph 22.

71 Guidelines for Countries to prepare for and participate in the African Peer Review Mechanism, 2003, paragraph 31 (a).

72 Steven Gruzd, 'Africa's Trailblazer: Ghana and the APRM', *Services Delivery Review* (SDR) Vol. 4 No. 3, 2006 p.23 (Journal of the South African Department of Public Services and Administration).

73 Author's interview with Professor Adjepong.

74 Author's interview with Ambassador Abankwah.

75 Author's interviews with various civil society groups.

exercise had not reached out to as much of the country as should have been the case, meaning that many people still did not know very much about the APRM when the self-assessment was under way. Sensitisation did not take place in advance of the evaluation process but in parallel with it. This led to some situations where people first heard of the APRM from the interviewers sent by the various TRIs rather than having first heard about the country self-assessment process from the NAPRM-GC. In some instances the field researchers reached the citizenry before the NAPRM-GC did⁷⁶ and in one instance a decision was taken to withdraw the field staff until the sensitisation and awareness-raising had been conducted.⁷⁷ Secondly, the consultation on the country self-assessment report and the programme of action were thought by some to be very cursory, and left people not really fully briefed about the documents they were evaluating. They also had no way of knowing how their suggestions were used, if at all.

Penetration ratios

More fundamental than the sequencing of the sensitisation and evaluation process was the nature of the sensitisation and consultation exercise itself. It was clearly a mammoth task, and would have to reach deep into the society for it to be considered a success. The NCCE was brought in during the sensitisation process to assist and provide deeper penetration.⁷⁸ On the basis that 50 000 people heard of the APRM, this implies a penetration ratio of the adult population of approximately 0,5 percent. This level of penetration means that in practice many adults are not aware of the APRM process. The APRM guidelines are silent on the penetration levels that would constitute a satisfactory level. One of the recommendations in this report attempts to address this issue.

Consultation and validation

The most important national consultation and validation events were the national stakeholder workshop in Akosombo in May 2004, attended by around 200 people; the national validation workshop at GIMPA in February 2005, attended by approximately 50 people; and the national validation workshop at the Regency Hotel in Accra in June 2005.

The majority of these and other meetings were conducted in the south of the country, in or near the capital, Accra, with invitations being issued to civil society groups from the regions to attend. The NAPRM-GC and its stakeholder liaison officer determined which individuals and groups were invited to which sensitisation workshops and other

programmes of the Governing Council. Although this would pass the requirement contained in the MoU between the African Union and the government it would not pass the more rigorous test set down in the APRM guidelines. No public invitations were issued; instead targeted invitations were sent out.

The main questions with regard to the nature of the consultation include:

- How entry to the site of consultation was organised?
- What assistance was provided to those who needed it to attend?
- Did participants receive timely documentary information prior to the event?
- What provisions were made to remove possible barriers to full participation by all attendees (language, physical, hearing or sight disability)?
- Was enough time provided for the event?
- Did the event allow participants sufficient opportunity to freely express their views?
- To what extent were the views expressed incorporated into the documentation going forward?
- What opportunities were provided to participants to monitor the way in which their interventions had been incorporated into documentation?

Entry: The NAPRM-GC was responsible for deciding who was invited to the consultations and validation exercises. The invitations were not issued publicly but to individuals or organisations. This meant that with the best will in the world accusations of favouritism or exclusionism could be made, but not adequately defended.⁷⁹ There was a definite sense among many of those interviewed for this report that the NAPRM-GC may have been guilty of targeting only those on whose allegiance it could count. This however is not wholly borne out by the facts, since those who were known to be critical of the process were invited to attend the main consultation and validation workshops. It seems to be the case that the heads of invited organisations tended to ask their juniors to attend on their behalf.

Assistance to attend: There is no mention of any provisions given to civil society members to be able to attend the various consultation and validation meetings. This is potentially of some importance, given the fact that plans to have events in some zones did not materialise, and instead the validation events were held in one location for the whole country.

Timely prior documentation: There was no record of participants being sent, before the consultation or validation exercise, the documents or summary texts of what was to be the subject of discussion at the meeting to which they had

76 Author's interview with Institute for Democratic Governance, and Abena Oduro, then of CEPA.

77 Author's interview with Dr Peter Quartey, research fellow, ISSER, University of Ghana, Legon.

78 Author's interview with Professor Adjepong.

79 Opoku, op.cit., p.27.

been invited. All such documentation was circulated at the meeting.

Facilitating access: There is no data on actions, if any, given to participants at the three consultation and validation events under consideration, to facilitate their access to the venue or to proceedings.

Duration: The consultation and validation exercises often took one or more days. This could be considered reasonable time for there to be adequate discussion of the issues to be covered.

Adequacy of framework for expression of views: The national APRM Secretariat was requested to but did not provide information on either the attendance lists or reports on the discussions during the main consultation and validation meetings.

Incorporation of views into documents: Participants at the February 2005 validation event were not able to see the report on which they were deliberating, the draft country self-assessment report (CSAR), though they were given presentations and some supporting documentation, on which they were able to comment. In the words of Eric Opoku of UNDP, their recommendations were able to 'enrich the final Ghana country reports'.⁸⁰ Their comments may well have done so, but they were not able to satisfy themselves that this had been the case.

Opportunities for participants to monitor use made of ideas expressed: The Ghana NAPRM-GC did not institute any mechanism for the participants to monitor how their comments, observations, and suggestions were utilised, either in the final document, or in the design of the process.

The effect of all these factors was to produce a process which secured a certain level of civil society engagement, but left the most prominent members of this group feeling that, although they had been invited to the party, they had not played any significant part in organising it – which, rightly or wrongly, they had expected at the beginning of the process. The NAPRM-GC has not had an opportunity to undertake a monitoring and evaluation exercise among stakeholders to find out how they experienced the process. One of the recommendations is that such an exercise should be undertaken.

Issues raised during sensitisation events

During the sensitisation events themselves, participants raised a number of issues in relation to improving civil

society engagement, either during the question and answer sessions after the main presentations, or during the syndicate discussions. Among the most important suggestions were that the NAPRM-GC should⁸¹:

- Hold district rather than regional fora
- Conduct stakeholder validation of the country self-assessment report before its submission to the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons
- Ensure minority group participation
- Stress the importance of a freedom of information act
- Strengthen the engagement of the NCCE with the process
- Make presentations relating to the process in Twi (the most widely spoken Ghanaian language) instead of English
- Translate the APRM questionnaire and other documents into Ghanaian languages

The lessons the NAPRM-GC recorded as having taken away from these and other comments were:

- The idea of NEPAD/APRM has general appeal despite the comments from some participants that the masses were not adequately consulted during the nurture of the idea. This brings out the fact that people would like to be involved in decisions that affect their development.
- The citizenry are ready and eager to participate in the process to express their views on the various development issues. Consultations should therefore be broadened to include a sizable number of people for Ghanaians to truly own the process and its outcome.
- The independence of the Governing Council and the technical teams are seen as commendable and very important for the elimination of all suspicion of political manipulation and to ensure objectivity of the final results.
- There is the need to step up awareness creation in the process, including by working with the NCCE, and also ensure responsible reportage by the media to encourage participation and ensure success of the APRM process.

The Ghana APRM process took place under special circumstances. Perhaps the most notable was that it was relatively soon after the government of President Kufuor had come to power, but also that the process of the country self-assessment straddled the election marking the end of his first term. Political sensitivities would have been acute. At best it could be argued that the members of the Governing Council, none of them having come from civil society, were unfamiliar and perhaps therefore uncomfortable with civil society engagement. It is of course possible that, given the standing of the members and the hierarchical character of African

80 Ibid., p.28.

81 Ghana NAPRM-GC website: <http://www.naprm-gc.org/home.php> (click on publications then on 1st RSForum).

society, this was deliberate; but this has not been proved yet. Also there was a time constraint, since the APRM Panel required the process to be completed within six months of the signing of the MoU. This did not in fact happen. Lastly there was the issue of money. As an African leader noted when supporting the adoption of Spanish as an official language of the African Union, in the face of some resistance because of the additional cost involved, 'democracy costs'. To have conducted a really penetrative public awareness programme would have been very expensive. To have conducted a meaningful consultation with stakeholders in the manner outlined above would also have been costly. But given that the process has happened, it is fitting that there is a pause, and a stock-taking, so that positions do not become places of retreat rather instead of places from which to reach out to others with differing positions.

Monitoring implementation of the NPOA

When speaking to those in the TRIs who had been involved in the country self-assessment, the clear impression gained by the author was that the TRIs were waiting for the Governing Council to resolve the issue of funding for a monitoring and evaluation framework, so that they could be engaged to contribute to the process.⁸² The progress report of the Governing Council, summarised above, suggests on the other hand that it is well on the way not only to developing, but to implementing such a framework. The idea of using a combination of district level grassroots organisations, working in conjunction with the district chief executives who are responsible for local government administration, to set up what are termed 'district level oversight and implementation committees' outlines this framework. The civil society groups spoken to were of the view, however, that this would unnecessarily bureaucratise and perhaps politicise the process. The district chief executive, who would be a core element of the system, is an appointee of whoever is the president of the country, and could not be expected to be highly critical of government initiatives.⁸³

Independent assessment by civil society groups

The Ghana Country Review Report records that: 'It may be added that some civil society organisations including the African Security Dialogue and Research (ASDR) and Institute for Democratic Governance on their own accord undertook a shadow APRM review of the country to interrogate and complement the official review process to deepen the national consultation engagement. This provided alternative information that was fed into the preparation of the GNPOA.'⁸⁴ Dr Appiah made a somewhat similar statement in a speech to a conference in South Africa.⁸⁵

This passage on the face of it suggests a very intense level of civil society involvement, and close and amiable working relations between civil society and the Governing Council. What was the nature of this independent shadow APRM and how were its results fed into the national consultation engagement? However, Professor Adjepong, chairperson of the Ghana NAPRM-GC, said that he had not seen the report from IDEG or ASDR, but had heard about the IDEG shadow APRM review when he had been seeking funds from DANIDA in support of the APRM process.⁸⁶ During their work, CDD had also heard about a shadow APRM assessment by IDEG, but had failed to unearth the relevant document.⁸⁷

When asked about this, both the Institute for Democratic Governance IDEG and the African Security Dialogue and Research (ASDR) said that they had not undertaken a shadow APRM review. What IDEG had done, explained Dr Emmanuel Akwetey, its chief executive, was to establish, with help from DANIDA, a 'governance issues forum' (GIF) to act as a mechanism to promote public policy dialogue among a broader spectrum of non-state actors in civil

82 Author's interviews with Samuel Cudjoe – Principal Programme Officer, Ghana APRM Secretariat, Dr Peter Quartey, Research Fellow ISSER, Daniel Armah-Attoh – Programme Officer, Ghana Centre for Democratic Development, and Joseph Asunka – Programme Officer, Ghana Centre for Democratic Development.

83 Dr Emmanuel O. Akwetey – Executive Director, Institute for Democratic Governance Nana Oye Lithur – Chief Executive, Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Emmanuel Nkonu – coordinator – International campaign for Corruption Free Schools, Kwabena Yarko Otoo – Research Officer, Ghana Trades Union Congress, Afi Yakubu – Director, Foundation for Security and Development in Africa (FOSDA).

84 Ghana – APRM Country Review Report, p.136, Ghana NPOA.

85 Dr Francis Appiah, 'The APRM Process – The Experience of Ghana', paper delivered at the Third Conference of the African Evaluation Association 1-6 December (neither the title of the lecture, or the web site, give any indication of the year in which it was delivered), Cape Town South Africa, Ghana NAPRM-GC website <http://www.naprm-gc.org/home.php>. There Dr Appiah says: 'It may be added that some civil society organisations, including the African Security Dialogue and Research (ASDR) and Institute for Democratic Governance, on their own accord are undertaking a shadow review of the process. These organisations have received funds from donors to undertake their own autonomous review. Whilst this may appear running parallel to the official review and thus unnecessary, we have not condemned the shadow review. Our attitude is that if it is done in a constructive and responsible manner, it can complement the official review process. Moreover, some of the organisations are doing so on the basis of a comparison among a number of African countries. Such civil society initiatives could enrich the process in the long term if constructively undertaken.'

86 Author's interview with Professor Adjepong.

87 Author's interview with Daniel Armah Attah and Joseph Asunka of CDD.

society and the private sector than would otherwise normally be the case.⁸⁸ He did also say that he had explained this to the Governing Council at a meeting attended by a number of its members, and chaired by Professor Adjepong.⁸⁹ In addition, IDEG is involved with AfriMAP in an assessment of Ghana's governance performance in a range of areas, but this was not completed during the time of the APRM review. ASDR, for its part, was involved in the preparation of a set of comparative reports published by the Institute of Security Studies in South Africa under the aegis of the African Human Security Initiative, a one-year project by seven African NGOs to report on the performance of eight African governments (Ghana among them) in respect of human security issues, including respect for standards on human rights, democracy, good governance and other issues. The relevant reports are in the public domain.⁹⁰ It would appear therefore that neither organisation consciously participated in a shadow APRM review. As things stand, therefore, the passage referred to above remains a mystery.

Failure to publish the country self-assessment report

There is a marked difference in the way the Ghana Country Self-Assessment Report (CSAR) and the Ghana Country Review Report (CRR) have been treated. The former is the report produced by the country during the self-assessment process and is the principal document on which the latter, the report presented to the heads of state participating in the APRM, was based. The country review report was made public by the APRM Panel six months after the Panel presented it to the APR Forum, and even before President Kufuor addressed the issues raised in it to his peers. On the other hand, only part of the country self-assessment report – the NPOA – has been made public, not by the secretariat of the National APRM Governing Council, and only because it was an integral part of the country review report. The bulk of the country self-assessment report remains out of the public domain. The author asked Dr Appiah of the Ghana APRM Secretariat, unsuccessfully, to have sight of this document. He was however able to see one page on which appeared the following text: 'This is a confidential working document of the African Peer Review Mechanism and should not be quoted or published until the review process is complete and

the country report is released in its final form.'⁹¹ There is however nothing in any of the APRM core documents that address themselves to if and when the CSAR should enter the public domain.⁹² Therefore the justification for this embargo is not clear. But even if there were sound justification for it, on the basis of the text that appears on the page seen by the author, its terms of embargo have lapsed, and the time for placing it in the public domain, come and gone.

88 Author's interview with Dr Emmanuel Akwetey, chief executive, IDEG.

89 Author's interview with Dr Akwetey.

90 For more information, see <http://www.africanreview.org/>.

91 Ghana Country Self-Assessment Report, section on corporate governance – p.124.

92 This is true of the Base Document; Guidelines; The MoU on Technical Assessment and Country Review; Objectives, Standards and Criteria; Organisations and Process; the Questionnaire; Democracy and Political Governance Initiative; Conditions for Sustainable Development; Peace and Security Initiative; and indeed the NEPAD Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance.

Closing comments on the APRM in Ghana and Africa

The APRM represents a new departure in African governance. It is the first framework for African countries to assess their collective efforts towards common goals. As such, it presents new opportunities to foster the development of collective strategies, at regional and continental levels. It is thereby available for potential use to advance any collective project within the continent. To succeed in this it needs to mobilise a critical mass of the population into sustained effort conceptually, practically, strategically and operationally.

Greater engagement with civil society: One of the dangers however is that it will become bureaucratised and fail to mobilise critical sections of the population. The lessons of the Ghana APRM experience include the need to differentiate between at least three kinds of audience: the members of government and independent state institutions; members of civil society with both interest and expertise in the four thematic areas of the APRM; and the ordinary citizens who have an interest in the thematic areas, but may not have expert knowledge. One of the striking aspects of the country self-assessment is that, for example, the views of the informal business sector were largely overlooked. Yet this sector is by far the largest employer in the country. It may of course be possible to design effective strategies for a sub-sector without taking into account the views of its members. It is a moot point to what extent the corporate governance indicators will be meaningful and relevant to the members of this group. Civil society may be in a position to provide coherent information about areas not normally in the public domain.

Gaining a critical mass of participating countries: By May 2007, Ghana, Rwanda and Kenya had been peer reviewed. By July 2007 a further two, Algeria and South Africa, will have been reviewed.⁹³ A further eight countries had received country support missions by May 2007, indicating that other things being equal they will have completed the country self-assessment between January and May 2008 and perhaps be peer reviewed by July 2008 or January 2009. This will take the total number of countries that will have been through the process to 13, with another eight who have given indication of willingness to commence the journey.⁹⁴

The need for review of the APRM: Once a critical number of countries have undertaken the country self-assessment process there should be a review of the whole process, paying particular attention on how to (a) make the questionnaire more user-friendly, (b) encourage countries to engage with civil society as partners during the process, (c) share information and best practices more effectively, and (d) best structure the questionnaire so that it can be used to assess movement towards the objectives of the APRM process: political stability, growth, sustainable development and integration.

93 See 'The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM): Africa's Innovative Thinking on Governance', paper prepared by the APRM for the Eighth Gathering of the African Partnership Forum, Berlin, Germany, 22-23 May 2007.

94 Communique of the Continental conference on the African Peer Review Mechanism: "Africa's Bold March to Capture the 21st Century" held in Accra 8-10 May 2007

Greater access to information: The failure to publish the Ghana Country Self-Assessment Report and its supporting documentation (the results of opinion poll surveys etc), does not serve to strengthen the idea of transparency and a new partnership between government and citizenry. In this respect it might help if the APRM Panel were to take some steps towards developing a framework of agreement for governments to publish the country self-assessments at the same time as the country review report is published.

Sharing experiences: As the number of countries that are members of the APRM increases, a wealth of experiences and information will be gathered. It seems important to provide regular opportunities at the regional and continental level for stakeholders from participating countries to inform one another of best, and worst, practice, driven by the continental APRM Secretariat.

Using the APRM to achieve development objectives: The objective of the APRM is to achieve political stability, growth, sustainable development, and integration in Africa. With time it will become necessary to have targets for each of these, and to use the questionnaire as a means to enable countries to inform themselves of their performance in this regard. Two questions were often asked about the APRM during the public awareness-raising fora. The first was about how different the APRM is from externally driven initiatives; and the second was whether the rich countries of the world will allow African countries to achieve the APRM objectives. It seems that these will be the critical tests by which people will judge the performance of the APRM. The questionnaire is the first line of defence, or perhaps attack, in pointing Africa in its chosen direction. The second is the ability of Africa to persuade, cajole, or even coerce its member countries to adhere to collectively agreed objectives. As things stand, there is evidence to suggest that there is considerable overlap between the indicators of the main strategies being used in Ghana's – and Africa's – various development strategies. Nevertheless, as governments make concerted efforts to harmonise the approaches of, for example, the poverty reduction strategies (PRS), the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and the APRM, they may be required to make hard choices. The PRS is a strategy, the Millennium Development Goals are just that – merely a set of development indicators, which in principle could be achieved by a number of different strategies. Nevertheless, indicators are not neutral, especially if they are comprehensive, specific and ranked. By adopting a particular set of indicators as targets to be striven for, preference is established for one development strategy over another. It may not therefore be possible to painlessly harmonise the various strategies. This is especially so when the different programmes give different

weights, and hence rankings to different targets. Eventually Africa should be able to arrive at a core set of strategies, tailored to their chosen objectives, which will be adhered to by governments irrespective of their political stripes, so that there is greater coherence and continuity in the continent's choice of development strategy.

Recommendations to improve future civil society involvement in the APRM process

For the APRM in Ghana it is recommended that:

The government should:

1. Further institutionalise APRM institutions by underpinning the Ghana NAPRM Governing Council and Secretariat by an act of Parliament, rather than, as is now the case, resting them on Ghana's ascension to the NEPAD and APRM agreements at African level.
2. Deepen the independence of the NAPRM-GC and provide for greater continuity by appointing its members for fixed terms of office, so staggered that a given proportion (say a quarter or a third) is replaced at regular intervals.

The Ghana NAPRM-GC should:

3. Place the Ghana Country Self-Assessment Report and all its supporting documentation into the public domain as soon as possible.
4. Commission an independent survey for all stakeholders to establish a) how they regard the Ghana country self-assessment exercise just completed, b) what suggestions they have for monitoring implementation of the NPOA; and act on these findings.

Civil society groups should:

5. Take steps to share with one another the findings they make during the process of monitoring the NPOA.
6. Explore ways to mobilise more effectively to collectively engage with the APRM.

For the APRM at a continental level it is recommended that the appropriate authorities should:

7. Amend the various documents establishing the APRM so that they are uniform in their treatment of important organs and procedures, and more prescriptive in the standards they require of participating governments, including a framework for governments to publish the country self-assessment reports.

CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE AFRICAN PEER REVIEW MECHANISM PROCESS IN MAURITIUS

8. Encourage and monitor governments' engagement with civil society as partners during the APRM self-assessment process and development of the programme of action.
9. Aim to conduct a comprehensive review of the conduct of the APRM, once a critical mass of countries have completed the review, perhaps at some point during 2008, with a view to evaluating and implementing its lessons.
10. As part of the review to amend the APRM questionnaire to make it more user-friendly, better able to get opinion about strategic goals, and to include bands for key performance indicators.

Chronology – Some key moments in the Ghana APRM process

Acceding to the APRM	
3 November 2002	Declaration of intention to accede to the APRM
9 March 2003	MoU establishing the APRM signed by Ghana
Preparing the ground	
1 May 2003	National focal point established – Ministry of Regional Cooperation and NEPAD created
February 2004	APRM secretariat formed ¹
18 March 2004	National APRM Governing Council inaugurated ²
	Appointment of technical research institutes
The country self-assessment and programme of action	
24 May 2004	Country Support Mission arrives ³
27 May 2004	MoU between Ghana government and APRM Panel signed during a formal opening ceremony described as National Stakeholders Workshop
27-29 May 2004	APRM National Stakeholders Workshop
29 May 2004	Country Support Mission leaves
September 2004	Stakeholder Forum for the Disabled – Accra Rehabilitation Centre ⁴
23-25 September 2004	Training for Trainer Workshop in collaboration with NCCE, Crystal Rose Hotel, Kumasi ⁵
August 2004	Forum for Security Services ⁶
10-13 February 2005	Deliberation on National Self-Assessment Report and NPOA at Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration – GIMPA, Accra
24 February 2005	APRM launched in Dodowa in collaboration with NCCE
March 2005	Final consolidated self-assessment report (CSAR) submitted to the APRM Secretariat together with draft programme of action
4 April 2005	APRM Country Review Team visit commences
April 2005	National Validation Meeting – GIMPA, Accra
2005 April	Stakeholder Forum for Chiefs in Kumasi ⁷
16 April 2005	APRM Country Review Team visit ends
May 2005	Draft NPOA submitted to the APRM Secretariat
8 June 2005	Validation meeting with chairperson of APRM Panel ⁸ – Regency Hotel, Accra
10 June 2005	Response from government to APRM Panel
19 June 2005	Presentation of Ghana APRM Country Review Report to APRM Forum (participating heads of state) ⁹
22 January 2006	APRM peer review of Ghana, Khartoum
Implementing the programme of action	
March 2007	Workshop to implement the APRM NPOA, Bolgatanga ¹⁰
May 2007	Workshop to implement the NPOA, Ho
May 2007	Workshop to implement the NPOA, Takoradi

1 A.E. Amoah, 'National African Peer Review Mechanism in Focus', *Daily Graphic*, 25 May 2004, p.7.

2 Author's Interviews with members of the Ghana NAPRM-GC.

3 Communiqué – The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) Support Mission to Ghana 24-29 May 2004.

4 Ghana National APRM Secretariat Ghana's Journey through the APRM Mechanism', *Daily Graphic*, 4 November 2005.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid.

8 Ibid.

9 Mark-Anthony Vinorkor, 'Ghana not yet Reviewed by APRM', *Daily Graphic*, 25 June 2005, p.1.

10 Benjamin Glover, 'Workshop on APRM held in Bolga', *Daily Graphic*, 19 March 2007.

Methodology

The material for this report came from the following sources:

APRM documents

- APRM Base Document – The APRM Base Document, [AHG/235(XXXVIII) Annex II] <http://sites.dbsa.org/aprm/index3.php>
- Guidelines for countries to prepare for and to participate in the African Peer Review Mechanism, 2003
- Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on the APRM [NEPAD/HSGIC/03-2003/APRM/MoU]
- Declaration on Democracy, Political, Economic and Corporate Governance AHG/235(XXXVIII) Annex I]
- APRM Organisation and Processes [NEPAD/HSGIC/03.2003/APRM/Guideline/O&P]
- Objectives, Standards, Criteria and Indicators for the APRM [NEPAD/HSGIC/03-2003/APRM/Guideline/OSCI]
- Outline of the Memorandum of Understanding on Technical Assessments and the Country Review [NEPAD/HSGIC/03-2003/APRM/Guideline/Outline]
- The APRM Ghana Country Review Report – <http://sites.dbsa.org/aprm/index3.php>
- The APRM Questionnaire <http://sites.dbsa.org/aprm/index3.php>

Ghana National Governing Council/ Secretariat documents

- APRM Report of Support Mission to Ghana – 24-29 May 2004
- APRM Ghana Annual Progress Report
- APRM 1st six-monthly Progress Report
- The APRM web site: <http://www.nepad.org/aprm/>

Unsuccessful requests were made to the Secretariat for the following information:

- A copy of the Ghana Country Self-Assessment Report – refused on the grounds that (a) there was only one copy available; (b) it could only be read by the author if Dr Appiah was in the Secretariat; (c) Dr Appiah would not be in the building from the time of the request until after the departure of the author and there was no electronic version of the document.
- A participants list of civil society groups that had attended the national stakeholder workshop during the country support mission visit from 27-29 May 2004, together with a report of the deliberations at the meeting – refused on the grounds that such information did not exist.
- A participants list of civil society groups that had attended the national validation meeting during the Country Review Mission visit in April 2005, together with a report of the deliberations at the meeting – refused on the grounds that such information did not exist.
- A participants list of civil society groups that had attended the confirmatory/validation meeting with the chairperson of the APRM Eminent Persons Panel on 8 June 2005 during her visit at the end of the process, together with a report on the deliberations of the meeting – refused on the grounds that such information did not exist.

The chairman of the Governing Council was notified by telephone and e-mail about the above developments.

Interviews

All interviews were carried out during May 2007

Members of the Ghana National African Peer Review Mechanism

Very Reverend Professor Samuel K. Adjepong – chairman
Ghana NAPRM Governing Council

Professor S.K.B. Asante, member Ghana NAPRM-GC

Ambassador Abankwa – member, Ghana NAPRM Governing
Council

Most Rev. Dr Bishop Paul Bemile – the Catholic Bishop of
Wa and director of the Inter-region Dialogue, member Ghana
NAPRM Governing Council

Dr Francis Appiah – executive director, Ghana NAPRM
Secretariat

Samuel Cudjoe – senior programme officer APRM
Secretariat

Members of TRIs

Daniel Armah-Attoh – programme officer, Ghana Centre for
Democratic Development

Joseph Asunka – programme officer, Ghana Centre for
Democratic Development

Samuel Cudjoe – contract services manager PEF, now
programme officer APRM Secretariat.

Abena Oduro – senior lecturer, Department of Economics,
University of Legon, Ghana

Dr Peter Quartey – research fellow, Institute of Statistical,
Social and Economic Research, University of Ghana Legon

Cynthia Addoquaye Tagoe – senior research assistant,
Institute of Statistical, Social and Economic Research,
University of Ghana, Legon

Members of civil society

Dr Emmanuel O. Akwetey – executive director, Institute for
Democratic Governance

Major General Coleman – African Security Dialogue and
Research

Nana Oye Lithur – chief executive, Commonwealth Human
Rights Initiative

Emmanuel Nkonu – coordinator – International campaign for
Corruption Free Schools

Kwabena Yarko Otoo – research officer, Ghana Trades Union
Congress

Afi Yakubu – director, Foundation for Security and
development in Africa (FOSDA)

Newspaper research

Daily Graphic – from January 2004 to May 2007