Chapter 3

Theoretical Frameworks of Policy Implementation in Relation to the Implementation Process of Nepad

3 Intoduction

Theoretical frameworks in social science inquiries enjoy trenchant advantages of versatility and transference, born out of evidently independent validity of each theoretical orientation relational to conceptualization of the object of study. This perspective, is with a view to define the basis which theoretical frameworks are variously applied in social science research studies. The implementation process of Nepad requires a scientific approach as a critical standpoint to attempt a multiple input from diverse policy implementation theoretical framework analysis, given the conceptualization of Nepad, its institutional mechanisms for implementation, the need for incremental implementation, and the patchy African policy implementation environment. This predisposes strategies and rumination of the implementation process at multi-level context to invigorate the process, that is, analysis for, rather than analysis of, policy implementation of Nepad. Preston has argued that, 'theoretical frameworks tell us what sort of world we have, what sort of explanations to provide, of which particular problem'. (Preston, 1996:10).

3. 1 Relationship with Previous Studies

The concept of Nepad is partially attractive to those interested in Africa's development studies, particularly (researchers, scholars, and intellectuals), partly because of its concept, context, principles, timing, and its indigenous frame. The dim interest generated in the concept is due to the huge wave of Africa's developmental imperatives. As a new phenomenon, researchers from the social sciences and related disciplines are increasingly un-fascinated of its prospects. They have not done enough to explore deeper and establish the validity of the

implementation process because keeping tab and up to date with such a complicated theme, presents quite a complex challenge. As a consequence the implementation analysis tends to be left in relative isolation and this receives scant attention.

A study that has systematically analyzed the implementation process that is revealing of the implicit impact factors is yet to come to the fore. If they do, they are rather partial, inadequate, and limited in context and vision. This study therefore strives to present some balanced arguments with futuristic standpoints on the prospects, or otherwise, of the implementation process. The implementation process is therefore to be systematically studied for the reason that it is pivotal and easily complicated by unintended consequences. This is with a view to improving the process to guarantee outcome-based implementation.

Nevertheless, it remains, to this day, near impossible to find a typically similar and significant analytical work that has prospectively caused intellectual exchanges on the object of study. The concept and the context of this study are thus limited and therefore exclusive with no direct relationship with any previous studies after an independent rigorous rational thought process.

3. 2 Conceptual Framework for the Study

Nepad is an organising template for the political and socio-economic development of Africa in the new millennium. Consequently, the study has conceptualized its evolution for the purpose of analysis in five basic characteristics:

- a regional public policy.
- a concept.
- a programme.
- an institution.
- a catalyst for Africa's development and economic integration.

Nepad has been viewed essentially as a regional public policy, owing to its proclamation and promulgation at the highest level of African leadership and governments and evolutionary policy process of policy initiation, agenda setting, policy design, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation as a result of defined policy problems. It is a concept because it is an idea – the ability to identify factors presumed to be causative to Africa's development as values for pursuit. It is a programme, due to its plan of activities for achieving the projected policy content and related objectives. It is a regional institutional arrangement for development, because a Secretariat has been established and staffed with personnel in an organisational structure to undertake prescribed functions. It is a catalyst, due to its policy-relevant character responsiveness to the development imperatives of the continent.

These conceptualizations have been adopted to provide the basis for analysis as well as guide the logic of argumentations central to the theme of the study. At the same time, other aspects have been incorporated as themes in the overall context of analysis to necessarily hold in balance, the dominant object of the study, having taken into consideration the empirical realities of the Nepad's programmatic frameworks *vis-à-vis* the implementation process. This is to offer a conceptual overview of the nature and the role of policy implementation analysis within the reference of Nepad. The communality of these concepts has been adopted both, descriptively and prescriptively, to test the research question and justify their applicability and validity.

Before examining the conceptual frameworks adopted in relation to the object of study, it is vitally important to note that a grand causal concept of policy implementation analysis is précis in all public policy contexts. Particular problems in particular circumstances place direct relevance of concepts in context to which they are useful and which have the value of each relative to the specific problem being researched or studied. In this study, some of these concepts have been selected according to their contextual utility to the object of study.

Policy implementation is still being perceived, by practitioners in its classic tradition to provide techniques for implementation in the contemporary policy process environments. This perspective runs against the dynamics of policy process environments within which implementation occurs. The operators of Nepad require good understanding of theoretical groundings drawn from the public policy domain to attempt a rationalization of issues of process, operationalization, and scope of the implementation process environments inclusive of the Nepad's programme.

Given the complexity of the African policy implementation environment and the labyrinth network of the contemporary sustainable development programmes, there seem to be a compelling surge to expand the public policy implementation domain. It is not only far more difficult to determine clearly what form policy implementation ought to adopt but also the attendant encumbrances to attain policy objectives. Every implementation process is dependent on the ever-changing local environment, that is, it is adaptive to its unique environment. Save the congruent policy implementation, theoretical models are engaged as the foundational approach of analysis, effective implementation may remain illusive, adversarial, and antithetical in any circumstances. The elements that imbue implementation process do not by themselves conduct implementation. Rather, effective implementation is as a result of the convergence of variables that lend to the process.

De Coning and Cloete have argued that, 'the development of various theories in disciplines such as political science, sociology, public administration and others is highly relevant to policy application' (De Coning & Cloete, 2000:29). The analysis of implementation process of a supra-nationalistic development programme as Nepad, should engage some of the theoretical frameworks of policy implementation as the basis for not only to test and validate the object of the inquiry but to predicate the logical presumptions within scientific paradigm.

This chapter seeks to render some perspectives on a number of policy implementation theoretical frameworks with approaches that underpin their relevance and interrelatedness to the object of study. Policy implementation theoretical models such as multi-actor/group-actors implementation, top-down implementation, bottom-up implementation, and advocacy coalition approaches will be examined. Thereafter theories of integration would be explained in relation to the object of study. A possible model for the study is the focal point of the argument. The conclusion, therefore, will be based on the resulting implications drawn from some of these theoretical groundings.

3. 3 Critical Explanatory Concepts and Perspectives

There are sets of conceptual variables that serve as explanatory constructs and paradigms for social science research inquiry. They aim at synthesising spontaneous applicability between, and among, competing, seemingly interrelated variables. Before delving into the theoretical models for the study, it is critically important to differentiate between what *theory*, *model*, and *framework* are, and what they are not, as well as their commonality in their application. The essence is that, the context of the adopted theories fit policy implementation process, which have taken on a multi-disciplinary characterization and assumptions.

However, there are various approaches that provide stages of heuristic explanations, which rest on the distinction between frameworks, theories, and models in the policy process. De Coning and Cloete have however explained that, 'there are similarities and differences between concepts, models, theories and paradigms' (De Coning & Cloete, 2000: 24), quoted in Cloete & Wissik (eds) (2000). Ostrom explains that, 'the differences between frameworks, theories, and models are not even generally recognised' (Ostrom, 1999:35-51).

3. 3.1 The Contextual Value of sub-Themes

Frameworks seek to organize inquiry but do not, by principle, in and of, themselves offer explanations for or predictions of behaviour and outcome. 'Frameworks bound inquiry directs the attention of the analyst to the critical features of the social and physical landscape' (Schlager, 1990:234).

De Coning and Cloete have classified theoretical constructs into the following:
A *concept* is an abstract idea (frequently controversial) that serves as a thinking tool to illustrate specific attributes of intangible phenomena.

- A *model* is a representation of a complex reality that has been oversimplified in order to describe and explain the relationship among variables, and even sometimes to prescribe how something should happen. Models can therefore be used in a neutral, descriptive way, or they can be used in a normative way, expressing a preference for a particular value judgment. Models are built around specific concepts.

- A *theory* is comprehensive, systematic, consistent, and reliable explanations and predictions of relationships among specific variables. It is built on a combination of various concepts and models, and attempts to present a full explanation and even predictions of future events. Theories can also be used descriptively or prospectively. While theories are normally assessed in terms of their predictive validity, models are normally assessed in terms of their utility in accurately reflecting reality.

- A *paradigm* is a collection or pattern of commonly held assumptions, concepts, models, and/or theories constituting a general intellectual framework of or approaches to scientific activities (e.g. ideologies like Liberalism, Marxism and Darwinism). A paradigm is dominant if it is widely accepted in the scientific community concerned.

 (De Coning & Cloete, 2000: 25).

3. 4 Theoretical Frameworks of Policy Implementation

Models and theories could be said to be the derivatives of frameworks. They could be a construct of specific concepts, which represent more intricate fact that has been rendered rather simple in order to relate, explain, and predict relationship between variables.

The essence of making distinctive differences between these theoretical constructs is to be able to engage in a scientific study, a suitable construct which best suit the context of object of study. Each theory is deemed for a specific type situation, in relation to which it aims to offer relationship, analytical framework, and generate certain contributions. De Coning and Cloete have argued that, 'it is important to know the difference between these uses, and to use models and theories in the correct way and for the correct reasons' (De Coning & Cloete, 2000:25). Both researchers have posited that public policy is normally studied for three reasons:

- To gain better academic knowledge about and insight into public policy (scientific, descriptive, explanatory and predictive objectives).
- To try to improve policy processes, contents and outcomes (a combination of descriptive and prescriptive objectives).
- To try to influence or control policy processes and content in order to ensure the desired outcomes (prescriptive objectives).

(Ibid.:25).

Accordingly, De Coning and Cloete explain that, 'it is important in policy analysis exercises to distinguish which of the above driving forces behind policy actions are the most strongest, in order to assess accurately what is going on'. (Ibid.: 25). This is true of policy implementation analysis, which suggests that theories, models, paradigms, and frameworks typically provide theoretical constructs to construe policy analysis and policy implementation, in specific circumstances, and render them situational. The theoretical frameworks will now be examined.

3. 4.1 Functional Policy Stages / Phases Theoretical Framework

This theory has essentially, as the basis, the gamut of the entire policy process, starting '…from policy initiation, agenda setting, policy process design, policy analysis, policy formulation, decision-making, policy diagram, policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation' (De Coning & Cloete, 2000:49). Similarly, the model has embraced policy process to discretely examine the character of the stages that policy issues may go through. Hogwood and Gunn (1984) emphasize that, 'this model lends support to a deeper understanding of how various kinds of analysis can be brought to bear at different stages of the policy process and underscore the advocacy of the model being beyond a simplistic analysis where one rung follows the next' (Hogwood & Gunn, 1984:4), quoted in De Coning and Cloete, (2000:45).

The stage model considers policy process as involving often-existing activities that are often ignored in the modern models. These activities enfold awareness of general policy problems by civic, political or stakeholder action, and agenda setting or placing the issues in the policy agenda and determining priorities. The next stage of process includes the identification of the problem issues, the principal stakeholders and choice of options, identification of the main alternative patterns of action to attend the problem issues. Then one alternative is selected and at the end the decision is publicized. This part of the implementation, resources need be allocated and provision for adjudication, which is partly concerned with policy enforcement through the administrative and legal actions before the full implication evaluations and feedback loop' De Coning and Cloete (2000:47); Fox et al., (1991:33).

Policy implementation in the overall policy process stages in the context of Nepad reflects the stages model theoretical framework and is relevant when viewed at the macro-level or international understanding of agenda setting. The policy programme of Nepad has been: agenda setting; several options

considered; policy decision taken; initialed; and implementation mechanism adopted [policy process]. The framework provides, though not exclusively, for the Nepad policy context, given the fact that the policy processes of Nepad evolve through the policy stages that correspond with the dynamics and activities in policy process.

To the extent that it is successful in analytical discretion and policy process, it is evidently clear that the policy process cannot conveniently be explicated as existing in a void. It must be seen as involving overall stages, which are largely interrelated, interdependent, and interconnected in a policy-making environment. The model demonstrates some adaptive traits and attributes to varied policy process environments. Given this context, the model is relevant in policy implementation analysis.

The theory falls short of extricating critical complexities and properties that are shared with all stages, that each of the stages of policy process experiences, including actors' customs, interest, and norms that are bound to influence policy making environment. At the same time, it has put into presupposition that all factors remain constant in every policy environment or domain. For example, no policy domain has linear characteristics but a repertoire of extraordinary variables and dynamics to respond to the elements under which they function. Indeed, through these repertoire of institutions and actors in a given policy domain, policy process could be regulated; internal structures transformed, and even a remodel of their essential policy goals. It precludes the target groups and the exogenous conditions of policy implementation in its concept and context.

The implications of the complexities in each stage of the policy process, which influence institutions, actors, and the overall policy environment, have not been set forth and explored by the stages model framework. The model holds out promises of a more intensive, all embracing, and inflexible theoretical imperatives of its own to policy analysis of the sub-systems of the policy process including

policy implementation. It has helped to increase the complexities of theoretical framework choice for analyzing and validating the research questions in public policy studies with regard to implementation of Nepad. To this end it has claimed end-means equation.

It has not made unequivocal prediction and predilection for any subsystem of policy process. It has yet been comprehensively put to test. The strength of the theory is that it adds up as a usable public policy theory to policy analysis.

3. 4. 2 Multi-actor / Group Theoretical Framework

The foundational creed of this model is the creation of the group struggle. Some schools of thought argue that, 'what may be called public policy is the equilibrium reached in this (group) struggle at any given moment, and it represents a balance which the contending factions or groups constantly strive to weigh in their favour' (Anderson, 2003:16). The model is founded on the argument that interaction and struggle among groups are central to the policy process. 'Multi-actors or groups are collections of persons that may, on the basis of shared attitudes on interests, make claims upon other groups of society'. (Ibid.:16).

Multi-actors or group-model plays a critical role in public policy analysis but not in all cases of public policy domain. In a more literal sense multi-actors constitute governments, public opinion, the press, civil society, and non-government groups. Their activities, participation and ideas play out essential influence in the policy-making domains up to the implementation stages.

The critical contention of the framework is the access and effective communication through which the multi-actors seek to posit their request, exercise influence, in order to shape implementation process and possible outcomes. The possibility for the group to attain the communicative access and influence are slim if their interest and viewpoints are not communicated and

influence level of interaction is poor. Public policy at any level reflects the interest and the views of the dominant group vigorously pursued. In other words, it is the dominant groups that posses the means and resources, access, effective communication, effective leadership styles, and organization that may influence and shape public policy in their favour, but those deficient in promoting factors would naturally lose. This situation is true in the implementation process. Groups or multi-actors would strive to exercise influence and seek to shape policy process, so that implementation of policy will yield in their favour.

The contextual significance of group or multi-actor framework emphasis is perhaps overstated. The sole reliance on group-actors appears symptomatic in the entire policy process. For example, the theory seeks to underplay the contributions of policy implementers and public officials in their values, discretion, interest, creativity, and the complex environmental conditions that impact on the policy processes. Public officials and implementers have a stake in the policies and programmes they deal with. Their actions and inactions are deterministic in the policy implementation direction.

The model has failed discrete typologies of groups and multi-actors in specific terms. It assumes policy processes as a monolithic process, whereas the actors in the process do have preferences, imbibe institutional culture, which are critical and overlap during and within policy processes and thus pushes its flexibility. Its group generalization forecloses participation of other groups such as street level actors that are not usually adequately represented in the policymaking process, but may as well be the target group of policies. The inter-group interaction has also missed a mention. However, the model adds up to the universal theoretical frameworks of policy implementation. With good reason, the implementation process cannot be structured solely around the multi-actor and group paradigms in the broadest sense. It appears to go in favour of the bottom-up insights and postulations.

3. 4. 3 Top-Down Theoretical Framework

The top-down model remains phenomenally virile in the contemporary policy process, particularly within the context of policy implementation. 'It is a much more widely quoted version' (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975). These researchers perceive the implementation process as a top-down process. The predisposition of this model emphasizes the 'hierarchical control', that is to say, implementation decisions arise from the top, downwards. In other words, greater influence over implementation is wielded from the top-most rung that makes policy than those at the lower rung who are actually involved in the execution of policies.

Policy implementation has been viewed by 'Van Meter and Van Horn (1975) as a top-down process, using three causations of implementation advocated by Kaufman *et al.* (1986), stating that, subordinates do not know what their superiors want, they cannot do what their superior want' quoted in Brynard (2000:171). The authors are of the view that the nature of policy is fundamental in either the success or failure of implementation, and proposed a model which Brynard (2000) refers to as being 'clusters of variables':

- The relevance of policy standards and objectives.
- Policy resources.
- Inter-organisational communication and enforcement activities.
- The characteristics of the implementing agencies.
- The economic, social and political environment affecting the implementing jurisdiction or organization.
- The disposition of implementers for carrying out policy decisions.

(Ibid.:171).

Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981) have posited the most consequential deal of top-down model of policy implementation. Their paradigmatic argument on the concept of implementation has ensued in three important findings:

- Policy-making is an iterative process of formulation, implementation and

reformation, and the distinction between the three should be maintained;

- The focus should be on the attainment of the stated policy goals, although the outputs of the implementing agencies and the outcomes of the implementation process are both important; and

- Implementation can be viewed from three quite different perspectives - the initial policymaker or the center, the field - level implementing officials or the periphery, and the actors at whom the programme is directed or the target group but a center-focused perspective to implementation is preferred' quoted in Brynard, (2000:172).

The top-down approach emerged as a second generation of studies that sought to be analytical and comparative in orientation to implementation. This is in response to questions such as: What are the preconditions to successful policy implementation? What are the critical impediments to policy implementation? These questions are attempts to offer explanations of variations in the implementation success across programmes by reference to specific variables and conceptual frameworks. The approach is largely as a result of mono-case analysis of studies drawn from successive failures of policy implementation outcomes.

The essential characteristics of this model according to Sabatier are that it begins with a policy decision by governmental (often central government) officials and then asks:

- To what extent were the actions of implementing officials and target groups consistent with (the objectives and procedures outlined in) that policy decision?

- To what extent were the objectives attained over time, that is, to what extent were the impacts consistent with the objectives?

- What were the principal factors affecting policy outputs and impacts, both those relevant to the official policy as well as other politically significant ones?

- How was the policy reformulated over time on the basis of experience? (Sabatier, 1997:273).

Researchers such as Edward and Sharnkansky (1978) have tried to offer convincing explanations of the assumption of hierarchical control of and influence on policy implementation. Top-down approach focuses on legally mandated aspects and underestimate the politics of street-level actors, organizational interactions, and bargaining in the trajectory of implementation process. They try to synthesize these varied conditions into smaller list of six variables for an effective implementation of legal objectives. These are:

- Clear and consistent objectives.

- Adequate causal theory.

- Implementation process legally structured to enhance compliance by implementing officials and target groups.

- Committed and skillful implementing officials.

- Support of interest groups and sovereign.

- Changes in socioeconomic conditions, which do not substantially undermine political support.

Sabatier (1997),quoted in Hill, (1997:274-5).

The top-down framework appears largely as a linear theoretical framework. It ignores the resourcefulness and the critical roles of those lower rung actors who actively prosecute policies, the basis for which bottom-uppers discountenance its objectivity. The proponents, therefore, fail to obligate the lower rung cadre to the implementation process. Policy process is not complete until policies are implemented and outcomes evaluated. Its strong emphasis on the top hierarchy involvement in the implementation process falls short of the third generation implementation assumptions of multi-actors and multi-level implementation approaches. It appears too bureaucratic and methodical in the context of this study. It invites red-tapism, a characteristic of bureaucratic inertia and dismissive of the concept of subsidiarity.

Formulation of policies generates the means and resources as inputs for policy implementation. The low-level line managers and the field staff normally involve in the virtual execution of policies that cause a flow in the implementation process have seemingly not been subsumed. It also neglects critical variables and capacities that could cope with the complexities of implementation process and influence of environmental factors. The bulwark between exogenous shocks in policy implementation is the line manager and low rung cadre who translate, relate and communicate more directly with the clientele. They are those who constitute the feedback loop to the top policy echelon. This reality has escaped critical attention of the model and its proponents.

It is flexible to the extent that it permeates the conceptual analysis of implementation process and public policy analysis. Of necessity, an analytical model that conceives of a policy implementation in a linear frame must similarly assume the environmental factors and implicit complexities of policy implementation. These are critical and deterministic, if only implicitly, to the implementation success or lack of success.

Another difficulty with the contention of the theory is the notion that all members of an organization have only a mono-goal preoccupation in the policy process as they seek to implement policies, that is, a linear movement in policy execution, in neglect of considerations for other underlying variables. For example, members of a system sometime wish to take positive action and earn, not only recognition and credit, but also reward for good implementation and be held to account. It neglects a feedback loop dimension of system analysis, which interlink in policy process.

Its emphases and empirical objectives dwell largely on local, provincial, and national level implementation processes. This renders it restrictive and localized. Obviously the conterminous emergence of sub-regional and regional political and socio-economic development policy initiatives has prompted the surge for higher-

level policy process and ultimately policy implementation. The model certainly remains and condones static rather than dynamic policy implementation. Policy analysis and implementation should be moved beyond frontiers, territoriality, and boundaries. It asserts a longer time frame as objectified conduct without providing a time frame. The model has become a sustained one with theoretical considerations and norms for implementation analysis as it offers theoretical explanation of empirical nature. In spite of the merit, its theorization falls out of favour for this study.

3. 4. 4   Bottom-Up Theoretical Framework

Almost simultaneously, an increasing surge of scholarship began counter claims to the contextual and conceptual narrative propositions of the top-down concept. Some of the researchers who belong to the counter-claim ideologues are Reign & Rabinowitz (1977) who invoke a converse view to the hierarchical position in policy implementation process. They push forth a bottom-up model through the principle of circularity, which led them to suggest that, 'implementation involves drift from declared purposes and that the process is (often) less one of slow incremental change than of bureaucratic entrepreneurship', quoted in Brynard, (2000:172). Similarly, the views extrapolated by the counter-claimers, such as Nakamura and Smallwood (1980), construct propositions which suggest that from the bottom-uppers paradigms, conception of the implementation process is a system of functional environments, each of which contains a variety of actors and arenas and is connected to the others by various communications and compliance linkages. (Ibid.:172).

Berman (1978) postulates that the real capacity to effect policy outcome rest effectively with the local or the people at the lower rung of the implementation scale rather than the authoritative policymakers. He devised four ways through which implementation could be carried out:

- Non-implementation - no adaptation to the project plan or deliverer

behaviour;

- Co-optation - no deliverer behaviour, but adaptation in the project to accommodate existing routines.

- Technologies learning - no adaptation of the project plan but adaptation - adaptation of routinised behaviour to accommodate the plan.

- Mutual adaptation - adaptation of both the project and deliverer behaviour' quoted in Brynard, (2000:173).

Contrary to the top-down model, Lipsky argues that, 'in numerous cases of implementation, the latitude of those charged with carrying out policy is so substantial that … policy is effectively "made" by the people who implement it' (Lipsky, 1978:398), quoted in Brynard (2000). These are those he refers to as street level bureaucrats. This set of individuals relates to the grassroots in the course of their duties and possess meaningful discretion in the discharge of their functions.

The bottom-up implementation theoretical model begins with the identification of network of actors that participate and are active in policymaking and service delivery at various sectors in one or more places and asks them about their aims, expectations, problems, activities, strategies and perhaps contacts. These then form policy input functions that are used as vehicles for devising a network mechanism to identify the policy areas at the local, provincial, national and even at regional levels as well as the actors involved in the planning, funding, and operatonalization of public and corporate sectors programmes. By this argument, the model thus offers a channel for moving from street-level policymaking 'bottom-up' to the 'top-down' policy formulation-implementation continuum.

This model, as already explicated by its exponents, promises more expansive and an all-inclusive participation in policy processes up to implementation phase. The fundamental strength of the bottom-up model is that, it foils the linearity perspective emphasized by the top-down model and recognizes multiplicity of

actors at various levels and environmental variables in implementation process. It acknowledges the interaction and interconnections of variables that flow in the policy processes. It offers an expansive construct with theoretical imperatives to policy implementation.

A critical difficulty remains, that of the contextual orientation of the framework. How does the potential policy that is to be implemented within an environment get communicated to the implementers? Commonsensical notion tells us that policymakers make policy and pass down the policy for implementation and that implementers do not often participate in the policymaking, which they implement. Do we have to treat each sector specific policymaker and implementer distinctly and separately in a policy process? If this was to be the case, the problem of systematic analysis of systemic policy constraints would virtually be insurmountable and the empirical interpretation lost. The framework abdicates and pays inordinate attention to the comparatively unique challenges that must require hierarchical ordering of rules, implementation, evaluation and a feedback loop to enhance a robust revision and direction of policies regarding implementation where necessary, for useful outcomes. In this context, the model appears more theoretical and more contemplative than practical.

It has failed to accomplish what it set out to do, that is, to offer one neat typical model fit in place of the top-down model. It has provided no adequate counter-theoretical framework claim as a single template of empirical applicability to policy implementation than the top-down model. Where it is applicable, its contributions may be more terminological, less pragmatic and less realistic. Given the weaknesses, it is not ideal for the study.

3. 4. 5 Advocacy Coalition Theoretical Framework

The extrapolation of this theoretical model seeks to acquire a locus that evolves a consummate theoretical implementation framework that ideally embraces the mutual features (comparative advantages) of both the 'top-down' and the 'bottom-up' paradigms. In other words, the conceptual projection is the convergence and synthesis of the best characteristics of the two theoretical models into a mould as a balanced paradigm for policy implementation.

Sabatier has contended that, 'the top-down approach is concerned with the manner in which legal and socio-economic factors structure behavioural options that need to be incorporated into the synthesis, as do their concerns with the validity of the causal assumptions behind specific programmes and strategies. The elements of the bottom-up concerns start from policy problem or sub-system rather than law or other policy decisions and then examine the strategies employed by relevant actors in both the public and private sectors at various levels of government as they attempt to deal with the issue consistent with their objectives' (Sabatier, 1997:287).

The approach advocates the aggregation of these elements into a unique approach in policy implementation. Accordingly, Sabatier argues, '…the synthesis adopts the bottom-uppers' unit of analysis - a whole variety of public and private actors involved with a policy problem as well as their concerns with understanding the perspectives and strategies of all major categories of actors (not simply program proponents). It then combines this starting point with top-downers' concerns with the manner in which socioeconomic conditions and legal instruments constrain behaviour'. (Ibid.:287).

The framework seemly draws heavily from the multi-actor/group and the contingency approaches. For instance, it assumes actors can be aggregated into a number of advocacy coalitions - each composed of, politicians, agency officials,

interest group leaders, public opinion, civil society, and intellectuals who share a set of normative and causal beliefs on core policy issues. At any particular point in time, each coalition adopts a strategy envisaging one or more changes not only in governmental institutions but policies, which could be perceived as way to further their objectives.

According to Sabatier (1997), the approach is primarily concerned with theory construction rather than with providing guidelines for practitioners or detailed portraits of particular situations. The syntheses that ultimately led to the evolution of the approach as an alternative middle level option to policy implementers provide a near concise framework in policy implementation theoretical groundings. It offers an expanded time span to be able to ascertain why policy succeeds and in some cases their failures, non-implementation, and an ill implementation. Its attempts are aimed at demonstrating 'rational option implementation approach' in the thick of the arguments between the top-down and bottom-up paradigms to achieve a near balance approach.

The framework runs not in the classical tradition of social science theorizing but builds on the resonance of applied systemic approach. Brynard (2000:169) has posited that, '…the most important fault-line in the field is that dividing a 'top-down' view of implementation (e.g. Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975, Edwards, 1980; Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983; Linder & Peters, 1987) from a bottom-up view (e.g Berman, 1978; Hans, 1978; Scharpf, 1978; Elmore, 1979; Lipsky, 1978; Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980; Barret & Fudge, 1981; Hjern & Hull, 1981). This perspective has offered critical iterative, but explanatory variables that have intellectual style, foundation, and methodological approach premised on a logical, systematic, objectified, and a valid sequence of debate especially to the top-down and bottom-up approaches to policy implementation. But, Sabatier argues that, 'it may be impossible to relate it to this study because it is a construct that is willing to utilise fairly abstract theoretical constructs and to operate from an admittedly simplified portrait of reality' (Sabatier, 1997:287).

There is also the question of specificity in utilization and applicability in implementation domain. This is because obstacles to implementation are environmentally induced and implementers and authors of policy operate in unique circumstances within economic, political, and socio-cultural levers. These conditions impact heavily against implementation inputs that are deterministic. Implementation is a process that evolves in incremental phases.

It has also failed to, or neglects the policy process and only views implementation as a substitute for other constituent policy processes. The assumptions of the framework cannot always be appropriate and explicit in all the implementation domains. For instance, implementation in country A may be different from how country B prosecutes her own implementation practices. The approach has failed to acknowledge the competing values of stakeholders that sometimes define implementation contagion at various levels of implementation.

The model ceases to provide an adequate template for analyzing implementation process. It is enough to direct a researcher towards empirical analysis of how connections could be formed towards defining units of analysis by observation of the boundaries of interaction and inter-relatedness among factors and units in the implementation process, which may not remain the same in actual implementation domain. Contingencies and unintended consequences or fallout that usually impact implementation process have missed a mention and critical analysis. It is an eclectic type theoretical framework for implementation.

One can use Nepad's implementation process as the progressive integration of a variety of not only the institutional implementation mechanisms but also from the multi-actors to the top-down and bottom-up approaches. But the postulations of the Advocacy Coalition approach seemingly enjoy good favour for the implementation of Nepad, particularly in patchy policy implementation environment of the continent. The above caveats notwithstanding, the model holds out fleeting possibilities that reinforce its relevance to the object of study.

3. 4. 6 The Theoretical Framework for the Study

The object of study focuses on policy implementation in relation to the implementation process of the policy goals of Nepad. The theories reflected in this study, when taken together have done well in providing the bases for the learning process of policy implementation as they provide causal theoretical groundings to analyze the implementation process and, in a greater manner, illuminate the special contributions that each of them makes to the theoretical understanding and the practice of policy implementation. The theoretical framework with the mix of the *top-down* and the *bottom-up* common object-oriented theoretics, are inextricably inter-woven with the concept and the object of study. Therefore, the advocacy coalition theoretical framework that combines the two contending frameworks is implicated, and it is recommended as the sustainable theoretical base of the new era for analysis in the study.

The institutional implementation frameworks put in place for Nepad, from the Assembly of the African Union, Heads of State and Governments Implementation Committee, the Nepad Steering Committee, to the Nepad Secretariat, evidently informs the engagement of this approach. Brynard (2000) has argued that, 'there is a general agreement that implementation is a complex, dynamic, multilevel, multi-actor process influenced both by the content and context of the policy being implemented' (Brynard ,2000:174).

The principle of circularity outlined by Reign & Rabinowitz (1977) quoted in Brynard (2000:174), implies that, the *top-down* and the *bottom-down* forces will often exist simultaneously in most implementation situations, which are framed by pressures from both the top and the bottom. Also, depending on the specific features of particular implementation cases, each approach may be more or less relevant. Finally, there is a growing consensus on the need to synthesize the major features of the two approaches and develop models that capture the strengths of both.

The implementation process of Nepad calls for no other implementation theoretical model than the 'advocacy coalition approach'. The caveats of the approach notwithstanding, the experience so far with regard to the implementation of Nepad indicates clearly that, the model is the necessary choice, given its potential. The model seems to hold in view a structured process of the implementation process for Nepad, in order that it provides an expected outcome.

The coalition framework focuses on various facets of Nepad that are reflective of, and in, consonance with the object of study. It offers the grounds for the contention of the study in relative terms. The advocacy coalition approach's propositions hold out formidable potentials to explain, analyze, and at the same time complement the object of study within the implementation context of Nepad. The implementation of the Nepad's policy goals must be interpreted, not only, in terms of what the implementers understand it to be, but also what the scholars, researchers, and practitioners equally understand and make of it. It is not manifestly an optimal theoretical framework for policy implementation process, but expediently suffices the context.

3. 5 Reviews of Relevant Literature

Literature reviews for any scientific study are to conduct an in-depth appraisal of the existing studies that portray direct relevance to the object of study in order to relate and examine the current state of knowledge in the subject sub-field and detect inconsistencies and gaps to justify a particular object of an academic inquiry. It is a point of departure for the demarcation of problem areas for a study so as to predicate the validity and the cognition of the study with a view to provide a unique perspective of knowledge. The literature reviews in this study take on the concepts of development, partnership, policy analysis, policy implementation, Nepad and the question of African development imperatives and the African patchy policy process and policy implementation environments.

These concepts have received a fair share of specialized scholarships worldwide. The trends have always taken argumentative turns in many respects. Therefore the literature reviews in the study reflect the above concepts and paradigmatic predispositions.

The primary purpose here is to provide a review of some of the books, articles from journals, and monographs that have dealt with core issues relevant and related to the object of study during the last two decades. The basis is not to provide a comprehensive review but rather to illuminate the core trends of argumentations on them to assist in a broader understanding of the concept of the study.

3. 5. 1 A Composite of Related Literature

Jennifer M., Brinkerhoff, (2002), in her book entitled, *Partnership for International Development: Rhetorics or Results,* seeks to clarify the concept of development partnership and in the process identifies typologies of partnership. She categorizes partnership in four dimensions:

- Partnerships for public service.
- Corporate social responsibility.
- Conflict resolution.
- International development.

In her espouse, she argues that all forms of partnership is about the ways and means by which actors look for the most effective and efficient service delivery, minimizing the direct involvement and funding of government bodies at the face of scarce resources both in human, capital and material terms. It is also, according to her, as the result of the felt need to embrace cultural identities in the process and outcome of international problem solving.

She describes partnership as rhetoric without the necessary trappings for result, which is prone to make things worse and lead to cynicism and lack of trust. This,

she concludes, has increasingly discouraged actors or practitioners from embracing and pursuing the partnership approaches and condemns the traditional understanding of partnership for international development.

Daid Callahan and Bruce Jennings (eds.), (1993), in their diatribe, *Interpretive Social Sciences and Policy Analysis,* offer an impressionistic academic evidence of policy analysis usually motivated in the first instance by policy failures. According to them, policy failures are often a function of actors responding insufficiently to the policy processes. They argue that policy analysis should seek to locate the anomalous responses, explicate them coherently in order to permit policy making more realistic way to the conduct of those who are to benefit from the policy and those whom the policies will apply.

Coete, K., Graaf, J., Hendricks, F., Wood, G., (2001) edited a book, entitled *Development Theory, Policy and Practice*. The text has sectional sub titles dealt with by respective authors on various thematics of development and policy studies. Central in this collection, is the need for a shift in development thinking at theoretical, policy, practical, and moral levels as a continuum. It is the conclusion of their contributions to the debate on the concept of Africa's development.

At the theoretical level, the editors have argued that macro-structural theories on development are virtually out of tune or are in dissonance with the actual reality of what people face in the third world countries. Social scientists, they argue, who are disinterested to decipher the practicalities of life and sequentially forecast their future course hide in obfuscation, given the over-emphasis of the macro-societal structures over and above certain capacity, creativity, and insight. On this plane, they argue for a change in perspectives to cater for what they refer to as 'micro-structures', which they regard as 'historical particularity', and 'individual actors'. They consider development as a controversial concept.

On the practical theme, they argue that the policies that emanated from the earlier theories had given themselves as unsustainable in the new era and that development concept driven by macro-agencies such as governments, international financial institutions like the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), often fail to create the desired effect in terms of convenient access to human and financial capitals. The macro-agencies fail to engage the civil societies who are meant to be the beneficiaries of the so-called development policies, and often seeking to do development through (in the editors' words) laptop, blue suited, razor-sharp development economists. This typology of development, according to them, is always fraught with series of failure, false start, chains of disaster, downward spirals, mismanagement, cupidity, and institutional complexities. These factors have perpetuated the underdevelopment overhang, particularly for African countries, with a resultant pessimism for any prospective development initiative.

The researchers argue that the involvement of civil society in the development policy and planning processes, as the basis for development, would bring about successful implementation of policies, as this would create opportunity to infuse the aspirations and needs of the target sectors, for development. Most of the themes included in this collection deal with civil society, civil participation, and how to make development sustainable. Another context of their argument deals with the changing development policy perceptions of international financial institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF, a view that corroborates the arguments by Turok, (2002). He contends that, the way to challenge the development policy of these institutions should be subtly acquired so as to create effect.

The book covers the governmental mechanism that should facilitate civil society participation in decision making *vis-à-vis* development. The argument here stresses the stagnated policy environment often created by the west, which often

tacked down the implementation process of these policies at the global dimension that denies Africa's development policies of meaning and effect.

They highlight the linkages between theory, meta-theory, research methods, policy, and practice as part of the continuum. This deals with the faulty theory syndrome of the so-called practical economists or social scientists because they disregard theory, they argue. The value-free and object of knowledge researches have also been disputed in furthering their arguments in the development theories debate.

A book edited by Hummelstrand Ulf, Kabiru Kinyanjui, and Edward Mburugu,(1994), *African Perspectives on Development,* deals with the mainstreaming of Africa's development imperatives *vis-à-vis* conceptual paradigms. This book is a collection of some studies by scholars who argue on a variety of imperatives that have characterized Africa's development. The book was planned and based on contemporary Africa's development studies, which has run into a paradigmatic crisis and therefore needs a paradigm shift to study development issues in Africa. According to the editors, the word 'paradigm' has become problematical within the context of Africa's development, as are issues of development and policy in the social sciences, which more often run into similar crises but do not technically occur in the natural sciences.

The word 'paradigm' is used in development studies to give special effect to certain concepts as object of knowledge. It is an emphasis that does not discard any other paradigm but specific selection of analytical and empirical research variables, and in terms of the kind of praxis in favour. The editors contend that the defined nature of the concept of development has created a wealth of debate. Given its fluidity, it is subject to multi-perspective interpretations and conceptualizations.

They further contend that, even among African social scientists, there are schisms and digitations on what African perspectives imply in the past and the present development thoughts, theories, and paradigms, given the varying sub-regional conditions, class or personal predicaments which have led to discussions on varying sub-regional initiatives for development. Different development theories, such as *Marxism*, *Modernization*, *Dependency*, and *World System* have, at different periods, been applied to denote what development is, and what empirical development is within different contexts. Empirical accomplishment, and the usage of the paradigmatic approach are of no value for those working within opposing paradigms, they argue. This means, that an object of knowledge as identified by one paradigm may not be exoterical and not for the uninitiated. It presupposes a dichotomy in communication and understanding in spite of the dialectical context of Africa's underdevelopment.

The researchers corroborate the editors' views, that social scientists and development theories are in crises, when applied to the underdevelopment situation in Africa and therefore a paradigm shift is required (Hyden, 1983). They categorize development strategies adopted in African countries in the last two decades into two areas: (a) Integration strategies associated with the modernization perspective and (b) Disengagement strategies associated with dependency and world-system paradigms.

They note that, the existing theories of development and underdevelopment, irrespective of their ideological dispositions are without the transformation of the peasant economy, the emergence of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) into the global ranks and that the eventual liquidation of underdevelopment would continue to be a mirage. These researchers have argued on the Africa's development–underdevelopment imperatives question, the philosophical contributions by African philosophers and the strategic typology of models to deal with the imperatives of Africa's development/ underdevelopment. They identify African philosophical efforts such as ethno-philosophy, Africanism, theory for

81

African revolution, professional philosophers, and the critics of the professional philosophers as the African theoretical approaches to Africa's development.

A book entitled *Institutional Reform – A Public Policy Perspective*, (1990), written by Jane, Jan-Erik, is a contribution to the debate in the fields of policy analysis and public policy which have come to be characterized and inundated by various paradigms and as a result, a set of propositions, models, and theories, which have won the support of scholars in the field have emerged. Policymaking has acquired a heuristic, motley processes and methods, and has therefore played a variety of roles in understanding the complex policy process in a given circumstance and environment. It has permitted a pluralistic usage of social scientific inquisition for various kinds of policies under various environments.

As a response to the above contention, the author has argued that institutional reforms are about a radical and innovative policy idea that has the prospect to fundamentally alter the behaviour and structure of public institutions, to bring about effectiveness and efficiency. This presupposes that public institutions be armed with certain policies that can be used to cause changes capable of affecting individual and institutional behavior and performance throughout the system. Any development-oriented policy, he argues, should be able to play an effective role and cause change, particularly in public institutions. It should by its initiative, operatives, and strategies stimulate, shape, and broker the implementation of radical public institution reforms and that the exceptional policy programme could bring about reforms by any change agent.

Mutahaba, Gelase and Balogun, M. Jide (eds.), (1992), published a book entitled *Enhancing Policy Management Capacity in Africa,* culled from seminar papers jointly organized by the African Association for Public Administration and Management (AAPAM) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) between June 1998 and September 1998. The central themes are clearly

a dire search for adequate policy formulation and implementation capacity environments in Africa that requires urgent and sustained attention.

They argue that the socio-economic crises and foreign interference in the internal affairs of African countries are contributory, to a larger extent, to the widening gap in policy design and implementation. They claim that the restructuring approaches in the public policy reformations through public administration were inadequate and fell far short from direction. Attention, they argue, was only given to areas such as organizational design, adoption of modern management techniques and technologies, industrial development, and sometimes the training of personnel. They also argue that attention to the creation and the development of institutions and organizations that would have specifically dealt with policy analysis, assembling data for policy formulation, critical evaluation of policy successes and failures were, and are still lacking.

They contend that policy programmes introduced by several African governments, at the tail end of the 20th century, were essentially as a result of the socio-economic crises that pervaded the continent. These policies were aimed at reform and to correct the abnormalities in their economic, monetary, and fiscal policies that were concentrated on content rather than context. Although important, they deserve some mention and encouragement, in that they were conclusive and exclusive in content, which led to defective and ineffective mechanisms for analyzing, formulating, and implementing policies. They ague that African policy outputs are generally deficient because the identification of strategic choices, assembling, analyzing, data storage, outlining implementation programmes of action, and implementation monitoring are dysfunctional. They call for a refocused policy processes so as to create the necessary capacity and resourcefulness for policy management.

A book entitled, *Policy Within and Across Developing Nations*, (1994), by Nagel, Stuart S., seeks to address African development policy environments. This book is divided into four sections:

- The first section deals with policy within developing nations and suggests the way through which they can be developed to win-win developmental policies, so as to provide a widespread prospective, useful innovation, democracy, and merit treatment.

- The second section takes on policy issues across developing nations – peace studies and research centres, a mini-symposium on international dispute resolution, exportation of democratic rights as a product, a mini-symposium on international prosperity, and global policy studies.

- The third section deals with the teaching of developmental policy studies, policy analysis training for development administrators, United States Information Agencies (USIA), win-win traveling seminars, and the proposed policy analysis training programme.

- The last section contains the relevant bibliography on developmental policy studies, the relevant literature and human rights in developing countries.

He argues that developing countries can be categorized. There are those that are in dire need of development, not necessarily those nations that are most rapidly developing, and that public policy refers, especially to governmental decisions that seek to improve the quality of life, or at least lessen the severity of various social problems. He classifies them as: economic, social, technological, political or legal, depending on what societal institutional or scholarly discipline is involved. He defines policy analysis as a methodology for determining relevant causal relations, generally for the purpose of evaluating alternative public policies in order to decide the best policies, combinations, allocations or a super-optimum solution whereby all sides come out ahead, of their best initial expectations (Nagel, 1994). He argues that the nations of sub-Sahara Africa are those that require, and qualify the truth-value of under-developed nations.

Patel, I.G., (ed.), (1992), in his book entitled, *Policies for African Development from the 1980's to 1990's,* is a collection of papers at a conference held in Gaborone, Botswana, in 1991. The economic crises that traversed the African continent with the advent of several economic adjustment programmes inspired by the IMF and the World Bank appears to be the main theme of the book. Contributors to the book include, among others, Camdesus, Mullei, Boorman of the IMF, and Rulihinda. Others are Berg, Helleiner, Martin, and Gondwe.

The book is divided into four major sections. The first section contains a collection of papers on the structural adjustment programmes in Africa, future approaches, and lessons learned from the past with perspectives from Africa by Mullei, Boorman of the IMF, and Rulihinda. The perspective they present only re-echoes the antecedents of aid funds for development with sudden dearth caveats. A theme of relevance to this study in the book is the contribution made by Camdesus, who wrote the foreward. Camdesus has argued that any bid to reposition Africa developmentally must rest on three principal strands:

- Regional integration.
- Special responsibility of the industrialized nations to assist Africa.
- A homegrown development initiative by Africans themselves.

The Camdesus's homegrown proposition bears more meaningful and direct relevance to Africa's development imperatives and in good measure lend credence to the emergence of Nepad. At the same time, it corroborates other similar views, on African regional integration, as the mechanism to attain concrete regional development. These argumentations seemingly rest on the experiences of African countries during the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) of the IMF *vis-à-vis* Africa's development imperatives.

The second section deals with Africa's adjustment and the external debt problem – issues and options. It chronicles how Africa came to acquire the debt burden and the multiplicity of the various cartels of creditors they have to negotiate with

on various fronts and levels. This was identified as placing burden on the economic generative growth for the continent.

Section three, is an exposition that explains *Financing Growth and Development in Africa, Outlook and Issues.* Section four deals with the *Trade, Investment and Growth Prospects for Africa.* The book draws its conclusion with discussions on the *Adjustment, Resources and Growth: How to manage in the 1990's*, and it was treated by Berg, Helleiner, Martin, and Gondwe, as contributors.

Emery Roe's, (1998) book, *Taking Complexity Seriously: Policy Analysis, Triangulation, and Sustainable Development,* is a contribution to the continued debate on methods of policy analysis and their relevance in the field of public policy. He has argued that methods of policy analysis can help produce valid outcomes while high, complex, and uncertain policy issues are being analyzed. He acknowledges policy environment as problematic in which policy analysis takes place. This is an attempt to provide policy makers a formal basis by which policy decisions are premised.

On the issue of sustainable development, he has used four respective perspectives with a focus on various problem areas, demonstrating their capacity. In each of these perspectives, he raises the same set of questions as what sustainable development really is. Why sustainable development? What does sustainable development require?

In the first perspective, a branch of economics called Girardian, examines patterns of what it refers to as 'Mimetic Behavior' among people in an economic transaction situation particularly in the third-world economies. This is a situation, which he describes how economic decisions of one person are affected by the economic choices of others. This pattern of economic choice has become a central variable in increasing economic returns in economic behavior and policies of developed systems. This type of behavior attracts rewards, only to those

whose economic activity is already active and successful. In the second perspective, cultural theory examines sustainable development through the different values that cultures place upon policy issues, and the extent to which these differences in value affect the willingness of policy audiences to explore unknown alternatives for action or pay the cost of potential failures.

Examination of the third perspective has been a critical theory, which explores sustainable development from a basis that governments and bureaucracies tend to foster negativism about issues in order to reinforce their elite position as the most appropriate means of action. Roe cited the example of this pattern from the Worldwatch Institute as one, given the mismanagement evident in the flux of ordinary unordered choices, advocates an elite approach to the management of world resources.

In the fourth perspective, Roe uses the local justice framework to examine the issue of sustainable development from creating a just environment for dwellers of local communities. In using this perspective, Roe contrasts the effects of actions taken locally with that intended to serve the global environment, and vice-versa. His prime reference is based on the framework that for the allocation of scarce resources and the consequences of such allocations for communities, as well as the examination of the cynical misuse of global needs to increase local gains to be effective, social justice must prevail.

3. 5. 2 A Composite Review of Journal Articles

Patrick Chabal's (2002), article entitled *The Quest for Good Governance and Development in Africa: Is Nepad the Answer?* has motivated an argument on several counts on Nepad including the relevance of the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) and the development question in Africa. He bases his arguments on the widespread fragile political stability and watershed economic

crises on the continent. These issues, he argues, pose consistent threats to Nepad.

The questions of the possible mandate or coercive powers, which Nepad possesses to bring about the critical element of enforcement in prescribed sanctions on an erratic and recalcitrant member state through the APRM initiative, given the experiences of electoral politics, in Africa over the past two decades remain problematic, he contends. Electoral politics played out on the continent over the years, in his view, has rendered good governance impracticable and, therefore, left the choice route for enforcement burdensome. The buzzword in currency, claims that Nepad is the basis for sustainable political and the socio-economic development for Africa in the new century. He acknowledges that, democracy could reduce the scope for conflict and stabilise the polity as a framework of attraction for, both, foreign and locally generated investments (Chabal, 2002).

The article entitled *What is New in the New Partnership for Africa's Development* by Alex De Waal, (2002), has agued that the concept of Nepad is no different from the pre-existing policy attempts, claimed to have been directed at Africa's development. According to him, these programmes were broadly constituted as frameworks within an interminable list of projects, which Nepad has now revived. Peer review mechanism, according to De Waal, is a rather ambitious policy, whose constraints Nepad has failed to envisage. Commitment to good governance, he argues, could only be operationalized through government programmes and not through a phantom political initiative to be encapsulated as a new radical approach in a development partnership. APRM therefore faces political hazards. On the question of resources, he admits, that Nepad may unlock additional financing for development, but at the same time warns that it should not be seen as a cash cow. Nepad appears oversold and is trying to attract unwarranted optimism in terms of expectations and even meaningful implementation, he argues.

An article entitled*, Is Funding from Western Countries Detrimental?* by Rozenda Hendrickse, (2003), advances some perspectives on the concept of foreign financing of development programmes in developing countries in general, and uses South Africa as a case study. Most developing and underdeveloped countries, including those in Africa do attract external funding for developmental purposes. Hendrickse argues that external funding of development programmes from the rich North draws, more often than not, sudden death caveats for the third-world countries. He explores the concept of foreign funding through the International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) with seemingly development-focused programmes that are in partnership with the local Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in Africa. He argues that the INGOs usually arrive with their own interpretation of development for the developing countries, set their own agenda without meaningful consultation and interfaced-programme with the indigenous civil society organizations.

The INGOs, he argues, hold partnerships with their local counterparts without a clear nature and defined roles for the local partners and that they always fail to seek and identify with the local intelligence and experience and more often than not do not collaborate their activities with the local NGOs, which are effectively involved in similar programmes. The article further argues that INGOs, most of the time, provide assistance through loans and grants, avoid identifying the local needs and aspirations; fail to provide in detail what they know about the services they purportedly ready to provide and focus more on what the contracted developers predetermine for the communities.

He argues that funding by INGOs should be provided through proposals only on what they are known and prepared for as well as what communities themselves have decided as their priorities. Funding from the so-called INGOs, he contends, leads not only to an undue recapitulation of the local NGOs but fragments them and rendering them inefficient and disorganised in functional terms, and that in the past the privilege to benefit from funds from the west to provide capacity

building programmes subsisted only for the later to create impediments upon the realisation that the funds provided were use for what they perceive as the wrong use. He contends that western assistance only favours the communities that kowtow to their demands, objectives, and coerced the local civil societies to change and revert to the linkages of efficiency that match the foreign trends which distract their original plans of action. INGOs are set up, according to him, to meet the objectives of the donors, which have the Western perception of development, for the poor countries, for example, democratisation, gender equality, and environmental conservation, as issues orchestrated in the West that become a prophesy in the poor countries.

Another article on Nepad entitled, *Nepad: Objectives and Implications for Investment and Trade* by Links, E., Santam and J., De Gama, (2002), draws largely from the social theory that seeks to chart the thwarted economies of the continent, the role of Nepad to attract FDI, and the continued imbalance between developed and developing nations that impede and aggravate conditions for the development of the continent. The article uses historical and analytical approaches that render accounts, revealing the causative variables of the developmental constraints facing Africa. In the introduction, the researchers seemingly corroborate the arguments made by Vil-Nkomo (2002), that Nepad in all its euphoria and seeming surge to reposition Africa, there is need to explore the exogenous issues and harness them for Nepad to be operationally effective. The article argues that, for Nepad to achieve any meaningful success, investment and trade are of equal significance to attract FDI in an applied development type linkage.

The central issues raised in the text are the international environment, FDI, Africa's continued failure to attract sizeable investment, and the domestic policy environment that seem to negate such attraction. It further argues that FDI is bi-dimensional in approach and that it can acquire a panacea status with an increased strength of policy maker, that is, creating new skills, technology,

increased access to capital base, and external market. At the same time, it can initiate net adverse consequences, like resource transfers, an impediment to the domestic entrepreneurship and internal savings; disregard for the environment when extracting natural resources; and can heighten internal tensions, if not properly controlled and managed. Links, E, Santam, and de Gama, J., (2002) argue that Nepad through investment and trade could generate employment and tax revenue, for the governments, for the provision of social sectors development and services.

The authors also argue that, for Africa to attract meaningful internal and external investments, it must be able to seriously aim at creating competitive, inviting environments, and conditions, drawing largely from the provisions of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development – Development, Trade and Capital Investment (UNCTAD-DTCI) sources which state that Africa as a whole does not compare favourable with regard to a number of basic determinants of FDI. These determinants, according to the arguments, include instability in the political environment, preponderance of small markets, lack of capital resources, inadequate functional infrastructure, and the perilous debts overhang. Africa, they argue, is being perceived as 'a location risk' (Links, E., Santam, De Gama,J., 2002).

Simon Maxwell and Karin Christiansen, (2002), have written an article entitled *Negotiation as Simultaneous Equation: Building a new Partnership with Africa,* This article is yet another scholarly corpus, in the ranging debate on Nepad. It raises four major areas of arguments on the question of partnership *vis-à-vis* Africa's development. Its areas of contention are: (a) who is in, and who is out, both on Africa's side and on the side of the would-be partners, the G8 nations, (b) what should the partnership cover, (c) how strong should the partnership be and what degree of backstopping, (d) what mechanism should be put in place to monitor the partnership and if necessary arbitrate between the two.

The authors have argued that the 'constituent elements' that led to the emergence of Nepad have been the subject of several debates, but the matrix of the partnership has barely been given any attention in these debates. They contend that the use of international fora to address issues as partnership, is a rather ambitious strategy, but that partnership ought to be dealt with in special circumstances with different arrangements. The authors have advanced a new paradigm they refer to as 'negotiation as simultaneous equation', and argue that the approach, leads to nothing but unnecessary clutter at international conferences. It ultimately dilutes the focus and that it is an opportunity that the developed nations use to draw leverages on issues of interest to them rather than those that affect the poor countries.

They corroborate the view that the concept of partnership is not new, as several models are on offer. They argue that trust and formal contractual agreements mark the distinction between types of partnership. While other models rely on trust, and envision informal methods for mutual accountability, some others specify formal institutions for the same purpose.

They argue that the African partnership for development with the rich North is tenuous, baseless, and born out of ingenuity given the asymmetrical relationship that continue to exist between the two sides, using the provisions of the Cotonou convention agreements, which seemingly are in favour of the developed nations to support their position. They advocate a partnership that requires symmetrical accountability and the conditions guiding the partnership clearly be stipulated, including commitment to the size and the composition of the flow of aid, the pace and sequencing of trade liberalization or debt relief and enforcement mechanisms, with penalties available for the rich countries who give aid to Africa. They support, generously, some schools of thought which regard the partnership for development as a 'hollow partnership' and an 'inflexible partnership' and thus pose a question, as to which of the two is better suited, for Africa.

They put forth the question of multi-lateralism for Africa's development, noting that the United Kingdom (UK), Canada, and France, from the G8 nations support Nepad while United States of America (USA) does not. They argue that, any new form of partnership arrangements with the G8 nations are highly likely to become problematical. On the African part, they argue, Nepad is being criticized for a lack of popular participation and genuine ownership, as it is a leadership-driven concept and that the broad base involvement of all African states would create obvious difficulties and assert that on either side, this partnership is a recipe for selective or limited partnership (Max and Christensen, 2002).

They argue, that the form of partnership, which Nepad seems to seek with the G8 is practically informal, given that the promoters of Nepad are occasionally invited to the G8 Summits. On the issue of the type of structure for the partnership, the authors argue that, some structure already exist which could be useful for the partnership. The structures they indicate are: the African Union (AU) and United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) on the part of Africa, while on the part of the G8 nations the structures already existence are: the Organization for Economic Corporation and Development (OECD) and the European Union (EU). These structures, according to their arguments, would help to avoid a proliferation of institutions and duplication of functions.

The authors used Rwanda as the case study to argue against any meaningful partnership between Africa and the developed nations. Rwanda, they argue, exemplifies the stereotypical 'Africa' political logjam, socio-economic stagnation, and poverty, on the one hand; and the low government capacity, patchy policy environment, and the dwindling agricultural productivity that are ubiquitous on the continent, on the other. Despite these debilitating factors to Rwandan development, they argue, the developed countries, in their collective judgment front aid provision and failed to mobilise interventionist approach and support at the pre-genocide period in Rwanda. This experience, they argue, has sown discord and distrust between the Rwandan government and the developed

nations. In their view, Nepad may witness a similar experience. In conclusion, they proffer a few recommendations maintaining that genuine development partnership should be all-inclusive, rather than selective.

Kurt Morais and Sanusha Naidu's (2002) article entitled, *Libya's African Policy: What Does it Mean for South Africa*? This article reflects on the current debate, on whether or not Nepad will succeed, given the evolving political and socio-economic conditions on the continent. The authors have cited Libya as being over zealous in approach, implicating Libya in terms of her current financial assistance not only to the French Equatorial African (AEF), but also to some Southern African countries, aimed at extracting multi-level support to her infamous political ambition on the continent. The authors raise concerns on the implication of such assistance to South Africa, which they argue, is at the helm of Nepad implementation and widely perceived as inconsistent and lagging in astute pursuit of her foreign policy objectives in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) sub-region.   The article stresses the implication of Libya's further encroachment in Southern Africa, for Nepad, in terms of its avid initiative of a monitoring mechanism for good governance.

It chronicles incidents of attempts at influence peddling and hegemony-seeking by Libya and cited the implicit danger, which Nepad is likely to attract through Libya's ambition, given her pariah status at the international level. The article agues that South Africa must assert intrepid influence more pragmatically *vis-à-vis* her foreign policy objectives than what currently appears to be the case. This would assist South Africa, according to the authors, to appear convincing before the international community and render Nepad as credible before the would-be partners.

Nepad and the Dialectics of African Underdevelopment, an article by John F.E., Ohiorhenuan, (2002), seemingly reinforces the ongoing argumentations on whether or not the concept of Nepad is a genuine African development strategy.

In the overview presented, the author underscores a crucial point by arguing that the programmatic frameworks of Nepad appear as a grandly over-arching development strategy in favour of more realistic strategy, on the one hand, and obscurely ambiguous on the other, given its transitional frames of reference since inception. The article treads on the familiar ground especially when it corroborates B. Turok's (2000) arguments that the Nepad initiative is not all new, and that it is actually evolved from the pre-existing programmes such as the Revised Framework of Principles for the Implementation of the New International Order in Africa; Intellectual Foundation for the Lagos Plan of Action for the Economic Development of Africa, 1989-2000, all undertaken by United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) under Adebayo Adedeji, from the 1970's through to the 1980's.

Against the background of the structural adjustment programme, the article argues, that 'UNECA developed action programmes – The African Alternative Framework to Structural Adjustment Programmes for Socio-economic Recovery and Transformation (AA-SAP), the document nodded and identified alternative frameworks to the IMF Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) with recommendations for new policy directions similar to Nepad and that the emergence of Nepad is not precursory to these programmes' (Ohiorhenuan, 2002). The author argues that, 'the only difference between those programmes and Nepad is the partnership characterization with the G-8 countries, donors, and multilateral international organizations and to a lesser extent the devotion of attention to conflict resolution and management in the continent. The article further argues that Nepad has entrenched itself on the global level, by encapsulating the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) adopted at the 56th session of the UN General Assembly in September 2001' (Ohiorhenuan, 2002).

The central arguments in the article, are what he refers to as 'complexity' and 'ambiguity' of Nepad. The 'ambiguity', which the author has noted, is drawn from the nomenclature change, which has negatively characterized Nepad as an

initiative', a 'project', an 'idea', a 'programme', and an 'implementation mechanism' for the African Union (AU). The article argues that, while Nepad is being declared as 'mandated initiative', equal status has therefore been accorded to it, with African Union (AU) and that in the confusion, it has become difficult for it to be the veritable mechanism for the political and the socio-economic emancipation of the continent. He explicates the structure, the specifications of Nepad's programmes, and the conditions for sustainable development that are enshrined in Nepad. The author's extrapolations have led to the identification of deviations in the sectoral priority areas with multi-disciplinary concepts such as poverty alleviation, capital flow, market access, negotiations of new relationships with the developed nations, multi-tier implementation structures, and the poverty reduction strategy, which the author regards as a complexity of Nepad.

The article, having evaluated the complexity of Nepad's programme descriptions, categorizes them into two sections:

- Wide ranging coverage and absence of any criteria for prioritization; and
- The problem of assigning task and coordination.

Given all the initiatives, the author is of the view that, 'Nepad does not emerge as a coherent set of activities to be implemented in the traditional sense. Accordingly, it does not seem to deal effectively with how specific responsibilities are, or would be assigned' (Ohiorhenuan, 2002).

Another area of ambiguity, according to the author, is the organizational structure to assign leadership of task teams to independent, unrelated bodies and sub-committees of member states, which in essence would mean the subordination of the goodwill of some of the UN Agencies, multilateral financial institutions, and the G8 countries. He has, however, acknowledged that good governance is an essential prerequisite for development. He argues that good governance should not have been the issue with the partners, but the African civil societies through guaranteed basic freedom of participation and choice, nurturing of creativity, as these would, in turn, build up the needed domestic resources and attract the

capital flight return and the FDI. He draws his conclusion by stating that the unnecessary, but complex substantive and institutional approaches would compromise the ability of Nepad to coherently prosecute the type of development Africa now requires. A programme such as Nepad with a Pan-Africanist vision needs a broader approach and consideration for the fundamental factors than the normative and the traditional way of dealing with the African development issues in terms of implementation.

Schoeman, N.J. (2003), in his article entitled, *Economic Growth and Development Constraints in Africa,* has argued that the pressure on governments in Africa has tended to exacerbate, not only their policy incapacities but also the funding of meaningful development projects as well as the linkage of their economies to the modern global economic systems. In its approach on the development problems through the political economy paradigm, the article's main findings though not new but nevertheless critical, includes:

- The state playing an appreciable role in the superior macro-economic outcomes.
- The inability to provide corporate governance in terms of social services–education, employment and health delivery.
- Marginalization of the state from FDI and other investments.
- Economic vulnerability to external shocks.

He rates these factors as constraints that increasingly impede Africa's development. He argues that ownership of production is less crucial if governance can be meaningfully administered, and that the constraints in South Africa are on inefficiency scale that pervades the local tiers of government, poor domestic savings, and lack of international competitiveness conditions, which resonate vividly and prevail on the continent.

The article further argues that a favourable economic response to growth can only take place when policy approaches address what it refers to as 'supply side' constraints, for example, decrease in unskilled real wage, enhanced the

education system, human capital development and the FDI, rather than 'demands side' expansion. It calls for clear, bold, innovative, and coordinated policy choices necessary to position the continent on the path to development and concludes that addressing the myriad economic conundrum of Africa requires multiple strategies. The author notes that to evolve and sustain such a policy in African may be rigorous and hugely challenging.

 Ben Turok's (2002), article entitled, *The International Response to Nepad,* highlights the recent convergent pronouncements at some international conferences ascribed to the G8 countries, the World Bank, the IMF, and the World Trade Organisation (WTO) representatives in the realization and appreciation of the growing underdevelopment consequences, stagnated economies, and the appreciable level of global poverty that have threatened international peace. Consequently, he argues on the possible reasons for the change of heart even in the acknowledgement of Nepad as the Africa's development initiative: He has located his contentions on:

- Deplorable economic regression in Africa and the aspirations that have prompted calls for decisive global actions against poverty.
- Unstable equilibrium of the world system and the shift in the world economic power largely to the developed nations.
- The loss of confidence in the crucial world economic institutions.
- The need for decisive action plan to cool the overheated world system.

 (Turok, 2002).

He argues that the poorest nations and their populace living below poverty lines are what he refers to as the 'ultimate systemic threat', being the fallout of the slow growth rate in their economies, continued drop in per capita income, increased debt burden, and widespread poverty. This, according to the article, contributes to the change of heart by the developed nations and their consequent endorsement of the Nepad initiative. Other reasons why Nepad has received international acclaim so far are premised on what some schools of thought have

to say that during the cold war, the rich countries were happy to prop up corrupt regimes in Africa, fought proxy wars, sold weapons to suppress their subjects and swelled their foreign debt. These debts, if anything, are crushing Africa, and have resulted in some of the countries spending more than they can internally generate on debt servicing, than they spend on education and health, he argues.

He argues that, foreign aid for development has always been tied to exports of western goods and services. The official aid package to Africa, in particular has dwindled from '$32 per an African in 1990 to $19 in 1998', The Economist, (February 20, 2001), quoted in Turok (2002). The article explains further what it refers to as the 'crisis thinking' mentality of the world financial institutions, the World Bank and the IMF, and their seeming concerns for poverty alleviation programmes and homegrown development policies, to assist in the reordering and sustenance of a new world political and socio-economic systems as perceived by them and conceal their ineffectiveness.

The perceptions and policy shifts in the G8, the IMF, and the World Bank, on the restructuring of the global economic systems to accommodate the developing economies have become clearer. These institutions seem to worry overmuch about strengthening the macro economic policy base of the developing countries; this shift appears to have given rise not only to the ongoing WTO round table debates but also the development partnership which Nepad seems to hinge on. The question remains as to what concrete steps would add value or impetus to these commonly used proclamation to prop up the fragmented economies in practical terms, he argues.

In another of his articles entitled, *The New Partnership for Africa's Development, (NEPA)* (2002), Turok unearths what seemly precipitated the concept of Nepad. He has agued that the Regional Integration initiative, which Adebayo Adedeji advocated as a radical move to aggressively pursue the continental efforts for development and growth, has become the nucleus of the Nepad's programme.

99

The initiative, according to Turok, was the 'African Alternative Framework for Structural Adjustment Programme (AAFSAP) to the IMF Structural Adjustment Programme'. He notes that Adedeji's futuristic advocacy for regional integration, at the time, led to the formation of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the East African Economic Community (EAEC). These economic groupings, he argues, are attempts toward socio-economic development, and therefore, Nepad could only be a rebound and the renewed Adedeji's Africa's economic development blueprint.

On a separate level, Turok questions the rationale for the exclusion of the South African apartheid government from the membership of the fledgling SADC at the time when the economic imperatives of the continent were dire. He argues that South Africa with her economic and technological comparative advantages and the economies of scale, over the rest of Africa, particularly the SADC sub-region could have had positive stabilizing effects, not only in the economies of the sub-region, but also those of the sub-Saharan nations. He claims that Adedeji had implicitly endorsed this fact at the Windhoek conference of January 1994.

Sibusiso Vil-Nkomo's, (2002), versed article entitled, *Leadership for Development in a Globalized Environment*, discusses the intractable problematic development imperatives, which the continent has faced, and the ubiquitous African leadership crises in the new millennium, which may challenge the realization of Nepad. The author has presented arguments with a new theoretical perspective on what he refers to as leadership for development, operational citizenship (elements which, do or do not, constitute leadership for development), the new scramble to save Africa both internally and externally, and the aftermath of globalization on the quest for Africa's development (Vil-Nkomo, 2002).

The author contends that given the contemporary Africa's development drive, the pertinent question is likely the 'leadership for development' paradigm. In other words, the implementation of the initiatives of Nepad, besides focusing attention

and action plans on the conventional dimensions and orthodoxy of development theorizing, there must be commitment to participatory and people-centred form of governance; the stakeholders must be made to feel being in control so as not only to create an imbalance but a sense of dynamism, adaptation, and a predictable environment, he argues. He notes that the leadership for development bears huge consequences and influence on any development initiative, Nepad inclusive. He further argues, that the pursuit and having individuals perceive themselves as leaders, must have a paradigmatic grounding which is dissimilar to ideology, so that their policy outputs and strategies could be long term and sustainable. The author had been quick to note that, 'Nepad is not as given'.

3. 5. 3 A Composite Review of Monographs

Ian Taylor's, Monograph (2002), entitled, *The Failure of the New Economic Partnership for Africa's Development',* presents the evolutionary antecedents and the purposes of Nepad and its possibility for extinction. He motivates that, the socio-political conditions on the continent in the last few years have come to put Nepad to test with its APRM initiative *vis-à-vis* the political realities that have seize the continent through the conduct and utterances of its promoters. For instance, Cote d'lvoire, Zimbabwe, Liberia, Sierra Leone, DRC, Somalia, Sudan, and Rwanda are some of the sticky flashpoints where the African diplomacy has been anything but effective let alone the APRM of Nepad.

He explains that, given the contentious nature of these incidents particularly in Zimbabwe, the Commonwealth of Nations with two important members of the G8, the United Kingdom (UK) and Canada, decided to intervene through the troika made up of Thabo Mbeki, Olusegun Obasanjo and John Howard of South Africa, Nigeria and Australia respectively. The article has argued that Nepad, a veritable apple pie wish list for Africa's development, has seemingly fallen apart, given the fact that it is a partnership driven concept with the rich countries of the

north, which Canada and the UK, whom its promoters oppose and turned against, are strong influential members. He argues that, the race card and dubious democratic credentials of it promoters have rubbed off the interest of the G8. The blatant refusal to own up the APRM ideals particularly with regard to the political logjam and the violent seizure of farmlands in Zimbabwe, for example negates the essence of APRM (Taylor, 2002).

The author argues that, Nepad has been set on the conservative political and economic frameworks through good governance, democratic and economic liberalization principles to attract development partnership and that the promoters have through their political and diplomatic ineptitude rendered Nepad irrelevant, at least in the eyes of the G8 and donor nations. He narrated how Mbeki and Obasanjo tried to block the suspension of Zimbabwe from the Commonwealth, and branded some of the G8 leaders as racists, and the false declarations on the internal political occurrences in Zimbabwe by Obasanjo, matters that should ordinarily have required political and diplomatic savvy, astuteness, and deft. These issues, he argues, render their antics fit into a well-worn pattern that stake out the evolution of Nepad. The goals of Nepad appear laudable. To drive the achievement and the realization of these goals requires openness and commitments of the promoters than their peer support, political symbolism and rhetoric, he argues.

The author also argues that the concept appeared to observers a qualitatively different approach from the previous declarations and that what had attracted the international focus was the promise to checkmate autocrats, dictators, and kleptocrats and rein them in, (Turok, 2002). Furthermore, he argues that, the rest of the world on the basis of honesty, transparency, accountability, mutual respect, recognition of the universal notions of democracy, human rights, and good governance equally perceived the ideal of APRM and that the events, that have taken place in Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, and Zimbabwe, for example, and the

corresponding response of the promoters of Nepad have certainly invited a great deal of skepticism.

He concludes that good governance is an essential ingredient to a coherent programme to tackle the myriad developmental problems of Africa and that the failure of APRM in the first test case to demonstrate its will and cut its teeth is something of a profound disappointment. He observes that any future discourse on Nepad is likely to be in remembrance of a good idea sabotaged by the behaviour of the promoters who seek first political aggrandizement and solidarity with their errant colleagues than those of the hard-pressed people of Africa (Taylor, 2002).

Jerry O. Kuye's, (2003) work, *Targeting NEPAD for Continental Development,* is a paper presented at a workshop hosted at the International Institute for Administrative Sciences (IISA), Regional International Conference, Yaounde, Cameroun in 2003, with the theme: *Shared Governance, Combating Poverty and Exclusion.* The issue of transformation of the African continent, that is, the eradication of poverty, political crisis, diseases, and substituting those with good governance, political stability, and economic growth, so that the continent can, in transition, move from underdevelopment to a developing state, through policy targeting as the theme of the paper. Nepad has come to serve as the template for development in Africa for the 21st century.

Kuye has captured a vivid account that has assumed a special character, in that he focuses on the theme that has so far been excluded from the ongoing debate on Nepad. He argues that for Nepad, and for that matter the AU, to become the mechanisms for Africa's development, public administration principles through policy targeting would have to be brought into a sharp focus. The logic here has opened space for the author's determination to fit public policy process into the context of Nepad and the AU in the quest to implement their onerous developmental policies.

In this respect, the author draws upon a methodological framework to buttress his arguments, which more or less serve an important agenda-setting function for African development programming. He has wittingly drawn attention to the fact that examination of public administration approaches to targeting policy for development as vehicles for AU and Nepad, (Kuye, 2003), are critical for Africa's development policies at all levels. He contends that, for governments in Africa and with the Nepad initiative, the uneven development and complex patterns of social and class differentiation, the need to ensure fiscal budgetary discipline and effective peer review mechanism among other factors, have made it necessary for the adoption of targeting as a methodological approach to address development (Kuye, 2003:2).

3. 5. 4 A Critiquing Overview of the related Literature

Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff's, (2002) argument on the issue of actors seeking cultural identities from partnership engagements, and her view of partnership as a concept without the necessary trappings for any advantages are inarguably simplistic. She has not given partnership of any kind any benefits that may have informed the context of partnership for development. She has come away without offering a better option, especially to meet the aspiration of the globalization process and the sustainable development phenomenon.

Then the pertinent question that arises is: What constitute different forms of partnership she has identified? The answer to this question could be based on the fact that, development partnership is for exchanges and to achieve effective, efficient service delivery, attract funding, technical assistance, and government participation, which appear to be the downstream considerations of activities. Brinkerhoff contentions are not ways beyond the context and concept of what international partnership for development seek hard to achieve. Her insights into partnership though, highlight some case studies are inconclusive. In essence, her arguments appear too generic in context. For instance, the policy concept of

Nepad is partnership driven, seeking international funding for regional development, which, as a consequence, will try to reposition Africa strongly globally. Nepad is more global, as it is afrocentric. She has clarified partnership in concept, but fails to address the scope, complex process, range and the context through which the concept is articulated and denies a fusion between the concept and context of partnership. She appears dismissive of any theoretical underpinnings to rationalize her standpoints.

What informs the concept of international development partnership could be mutually reinforcing for the partners with inherent hybrid variables and interests, which are equally deterministic in development partnership. International partnership for development is not mutually exclusive. Her book is useful, as it is one of the few to deal directly with the concept of international partnership for development.

David Callahan and Bruce Jennings (1993) attempt to justify policy failures appears a study in isolation of a particular policy, but various public policy analyses do fully explain what happens in particular places, circumstances, and times in policy process environments. The argument on 'anomalous responses' of policy makers being responsible for policy failures, though plausible, is not all convincing. For instance, the gaps between the policy propositions by policy analysts could be found by questions arising from what policy analysts say and advise, and what the political actors or policy implementers say and do in the course of policy implementation. The questions that arise are: Were the policies contradictory in concept and context? What had necessitated the policy? and What were the set objectives?

The failure of a particular policy in one setting may not necessarily mean it cannot flourish well in another, and vice versa. This is because some policies are conceptualized within different contexts, exigencies of objectives and aspirations, which may be at variance at different times and needs. That is to

105

say, various policies are conceptualized in different contexts, in different circumstances; at various settings; times; differing opinions of what should be, or not be; what the policy is meant to achieve, priority areas, and the policy environment. Yet, policy analysts have been implicated in the determination of types of policy process, policy options, implementation, and policy outcomes, and even policy failures.

It cannot be safely argued that the failure of policies is a direct responsibility of policy analysis, as Jennings would have us believe. Policy analysis is not an end in itself, but a means to proffer alternative best choice to achieve a set objective. Essentially, it is critically important to reason, from the cause to the effect, rather than the effect to the cause. The text offers lessons already learnt on contemporary policy analysis issues. There is a lot to be done on this paradigm.

Jan K Coetzee, Johan Graaf, Fred Hendricks, Geoffrey Woods, (2002) edited book, does exactly what the title says. The book's central argument is the issue at debate - development imperatives in Africa. It stresses the need to move debates beyond the frontiers of the usual macro-structural paradigms, so as to be able to roundly situate Africa's development dilemmas. This is due to the fact that, most public discourses on Africa's development imperatives, focus largely on macro-agencies of governments and their policies with little or no emphasis on micro-agencies, it argues. The authors contend that, the lack of emphasis on micro-structural agencies is, by implication, developmentally constraining Africa.

The book focuses on policy re-orientation, civil society participation in policy processes for any meaningful development to take place in Africa, with a more emphasis on micro-structures. It corroborates the calls for a paradigm shift, both in, approaches and theories of Africa's development. Notwithstanding the difficulties in an edited study, it would have been more useful if the editors had sought to tackle more directly, the central paradox of contemporary Africa, that is, the fact that the continent is unquestionably modernizing while at the same time

failing to develop. The sympathetic critique, on this piece of work, is that it has failed to analyze the theoretical linkages, which earn their support against the pseudo-theoretical underpinnings of some of the development economists. The book is an eminent resource for those researchers, scholars and policy practitioners with keen interest in Africa's development studies.

The book by Ulf Himmelstrand; Kabiru Kinyanjui; and Edward Mburugu, (1994) have engaged in issues of development within the African perspective, and have, at the same time assessed their real impact on Africa's development imperatives by employing a variety of development theories and paradigms, which underscore their respective arguments. They have failed to relate which specific development theory or the contemporary African regional development initiatives fit the contemporary African development efforts, on the one hand, and the dynamics of exogenous conditions that may or may have impacted the implementation processes of precursory development policy programmes on the continent on the other. The book, has however, generated stimulating thoughts for those engaged in the Africa's development studies.

Jan-Erik Lane's, (1990) work has the theme of 'institutional reform'. The author offers reform proposals that seemingly hold out a promise to address the problems hampering the public institutions' reformation. The concept of a policy instrument for institutional reformation seems inspiring, but the authors' overwhelming dependence on this single concept is a bit of an over-stretch. The book, is readable and uncluttered by jargon, describes several key institutional problems that afflict various institutional reforms, some of which have been proposed in various texts. The author seems to believe, more in the creation of incentive, to increase efficiency and outcome quality. It tends to skip over policy reform details, established theories, and empirical research, while providing a temptingly painless way to reinvent public institutions and render them efficient and effective.

The author seems to have been forced at several key junctures to wish away misaligned incentives, and he is unable to provide evidence that suggest his scheme is a fail-safe work. He oversimplifies and over-generalizes the reformation process and overlooks vital complexities relating to implementation of the institutional reformation process. He avoids addressing numerous significant consequences that his proposals are likely to produce and relies more on good intentions rather than design. Fictional account is not any evidence. The author has sought to explain the issues clearly that generally hamper reformation of public institutions and their performance, an approach that seems to receive little attention from policy studies, but one that can create significant unintended consequences. As a result, the implementation of policy initiative and institutional reforms require thoughtful and broader considerations.

The author takes a bold leap in extending the implications of his findings for prospective policy initiative for institutional change. Unstructured institutional reform can cause a shift in motivation of policy operators from fulfilling bureaucratic mandates, to responding to system demands. How effective institutions translate policy from cause to effect through implementation has escaped mention. The book is eminently readable and a valid contribution to the public policy debate on the relevance of institutional reforms, particularly when those institutions performance fall far short than expected. Nepad has, in this study been conceptualized as a public institution for coordination, management, administration and the implementation of the Nepad's programmes.

Gelase Mutahaba and M. Jide Balogun book (1992) have dealt with the contagion of implementation difficulties on the continent. In as far as these expositions go, with specific reference to strengthening the policy processes in Africa, the arguments are seriously partial, if not prejudicial. They run against African historical past, given the fact that the African policy environments are the legacies of colonialism. The then regional organization, the OAU had failed to introduce effective macro-economic policies, and strengthen management

capacities within the continent. These issues could have assisted in creating viable environment on some of the vexing issues of African development imperatives.

If OAU had a pragmatic policy framework (as has been the case with the EEC) such as multi-criteria decision-making framework, there would have been a spin off effect. System dynamics are not exclusive to nation states. Supra-national institutions are better suited to exercise greater influence in policy formulation, alignment, and implementation, the EU, for example. Similarly, the issue of dysfunctional policy design, policymaking, and policy implementation in Africa are tied to a number of conceptual and empirical questions that have characterized the political, socioeconomic, and leadership conditions which enjoy dubious eminence, and negatively impact public administration and policy processes on the continent.

With the magnitude and character of Africa's development crisis, steps that ought to have been taken, for cause and effect, and the crisis of policy management capacity are some of the likely questions that may arise from the African policy process environment *vis-à-vis* Nepad. The extent to which the domestic policy management capacity could meet the demands, and if the existing capacity falls short of requirements, how far then, should we go in closing any perceived gaps through foreign assistance in policy making and implementation? Others may argue on the appropriate institutional infrastructure to facilitate the achievement of the basic policy objectives. It could be asked that, to what extent have the management development, improvement agencies, and institutions been effectively engaged and challenged in the formulation of domestic policy in strengthening the management, implementation and delivery capacities of both, the macro-and micro-economic policies in the continent in the past four decades? This is a critical juncture with regard to the implementation process of Nepad.

The strength of Stuart S. Nagel's (1994) book lies in the breadth of his cross-fertilized policy studies experiences. He conceptualizes public policy into policy studies, public policy, and policy analysis, as it were and applies a non-dogmatic approach to his arguments, on the intermittent, but patchy development policy environments prevalent in most developing countries, and even worse so in Africa. This nonplussed and persistent situation has undermined the development question based on policy variables and options.

The theoretical framework of analysis of the policy environment in developing countries is well grounded and articulated by the author. What Nagel (1994) has not told us is the causal link between policy within and policy without concepts, which are not explored in relation to developmental policies of the third-world nations. He has also failed to predicate policy implementation analysis and development to regional developmental programmes, particularly in the third-world environment, which appears to be the basis for the book. He has omitted the 'dependency' or the 'interventionist' approaches, which could improve policy formulation and implementation domains, especially in third-world nations.

This book is an informative piece of work done by a renowned author of policy analysis and policy studies; he has offered models for informed scholarship of policy environments in the third-world. Regional integration is not by itself, coalescing of development policy processes especially in the third-world.

I. G. Patel (ed), (1992) edited book deals essentially with three major elements – regional integration, special responsibility of industrialized nations to assist Africa and the homegrown initiative to overcome consequences of the structural adjustment programmes. The regional integration argument does not appear credible enough, for instance, the OAU has been a regional organisation since independence, but could not prove developmentally effective for the continent. It is a truism that development is a process and not an event, which means a direct focus, would mean a step in a right direction for development. The point at issue,

therefore is, did the OAU take any development initiative, and if it did, which one could be ascribed to it? The introduction of the SAPs on the continent is a direct consequence of inept policy mechanisms, which the OAU may not be convincingly, absolved. The effect of the SAPs are still the lingering question of structural economic dependency of a continent on their colonial masters, and the international capitalist operatives, due to limited resources, that is, capital and human resourcefulness, and the scanty and inappropriate development policy environments. This book has an historical orientation. It fails to engage theoretical and empirical paradigms to underpin arguments. It serves the purpose in which African countries, and the international financial institutions interplayed on the way foreword in the search for an appropriate strategy for Africa's development. It appears to be a general interest-reading book.

Emery Roe's (1998) thesis on the advantages of 'Triangulation' could be found from the four perspectives that Roe has identified from sustainable development. Although Roe did not innovate or enunciate any fresh policy analysis method in this book, the method of triangulation and use of multiple perspectives on complex policy issues are situated approaches in policy analysis (Dunn, 1987)

Roe (1998) has however, emphasized the seriousness of complexity in policy environment and the need to incorporate them into the analysis of substantive policy issue. Nepad is a complex policy issue within an equally complex policy environment. In spite of this observation, the arguments are relevant to this study. It could be argued that every society is in dynamic evolution. The dynamic nature of each society is dependent on a number of factors that differs from one to the next. Consequently, different levels of complexity and uncertainty may influence policy analysis, policymaking, policy decisions and policy environments. The 'Triangulation' concept has a more useful application in the Western environment than in the developing world. The book is limited on the evenness of policy environments, but has the theoretical and methodological coherence for policy studies.

It is, without gainsaying that the postulations advanced by Chabal (2002) are observable occurrences, which have plagued the continent for decades. The counter argument is: Is it better to sit and do nothing than to do something? The response to the question could be found in the development imperatives of Africa and the willingness to acknowledge and address them, and to learn from doing. Nothing is more vital to implicate than self-correction; nothing is worse than blind preservation, Warwick, (1982). For all the development constraints of the continent, people, particularly the African leaderships, must necessarily exercise optimal concern by initiating measures that could prove effective, in conjunction with the contemporary globalization process, the UN MDGs, and the sustainable development phenomenon. Nepad is one of such efforts. The author has failed to offer any alternative policy choices to replace Nepad, nor examines the conditions that could strengthen their implementation processes.

Nepad may have evoked some particularities of the old programmes, as claimed by De Waal, (2002) but development policy as every other socio-economic concept is dialectical within the context of competing imperatives. The conceptualization of the Nepad programmes may have had implicit grey areas, which has been placed in context. Essentially, the APRM is a radical approach in determining acts of governance among member states with particular reference to their economic and political policies. The peer review mechanism was never initiated and incorporated in the previous agenda of the precursory policy programmes. If it were, it was not mentioned. System dynamics entail new concepts, ideas, and applications including policy dynamics.

Hendrickse's (2003) article has critical relevance to Nepad and the concept of the study. This is because the emphases essentially deal with the issues of development, partnership, western funding for development, and underdevelopment. The overall text underpins the Nepad concept of partnership with international NGOs as case studies.

The visions and missions of the INGOs may be under cloak but remain an explicit agenda in pursuit of their programmes in developing countries. They often tend to the dictates of their sponsors with regard to policy and programmes implementation. But the themes being argued by Hendrickse (2003) are not all conclusive because they are incoherent and dissonance with the international partnership paradigms, aid assistance for development, and the fragmentation of the domestic NGOs. He has established the necessity and the usefulness of partnership with the west within a development context and technical assistance. It may be true that the INGOs adopt different development approaches in different regions of the developing countries and tailor programmes to meet their various perceptions, but this does not erode the overall advantages of partnership. The issues of critical importance are the resource and capacity constraints facing the third-world countries and the local Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), which hamper them to draw leverages from the partnership, a fact Hendrickse omitted in his arguments.

Development partnership in most cases entail interest, engagements, funding and activities. They are in various forms and contexts. Development oriented partnership particularly when it involves the economic relationship between the developed and the under-developed nations, refers to a community of interests and high stakes. The local NGO's must endeavor, as a rule, to embark on training so as to improve management techniques, organization skills, budgeting, prioritizing programmes, defining policy agenda and programmes, in consultation with the civil society they seek to serve and governments, within the resources at their disposal in relation to their developmental objectives. Where they fail to capacitate themselves, either through training or domestic fundraising, the INGOs, which are almost always better organized, better managed, and better resourced, cannot be held accountable.

The article has succeeded in opening up a fresh understanding with a different perspective of development partnership between the International Non-

governmental Organizations (INGOs) and their counterparts in the developing nations especially in Africa. It has added to the debate on the partnership for development. He has failed to recognize the modern theme of negotiated interdependence in development partnership and the winds of globalization.

Hendrickse's (2003) article has waged critiques on the INGOs, using the South African indigenous NGOs as the case studies. He made no specific mention of any local NGOs in any particular Province in South Africa to drive home his contentions. His arguments are seemingly isolated for the simple reason that if the INGOs do not perform in South Africa, it is not given that they are unsuccessful in other third-world locations, irrespective of time period. The basis for comparative analysis is indeed flawed and therefore reduces the value of his arguments. This is because his thesis is limited and non-global, given the imperatives of the UN MDGs, globalization process and the sustainable development fundamentals. Partnership for development seems to be the current theme with global appeal. The view that external aid for Africa's development has, if anything exacerbates the macro-economic and development policies of the developing countries is a hard sell. The local NGOs must be able to solicit adequate funding to be able to detach themselves from the apron string of their Western counterparts, which is not an option.

Hendrickse's conclusion that Western funding undermines democracy and interferes with the governance of South Africa is warped and disjointed. He did not provide empirical evidence, nor prove beyond controversy. The arguments are more like propaganda and they fall below an academic base-point. International NGOs are voluntary agencies, perceived as geo-strategic organizations whose agenda and programmes are multi-focused. They are not multi-national companies and cannot be so perceived. The topic for this article should have read 'Unequal Partnership between the Northern and the Southern NGOs'. The title is rather a miss read.

E. Santam Links and J. De Gama (2002) article appears to be a meta-evaluation of investment possibilities open to Africa through Nepad. The article reflects a neo-liberal economic doctrine. Interestingly though, the emphasis on the development and investment constraints are central to the partnership and development themes as well as the upliftment of the downward trends of the domestic economies. The Nepad initiative has not been adequately dealt with in this article. The authors fail to apply social theory, which they appear to have started out with, to suggest further policy options either at the macro-or micro-levels as an alternative to the Nepad initiative. They rely on macro-economic recommendations with no emphasis on the micro-structures that could generate meaningful internal economic growth for the continent.

The article does not offer a critique on the political and socio-economic theories in tandem with Africa's development, but rather engages the contemporary thoughts to rationalize the economic opportunities that abound through Nepad. In other words, it is a thorough account of the prospects, which Nepad stands to generate for the African economy. The article deserves commendation, in its own right, as a contribution to the ongoing debate on the Nepad initiative.

Simon Maxwell and Karin Christiansen's, (2002) article under review has used analytical and descriptive approaches to strengthen their arguments, which do not appear paradoxical to Nepad. It successfully argues both, for and against, the concept of development partnership and by extension Nepad. The arguments appear plausible to the extent of the Rwandan recent political history and experience. It has dealt not sufficiently, though, with the crucial elements that may complicate the implementation process.

The article is unable to draw out the deterministic variables that could be conducive for partnership engagement, but it has cited types of partnership without, again, proposing any as a substitute for Africa in the age of globalization. It has not advanced any partnership theory as a framework of analysis to seal

their arguments. The crucial point to note is that for any development partnership to occur, attention must be paid, not only, to the palliative measures and the immediate needs, but also to the underlying conditions that could facilitate or militate against the implementation process as well as the direct implementation mechanisms. These are obvious value-laden elements in the implementation of the Nepad ideals.

The truth-value of their arguments, particularly on the overarching action plans of Nepad, which have successfully drawn in multiple stakeholders, cannot be over-emphasized. It is also true that the exigencies that prompted the genocide in Rwanda may not result in a similar magnitude of upheaval elsewhere on the continent, except if the authors mean to impress that there are no success stories in the continent. However, the article remains ambivalent to these issues and offers no propositions on how the partnership may achieve success.

Kurt Morais and Naidu Sanusha's (2002) article is a politically generated knowledge text, aimed at the 'quiet diplomacy' posturing of the South African government on Zimbabwe. The arguments are based on the fact that the quiet diplomacy of South Africa may not attract to Nepad the required assistance from the would-be partners. The article is parsimonious on advancing directions and alternative models, with which South Africa should pursue her sub-regional foreign policy objectives for the benefit of Nepad's implementation. The framework of analysis does not present insightful discussions on the interrelated paradigms of politics and socio-economic development disparities in the sub-region that have warranted Zimbabwe, South Africa, and AEF countries to behave the way they do taking cognizance of the partnership context of Nepad.

By arguing that Libya is ambitiously seeking a hegemonic role in Southern Africa is merely an inexorable tirade and declamation. It is preposterous, at least, in the context of Nepad, to presume the two countries that simultaneously are signatories to AU cannot work together as partners in the realization of the

Nepad's ideals. The import of this assertion is rather subjective. Does it purport to demonstrate that the two countries cannot negotiate in other ways in the breadth of their experiences, even for the sake of a political coalition, to maintain contact and minimal understanding, a role that remains essential and could increase in significance for Nepad?

Is the article saying: How can the differences between the two nations, if any, in the type and manner of their responses to Nepad change the rationale? The inverse seems equally relevant where South Africa's foreign policy on Zimbabwe remains essentially indeterminate and ambiguous. The remark that South Africa has the exclusive role in the implementation of Nepad rather than other member states is a hard sell, if the partnership context and the evolution of Nepad are properly understood. The article is well written and has tried to underscore the conservative viewpoints on the prospects of Nepad.

John Ohiorhenuan,'s (2002) article has provided some critical retrospections on the concept through which he identifies calabashes of challenges to Nepad. Amongst them are what he refers to as ambiguities and complexities of Nepad's conceptualization. The promotion, the implementation process, and the overall success of the Nepad's ideals would best be explained, and understood within the concepts of 'ambiguities' and 'complexities' identified by the author and on which the study has focused. It is only then that the issues that suffer exclusion and are glossed over would receive adequate attention.

The concept of APRM as a measure to instill the practice of good governance and strengthen democratic principles in Africa, which has largely been cited in debates and public discourses as impasse to Africa's development have received no mention in the article. The article uses no theoretical framework to further its arguments. It came away from the critically inherent conditions that could negatively impact the implementation process of the Nepad's ideals.

The article is a valuable resource to student of policy analysis and development, Nepad, AU secretariats, and African development scholars alike. The author writes with great lucidity and brings his breath of experience in development policy management to bear. He examines pointedly, both the complexity and ambiguity empirically and conceptually.

Schoeman, N.J., (2002) postulations on the policy incapacity, limited resources, in relation to the linkage of African economies to modern global economic systems remain insufficient and partially grounded. They could be supplemented by other considerations such as permanency of both policy barriers and institutional insulations that have increasingly led to high transaction costs in international trade, thereby constraining their ability to attract integration prospects in the global market. The specific features common in these economies that have hindered their capacity for expansion and export-driven are limited markets, overburdened policy environments, lack of endowment factors, a huge unskilled labour force and cost.

Economic liberalization, where it exists, has exposed domestic firms to competition from international trade. Expansion and integration prospects, which largely depend on their ability to forge links with international markets, establish distribution networks, market networking, are either in delinquency, depraved, or unstructured. All this taken into account at varied levels sufficiently negate expansion and merit them as location risk and provide the necessary opportunities for development partnership at various levels and increased participation of global businesses. The underside of the world economic arrangements, which reinforces the North-South divide, and perpetuates debt burden, impoverishes the marginalized and reconfigures the global economic power relations to lend credence to liberalization schemes, unfortunately falls outside the article's problematic.

Ben Turok (2002) argues that the issues of global stability, the effective functioning of the global markets and the management of the international financial crisis remain crucial to the global financial institutions but leave out the obvious issues of how to bring Africa into the mainstream of these systems. The problem with this otherwise well-written article, is that it avoids suggesting alternatives as the way forward for the Nepad's pundits. The arguments lose focus on the necessary conditions for the implementation of Nepad.

His conclusion that Nepad may lead to an increase in development aid to Africa appears less convincing and more controversial than what he seems to advocate. Would it not be expedient for Africa to begin to initiate self-reliant programmes than forever seeking aid for development from the G8 and the donor nations thereby recapitulate its initiative. The structural adjustment programmes of the eighties, which brought more hardship to the continent than anywhere else in history, are instructive. Africa should adopt its own aid mechanisms, capacity building measures, and institutions and built on them as a means to directly attract the necessary foreign direct investment and generate domestic investments climates to complement their efforts. Notwithstanding his positive assessment, he offers little of what is new or not obvious.

It is increasingly clear that globalization through economic liberalization neither guarantees that the benefits of free trade trickles down through societies, nor that political liberalisation secure economic stability, particularly in Africa. Turok (2002) has produced a careful study with implications for a wider debate on the concept of Nepad and the concept of partnership for Africa's development in the 21st century.

In another of his articles, Turok (2002) has revealed that Adebayo Adedeji had advocated for an African alternative framework for development and regional integration to strengthen the development aspirations of the continent. It is also true, that, his advocacy brought about the establishment of some of the sub-

regional integration groupings on the continent. All these African initiatives give meaning to development efforts.

In order to be able to understand the logic of the argument, it is pertinent to properly conceptualize regionalism, in the context of the geo-political arrangements, what regionalism is and what it is not. Regionalism and sub-regionalism differ in context and in concept. Geo-politically speaking, regions refer to the principal regions or continents of the world, while sub-region refers to the sub-geographical divides that make up a particular region. On the same token, regional and sub-regional integration differ. Regional integration refers to the integration of the entire continent, which has found expression in Organizations such as the African Union (AU) and the European Union (EU). Sub-regional integration refers to the integration of the units of the sub-geographical divides as Southern African Development Community (SADC) from the Southern Africa and Economic Community of West African Sates (ECOWAS) from West Africa, the Arab Magreb Union (AMU) from North Africa, and the East Africa Community (EAC) from East Africa. This distinction was avoided by Turok (2003), which confuses a deeper understanding of the comparative analysis between Adedeji's concepts and Nepad initiative. Again to liken Nepad to the pre-existing policy programmes, at this time, is an incorrect viewpoint. Nepad is a Pan-African concept, global, and with partnership characterization, this is the unique point of departure. It is a partnership-seeking initiative with a development diplomacy context, as against what old paradigms may have professed.

The essence of Nepad, among others, is on building a constructive partnership with industrialized and donor nations, taken at the recognition from the deep-rooted resource constraints and the significance of development partnership. It has also taken, the fact that for there to be meaningful development in Africa, the human capital base has to be developed, strengthened, and expanded. These fundamentals escape elucidation in a comparative context.

Vil-Nkomo's (2002) article has two contentions, that is, 'leadership for development' and the incorporation of 'exogenous conditions' for effective implementation of development programmes in Africa, Nepad inclusive. The argument on the leadership question, on the continent, and the challenges it poses for Africa's development remains not only factual and relevant but it is also a new paradigm in the broader context of Nepad's implementation. It is revealing of the leadership crisis; constantly inept institutions; mal-administration; bureaucratic inertia; often disarticulated political and socio-economic development policies and programmes that have traversed the continent. In some renderings, it has been argued that, African political leaderships should realize that the world owes Africa no less of a responsibility, than it owes itself.

The process, he argues, requires strategic approaches to systematically investigate the 'exogenous issues' across the spectrum, and move beyond the simplistic. The term, 'exogenous', coveys the notion that there are implicit impact factors or contingencies that are fundamental in the trajectory of the implementation process of the initiative, and to downplay them could vitiate the process.

The article has missed out the crucial point of the mechanism of implementation; neither does it seek to establish critical contingencies that may impact the process. The leadership question in Africa would have been equally grounded if contributory factors such as: monopoly of power, corruption, nepotism, ethnocentrism, injustices, poverty, and ethnic nationalism, which form the bane of the leadership crises on the continent, were also highlighted. The dependency theory principles weigh heavily against the advancement of the African society, as championed and in most cases propagated by the contemporary African political leaders. This has escaped a mention. Leadership is a critical factor in targeting policy for implementation. As far as the conceptualizations of Nepad remain obvious, the contributions made by Algeria remain significant which the article has not reflected.

This is a scholarly article written in high prose, and it deserves a wider audience. It has, by commission, set the framework for research on the concept of Nepad. It reveals the complexities and characteristics of leadership attributes for development in a society whose stereotypical international image rest on location risks, difficulties and failed opportunities.

Ian Taylor's (2003) article is arranged in a logical order and is written with expository prose and analysis. The arguments, though succinct, take the political dimensional analysis and seemingly deliberately miss the socio-economic imperatives equally crucial to Nepad. Although the goals of Nepad and the implementation mechanism have been mentioned, it has glossed over the factors that practically impact on the implementation process. The article is a major exposition in the interest of Nepad and corroborates the question asked by Sibusiso Vil-Nkomo (2003) whether or not Nepad will outlive its proponents, or diminishes with them after office? De Waal (2002) has also endorsed this contention. The arguments are certainly not wrong in term of their context. The upshot of this paradigmatic argument bears the trappings of policy development and by extension policy implementation. Targeting impact factors ought to serve as a critical index in implementation process of development policy of Nepad.

Kuye's (2003) article embodies a focus on targeting policy as a means to the implementation of the development policy programme of Nepad. Nepad has, as its objectives eradication of poverty and diseases, to embark on political renewal and socio-economic regeneration of Africa. Development, in this context, is the effective harmonization and management of social, political and economic resources to transform the continent. Policy-targeting, therefore, becomes an indispensable option of choice for these complex tasks.

This, in part, is drawn from the need for strategic policy decision by government and Nepad to create legitimacy and subordination. On the other hand, what belies the context variable of this paradigm is the patchy policy environment,

weak institutional capacity, poor implementation environment, and limited resources pervading the continent. The continent has continued to struggle with development policy implementation over the years. Kuye (2003) is insightful in terms of the public administration variable when he captures the adaptation of public administration principles to Nepad and the AU implementation domains, to meet Africa's development targets. Contrary to the author's expectation, a supranational organ such as the AU, with political and bureaucratic dominance, over the continent, has not been influential, cohesive, and thus remains essentially subjunctive. In the context of the article and policy development, the converse should have been the case, if the truth-value is to become the prescription. So far no national development policy has enjoyed the articulation of the AU. The basis for Nepad, and AU, to deal with the problem of development through targeting methodology appears the *sin qua non*.

The contentions in the monograph, nonetheless, point out the need for further refinement and application of a methodology, for example, policy targeting for Nepad, given the internal policy dynamics in Africa. The time is ripe to decide how well patterned methodological approaches can be used in relation to the implementation of development policies particularly the supra-nationalistic policy for effective results. Kuye's (2003) proposition will be of immense benefit, to both, Nepad and the AU, in their onerous task of Africa's development. However, the author has refrained from faulting African political leaderships, poor governance, and disarticulated development policy implementation processes as the root causes of the strangulation of African efforts with development. It is worthy to note that, targeting for implementation is an evolving process. The monograph brilliantly fulfils its aims in terms of specificity in conceptualizing public administration principles in relation to Africa's development policies as a methodological approach in their implementation. The analysis is intellectually rigorous, detailed, incisive and objective. It is therefore audacious, timely, and exemplary for Nepad.

3. 6 Regional Development Initiatives: International Experiences

The critical points of note here are that Nepad, and its implementation process are still evolving and the concept of 'development' is not absolute but relative. It is important to begin by stating what this sub-topic purports to do before indicating what it tries not to do. First, the fact that Nepad is upon Africa today means that, it trades among the other pre-existing regional development programmes. This, therefore, compels comparative studies. This sub-topic, therefore, seeks to do a comparative analysis of regional development initiatives in five regions namely, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Latin America, South East Asia / Asia Pacific and Africa before the advent of Nepad. This is with a view to draw, in comparative terms, the similarities in politics of evolution, their aims and objectives and the implementation processes where applicable *vis-à-vis* Nepad.

Second, the sub-topic does not seek to offer an all inclusive narrative of the selected development trends around the world, nor offer a log of all the broad spectra of institutional functions, interaction, and the systematic account of all policy domains wherein involved. This is because the imperatives of development vary from one regional context to another. As a consequence, different regions evolve different development paradigms and strategies to meet their unique regional aims and aspirations. This induces the type and quality of policy and implementation styles, given the fact that, regional development initiatives appear in a variety of characters and the surge for them even more.

The significance here is to offer a comparative study of the trends of regional development programmes in concrete terms, specifically on the political, socio-economic development programmes and reforms, through regional institutional arrangements. It is intended to cull, and tell apart, those variables that are seemingly useful and could assist in providing some pointers towards development oriented implementation strategy, with Nepad as the comparator.

Be that as it may, the concept of regional development remains fundamental in all the contexts.

A comparative analysis strives to reflect the imperatives of development in the respective regions, that is, the conditions that necessitate the surge for regional development policy initiatives with regard to the need to improve their societies. Development imperatives are more complex in character, scope, obfuscated in tasks, rigorous in implementation over time, than could possibly be wished away in every region.

The pursuit of development through regional policy programmes and mechanisms could easily be traced to:

- Internal socio-economic and political constraints.
- The need to improve their societies.
- Consideration for relevance, pro-active and sustained participation at the regional and international socio-political and economic arrangements.
- Security concerns and Influence seeking. (Source: compile by author).

These impermanent conditions dictate activities that underscore the evolution of regional development policy initiatives. The objectives and the leverages available to policymakers vary considerably among the regions including Africa. The unique conditions have led the respective regions, from the then USSR, Western Europe, South East Asia/Pacific, and Latin America and Africa, to develop one form of development initiative or the other. These different forms of regional programmes are enumerated and discussed below.

3. 6.1 Development Initiatives in USSR/ Warsaw Pact Countries

There were two varying reformation programmes initiated in the late 1980s in the then Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), under Gobachev's administration, namely *Glasnot* and *Perestroika*. They were essentially designed

to restructure the political and socio-economic systems of not only the USSR but also the Warsaw Pact countries, and the satellite socialist states around the world, in an incremental pace.

3. 6. 1. 1 Glasnot

Glasnot was initiated against the backdrop of the closed Soviet State practices controlled by the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Glasnot meant a regional development policy programme that sought an open and free society, where respect for Human Rights and relations between the government and its own citizens are enhanced for the benefit of both. Cohen and Wilson (1990) have argued that, 'Glasnot campaign began its lethargic progress in 1986 to address the plethora of social problems, misdeed, and increasing state failures to meet its obligations. This was easily acceptable to the populace, the Soviet intelligentia, and the media. Under this initiative, state victims of Stalinism had to be rehabilitated. It even extended to foreign policy and international economic policy advocated by Edward Shevardnadze, the then Foreign Minister, in 1987 and a member of the politburo. This led to the gradual ease in the East / West confrontation, downgraded East / West support for the third world liberation movements, pacification of the global theatre and the Euro-theatre, preponderance advantages were also reduced' (Cohen & Wilson, 1990:65).

It was an era for a new beginning that was hoped to decentralize and remove restrictive laws and restraints to advance an open society. Glasnot was introduced to eradicate cumulatively, the millions of denied or controlled human contacts, even within its own people and the rest of the world. The central characteristics of the initiative were freedom of movement, life and laws of the Soviet Union and its people, secular worship and labour movements as substitutes.

Glasnot was a pilot reform scheme and an experiment at the national and regional levels to generate certain dynamism needed for furthering development initiatives. Manning and Parison (2004) have argued that, 'this required that the central reform team and governments be willing and able to generate incentives within the system for 'national' and 'regional ' units to participate actively and willingly in a broad range of pilot reform activities and experiments' (Manning & Parison, 2004:58).

It could be argued that the increasing internal pressures on the system for change, in order to raise and achieve citizens' restiveness for expectations of, and demand for a better life, goods and services, generated the key issues for the reform measures. To premise this argument, Manning and Parison affirm that, in this respect, it will be important that the reform team be able to publicize widely and effectively the best practice performance and service levels and standards achieved in the most successful experiments and pilots. (Ibid.:59).

3. 6.1. 2 Perestroika

Perestroika was the twin concept to Glasnot, introduced simultaneously. It meant: a gradual or phased reformation and restructuring of the pre-existing economic and political structures and institutions, on the one hand, and the internationalization of both the political and economic systems, inclusive of the Soviet societies to embrace Western type structures, institutions, cultures and values, on the on the other.

On the political front, political pluralism made an ascent. That meant the organization of free and fair elections and the emergence of other multi-party dispensations against the mono-central party system, that had been in place for 70 or so years, coupled with the introduction of economic liberalization, such as: market reforms, private property ownership, and various privatization programmes. It presupposed freedom of speech and freedom of association, a

one person one vote democratic principle, the holding of free and fair elections for a representative and participatory system of government. Although there may have been some peculiarities akin to the emerging democracies in comparison to the existing models of democratic transition, it implied a grand shift from the communist styled government that had been the experience, and therefore differed in both point of departure and swiftness. Perestroika was a gradual widening of universal suffrage for the new democracies to learn basic practices and principles of Western-style democracy.

On the economic sphere of Perestroika, Balcerowicz (1995) has argued that, 'the post 1989 economic reforms in Eastern-Central Europe are fundamentally different from those in the past in that they go beyond socialism, as defined by the overwhelming dominance of the state sector economy. The privatization process in Russia best illustrates (this fundamental change). The general direction of present Eastern-Central European economic transition is therefore, basically in line with the economic reforms elsewhere; less state, more private enterprise and market' (Balcerowicz, 1995:147). 'This sequence particularly in the economy of the socialist nations, implied that market-oriented reforms, which must be exceptionally comprehensive because of the socialist economic legacy, have to be introduced under democratic or at least pluralistic, political arrangements' (Balcerowicz, 1995:146). These changes were as the result of negotiated changes given the authoritarian regimes, which invariably failed to generate or promote rapid economic growth and ultimately economic development, which had disastrous effects on their political and economic systems.

Before the campaign for these multi-faceted themes began, 'the Soviet economy had faced a deplorable recession. The resultant decline in the heavy industrial complex and technology, retreat in labour productivity, deterioration in infrastructure, a primitive and centrally controlled economy, stagflation, rising cost of sustaining subsidy of the Soviet empires, and the high cost of the national

defence complex had become common place'. (Ibid.:148).

The implementation process became cumbersome and patchy due to complexities and contingencies that were unintended. Richard and Wilson argue that, 'indeed the obstacles to future success created by the elements of the program itself had forced a substantial retreat in the implementation of its principal features' (Richard & Wilson, 1990:57). These experiences were true of the Eastern European bloc (Warsaw Pact and other satellite nations, for example, Cuba). The context played out through the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), as Moscow exerted greater pressure on the allies to take remedial economic measures aimed at high cost burden reduction that USSR had previously absorbed on their behalf.

In order to provide a support base for the national security sector, the need to remain relevant in the quest for future high politics, future technology strategic environment, a liberalized market economy and the concerns for high workforce skills seemingly became the ultimate strategic goals for the restructuring and the reformation (development) that informed the initiatives of perestroika and glasnot, at least as perceived by the soviet leadership at the time. It could be argued that the 'development' context in the USSR and the eastern bloc meant the reforms and the restructuring of the socialist/communist system, structures, and institutions that held hegemonic sway in the political and the socio-economic underdevelopment of the society and the lives of the populace. Regional development context here, had assumed unique development imperatives by implication.

3. 6. 2 Development Initiatives in Western Europe

On May 9, 1950, Robert Schuman, Foreign Minister of France declared 'it is no longer the moment for vain words, but for a bold act - a constructive act. With these words, the offer to Federal Republic of Germany specifically and to any

other European state that so wished, the idea of pooling its resources of Coal and Steel into a European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), had been launched (Monnet, 1978:304; McAllister,1975:177), quoted in McAllister, (1997: 11). Unbeknown to anyone at the time, 'this was to become the first of three 'European Communities' - European Economic Community (EEC), the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom)'. (Ibid.:12).

The declaration and assertion for the launch of the European Co-operation followed. The needs and aspirations of these reform initiatives were essentially dictated at the time by the perceptions in Europe of collective security for Western Europe (to wade off geo-strategic tensions that became prevalent and diffused the European societies), affording assistance to each other, and resisting the policy of aggression against each other. The starting point was the general common market for the member states. This was to gain some influence and transformation of the political relations of the member states. (Ibid.:26).

The EEC started with six countries, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy, The Netherlands and Luxembourg, as the founding members. It expanded to twelve member states, which subordinated to the central authority of the EEC certain areas of their political authorities. The economic dimension of the EEC focused on the elimination of trade barriers between the member states; development of a common tariff for imports from abroad and the creation of a common policy for managing and supporting agriculture. The new Treaty that brought about the launch of EEC, provided for the supranational status of EEC as the economic integration progressed and strengthened each member national government greater role in the initiative than had the earlier (ECSC) treaty (Funk & Wall Encyclopedia, 1988:443-447).

The European Economic Community (EEC) emerged as a supra-national institutional development arrangement for the Western European integration and

unification. The EEC is commonly referred to as the 'common market'. It did not ascend to the Western European political union as rapidly as its interlocutors and promoters had envisaged. It became a European Community composed of, what were previously, three separate organizations: the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) created in 1951; the European Economic Community (EEC); the European Atomic Energy Community [Euratom], the last two were established in 1957. In 1968, the acronym EEC was dropped for European Community (EC) as a process to fashion a new development thinking that would address the impasse of membership, common goals, and aspirations of the member states. The sole purpose of the formation was the need for reformation of development policy initiatives for restructuring Western Europe in order to meet the political and the socioeconomic exigencies of the time.

The process of consolidation for the European Economic Community (EEC) brought into focus the need for Atlantic Alliance involving the United States of America (USA). This alliance, in other words, was partnership seeking for the special mutual interest in collective security and trade, the essential elements in development partnership and the subsequent proclamation by President Kennedy's ''Grand Design'' for the USA - European interdependence (Ibid.:26). Thus the EEC was born in Rome on 25 March 1957, but only came into effect in January 1958.

Costa and Magnette (2003) have argued that, 'external constraints played a major role in the formation and consolidation of these agreements. The original context of the 'Cold War', American incentives to further economic co-operation and the political will of the European leaders to contain risks of contagion from the socialist revolution, all these factors greatly contributed to the making of durable relations' (Costa & Magnette, 2003:8).

The two authors further argue that, 'sometime later, 'exogenous shocks' encouraged the adoption of new agreements - for example, the new awareness

of economic interdependence and the loss of international competitiveness in the 1980s; the fall of the Berlin Wall and the spreading of the suppose threats (nuclear proliferation, crime, immigration and so on) in the early 1990s; financial speculation on the occasion of the debate on monetary union; international terrorism in the context of enhanced judicial cooperation'. (Ibid.:9). Seeking a counterbalance against centrifugal impacts of externalities on Western Europe at the time necessitated the adoption of new policy goals, objectives, amendments and reforms.

The regional problems, such as the imminent political fragmentation, instability, the need to re-order Western European nations for development void of tension, the changing nature of conflicts in Europe and the need for their mitigation played crucial roles in the formation of a successor union - the EC. Although the membership of the EC was staggered, other vital developments did occur. Besides the quarterly summits, direct elections for the European parliament, institution of European Monetary System that aims to provide some balancing in the currencies of the member states, the decisions to exempt all international economic barriers within EC within a certain time period, and the provision for membership enlargement had been all in the process of implementing the policy goals for the continued development efforts of Europe.

The EC was mandated to administer the statutory EC laws, policies, and regulations that largely were in the interest of the member states and therefore its critical regulatory roles and powers to administer the statutes. In addition, the Commission initiated policies of general nature and served as the protector of the member nations' interests, which at the same time had complimentary role to initiate policies, especially at the Summit level.

Over time, there have been both internal and external factors that have influenced policy reforms, policy decisions, implementation process, and policy agenda of the Community. This has led to subsequent amendment to the

founding treaties - the merger of Commissions of Euratom and ECSC that led to the emergence of the EEC. One of the measures to strengthen the response capacity of Western Europe to the series of the contemporary international conditions, events, and their aspirations, culminated in the Maastricht Treaty of 1992, which changed EC to the now European Union [EU]. This marked a symbolic step towards yet a new epoch in European integration paradigm as the urgent need to evolve new response initiatives to their contemporary needs and aspirations. The EU deals with new and wider scale of policy reforms as well as providing institutional mechanisms for effective implementation of the policy objectives. The EU effectively replaced EC in 1997 based on three pillars:

- The European Communities.
- A common foreign and security policy (CFSP).
- Cooperation in the fields of justice and home affairs (JHA).

(Nugent, 1999:67).

Indeed, exogenous shocks, integration for Western Europe, collective security, which marked the political and socio-economic imperatives for development, and partnership with U.S.A., became the critical imperatives for the regional development initiatives in Western Europe. It could be argued that these elements constituted the central development imperatives for Western European to seek reforms and development.

3. 6. 3 Development Initiatives in South East Asia / Pacific

The Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), and the Association of the South East Asian Nations [ASEAN] are the two major economic and political Association / Programme, among others, in the region. The purpose for APEC and ASEAN initiatives is for the economic development and integration of the nations in the region. They were also conceptualized as development initiatives, which have drawn the attention of this study.

The Bangkok Declaration of August 1967 saw the emergence of ASEAN, when a solemn document was signed into effect.   It was a replacement for the Association of South East Asia [ASEA] formed in the early 1960s. The basic goals of the association include:

- Acceleration of economic growth, social progress and cultural development through joint efforts in the spirit of equality and partnership.
- Provision of mutual assistance in training and research facilities in the educational professional, technical, and administrative fields.
- Promotion of political stability in South East Asia.
- The development of close links with other international and regional organization with similar aims.

 (Schiavone, 1997:38).

The organization exists within new line of framework of economic co-operation and development with a view to effect greater utilization of opportunities with the rest of the world including similar associations within, and around the region. The association has as its objectives to enunciate policies, set guidelines for the development of the regional co-ordination and co-operation in areas of specific interest with other international and regional organizations.

The promising area of cooperation is 'the association tie with the European Union [EU] Schiavone'. (1997:67). A renewable five-year cooperation agreement, strengthening trade relations and increasing joint action in scientific and agricultural spheres have been entered into in a formal contract partnership. This is with the aim of engagement through the initiative to encourage European investment in the region, identify joint industrial projects and facilitation of access into ASEAN markets. The ASEAN and the EU have participated in areas of their felt needs (increased trade and drug trafficking, promotion of private sector) in both regions for mutual benefit. Other area in which partnership has blossomed is the link made between trade, economic agreements, with social and Human Rights issues.

Not only did a contractual partnership exist between the ASEAN and the EU, it has effective relations with what Schiavone calls 'dialogue partners' comprising USA, Canada, Australia, Japan, Korea, and New Zealand. The ASEAN has consultative contact with China, which later became a member. It has drawn unto itself an ASEAN identity and ownership of all its activities, taking serious positions in regional and global contending issues, pressing home their demands for consideration in favour of their objectives.

However, the end of communism created a fresh dimension for key development in term of economic issue and regional integration and cooperation with member states and non-member states. As an effort to strengthen and promote economic and trade cooperation, a Basic Agreement and the Establishment of Preferential Trading Arrangement (PTA) were entered into which provided a framework for gradual tariff reductions. On the political level, two vital treaties, the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation established:

- The principles of mutual respect for the independence and sovereignty of all nations;
- Non-interference in the internal affairs;
- Peaceful settlement of disputes; and
- Effective cooperation.

(Schiavone, 1997:33).

3. 6. 4 Development Initiatives in Latin America

Among the several economic development arrangements that abound in Latin America, the one that is of relevance to this study is the Latin American Integration Association [LAIA] otherwise known as Aisociacion Latinoamericana de Integracion [ALADI], a successor to Latin America Free Trade Association [LAFTA]. The Treaty of Montevideo, Uruguay brought into effect in 1980 LAIA. It is made of eleven Latin American founder nations - Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Columbia, Ecuador, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuala

(The Europa Directory of International Organisations,1999:363).

The various commitments under the LAFTA Treaty had been reviewed and that led to the birth of LAIA. At the same time new resolutions with a broader and more flexible nature for the re-organisation, update structure, and mechanisms came on board for integration schemes. The LAFTA Treaty had a vision to establish, within a 12-year period, free trade zones, by progressive elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers, which had proved difficult to implement (The Europa Directory of International Organisations,1999:363); (Sciavone ,1997:188).

The complementation agreements in specific areas of economies of the member states failed to reinforce subsequent policies meant for greater cooperation and industrial integration. In the financial sphere, a common regional bank was established as a sign of cooperation on common financial instruments, it failed to materialize. Following the remarkable failures that accompanied LAFTA protocols, on basic issues and widespread disappointment over the lack of concrete perspectives, LAIA was signed into effect in March 1981. Membership was open to all Latin American countries. Presently there are some member countries with permanent observer status from Latin America, Europe, and Asia, five international agencies: UN Economic Commission for Latin American and the Caribbean Countries (UNECLAC), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), European Union (EU), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), and the Organization of American States (OAS). (The Europa Directory of International Organizations, 1999:363).

The aims of the association, among others, are to pursue a long-term common market by establishing sectors of economic preferences. The association was to serve as an economic bulwark to less developed nations in the region and to enunciate partial agreements among member nations in economic, trade, and industrial complementation, agriculture and livestock, and export promotion. All these objectives are to be targeted, bearing in mind, a set of basic principles

such as differential treatment to the members who are categorized according to their respective economic strength, grouped into three divisions - most developed, Argentina, Brazil, Mexico; intermediate, Chile, Colombia, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela; and least developed, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Paraguay (Sciavone,19997:189).

Central to the association are the activities of coordinating and co-operating with other countries and their economic groupings especially in Latin America with the conception of Latin American preference on tariff and negotiations of the partial scope agreements. The important framework of the association is the promotion of bilateral and multilateral agreements in economic and financial sectors. All the objectives and activities of the association are aimed at strengthening inter-regional economic integration and cooperation for implicit economic growth and development of the region. The challenges confronting the association are the proliferation of sub-regional arrangements with multiplicity of membership and duplication of functions and activities, which ultimately imperil the implementation process (Ibid.:189).

3. 6. 5 Development Initiatives in Africa

Africa has not experienced a typical regional development policy initiative in the truest and functional terms at the scale, scope, and context that have occurred in the afore-mentioned regions. This could be attributed arguably to three major reasons:

- The late attainment of independence and self determination;
- Lack of development oriented vision, visioning, and aspiration by the African political leadership;
- Diminutive capacities and resources (human and capital), political conflict. (Source: compile by author).

However, few attempts for the development and economic integration were initiated through UNECA in the mid 1970s to late 1980s. These were parallel initiatives at seeking alternative measures to the IMF and the WB generated development programmes - SAPs for the third-world countries including those in Africa, that resulted in the deepening and perpetuating economic crises, political instability and social fragmentation on the continent. The pre-existing programmes such as the Revised Framework of Principles for the Implementation of the New International Order in Africa; Intellectual Foundation for the Lagos Plan of Action for the Economic Development of Africa, 1989-2000, all were undertaken by the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) under Adebayo Adedeji, from the 1970's through to the 1980's. Against the background of the structural adjustment programme, other development plans initiated by UNECA were, The African Alternative Framework to Structural Adjustment Programmes for Socio-economic Recovery and Transformation (AAF-SAP).

These were embarked upon to begin the process of stimulating sub-regional economic growth and socio-politico stabilization for the respective sub-regions on the continent. These programmes formed the origin of the sub-regional economic communities. Examples are: the Economic Community of West African States [ECOWAS], East African Community (EAC), Magreb Arab Union (MAU), Economic Community of the Great Lakes Countries (ECGLC), Southern Africa Development Community (SADC). (Ohiorhenuan, 2002); Turok , 2002).

The translation of these initiatives and ultimately their objectives suffered set-backs and experienced limitations. The challenges that impeded the actualization and the subsequent attainment of their objectives, it could be argued were:

- The de-colonization imperatives and the delusion of self-determination;
- Lack of institutional capacity and institutionalized structure as implementation mechanism;
- The tinge question of ownership;

- Projects' activities were down and thus distant, and charting a course of action remained essentially problematic. (Source: compile by author).

3. 7 Traditional Theories of Integration

The concept of integration is best understood when implications of theoretical frameworks of integration are utilized and placed in context as the basis for constructive explanation of the concept. Integration concept bears national, sub-regional, and regional contexts, which have acquired distinctive application variables, teleology, and heuristics. Integration as in development is not an event but a process. Before delving into the theoretical constructs that are traditionally in use to rationalize the concept, it is worthy to explicate the paradigmatic turns of some contending perspectives.

Integration could be classified into both political and economic patterns with theoretical frameworks. This is informed by the contextual and conceptual paradigms of the concept. The theories that are reflected here bear implications to the context in which they are being adopted in the study. The theoretical approaches are 'functional' and 'development' integration approaches.

3. 7. 1 Functional Integration Approach

This approach is also known as integration through project coordination. It is premised on the view that 'underdevelopment production structures and infrastructures and infrastructural deficiencies constitute major barriers both to regional trade and to integration in the 'Third World' regions. It therefore proposes co-operation in the formulation and execution of joint projects in infrastructure and production in order to remove immediate barriers to regional trade' (Cheru, 2002:125). Cheru (2002) has countered the theory by arguing that, '…although project coordination, …has tremendous impact on trade, such a strategy can only become fruitful when enabling macroeconomic policies are in

place, supported by strong government commitment to harmonize policies across frontiers'. (Ibid.:126).

Functional integration theory's significant contribution to the understanding of the dynamics in economic integration has been a scholarly account of the capacity of factors of production - infrastructure and structures. These factors are of critical consequence in any pattern of economic integration arrangements. But the theory has not recreated the concept of integration useful in scholarship. It follows then that structures and infrastructures agglomeration, as stressed would constantly require periodic upgrading and provision, which is something in the nature of flux and, therefore, constantly under threat to diminish in a patchy policy enforcement environment as Africa, even at the national, sub-regional, and regional levels.

This scenario would discourage integration where these factors of production are dysfunctional. The theory blurs the distinction between the methodologies in integration process, which is a critical commonality of the process. There is not a clear set heterogeneous criterion for integration, especially in Africa. This would mean that the continent might not seek continental integration. It is also restrictive, in that other forms of integration such as military for regional peace and security have been subsumed in the espouse. The theory, as a consequence, is limited in context, having an overemphasis on efficient production, structures, and infrastructures. It does not suggest how best the imbalance could be corrected and streamlined for economic strength in order to provide the infrastructures where they do not exists, and in order to expand the frontiers of integration.

3. 7. 2 Development Integration Approach

Unlike the functional integration approach, the development integration approach stresses the need for both macro-coordination in a multi-sectoral programme, embracing production, infrastructure, and trade. It stressed the need for close political cooperation at an early stage of the integration process in contrast to the market integration approach; it seemingly stresses the need for the equitably balanced distribution of the dividends of integration. It argues that, 'trade liberalization measures should be oriented particularly towards the least developed member countries. It therefore saw a need for trade integration to be complemented by efforts to promote coordinated regional industrial development and for regional funds or banks to be established to give priority to the least developed members. It has granted less developed members greater preference in access to regional markets and facilities, a longer period to reduce tariffs, and some co-ordination of macro-policies to be achieved at an early stage, particularly in relation to fiscal incentives for investment' (Cheru, 2002:126).

The development integration approach has drawn criticism from a number of different perspectives. Supporters of *laissez-faire* approaches have critiqued the approach for its emphasis on political cooperation and state-directed approach. Skepticisms have been leveled on the grounds that the high level of political cooperation required is difficult to achieve in practice. Attempts to implement such programmes have been beset with practical problems of implementation (Cheru, 2002:126).

The approach precludes political integration as a complementary development paradigm, while it tries to approximate its context as the mono-thesis to integration. Development integration could be impossible to attain in the absence of political will and commitment (both critical clichés) of the integrating members, particularly at a supra-national level. The absence of these clichés leaves the converging pattern for integration towards narrowcasting, regional fragmentation

and underdevelopment. The emphasis on production, infrastructures and trade as crucial for integration, places its paradigm in the same context with the Functional Integration school of thought. It, therefore, offers nothing new.

3. 7. 3 Competing Paradigms of the Integration Concept

Integration appears in a bi-contextual pattern of 'political' and 'economic' paradigms. In this study integration is conceptualized as an essential trend of comprehensive development approach for society, which evolves through the convergence of quantitative economic growth and qualitative structural changes of the economies and the political reconfiguration of institutions of the integrating members to achieve set targets. This is predicated on the contention that integration is ultimately society and people driven.

3. 7. 4 Political Integration

Political integration is a political framework arrangement with intergovernmental relations, which in character and statutes, does not pursue and articulate a super-state approach, which is receptive to the participation by interested member states Makgetlaneng (2003), argues that '… political integration is the basis upon which the socioeconomic, financial and trade relations of … countries will become interlinked' (Makgetlaneng, 2003:1). The thesis of the concept, if it is political, is that of respect for national sovereignty, equality of states before international law, principle of non-interference in the domestic affairs of another. Equally critical in this arrangement is the political stability of both the integrating states in particular and the sub-region in general.

At the political level the integrating members are expected to pool together, under agreement, their political resources and comparative advantages with a view to forging internal strategic interests at a much higher scale to the centre for mutual benefits. The underlying theme of political integration is the subordination

of tasks that have previously enjoyed exclusivity by the integrating members, which thereafter are executed by the integration mechanism. In other words, this means a fundamental change in the integrating region to foster political stability.

In Africa, what occurred was a loose political integration that brought the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) into effect in 1963. Political integration took precedence over economic integration in the post 1960s. The focus then had been to extricate the continent from all vestiges of colonialism, as a result economic integration received less and less attention. The maxim at the period seemed to have been 'political freedom without economic emancipation is more meaningful.

3. 7. 5 Economic Integration

Economic integration, according to Davis (1992), refers to a process in which the economies of individual states are merged (in whole or in part) into a single regional entity. Economic cooperation, on the other hand, is a much more open-ended concept referring to a range of situations in which individual states share or make available to each other resources, technology or expertise, collaborate in joint projects, or act together in external economic relations. Such cooperation may or may not be undertaken with the aim of promoting economic integration' quoted in Cheru, (2002:123).

Economic integration is 'characterized by a fundamental shift from donor aid to trade as a means of cooperation and a focus on commercial links with mutual benefits. It constitutes a fundamental shift from politically motivated agreements to those driven by socio-economic interest' (Makgetlaneng, 2003:38). Economic integration also means expression in terms of subordination of regional trade and arrangements to the World Trade Organization (WTO). (Ibid.:38). It is a process aimed at sub-regional economic stabilization for the integrating members.

Abolin has argued that 'macroeconomic stabilization is directed to overcome economic crisis and, it is linked with the implementation of some structural economic measures and formulation of new economic relations. Measures for economic stabilization include a number of important factors among which are broad participation in decision-making, maintenance of equity and justice, creating a favourable investment climate, facilitation of access to opportunities for all' (Abolin, 1999:3). This argument has offered an un-eclectic rendering of an economic integration paradigm.

It is not yet recorded by any study on 'integration', that has claimed the embrace of both perspectives simultaneously. The European Union (EU), that is experiencing problematic political integration, the dream of its initiators, serves as a clear example. Economic integration could precede a political integration or vice versa. Economic integration is essentially concerned with pooling of economic resources, the gradual elimination of individual national barriers to trade and market for the common good. It also means seeking to generate the gross national product (GNP) along side the stimulation of economic growth. This is with the sole objective of promoting the material well-being and material conditions of the populace.

3. 8   The Organisation of African Unity (OAU)

The African realities - primordial problems, and the attainment of independence in South East Asia after the Second World War, set the stage for agitation for self-determination in Africa, which was largely under colonial rule, with the exception of Liberia and Ethiopia. The agitation was a major attempt to establish a strong political front for the de-colonization process on the continent. As a result, two major groups emerged - the Casablanca and the Monrovia groups, in the pursuit of a common cause. The activities initiated by the two groups led to Africa's political integration at the regional level at the attainment of political independence with the establishment of the OAU.

3. 8. 1 Formation

A Charter was drafted in 1958 by Ghana and Guinea and later joined by Mali, which was the basis of a Union of African States and led to the Conference held in Casablanca, Morocco in January 1961. (The Europa Directory of International Organizations, 1997:400). This was later to become the *Casablanca* group. Franco-phone African countries held another Conference in Tananarive between 1961 and 1962. These conferences led to the ratification in September 1961, of a Charter establishing the *Union Africaine et malgache*, that later became the *Organisation Commune Africaine et Maurcienne* (OCAM). In the same period a conference was held in Monrovia, Liberia and was attended by 19 heads of state and government and in Lagos, Nigeria in January 1962 with a permanent secretariat and a standing committee. (Ibid.:400). At this conference a draft Charter for the organization of inter-African and Malagasy states was accepted.

A conference was convened in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia in May 1963. This conference brought about the merger of the three groups under one umbrella, despite geographical spread, religious inclinations, political orientation, and linguistic differences. The Heads of State conference on 23 May 1963 drew up the charter of the OAU, signed into effect by 30 countries on 25 May 1963. The charter emerged as a compromise between the concept of loose association of states, favoured by the Monrovia Group, and the federal idea supported by the Casablanca Group. (Ibid.:400).

3. 8. 2 The OAU as the Old Paradigm of Africa's Integration

The formation of the OAU was a tactical move by African leaders who had already attained independence, to have a common front to seek self-determination in the form of a de-colonization process, to rid the continent of the vestiges of colonialism. Hargreaves has argued that, 'The position of the African political leaders that Africa was a victim of, and not masters of their own destinies

spurred the movements against the colonial powers. Consequently, the Charter reflected: (a) creation of an organization of African states; (b) cooperation among African states in the following fields, economic and social, education, culture and science, collective defence; (c) de-colonization; (d) creation of a permanent conciliation commission; and (e) Africa and the United Nations' (Hargreaves, 1996:219). Hargreaves further explains that Organization of African Unity (OAU), established in Addis Ababa on May 1963, was a practical attempt to find means by which thirty-two African governments of very different inclinations and capacities might continue the struggle for continental decolonisation …'. (Hargreaves, 1996:219).

The leading principles of the OAU, as defined in Article 111, of its Charter were the sovereign equality of all states; non-interference in internal affairs, and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each state, and for its inalienable rights to independent existence. Article 11 of the Charter proclaimed, among others, eradication of all forms of colonialism from Africa; and in the General Assembly of the United Nations and the Special Committee on Decolonisation, it established in 1961, the African group that could exercise influence by virtue of numbers unrelated to the strength of individual states (Hargreaves, 1996:219). Ochieng argues that, 'the idea of unification of Africa originated during the colonial struggle and was mainly associated with the late Kwame Nkrumah who said we are looking forward to solving our problems but this can be only achieved through unification of African States' (Ochieng, 1999: 91).

3. 8. 3 The African Union (AU)

The end of the cold war in the late 1980s, the globalization phenomenon, the United Nations new millennium development goals in 2000, and the dominance of the concept of sustainable development, markedly influenced the beginning of a new era of political integration in Africa. The basic principles that informed the

formation of the OAU, and the urgency to recapture and propagate the relevance of the African integration, in a new context of the world order, and its new realities led to the formation of AU. This had been precipitated on the need for a re-conceptualization of a continental organ to reposition and drive changes in the political, economic, and social spheres of Africa's regional life, in line with the dictates of the contemporary global development-oriented thinking. In addition, Usov has argued that the victory of African National Congress in 1994 democratic elections in South Africa resulted in some exhaustion of objectives of the OAU, mainly political-oriented organization, emphasizing anti-colonial pathos' (Usov, 2002: 29).

3. 8. 3. 1 Formation.

In May 2001 the Constitutive Act of the African Union [AU] came into effect. In July 2002 the AU became fully operational, replacing the OAU. As argued by Kongwa, 'the challenges of globalization and Africa's marginalization from the global economy have been the main motivating factors in prompting African leaders, at the Summit in July 2001 held in Lusaka, to replace the Organization of African Unity with the African Union in a bid for greater economic, political and institutional integration for the continent' (Kongwa, 2002:13).

3. 8. 3. 2 The AU as the New Paradigm of Africa's Integration

At the emergence of globalization and the end of the cold war, the context of Africa's integration and development had shifted from the pursuit of de-colonization, self-determination, and ideological inclination, to sub-regional socioeconomic integration and to regional development and growth. This took a proclamation to eradicate perennial poverty, political instability, economic crises, social fragmentation, and diseases and substitute them with the ideals of good political and economic governance, democratic principles, and strengthening of institutions in pursuit of economic growth and comprehensive development. To

carry out these tasks, certain development denominators and enunciations began continent-wide. Nepad emerged as a result. It has come to represent the regional fulcrum to address at a broader context, the development imperatives of the continent.

 The Constitutivte Act of the AU contains some new rules aimed at the promotion of political responsibility of African leaders. The AU, in accordance with its principles, reserves right of intervention in a member state where cases of grave circumstances namely war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity take place. Governments that should come to power through unconstitutional means are not allowed to participate in the activities of the Union (AU Constitutive Acts, Article 4, Principles h, and p).

On the creation of the AU, Usov argues that, 'the creation of the AU could be seen as a next stage in the development of both concepts and practice of African integration. Working out a common position of African countries, which face globalization's challenges, is another side of such approach' (Usov, 2003:29).

Similarly, Kongwa contends that '… there is much promise in that the series of organs established, … are expected to provide opportunities and platform for African governments, the civil society, the private sector, and the international community to work together in addressing the African challenges posed by poverty, debt burdens, disease and conflict' (Kongwa, 2002:13–14). From the foregoing, it could be argued that the new paradigm of the AU is rested on regional integration, socio-economic development, economic growth, and eradication of poverty and extermination of political crises through good political and economic governance.

3. 9 Public Administration

Public Administration is based on perceived universal principles that constitute management of public institutions in various settings with the acronym, POSDCORB, categorized in an attempt to classify the functions carried out in the public administration. The principles are:

- P - planning: the broad definition of things to be done and methods to do them, in order to realize the objectives of the organization;

- O - organizing: the formal structure of authority through which the division of labour for realizing objectives is arranged, defined and co-ordinated;

- S - staffing: the whole personnel function – supplying and utilizing personnel and ensuring favourable conditions of employment;

- D - directing: the continuous task of serving as leader and making decisions, and of translating them into specific and general commands and instructions;

- CO - co-ordinating: the very important task of uniting the various elements of work;

- R - reporting: informing superiors and subordinates alike on how the things are progressing by means of records, research and inspection; and

  B - budgeting: fiscal planning, accountability and control. (Fox & Meyers, 1995:99-100).

These seminally vintage principles are not constant in organizational culture and planning. Other elements such as "motivation" in terms of reward for personnel, transparency, accountability and collective bargaining are critically vital in the contemporary public management and administration. Perhaps this has informed the current surge for new public administration in order to strive to re-orientate public administration to meet the increasing needs, demands and challenges of the contemporary times.

The issues and problems that public administration has to address, require methods as well as institutions to develop and manage them, in scale and scope, in a streamlined manner, particularly in the context of political and economic governance. Government does not exist in a vacuum, but in a well define domain, that is, being legitimate and more strategically evolved within an environment to be able to govern, formulate policy by which values could be authoritatively allocated thereby defining public administration and policy through institutions.

Public administration also 'constitutes in a unique scale executive institutions and functionaries; political executive institutions and functionaries, administrative executive institutions, Judicial institutions' (Cloete, 1998:V1). These perspectives embrace public administration and policy models of governance such as an open system, rational model, and incrementalism. The aim is to downplay complacency and generate optimal efficiency through public administration and governance *vis-à-vis* Nepad. Dobuzinskis argues that, '… as a social scientific discipline, public administration asks, "why are public policies formulated and implemented the way they are?" or "why are government agencies operating the way they do?' (Dobuzinskis, 2003:739). The public administration principles as well as its implementation process have imbued Nepad as a regional public policy.

3. 9. 1 Policy

Fox and Meyer viewed policy as 'a guide of action or statement of goals that should be followed in an institution to deal with a particular problem or phenomenon or a set of problems or phenomena' (Fox & Meyer,1995:96). While Meek contends that, '… Public administration … traditionally defined as hierarchically organized and managed governmental institutions, that are bound to a well-defined jurisdiction' (Meek, 2003:929). Public policy is normally conceived as government action to address some problems. The central focus is

… who gets what, when, and how. 'Policy is the end result of a complex decision making system, encompassing many actors' (Peterson, 2003: 1030). It has already been argued that Nepad is being conceptualized as a policy programme which has gone through a complex decision making process.

3. 9. 2 Governance

In a broad term this 'refers to the ordering of a group, community, or society by a public authority' (Fox & Meyer,1995:55). Conceptually, governance has incorporated lessons from public administration and policy models. This is as the consequence of extensive demands, complexity, and standards for maximization of social equity through effective service delivery in a defined circumstance.

Maheshwari has argued that, 'the concept of governance claims a complex of traits, the principal structural indicators of which are a written constitution, rule of law, limited government, constitutionalism, accountability, transparency, judicial review, decentralization, citizen participation, observance of human rights. Governance thus includes both procedural and substantive formulations' (Maheshwari, 2002:241). Meek argues that, 'With the growth and evolving complexity …, policy networks have appeared and approach policy problems and solutions side by side with governmental bureaucracies. These networks are forms of governance' (Meek, 2003:928).

Indeed, models have offered the possibility of rationalizing and describing public administration and policy models of governance in an integrated manner. Public administration strengthens the role of governance and what becomes of policy. There is therefore interconnectivity among the models, given their points of departure that overlap in many important ways.

There are public administration and policy models that could be related to governance. These are rational model, incrementalism, and open system, among

others. De Coning and Cloete have argued, 'there are similarities and differences between concepts, models, theories and paradigms' (de Conning & Cloete, 2000: 24). In other words, models have causal versatility effect and could be transpositioned (in social science) from one context to another, which offers valid description of components' relationships or whole of a phenomenon with predictive value. This is an indication of the relative merit of competing models that embraces commonality in application from public administration and policy to governance theoretically.

Public administration models such as "open system", 'rational model' and "incrementalism" retain universal applicability in social sciences. The context with which they are used has to be determined to facilitate exchanges, particularly in public administration and policy models of governance paradigm. The nature and dynamics of socio-political and economic systems require interface of models to bring about reality of human perception in a different kind of perspectives.

3. 10 Public Administration and Policy Models of Governance

A grand unifying model of public administration and governance is yet to come to the fore. Given the increasing growth of multi-jurisdictional, cross-sector policymaking and policy implementation environments and policy demands, scholarships have been attracted to evolve and where possible adopt theoretical models, not only in governance but also in other sub-fields of public administration and policy. The root of the model framework is at rendering descriptive techniques and a predictive value to concepts and phenomena with social scientific orientation.

Public administration and policy models of governance have some commonality of elements in environments, objectives, and processes. However, public administration and policy models of governance are a set of concept constructs

for thinking about and describing a phenomenon that is different from ideas drawn from other perspectives. Emphasis is to replace theory with a broader simplification of a phenomenon.

Models of social sciences are not justification-based constructs and therefore suffer numerous interpretive definitions. Weber argues that, 'the term model refers to a representation of a specific set of relationships that are able to be empirically tested and provide some predictive value. Many times the term model is used interchangeably with theory' (Weber, 2003:779). Ostrom has argued that, 'the difference between frameworks, theories, and models are not even generally recognized' (Ostrom, 1999:35). Public administration and policy models of governance are not distinctly delineated from each other. The contention by De Coning and Cloete on models suggests that, 'there are similarities and differences between concepts, models, theories and paradigms' (De Conning & Cloete, 2000:24). The point of departure is to try to expound subtly the models of public administration, public policy, and governance, and to seek the limit and synthesis for universal applicability of the competing models without contrast in relation to Nepad.

3. 10. 1 Open System

The pattern of interaction and relationship postulated by open system relates it as a model of public administration and public policy and governance. In summation, organizations are complex systems that continuously interact with the external environment. They import critical inputs, transforming inputs into valued services and products, and exporting these services and products to the external environment thereby creating a feedback loop.

According to Chisholm, *Open System*, is, a set of interacting units with relationships among them Miller, (1978), quoted in Chisholm, (2003). He explains that organizations are a type of concrete versus abstract living system. Because

all living systems are open (versus closed systems that have no transactions with an external environment}, organisations are by definition open systems: … According to Open Systems Theory (OST), 'all organizations (public, private, and non-profit) depends on the external environment to provide certain critical inputs to exist and carry out work over time. … These required inputs include money, personnel, various types of materials and supplies formation Chisholm' (2003).

The concept of OST has attracted various argumentions. For instance, Chrisholm has argued that, 'because of the continuous input-transformation-output process, organizations depend upon the outside environment for their existence. And to remain viable overtime, they must deliver services (products) that meet the requirements of clients and other key decision makers outside the organization. Maintaining viability also requires designing and managing effective feedback processes' (Chrisholm, 2003:851). This context aptly fit the context which Nepad and its implementation could be perceived.

3. 10. 2 Rational Model

The rational model of decision-making, also known as classical or economic model is one among others in public administration. The model is derived from the economic theory that people seek to maximize utility and pursue their self-interests. The model is based on the assumption that people are economically rational and attempt to maximize outputs for a given input or minimize input for a given output in an orderly and sequential process. The steps involved in the model are: (1) identify the problem to be solved, (2) establish the evaluation criteria for problem resolution, (3) propose the various alternatives for solving the problem, (4) analyze the likely consequences of each, (5) compare and evaluate the results of each alternative (6) chose the best alternative (7) implement the chosen alternatives, (8) evaluate the results (Guseh, 2003:317). These steps aptly capture the public policy process. Nepad has been conceptualized in this study as a regional public policy.

A political economy perspective has been used to extrapolate the rationale model of public administration. For instance, Guseh (2003) has presented 'Anthony Down's, (1957), economic analysis of the rational model as an economic analysis thus consists of two major steps: discovery of the ends a decision maker is pursuing and most reasonable that requires the least input of scarce resources…. Thus whenever economists refer to "rational man" they are not designating a man whose thought processes consist exclusively of logical propositions or a man without prejudices or a man whose emotions could be considered rational but the economic definition refers solely to a man who moves towards his goals in a way which, to the best of his knowledge, uses the least possible input' (Guseh, 2003:317). The same could be said in public administration and governance in which the 'economic man ' metaphor reverts to 'policy maker' whose aim is equally to achieve the most with minimal input.

It could therefore be argued that, the 'rational model' refers to a decision-making process that is a rational activity in an organization, followed by rational process for effectively managing organizations and the decisions that flow from there, are for vested public purposes and interests. The challenges to public administration to deal with social equity have led to the galloped interest in the concept of governance in public administration in particular. Governance, basically, is the repository of public administration, so as to be, and retain responsive culture, less expensive, and strengthened to meet service demands, short of impeding reins of bureaucracy. From these perspectives, rational model of decision-making (policy) in governance is the design of work processes to be consciously maximized through efficiency and outcome for social equity, which have been reflected in the concept of Nepad.

3. 10. 3 Incrementalism

Political scientist, 'Charles Lindblom who critiqued the Rational Model came up with this model variously call incrementalism, muddling through, and successive

limited comparism' (Guseh, 2003:318). In contrast to rational model, incrementalism stresses decision making through a series of limited, successive comparison with a relatively narrow range of alternatives rather than a comprehensive range; it uses the status quo not abstract goals, as the key point of reference for decisions. 'Incrementalism focuses primarily on short term rather than long-term effects, on the most crucial consequences of an action rather than on all conceivable results, and on less formalized methods of measuring costs and benefits' Milakovich (2000), quoted in Guseh, (2003:318).

The "incrementalism" model contends that errors that result from employing incremental changes from the status quo may not have serious implications and may be easier to correct. Linblom has presented several arguments to support the "incrementalism" model. According to Lindblom, politically, incremental solutions are easier to agree upon since this change may fall somewhere between extreme positions, thereby getting plurality support. Lindblom in furtherance of his argument maintains that, 'making continual incremental adjustment in both the problem definition and proposed solutions is a reasonable and effective method of solving problems and making decisions', quoted in Guseh, 2003:319).

The essential elements of this model include the followings:
- Goals are not isolated and determined before analysis begins.
- Goals determination and analysis are closely intertwined, even simultaneously. The means often affect the end, vice versa.
- Decision makers usually consider only a limited number of alternatives – ordinarily only those that differ marginally from existing policy.
- All consequences, even of the more restricted options, are not evaluated. All consequences cannot be known, and the time and effort required for comprehensive assessment normally is unavailable.

Since the means and ends are inseparable, problem redefinition is continuous; analysis is never ending, and policy is never made once and for all but remade

endlessly (Ibid.:319). The incremantalism model has imbued on the concept of Nepad, particularly the implementation process.

3. 11 The Governance and Leadership Imperatives of Nepad on Africa

The increasing use of 'governance' and 'leadership' concepts has acquired varied connotations and interpretations in the contemporary social science scholarships and society at large. There are those who perceive them in a normative sense, while others envision rapid development through efficient and effective bureaucracy particularly as the study of public administration is evolving new techniques and paradigms of NPM in response to the dynamics of the modern societies. These contradictory perceptions dictate broader debate on the appropriate meaning of the concepts of governance and leadership. According to Cloete (1999) the concept of governance refers to the role of the state in society. Like other social sciences concepts, it can and has at different moments been used either descriptively or in a prescriptive way Frischtak, (1994), quoted in Cloete (1999:8). Governance and leadership imperative are some of the critical imperatives of Africa's development, which Nepad has encapsulated and poised to address. These governance and leadership concepts are of critical importance to Nepad.

3. 11. 1 Governance Imperatives of Nepad on Africa

The concept 'governance' in its contemporary context literally means 'good governance' identified with the aspirational level of society. Maheshwari has explained that, 'good governance is promoted by factors like decentralization, participatory management, citizen-participation in decision-making, etc' (Maheshwari, 2002:242). Given Africa's internal dynamics and complexities with regard to Nepad, governance is recognized as critical. This can be adduced to the implementation pattern of Nepad. Governance imperatives of Nepad would mean the orderly organization of society in line with their demands and

aspirations. This must, therefore, include principles, in a partisan sense, creation of equal opportunities, social equity, democratic governance, development, control, and distribution of resources both material and human, wealth creation and control of disparity in allocation, gender empowerment, and information articulation and dissemination. It must, at the same time, strive to protect human and property rights, mitigate internal conflicts and guarantee material social welfare to stem political and economic destabilization in Africa.

Fluctuations of these development imperatives are the apparent symptomatic challenges that may face Nepad. The initiative has to exercise control in the enunciation of policy actions as best practices to address these challenges. To assure success Nepad will have to view itself as promoter of Africa's development (strategically formulating and implementing development focused policies); as manager and distributor of these policies (distribution and allocation of values for social equity); as regulator for social, political, and economic resources; and as protector (development and guaranteeing human capital) for empowerment against poverty.

In the contention with the underdevelopment thesis of dependency theory, Liou has explained that, 'the problem of many least developed countries (LDCs) are related to a situation in which these countries downgraded the central role of their government in the development processes to a dependent and responsive entity' (Liou, 2003:370).

3. 11. 2 Leadership Imperatives of Nepad on Africa

The art of political leadership has eluded the continent since independence and has thereby plunged every development policy into quagmires. As a response to the winds of globalization, collapse of the bi-polar world, and the UNMDGs, African leaders initiated the Nepad programme. The issue, which arises, is the character of leadership that would reasonably be beneficial and relevant to

Nepad, given the political, socio-economic, and cultural imperatives that have created imbalance, divisiveness, and policy enforcement defects in Africa.

The concept of governance and leadership in the context of Nepad include policy implementation direction of the programme. The implementation of Nepad, could, to a reasonable extent, hinge on the implications of the African leadership and governance questions. This presupposes the effective and efficient implementation process and not just policy outcome. The leadership imperatives in Africa for Nepad require the inculcation of transactional leadership styles, leadership for development attributes, and leadership for reform, so as to bring about the much-required sustainable development through the Nepad programme. Vil-Nkomo has argued that, 'the advancement of Africa and Nepad depends entirely on the emergence in this millennium of an African leadership for development' (Vil-Nkomo, 2002:292).

Leadership is often perceived as the ultimate exercise of ascribable power and authority. It should however be viewed in a broader context particularly in a supra-national realm of policy implementation such as Nepad. This would enable robust examination of the context including determinants and indicators – which Kuye (2002) refers to as "vision, visioning", economic capacity, mental strength, social and environmental concerns, people-centred policies, collaboration, boundless adult universal suffrage, freedom for participatory process, conflict resolution, and provision and maintenance of social amenities. These are indicator requisites for the contemporary African leadership and governance to steer African development.

To this extent, the imperatives of governance and leadership of Nepad, that is, the capacity of the institutional arrangement and of the promoters, forced by the development necessity of the continent, should evolve qualitatively rather than quantitative policy measures, survivalist dependency syndrome, and political impropriety. It requires basic capacity to act, forthrightness, followership,

potential intelligence, and sensitivity to rein in the troubled attempts to shape the often-puzzled policy implementation environments in the continent in order to improve Nepad.

3.12 The Determinants of and Indicators of Leadership, Governance, Public Policy, and Nepad

These concepts embrace varied descriptive narrative constructs, which allow for multivariate paradigms. The foundational indicators and determinants of leadership, governance, and public policy are reflections only through qualitative attributes and empirical functions observed and experienced in a given circumstance. They either imply elevation of the structures, characterization, hierarchy and directive principles in goal attainment for the society through policy, governance and leadership. But the daunting task of development has remained un-abated and imminent, by clamouring for solutions. These solutions can come largely through effective and transformative leadership. Maheshwari (2003) argues that, 'this is from who are willing to summon the nations' forces, marshal resources, motivate people to achieve group goals …, who can inspire and bolster confidence' (Maheshwari, 2002:300).

The African leadership formed the Nepad programme and could be perceived as catalytic to the implementation of the Nepad programme. Nepad and its implementation mechanisms should evolve an institutionalized approach which means leadership must involve team and collaborative efforts. Leadership indicators and determinants refer therefore to a bevy of virtues or traits. Leadership ought to exhibit a team of superior performers.

It could be argued that a participatory form of leadership, respect for rule of law and democratic principles, vision and visioning remain critical leadership indicators that could effectively invigorate the enforcement of people centred development policy for Nepad. The imperatives as argued by Vil-Nkomo for

Africa's development is 'dependent on the participation of individuals and society. … Political economies that create stability, development, sustainable access to opportunities to society and operational citizenship are the cornerstone for leadership for development' (Vil-Nkomo, 2002:298).

Governance has a critical bearing on Nepad and the implementation of its policy objectives. The implementation of the initiative requires laid down 'fundamental governance principles; right to an adequate means of livelihood; operation and control of material resources of community and distribution at best to subserve the common good; the operation of the economic system which does not result in the concentration of wealth and the means of production to the common detriment, the assurance of equal pay for equal work for both men and women, the health and strength of workers men and women; and the tender age of children are not abused; and the citizens are not forced by economic necessity to enter vocation unsuited to their age or strength' (Maheshwari, 2002:240-241). The process of governing, techniques, and capacity to support these conditions are required through governance for Nepad.

The organization, operationalization, management, and implementation of public policy are equally deterministic in the context of indicators and determinants of Nepad. This means more foci on the enforcement and translation of policy programmes into policy outputs and outcomes. No less necessary are the concerns for gender empowerment as well as the environment, actors and their values, and policy content.

3. 13 Concluding Reflections

The contextual backdrop of relevant theoretical frameworks and models implicated in the study renders convergence and offers exploratory perspectives. They have a thematic context to explain the validity of the object of study. They are derived essentially from public administration and policy studies, given their

propriety in public administration and policy analysis that render them explicit and less fuzzy to deploy. Although the models discussed in the study have their strengths and weaknesses, they provide useful theoretical groundings.

The literature reviews deal with the ubiquitous development question, partnership and Nepad, which have provided deeper contextual renderings for deeper understanding of Nepad. They provide detailed development imperatives that confront Africa, but bear significant similarities of fundamental implementation problems for Nepad.

The selected regional initiatives help to draw comparative perspectives in contrast and similarity with Nepad as well as draw in different models, their aims, objectives, and politics of evolution. The concept of regional integration has received theoretical explications in two distinct patterns of political and economic paradigms. This reinforces the fact that regional integration cannot be roundly achieved at both fronts. This has been the Africa's integration experience.

Public Administration creed and Policy models of governance bear cross-criteria significance and offers descriptive and predictive values that deepen their relationships to a greater scale to Nepad. These models hold broader and unique potential application to the object of study.

The myriad of development impediments to Africa requires targeting of development policies to implementation process, which are implicated, so as to be able to effectively deal with the fundamental imperatives of Africa's development. But these factors are not by themselves enough to deal with the issues without acquisition of the relevant principles replicated as determinants and indicators. It is only when these are determined that Nepad could be strengthened and ready to perform. What is strange though is that the actors are negotiating social networks without consideration for the conditions that could impact the implementation process.