

**HANNS SEIDEL FOUNDATION**  
**NAIROBI OFFICE**

**Making the African Peer Review Mechanism Work**  
Nairobi, 25<sup>th</sup> - 27<sup>th</sup> April 2006

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The National Governing Council should be inclusive of, but not dominated by government representatives.
2. The involvement of the government in the preparation, funding and implementation of the APRM as well as in the Programme of Action (PoA) is crucial.
3. The implementation of the APRM should be free from government manipulation.
4. To create ownership of the process, governments should be encouraged to be the main financiers of the costs of the APRM process.
5. The APRM should be more inclusive than other on-going government development programmes.
6. The views of the citizens may differ from the government and this may call for consensus among the parties.
7. Civil society should participate in designing, implementing and monitoring the PoA in a consultative and participatory manner.
8. No stakeholder group should be excluded from the implementation of the APR process.
9. Members of civil society may require assistance to improve their capacity and competence to enable them to effectively participate in the APR process.
10. The education, sensitization and creation of ownership among stakeholders and members of society play a crucial role in enhancing the credibility of the APR process.

11. Existing institutions for civic education shall be used to include the civil society and to build their capacity.
12. It should be understood that the peer review is a country assessment and not an assessment of the performance of any particular government and also not a scorecard; it is a review of the process of governance in general.
13. The APRM is a democratic and a Pan-African process. The technical discussion on procedures, methodologies, institutions, etc. must not forget the reason of the APRM, namely Africa has to change. The gap between rulers and citizens has to be closed. People need to articulate themselves.
14. The co-operation between countries that have acceded to the APR process should be encouraged and exchange of experiences amongst them is desirable; and this indeed is already happening.
15. Countries at the beginning of the process could solicit technical support from experienced and APR partner institutions.
16. The APRM Secretariat should clarify the role and location of the Focal Point and relationship to the government. The Focal Point should ensure continuity and easy access to the Head of State.
17. The APRM Secretariat should provide more guidance than it has done in the past. Also, the Secretariat should also organize networking among the participating countries and it should market the APR process at different levels from the APR Forum and below. To fulfill its tasks, its capacity should be enhanced.
18. The period of 6 months for completing the self-assessment is too short; it should be extended to 9 – 12 months. After submitting the report to the Panel the time for feedback to the Focal Point should normally not exceed 3 months.
19. The PoA and its monitoring are dynamic processes and they ensure that corrective measures are taken to address gaps and deficiencies.
20. The momentum of the APR process should be maintained before and during monitoring and evaluation through continued sensitization and dissemination.