VOL. 08 NO. 2,
MAY, 2025
E-ISSN 3027-1533
P-ISSN 3026-8648

African Scholar Publications & Research International
www.africanscholarpub.com

Journal of African Innovation & Advanced Studies (JAIAS)

The Governance-Security-Development Nexus: Rethinking African Structures for Transformative Change

Salome Achieng' Delaila; & Prof. Siphamandla Zondi
University of Johannesburg, South Africa
Corresponding Author: sallydelaila@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70382/ajaias.v8i2.040

Abstract

The interrelationship between governance, security, and development forms a critical nexus that continues to shape Africa's socio-political and economic trajectory. Historically treated as discrete domains, these three spheres are deeply interdependent and must be approached as complex, dynamic system components. Good governance creates the institutional foundation for inclusive development and peacebuilding; sustainable development reduces vulnerability to conflict and insecurity; and effective security frameworks provide the stability necessary for governance and growth. This article interrogates the governance–security–development nexus through an Afrocentric lens, arguing for a shift toward integrated, locally rooted, and systemically coherent policy approaches. Drawing from African institutions such as the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), the African Union Development Agency (AUDA-NEPAD), and the African Governance Architecture (AGA), the article explores how continental and regional mechanisms can enhance national reforms. It critically examines case studies from Rwanda and Nigeria, identifying structural weaknesses, coordination failures, and donor dependency as key impediments to sustainable transformation. Through literature synthesis, policy analysis, and systems thinking, the article offers actionable recommendations in six key areas: integrated policy planning, institutional investment, early warning and response systems, local participation, regional cooperation, and digital

transformation. The study concludes by advocating for structural reform grounded in Afrocentric epistemologies and institutional innovation, positioning the governance–security–development nexus as an academic framework and a blueprint for African-owned transformation and sustainable peace.

Keywords: Governance, Security, Development, Nexus, African Union, APRM, Institutional Reform, Afrocentricity, African Governance Architecture (AGA)

Introduction

Africa's pursuit of sustainable development is inextricably linked to its governance systems and security architecture. While each domain has been studied extensively in isolation, the continent's experience reveals that governance, security, and development are deeply interwoven and mutually reinforcing. Governance failures often exacerbate security risks, while insecurity undermines institutional capacity and policy continuity, which are critical for developmental progress (Akinola 2021; Cilliers 2023).

Historically, postcolonial African states inherited weak institutions and arbitrary borders, exacerbating internal conflicts and governance fragility. In recent years, the rise of violent extremism, transnational criminal networks, and climate-induced displacement has further complicated the security-development-governance nexus (Mkutu 2019). These challenges have prompted African leaders and institutions to seek more coordinated, multilevel governance strategies. However, regional commitments to good governance, such as the African Union's (AU) Agenda 2063 and frameworks like the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), have yielded mixed outcomes, with implementation remaining uneven across countries and sub-regions (AU 2020).

Contemporary scholarship has increasingly embraced the interconnectedness of governance, security, and development. Williams (2022) argues that hybrid governance arrangements, where state and non-state actors share authority, can mitigate or exacerbate insecurity, depending on their inclusivity and legitimacy. Geda and Yimer (2023) contend that inclusive governance is essential for long-term peace and economic resilience, particularly in fragile and conflict-affected settings. Moreover, Obeng-Odoom (2022) highlights the need for structural transformation that transcends economic growth and incorporates social justice and environmental sustainability.

The APRM stands out as a uniquely African initiative that operationalizes the integration of governance, security, and development through voluntary peer learning, self-assessment, and policy

reform. By fostering a culture of accountability and mutual evaluation, the APRM has the potential to catalyze institutional change and strengthen democratic governance across the continent (Gruzd et al. 2021). However, its impact is contingent on political will, civic participation, and the capacity of national institutions to translate review findings into action.

This article investigates how African-led mechanisms, specifically the APRM, can be harnessed to operationalize the governance-security-development nexus in ways that enhance institutional resilience, policy coherence, and transformative governance.

It asks: *How do African-led mechanisms such as the APRM operationalize the governance-security-development nexus to foster institutional resilience and transformative governance?*

In addressing this question, the article draws on systems-thinking theory and an Afrocentric epistemological lens to examine the complex interdependencies between governance, security, and development. It employs comparative case studies of Rwanda and Nigeria to demonstrate how coordinated or fragmented policy approaches impact national resilience. The article contributes to ongoing debates on African regionalism, institutional innovation, and decolonized policy frameworks by proposing a systems-informed approach to understanding and strengthening the GSD nexus in African contexts.

Conceptual Framework

Building on the theoretical insights and empirical case studies that underscore the intertwined nature of governance, security, and development, this section establishes the key concepts and analytical lenses that guide our examination of the governance–security–development nexus. By articulating precise definitions and exploring the evolution of these domains, we lay the groundwork for understanding their interdependence and preparing for a deeper analysis of each component in turn.

Governance

Governance refers to the processes, institutions, and practices through which authority is exercised, decisions are made, and public affairs are managed. Traditionally associated with state-centric control and bureaucratic administration, the concept of governance in Politics and International Relations has undergone a significant evolution, particularly in response to globalisation, neoliberal reforms, and the limitations of state capacity in many parts of the Global South. In contemporary discourse, governance is increasingly understood as multi-level and multi-actor, involving various stakeholders including civil society, private actors, regional bodies, and international institutions (Pierre & Peters 2020).

In Africa, governance extends beyond mere state functionality to encompass inclusive political participation, responsiveness to citizens' needs, and the ability to manage diversity within often heterogeneous societies. The post-independence era revealed structural and institutional weaknesses that hindered democratic consolidation and developmental progress. Consequently, the focus on good governance entailing transparency, accountability, citizen participation, responsiveness, and adherence to the rule of law has become central to continental and global policy discourses (Olowu & Chanie 2018; Andrews 2020).

Moreover, African governance frameworks increasingly acknowledge the legitimacy and utility of hybrid governance models, where authority is shared between formal state institutions, traditional leaders, religious authorities, and community-based organizations. Though often informal, these arrangements are crucial in delivering justice, resolving disputes, and enhancing public service access, especially in rural or fragile settings (Booth & Golooba-Mutebi 2019; Mkandawire 2022). While such hybridity can promote local legitimacy and context-specific solutions, it also raises challenges regarding standardization, rights protection, and the harmonization of governance practices across different layers of authority.

Recent debates in African political theory and international governance studies have also stressed the importance of adaptive and resilient governance, particularly in the face of complex challenges like climate change, pandemics, migration, and violent extremism. This has led to a growing emphasis on governance as a process rather than a fixed institutional model, privileging iterative learning, inclusivity, and flexibility in response to shifting political economies and security landscapes (De Oliveira et al. 2023; Abdulrauf & Ebiede 2021).

From a systems-thinking perspective, governance in Africa is best understood as a complex, adaptive field of interaction. Institutions are not static but evolve through feedback, negotiation, and contextual learning. When Afrocentric perspectives are applied, governance is also revealed as a space where indigenous values, traditional authorities, and communal knowledge systems interact with formal state structures to form locally legitimate and resilient institutions.

Security

Security in Africa today transcends traditional, state-centric definitions rooted in military defence and territorial integrity. While these remain important, the contemporary security landscape demands a broader, more inclusive framework of human security which prioritizes the protection of individuals and communities from chronic threats such as hunger, disease, political repression, and economic marginalization (Tschirgi, Lund, & Mancini 2020). This paradigm shift reflects theoretical advances in International Relations

and the lived realities across African societies, where insecurity is often multidimensional and deeply embedded in structural inequalities.

The African Union and related regional institutions have increasingly adopted this expansive understanding of security. This is evident in normative frameworks such as the AU's *Common African Defence and Security Policy* and its commitment to the Silencing the Guns initiative, which recognize that peace is unattainable without addressing the root causes of conflict poverty, governance failures, youth unemployment, and social exclusion (Cilliers 2023). Consequently, security is now conceptualized in terms of the absence of violence (negative peace) and conditions that allow individuals to live with dignity and opportunity (positive peace).

In fragile and conflict-affected settings such as the Sahel, Horn of Africa, and parts of the Great Lakes region, hybrid security arrangements have emerged as pragmatic responses to weak state capacity and contested legitimacy. These arrangements involve collaborations, sometimes uneasy, between state security forces, traditional authorities, vigilante groups, non-state armed actors, and international peacekeeping missions (Mkutu 2019; De Waal 2021). While they may provide localized stability, such hybrid configurations also risk institutionalizing parallel authorities, fostering impunity, or entrenching exclusionary power dynamics if not carefully managed (Olonisakin & Ekiyor 2022).

Moreover, the securitization of development and governance issues, often driven by external actors, has sparked critical debates about agency, priorities, and effectiveness. Scholars caution against over-reliance on militarized responses to inherently political or socio-economic challenges, emphasizing the need for human-centred security strategies embedded in local contexts and aligned with community aspirations (Abrahamsen 2021; Williams 2022).

Ultimately, a nuanced and context-sensitive approach to security is vital for reinforcing governance and enabling sustainable development. The security–governance–development nexus thus becomes especially salient: effective and inclusive governance can mitigate security risks, while sustainable development reduces the drivers of instability. Integrating these dimensions provides a more holistic lens for understanding Africa's complex security dynamics and crafting resilient policy responses.

In line with systems thinking, security in Africa cannot be separated from broader governance dynamics. Public trust, perceived legitimacy, and equitable access to justice all shape security outcomes. Afrocentric thought further broadens this lens by conceptualizing security not merely as the absence of violence but as the presence of communal harmony, intergenerational stability, and respect for indigenous conflict resolution systems.

Development

Development is broadly understood as improving living standards, economic prosperity, and social well-being. It encompasses a multidimensional spectrum including access to quality education, healthcare, infrastructure, employment opportunities, and environmental sustainability. These dimensions are interconnected and mutually reinforcing, with progress in one area often catalyzing gains in others (Sen 1999; Stiglitz, Sen, & Fitoussi 2018). In the African context, development transcends mere economic growth to include social justice, equity, and the rectification of historical injustices rooted in colonial-era exploitation and systemic marginalization.

Africa's developmental challenges are compounded by legacies of underdevelopment, resource extraction, and institutional weaknesses, which have perpetuated inequalities within and between states (UNECA 2022). Addressing these structural issues requires robust institution-building efforts prioritizing inclusive governance, the rule of law, and the empowerment of historically marginalized groups, including women, youth, and rural communities (Geda & Yimer 2023). Development is thus not a passive outcome but a deliberate process involving participatory policymaking, capacity building, and structural transformation.

The African Union's *Agenda 2063* articulates a continental vision for people-centred, inclusive, and sustainable development. It emphasizes structural transformation, shifting from primary commodity dependence to diversified, resilient economies capable of withstanding global shocks (AU 2015). This vision highlights the importance of regional integration, technological innovation, and sustainable resource management as key development drivers (UNECA 2022). Moreover, Agenda 2063 integrates social and environmental dimensions by promoting access to quality education, universal health coverage, and climate resilience, aligning with the global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Recent scholarship underscores that sustainable development in Africa cannot be achieved without addressing governance and security deficits. As Geda and Yimer (2023) argue, inclusive governance ensures that development policies are equitable and responsive, while security is a prerequisite for sustained economic activity and social cohesion. The development-security-governance nexus thus becomes a critical conceptual framework for understanding the continent's prospects and challenges.

When viewed through a systems lens, development emerges not as a linear goal but as a product of reinforcing dynamics where governance capacity, institutional legitimacy, and citizen wellbeing co-evolve. Afrocentric frameworks deepen this perspective by framing development as restoring historical agency and dignity, built upon African priorities, languages, and epistemologies rather than imported models.

The Nexus

The governance–security–development nexus framework posits that the conditions and dynamics within one domain invariably influence the others, creating a complex web of interdependencies. Weaknesses or strengths in governance, security, or development do not exist in isolation but rather interact to shape overall stability and progress on the continent (Akinola 2021; Cilliers 2023).

Systems thinking reinforces the idea that the governance–security–development nexus is not a collection of separate challenges but a single dynamic system characterized by non-linearity, mutual causation, and emergent behavior. This logic underscores the importance of mechanisms like the APRM, which offer peer accountability and system-wide diagnostics and early-warning functions.

Poor governance, characterized by a lack of transparency, corruption, exclusionary politics, and weak institutions, often generates conditions conducive to political instability and violent conflict. Such governance deficits erode citizen trust and legitimacy, opening spaces for non-state actors, insurgent groups, or criminal networks to exploit grievances and challenge state authority (Booth & Golooba-Mutebi 2019; Williams 2022). These conflicts and insecurities, in turn, severely disrupt service delivery, economic activity, and social cohesion, impeding development efforts and perpetuating cycles of vulnerability (Mkutu 2019; De Waal 2021).

Conversely, insecurity, whether stemming from armed conflict, terrorism, or chronic threats like food insecurity, undermines governance capacity by diverting resources, weakening state institutions, and limiting the government's ability to provide public goods. It also diminishes investor confidence, restricts market access, and increases humanitarian needs, negatively impacting development outcomes (Tschirgi, Lund, & Mancini, 2020; UNECA, 2022).

Underdevelopment exacerbates this vicious cycle by fuelling economic desperation, social inequalities, and identity-based exclusions that often manifest as grievances against the state or dominant groups. Such grievances can catalyse protests, insurgencies, or political instability, further eroding governance and security (Geda & Yimer 2023). In this way, underdevelopment is both a cause and a consequence of governance failures and insecurity, reinforcing a feedback loop that traps many African countries in persistent fragility.

Recognizing this interconnectedness, contemporary scholars advocate for integrated, multi-sectoral policy approaches that holistically address the root causes of instability and underdevelopment, rather than through fragmented interventions. Williams (2022) highlights the importance of hybrid governance models that combine formal state authority with community-level actors to enhance legitimacy and security. Similarly, Tschirgi et al. (2020) argue that human security frameworks integrate governance and development agendas to foster resilience.

At the regional level, the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) provides critical platforms for promoting policy coherence and institutional learning across the governance, security, and development domains. The APRM facilitates peer review processes that encourage transparency, accountability, and best practice sharing among African states, helping to align national reforms with continental priorities such as Agenda 2063 (Akinola 2021; AU 2015). By fostering peer accountability, the APRM supports collaborative efforts to address cross-border security threats and development challenges that transcend national boundaries.

In sum, the governance-security-development nexus serves as a vital conceptual framework for understanding Africa's complex realities and designing integrated policies that can break cycles of fragility and foster sustainable transformation.

Analytical Lenses: Systems Thinking and Afrocentric Epistemology

This article adopts two interrelated analytical lenses to explore Africa's governance–security–development nexus: systems thinking and Afrocentric epistemologies. Systems thinking is a holistic approach that conceptualizes governance challenges as complex, dynamic, and interdependent rather than isolated issues (Meadows, 2008; Senge, 1990). This perspective emphasizes the importance of feedback loops, emergent properties, and multi-level interactions, urging policymakers and practitioners to move beyond linear cause-effect models and adopt iterative, adaptive, and context-sensitive solutions (Sterman, 2000). Within governance, this means recognizing how security, political institutions, economic development, and social factors interact continuously, often in unpredictable ways (Checkland, 1999; Midgley, 2003). Applying systems thinking to African governance thus allows for a nuanced understanding of the cascading effects of policy interventions and the risks of unintended consequences (Ramalingam, 2013).

Complementing this is the Afrocentric epistemological lens, which centres African worldviews, knowledge systems, and historical experiences as critical to understanding and addressing the continent's contemporary challenges (Asante, 1991; Mazama, 2001). Afrocentricity challenges the dominance of Western paradigms that have historically marginalized African voices and imposed external frameworks ill-suited to African realities (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018). By foregrounding indigenous knowledge, cultural values, and local agency, Afrocentric epistemologies provide a normative and decolonial orientation that resists neo-colonial influences embedded in international governance discourses (Mudimbe, 1988; Nkrumah, 1965). This lens insists on reclaiming Africa's intellectual sovereignty to foster authentic and sustainable solutions (Mbembe, 2016).

Systems thinking and Afrocentric epistemologies offer a complementary framework for interpreting the successes and limitations of continental governance mechanisms like the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). Systems thinking highlights the structural interdependencies and the need for iterative policy adjustments within the APRM process

(Ayissi & Matsuoka, 2019), while Afrocentricity ensures that the mechanism's normative foundations and operational modalities resonate with African realities, values, and aspirations (Asante, 2015; Eze, 2010). This combined approach thus enables a critical evaluation of how the APRM navigates complex governance-security-development linkages and identifies locally grounded, transformative strategies that transcend imported models and foster genuine African-led development trajectories (Ojo, 2014; Nkrumah, 1970). Together, these lenses provide the conceptual scaffolding for investigating how the GSD nexus materializes in practice across African contexts. The following section outlines the methodological framework employed to examine this interdependence through case-based analysis.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, interpretive methodology informed by Afrocentric and postcolonial epistemologies (Asante, 1991; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013). The research design prioritizes contextual depth and conceptual richness over generalizability, aligning with the complexity of the governance–security–development (GSD) nexus in African settings. Case selection was purposive, drawing on six African countries, Rwanda, Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Somalia, South Sudan, Ghana, and Botswana, to reflect a diversity of governance experiences, institutional resilience, and conflict trajectories. Rwanda and Nigeria were selected as primary comparative cases due to their starkly contrasting GSD dynamics: Rwanda exemplifying coordinated institutional integration, and Nigeria highlighting fragmented and reactive governance approaches.

Data collection involved a comprehensive review of over 70 sources, including peer-reviewed academic articles, African Union policy frameworks (e.g., APRM reports, NEPAD documentation), and grey literature from think tanks and NGOs. A thematic content analysis was applied, identifying recurring patterns and divergences across the governance, security, and development domains. Codes were inductively derived and synthesized into interpretive themes aligned with the GSD nexus. This methodology privileges African perspectives and historical memory, framing knowledge production as an act of epistemic agency rather than neutral abstraction.

Interdependence in Practice: African Case Studies and Afrocentric Contexts

Building on the methodology outlined above, this section applies a qualitative, interpretive lens to examine how the governance–security–development nexus manifests across selected African contexts. Through purposive case selection, the study examines fragile, transitional, and stable states, specifically the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), South Sudan, Somalia, Rwanda, Ghana, and Botswana, to illustrate varying configurations of interdependence across the nexus. These case studies were chosen for their representativeness of different stages of institutional development, conflict trajectories,

and governance strategies. The analysis relies on secondary data, including scholarly literature, policy documents, and reports from international and regional organizations. A thematic content analysis approach is employed to identify patterns and divergences within and across cases. The methodological orientation is explicitly Afrocentric, privileging African experiences, historical trajectories, and knowledge systems in assessing the interdependence between governance, security, and development. This approach ensures the analysis avoids universalist assumptions and centres context-specific insights relevant to African policy and scholarly discourses.

Fragile States and the Governance Deficit

Fragile states in Africa, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), South Sudan, and Somalia, exemplify the critical challenges posed by governance deficits. In these contexts, weak and often dysfunctional institutions fail to provide basic public goods, uphold the rule of law, or ensure inclusive political participation. This institutional weakness contributes significantly to state fragility, characterized by limited state capacity, contested sovereignty, and frequent outbreaks of violence (World Bank 2022; Ero 2021).

In the DRC, decades of kleptocratic rule, corruption, and weak state presence in vast rural areas have created a governance vacuum exploited by armed groups, undermining security and developmental prospects (Autesserre, 2019). The failure to establish credible and legitimate institutions has eroded public trust and legitimacy, which are essential for state authority and social cohesion (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2020). Similarly, South Sudan's post-independence experience highlights how nascent institutions lacking inclusive governance structures quickly succumbed to factional violence, exacerbating insecurity and humanitarian crises (de Waal, 2020).

Somalia's prolonged absence of a functioning central government until recent decades illustrates how governance vacuums enable the rise of non-state actors and militias that challenge territorial control and exacerbate insecurity (Menkhaus, 2023). The persistent governance deficit obstructs coordinated development efforts and perpetuates cycles of displacement, poverty, and social fragmentation (International Crisis Group, 2023).

The interlinkages between governance failure, insecurity, and development stagnation in fragile states underscore the need for comprehensive approaches prioritising institution-building, inclusivity, and accountability. Scholars such as Call and Cousens (2022) emphasize that strengthening governance in fragile contexts is a prerequisite to breaking the cycle of violence and underdevelopment. Without addressing the foundational governance deficit, efforts to improve security and foster development risk remaining superficial and unsustainable.

Security as a Precondition for Development

The case of Rwanda provides a compelling illustration of how deliberate and sustained security interventions, paired with institutional reforms, can lay the foundation for rapid and inclusive development. Following the 1994 genocide, Rwanda faced profound human devastation, institutional collapse, and a fractured society. However, through a state-led approach focused on restoring order, demobilizing militias, and rebuilding the security sector, the country established a stable and secure environment within a relatively short period (Clark 2018; Straus 2021).

Security in post-genocide Rwanda was not solely about military dominance or policing, but also entailed broader governance reforms that prioritized reconciliation, justice, and institutional accountability. Though controversial, establishing the Gacaca courts attempted to address justice and reintegration through local community-based mechanisms (Uvin 2009). These initiatives were central to rebuilding public trust and a sense of national unity, both critical elements for sustainable development.

Rwanda's leadership recognized that economic and governance reforms must accompany security. The government implemented policies to reduce corruption, strengthen public service delivery, and foster macroeconomic stability, all facilitated by a relatively secure environment (Booth and Golooba-Mutebi 2019). As a result, Rwanda has recorded sustained GDP growth, expanded access to healthcare and education, and developed a digital economy that is among the most advanced in East Africa (World Bank 2022).

Nonetheless, critiques remain regarding the narrowing of political space, constraints on civil liberties, and the centralization of power under the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF). Scholars such as Reyntjens (2020) caution that while the development gains are laudable, the long-term sustainability of Rwanda's model may be undermined if political inclusivity and democratic governance are not adequately addressed. Therefore, Rwanda demonstrates that while security is a vital precondition for development, its success is contingent on balanced governance that fosters accountability, inclusivity, and citizen engagement.

Development as a Stabilizing Force

In contrast to fragile states, countries such as Ghana and Botswana demonstrate how sustained development efforts, when equitably implemented, can serve as powerful instruments for stability, social cohesion, and governance legitimacy. Development in these contexts is measured in economic growth and investments in human capital, public infrastructure, and social inclusion. These elements diminish the structural drivers of conflict, such as youth unemployment, regional inequality, and political marginalization, by creating opportunities and fostering trust in the state (Gyimah-Boadi & Prempeh, 2019; Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012).

Ghana, for instance, has consistently invested in democratic consolidation and pro-poor development policies since the return to civilian rule in the 1990s. Through decentralization, social protection programs like the Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) and expanded access to education, the country has managed to diffuse tensions that often arise from socio-economic exclusion (Whitfield et al. 2015). Similarly, Botswana's prudent management of natural resources, coupled with a strong emphasis on public service efficiency and anti-corruption mechanisms, has enabled the country to maintain peace and deliver steady development gains (Sebudubudu & Botlhomilwe, 2018).

These cases affirm that development is an outcome and a driver of governance legitimacy and national security. By addressing horizontal inequalities and creating inclusive economic opportunities, development helps mitigate grievances that might escalate into political unrest or violent extremism (Stewart 2010). Equitable development is essential for fostering resilient societies and sustainable peace.

However, it is important to contextualize these successes within broader historical and structural dynamics that shape African governance and development outcomes. This brings us to the next section, which explores how Afrocentric perspectives and postcolonial realities frame the governance–security–development nexus.

Afrocentric Perspectives and Structural Contexts

Understanding Africa's governance–security–development nexus requires engaging with Afrocentric perspectives centring the continent's historical, cultural, and structural specificities. Afrocentricity challenges Eurocentric models of state-building and development that have often overlooked the lived realities of African societies and imposed external norms of governance and institutional design (Asante, 2007; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013). It calls for an epistemological shift that privileges African knowledge systems, endogenous solutions, and a critical interrogation of the colonial legacy that continues to shape African states' political and economic structures.

Colonialism extracted resources and disrupted indigenous governance systems; it entrenched artificial borders, centralized authoritarian governance models, and created economies structured for external dependency (Rodney, 1972). The postcolonial state often inherited these dysfunctional institutions without undergoing the structural transformation needed to align governance and development with indigenous values or socio-political realities (Mamdani, 1996). This historical baggage partly explains the persistence of governance deficits, insecurity, and underdevelopment across the continent.

An Afrocentric perspective insists on locating current policy challenges within these broader structural continuities. For instance, land tenure conflicts in Kenya or resource-based conflicts in the Niger Delta are not just issues of poor governance or security failure they are also outcomes of historically rooted inequalities and exclusionary development

models (Okoth-Ogendo, 2000; Obi, 2010). Similarly, efforts at institutional reform and capacity-building must be informed by a deep appreciation for local norms, traditional authorities, and communal decision-making practices, which often hold greater legitimacy than formal state institutions (Logan, 2009; Olowu & Wunsch, 2004).

Regional initiatives like the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) represent a step toward institutionalizing Afrocentric approaches to governance and development. By emphasizing peer learning, self-assessment, and context-specific policy recommendations, the APRM acknowledges the diversity of African governance systems and seeks to create space for African states to chart their developmental paths. However, the APRM's effectiveness depends on the political will of member states and their capacity to implement reforms that are not only technically sound but also socially embedded and historically informed (Hope 2016; Adebajo 2020).

Thus, the governance–security–development nexus must be reimagined through lenses that validate African agency, reclaim historical memory, and prioritize context-sensitive policy innovation. This integrative, Afrocentric framework offers the continent a more grounded and transformative approach to sustainable peace, resilience, and prosperity.

The Role of African Structures in Strengthening the Nexus

This section analyses two key continental institutions, the APRM and NEPAD, using a qualitative, Afrocentric policy analysis approach. Drawing from institutional reports, scholarly literature, and AU frameworks, the analysis assesses the extent to which these mechanisms embody the logic of the governance–security–development nexus and offer context-specific frameworks for coordinated policy action across governance, security, and development domains.

Continental structures such as the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) are central to institutionalizing a cohesive and African-led response to the interlinked governance, security, and development challenges. These frameworks emerged from a continental recognition that externally imposed development and governance models had largely failed to address Africa's structural inequalities and postcolonial vulnerabilities (Adesina, 2020; Adebajo, 2020). As such, the APRM and NEPAD reflect Africa's collective resolve to reframe its governance agenda, promote policy sovereignty, and take ownership of its development trajectory by establishing mechanisms rooted in shared values, historical context, and mutual accountability.

Within this paradigm, NEPAD was launched in 2001 as a strategic framework to promote sustainable development through African agency, infrastructure development, and enhanced governance. It stressed the importance of political, economic, and corporate governance as a means and an end to achieving peace and prosperity (NEPAD, 2001; Taylor, 2019). The APRM, introduced in 2003 under NEPAD's governance pillar,

operationalizes this vision through structured self-assessment, peer learning, and early-warning diagnostics that enable African states to identify and rectify governance deficits before they escalate into broader crises (Akokpari & Zimbler, 2021; Hope, 2013).

These mechanisms operate within the broader African Union (AU) architecture, aligned with the African Governance Architecture (AGA) and the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA), fostering coordination between development planning, conflict prevention, and democratic consolidation (AU, 2021). Importantly, they are institutional vehicles for promoting regional integration, resilience-building, and accountable leadership through African-led evaluations and context-sensitive reforms. The APRM, for example, encourages participatory review processes involving civil society, academia, and policymakers, thus reinforcing transparency, legitimacy, and inclusive governance (Masterson, 2016; Grugel & Hammett, 2021).

Moreover, the evolving mandates of these structures reflect a growing emphasis on cross-sectoral policy coherence in line with Agenda 2063, the AU's strategic blueprint for the continent's transformation. By linking governance reforms to structural economic transformation and peacebuilding, these mechanisms embody the logic of the governance–security–development nexus (UNECA, 2022; Cilliers, 2023). They signal a paradigm shift from reactive crisis management toward preventive governance, supported by data-driven analysis, continental solidarity, and a commitment to Africa's renewal from within.

The African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)

Established in 2003 under the auspices of NEPAD, the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) is a voluntary, participatory instrument designed to promote good governance through self-assessment, peer learning, and mutual accountability among participating African states. It was conceived to identify governance weaknesses before they escalate into crises that could jeopardise national and regional stability and development (APRM Secretariat, 2020; Hope, 2013). The APRM evaluates member states across four interrelated thematic areas: democracy and political governance, economic governance and management, corporate governance, and socio-economic development all of which directly engage with the governance–security–development nexus.

The design of the APRM reflects a multilevel governance model that engages a wide array of actors, including government institutions, civil society, academia, and private sector stakeholders. This inclusivity reinforces both horizontal (across institutions) and vertical (between state and society) accountability structures (Masterson, 2016). The mechanism diagnoses governance deficiencies through Country Review Reports and National Programmes of Action (NPAs). It provides platforms for capacity building, policy reform, and resource mobilization tailored to each country's unique political and socio-economic context (APRM Secretariat, 2022).

Significantly, the APRM has demonstrated its potential as an early warning and preventive diplomacy tool. For instance, in the case of Kenya, the APRM process flagged deep-rooted issues of ethnic polarization, land tenure disputes, and institutional weaknesses well before the outbreak of post-election violence in 2007–08. Although the limited uptake of the APRM's recommendations highlighted challenges in implementation and political will, the process nevertheless spotlighted key fault lines that contributed to later unrest (Hope, 2013). As such, scholars like Adebajo (2020) and Masterson (2016) underscore the APRM's promise as a uniquely African initiative that elevates transparency, peer learning, and public engagement as mechanisms for reform.

Moreover, the APRM is critical in mainstreaming governance within Africa's development discourse. It has contributed to the normalization of performance benchmarking, encouraging states to measure their governance progress against international standards and African-defined values and best practices. The mechanism has increasingly emphasized cross-cutting issues such as youth inclusion, climate resilience, and digital governance, all of which are vital to contemporary policy frameworks that seek to integrate governance, security, and development imperatives (Akokpari & Zimbler, 2021; Cilliers, 2023).

The APRM's integration into the African Union's Agenda 2063 and its alignment with Agenda 2030 further signal its relevance in guiding Africa's long-term developmental and governance ambitions. As of 2024, 43 AU member states have acceded to the APRM, reflecting widespread continental commitment to African-led accountability and peer-based reform (APRM Secretariat, 2024). This growing membership base also enhances regional integration, as the APRM fosters governance harmonization, policy coherence, and continental solidarity across diverse political systems.

While its impact has been uneven and often constrained by national-level politics, the APRM remains a critical institutional framework for operationalizing the governance–security–development nexus. Providing a diagnostic and policy-bridging platform enhances state legitimacy, strengthens societal trust, and positions governance reform not as a stand-alone aspiration but as an enabler of African peace and prosperity.

NEPAD and the Governance Imperative

The New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), adopted in 2001 and later integrated into the African Union (AU) as its development agency, laid the groundwork for institutionalizing an African-owned and -led development agenda. At its core, NEPAD recognizes good governance, peace, and security as indispensable preconditions for sustainable development. It advances a holistic, rights-based, and participatory approach to development. It rejects externally imposed prescriptions favouring homegrown solutions grounded in Pan-African ideals of self-determination, dignity, and solidarity (Nabudere, 2006; Taylor, 2016).

NEPAD's framework links development to structural transformation by advocating for sound political governance, macroeconomic stability, infrastructure development, and regional integration. Its emphasis on state capacity-building, policy alignment, and institutional reform aligns closely with the governance–security–development nexus model (UNECA, 2022). Indeed, NEPAD identifies governance failures such as corruption, weak institutions, and lack of accountability as root causes of insecurity and underdevelopment, particularly in post-colonial contexts where state legitimacy remains contested (Cilliers, 2023; Akokpari, 2021).

One of NEPAD's most impactful contributions has been its role in establishing and supporting the APRM, which embodies NEPAD's core governance principles. By anchoring the APRM within its institutional architecture, NEPAD has helped institutionalise peer accountability, participatory evaluation, and preventive diplomacy norms. These mechanisms promote early detection of fragility risks, enabling governments to enact timely reforms and avert crises that might otherwise escalate into conflict (Hope, 2013; Turok, 2022).

Furthermore, NEPAD operates as a development coordination platform within the AU, facilitating flagship initiatives that integrate governance, security, and development objectives. These include projects in agricultural transformation (CAADP), infrastructure connectivity (PIDA), and science and technology development, each of which contributes to building resilient economies and addressing structural inequalities that often underlie instability (NEPAD Agency, 2021). Its support for post-conflict reconstruction and development (PCRD) is particularly relevant in fragile contexts, where NEPAD's governance-first approach aims to rebuild state legitimacy, foster inclusive institutions, and promote community-based peacebuilding (AU, 2020).

Importantly, NEPAD's agenda has been institutionally embedded into Agenda 2063, the AU's strategic blueprint for inclusive and sustainable continental transformation. By articulating a people-centred development vision and anchored in governance integrity, NEPAD reinforces the principle that development without governance is unsustainable and that security cannot be achieved without addressing structural development deficits and governance vacuums.

In recent years, NEPAD's evolution into the AU Development Agency (AUDA-NEPAD) has expanded its mandate, enabling it to provide technical support, policy guidance, and implementation oversight across AU member states. This transformation reflects the AU's recognition of NEPAD's pivotal role in bridging high-level continental priorities with national development planning a critical aspect of operationalizing the governance–security–development nexus.

In conclusion, NEPAD is a development framework and an institutional cornerstone of Africa's efforts to build peaceful, democratic, and prosperous societies. By embedding governance as both an enabler and an outcome of security and development, NEPAD

provides a strategic policy infrastructure for addressing Africa's complex challenges anchored in a coherent, integrative, and Afrocentric policy paradigm. Whereas the APRM focuses on peer-based governance diagnostics and accountability, NEPAD provides the developmental infrastructure and implementation support necessary to translate governance reform into tangible security and development outcomes.

Despite their normative strength, the APRM and NEPAD face structural and political constraints, including inconsistent implementation across member states, limited resources, and uneven political commitment. Addressing these challenges is crucial for these mechanisms to fulfil their potential as pillars of Africa's transformative and integrative governance agenda.

Theoretical Insights: Systems Thinking and Complexity

Building on the institutional foundations discussed in the previous section, a deeper understanding of how governance, security, and development intersect requires a shift in the analytical lens. NEPAD and the APRM offer integrative mechanisms, but we must also consider how complex systems behave and evolve to grasp their full potential and limitations. A systems-thinking perspective provides such a framework, emphasizing the interconnectedness, feedback loops, and adaptive dynamics that shape African policy outcomes.

Understanding the intricate relationship between governance, security, and development requires moving beyond linear models of cause and effect. These domains do not operate in isolation; rather, they form an interdependent and complex adaptive system in which multiple actors, institutions, and contextual variables interact dynamically over time (Meadows, 2008; Rittel & Webber, 1973). These systems exhibit non-linearity, feedback loops, emergent behaviour, and path dependence, which make them difficult to predict or govern through siloed or fragmented interventions.

A systems-thinking approach to the governance–security–development nexus encourages policymakers and practitioners to consider the full ecosystem in which policies operate. For instance, a governance reform may trigger unintended effects on local power dynamics, which in turn influence patterns of insecurity or access to development resources. Conversely, failure to address marginalization in development planning may undermine state legitimacy and fuel conflict, outcomes that cannot be adequately captured by siloed or sector-specific models (Ramalingam, 2013).

This approach aligns with the African Union's Agenda 2063 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)**,** emphasising integrated solutions responsive to complexity. Systems thinking promotes adaptive governance, allowing institutions to respond to uncertainty and change through iterative learning, inclusive participation, and feedback-sensitive policies (Dryzek, 2017; Bammer, 2015). It also underscores the value of institutional coherence and alignment, particularly through mechanisms such as the

APRM and NEPAD, which aim to facilitate cross-sectoral dialogue, policy coordination, and early warning.

Importantly, systems thinking invites a shift in mindset: from managing individual symptoms of insecurity or underdevelopment to cultivating the resilience and capacities of the entire system. This perspective opens the door to long-term, structural reforms more likely to produce sustainable peace and prosperity, especially in contexts marked by fragility or contested statehood (Grindle, 2004; Tschirgi, 2020).

Case Study Reflections

To illustrate the practical utility of a systems-thinking lens, the study examines: Rwanda demonstrates the potential benefits of coordinated integration in fostering resilience and progress, albeit with trade-offs; Nigeria reveals the dangers of fragmented governance-security-development systems, which can entrench conflict and underdevelopment. Understanding such complexities encourages tailored, context-sensitive policies and adaptive institutional designs vital for sustainable outcomes in Africa.

Case Study 1: Rwanda - Coordinated Integration for Post-Conflict Recovery

Rwanda offers a compelling example of how coordinated governance, security, and development integration can facilitate rapid recovery after a devastating conflict. Following the 1994 genocide, the government embarked on an ambitious program to rebuild state institutions, restore security, and promote socio-economic development simultaneously. This systemic approach included reforms to enhance political stability, strengthen the security sector, and drive economic transformation through investment in infrastructure, education, and health services (Ansoms & Rostagno, 2012; Thomson, 2018).

Rwanda's recovery was anchored in the government's adoption of a holistic development vision embodied in the Vision 2020 plan, which explicitly linked governance reforms with security imperatives and economic goals. The ruling party prioritized national unity, the rule of law, and decentralization as foundational pillars to prevent the recurrence of conflict and exclusion (Clark, 2018). The government's effective control over security forces and community policing initiatives helped maintain peace and order, creating a conducive environment for development programs to flourish (Reyntjens, 2011).

However, Rwanda's model also illustrates some limitations of a tightly controlled governance-security nexus. Critics highlight the trade-offs between stability and political space**,** with constraints on opposition parties, media freedoms, and civil society participation (Pham, 2017). From a systems perspective, Rwanda's approach reflects a governance-security-development system that prioritizes resilience and order but may constrain the emergence of diverse political voices and citizen-driven innovation that pluralistic participation enables (Pitcher, 2021). Thus, while Rwanda's integrated model

has driven impressive gains in poverty reduction and human development, it also poses questions about the sustainability of such tightly managed systems without expanded democratic accountability.

Case Study 2: Nigeria — Fragmentation and the Consequences of Disjointed Governance

Nigeria exemplifies the challenges when governance, security, and development policies remain fragmented within a complex, diverse system. Nigeria faces overlapping security crises, from Boko Haram's insurgency in the Northeast to communal violence in the Middle Belt and militancy in the Niger Delta. These security challenges are deeply intertwined with governance deficits such as corruption, weak institutional capacity, limited citizen trust, and uneven development marked by regional inequalities and youth unemployment (Adebanwi & Obadare, 2010; Campbell, 2017).

Nigeria's security response has often been militarized and reactive, lacking integrated coordination with development strategies that address root causes like poverty and marginalization (Okereke, 2020). For example, counterinsurgency efforts in the Northeast have sometimes exacerbated local grievances by displacing populations and disrupting livelihoods, fueling cycles of insecurity (Agbiboa, 2015). Governance reforms have been inconsistent, with corruption and elite capture undermining policy implementation and accountability (Lewis, 2011).

From a systems-thinking perspective, Nigeria's experience underscores how failure to align governance reforms with security and development efforts creates negative feedback loops**,** deepening fragility rather than resolving it (Tschirgi, 2020). The absence of effective institutional coordination means that uncoordinated interventions in one domain often trigger unintended consequences in others, reinforcing cycles of instability. This highlights the need for adaptive governance structures that promote policy coherence, multi-stakeholder engagement, and inclusive development planning principles advocated by frameworks like the APRM and AU Agenda 2063 (Akinola, 2021).

The case studies of Rwanda and Nigeria vividly illustrate the complexities inherent in managing governance, security, and development as an interconnected system. Rwanda's post-conflict trajectory showcases how integrated policy design and institutional coherence can catalyse sustainable recovery and growth. Its successes underscore the potential of a systems-thinking approach to align multiple domains towards common goals, fostering resilience and national stability. However, Rwanda also exemplifies the trade-offs such centralized control entails, raising important questions about the inclusivity and long-term sustainability of tightly managed governance structures (Pitcher, 2021).

In contrast, Nigeria highlights the risks of fragmentation and disjointed interventions within the governance-security-development nexus. Persistent security crises, governance

weaknesses, and uneven development interact in reinforcing cycles of instability and underperformance. This case underscores the critical need for adaptive governance systems to facilitate coordination across sectors, address root causes of insecurity, and promote equitable development. Without such integration, isolated efforts risk deepening rather than alleviating systemic challenges (Tschirgi, 2020; Akinola, 2021).

These cases affirm systems thinking as a critical lens for African policy frameworks, promoting holistic analysis, feedback responsiveness, and multi-level governance coherence. Ultimately, systems thinking challenges African policymakers to transcend reactive, piecemeal solutions and embrace complexity as a strategic asset. Mechanisms like NEPAD and the APRM can move from normative frameworks to effective transformation engines by cultivating adaptive, inclusive, and learning-oriented institutions. This shift is not merely technical but political, institutional, and epistemic, requiring a reconceptualization of governance as a dynamic, integrative process.

To further clarify the contrasting dynamics between Rwanda and Nigeria, the table below summarizes key differences across governance, security, and development dimensions as they relate to GSD integration.

Table 1. Comparative Overview of GSD Nexus in Rwanda and Nigeria.

Dimension	Rwanda	Nigeria
Governance	Centralized, coordinated, developmental	Fragmented, plagued by corruption
Security	Stable, strong state-led security apparatus	Multiple crises, militarized and reactive
Development	Inclusive, state-driven with tech focus	Uneven, regionally imbalanced
Institutional Coherence	High (vision 2020, APRM-aligned)	Low (Policy inconsistency, weak coordination)
Civic Space	Constrained	Partially open, but marred by distrust
GSD Integration	High (systems-thinking evident)	Low (synergy dominate)

Drawing from the comparative insights above, the next section offers actionable policy recommendations informed by systems thinking and Afrocentric values to address the interlinked challenges of governance, security, and development.

Policy Implications and Recommendations

The interdependence of governance, security, and development demands coherent, integrated policy approaches. Siloed interventions often fail to address the systemic nature

of Africa's challenges. The following policy recommendations derive from a systems-thinking perspective and an Afrocentric commitment to locally rooted solutions:

Integrated Policy Planning

National development strategies must transcend sectoral divides by embedding governance and security considerations into economic and social planning. Effective integrated planning begins with the creation of inter-ministerial coordination platforms, such as joint committees of finance, planning, interior, defence and social services tasked with developing unified budgets, risk assessments and performance targets that reflect the governance–security–development nexus rather than isolated mandates (Akinola 2021; UNECA 2022).

A second pillar is evidence-informed decision-making, which requires investment in interoperable data systems and analytics capacity. By bringing together national statistics, conflict and crime monitoring, public-service delivery metrics and citizen-feedback mechanisms, governments can detect emerging governance or security lapses early, calibrate interventions in real time, and track their impact on development outcomes (Tschirgi, Lund, & Mancini, 2020).

Finally, integrated policy planning must be anchored in long-term visioning that aligns national priorities with continental and global frameworks, namely, the African Union's Agenda 2063 (AU 2015) and the UN Sustainable Development Goals (UN 2015). Embedding multi-year milestones and mid-term policy reviews into these strategies helps to sustain coherence across electoral cycles and guard against policy reversals, ensuring that governance reforms and security investments reinforce, rather than undermine, sustainable development (Andrews 2020; Cilliers 2023).

Investment in Institutions

Weak public institutions remain a primary driver of state fragility across Africa, eroding rule of law and citizen trust. A strategic institutional investment agenda should address three interlinked dimensions:

- **Rule of Law and Judicial Capacity.** Strengthening courts, prosecutorial services, and legal aid mechanisms is essential to deter impunity and ensure accountability. This entails funding courthouse infrastructure, continuous training for judges and prosecutors on human-rights standards, and extending legal aid networks into rural and peri-urban communities (Olowu & Chanie 2018; Andrews 2020).
- **Decentralized Service Delivery.** Many governance failures and citizen grievances originate at the local level. Empowering sub-national governments through fiscal decentralisation, targeted capacity building for district administrations, and institutionalised community feedback mechanisms can

enhance responsiveness in health, education, and basic utilities (Booth & Golooba-Mutebi, 2019; Cilliers, 2023).

- **Oversight and Anti-Corruption Bodies.** Independent anti-corruption commissions, audit offices, and legislative oversight committees must be granted operational autonomy, adequate budgets, and clear legal mandates to investigate and sanction malfeasance. Public reporting requirements and whistleblower protections further bolster transparency and civic confidence (Akinola 2021; UNECA 2022).

Tailoring these reforms to local contexts, while embedding them in integrated national strategies, is key to fostering institutional resilience and inclusive development.

Early Warning and Response Systems

Effective governance and security systems must incorporate mechanisms for early detection and rapid response to emerging threats. AU-led initiatives like the Continental Early Warning System (CEWS), APRM, and the Peace and Security Council serve as key platforms for pre-empting political, social, and environmental crises (AU, 2021; Akinola, 2021).

To enhance effectiveness, these systems must be decentralised and localised, integrating real-time data analytics, community-based intelligence, and digital tools. Engaging civil society organisations, traditional leaders, youth networks, and women's groups increases both the credibility of information and the legitimacy of responses (Logan, 2009; Olowu & Chanie, 2018).

Mobile technologies and social media platforms are valuable early alert tools, but require safeguards against manipulation and misinformation (UNECA, 2022). Furthermore, linking early warning with coordinated rapid response across security, humanitarian, and governance actors is vital (Booth & Golooba-Mutebi, 2019). Strengthening EWRS capacities through training, financing, and regional information-sharing platforms is essential for preventing crisis escalation.

Local Participation and Ownership

Sustainable development cannot be achieved through top-down interventions alone. Inclusive governance demands genuine local participation, especially from historically marginalized groups (Olowu & Wunsch, 2004; Logan, 2009). Empowering citizens, particularly youth, women, and minority communities, to shape governance structures enhances both legitimacy and civic responsibility (Whitfield et al., 2015).

Decentralised mechanisms such as local councils, community development committees, and participatory budgeting must be institutionalised and resourced to be effective rather than symbolic (Booth & Golooba-Mutebi, 2019; Andrews, 2020). Overcoming barriers

such as gender bias, language exclusion, and limited access to technology is essential (Sen, 1999).

Participation must extend to co-creation and monitoring of policies. Tools like social audits, digital civic platforms, and citizen report cards promote mutual accountability (Tschirgi, 2020; De Oliveira, Hassan, & Olayode, 2023). When aligned with cultural norms and traditional institutions, within a human rights framework, such approaches improve implementation and foster resilience (Mazama, 2020; Mamdani, 1996).

Regional Cooperation and Institutional Synergy

Continental frameworks such as APRM, AUDA-NEPAD, and the African Governance Architecture (AGA) provide crucial infrastructure for addressing the governance–security–development nexus. These bodies facilitate technical support, mutual learning, and alignment of national policies with continental benchmarks (Hope, 2013; AU, 2021). Regional Economic Communities (RECs) such as ECOWAS, SADC, and IGAD complement this architecture by harmonising standards, mediating cross-border conflicts, and coordinating regional infrastructure and peacebuilding projects (Tschirgi, Lund, & Mancini, 2020; Cilliers, 2023). Strengthening coordination through joint task forces, harmonised reporting templates, and digital data-sharing platforms can amplify regional capacity to address complex challenges.

Embracing Digital Transformation

Digital technology is reshaping the governance landscape. E-governance tools, digital ID systems, and open data portals expand access, transparency, and inclusion. Meanwhile, satellite imaging, GIS, and mobile platforms improve crisis response, public service delivery, and conflict mapping (UNECA, 2022).

However, unregulated digitalisation risks reinforcing inequalities and authoritarianism. Gaps in access, digital literacy, and regulatory frameworks can exacerbate exclusion, while surveillance and disinformation threaten democratic norms (Abrahamsen, 2021; Andrews, 2020).

African states must develop inclusive digital governance frameworks that balance innovation with the protection of rights. This includes data protection laws, digital skills initiatives, independent digital ombudsmen, and rights-based oversight mechanisms (Pierre & Peters, 2020; Cilliers, 2023). When governed wisely, digital tools can serve as enablers of the governance–security–development nexus.

Conclusion: Toward Structural Reform and African-Centred Policy Coherence

This study has argued that governance, security, and development in Africa are deeply interconnected. These challenges must be approached as elements of a dynamic system that can either spiral into dysfunction or be harnessed for transformation. Case studies

from Rwanda and Nigeria illustrate both the risks of disjointed policy and the promise of integrated governance.

AU-led frameworks such as the APRM and NEPAD offer Afrocentric models for peer learning and voluntary reform. However, coordination gaps, donor dependency, and inconsistent implementation undermine their potential. Coherence between national, regional, and continental mechanisms is essential to transform policy into impact.

Challenges and Opportunities

Persistent challenges include fragmented governance, institutional overlap, and the exclusion of civil society. Yet Africa has notable assets: a rising youth population, technological innovation, and enduring pan-African values of solidarity and self-determination.

A Call for Structural Reform

To advance, structural reform must embrace Afrocentric epistemologies centring African experiences, knowledge systems, and voices. Revisiting colonial legacies and embedding feedback-rich, adaptive governance mechanisms will be key to escaping cycles of dependency and instability.

Actionable Recommendations

- Embed the governance–security–development nexus in national policy, supported by inter-ministerial coordination.
- Invest in robust, accountable institutions at all governance levels.
- Expand the scope of APRM and NEPAD to include digital, environmental, and urban governance.
- Deepen civic education and youth inclusion to foster democratic resilience.
- Strengthen regional knowledge exchange through peer review, academic collaboration, and open data ecosystems.

Africa's pathway to peace and prosperity lies not in imported paradigms but in African-owned frameworks of coherence, inclusion, and transformation.

Funding Acknowledgment

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

Abrahamsen, R. (2021). *Security beyond the state: Private security in international politics*. Cambridge University Press.

Abdulrauf, L., & Ebiede, T. M. (2021). Beyond the state: Non-state actors and governance in Africa. *African Security Review, 30*(3), 270–284.

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Business.

Adebajo, A. (2020). *The curse of Berlin: Africa after the Cold War*. Hurst.

African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). (2020). *Continental self-assessment report 2020*. APRM Secretariat.

African Union. (2015). *Agenda 2063: The Africa we want*. African Union Commission.

African Union. (2021). *African governance report IV: Promoting African shared values*. African Union Commission.

Akinola, A. O. (2021). Governance, security and development in Africa: Intersecting challenges and prospects. *African Journal of Governance and Development, 10*(2), 35–52.

Andrews, M. (2020). Governing for development: Institutional capabilities and public sector performance in developing countries. *World Development, 136*, 105084. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105084

Ansoms, A., & Rostagno, D. (2012). Rwanda's Vision 2020 halfway through: What the eye does not see. *Review of African Political Economy, 39*(132), 427–450.

Autesserre, S. (2019). *The trouble with the Congo: Local violence and the failure of international peacebuilding*. Cambridge University Press.

Booth, D., & Golooba-Mutebi, F. (2019). Developmental patrimonialism? The case of Rwanda. *African Affairs, 118*(472), 466–492.

Call, C. T., & Cousens, E. M. (2022). Ending wars and building peace: International responses to war-torn societies. *International Studies Perspectives, 23*(1), 1–18.

Campbell, J. (2017). *Nigeria: Dancing on the brink*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Cilliers, J. (2023). *Africa's path to 2063: Choice in the face of great transformation*. Institute for Security Studies.

Clark, P. (2018). *The Gacaca courts, post-genocide justice and reconciliation in Rwanda: Justice without lawyers*. Cambridge University Press.

De Oliveira, R. S., Hassan, M., & Olayode, K. (2023). Resilience and adaptation in African governance systems. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 41*(1), 45–67.

De Waal, A. (2020). *South Sudan: A new history for a fragile state*. Zed Books.

De Waal, A. (2021). *New pathways to peace in Africa: Security beyond the state*. Zed Books.

Ero, C. (2021). Governance and fragility in Africa. *African Security Review, 30*(2), 143–161.

Geda, A., & Yimer, M. (2023). Inclusive governance and development resilience in Africa. *Journal of African Development Studies, 15*(1), 19–41.

Gruzd, S., Turianskyi, Y., & Edwell, R. (2021). *African Peer Review Mechanism: Lessons from the first 20 years*. South African Institute of International Affairs.

Gyimah-Boadi, E., & Prempeh, H. K. (2019). Preventing democratic backsliding in Ghana. *Journal of Democracy, 30*(4), 64–78.

Hope, K. R. (2013). The African Peer Review Mechanism: A critical appraisal. *South African Journal of International Affairs, 20*(2), 157–176.

International Crisis Group. (2023). *Somalia's protracted conflict and the governance challenge (Africa Report No. 320)*. https://www.crisisgroup.org

Lewis, P. (2011). Nigeria: Elections in a fragile state. *Journal of Democracy, 22*(4), 112–126.

Logan, C. (2009). Traditional authority and local government in Africa. *African Studies Review, 62*(3), 38–58.

Mamdani, M. (1996). *Citizen and subject: Contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism*. Princeton University Press.

Masterson, G. (2016). The APRM: A governance agenda in difficult times. In A. Adebajo (Ed.), *African solutions: Linking governance, development and security* (pp. 123–148). UCT Press.

Mazama, A. (2020). *Afrocentricity and African governance: Decolonizing perspectives*. Routledge.

Mbembe, A. (2021). *Necropolitics*. Duke University Press.

Menkhaus, K. (2023). *Somalia: State collapse and the rise of non-state actors* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Mkandawire, T. (2022). The institutional logic of hybrid governance in Africa. *African Affairs, 121*(482), 312–329.

Mkutu, K. (2019). Security governance and hybrid security arrangements in Africa. *African Affairs, 118*(472), 539–562.

Mudimbe, V. Y. (2019). *The invention of Africa: Gnosis, philosophy, and the order of knowledge*. Indiana University Press.

NEPAD. (2001). *The New Partnership for Africa's Development: Framework document*. African Union.

Obeng-Odoom, F. (2022). *The commons in an age of uncertainty: Decolonizing nature, economy, and society*. University of Toronto Press.

Olowu, D., & Chanie, P. (2018). *State fragility and state building in Africa: Cases from Eastern and Southern Africa*. Springer.

Olonisakin, F., & Ekiyor, T. (2022). Hybrid security governance and local ownership in Africa. *African Security Review, 31*(2), 165–180.

Okereke, C. (2020). Security challenges and development in Nigeria's North-East. *African Security Review, 29*(3), 225–242.

Okoth-Ogendo, H. W. O. (2000). Legislative approaches to customary tenure and tenure reform in East Africa. *Land Reform, Land Settlement and Cooperatives, 1*, 69–74.

Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2020). *Governance, politics and the state* (2nd ed.). Red Globe Press.

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Alfred A. Knopf.

Sen, A., Stiglitz, J. E., & Fitoussi, J.-P. (2018). *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. OECD.

Sebudubudu, D., & Botlhomilwe, M. G. (2018). Democracy and development in Botswana: What role for the opposition? *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 12*(2), 21–29.

Stewart, F. (2010). *Horizontal inequalities and conflict: Understanding group violence in multiethnic societies*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Thomson, S. M. (2018). *Whispering truth to power: Everyday resistance to reconciliation in postgenocide Rwanda*. University of Wisconsin Press.

Tschirgi, N. (2020). *The nexus of governance, security, and development: A framework for addressing complex crises*. International Peace Institute.

Tschirgi, N., Lund, M., & Mancini, F. (2020). *The security-development nexus: Peace, conflict and development* (2nd ed.). Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Ubink, J., & Menkel-Meadow, C. (2020). *Customary justice and the rule of law in Africa*. Cambridge University Press.

UNECA (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa). (2022a). *Building forward better: Towards a resilient and inclusive Africa*. https://www.uneca.org

UNECA. (2022b). *Economic report on Africa 2022: Leveraging Africa's demographic dividend for sustainable development*. https://www.uneca.org

Uvin, P. (2009). *Life after violence: A people's story of Burundi*. Zed Books.

Williams, P. D. (2022). *Understanding peacekeeping* (3rd ed.). Polity Press.

World Bank. (2022a). *Fragility, conflict, and violence in Africa*. https://www.worldbank.org

World Bank. (2022b). *Rwanda economic update: Seizing the digital opportunity*. https://www.worldbank.org