



Attaining Equity and Regional Balance in Economic Development in the East African Community: A Critical Review of the Progress and Challenges

CJSSM

ISSN 2518-8623

Volume 2. Issue 1

pp. 1-31, June 2023

www.cavendish.ac.ug

email: secretarycjssm@cavendish.ac.ug

Alex Thomas Ijjo

Cavendish University Uganda.

Email: aijjo@cavendish.ac.ug

Olive Sabiiti

Cavendish University Uganda.

Email: osabiiti@cavendish.ac.ug

Andrew Musiime

Ministry of East African Community Affairs in Uganda

Emmanuel Mutahunga

Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives in Uganda

How to cite this article: Ijjo, A. T, Sabiiti, O, Musiime, A. & Mutahunga, E. (2023). Attaining Equity and Regional Balance in Economic Development in the East African Community: A Critical Review of the Progress and Challenges. Cavendish Journal of Social Science and Management, Vol 2.

Abstract

This Paper examines whether there is any transition toward equity and regional balance in economic development in the East African Community (EAC). The attainment of equity and regional balance is a key objective of the EAC integration enshrined in Article 5 of the Treaty establishing the EAC and is aligned with its Vision 2050 and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal Eight. After two decades of the revival of the EAC, there is a need to evaluate whether there has been any transition toward economic convergence. The study uses Analysis of Variance to compare a range of economic indicators across five-member countries, including per capita incomes, life expectancies, unemployment levels, human development indices, foreign direct investment flows, manufacturing value-added, trade flows, and infrastructure development. The findings reveal persistent disparities in all metrics, highlighting challenges such as infrastructural development and connectivity asymmetries, trade interference, pockets of insecurity, weak supranational authority, and knowledge-based marginalisation. The results underscore the necessity for targeted interventions to deepen economic linkages and connectivity to promote equity and regional balance.

Key words – Equity, regional balance, economic development, principle of asymmetry, compensatory mechanism, variable geometry, East African Community.



1.0 Introduction

Regional Economic Communities (RECs) are organizations formed by groups of countries in a given geographic region to promote economic cooperation and development. A key component of a REC is usually trade liberalization within the REC. As a result, RECs are seen as a step toward full liberalization of trade with the rest of the world and are therefore compatible with the liberal trade rules of the World Trade Organization (WTO). In recent years, Regional Integration Agreements (RIAs) which govern such economic communities have become a rising phenomenon. The trade liberalization reforms entailed in the agreements are seen as instrumental in driving economic growth and development. In particular, RIAs enhance market size and lead to increased trade and investment, economies of scale, enhanced competitive intensity, productivity and innovation by firms (Sharpe and Currie 2008).

The East African Community (EAC) is a key regional economic integration effort in Sub-Saharan Africa. One critical goal of the EAC integration is ensuring equity and regional balance in economic development within the Community as expressed in the EAC's Treaty, Vision 2050, and 6th Development Strategy (EAC, 1999; EAC, 2016; EAC, 2021). There is a range of perspectives regarding equity – including 'fairness' in distributions (Rawls, 1971); equality of opportunity, treating people with equal concern and respect (Dworkin, 1983); and the idea that similar cases should be treated alike, with similar benefits (or burdens) to be enjoyed (or suffered) by similar people. Equity explicitly considers empowerment, shared prosperity, and promoting equality of opportunity. (Oestreich, 2018). In the context of this paper, the term equity is taken to mean fairness, justice and equality in the access to economic opportunities and the allocation of resources within the society. Equity recognizes differences in starting points and circumstances and seeks to redress imbalances to ensure equal opportunities for all. Equity represents an essential principle in the EAC regional integration effort as Partner States commit to the equitable distribution of the benefits of the integration. Equity in sharing the benefits of integration was a significant factor in the failure of the first attempt at EAC integration in 1977 and is likely to be instrumental in the success of the revived EAC. The other important goal is regional balance, which refers to uniformity in progress toward economic development for all of the Community.

Article 5 of the EAC Treaty states that EAC integration aims to bring about "accelerated, harmonious and balanced development and sustained expansion of economic activities, the benefit of which shall be equitably shared" (EAC Treaty, 1999). The importance of the issue of equity is such that The EAC Customs Union (EAC CU) which came into force in 2005 incorporated the principle of asymmetry as a compensatory mechanism to address the initial

imbalances among the partner states particularly the dominance of Kenya, a middle-income country, vis-à-vis the other member states.

The EAC Treaty spells out that a “market-based” approach will be the operational principle for attaining the Community’s objectives of accelerated and equitable development in a fully-fledged customs union (EAC 1999: Article 7:1(a); EAC 2005: Article 21). The Treaty however recognizes the limitation of the market-friendly principle especially in cases of significant initial disparities among the Members States. It therefore provided for compensatory mechanisms and for market-oriented interventions by individual countries to improve their share of the benefits of the integration.

The EAC member states adopted the Principle of Asymmetry during its transformation into a Customs Union. The principle of asymmetry addresses variances in the implementation of measures in an integration process for purposes of achieving a common objective. In the case of the EAC the principle allowed Uganda and Tanzania to retain but gradually phase out tariffs against certain category of goods from Kenya by the year 2010 (EAC, 2004). This was agreed in view of Kenya’s relatively more advanced status vis-à-vis Uganda and Tanzania.

In a liberalized framework, the distribution of the benefits among partner states will reflect the competitiveness of individual member states. This is fair system in as far as there are no significant historical or systemic disparities among the partner states. In case of significant inequalities in initial conditions, the Treaty recommended the use of compensatory measures to address the imbalances (EAC, 1999).

However, in spite of the much-anticipated shared benefits of the economic integration, there is lingering scepticism regarding the realization of equity and regional balance in the EAC. Stahl (2005) predicted that the EAC Customs Union is likely to benefit member states unequally due to the uneven infrastructure development and other constraints. Stahl (2005) recommended putting in place compensatory policy measures to address imbalances and constraints to integration in member states to ensure a more equitable distribution of the benefits of the EAC integration and subsequently the stability of the Community.

The issue of equity in the sharing of the benefits of integration in the EAC is so crucial that Article 35 of the Customs Union (CU) protocol incorporates a provision for addressing imbalances among the community member states. In particular, the article provided for the application of the principle of asymmetry which permitted slower rates of tariff liberalization for Uganda and Tanzania vis-à-vis Kenya over the five-year transitional period 2005-2010 for the Customs Union. This is in addition to the conventional market-based approach to the sharing of the benefits of the integration (Article 21 of CU protocol). The question this paper

addresses is whether, 20 years on, there is any transition toward convergence in economic indicators reflecting regional balance in the EAC. It is hard to find studies that evaluate the progressive realization of equity, inclusiveness, and regional balance in the EAC. This study addresses this lacuna.

2.0 Objectives of the Study

The paper uses the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) technique to compare a range of economic indicators including per capita incomes, proportion of national income consumed, life expectancies, human development indices, unemployment, foreign direct investment inflows, manufacturing value added, Gini coefficients, and others for five EAC member states. The member states selected are Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda. This selection is based on the availability of the relevant data sets and full implementation of the EAC CU, as the starting pillar of the EAC Integration. It should be noted that whereas Republic of South Sudan and Democratic Republic of Congo are members of the EAC, they may not have fully adopted a number of integration processes having joined recently.

The analysis compares the various socioeconomic indicators averaged over the last twenty years for similarity or significant differences. Similarity in the mean indicators will suggest convergence and therefore the realization of the objective of equity and regional balance in the EAC. Significant differences on the other hand will signify persisting inequality and the possible need for compensatory interventions to aid the market-based approach.

Finally, the paper examines the challenges facing the Community in moving toward equity and regional balance in economic development. To this end, the paper carries out content analysis of the available literature to identify the key challenges and their operational mechanisms with bearing on the objective of equity and regional balance. The results will help in justifying the need for compensatory interventions, the critical sectors and the mechanisms to employ to move the Community toward equity and regional balance.

3.0 Review of Literature

In the last few decades, the phenomenon of economic integration has been on the rise in Africa as elsewhere (Bala, 2017; Sha, 2021; Brenton and Hoffman, 2016). Examples of these African Economic Communities include – the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) founded in 1975; the Southern African Development Community (SADC) formed in 1980; the Common Market for Eastern and Southern African States (COMESA) founded in 1994; the East African Community (EAC) established in 2000; and many others. African countries have recognized the potential benefits of regional economic integration. These

benefits include but are not limited to enlarged market sizes, attractiveness to inward foreign investment, increased trade, potential for increased employment creation, broadening of choices for consumers, enhancing strategic security, sustaining fraternal relations, higher bargaining power with the rest of the world, and overall economic growth.

The rationale for regional economic integration is drawn from a number of economic theories including the theory of economic integration, transaction cost theory, economies of scale, and trade liberalization theory. These theories provide complementary explanations for the benefits of trade between member states of a regional economic grouping. Specifically, economic integration theory focuses on the process by which neighboring countries come together to foster greater economic cooperation for shared benefits. The primary goal is to create larger, integrated markets which allow for more efficient resource allocations, economies of scale, increased trade, and enhanced economic growth within the region (Bhagwati, 1993; Schiff and Winters, 2003).

On the other hand, trade liberalization highlights the benefits of free trade for participating countries. Adam Smith's absolute advantage theory (1776) and David Ricardo's comparative advantage theory (Ricardo, 1817) all advocated for free trade. These theories were later augmented by the Heckscher-Ohlin theory and other modern trade theories (Krueger, 1997; Corden 1984). It is complementary to the broader economic integration approach to trade, emphasizing the positive effects of trade openness on the volume and patterns of trade between countries. Trade openness is one of the key aspects of economic integration operationalized through customs unions and common market arrangements and other forms of integration (Bagwati, 2002; Baldwin and Krugman, 1999; Krugman, 2018)

In a regional economic integration effort, the initial level of economic integration is normally a Preferential Trade Area (PTA), which represents economic integration between countries that aim to promote trade by reducing or eliminating tariffs and other trade barriers on goods and or services among themselves. In a PTA, member countries agree to give preferential treatment to each other's goods or services, typically in the form of reduced tariffs or tariff exemptions. The preferential treatment is limited to the member countries and does not extend to non-member countries.

The next form of grouping is a Free Trade Area (FTA) which refers to economic integration where a group of countries agree to eliminate tariffs, quotas, and other trade barriers among themselves while allowing each member country to maintain its own external trade policies with non-member countries. The next level of economic integration to the FTA is a Customs Union which represents a free trade area but with a common external tariff on goods imported from non-member countries. In a Customs Union, Member countries eliminate internal tariffs

and other trade barriers among themselves, and agree to apply the same tariffs to goods imported from non-member countries. The EAC established a Customs Union in 2005.

A Common Market (CM) extends the customs union by allowing the free movement of the factors of production including capital, labour and services, among member states, in addition to merchandize. The EAC transformed into a Common Market in 2010. The EAC Common Market allows for the free movement of goods, services, capital, and labor among member countries. The next level of integration is an Economic Union which involves deeper integration including the creation of common fiscal and monetary policies often involving a monetary union (single currency). The final level of integration is the political federation which involves the creation of a supranational authority with power to tax, spend, and regulate economic activity across member countries.

The East African Community (EAC) is a regional intergovernmental economic grouping comprising of the seven-member states of Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and Uganda. After its collapse in 1975, the EAC was re-established in 2000 with the aim of promoting economic integration, political cooperation, and social development among its member countries. The EAC is currently implementing a Customs Union and the Common Market, and is moving toward Monetary Union and Political Federation as the remaining pillars of full integration.

The advantages of Regional Economic Integration include but are not limited to increased Trade, economic growth, improved efficiency in production and distribution, economies of scale in production and lower production costs, increased competition, innovation and improved quality of goods. In addition, economic integration boosts foreign investment inflow through owing to the larger markets created, greater stability and security from enhanced political cooperation and institutional development within the region.

However, there are also challenges which face regional economic integration efforts. These challenges include – the exacerbation of economic disparities as more developed countries may benefit more from the integration process than less developed countries (Stiglitz, 2004; Klein 2007; Stahl, 2005); loss of sovereignty in complying with common policies and regulations determined by the supranational authority however unfavorable; economic integration can also lead to protectionist tendencies among member countries, as they may seek to protect their domestic industries from competition from other member countries, and persistent and recurring non-tariff barriers (NTBs) that slow down the integration.

Finally, regional economic integration can also lead to trade diversion, where member countries shift their trade away from more efficient non-member countries towards less

efficient member countries as a result of the common external tariff (CET) surcharge on the prices of imported goods. In addition to trade diversion, member states can have political differences and conflicts that can affect cross border trading and economic activities. An example is the conflict between Uganda and Rwanda on political, security and mutual allegations that led to the closure of the border for three years from February 2019 to January 2022!

The EAC has registered notable successes in opening up trade among the member states (Table 1). Export performances for Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi show some fluctuations while that of Kenya and Tanzania are relatively stable at least for the years considered. This may reflect the relative development of the export sectors of Kenya and Tanzania. Uganda’s export sector expanded from traditional exports such as coffee, tea and tobacco to include non-traditional exports such as fish, flowers, beans, maize, building materials and others while Rwanda and Burundi’s export levels remain relatively low.

Table 1: Intra-EAC exports, imports and GDP (Millions of 2015 USD)

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Burundi	Exports	92	132	118	125	173	180
	Imports	676	655	579	527	648	676
	GDP	2,400	2,723	2,811	2,920	3,097	N/A
Kenya	Exports	5,846	6,219	5,982	5,747	5,792	6,105
	Imports	16,089	17,538	15,563	13,413	15,994	16,341
	GDP	64,951	66,806	63,470	84,518	88,166	93,525
Rwanda	Exports	703	723	684	727	1,050	1,126
	Imports	1,852	2,000	1,917	2,033	1,879	2,041
	GDP	7,177	7,618	8,293	8,791	9,331	10,131
Tanzania	Exports	5,258	5,319	5,648	4,950	4,524	4,380
	Imports	11,029	10,918	9,843	8,464	7,552	7,752
	GDP	41,813	44,621	47,379	50,636	54,061	57,819
Uganda	Exports	2,829	2,725	2,667	2,921	3,450	3,642
	Imports	4,974	5,100	4,955	4,518	5,164	6,100
	GDP	26,692	28,066	29,463	30,739	32,290	34,336

Source: EAC Data Portal, 2023

Growth in trade notwithstanding, a number of challenges remain in fully realizing the vision of the EAC integration, particularly that of attaining regional balance and equity in economic development. These challenges include persisting income inequalities, infrastructure development imbalances, incomplete harmonization of policies and regulations, non-tariff

barriers to trade, political differences and unresolved disputes, and the need for continued political commitment to overcome obstacles to the deepening of the integration.

The degree of regional balance and equity in economic development among EAC's member countries can be assessed through indicators of socioeconomic development and wellbeing in the respective countries. The socioeconomic indicators selected for assessment in this paper include the level of national income per capita which is a proxy for the level of material wellbeing of people in the member states. The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita which represents the value of goods and services produced in a country over the period of one year divided by the population and per capita GDP a theoretical figure that assumes the national income is equally distributed among the people.

Closely related to income levels are measures of poverty or deprivation in the basic necessities of life. This is also measured in various ways including head count of individuals below an absolute poverty line expressed in terms of daily expenditure per person. The average daily consumption expenditure per person is good measure of the relative material wellbeing of persons in a country. Alternatively, consumption as percent of GDP provides an indication of the proportion of the GDP (annual output in a year) that is consumed. Thus, the comparison of consumption levels constitutes a measure of level of material wellbeing of the people in the respective countries.

Another critical indicator of the degree of regional balance and equity in the Community is the longevity of life of the people in member states. The standard measure for longevity of life is the life expectancy at birth (LEB) expressed in years. This data is available in the World Bank's WDI. Closely related to the LEB is the Human Development Index (HDI) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The HDI is a composite index that incorporates life expectancy, educational attainment, and per capita income. Comparing the HDI scores for EAC's member states will provide a good idea of the quality of life in the respective countries. This data is available from the UNDP's Human Development Reports (HDRs).

The Gini coefficient is a measure used for measuring inequality. It quantifies the distribution of income within a country or region. Calculating and comparing Gini coefficients for the EAC member states provides insights into the level of inequality in the respective countries. This measure is important since it captures situations where countries, regions, or populations are excluded from the growth and development process contrary to the key UN SDG of inclusivity.

Measures of employment and labor market participation also provide an idea of the socioeconomic condition across the EAC member countries and can be used for assessing the performance of the countries. The indicators can bring out differences in employment levels

across the countries. For example, high labor participation rate and low unemployment are indicators of possible economic wellbeing. So, a comparison of the level of employment or unemployment will provide a measure of the degree of equity and regional balance in economic participation and wellbeing within the Community.

Manufacturing value added (MVA) as a percentage of GDP basically provides insights into the significance of the manufacturing sector in the economy. However, besides reflecting the contribution of the manufacturing value added to the economy, it also signifies the level of industrial development. Viewed against the performance of other key sectors, the MVA can give an idea of the level of economic diversification and industrial development including things like agro-processing, automotive, electronics, textiles, footwear, or machinery. The MVA can also give insights into the level of technological advancement of the country, technological innovation, potential for employment creation, and export competitiveness.

Trade as a percentage of GDP, also known as the trade-to-GDP ratio, is another important macroeconomic variable that can be used in comparing performance among countries. In particular, the measure provides insights into the extent to which a country engages in international trade in relation to its overall economic output. The trade-to-GDP ratio gives indication of the level of openness to international trade; the integration of the country's economy in the global economy; the degree of export competitiveness; the diversity and resilience of the economy and exposure to global economic conditions and the strategic goals of the country and the possible diversity of goods and services.

The rate of foreign direct investment (FDI) inflow into the EAC member countries provides insights into the relative attractiveness of the partner states to investors and has a strong bearing on the level of economic activity and factor (especially labor) employment and subsequently per capita incomes. The distribution of FDI per capita in the member states has the potential to influence regional balance in economic development. Thus, a comparison of the distribution of investment, economic activities among member states brings out any imbalances in the economic development of the Community.

The level of development of the economic infrastructure in each member state is another important variable for assessment. Evaluating the level of infrastructure development, such as transportation networks, kilometers of railways, power supply, and telecommunications, are indicators of linkage and accessibility to economic opportunities and resources. Economic infrastructure is instrumental in linking up markets, economic activities and support services and systems. Unequal access to infrastructure and connectivity, including transportation, communication, and energy, can limit economic opportunities and hinder regional economic integration efforts. Comparing the quality and availability of infrastructure in each member state can provide insights into economic dynamism or marginalization.



The second issue addressed by this paper is the role of market-based approach in delivering the EAC objective of equity and regional balance. In a liberalized market framework, trade patterns reflect the competitiveness of the participating firms and countries (WEF, 2014). According to Fagerberg (1996) “countries that gain market share are characterized by rising technological capability and productivity. Indeed, productivity has come to constitute one of the most important drivers not only of market competitiveness (Porter, 1990), but also long-term economic growth and steady increase in income levels (Fagerberg and Srholec, 2007).

In a free and unfettered environment, the market-based approach would be a fair system for allocating the benefits of production and trading in the Community. However, where there are infrastructural obstructions and accessibility challenges, markets will not be able to coordinate efficient resource allocation and trade flows. In such cases, it is evident that the constraints have first to be removed before market forces can work. This will often necessitate direct intervention to create the conducive environment for the markets to function. This is also associated with the strategy of compensatory mechanisms aimed at levelling the playing field for the member countries.

Indeed, in the wake of significant regional imbalances, the EAC has applied compensatory intervention as a complementary safeguard to the liberal market-based approach. Many successful regional integration arrangements (RIAs) like the European Union (EU), the Southern African Customs Union (SACU) and others owe much of their success to such mechanisms (Saidi, 2005; Fernandez and Portes, 1998; Whalley, 1998). Compensatory and Countervailing measures in regional integration are put in place to assist poorly performing countries in RIAs to compete favourably. A wide range of compensatory mechanisms have been used by various regional groupings to address imbalances and injuries that arise.

The World Trade Organisation (WTO) provides for countervailing measures for example in relation to subsidies where there is evidence of injury to an economy from import trade with another (Hoekman, 1995). The European Union (EU), the Dominican Republic-Central American Free Trade Area (DR-CAFTA) along with other groupings used compensatory mechanisms to insure against injuries. The South African Development Cooperation used the removal of exchange controls as compensatory mechanisms to redress negative effects on growth and equity in the region (Jenkins *et al*, 2000).

In contrast, the absence of such compensatory mechanisms has slowed down the integration process in many RIAs with the process only picking up once such mechanisms are put in place. The limited success of the integration of MERCOSUR (Mercado Comune del Sur or South Common Market) especially before 2004 can be attributed to the absence of compensatory

policies. As part of the effort to ensure convergence and equity in economic development, the MERCOSUR introduced the structural convergence fund aimed at financing programmes to promote structural convergence, develop competitiveness and promote social cohesion among smaller and less developed nations.

Due to the lack of such safeguards in MERCOSUR, for example, Argentina suffered considerable economic injuries as a result of competition from Brazilian imports since 2005. Both Argentina and Brazil are members of MERCOSUR. Thus, it can be argued that the absence of compensatory policies thwarted the liberalization process in the MERCOSUR (Orcalli, 2012). However, in 2004 the MERCOSUR established the Structural Convergence fund similar to the EU's structural funds. Becoming operational in 2006, the structural convergence fund has contributed to reducing asymmetries within MERCOSUR. Thus, although many trading blocs have had limited success in integration due to the lack of effective compensatory mechanisms, the EU stands out as one bloc that has realized significant success as a result of effective compensatory systems. The EU has four structural funds that are used to reduce imbalances in the EU. These are the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the European Social Fund, the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, and the Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance.

Botelho (2012) has argued the importance of addressing policy asymmetries as an important measure of deepening integration processes. The failure of the EAC in 1977 has been at least in part, attributed to the unequal distribution of benefits and the lack of compensatory arrangements especially for Uganda and Tanzania (Atsiaya, 2014). However, the revived EAC incorporated the principle of asymmetry and the provision of Variable Geometry in accession to the RIAs to address initial imbalances among the member states during the five-year transitional period to the customs union.

4.0 Methodology

This paper employs the technique of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to compare key socioeconomic indicators for five of the seven EAC member countries having the relevant datasets. The countries considered in the paper are Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda. The paper compares measures of socioeconomic performance across the five countries including but not limited to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita, Consumption as percent of GDP, Life Expectancy at Birth (LEB), Human Development Index (HDI), Trade-to-GDP ratio, Manufacturing Value Added (MVA) as percent of GDP, Unemployment, Infrastructure development, Foreign direct investment (FDI), Gini Coefficient, and others.

The data is obtained from the World Bank’s World Development Indicators (WDI), the EAC’s Annual Reports on Trade and Investment, and the EAC Data Portal. The WDI data considered for majority of the variables runs from the year 2000 to the year 2021, that is, 22 years. The data from the EAC’s Data Portal employed is largely from 2013 to 2018. The datasets on all the indicators are presented in the appendix. The paper tests the null hypothesis that the means for each indicator for the member states are the same and equal to some population mean, and the alternative hypotheses that at least one mean is significantly different from the population mean. This is expressed as follows for each indicator considered:

$$H_0: \mu_{BDI} = \mu_{KEN} = \mu_{RWA} = \mu_{TZA} = \mu_{UGA} = \mu_0$$

$$H_1: \text{At least one mean } \mu_i \neq \mu_0$$

Where,

- μ_{BDI} = Mean of the indicator for the country subscribed;
- μ_0 = Population mean for the indicator for the selected countries;
- μ_i = Mean of the indicator for any of the countries subscribed i.

The analysis of variance techniques compares the variation “between” the means of different “treatments” or in this case, “countries”, for similarity. The method uses the F-Statistic that compares the sum of squares between countries with the sum of squares within each country as per the formula:

$$F_{ratio} = \frac{\text{Variation between countries}}{\text{Variation within countries}}$$

Table 2: Computation of the F-Statistics

Source of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F-Statistic
Between	$SSB = \sum_{j=1}^k [X - \bar{X}]^2$	$df_b = n - k$	$MSB = \frac{SSB}{df_b}$	$F = \frac{MSB}{MSW}$
Within	$SSW = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{i=1}^l [X - \bar{X}_j]^2$	$df_w = k - 1$	$MSW = \frac{SSW}{df_w}$	
Total	$SST = \sum_J [\bar{X}_J - \bar{X}]^2$	$df_t = n - 1$		

In the interpretation, a computed F-Statistic that is greater than F-Critical and or p-value less than 0.05 is statistically significant and represents a rejection of the null hypothesis that the mean indicators for the selected countries are the same. In economic terms, this implies that the means of the specific economic indicator for the member states considered are not the same.



This indicates the absence of convergence on the socioeconomic parameters. On the other hand, if the F-Statistics is less than F-Critical, then we fail to reject the null hypotheses and conclude that the socioeconomic indicators for the selected countries are similar. This would then suggest a convergence on the indicators among the member states.

4.1 Analysis and Results

The economic indicators analysed are - the gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (in constant 2015 US\$), final consumption expenditure (percent of GDP), life expectancy at birth (years), human development index (HDI), Gini coefficient (0-1), unemployment (percent of labor force), trade-to-GDP ratio, manufacturing value added to GDP ratio, intra-EAC trade balance (% of GDP), foreign direct investment inflow (as percent of GDP), railway infrastructure development (Km).

Table 3: Summary of the ANOVA analysis results.

	GDP/CAPITA (\$)	CONSUM/GDP (%)	LEB (Years)	HDI (0-1)	GINI INDEX (0-100)	UNEMPL (%)	MVA/GDP (%)	TRADE/GDP (%)	FDI/GDP (%)	RAIL INFR (Km)	INTRA-EAC TB
BDI	293.49	106.45	56.58	0.39	36.00	1.92	10.18	32.66	0.54	0.00	-0.18
KEN	1,381.78	90.15	59.66	0.54	43.65	3.45	10.17	47.48	0.88	2,490.60	-0.13
RWA	604.69	94.92	60.76	0.47	47.30	12.09	8.25	40.93	1.93	0.00	-0.13
TZA	810.65	74.04	60.44	0.49	38.98	2.79	8.81	38.68	3.05	3,605.33	-0.09
UGA	749.96	85.62	57.00	0.48	43.13	3.27	12.43	39.56	3.46	259.00	-0.07
F-Stat	162.19	156.17	3.68	29.46	9.91	778.43	10.66	7.51	26.09	8.86	9.49
F-Crit	2.46	2.46	2.46	2.46	3.11	2.45	2.46	2.46	2.46	3.63	2.78
P-value	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Source: Computed by the authors from the WDI, UNDP, and EAC data sets

The summary of the ANOVA analysis results is presented in Table 3 showing the mean values of the socioeconomic indicators for the five countries and the computed F-statistics and their p-values. All the F-statistics values are greater than the critical and significant at the 1 percent level of significance (p-value < 0.01). This represents a rejection of the null hypotheses that the socioeconomic indicators for the five countries are the same.

The empirical results show persisting asymmetries in the key economic indicators for the five EAC countries. This means that over the 15 to 20 years of the revived East African Community, there is as yet no significant convergence in the socioeconomic indicators across the partner states. This is despite the considerable effort in trade liberalization and the coordination of economic policies. These findings agree with the findings of other studies including Vigninou Gammadigbe (2021) and Stahl (2005) but raise the question of what bottlenecks are preventing the harmonization of the socioeconomic conditions in the Community; and whether ultra-market compensatory interventions are required, and the specific sectors that are critical in leveraging equity and regional balance in economic development within the EAC.

One of the pivotal factors in the spread of economic prosperity is the development of economic infrastructure which is essential in linking up different parts of the community economically and socially. Both the literature and the empirical results clearly underscore the asymmetries in economic infrastructure development in the EAC (Stahl 2005). The imbalance grossly affects accessibility to hubs of economic activities and opportunities for different regions of the Community. Markets function efficiently when there is effectual linkage and free accessibility to resources, commodities and services. This shows that without the necessary infrastructural linkages and economic connectivity, the market approach to stimulating inclusive growth and equity in the EAC is unlikely to ensue.

Table 4: Global Competitiveness Rankings for EAC states

Country	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Burundi	133	134	136	135	133
Kenya	90	96	91	93	95
Rwanda	58	52	56	55	58
Tanzania	116	122	116	113	110
Uganda	120	118	114	115	115

Source: World Economic Forum, GCR (2015-2019)

The other critical sector is education, a key factor in human capital development. The empirical analysis above showed significant disparities in the HDI for the partner states. The HDI incorporates educational attainment, an important enabler for equity and convergence as it underpins growth in human capital and subsequently the participation and economic productivity of the people. There will be need to harmonize and facilitate free exchange of educational services and training for the development of skills across the EAC. To a significant extent this is already being done through the EAC's various policy initiatives to harmonize education systems and training curricula in the region along with the role of the Inter-University Council of East Africa (IUCEA).

Although Kenya remains a dominant and competitive economy in intra-EAC trade especially in terms of export shares, the Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) of the World Economic Forum ranks Rwanda among the most competitive economy in the EAC. Recently Rwanda also posted strong performance especially in creating an efficient investor friendly economy in the region. Kenya's export competitiveness derives from its middle income status and long established export oriented processing sectors.

In the case of the EAC, the application of the asymmetric tariff liberalization as a form of compensatory mechanism clearly engendered some rebalancing in trade shares during the period 2005-2010, an effect that was also observed by Othieno and Shinyekwa (2011). The re-adjustment was however short-lived as Kenya has since regained its dominance in intra-EAC trade, recording a surplus of USD 1.2 billion in 2011. A pertinent question here is whether the asymmetric transitional period for the EAC-CU should have been longer than the five years (2005-2010) actually implemented.

From a theoretical perspective, if countries started off on a "level" playing field, the free and competitive market system can provide a fair system for allocating the benefits of economic integration. This is because the competitive market model selects the most efficient and competitive market players in relation to product characteristics such as price, quality and other beneficial spillovers for consumers. In the case of the EAC however, not only are the initial conditions unequal but Burundi, Rwanda, South Sudan and DR Congo joined the community at different times. Thus, the EAC member states joined the community at different times and at different levels of economic development. The free and competitive market economic system however does not have an inherent automatic mechanism for ameliorating gross inequalities among people in a society. In fact, it can often exacerbate such inequalities, as those who already have wealth and power are better positioned to accumulate even more wealth and power through the workings of the market (Stiglitz, 2012; Piketty, 2013; Klein, 2007).

In view of the fact that liberal markets offer no guarantees of equity, the EAC put in place compensatory safeguards to ensure equity and regional balance in economic development. These measures included the principle of asymmetry and the principle of variable geometry that help member states accommodate differing levels of development, interests, and capabilities in the framework of the integration. In particular the principle of asymmetry refers to the unequal distribution of the benefits, responsibilities, and integration commitments among member states during the integration. It acknowledges differences in the level of economic development, institutional capacity, or resources and the need to accommodate these differences to ensure effective cooperation. Its key aspects include but are not limited to gradual integration, and special and differential treatment. The principle of variable geometry or

"flexible integration" on the other hand, allows member states to choose different levels and areas of integration based on their preferences and capabilities.

In case of significant imbalances between partner states in a RIA, it is clear from the results of this study that the free and competitive market framework may not be an effective strategy for correcting such long standing or systemic imbalances. It will most certainly be necessary to invoke the suggested ultra-market compensatory mechanisms to reduce the asymmetries between the countries as a complimentary strategy to market liberalization. As pointed out earlier, the application of the principle of asymmetry in the transition to the Customs Union in the EAC was employed during the transition phase of the CU for such a purpose even though the effect appears to have been minimal and temporary. The transitory nature of the effect underscores the limitation of unaided market forces framework in delivering equity and regional balance in the EAC.

5.0 Policy Implications

This study investigated the transition of the EAC toward its goal of equity and regional balance in economic development over the last two decades by comparing key socioeconomic indicators for five of the seven-member States. The EAC treaty envisions “*accelerated, harmonious and balanced* development” and the “*equitable*” sharing of the benefits of growth in the EAC (Article 5:2). At the same time the EAC adopted a liberalized market-driven operational principle for the community’s integration effort (Article 7:1(a)).

The findings of the study reveal persisting disparities in key socioeconomic indicators for the member states, representing a rejection of the convergence hypothesis but also underscores the limitation of the liberal market approach to delivering equity and regional balance in the EAC. Indeed, in recognition of the limitations of a market driven strategy for equity and regional balance, the EAC itself put in place protocols to offer safeguards against possible economic injuries to partner states resulting from unregulated market forces during the integration process (Article 78 of the Treaty, 36 of CU, 48 CM). Accordingly, the protocols incorporated measures to address imbalances in the economic development of the partner states (Article 77 of the Treaty, 35 of the CU and 49 of the CM).

The study’s findings lend credence to the numerous theoretical and empirical evidence of the incapacity of the market-based system to ameliorate inequality especially in the face of significant initial disparities in economic development (Stiglitz, 2004; Piketty, 2014; Klein, 2007). Additionally, Stahl’s (2005) scepticism of equitable benefits from the integration in view of the disparities in infrastructural development is supported by the evidence from this

study. In view of this, the study concurs with Stahl's (2005) recommendation of the need for compensatory policy measures to address the imbalances and constraints to the integration to ensure the stability and the sustainability of the Community.

The paper recommends the use of market friendly strategies to remove bottlenecks to the functionality of the EAC markets. A market friendly approach will be in line with the EAC's preferred market-based principle but also likely to be more efficient and effective since it is aimed at stimulating rather than bypassing the market. The key bottlenecks to the full integration and functionality of the EAC markets include the uneven economic infrastructure and human capital developments. Thus, one clear policy implication from this study is the need to create high quality economic infrastructure to enhance economic connectivity of the different geographical regions of the EAC.

Table 5: The comparative advantage areas for the EAC member countries

Country	Economic Comparative Advantage Areas / Areas of possible concentration
Kenya	Agriculture (tea, coffee, horticultural products); Tourism (wildlife, landscapes); Services (financial, technological hub)
Uganda	Export Processing Zones (manufacturing, assembly); Agriculture (coffee, tea, cotton); Tourism (national parks, mountain gorillas); Hydropower (potential for energy export)
Tanzania	Minerals (copper, cobalt, limestone); Mining (gold, gemstones, natural gas); Mining (Gold, gemstones, natural gas); Agriculture (cash crops, food crops); Tourism (Mount Kilimanjaro, national parks).
Burundi	Livestock farming (cattle); Coffee and Tea (major export commodities); Agriculture (staple crops)
Rwanda	Natural Resources (nickel deposits); Services (finance, technology, logistics hub); Coffee and Tea (exports, rural livelihoods); Tourism (mountain gorillas, Lake Kivu)
S Sudan	Natural Gas (potential energy source); Oil (significant oil reserves); Agriculture (sorghum, maize, livestock)

Source: EAC Development Strategy (2011/12 - 2015/16; Chingarande *et al*, 2013; and the EAC website <https://www.eac.int/industry/eac-and-industrialisation/priority-sectors>.

Although the EAC has several infrastructure projects, these continue to face numerous challenges. The infrastructure projects include but are not limited to the EAC Railway infrastructure master plan, the EAC oil pipeline (EACOP), and several road and maritime infrastructure projects. However, many of these projects are faced with funding constraints; land acquisition and compensation challenges; corruption and governance issues; political and administrative hurdles; technical and engineering challenges; regulatory and legal barriers; security concerns; and environmental and social impact concerns. These challenges need to be

effectively addressed to enable the integration to boost economic productivity, trade, investment, and competitiveness of the EAC in the domestic and foreign markets.

Another important policy requirement is the development of the comparative advantages of each partner state but also appropriate community-wide value chains. There is considerable scope for ensuring regional division of specializations and trading linkages that are instrumental in boosting intra-EAC trade and investments. Tourism is a common though diversified advantage for the EAC countries. One specialization for Uganda and Rwanda could be logistics given their central locations in the EAC but also sub-Saharan Africa. The development of maritime ports by Kenya and Tanzania to be linked by road, railway, air and waterways could be specializations for Kenya and Tanzania. The potential for developing different niches of competitiveness in the EAC are vast (EAC, 2011/12-2015/16; Chingarande *et al*, 2013). The development of comparative advantages by the member states is necessary in strengthening the competitiveness and the sustainability of the competitiveness of the region. Competitiveness refers to the set of institutions, policies, and factors that make a nation productive over the longer term while ensuring social, economic, and environmental sustainability (WEF, 2017-2018). The sustainability of competitiveness is critical in ensuring long term economic growth and prosperity in the EAC.

Other key complementary policy measures for stimulating the EAC market is the development of more efficient institutions, the creation of favorable low-cost environment for enterprise activity, the facilitation of access to land and utility services, lowering the cost of energy and other inputs into the production sector, instituting enterprise supportive legal framework, and putting in place high quality socioeconomic facilities.

Finally, the scope for intra-EAC trade can be further enhanced in developing “process” rather than “product” specializations. This is where partner states can further amplify their specializations to provide specific segments of the value chain of the product rather than the entire product. In such “process” rather than “product” specializations, similarities in the economic structures of the partner states actually constitutes an advantage since this enhances the possibility of cooperation in the production of the given product value chain. The specialization argument is consistent with the objectives of the EAC CU in Article 3 of promoting efficiency in production. Process specialization on the other hand has the potential to amplify trade opportunities between the EAC partner states going into the future.

6.0 Conclusion

This paper examined the transition of the East African Community toward its goal of equity and regional balance in economic development. It compared key socioeconomic indicators for five of the seven-member states using the technique of Analysis of Variance. The paper found



persisting disparities among the partner states on all the indicators considered suggesting as yet a lack of convergence in the Community. The paper also underscored the limitation of the market-based model in delivering the anticipated equity and regional balance in the community. Accordingly, the paper recommends targeted interventions particularly in infrastructure, education and trade and investment to level the playing field and deepen economic linkages among the Partner States. The paper agrees with the use of compensatory mechanisms targeted at systemic and persistent imbalances as means of bringing about equity, inclusiveness and regional balance in the EAC.

7.0 References

- Aghion, P. Braun, M. and Fedden, J. (2006) Competition and Productivity in South Africa CID Working Paper No. 132 Centre for International Development at Harvard University.
- Atisaya, Angella. (2014) Challenges facing Economic Integration: A Case Study of East Africa Community 2002-2012, Master's thesis, University of Nairobi
- Bala, M. T. (2017). The Challenges and Prospects for Regional and Economic Integration in West Africa in Asian Social Science. Canadian Center of Science and Education. 13(5).
- Barro, Robert J.; Sala-I-Martin, Xavier (2004). "Growth Models with Exogenous Saving Rates". Economic Growth 2nd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill. pp. 23–84. ISBN 0-262-02553-1.
- Bhagwati, J. (1993). The Case for Free Trade: Environmentalists are wrong to fear the effects of free trade. Both causes can be advanced by imaginative solutions. The Scientific American. November 1993.
- Biesebroeck, J. V. (2003) Exporting Raises productivity in Sub Saharan Africa Manufacturing Plants, NBER Working paper services, 1050 Massachusetts Avenue Cambridge, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Botelho, João Carlos A. The Reduction of Asymmetries in MERCOSUR as a Way of Development Aid and South-South Cooperation: The Case of FOCEM. Geopolítica(s), vol. 4, n. 1, 2013, p. 43-62. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.5209/rev_GEOP.2013.v4.n1.40538.
- Brenton, P. and Hoffman, B. (2016). Political Economy of Regional Integration in Sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank, Washington, DC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10986/24767>
- Bruno, M. 1972. Domestic Resource Costs and Effective Protection. Clarification and Synthesis in *Journal of political economy*. Vol 80(1) PP. 16-33.
- Corden, W. M. (1984). A Handbook of International Economics. Vol 1, 1984 pp 63-130.
- Devlin, R. and French – Davis, R. (1998). Towards an Evaluation of Regional Integration in Latin America in the 1990's. Working paper 2 NW Washington D.C 20577 United States. Inter-American Development Bank.
- Dworkin, R., 1983. Comment on Narveson: In defence of equality. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1(1), pp.24-40.
- East African Community. (2016). East African Community Vision 2050: Regional Vision for Socioeconomic Transformation and Development. EAC, Arusha, February 2016. https://www.foreign.go.tz/uploads/eac_vision_2050- web.pdf
- East African Community. (2021). 6th EAC Development Strategy 2021/22-2025/26. Arusha, EAC. <http://repository.eac.int/handle/11671/24324#:~:text=The%206th%20EAC%20Development%20Strategy,investment%20in%20the%20immediate%20future>.
- East African Community. 1999. The East African Community Treaty. Arusha, EAC.
- East African Community. 2004. The East African Community Customs Union Protocol. Arusha, EAC.
- Edward, S. (1998) Openness, Productivity and Growth: What do we really Know? In *Economic Journal* Vol. 108 PP. 383-398.
- Edwards, S. (1993). Trade Liberalization and Growth in Developing Countries in *Journal of Economic Literature* Vol. 31(3) PP. 1358-1393.
- Edwards, S. 1998. "Openness, Productivity and Growth". *Economic Journal*. 108. 383-398.
- Eifert, B. Gelb, A and Ramachandran, V (2005) Business Environment and Comparative Advantage in Africa: Evidence from the Investment Climate Data.
- Fagerberg, J. "International Competitiveness" in *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 12, No. 3, Autumn 1996, pp. 39-51, Oxford University Press Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23606440>.
- Fagerberg, J. and Srholec, M. (2007). The Competitiveness of Nations: Why some Countries Prosper while other Fall behind" in *World Development*. Vol 35, No. 10. pp 1595-1620.
- Fernandez, R. and Portes, J. (1998). Returns to Regionalism: An Analysis of Nontraditional Gains from Regional Trade Agreements. *The World Bank Economic Review*. 12 (3), 197-220.
- Goldstein, M. Lawrence, H. New Measures of Prices and Productivity for tradable and Non-Tradable goods. Washington DC, International Monetary Fund.
- Hernandez – Cata, E. (2004). The African Competitive Report 2004, Geneva Switzerland, World Economic Forum.
- Hertel T. Ivanic, M. Preckel, P. and Cranfield (2002) The Earngs Effect of Multilateral Trade Liberalization Implactions for poverty in developing countries CITAP working papers, Agricultural Economics.
- Hoekman, B. M. (1995) Trade laws and Institutions Good Practices and the World Trade Organisation, World Bank Discussion Papers, 282, The World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Hulten, C.R. New Developments in Productivity Analysis: Total factor Productivity Vol ISN: 0-226-36062 – 8 University of Chicago Press. P. (1-54).



- Javorcik, B.S. (2004). Does Foreign Direct Investment Increase the Productivity of Domestic firms? In search of spillovers through Backward Linkages in *American Economic Review* Vol. 94 (3) pp. 605-627.
- Jenkins, C., J. Leape and L Thomas. 2000. *Gaining from Trade in Southern Africa*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Khoranas, S. Kimbugwe, K and Perdikis, N. (2007). The Impact of tariff reductions under the East African Community Customs Union. Intra-trade effects on Uganda International Conference on policy modeling in Sao Paulo, Brazil, Aberystwyth University.
- Kimbugwe, K. *et al.* (2012). *Economic Development through Regional Trade: A Role of the New East African Community*. Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Klein, N. (2007). *The Shock Doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*. Metropolitan Books/Henry Holt and Company.
- Krueger, Anne (1997), "Trade Policy and Economic Development: How We Learn," *American Economic Review* 87 (1), 1-22.
- Levine, R. 2007. The Competitiveness of Nations: Why Some Countries Prosper While Others Fall Behind in *World Development* Vol. 35, No. 10, pp. 1595–1620.
- Marin, D. (1992). Is the export led Growth Hypothesis Valid for Industrialised Countries? In: *Review of Economics and Statistics* Vol. 74 (4), pp. 678-688.
- Mbabazi, J. Milner, C. Morrissey, O. (2004). Trade Openness, Trade Costs and Growth: Why Sub-Saharan Africa Performs Poorly.
- Ministry of Tourism Trade and Industry (MTTI) and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). 2007. Uganda: Integrated Industrial Policy for Sustainable Industrial Development and Competitiveness. Vienna, MTTI and UNIDO.
- Monika, H. and Klaus, F. (1997): Comparing Measures of Competitiveness, Discussion Papers, Institute of Agriculture Development in Central and Eastern Europe.
- Mugisa, E., Onyango, C. and Mugoya, P. (2009). An Evaluation of the Implementation and impact of the East African Community Customs Union, Final Report Arusha, Tanzania, the EAC Secretariat.
- Muns, A. (2003). Impact of Regional Aid on Catalonia. In: Funck, B. and Pizzati, L. *European Integration, Regional Policy, and Growth*. Washington, DC: The World Bank. 177-181.
- Mwapachu, J.V. (2011). EAC Experience, Achievements, Challenges and Prospects: The dynamics of deepening regional integration. Presented at the 2nd EAC Symposium, Snowcrest Hotel, Arusha, April 28, 2011.
- Nabli, K.M (2002). Exchange Rate Regime and Competitiveness of Manufacturing Exports: The case of MENA Countries Washington D.C World Bank.
- Nishimizu, M. and Page, J.M.Jr. (1982). Total Factor Productivity Growth, Technological Progress and Technical Efficiency Change: Dimensions of Productivity Change in Yugoslavia in *Economic Journal*. Vol 92 (368), PP, 920-936.
- Njikami, O. Binam, J. N. and Tachi, S. (2006). Understanding Total Factor Productivity Growth in Sub Saharan African Countries.
- OECD Manual (2001) Measuring Productivity OECD Manual. Measurement of Aggregate and Industry level Productivity Growth.
- Oestreich, J.E., 2018. The World Bank and the “Equity Agenda”: An assessment after ten (or so) years. *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, 24(4), pp.557-574.
- Office of National Statistics (ONS). 2007. *The ONS Productivity Handbook: A Statistical Overview and Guide*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Okumu, L. Nyankori J.C.O (2010) Non – Tariff Barriers in EAC Customs Union Implications for trade between Uganda and other EAC Countries, Economic Policy Research Center.
- Orcalli, Gabriele. (2012) MERCOSUR: a case of constitutional failure? *Interdisciplinary Journal of Economics and Business Law*, 1(3), pp: 8-30.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). 2001. *Measuring Productivity: Measurement of Aggregate and Industry-level Productivity Growth*. OECD Manual. Paris, OECD.
- Othieno, L and Shinyekwa, I. (2011) Trade, Revenue and Welfare Effects of the East African Community Customs Union Principle of Asymmetry on Uganda: An Application of WITS-SMART Simulation Model. Kampala, Economic Policy Research Center Research Series No. 79.
- Pieper, U. (1998). Openness and Structural Dynamics of Productivity and Employment in Developing Countries: A Case of De-Industrialization?
- Porter M. E. *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. Harvard Business Review. Harvard, President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- Rawls, J., 1971. *A theory of justice*. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Schiff, M. and Winters L. A. (2003). *Regional Integration and Development*. World Bank. <https://econpapers.repec.org/bookchap/wbkwbpubs/15172.htm>.



- Sha M. I. (2021). Investigating the Role of Regional Economic Integration on Growth: Fresh Insights from South Asia. *Global Journal of Emerging Economies*. 13(1) 5-57.
- Stahl, H-M. (2005). Tariff Liberalization impacts of the EAC Customs Union in perspective. Tralac working paper #4/2005.
- UNCTAD, (2014). The Least Developed Country Report. Growth with Structural Transformation: A Post 2015 Development Agenda. New York, United Nations.
- Viginou Gammadigbe. (2021). Is Regional Trade Integration a Growth and Convergence Engine in Africa? Washington, IMF Working Papers.
- East African Community. (2004). East African Community Customs Union Protocol. Arusha, The EAC.
- WEF. (2013). The Africa Competitiveness Report. Geneva, WEF, IBRD, ADB, and Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark.
- Whalley, J. (1998). Why do Countries Seek Regional Trade Agreements? In: Frankel, J, A. *The Regionalization of the World Economy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 63-90.
- World Bank. (2013). Uganda Diagnostic Trade Integration Study (DTIS) Update (Prepared for the Enhanced Integrated Framework- EIF). Washington D.C., World Bank.
- World Bank. (2014). Doing Business 2015: Going beyond efficiency. Washington D.C., World Bank.
- Ricardo, D. (1817) The Theory of Comparative Advantage. In: Ricardo, D., Vol. 1 Ed. By Pierro Sraffa with Collaboration of M.H. Dobb, Principles of Political Economy and Taxation, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London.
- Piketty, T. (2014). Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Cambridge Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press,
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers Our Future. New York, W.W. Norton & Co, 2012.
- Chingarande, A., Mzumara, M. and Karambakuwa, R. (2013). Comparative Advantage and Economic Performance of East African Community (EAC) Member States. *J Economics* 4(1), 39-46.
- World Economic Forum. (2017). The Global Competitiveness Report 2017/2018. WEF.

Appendix

Data employed in the analysis

GDP per Capita (Constant 2015 US\$)

	Burundi	Kenya	Rwanda	Uganda	Tanzania
2000	310.01	1,187.33	337.46	508.76	551.66
2001	308.65	1,195.44	361.02	519.09	569.48
2002	313.49	1,166.06	401.40	547.14	594.16
2003	300.09	1,165.17	400.87	564.66	617.19
2004	303.12	1,188.57	419.76	585.52	645.78
2005	294.74	1,221.86	447.20	604.77	675.11
2006	299.77	1,262.81	475.62	650.74	699.34
2007	298.94	1,309.90	498.32	685.09	726.05
2008	300.84	1,274.40	539.28	723.27	746.72
2009	296.85	1,278.14	558.04	750.26	766.66
2010	297.79	1,342.77	583.56	769.79	794.45
2011	299.02	1,374.54	614.04	817.96	831.39
2012	301.48	1,401.49	650.90	825.12	843.94
2013	305.29	1,420.08	665.59	830.48	874.37
2014	307.77	1,457.54	690.04	847.35	904.62
2015	289.36	1,496.65	733.44	864.18	928.81
2016	282.98	1,525.74	758.48	875.80	958.72
2017	277.96	1,550.20	769.33	872.19	989.89
2018	274.13	1,604.80	815.23	896.16	1,011.08
2019	270.14	1,653.83	871.28	922.02	1,037.94
2020	263.36	1,616.87	822.07	918.12	1,027.29
Mean	293.49	1,381.78	604.69	749.96	810.65

Source: World Development Indicators (World Bank, 2023)

Final consumption expenditure (% of GDP)

Year	Burundi	Kenya	Rwanda	Uganda	Tanzania
2000	107.13	93.35	104.44	91.96	84.91
2001	106.14	95.54	101.88	92.99	82.05
2002	108.35	95.69	102.63	94.24	80.85
2003	106.74	95.25	100.59	92.78	79.59
2004	107.32	93.38	98.32	89.77	77.03
2005	104.50	92.78	97.69	88.13	75.60
2006	109.29	90.58	96.43	91.75	75.61
2007	110.01	89.48	91.84	91.16	75.75

2008	112.79	91.00	93.71	84.72	72.61
2009	103.63	86.03	95.05	85.44	72.79
2010	102.94	85.78	95.26	84.76	76.41
2011	109.05	88.70	93.50	87.16	78.16
2012	107.98	87.47	93.25	85.25	74.78
2013	113.78	88.34	91.27	79.65	73.14
2014	111.40	87.81	92.93	76.45	71.56
2015	97.84	88.24	94.50	85.71	73.79
2016	101.04	89.02	92.52	79.14	70.55
2017	101.38	90.25	88.78	78.90	67.94
2018	104.12	89.45	92.16	80.94	67.99
2019	104.55	89.59	90.83	79.95	66.32
2020	106.23	88.11	91.38	80.76	65.92
2021	105.71	87.63	89.44	82.05	65.69

Source: World Development Indicators (World Bank, 2023)

Life Expectancy at Birth (Years)

	BDI	KEN	RWA	UGA	TZA
2000	47.51	54.41	47.13	48.34	52.36
2001	48.43	54.51	49.02	49.01	53.16
2002	49.89	54.99	51.03	49.65	53.86
2003	50.86	55.60	53.37	50.37	54.90
2004	52.01	56.36	55.49	51.55	55.60
2005	53.02	57.34	57.32	52.98	56.30
2006	53.87	58.22	58.71	54.37	56.91
2007	54.73	58.87	59.97	55.24	57.52
2008	55.71	59.61	61.13	55.82	58.09
2009	56.39	60.37	61.96	56.49	58.89
2010	57.08	60.65	62.54	57.06	60.11
2011	57.77	61.05	63.26	57.97	61.05
2012	58.49	61.12	64.01	58.82	62.03
2013	59.24	61.39	64.43	59.76	62.96
2014	59.87	61.82	64.94	60.41	63.87
2015	60.22	61.89	65.30	61.09	64.65
2016	60.79	62.16	65.74	61.65	65.39
2017	61.55	62.48	65.94	62.12	66.00
2018	61.69	62.68	66.25	62.71	66.54
2019	62.35	62.94	66.44	62.99	66.99
2020	61.57	62.68	66.77	62.85	66.41
2021	61.66	61.43	66.07	62.71	66.20
Mean	56.58	59.66	60.76	57.00	60.44

Source: World Development Indicators (World Bank, 2023)



Human Development Indices

YEAR	BURUNDI	KENYA	RWANDA	TANZANIA	UGANDA
2000	0.30	0.48	0.34	0.40	0.39
2001	0.30	0.49	0.35	0.41	0.40
2002	0.31	0.49	0.37	0.42	0.42
2003	0.32	0.50	0.39	0.43	0.43
2004	0.33	0.51	0.41	0.44	0.44
2005	0.34	0.52	0.42	0.45	0.45
2006	0.36	0.53	0.44	0.46	0.47
2007	0.37	0.53	0.46	0.47	0.48
2008	0.39	0.54	0.47	0.47	0.48
2009	0.40	0.54	0.48	0.48	0.49
2010	0.41	0.55	0.49	0.49	0.50
2011	0.41	0.55	0.50	0.50	0.51
2012	0.42	0.55	0.51	0.50	0.50
2013	0.42	0.55	0.51	0.51	0.51
2014	0.43	0.56	0.51	0.52	0.51
2015	0.43	0.56	0.52	0.52	0.52
2016	0.43	0.57	0.52	0.52	0.52
2017	0.43	0.57	0.53	0.53	0.52
2018	0.43	0.58	0.53	0.54	0.52
2019	0.43	0.58	0.53	0.55	0.53
2020	0.43	0.58	0.53	0.55	0.52
2021	0.43	0.58	0.53	0.55	0.53

Source: UNDP - <https://hdr.undp.org/data-center/documentation-and-downloads>, 2021

Gini Index

	Burundi	Kenya	Rwanda	Uganda	Tanzania
2000			48.5		37.3
2001					
2002				45.2	
2003					
2004					
2005		46.5	52.0	42.9	
2006	33.4				
2007					40.3
2008					

2009				44.2	
2010			47.2		
2011					37.8
2012				41.0	
2013	38.6		45.1		
2014					
2015		40.8			
2016			43.7	42.8	
2017					
2018					40.5
2019				42.7	

Source: World Development Indicators (World Bank, 2023)

Table 6: Unemployment, total (% of total labor force - ILO estimate)

Year	Burundi	Kenya	Rwanda	Uganda	Tanzania
2000	3.00	3.13	11.94	3.55	3.07
2001	3.00	3.07	11.94	3.54	2.99
2002	3.01	3.09	11.88	3.50	3.03
2003	3.13	3.04	12.03	3.60	3.10
2004	3.09	3.00	11.94	2.75	3.15
2005	3.19	2.97	11.91	1.90	3.22
2006	3.18	2.94	11.90	2.28	3.30
2007	2.42	2.92	11.92	2.72	3.02
2008	1.63	2.98	11.86	3.14	2.77
2009	1.63	2.92	11.92	3.60	2.50
2010	1.61	2.85	11.90	3.59	2.99
2011	1.60	2.86	11.88	3.49	3.47
2012	1.59	2.84	11.86	3.55	3.26
2013	1.58	2.83	11.91	1.91	2.93
2014	1.57	2.80	11.88	2.32	2.12
2015	1.48	2.77	11.83	2.75	2.14
2016	1.32	2.76	11.86	3.18	2.15
2017	1.17	3.52	11.88	3.64	2.17
2018	1.02	4.25	12.10	3.57	2.20
2019	0.87	5.01	12.43	3.55	2.21
2020	1.03	5.62	13.01	4.51	2.78
2021	1.13	5.64	13.32	4.30	2.74
2022	1.02	5.50	13.01	4.28	2.76

Source: World Development Indicators (World Bank, 2023)

Table 2: Manufacturing, value added (% of GDP)

Year	Burundi	Kenya	Rwanda	Uganda	Tanzania
2000	10.90	10.32	9.63	7.10	9.86
2001	10.92	9.78	9.06	7.06	9.47
2002	11.09	9.82	9.76	7.35	9.37
2003	11.04	9.71	8.89	7.06	9.38
2004	11.45	10.00	8.84	6.36	9.19
2005	11.89	10.54	8.71	7.01	9.03
2006	10.37	12.69	8.99	7.09	8.82
2007	11.11	12.79	8.13	7.13	8.82
2008	9.62	12.10	7.93	7.31	8.74
2009	9.49	11.49	7.97	16.46	8.67
2010	9.25	11.16	8.25	16.74	8.67
2011	9.32	12.05	8.36	17.07	9.55
2012	8.83	11.08	8.28	16.65	9.44
2013	9.55	10.91	6.82	15.55	9.11
2014	10.12	10.07	6.81	15.46	9.12
2015	8.68	9.98	6.83	16.78	7.86
2016	9.36	9.32	6.70	16.23	7.81
2017		8.74	7.68	15.52	7.66
2018		8.41	7.63	15.78	8.07
2019		7.90	8.37	15.47	8.49
2020		7.61	8.74	15.80	8.50
2021		7.24	9.18	16.43	8.30

Source: World Development Indicators (World Bank, 2023)

Trade (% GDP)

Year	Burundi	Kenya	Rwanda	Uganda	Tanzania
2000	22.55	53.31	27.50	32.75	23.98
2001	20.96	55.95	29.22	35.33	28.02
2002	21.67	55.17	27.63	36.28	27.49
2003	27.38	54.13	29.33	36.59	30.44
2004	31.58	59.48	33.48	35.46	33.60
2005	35.10	64.48	34.23	38.99	36.96
2006	42.40	55.24	33.24	43.63	42.77
2007	38.80	53.89	35.99	46.78	48.06
2008	47.20	57.58	37.62	56.26	49.03
2009	35.80	45.95	36.82	47.06	43.53
2010	39.50	50.39	37.30	38.27	47.64
2011	43.00	58.40	39.74	39.76	56.17

2012	43.71	51.62	40.56	43.50	54.37
2013	46.60	47.46	42.72	43.11	48.63
2014	43.00	46.17	43.93	36.01	45.36
2015	22.84	40.33	45.22	37.69	40.76
2016	23.04	34.87	49.51	31.21	35.42
2017	22.24	36.00	53.68	36.84	32.24
2018	26.60	34.41	55.76	36.64	32.64
2019	29.03	31.76	57.94	39.36	32.96
2020	26.77	27.23	55.13	37.00	29.60
2021	28.82	30.67	53.85	41.71	31.38

Source: World Development Indicators (World Bank, 2023)

Net Foreign Direct Investment Inflow (% of GDP)

	BDI	KEN	RWA	UGA	TZA
2000	1.3422	0.8729	0.3918	2.5948	3.4644
2001	(0.0013)	0.0408	0.9412	2.5939	4.0442
2002	-	0.2101	0.0763	2.9885	2.7971
2003	-	0.5484	0.2199	3.0603	2.0914
2004	0.0049	0.2862	0.3242	3.7209	2.6538
2005	0.0523	0.1132	0.2715	4.1108	5.0846
2006	0.0025	0.1962	0.9235	6.4571	2.1611
2007	0.0369	2.2812	2.0226	6.6566	2.6622
2008	0.2378	0.2663	1.9758	5.0474	4.9470
2009	0.0196	0.2745	2.0924	3.3492	3.2757
2010	0.0384	0.3922	3.5317	2.0390	5.6637
2011	0.1501	3.0947	1.6294	3.2086	3.5472
2012	0.0259	2.4473	3.5241	4.4144	4.5388
2013	4.7613	1.8142	2.9908	3.7903	4.5693
2014	3.0212	1.2022	3.8131	3.2459	2.8342
2015	1.5987	0.8838	1.8981	2.2776	3.1787
2016	0.0021	0.6276	3.2189	2.1425	1.7359
2017	0.0117	1.6409	2.9615	2.6109	1.7586
2018	0.0370	0.8327	3.7977	3.2051	1.7044
2019	0.0406	0.4682	2.5412	3.6025	1.9910
2020	0.3198	0.4235	1.4985	2.3238	1.0974
2021	0.2841	0.4199	1.9141	2.7152	1.3588

Source: World Development Indicators (World Bank, 2023)