

ECONOMIC EMERGENCE OF NATIONS

Theory · Measurement · Strategic Governance

Moubarack LO | Institut de l'Émergence, Dakar | April 2026

POLICY NOTE

Many African economies have experienced decades of sustained growth. Yet this observation demands a more rigorous assessment: growth in gross domestic product is not synonymous with economic emergence. Emergence designates a distinct qualitative process - the transition of an economy toward a durable, diversified structural equilibrium that generates shared prosperity. Measured on a panel of 85 to 130 countries over thirty-two years, the spontaneous pace of this process reveals a half-life of seventy years: the horizon at which the structural gap between African economies and emerged economies would be reduced by half in the absence of any deliberate governance. This measure is not intended to discourage - it is intended to calibrate. It establishes that emergence does not occur spontaneously and that it requires a rigorous analytical framework, a proven governance methodology, and sustained political will over time.

This framework is organized around the Emergence Pyramid, which structures the process into five hierarchical pillars anchored in six theoretical traditions: convergence theory, endogenous growth, structural transformation, economic complexity, New Institutional Economics, and economic cybernetics. **Prerequisites** - civic peace, macroeconomic stability, institutional legitimacy, a functional environment for the private sector, development-oriented leadership, and a value system conducive to productive effort - constitute the foundation without which no sectoral reform can produce lasting structural effects. **Strategic levers** - human capital, infrastructure, business environment, financial system, innovation, and state capacity - are the instruments through which public action transforms the productive base; two additional levers - environmental sustainability and digital transformation - are under construction. **Sectoral drivers** are competitive productive clusters that convert this action into measurable structural transformation. The characteristics of emergence - inclusive wealth, macroeconomic dynamism, structural transformation, and global integration - are measured by the **Synthetic Index of Economic Emergence (ISEME)**, a composite of twenty-two indicators. The fruits of emergence - the effective redistribution of growth gains - are measured by the **Synthetic Index of Quality of Life (ISQV)**. The gap between these two measures, the **fruits deficit** ($\Delta F = \text{ISEME} - \text{ISQV}$), is the revealing indicator of the development model: it distinguishes inclusive emergence ($\Delta F \leq 0.05$), where structural transformation benefits the entire population, from dualistic emergence ($0.05 < \Delta F \leq 0.10$), extractive emergence ($\Delta F > 0.10$), and regressive emergence ($\Delta F < 0$).

The Emergence Pyramid finds its governance instrument in the **DMAIC** cycle - Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve, Control - drawn from the Six Sigma tradition (Motorola, 1986) and transposed to national development governance. Anchored in economic cybernetics, it operates as a double-loop regulation system: the first loop corrects observed deviations from the ISEME target within the existing causal model; the second revises the causal model itself when first-loop corrections prove insufficient. **Define** means setting precise, time-bound emergence objectives. **Measure** means maintaining an annual national dashboard - ISEME, ICLE, IDI, ISQV - enabling the country to position itself in the global hierarchy and detect deviations in real time. **Analyze** means identifying the binding constraint: the lever whose unlocking releases the greatest emergence potential. **Improve** means designing coherent reform packages that exploit complementarities across levers. **Control** means maintaining the rigor of results beyond political cycles, through public reviews and an iteration mechanism.

A comparative analysis of ten national experiences - from Malaysia and South Korea to Rwanda, from Singapore to Morocco, Senegal, Chile, the United Kingdom, the European Union, and the African Union - establishes that countries that have carried out all five DMAIC phases achieve structurally superior emergence trajectories compared to those that limit themselves to the definition and investment phases without organized results monitoring. Five institutional factors predict the effectiveness of DMAIC: high-level political anchoring in phase C reviews; the quality of the binding constraint diagnosis in phase A; the public-private-civil society coalition in phases D and C; the public transparency of the performance dashboard; and inter-cycle institutional continuity.

Four empirical results support these prescriptions. The determinants of membership in the emerged class, identified on 1,260 observations with a five-year lag using an ordered Probit model, designate, in order of explanatory power: the secondary school enrollment rate (coefficient 0.842; $p < 0.001$), infrastructure quality (0.716; $p < 0.001$), financial access (0.583; $p < 0.001$), R&D expenditure (0.491; $p < 0.001$), and reduction in transaction costs (-0.374; $p < 0.001$). Exploiting the timing of giant hydrocarbon discoveries as a natural experiment establishes that oil rents improve macroeconomic dynamism in the short term but degrade structural transformation over twelve years - except when economic diversification and institutional quality preexist the discovery. On the institutional side, a five-year improvement in IDI predicts a gain of 0.20 ISEME points ($R^2 = 0.54$) and 0.35 ICLE points ($R^2 = 0.58$): no sectoral investment program matches this return. Finally, analysis of eighteen successfully emerged economies reveals that reforms do not add up - they multiply: the simultaneous activation of human capital, business environment, and institutional quality generates gains 40 to 65% greater than the sum of their separate effects.

The Emergence Framework and the Sustainable Development Goals

The Emergence Framework does not merely align with the United Nations' 2030 Agenda and the African Union's Agenda 2063: it constitutes the instrument for their causal operationalization. The correspondence exceeds the formal alignment of objectives. It is architectural: it connects the normative SDG targets to a validated causal chain, identifies the sequencing of reforms, and quantifies their transmission lags - three dimensions structurally absent from the existing SDG monitoring system.

I. Systematic Mapping of the Indices and the SDGs

Each of the four composite indices of the framework aligns with the SDGs with a structural precision that existing monitoring instruments do not achieve.

The ISQV (Synthetic Index of Quality of Life) (eight dimensions) directly covers the human well-being SDGs: SDG 1 (no poverty) and SDG 10 (reduced inequalities) via its income and inequality dimension; SDG 3 (health) via its health dimension; SDG 4 (quality education) via its education dimension; SDGs 5 (gender equality) and 8 (decent work) via its employment and gender equality dimension; SDG 6 (clean water) via its water and sanitation dimension; SDG 7 (clean energy) via its infrastructure and energy access dimension.

The ICLE levers (Composite Index of Emergence Levers) (six levers, 48 indicators) operationalize the production SDGs: Lever 2 (human capital) operationalizes SDG 4; Lever 4 (physical infrastructure) operationalizes SDG 9; Lever 5 (financial system) operationalizes SDGs 8 and 17; Lever 6 (technological innovation) also co-operationalizes SDG 9. The under-construction Lever 7 (environmental sustainability) will directly cover SDGs 13 (climate action), 14 (life below water), and 15 (life on land).

The IDI (Institutional Development Index) (six empirically weighted dimensions) directly operationalizes SDG 16 (peace, justice, and strong institutions). Its six components - government effectiveness (21%), regulatory quality (20%), rule of law (18%), control of corruption (15%), political stability (14%), and

citizen voice (12%) - correspond to the institutional targets of SDG 16 with weights derived from their empirical correlation with the ISEME, not from a normative prescription.

The ISEME (four structural dimensions) covers the productive transformation layer of the SDG agenda: inclusive wealth (SDGs 1, 10), macroeconomic dynamism (SDG 8), structural transformation (SDG 9), and global integration (SDG 17).

II. Specific Value Added Relative to Existing SDG Monitoring

The SDG monitoring system tracks 232 indicators independently, without a causal architecture or priority hierarchy. Four structural gaps result, each of which the Emergence Framework addresses precisely.

Absence of a lever-to-outcome causal chain. The ICLE→ISEME relationship, validated at $R^2 = 0.96$ with five-year lags on a panel of 94 countries, provides the missing predictability: a government that improves its ICLE profile can anticipate, within an empirically calibrated range, the ISEME gain achievable in the following five-year period - and, by extension, the SDG dimensions that will benefit.

Absence of a growth-wellbeing divergence measure. A country can simultaneously improve its SDG 8 scores (economic growth) and widen its SDG 10 gap (inequalities) - a divergence that the HDI and national SDG dashboards do not detect. The fruits deficit $\Delta F = ISEME - ISQV$ is the first systematic, transnational quantitative measure of this gap. The systemic instability threshold $\Delta F > 0.10$, empirically confirmed by the July 2021 riots in South Africa ($\Delta F = +0.143$), constitutes an operational early-warning instrument for the social risks generated by unredistributed growth.

Absence of priority sequencing. The 17 SDGs are formally equal, with no guidance on the order of reforms. The ICLE binding constraint methodology fills this gap. In Senegal, the binding constraint is human capital (Lever 2: secondary completion rate below 40%) - improving SDG 4 is the prerequisite for gains on SDGs 8 and 9. In Ethiopia, it is physical infrastructure (Lever 4): SDG 9 investment is the key. In Morocco, it is innovation (Lever 6, R&D at 0.7% of GDP versus an endogenous innovation threshold of 2%). A national plan that treats all SDGs as simultaneously actionable misallocates reform capital; the binding constraint imposes a prioritization discipline.

Absence of transmission lag quantification. The five-to-ten-year lag between a lever reform and its measurable effect on the ISEME means that reforms initiated in 2025 will produce their structural effects at the earliest by 2030 (depending on reform complexity), precisely the SDG target year. A government that relies on annual SDG indicator updates to assess these reforms will systematically underestimate their impact and risk abandoning them prematurely. The DMAIC's anticipatory mechanism - adjusting levers five years before consequences materialize in ISEME scores - is the governance correction that the SDG monitoring architecture does not possess.

III. Quantified Assessment of SDG Attainability for Africa

The spontaneous seventy-year half-life of the ISEME convergence process ($\beta = -0.0099$ per year) constitutes a precise alarm signal for the 2030 Agenda: at the current pace, the majority of African countries will not reach the ISEME thresholds corresponding to the SDG targets set for 2030. The most at-risk SDGs are those related to structural transformation (SDGs 8, 9), which require the highest ICLE scores to materialize within a five-year window, and those related to well-being (SDGs 1, 3, 4), which require both macroeconomic performance and active redistribution mechanisms - precisely the combination that a high fruits deficit signals as absent.

Under an actively managed reform scenario - with the binding constraint identified and addressed at each DMAIC cycle - the structural half-life compresses from seventy to forty-five years, a gain of twenty-five years attributable to supermodular resonance among complementary levers (40 to 65% additional ISEME gain from joint versus sequential activation). This conditional half-life sets the requirements for an

accelerated SDG trajectory: not isolated sectoral investments, but coherent reform packages exploiting complementarities across levers.

Under this scenario, six to eight African countries can cross the emergence threshold (ISEME score of 0.75, emerged country status) by 2035 - Morocco (ISEME = 0.63, having surpassed the Emerging threshold in 2022), South Africa, Egypt, Mauritius, Tunisia, and Botswana.

IV. Alignment with the African Union's Agenda 2063

Agenda 2063 presents, viewed through the DMAIC lens, an exceptionally strong Phase D (Define) architecture - seven aspirations articulated into 20 goals and 174 national targets - but a structurally deficient Phase A (Analyze): no systematic binding constraint diagnostic has been produced at the continental, regional, and national levels to guide the sequencing of the Ten-Year Implementation Plans (TYIPs). The African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) is the most telling illustration: its impact on the sophistication of African exports depends on the prior productive capacities of each member state, which are highly heterogeneous. A continental binding constraint diagnostic would reveal that the main obstacle to the AfCFTA is not tariff-based - intra-continental customs duties are already relatively low - but logistical (intra-African transport costs among the highest in the world) and normative (absence of harmonization of sanitary and phytosanitary standards): constraints falling under Lever 4 (infrastructure) and Lever 3 (business environment), mapped in the ICLE. The TYIP 2 (2024-2033) offers the opportunity to correct this deficit by integrating ICLE-compatible diagnostics by regional cluster of member states.

V. Five Principles of Strategic Action

All of the preceding analyses converge on the same finding. The empirical determinants of emergence - secondary school enrollment rates, infrastructure quality, financial access, R&D expenditure, reduction in transaction costs - establish a causal hierarchy that sectoral intuition cannot substitute. The comparative study of ten national experiences shows that countries that have carried out all five DMAIC phases achieve structurally superior trajectories compared to those that limit themselves to defining objectives and investing without organized results monitoring. The SDG attainability analysis reveals that the obstacle is neither ambition nor resources, but the absence of a causal architecture - binding constraint diagnosis, reform sequencing, quantification of transmission lags. And the supermodularity measure indicates that reforms do not add up: they multiply when activated jointly. These regularities are not generic recommendations - they are structural properties of the emergence process, successfully validated on 1,260 observations and eighteen emerged economies over a 20-year period. The five principles that follow translate them into operational prescriptions.

Diagnose before reforming. The binding constraint differs from country to country - human capital in Senegal, infrastructure in Ethiopia, innovation in Morocco - and no national plan should be finalized without having precisely identified it.

Treat institutional quality as a strategic priority, not as an external conditionality. It is the highest-return investment in any emergence profile - and the only one that conditions the effectiveness of all other levers.

Build coherent reform packages exploiting complementarities across levers rather than activating them separately.

Plan on the right horizon. The five-to-ten-year lag between a lever reform and its measurable effect on the ISEME requires commitments that transcend ordinary political cycles. Under an active management scenario, this governance discipline compresses the structural half-life from seventy to forty-five years, a gain of 25 years.

Pursue accelerated trajectories. The technological leap and the green transition offer Africa structurally distinct emergence trajectories - bypassing capital-intensive industrial stages while building productive complexity in renewable energies, digital services, and green manufacturing. Reforms initiated in 2025 will produce their structural effects by 2030 and will determine Africa's position in emergence rankings by 2035. Under an accelerated reform scenario, six to eight countries on the continent can cross the emergence threshold by then. The window is open; this framework is the instrument to cross it with method and consistency.

Institut de l'Émergence - Dakar, Senegal

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Convergence Theory and Emergence Dynamics

- Barro, R. J. and Sala-i-Martin, X. (1992). Convergence. *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(2), 223-251.
- Barro, R. J. and Sala-i-Martin, X. (2004). *Economic Growth* (2nd edition). MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Solow, R. M. (1956). A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 70(1), 65-94.
- Mankiw, N. G., Romer, D. and Weil, D. N. (1992). A Contribution to the Empirics of Economic Growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107(2), 407-437.
- Lo, M. (2013). La Mesure du niveau d'émergence économique des nations africaines. *African Intégration and Development Review*, 6 (1), 53-105

2. Endogenous Growth

- Romer, P. M. (1986). Increasing Returns and Long-Run Growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 94(5), 1002-1037.
- Lucas, R. E. (1988). On the Mechanics of Economic Development. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 22(1), 3-42.
- Aghion, P. and Howitt, P. (1992). A Model of Growth through Creative Destruction. *Econometrica*, 60(2), 323-351.
- Aghion, P. and Howitt, P. (1998). *Endogenous Growth Theory*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

3. Structural Transformation and Productive Development

- Kuznets, S. (1966). *Modern Economic Growth: Rate, Structure, and Spread*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour. *The Manchester School*, 22(2), 139-191.
- McMillan, M., Rodrik, D. and Verduzco-Gallo, I. (2014). Globalization, Structural Change, and Productivity Growth, with an Update on Africa. *World Development*, 63, 11-32.
- Rodrik, D. (2016). Premature Deindustrialization. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 21(1), 1-33.
- Lin, J. Y. (2012). *New Structural Economics: A Framework for Rethinking Development and Policy*. World Bank, Washington D.C.

4. Economic Complexity and Product Space

- Hidalgo, C. A. and Hausmann, R. (2009). The Building Blocks of Economic Complexity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(26), 10570-10575.
- Hausmann, R., Hwang, J. and Rodrik, D. (2007). What You Export Matters. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 12(1), 1-25.
- Hidalgo, C. A. (2015). *Why Information Grows: The Evolution of Order, from Atoms to Economies*. Basic Books, New York.
- Hausmann, R. et al. (2014). *The Atlas of Economic Complexity: Mapping Paths to Prosperity*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

5. New Institutional Economics and Governance

- North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Acemoglu, D. and Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*. Crown Publishers, New York.
- Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S. and Robinson, J. A. (2001). The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development. *American Economic Review*, 91(5), 1369-1401.
- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A. and Mastruzzi, M. (2010). *The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430.
- Williamson, O. E. (2000). The New Institutional Economics: Taking Stock, Looking Ahead. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 38(3), 595-613.

6. Economic Cybernetics and DMAIC Governance

- Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics: Or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Argyris, C. and Schon, D. A. (1978). *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- Harry, M. J. and Schroeder, R. (2000). *Six Sigma: The Breakthrough Management Strategy*. Currency/Doubleday, New York.
- Hausmann, R., Rodrik, D. and Velasco, A. (2008). Growth Diagnostics. In Serra, N. and Stiglitz, J. E. (eds.), *The Washington Consensus Reconsidered*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 324-355.

7. Empirical Methods and Panel Data

- Wooldridge, J. M. (2010). *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data* (2nd edition). MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Angrist, J. D. and Pischke, J. S. (2009). *Mostly Harmless Econometrics*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Collier, P. and Goderis, B. (2012). Commodity Prices and Growth: An Empirical Investigation. *European Economic Review*, 56(6), 1241-1260.

8. Comparative Studies and African Emergence Trajectories

- Lo, M. (2025). *Economic emergence of nations: theory, measurement, and strategic governance*. Institut de l'Émergence, Dakar.
- United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (2017). *Industrialization and Structural Transformation in Africa*. UNECA, Addis Ababa.
- IMF (2024). *Regional Economic Outlook: Sub-Saharan Africa*. International Monetary Fund, Washington D.C.
- African Union (2015). *Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want*. African Union Commission, Addis Ababa.
- United Nations (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Resolution A/RES/70/1, New York.
- Pritchett, L. (1997). Divergence, Big Time. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11(3), 3-17.
- Easterly, W. (2001). *The Elusive Quest for Growth*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Sachs, J. D. and Warner, A. M. (1997). Sources of Slow Growth in African Economies. *Journal of African Economies*, 6(3), 335-376.

ANNEX: COUNTRY PROFILES

ANNEX H: COUNTRY PROFILES

Diagnostic ISEME · ICLE · ISQV · IDI · IEG

Regions: Europe, South Africa, Ethiopia, Kenya





Index 11 – Quality Profile 1



Index 11 – Quality Profile 2



Area 14 - Quality Profile 4



Area 14 - Quality Profile 5