



**TECHNIUM**  
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

[www.techniumscience.com](http://www.techniumscience.com)



**Vol. 76/2025**  
**A New Decade for Social Changes**

**PLUS**  
**COMMUNICATION P**



**International**  
Communication & PR

## **Comparative Analysis of Infrastructure Integration and Development in East and Southern Africa and Latin America**

**Salum Mussa Haruna<sup>1</sup>, Agostinho Vontade Ntali<sup>2</sup>, Clesio de Anacleto Henriqueta Guambe<sup>3</sup>, Mamudo Antonio Omar<sup>4</sup>, Eugenio Daniel Paya<sup>5</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Doctoral Candidates, Department of African Studies Center, School of International Relations, Yunnan University, Kunming, Yunnan Province, China, <sup>2</sup>PhD Candidate in International Trade, School of Overseas Education, Yunnan University of Finance and Economics, Kunming, Yunnan Province, China, <sup>3</sup>Master's in Engineering Management, School of Overseas Education, Yunnan University of Finance and Economics, Kunming, Yunnan Province, China, <sup>4</sup>Master's Candidate of Engineering Management (majored in Project Management), School of Overseas Education, Yunnan University of Finance and Economics, Kunming, Yunnan Province, China, <sup>5</sup>Master's Candidate of Engineering Management (majored in Project Management), School of Overseas Education, Yunnan University of Finance and Economics, Kunming, Yunnan Province, China

harunasalum.sh@gmail.com, agostinhovontade30@gmail.com,  
clesiodeguambe@gmail.com, mamudo.omar2@hotmail.com,  
danielpaya2@gmail.com

**Abstract.** Cross-border infrastructure is one of the main drivers of regional integration and development in Eastern and Southern Africa but suffers from institutional fragmentation, asymmetric connectivity, and dependence on external finance. This study applies a comparative qualitative approach, based on expert interviews and document evidence, to examine integration policies in East and Southern Africa and derive lessons from Latin American experiences, including IIRSA, COSIPLAN, and regional energy integration. Drawing on endogenous development and dependency theory, the paper mentions everlasting setbacks—misaligned tariffs, rural infrastructure gaps, and ineffective policy coordination—via transport, energy, telecommunication, and water sectors. Latin America deserves credit for its application of public-private partnerships, long-term planning, and supranational coordination that offers adaptable lessons. The case made herein is that the agenda for infrastructure in Africa should transcend the physical investment by embedding governance, sustainability, and institutional consistency. The paper suggests an adaptive framework based on African realities and South-South comprehension, with infrastructure as a strategic tool for inclusive growth, political autonomy, and regional integration.

**Keywords.** Infrastructure Development, Regional Integration, Comparative Political Economy, East African Community, Latin America, Sustainable Development Governance

## Introduction

Infrastructure has been widely recognized as a main driver of economic transformation, regional integration, and sustainable development (Prus & Sikora, 2021; Calderón & Servén, 2010; Foster & Briceño-Garmendia, 2010). In the Global South—and particularly across Africa—infrastructure is far more than mere technical hardware (Kwet, 2019). It serves as a powerful political tool, influencing state legitimacy, economic interdependence, and regional identities (Hönke et al., 2024). This phenomenon is especially notable in Eastern and Southern Africa, where cross-border infrastructure is essential for enhancing intraregional mobility, ensuring energy security, broadening digital access, improving water security, and facilitating increased trade flows (MINKO, 2024; Tandrayen-Ragoobur, 2024; Kofi, 2024). These are key to stepping up integration efforts and bolstering regional resilience to systemic shocks like geopolitical upheavals and climate uncertainties.

Despite notable regional commitments such as the Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa (PIDA), the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA), and the African Union's Agenda 2063, Africa continues to struggle with fragmented infrastructure, poor intergovernmental coordination, and financial dependence (Dethier, 2015; Turok, 2016; Ndulu, 2006). The overwhelming majority of the projects are donor-funded or underfunded and lack local ownership or viability (Ncube, 2017). Despite this, structural weaknesses such as irregular rules, poor planning capabilities, non-maintenance, and rural-urban disparities hold up Africa's infrastructure growth. As intra-African trade accounts for less than 16% of total commerce volume, whereas over 60% in the European Union and more than 50% in Latin America, Africa is one of the least integrated continents (Mold, 2022; Brenton & Isik (Eds.), 2012).

Eastern and Southern Africa present instructive case studies on the paradox of infrastructure investment and underdevelopment. Despite being endowed with Regional Economic Communities (RECs) like the East African Community (EAC), the Southern African Development Community (SADC), and the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), regional infrastructure projects are prone to severe delays, duplication, and inefficiencies. National political-economic agendas, inadequate inter-agency cooperation, and insufficient institutional capacity tend to hinder or postpone developments (Carter III et al., 2019). International investments, as welcome as they are, have a tendency to impose technical and financial requirements ill-coordinated with regional integration goals. Low energy and transport system interoperability, excessive access and maintenance costs, and project fragmentation exacerbate socioeconomic disparities, especially in post-conflict and landlocked nations (FOLORUNSHO & SAMUEL, 2025).

The Africa Infrastructure Development Index (AIDI) states that the continent still experiences massive inequalities (Marire & Iqbal, 2024). The leaders in infrastructure availability and quality are South Africa, Kenya, and Egypt, while South Sudan, Burundi, and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) are among the most underserved nations (Graca, 2025). Unbalanced infrastructure is fuelled by unconnected value chains and territorial fragmentation. Low productivity, low human development indices, and restricted access to the international market are also closely associated with inadequate infrastructure in transport, electricity, water, and ICT (Aluko & Ngubane, 2024; Nguea, 2025). The strategic value of cross-border infrastructure as a cause and effect of regional integration is addressed in this article. In order to set the common challenges and strategic contrasts between Eastern and Southern Africa, it addresses four major industries: transportation, energy, telecommunication, and water. In an attempt to enrich the analysis further, the paper also learns lessons from comparative experiences in Latin America, a region also experiencing fragmentation but has

made considerable progress integrating its infrastructure by means of programs such as the Initiative for the Integration of Regional Infrastructure in South America (IIRSA), the South American Council on Infrastructure and Planning (COSIPLAN), and the Central American Electrical Interconnection System (SIEPAC).

The Latin American experience holds useful lessons to impart—not as a model to be emulated, but as contextual inspiration. Its infrastructure models demonstrate how political will, supranational planning institutions, and innovative financing instruments, such as Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), can be combined to drive regional agendas (Paz, 2025; Fioravanti et al., 2019). There are some nations, for example, Brazil, Chile, and Mexico, which were capable of integrating infrastructure into more all-encompassing development plans by utilizing institutions that survive short-term political terms (Armijo & Rhodes, 2017). Specifically, the institutions in Latin America pursued a developmental regionalism approach, linking infrastructure with declared regional industrial policy, social inclusion, and sustainability (Helmsing, 2001; Balanzo et al., 2020). While policy transfers in direct lines remain chimerical due to variations in context across the themes of governance, fiscal space, and politics, the Latin American experience draws attention to the imperative to integrate infrastructure into long-term, regionally-owned development agendas.

Africa's infrastructure trajectory is nevertheless still under the hegemony of external actors such as China, the European Union, and multilateral development banks. While such coalitions have delivered huge physical infrastructure—railways, dams, and fibre-optic cables, for instance—these have rarely translated into sustainable institutional learning or local ownership. This limits the horizon for self-reinforcing development as well as local autonomy. The article is based on endogenous development theory and also dependency theory, which provide analytical frameworks that are essential to understanding Africa's infrastructure dilemma. Endogenous development emphasizes the local social, political, and institutional structures' priority in shaping development pathways, favouring bottom-up strategies that improve local capacity, ownership, and sustainability (Rodríguez-Cohard, 2016; Bardhan, 1995). Dependency theory, however, decries the structural asymmetries of world capitalism, indicating how peripheral regions fall into the pattern of extractive economic linkages and externally led models of development (Fischer, 2015; Gessi, 2024; Kuran, 2024). In these narratives, therefore, infrastructure is not a technological input affair—it is a contested political landscape instituted in rival interests, power relations, and development imaginaries. The prevailing donor-driven, project-centric modality consolidates neo-dependency regimes and destroys endogenous capabilities for planning, financing, and providing infrastructure. Consequently, infrastructure is perpetually estranged from national and regional development agendas. This estrangement subverts integration and widens social inequality.

The article thus demands a rebalancing of the African infrastructure agenda: one that puts at its core the positioning of infrastructure planning in inclusive governance systems, prioritizes participatory processes of development, and aligns infrastructure investment with regional priorities, rather than external pressures. The paper proposes a suggestion of an adaptive framework, based on African realities but learned through South–South learning, to transform infrastructure from a constraint to an anchor for inclusive growth and structural transformation. By situating infrastructure in a political-economy and institutional context, the paper moves beyond technical analysis in posing questions on trans-boundary power relations and development impacts. It calls for increased regional solidarity, institutional coordination, and integrated financing modalities that enhance local ownership and reduce dependence. In

the long run, the vision is to redefine infrastructure not only as physical capital, but as a strategic instrument of regional integration, political autonomy, and economic emancipation.

This research is structured around the subsequent questions:

- a) What structural and institutional factors hinder infrastructure-led regional integration in Eastern and Southern Africa in comparison to Latin America?
- b) What is the impact of dependency dynamics on the sustainability of infrastructure development in both regions?

From these enquiries, we propose the following hypothesis:

- H1: Infrastructure development that aligns with endogenous planning fosters greater inclusivity and resilience in regional integration.
- H2: Dependence on external financing sustains fragmentation and dependency across all regions.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Infrastructure, Integration, and Development: General Views**

Infrastructure has been recognized as key to regional integration, economic growth, and poverty alleviation in the Global South. Pilot studies demonstrate that investment in transport, energy, telecommunications, and water networks increases market development, generates investment, and enables enhanced social inclusion (Josa & Magrinyà, 2021). Poor infrastructure in Eastern and Southern Africa has been attributed to low competitiveness, low productivity, and unbalanced territorial development (Adika, 2021).

Here, regional integration is both a policy notion and a strategic adaptation to economic dependency and spatial fragmentation. The African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) is a representative structural effort at harmonization of regional infrastructure and market systems (Brandi et al., 2025). In Latin America, initiatives like Mercosur, the Pacific Alliance, and IIRSA labor to establish economic interdependence and cross-border connections in the context of ongoing institutional fragmentation as well as political volatility (Pena et al., 2023). Literature indicates that infrastructure is both a result and a catalyst of integration. Empirical evidence confirms regional infrastructure to increase commerce and productivity (Bricchetti et al., 2021). But these are dependent upon the quality of government, political stability, and institutional coordination (UNCTAD, REPORT 2009).

### **2.2 Contextualisation of the Importance of Infrastructure Corridors for Economic Development**

#### **2.2 Contextualisation of the Importance of Infrastructure Corridors to Economic Development**

The contextualization of the role of infrastructure corridors in economic growth is a relevant issue to frame the relationship between infrastructure and economic development. Infrastructure corridors are considered integral to economic growth, as they make easier the flows of trade, services, and investment and integrate regions and countries.

Infrastructure corridors, according to the World Bank, play a crucial role in lowering transport and communication costs to make regions and nations competitive (World Bank, 2016). Furthermore, they can contribute to sustainable development, as they enable the integration of marginalised regions and promote employment (Dossani, 2018). Infrastructural corridors are also considered to be a critical force of regional and international integration because they enable the creation of transport and communication infrastructure that connects nations and regions (Dannenberg et al., 2018). This encourages the creation of jobs, levels of output, and economic growth (Haldea et al., 2019).

However, there are also significant challenges associated with infrastructure corridors, such as high construction and maintenance cost, political and social concerns, as well as environmental issues (Khalil, et al., 2020). In East Africa and Southern Africa, infrastructure corridors are considered fundamental to the region's economic development. For example, the North-South Corridor of the African Development Corridor is considered one of the region's main infrastructure corridors (KPA, 2018). In Latin America, infrastructure corridors are also fundamental to economic development. For example, the North-South Corridor of Latin America is considered one of the region's main infrastructure corridors (UN, 2019).

### 2.3 Theoretical Frameworks: Endogenous Development and Dependency

Multiple theoretical frameworks contribute to the examination of infrastructure and integration in the Global South. The notion of endogenous development is significant, promoting growth that is locally driven and reliant on domestic resources, institutional innovation, and territorial identity (Antonio, 2007). This approach significantly differs from exogenous, donor-driven development models and underscores the necessity for autonomy in planning and implementation.

Dependency theory further critiques the integration of Africa and Latin America into the global economy. Contend that external financing and infrastructure models frequently perpetuate hierarchical global relations. From this perspective, integration should be based on productive autonomy, coordinated planning, and regional solidarity to mitigate vulnerability to external shocks and conditionalities (Furtado et al., 2021).

These frameworks are essential for analysing the dual function of infrastructure, serving both as a means of liberation and as a possible source of dependency. According to (UNCTAD, 2009), the integration of physical connectivity with institutional coherence and policy sovereignty is essential for fostering sustainable and equitable development.

### 2.4 Comparative Analysis: Africa and Latin America

Comparative literature demonstrates both similarities and differences in the infrastructure-integration relationship in Africa and Latin America. Historically, Latin America has pursued integration via formal regional blocs and sector-specific mechanisms, including COSIPLAN for infrastructure and SIEPAC for energy interconnection (Ayuso & Villar, 2014). The models have gained from enhanced institutional continuity and increased urbanisation; however, they are still limited by overlapping memberships and variable political commitment (Staden, 2016).

In contrast, the integration efforts in Eastern and Southern Africa face challenges due to overlapping regional economic communities, inadequate rural infrastructure, and ongoing dependence on foreign aid and external technical expertise (Regional Integration in Africa , 2011). Integration initiatives in Eastern and Southern Africa face challenges stemming from overlapping regional economic communities, inadequate rural infrastructure, and ongoing dependence on foreign aid and external technical expertise ( ECA, 2004). Notwithstanding these constraints, Africa is experiencing a burgeoning demographic dividend and enhanced political support for initiatives like AfCFTA and PIDA. According to comparative research, Latin America has better developed regional institutions, whereas Africa has greater potential for structural transformation, provided that coordination weaknesses and institutional fragmentation are addressed (Brichetti & Serebrisky, 2022).

### 2.5 Inter-institutional Coordination and Policy Consistency

Both regions face a recurrent problem with institutional coordination. Research on public policy indicates that fragmented governance, both vertical (among different levels of government) and horizontal (across various sectors and agencies), considerably diminishes the

effectiveness of infrastructure development (Biermann et al., 2020). Policy incoherence causes duplication, delays, and misplaced goals, reducing infrastructure investments' developmental benefits (Charles & Lindblom, 2012).

Cross-border collaboration is particularly difficult in federal and multi-country settings due to different economic policies, norms, and capacities. Integration attempts in Latin America and Africa often start with strong regional organisations or coordination mechanisms that link national development goals with infrastructure priorities (ECLAC, 2020).

#### 2.6 Funding and Dependency's Structure

Financial dependency hinders infrastructure development on both continents. Many Latin American and African states still use donor aid, foreign direct investment, and international financial institutions to support infrastructure projects (Teplova et al., 2020). Capital inflows can boost growth but also weaken budgets and upset priorities. Dependency theorists say finance systems that use external debt, conditionality, and global market cycles worsen peripheral position (Marini, 1967). External money, whether through partnerships or concessional loans, often perpetuates underdevelopment without local capacity-building and institutional strengthening (Nikulina et al., 2025). Recent literature supports the need for improved domestic resource mobilisation, strategic fiscal decentralisation, and regional financial instruments as alternatives to traditional donor-driven models (Tidjani & Madouri, 2024). Financial technologies and regional development banks present potential benefits; however, sustainable transformation necessitates institutional innovation and political commitment.

#### 2.7 Economic Development Implication Analysis

East African, Southern African, and Latin American infrastructure corridors significantly contribute to economic growth, integration, and sustainability. When planned and built with deliberate long-term regional objectives, they can potentially play a role as drivers of change to structural transformation. They enhance the productive capacity and competitiveness of domestic industries through maximum transportation efficiency, reduced transaction costs, and greater market access (Krugman, 1994), as well as increasing employment and developing local economies Job Creation: Infrastructure corridors can create jobs and stimulate the local economy (World Bank, 2019; ILO, 2018)). Regional integration schemes could intensify the cross-country economic connections, increase intra-regional trade, and deepen institutional collaboration between member states (Tomassian, 2009; Bhagwati, 2004; Hix & Høyland, 2005). Additionally, their long-term developmental influence depends on their social and environmental sustainability. Corridors that attempt to minimize environmental disturbance (UNEP, 2019) can both be environmental conservation efforts and drivers of access to services, inequality reduction, and improvement in the living standard of host communities along them (Bank, Belt and Road Economics: Opportunities and Risks of Transport Corridors, 2019; (UN, 1987)). The impact on development of infrastructure corridors rests on good design, good governance, and integration into broader policy contexts that strike a balance between economic development, regional integration, and environmental protection.

### 3. Methodology

According to (Kerlinger & Lee, 2013), methodology is a fundamental concept in research that encompasses method and science. It is the path towards a goal, defined by a set of rules and procedures established to conduct research. This approach derives from science, which comprises a set of precise and methodically ordered knowledge in relation to a specific domain of study. As (Creswell, 2014) states in his book "Research Methodology: A Guide for

Social Scientists", methodology is a crucial aspect of research. Similarly, (Kerlinger & Lee, 2013) who views methodology as a guide for social scientists.

To examine the interlinks between infrastructure, regional integration, and development in Latin America and Eastern and Southern Africa, this study utilizes a qualitative comparative design steered by interpretive epistemology. Endogenous development as the theme, infrastructure as a catalyst, and regional integration to eliminate dependency are the three principal concepts guiding this approach, which combines theoretical investigation with actual case studies.

### 3.1 Comparative Research Methodology and Study Structure

Comparative case study research was employed with the goal of evaluating institutional, socio-economic, and political dynamics found in a number of different countries. The regions were selected as they experienced similar challenges, such as dependency on foreign finance resources, spatial inequality, and division of management, and also exhibited evident trends of regional integration.

The nations to be sampled were chosen using purposeful sampling, with a particular emphasis on the nations that possessed live infrastructure plans and regional strategies. The nations in the list are as follows:

- Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, Malawi, Ethiopia, and Kenya from the East and Southern Africa region
- Latin America consists of countries such as Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Chile, Peru, and Colombia.

Though comparative analysis provides useful findings across regions, differences in data reliability, institutional transparency, and cultural environments provide some constraints. Centralised records of Latin America guarantee comprehensive documentation, while African data are scattered, necessitating triangulation by means of grey literature and interviewing interested stakeholders.

### 3.2 The Accumulation of Data

Data were drawn from various primary and secondary sources including:

- **Primary Data:** Thirty-four short questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were completed with twelve different countries' capital city key informants. These key informants included policy makers, regional officials, infrastructure developers, and community actors. Remote communication was facilitated through WhatsApp, email, and Facebook with the assistance of a standardized six-question guide covering infrastructure, integration, and development.
- **Secondary Data:** Among the documentary materials were some Reports of AfDB, UNCTAD, ECLAC, and IDB, Regional policy documents, including the South African Development Community Infrastructure Master Plan and the COSIPLAN/IIRSA. Peer-reviewed literature on the themes of regionalism, development, and political economy were also used. It was possible to make an exhaustive comparison across the regions through these sources.

### 3.3 Analysis-Based Strategy

In order to achieve the data analysis, NVivo application, and a three-stage thematic coding approach were employed:

Open coding to identify concepts that repeat, and axial coding to organize these concepts into theme divisions. Use of selective coding to develop an interpretive framework that aligns with the aims of the study. Use of this method allowed for comparison of the

institutional systems, modes of funding, coordination methods, and development outcomes across regions.

#### 3.4 Ethical Considerations

The research was carried out within the ethical standards required by the institution. People who took part in the research provided their informed consent, and data confidentiality was ensured through anonymisation and limited information access. Sensitivity to socio-cultural settings was ensured, especially for activities that engaged local communities.

### 4. Findings and Analysis

This chapter addresses Eastern-Southern Africa and Latin America's political, institutional, infrastructural, and developmental barriers to regional integration and endogenous growth. This study uses empirical evidence, regional case studies, and thematic comparisons to investigate infrastructure as a development accelerator across governance systems.

#### 4.1 The Influence of Political and Institutional Dynamics

The interplay of institutional frameworks and political dynamics plays a pivotal role in shaping the integration driven by infrastructure. In Eastern and Southern Africa, the Regional Infrastructure Development Master Plan (2012–2027) is propelled by SADC, COMESA, and the African Union, focussing on energy, transport, ICT, water, and tourism to enhance connectivity and foster growth (SADC, SARDC, 2019). In Latin America, the IIRSA, initiated in 2000 and subsequently incorporated into UNASUR's COSIPLAN, orchestrates transport, energy, and communication initiatives via regional hubs and prioritised agendas (Carrara, 2020). The advancement in both regions is hindered by a lack of cohesive institutions, political instability, insufficient local engagement, and reliance on external funding, which compromises policy independence and sustainable stability. The limited administrative capabilities in Africa lead to a dependence on external entities, whereas the political polarisation in Latin America, coupled with the lack of supranational enforcement mechanisms, obstructs effective policy coordination.

Public engagement is notably limited, characterised by centralised and opaque decision-making processes that marginalise communities, diminish legitimacy, and exacerbate socio-environmental risks. Furthermore, the dynamics of global geopolitical rivalry—exemplified by Chinese investments in Africa and Western influence in Latin America—serve to heighten strategic dependencies, thereby complicating efforts towards inclusive and sustainable integration.

#### 4.2 Obstacles confronting the region in terms of infrastructure and integration

##### 4.2.1 East Africa

Regardless of EAC and COMESA efforts, chronic shortages of infrastructure in Eastern Africa, especially in rural and border areas, discourage transport, electricity, and telecommunications access. Over-reliance on foreign aid, including Chinese-funded Mombasa Port and Mombasa-Nairobi railway (Wissenbach, 2019), causes sovereignty and sustainability concerns. Non-interopability, poor maintenance, and uneven investment exacerbate territorial inequalities. Non-harmonisation of customs, technological standards, and labour mobility delays integration, while institutional fragmentation, duplicative mandates, and political instability hinder coordination. Primary export utilisation, technology incapacity, and non-regional internal policies also limit endogenous growth.

The opportunities lie in demographic growth, intra-regional value chains, digital transformation, and green infrastructure. To achieve these, investment needs to be done in people's skills, AfCFTA-harmonized trade laws, digitally harmonized policy, and climate-

resilient infrastructure. The rest will be based on strengthened institutional capacity, political will, and inclusive regional governance.

#### **4.2.2 Southern Africa**

SADC-member states are struggling to improve its infrastructure and achieve deep regional integration in the wake of institutional achievements like the Regional Infrastructure Development Master Plan (Mlambo, 2017). Power shortages make industrialization difficult, especially in countries that are not able to produce in bulk. Landlocked countries are less competitive due to the costly logistics and insecure transport networks (Rizwan et al., 2024; Poponcini, 2024). Limited access to low-cost information and communication technologies and digital exclusion hinder proactive inclusion and innovation. The infrastructure investment geography in industrialised economies like South Africa and Angola widens spatial inequalities (Hönke et al., 2024; Mbuyazi et al., 2025).

Policy fragmentation and harmonization problems afflict institutional systems (Musayev, 2025). Corruption and poor technical skills compound socio-political issues hindering progress. Southern Africa possesses strategic assets that could facilitate infrastructure development and regional integration if effectively utilised. The region's minerals, energy reserves, and arable land can facilitate industrial diversification and cross-border economic cooperation when managed responsibly and equitably. Effective governance is essential for managing resource wealth, ensuring accountability, transparency, and equitable distribution of benefits.

Member states continue to implement SADC procedures and principles inconsistently. To reduce policy fragmentation and harmonise regulations across digital, energy, transport, and trade infrastructure, it is essential to enhance national and regional institutional capacities. Consolidating a planning commission with a regional monitoring system would enhance project continuity and mitigate duplication. Malawi, Zambia, and Zimbabwe are landlocked countries that experience limited access to international and regional markets (Nyengere et al., 2024). Multimodal transport routes integrating port, rail, and road infrastructure are anticipated to enhance efficiency and reduce logistics costs. The North-South Corridors and Walvis Bay have the potential to improve regional connectivity through effective management and planning.

The digital revolution has the potential to facilitate development in Southern Africa (Mateko, 2024). Digital skills, regional technical ecosystems, and broadband penetration boost integration and creativity, especially for youth and small businesses. A safe and inclusive digital future requires regional cyber-security, data governance, and digital trade cooperation. Institutional change and democratic consolidation are needed to overcome corruption, disenfranchisement, and unequal public administration capacity. Trust between citizens and member nations are essential for authentic and sustained regional projects. Improving policy talks and boosting academic, business, and civil society responsibilities may ensure infrastructure development supports resilience, equity, and shared prosperity.

#### **4.2.3 Latin America**

Latin America's regional blocs—the Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR), the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR), and the Pacific Alliance—remain divided, with political instability undermining policy continuity and cooperation (Lakos & Szabó, 2025; Armijo et al., 2025). Infrastructure investment is usually concentrated in urban and commercial hubs, while border and peripheral areas are left behind. Weak governance hinders project prioritization, execution, and evaluation, while deficits in basic infrastructure such as sanitation, urban mobility, and digital connectivity limit public participation and business competitiveness. The reliance on foreign investors and international banks limits strategic autonomy, while

socioeconomic inequality, low innovative ability, and incoherent policy regimes stifle endogenous growth.

There is potential for building complementary regional value chains, prioritising infrastructure based on social and environmental goals, and reviving institutions like COSIPLAN and the Latin American Development Bank (CAF) to support long-term, depoliticised planning. (Neves & Honório , 2024) Greater participatory governance—bringing in local communities, indigenous peoples, and civil society—can help promote transparency and ensure projects meet actual needs.

Digitalisation, through greater broadband coverage and digital corridors at the regional scale, can reduce inequality and bring economic opportunities, while climate-resilient infrastructure—renewable, sustainable public transport, and nature-based solutions—can reduce environmental vulnerabilities and be job-creating. Realising these possibilities depends on political will, policy continuity mechanisms, conflict resolution, and collective monitoring. The way forward for Latin America's integration is in balancing national interests and regional ambitions, fostering innovation, and making development gains extend beyond metropolitan hubs.

#### 4.3 Comparative Infrastructure Deficiencies

East Africa, South Africa, and Latin America exhibit unique yet interrelated challenges regarding energy, transportation, investment, regional integration, and socioeconomic development infrastructure. The deficiencies in electricity, transport, and telecommunications in rural East Africa hinder both economic growth and social interaction (Nagy et al., 2024). Foreign finance, disjointed national systems, and fragile institutions hinder cross-border connectivity and inclusive growth.

The SADC Master Plan illustrates the development of increasingly complex models in Southern Africa; however, logistical inefficiencies, elevated transit costs, and the enduring impact of colonial-era infrastructure, which was primarily designed for resource extraction rather than regional integration, persist. Regulatory convergence and project implementation in landlocked countries are hindered by institutional asymmetries. Latin America exhibits a robust urban foundation; however, geographic disparities remain evident. Regional blocs encounter difficulties stemming from political instability, ideological divisions, and insufficient transnational coordination. Investment flows remain concentrated in metropolitan areas, while border and rural regions on the periphery experience diminished attention.

Infrastructure challenges across all three regions are exacerbated by poor governance, institutional disorganisation, and inequitable resource distribution. Technical and financial issues reflect deeper governance challenges stemming from historical and political inequalities. These problems necessitate a comprehensive approach addressing infrastructure development, institution building, capacity building, regional policy coordination, and inclusive governance.

**Table 1: Infrastructure Deficits in Transport, Energy, Investment, Integration, and Socioeconomic Impact — Eastern & Southern Africa, and Latin America**

Aspect	Eastern Africa	Southern Africa	Latin America
Access to Transportation	Inadequate number of paved highways; rural seclusion	Logistical corridors influenced by colonial heritage and geo-economic obstacles	Inadequate road infrastructure; excessive dependence on highways

Energy and Electricity	Significant shortfall in dependable energy access	Disparate advancement, segregated accessibility	Outdated grids in multiple regions
Investment in Infrastructure	USD 106 to 149 billion required to achieve Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	Funding deficiencies, dependence on external assistance	By 2030, investment must reach 3.12% GDP from 1.8%.
Regional Integration	Political constraints in EAC and COMESA initiatives	The integration efforts of SADC are impeded by the lack of policy harmonisation.	Limited inter-state cooperation; low coordination
Socioeconomic Impact	Limited essential services and community isolation.	Weak industrial competitiveness and elevated unemployment	Urban disparity, diminished productivity, informal employment

Source: (AfDB, 2022) <sup>1</sup>

We can easily notice from Table 1 that, all three regions experience severe infrastructural inadequacies though the nature and inclination are varying. Eastern Africa is geographically isolated and receives little investment; Southern Africa has institutional plans but inadequate distribution; and Latin America has outmoded systems and incoherent policies.

#### 4.4 Ethical Considerations in Infrastructure Development

Infrastructure development is not merely a technical or economic issue—it has profound ethical implications for legitimacy, sustainability, and inclusivity (Firoozi & Firoozi, 2024). The core issues are distributive fairness, participation, and environmental management. The questions are who profits, who gets excluded, and how decisions are taken.

In Southern-East Africa, and Latin America, the projects are continuously displacing communities, impacting indigenous lands, and hurting ecosystems. Marginalized communities are continuously suffering disproportionate damage without an equivalent benefit. Decisions are dominated by elites, with no transparency, public participation, and resulting decreased trust and mismatched priorities. Environmental ethics are essential in cases that are characterized by high levels of exposure to climate change. Short-term profits from activities like burning fossil fuels and deforestation may lead to long-term risks to resilience (Devi & Salam, 2025). Ethical progress includes the adoption of renewable energy, sustainable transport, and adaptation against climate change. Financial decisions have ethical considerations. Dependence on external financing can undermine sovereignty and enhance further dependency. Only equitable partnerships, local capacity development, and safeguarding against exploitative contracts are required.

Lastly, ethical infrastructure needs to be grounded on the foundations of distributive justice, participatory governance, and ecological stewardship. Table 2 outlines indicators that

<sup>1</sup> Other Information gathered from a delightful mix of regional development banks, United Nations agencies, government reports, and academic studies (check the References for the full scoop).

permit measurement of how infrastructure benefits inclusive, equitable, and sustainable development.

**Table 2: Comparative Infrastructure and Integration Metrics across Eastern Africa, Southern Africa, and Latin America**

METRIC	EASTERN AFRICA	SOUTHERN AFRICA	LATIN AMERICA
Percentage Of Intra-Regional Trade	<15%	~ 20%	~ 60%
Energy Access Rate (%)	~ 45%	~ 60%	~ 85%
GDP Growth as a Motivator for Infrastructure Investment.	<1.5%	~ 1.8%	2–3%
Mobile Connection Coverage	~ 55%	~ 65%	~ 80%

*Source; Data compiled from multiple sources, including regional development banks, United Nations agencies, government reports, and academic studies (see References for full details).<sup>2</sup>*

Table 2 illustrates notable infrastructural and integration deficiencies in Latin America, Southern Africa, and Eastern Africa. The consolidation of institutions and an extensive framework for regional planning have contributed to Latin America's prominence in intra-regional trade, energy accessibility, and infrastructure investment relative to GDP. Nevertheless, inadequate connectivity, fragmented trade, and insufficient investment hinder economic integration and inclusive growth in East and South Africa. Latin America possesses nearly universal mobile access, however Africa falls short due to infrastructural, cost, and regulatory challenges.

These findings suggest that transformative growth requires strong governance structures and long-term strategic infrastructure planning. They also emphasize endogenous planning and less external dependence for sustainable, equitable integration. Latin America has stronger institutions and plural economies, but political conflict, territorial inequality, and social exclusion continue. Colonial legacies, fiscal inflexibilities, and institutional shortcomings have underinvested in frontier and rural infrastructure over metropolitan and important regions, worsening African social and economic imbalances. Closing digital disparities requires public-private partnerships, inclusive technology, and regional solidarity for marginalised populations.

These metrics reflect progress and shortfalls, necessitating context-dependent policies that promote cross-regional learning. Both continents can attain transformative integration and

<sup>2</sup> Data for this table have been compiled from multiple authoritative sources covering regional trade, infrastructure investment, energy access, and connectivity, including reports and studies by the African Development Bank (2022), PricewaterhouseCoopers (2015), the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (2020), Cristino (2018), Zumbire (2015), Cuenca and Teixeira (2020), the Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa (2012), GPEARI (2011), Serebrisky (2015), and the International Telecommunication Union (2021).

inclusive growth by aligning infrastructure development with principles of equity, sustainability, and regional solidarity.

**Table 3. Comparative Ethical Dimensions of Infrastructure Development in Eastern and Southern Africa and Latin America**

<b>Ethical Aspect</b>	<b>Eastern Africa</b>	<b>Southern Africa</b>	<b>Latin America</b>
Social Inclusion	Exclusion of rural and marginalised populations	Inequity in service accessibility; marginal exclusion	Urban elite dominance; marginalised groups encounter difficulties
Corruption and Transparency	Absence of accountability mechanisms	Corruption in procurement and contractual agreements	Suboptimal administration, corruption in public infrastructure
Public Engagement	Minimal local engagement	Lack of remuneration and consultation	Neglected social and environmental consequences for indigenous populations
Ecological Sustainability	Insufficient impact evaluations	Corridor extension without mitigation	Deforestation and degradation caused by initiatives
Intergenerational Equity	Infrastructure orientated towards short-term demands	Lack of future-oriented planning	Unsustainable investments jeopardise future resources

**Source: Data compiled from multiple studies and reports covering Eastern Africa, Southern Africa, and Latin America (see References for details).<sup>3</sup>**

Table 3 contrasts Eastern Africa, Southern Africa, and Latin America's ethical infrastructure development in five areas: social inclusion, corruption and transparency, community consultation, environmental sustainability, and intergenerational equity. Megaprojects without genuine engagement marginalise rural and indigenous populations worldwide, causing displacement, cultural loss, and environmental deterioration. In Eastern and Southern Africa, weak institutional control and opaque procurement, and in Latin America, political intervention and insufficient monitoring erode accountability and public trust. Poor impact evaluations and unchecked ecological harm like deforestation, water pollution, and biodiversity loss are common. Political expediency overrides intergenerational justice, trapping regions under unsustainable growth paradigms. These trends demonstrate that infrastructure is political and moral, determining society destiny. Justice, inclusivity, and sustainability must be integrated into planning, finance, implementation, and evaluation through better institutions,

<sup>3</sup> Ethical dimensions are drawn from multiple regional studies and reports on infrastructure development in Eastern and Southern Africa and Latin America (see References for full details). Key sources include Cristino (2018), Zumbire (2015), PwC (2015), Franco and Monié (2023), Fraga and Resende (2023), Cuenca and Teixeira (2020), PIDA (2012), Serebrisky (2015), and CAF (2022).

participatory governance, and ecological responsibility for equitable and transformative development.

#### **4.5 Case Studies: Infrastructure as a Catalyst for Regional Integration**

##### **4.5.1 East Africa: Port of Mombasa, Kenya**

The Port of Mombasa functions as the principal marine access point to the East African Community through the Northern Corridor (Cyuzuzo, 2024). This enables Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, and the northern region of South Sudan to engage in diverse business enterprises. The full potential is constrained by congestion, protracted customs procedures, fragmented logistics, and inadequate multimodal integration, while the Standard Gauge Railway offers a partial remedy. The site in the Indian Ocean holds strategic importance for regional connectivity; nonetheless, its potential is constrained by certain inherent characteristics (Nazir & Nazir, 2024). The absence of established protocols at international crossings, coupled with inadequate institutional coordination among many agencies, presents significant challenges to the system's integration and efficiency. Ethical and sustainability concerns emerge over environmental deterioration, insufficient engagement with local communities, and the potential for extensive displacement. Investment in infrastructure, governance enhancement, trade process synchronisation, and robust environmental safeguards are essential to position the port as a genuine regional hub (Wang & Slack, 2004; Barnes-Dabban et al., 2018). This would enhance economic resilience and competitiveness across East Africa.

##### **4.5.2 Southern Africa: Maputo Corridor (Mozambique)**

The Maputo Corridor is a key multimodal transport project that will increase cross-border trade and development in poor areas by connecting Maputo Port to Gauteng, the industrial hub of South Africa (Scholvin et al., 2024). Road rehabilitation and public-private partnership have been increasing connectivity and attracting investment, but there are outstanding legal, environmental, and social issues. Divergent investment, transport, and customs policies between Mozambique and South Africa reduce operational efficiency, and inadequate environmental planning damages ecologically sensitive areas through deforestation, habitat loss, and pollution. Inadequate community participation in decision-making erodes social cohesion and impedes equitable development. The complete potential may only be realized through harmonized systems of legislatures, protection of the environment, and inclusive governance, thereby becoming a driver of regional integration and a model for sustainable, socially equitable infrastructure.

##### **4.5.3 Latin America: IIRSA and the Tarapoto–Yurimaguas Highway (Peru)**

Part of the Initiative for the Integration of the Regional Infrastructure of South America (IIRSA), Peru's Tarapoto–Yurimaguas Highway links the nation's Pacific coast to Brazil and the Amazon basin, lowering the logistics and continental-link costs (Melón, 2022). But by environmentally fragile Amazonian regions, it has accelerated deforestation, threatened biodiversity, and disturbed water supplies—problem that is compounded by lax environmental studies and preservation. Indigenous displacement and refusal to grant free, prior, and informed consent have fuelled protests and eroded public trust in state institutions, revealing deep ethical failures in project management. Transparency deficiencies, poor inter-agency collaboration, and political discontinuity degrade integration and accountability goals further. These case points out that infrastructure cannot bring sustainable regional integration by itself; it has to be anchored upon resilient regulation, governance with participation, and environmental protection based on the region's socio-ecological conditions (Domingues, 2017).

## **5. Infrastructure, Integration, and Development Dynamics in East-Southern Africa and Latin America**

### 5.1 Overview

Infrastructure, regional integration, and development patterns are essential for enhancing economic competitiveness, diminishing inequities, and strengthening regional unity. In East and Southern Africa, the persisting weaknesses include logistical weaknesses, energy shortages, and political fragmentation that can delay effective inter-country integration along strategic trade corridors. Latin America, meanwhile, grapples with historical infrastructural weaknesses, territorial disparities, deficient transnational coordination, and the complex social and environmental consequences of large-scale projects. Despite facing analogous obstacles, these regions possess significant transformative potential through ethical investment, strategic planning, and strengthened regional cooperation.

### 5.2 Risks Arising from Inadequate Infrastructure

Inefficient infrastructure across East Africa, Southern Africa, and Latin America exposes these regions to multiple interrelated risks, including:

- Economic slowdown spurred by high logistical expenses and reduced productive competitiveness.
- Social isolation of disconnected populations with reduced access to healthcare, education, and mobility.
- Environmental fragility, owing to inadequately resilient infrastructure that cannot resist natural disasters.
- Political instability, fueled by territorial disparities and poor regional integration.
- Capital flight, caused by landscapes felt to be insecure and uninviting for outside investors.

### 5.3 Management Practice Mitigating Infrastructure Deficits

Regional measures in response to infrastructure deficiencies are:

- East Africa: Development of the Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa (PIDA), with priority given to core regional projects, through public-private partnerships (PPPs), and mobilization of multilateral funds to fill logistically and energetically.
- Southern Africa: Greater cooperation through SADC, in transport corridors and in energy integration, in addition to decentralization and strengthening at local technical levels.
- Infrastructure planning in the long-term, planned deployment of PPP, and financing from regional development banks like the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and Development Bank of Latin America (CAF) in Latin America are likely to maintain and replace current infrastructure.

These methods aim to reduce infrastructure shortfalls and match investment flows with sustainable development goals.

### 5.4 Effectiveness of Infrastructure Deficit Management

- East Africa: Though PIDA has improved in considering strategic regional projects, inter-institutional coordination and sustainable financing issues continue to plague it. There has been progress in building logistical corridors and energy networks; however, institutional vulnerabilities are still present (de Melo et al., 2020).
- Southern Africa: SADC's efforts have advanced physical and energy integration, supported by PPPs and external aid. Nonetheless, political volatility, limited technical capacity, and endemic corruption restrict the overall effectiveness of these initiatives (Zumbire, 2015).
- Latin America: Development by way of far-reaching infrastructure plans and strategic funding by regional banks has been significant. However, ongoing inter-country coordination

weaknesses, institutional vulnerability, and unresolved social implications limit the effectiveness of these management efforts (Estache et al., 2015).

#### 5.5 Key Lessons for Integrated Governance

The comparison accentuates a number of pivotal factors for the success of governance of infrastructure and integration projects:

- Strategic Regional Planning: Integration will necessitate a shared vision of countries and institutional alignment over and above territorial fragmentation.
- Social Participation and Transparency: Good projects take into account social consultations, social oversight, and the presence of mechanisms against corruption
- Sustainable and Multilateral Financing: Diversifying funding sources and using PPPs could bolster project viability
- Resilience and Territorial Inclusion: Infrastructure needs to consider the needs of vulnerable populations, remain robust to climate risk and geopolitical risks.
- Institutional Capacity Building: Effective governance depends on qualified technical personnel and administrative structures adapted to local contexts.

### 6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This comparative study investigated the relationship between infrastructure, regional integration, and development in East Africa, Southern Africa, and Latin America. Despite different geographical and institutional contexts, the three regions have similar structural constraints: long-lasting transport, energy, and sanitation shortages; institutional fragmentation limiting policy harmonization; dependence on external finances limiting autonomy; and weak responses to socio-environmental impacts. Weak governance and restricted public engagement also erode the ability to coordinate infrastructure with inclusive development goals.

The study demonstrates that infrastructure must not be viewed as a physical piece of equipment but as a strategic tool needing integrated governance, long-term planning, and participatory management. Initiatives such as Africa's Programme for Infrastructure Development in Africa (PIDA) and Latin America's IIRSA reveal both the potential and risk of regional infrastructure initiatives, particularly where political coordination and socio-environmental protections are still embryonic. Effective integration and development call for sustainable infrastructure models, stronger local institutional capacity, and moral, participatory project design and implementation approaches.

Three broad conclusions can be drawn. First, integrated infrastructure planning—linking physical investment with industrialisation, trade, and sustainability goals—requires intersectoral policies between regional institutions, civil society, and local governments, and coordinated regulations in sectors such as transport and energy to facilitate cross-border travel. Second, stakeholder participation would require a transition from ad hoc consultation towards institutionalized processes that ensure transparency, grievance redressal, and participatory monitoring, thereby building legitimacy and trust. Third, robust regulatory and institutional frameworks are required to catalyze investment, promote regional regulatory coordination, and mainstream climate resilience and innovation into public policy. These agendas depend on sustained investment in human assets, technical capabilities, and multi-level governance coordination anchored in knowledge-sharing platforms that build local capacities and enable continuous learning.

Region-specific paths emphasize the need for differential strategies. In East Africa, regional integration will accelerate with the development of multimodal transport corridors in

conjunction with digital and renewable energy networks; harmonization of EAC customs and trade policy to reduce non-tariff barriers; youth enterprise and sustainable agriculture to promote employment and rural value chain development; and establishment of monitoring systems in cooperation with universities and research centres to enable evidence-based adjustment. In the Southern Africa region, the priorities are intensifying energy integration through the Southern African Power Pool to enhance efficiency and access, harmonization of trade in the SADC to reduce barriers and enhance cross-border project governance, inclusive industrialization through innovation and skills, and interoperable regional data platforms for policy analysis and monitoring of impact. In Latin America, escaping the confines of nationally oriented and politically fragmented infrastructure planning will require stronger regional coordination institutions, harmonized regulatory environments, and targeted investment along corridors linking under-served regions, accompanied by social and environmental safeguards.

Lastly, placing infrastructure at the centre of social and regional transformation is dependent on reconciling technical design with broader development strategies, constructing inclusivity and sustainability in each step of the process, and promoting cooperative methods that bridge political, institutional, and territorial cleavages.

## References

- [1] ECA. (2004). *Assessing regional integration in Africa*. Addis Ababa: Economic Commission for Africa. Retrieved June 11, 2025, from [www.uneca.org](http://www.uneca.org)
- [2] SADC, SARDC. (2019). *SADC regional infrastructure development – Short term action assessment 2019*. <https://www.sadc.int>: Southern African Development Community (SADC), & Southern African Research and Documentation Centre (SARDC). .
- [3] World Bank. (2011). *Conflict, Security, and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [4] Adika, G. (2021, July 27). Regional economic integration, natural resources and foreign direct investment in SADC. (E. P. Limited, Ed.) *Journal of Economics and Development*, 24(1,2022), 46. doi:10.1108/JED-02-2021-0021
- [5] AfDB. (2022). *African Economic Outlook: Supporting Climate and a Just Energy Transition in Africa*. Côte d'Ivoire: African Development Bank. [https://www.afdb-org.kr/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/african\\_economic\\_outlook\\_2022\\_web.pdf](https://www.afdb-org.kr/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/african_economic_outlook_2022_web.pdf)
- [6] Aluko & Ngubane. (2024). The role of infrastructure investment on inclusive growth and human development index: Evidence from emerging economies. *International journal of economics and financial issues*, 14(6), 219-231. <https://doi.org/10.32479/ijefi.16654>
- [7] Antonio, V. B. (2007, 12 13). Desarrollo endógeno. Teorías y políticas de desarrollo territorial. *Red de Revistas Científicas de América Latina, el Caribe, España y Portugal Proyecto académico sin fines de lucro, desarrollado bajo la iniciativa de acceso abierto*, 183-210. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/289/28901109.pdf>
- [8] Armijo & Rhodes. (2017). Explaining infrastructure underperformance in Brazil: cash, political institutions, corruption, and policy Gestalts. *Policy Studies*, 38(3), 231-247. DOI:10.1080/01442872.2017.1290227
- [9] Armijo et al. . (2025). How Latin America Cooperates: A Brief Look at the Historical Record. In *South American Policy Regionalism* (pp. 3-26). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003519577-2/latin-america-cooperates-leslie-elliott-armijo-markus-fraundorfer-sybil-rhodes>
- [10] Ayuso & Villar. (2014). Integration processes in Latin America. *GRC Gulf papers*, 1-22. [https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/184537/Unity\\_Aнна\\_Ayuso\\_fin\\_9127.pdf](https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/184537/Unity_Aнна_Ayuso_fin_9127.pdf)

- [11] Balanzo et al. (2020). Typical challenges of governance for sustainable regional development in globalized Latin America: a multidimensional literature review. *Sustainability*, 12(7), 2702. DOI:10.3390/su12072702
- [12] World Bank. (2011). *Conflict, Security and Development*. Washington DC: World Bank. doi:10.1596/978-0-8213-8500-5
- [13] Bardhan. (1995). The contributions of endogenous growth theory to the analysis of development problems: an assessment. *Handbook of Development Economics*, 3, 2983-2998. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4471\(95\)30023-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4471(95)30023-6)
- [14] Barnes-Dabban et al. (2018). Regional convergence in environmental policy arrangements: A transformation towards regional environmental governance for West and Central African ports? *Ocean & coastal management*, 163, 151-161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.06.013>
- [15] Bhagwati, J. (2004). *In Defense of Globalization*. Oxford New York: Oxford University Press. <https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/books/191> Retrieved July 2, 2025
- [16] Biermann et al. (2020, April 17). Governance Fragmentation from Part II - Core Structural Features. (F. Biermann, & R. E. Kim, Eds.) *Cambridge University Press*, 158 - 180. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108784641.008>
- [17] Brandi et al. (2025, April 07). Africa's regional and global integration: introduction to the special issue. (Springer, Ed.) *Review of World Economics* , 1-5. doi:10.1007/s10290-024-00577-x
- [18] Brenton & Isik (Eds.). (2012). *De-fragmenting Africa: deepening regional trade integration in goods and services*. Washington, D.C: World Bank Publications. <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/245181468009603809/pdf/684900ESW0Whit00Box367921B00PUBLIC0.pdf>
- [19] Brichetti & Serebrisky. (2022, June 19). America and the Caribbean to reach the Sustainable Development Goals. *Latin America Policy Journal*, 22-101. file:///C:/Users/LENOVI/Downloads/The-Infrastructure-Gap-in-Latin-America-and-the-Caribbean-Investment-Needed-Through-2030-to-Meet-the-Sustainable-Development-Goals%20(3).pdf. Retrieved June 11, 2025
- [20] Brichetti, J. P., & Serebrisky, T. (2022, June 19). The infrastructure gap in Latin America and the Caribbean to reach the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030. *Latin America Policy Journal*, 22-101. Retrieved June 11, 2025
- [21] Brichetti, J. P., Mastronardi, L., Amiassorho, M. E., Serebrisky, T., & Solís, B. (2021). *THE INFRASTRUCTURE GAP IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN*. American Development Bank.
- [22] Calderón & Servén. (2010). Infrastructure and economic development in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of African Economies*, 19(suppl\_1), i13-i87. <https://studentreview.hks.harvard.edu/the-infrastructure-gap-in-latin-america-and-the-caribbean-to-reach-the-sustainable-development-goals-by-2030/>
- [23] Carrara, A. F. (2020). The struggle for indigenous territories in the Brazilian Amazon . (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida).
- [24] Carter III et al. (2019). 7China in Africa: Opportunities, Challenges, and Options. *China's Global Influence*, 105. [https://apcss.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/7-China\\_in\\_Africa-Carter-Gilpin-Paul\\_Nantulyal.pdf](https://apcss.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/7-China_in_Africa-Carter-Gilpin-Paul_Nantulyal.pdf)
- [25] Charles, E., & Lindblom. (2012, 09 02). The Science of Muddling Through. *Advancing excellence in public service*, 19(2), 79-88. Retrieved June 11, 2025, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/973677> .

- [26] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Chicago: Sage Publications Inc. <https://www.amazon.ca/Research-Design-Qualitative-Quantitative-Approaches/dp/1452226105>. Retrieved July 3, 2025
- [27] Cyuzuzo, L. (2024). Gatekeeping beyond the state: The mombasa port development program and the emergence of the gatekeeper city. *Political Geography*, 114, 103194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2024.103194>
- [28] Dannenberg et al. (2018, April 6). Spaces for integration or a divide? New-generation growth corridors and their integration in global value chains in the Global South. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie*, 62(2), 135–151. DOI:10.1515/zfw-2017-0034 Retrieved July 2, 2025
- [29] de Melo et al. (2020). A primer on African market integration with a hard look at progress and challenges ahead. *FERDI Working Paper No. P268, Fondation pour les études et recherches sur le développement international (FERDI) Clermont-Ferrand*. <https://ferdi.fr/en/publications/9d00a822-f238-453c-bde5-44e1d22b4fb5>
- [30] Dethier. (2015). *Infrastructure in Africa*. The Oxford handbook of Africa and economics, 2. <https://doi.org/10.1093/OXFORDHB/9780199687107.013.022>
- [31] Devi & Salam. (2025). Resilience, Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies to Combat Climate Change for a Sustainable Future. *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change*, 15(4), 423-438. DOI: 10.9734/ijecc/2025/v15i44822
- [32] Domingues, I. (2017). Filosofia no Brasil: legados & perspectivas. *SciELO-Editora UNESP*. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0100-512X2018n14015ogj>
- [33] Dossani, R. (2018). Promoting the Sustainable Development of Transport and Economic Corridors Under the Belt and Road Initiative. In R. Dossani, *Promoting the Sustainable Development of Transport and Economic Corridors Under the Belt and Road Initiative* (pp. 55-75). UK: UNDP. <https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/migration/cn/21ea003ef9ec30a788487068b09588b2ce48a09f51f22a1ad1c8d75bda0a6ae6.pdf> Retrieved July 2, 2025
- [34] ECLAC. (2020). *COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (CSTD)*. Geneva: Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. <https://unctad.org/meeting/commission-science-and-technology-development-twenty-fourth-session> Retrieved June 11, 2025
- [35] Estache et al. (2015). Financing infrastructure in developing countries. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 31(3-4), 279-304. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2654287](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2654287)
- [36] Fioravanti et al. (2019). Fundamental Principles in PPP Laws: A Review of Latin America and The Caribbean. <https://doi.org/10.18235/0001694>.
- [37] Firoozi & Firoozi. (2024). Ethical Design and Development Guidelines. In *Revolutionizing Civil Engineering with Neuromorphic Computing: Pathways to Smart and Sustainable Infrastructure* (pp. 81-97). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. DOI:10.1007/978-3-031-71097-1\_10
- [38] Fischer. (2015). The end of peripheries? On the enduring relevance of structuralism for understanding contemporary global development. *Development and change*, 46(4), 700-732. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12180>
- [39] FOLORUNSHO & SAMUEL. (2025). Examining the relationship between poor governance and sub-national conflicts in Africa: causes, impacts and policy implications. *International Journal of Humanities, Literature and Art Research*, 7(6). DOI:10.70382/mejhlar.v7i6.021

- [40] Foster & Briceño-Garmendia. (2010). *Africa's infrastructure. A Time for Transformation*. A co-publication of the Agence Française de Développement and the World Bank <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search>.
- [41] Furtado et al. (2021, fevereiro 1o). interpreter of dependency. (R. d. Brasileiros, Ed.) *Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros*, 182-205. doi:<https://doi.org/10.11606/iss.231-901X.v1i78p182-205>
- [42] Gessi. (2024). Underdevelopment and unequal exchange: an examination of dependency theory with a focus on Latin America.<https://unitesi.unive.it/retrieve/b85d113d-2a48-4eb3-ab77-343f6ba5b0ca/867813-1293601.pdf>
- [43] Graca, d. (2025). Case Study on the Maritime Transition Goal and Its Effects in Egypt, South Africa, Kenya, Mozambique, and Seychelles. (*Master's thesis, Texas Southern University*).
- [44] Haldea et al. (2019). Closing the Gaps in Social and Physical Infrastructure for Achieving Sustainable Development Goals in Asia and the Pacific. *Millennial Asia*, 10(3), 372–394.DOI:10.1177/0976399619879867. Retrieved July 2, 2025
- [45] Helmsing. (2001). *Partnerships, Meso-institutions and Learning New local and regional economic development initiatives in Latin America*. Institute of Social Studies, The Hague, The Netherlands.[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228809078\\_Partnerships\\_Meso-institutions\\_and\\_Learning\\_New\\_local\\_and\\_regional\\_economic\\_development\\_initiatives\\_in\\_Latin\\_America](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228809078_Partnerships_Meso-institutions_and_Learning_New_local_and_regional_economic_development_initiatives_in_Latin_America)
- [46] Hix, S., & Høyland, B. (2005). *he Political System of the European Union*. Palgrave Macmillan (2nd ed.). New York: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS and. [http://lib.yzu.am/open\\_books/416593.pdf](http://lib.yzu.am/open_books/416593.pdf). Retrieved July 3, 2025
- [47] Hönke et al. (2024). *Africa's Global Infrastructures: South–South Transformations in Practice*. London: Hurst Publishers.<https://www.hurstpublishers.com/book/africas-global-infrastructures/>
- [48] Hönke et al. (2024). *Africa's Global Infrastructures: South–South Transformations in Practice*. Hurst Publishers.<https://www.hurstpublishers.com/book/africas-global-infrastructures/>
- [49] ILO. (2018). *Assessment of Infrastructure Investments in Transport and Job Creation*. Jordan: (ILO) & World Bank.<https://researchrepository.ilo.org/esploro/outputs/report/Assessment-of-infrastructure-investments-in-transport/995218998202676> Retrieved July 2, 2025
- [50] INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AND DISASTER RISK REDUCTION DIVISION, ESCAP / 5-WP / 13 (Infrastructure Corridor Development Series Part I: In-Depth Analysis of Three Promising Infrastructure Corridors June 13, 2021). Retrieved July 2, 2025, from <http://www.unescap.org/kp>
- [51] Josa, S. O., & Magrinyà, F. (2021). From Priority Projects to Corridor Approaches: African and European Transport Networks in Perspective. In S. O. Josa, & F. Magrinyà, *From Priority Projects to Corridor Approaches: African and European Transport Networks in Perspective* (pp. 78-101). European Research Council.DOI:10.2307/j.ctv2x4kp3n.9
- [52] Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2013). *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (4th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing. doi:978-0155078970
- [53] Khalil, M., Ghosh, P., Elms, D., Adiga, A., Mead, M., Jobs, S., & Hawking, S. (2020). *Analysis of Environmental Impacts of Infrastructure*. Switzerland AG: Springer. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48559-7\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48559-7_8)

- [54] Kofi. (2024). *Infrastructure, Connectivity and Trade in Africa*. The Palgrave Handbook of International Trade and Development in Africa, 441.DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-65715-3\_23
- [55] KPA. (2018). *THE STRATEGIC PLAN 2018–2022*. Kenya Ports , Office of the Managing Director. Mombasa: Kenya Ports Authority. Retrieved July 2, 2025
- [56] Krugman, P. R. (1994). *Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession* (Vol. 94). Massachusetts: World Economy Laboratory at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.<http://gesd.free.fr/krugman94.pdf>. Retrieved July 2, 2025
- [57] Kuran. (2024). Are Dependency Theory and Modern World-System Analysis Relevant Today? *Politik Ekonomik Kuram*, 8(2), 332-344.DOI:10.30586/pek.1431514
- [58] Kwet, M. (2019). Digital colonialism: US empire and the new imperialism in the Global South. *Race & class*, 60(4), 3-26.DOI: 10.1177/0306396818823172
- [59] Lakos & Szabó. (2025). Southern Common Market (MERCOSUR). In *The Economics of Regional Integration* (pp. 195-222). Routledge.DOI:10.4324/9781003506423-9
- [60] Marini, R. M. (1967). Dialectics of Dependency. In R. M. Marini, *Dialectics of Dependency* (pp. 123-423). Rio de Janeiro: Monthly Review Press. Retrieved June 21, 2025
- [61] Marire & Iqbal. (2024). Infrastructure development, informal economy, and gender inequality in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(6), 3413.<https://systems.enpress-publisher.com/index.php/jipd/article/view/3413>
- [62] Mateko, F. M. (2024). Opportunities in emerging technologies for Southern Africa: How the Global South should adopt to take advantage? *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 90(5), e12321.DOI: 10.1002/isd2.12321
- [63] Mbuyazi et al. (2025). Improving Stakeholder Harmonisation and Policy Development Processes in the National System of Innovation. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 25(2), e70045.DOI:10.1002/pa.70045
- [64] Melón, D. (2022). The Integration of Regional Infrastructure in South America (IIRSA): Territorial coloniality at the service of extractivism. *Alternautas*, 9(2), 201-221.
- [65] MINKO. (2024). ASSESSING THE IMPACTS OF REGIONAL INTEGRATION ON INTRA-AFRICA TRADE, MIGRATION PATTERNS, LAND USE, AND SUSTAINABILITY: A CASE STUDY OF THE EAST AFRICAN COMMUNITY. *African Journal on Land Policy and Geospatial Sciences*, 7(5).DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48346/IMIST.PRSM/ajlp-gs.v7i5.50623>
- [66] Mlambo, D. N. (2017). Regional supremacy or coalition? evaluating South Africa's regional integration efforts within the Southern African Development Community (SADC) . (*Doctoral dissertation, University of Zululand*).<https://hdl.handle.net/10530/1704>
- [67] Mold. (2022). The economic significance of intra-African trade. *The future of African trade and development*, 25-48.[https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Economic-significance\\_of\\_intra-African\\_trade.pdf](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Economic-significance_of_intra-African_trade.pdf)
- [68] Musayev, M. (2025). REGULATORY FRAGMENTATION AND HARMONIZATION CHALLENGES IN ENERGY SECTOR CYBERSECURITY LAW. *Elita.uz-Elektron Ilmiy Journal*, 3(1), 50-70.[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382113045\\_INDIA\\_AND\\_THE\\_INDO-PACIFIC\\_STRATEGIC\\_PARTNERSHIPS\\_AND\\_REGIONAL\\_STABILITY](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382113045_INDIA_AND_THE_INDO-PACIFIC_STRATEGIC_PARTNERSHIPS_AND_REGIONAL_STABILITY)
- [69] Nagy et al. (2024). The role of transport, ICT and power infrastructure in the Ethiopian economy. *Экономика региона*, 20(1), 235-247.DOI:10.17059/ekon.reg.2024-1-16
- [70] Nazir & Nazir. (2024). India and the Indo-Pacific: Strategic Partnerships and Regional Stability. *International Journal of Educational Review*, 4(4), 1098-

1103.[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382113045\\_INDIA\\_AND\\_THE\\_INDO-PACIFIC\\_STRATEGIC\\_PARTNERSHIPS\\_AND\\_REGIONAL\\_STABILITY](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382113045_INDIA_AND_THE_INDO-PACIFIC_STRATEGIC_PARTNERSHIPS_AND_REGIONAL_STABILITY)

[71] Ncube. (2017). Infrastructure deficit and financing needs in Africa. In *Infrastructure in Africa* (pp. 583-614). Policy Press. DOI:10.2307/j.ctt1t88xmm.23

[72] Ndulu. (2006). Infrastructure, regional integration and growth in Sub-Saharan Africa: Dealing with the disadvantages of geography and sovereign fragmentation. *Journal of African economies*, 15(suppl\_2), 212-244. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejl033>

[73] Neves & Honório . (2024). Infrastructure as a Geopolitical Lever: Strategic Dynamics in Latin America's Global Power Struggle. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 67(2), e021. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-7329202400221>

[74] Nguea, D. &. (2025). The role of energy vulnerability in shaping human development outcomes: A multidimensional analysis. *Energy Reports*, 13, 538-547. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egyr.2024.12.044>

[75] Nikulina et al. (2025). *Infrastructure Horizons The forces shaping the future of infrastructure investing*. Bern: IFM. Retrieved June 27, 2025

[76] Nyengere et al. (2024). ANALYSIS OF THE GEOGRAPHICAL FACTORS INFLUENCING CHOICE OF INFORMAL FISH TRADE ROUTE AND DESTINATION BY FISH TRADERS BETWEEN MALAWI AND NEIGHBORING COUNTRIES. *Discover Global Society*, 2(1), 68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44282-024-00100-5>

[77] Paz, C. &. (2025). Public-private partnerships in Latin America and the Caribbean: a review of the Ecuador case. *Handbook of Public Management in Latin America and the Caribbean*, 278-299. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781035317684.00023>

[78] Pena et al. (2023). *Cataloging-in-Publication data provided by the Inter-American Development Bank Felipe Herrera Library*. Institute for the Integration of Latin America and the Caribbean , Institute for the Integration of Latin America and the Caribbean . Bolivia: Inter-American Development Bank. Retrieved May 27, 2025, from <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/igo/legalcode>

[79] Poponcini, L. (2024). Global supply chains: opportunities and challenges for Africa. *Global Trade and Customs Journal*, 19(7/8).

[80] Prus & Sikora. (2021). The impact of transport infrastructure on the sustainable development of the region—Case study. *Agriculture*, 11(4), 279. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture11040279>

[81] Regional Integration in Africa , CH 1211 (Trade Law Centre for Southern Africa (tralac) October 21, 2011). [https://www.wto.org/english/res\\_e/reser\\_e/ersd201114\\_e.pdf](https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/reser_e/ersd201114_e.pdf)

[82] Resende, F. &. (2003). Infraestrutura, expectativas e investimento: evidências empíricas para a América Latina. *Economia e Sociedade, Campinas, Unicamp. IE*, 79-102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-3533.2023v32n1art04>

[83] Rizwan et al. (2024). Navigating Security Challenges: Data Insights into the Foreign Policy Paradigm of Landlocked Nations. DOI:10.62019/abbdm.v4i3.195

[84] Rodríguez-Cohard, V.-B. &. (2016). Endogenous development and institutions: Challenges for local development initiatives. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 34(6), 1135-1153. DOI: 10.1177/0263774X15624924

[85] Scholvin et al. (2024). Why multinational development corridors don't move ahead: insights from the Bioceanic Corridor in South America. *Area Development and Policy*, 9(3), 365-384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23792949.2024.2303655>

- [86] Staden, A. V. (2016). *SUBSIDIARITY IN REGIONAL INTEGRATION REGIMES IN LATIN AMERICA AND AFRICA*. Montevideo: Duke Law. Retrieved Jun 2, 2025, from <https://scholarship.law.duke.edu/lcp/vol79/iss2/2>
- [87] Tandrayen-Ragoobur. (2024). The role of infrastructure in regional trade in the SADC region. In *Regional Policy in the Southern African Development Community* (pp. 123-144). Oxfordshire: Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/oa-edit/10.4324/9781003379379-9/role-infrastructure-regional-trade-sadc-region-verena-tandrayen-ragoobur>
- [88] Teplova et al. (2020, 09 03). Perception and Drivers of Financial Constraints for the Sustainable Development. *Bank Management, Finance and Sustainability*, 12(17)(7217), 1-29. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12177217>
- [89] Tidjani, C., & Madouri, A. (2024, April 12). Fintech, financial inclusion, and sustainable development in the African region. *financial inclusion, and sustainable development in the African region*, 01-25. doi:10.3389/fams.2024.1276218
- [90] Tomassian, G. C. (2009). *PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND REGIONAL INTEGRATION*. Caribbean: ECLAC. <https://hdl.handle.net/11362/36290>
- [91] Turok. (2016). Getting urbanization to work in Africa: the role of the urban land-infrastructure-finance nexus. *Area development and policy*, 1(1), 30-47. <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11910/9768>
- [92] UN. (1987). *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*. Washington DC: New York. <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/139811?v=pdf>
- [93] UN. (2019). *A South American Interoceanic Network: Bioceanic Corridors and the Role of Connecting States*. Paris: CEPAL. Retrieved July 2, 2025
- [94] UNCTAD. (REPORT 2009). *THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES The State and Development Governance*. Geneva: UNITED NATIONS. Retrieved May 27, 2025, from [www.unctad.org/ldcr](http://www.unctad.org/ldcr)
- [95] UNCTAD. (2009). *TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT REPORT*. Geneva: United Nations. <https://unctad.org/publication/trade-and-development-report-2009>
- [96] UNEP. (2019). *Annual Report 2019*. UNEP. <https://www.unep.org/resources/unep-annual-report-2019>
- [97] Wang & Slack. (2004). Regional governance of port development in China: a case study of Shanghai International Shipping Center. *Maritime Policy & Management*, 31(4), 357-373. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0308883042000304467>
- [98] Wissenbach, U. (2019). Kenya's Madaraka Express: An Example of the Decisive Chinese Impulse for African Mega-Infrastructure Projects. *Duality by Design: The Global Race to Build Africa's Infrastructure*, 315-52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108562492.012>
- [99] World Bank. (2016). *Connections Transport & ICT*. Washington DC: World Bank. Retrieved July 2, 2025, from <http://www.worldbank.org/transport>, <http://www.worldbank.org/ict>
- [100] World Bank. (2019). *Belt and Road Economics: Opportunities and Risks of Transport Corridors*. Washington, DC: World Bank. Retrieved July 2, 2025
- [101] Zumbire, B. J. (2015). A Importância das Infraestruturas no Desempenho Econômico de Moçambique Uma análise aplicada de séries temporais. (*Master's thesis, Universidade de Coimbra (Portugal)*). <https://hdl.handle.net/10316/29725>