



MINI REVIEW

Trade Implications of Kenya–South Africa Economic Relations

under the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA)

Jelle Bulle Noor

ORCID [0009-0000-2659-0289](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2659-0289)



ABSTRACT

This mini review examines Kenya–South Africa relations after their June 2026 Strategic Partnership agreement. It asks a focused question: does deeper institutionalisation produce a stable economic partnership, or does it simply move conflict into new instruments, such as tariffs? The review applies complex interdependence theory (Keohane and Nye, 1977) alongside the regime concept of reciprocity (Keohane, 1986). It treats institutional density and reciprocity enforcement as two independent variables, with partnership stability as the dependent variable. The analysis draws on a qualitative, desk-based review of government statements, trade ministry announcements, and Africa-focused news reporting published between May and August 2026. It traces the signing of six Memoranda of Understanding, the first African Continental Free Trade Area consignments between Durban and Mombasa, and a rapid tariff dispute over Kenyan timber duties and South African tea concessions. The review argues that interdependence has deepened cooperation while also generating recurrent, short-cycle friction. This supports a core proposition of complex interdependence theory: deep ties redistribute conflict rather than remove it. The review closes with implications for African regional trade governance and for firms operating across the two markets.

Keywords: Kenya; South Africa; AfCFTA; complex interdependence; reciprocity; regional trade; African regionalism; bilateral relations

HOW TO CITE

Noor, J. B. (2026). Trade Implications of Kenya–South Africa Economic Relations under the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA). *African Journal of International Relations*, 1 (2026), 33-40

Open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license: creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Introduction

Kenya and South Africa are two of Africa's most diversified economies. Their bilateral relationship has long been thinner than their combined economic weight would suggest. Diplomatic ties date from the early years of South Africa's post-apartheid government, but trade volumes between the two countries remained modest for two decades, overshadowed by each country's stronger ties within its own regional bloc, the East African Community and the Southern African Development Community respectively.

This changed abruptly in mid-2026. President William Ruto's state visit to Pretoria produced a formal Strategic Partnership. Six new Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) anchored the agreement. Both countries also moved their first cargo consignments under the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) Guided Trade Initiative, linking the ports of Durban and Mombasa.

The achievement did not last unchallenged. Within weeks, Kenya's 2026 Finance Act introduced a 30 per cent duty on South African timber. South Africa responded immediately. It suspended its duty-free concessions on Kenyan tea, coffee, and spice exports, citing the AfCFTA reciprocity principle. Both governments now face a sixty-day window to repair the arrangement.

This sequence is analytically striking. Rapid institutional deepening was followed by rapid retaliatory friction. The pattern fits a textbook description of complex interdependence (Keohane and Nye, 1977). Multiple channels of contact exist between the two states. No clear hierarchy separates high diplomatic politics from low trade politics. Conflict is expressed through tariffs, not through force. Yet a more sceptical reading is also possible: tariffs can remain tools of national leverage, even inside a formally cooperative regime.

This review advances one central claim. Institutional depth and strict reciprocity enforcement operate together. Their joint effect is a partnership that is resilient overall, but recurrently unstable at the sectoral margin. Deepening ties does not eliminate conflict; it relocates it into narrow, technical disputes. These disputes resolve quickly, precisely because both governments value the wider relationship more than the disputed sector.

The review proceeds in four further parts. Section two sets out the theoretical framework and defines two independent variables, institutional density and reciprocity enforcement, against one dependent variable, partnership stability. Section three explains the methodology, including search strategy and inclusion criteria. Section four presents results across four thematic areas. Section five discusses the central claim against the evidence and against a rival theoretical reading. Section six concludes with implications for policy and for business.

The business–international relations nexus

International relations theory rarely speaks directly to firms. Yet the Kenya–South Africa case shows why it should. Manufacturers, exporters, airlines, and development financiers are named participants in the Strategic Partnership, not passive bystanders. A tariff dispute between two finance ministries changes real input costs for South African timber firms, and real export revenue for Kenyan tea cooperatives, within weeks rather than years. Firms operating across both markets therefore need a reading of bilateral risk that goes beyond headline diplomacy.

Complex interdependence theory offers exactly that. It predicts where friction is likely to appear, in narrow technical instruments, and where it is unlikely to spread into unrelated cooperation channels. This is of direct, practical value to business planners, not only academic readers, and it is why this review treats business and international relations as a single analytical field rather than two separate conversations.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

Complex interdependence

Keohane and Nye (1977) define complex interdependence through three features. First, multiple channels connect societies: state-to-state, firm-to-firm, and civil society-to-civil society. Second, no fixed hierarchy separates issues; trade and technical regulation can matter as much as classical diplomacy. Third, military force plays a diminished role between interdependent partners.

Kenya and South Africa satisfy this description closely. Their relationship now runs simultaneously through trade ministries, national airlines, development banks, and diaspora communities. This is a marked change from a historically diplomat-led relationship, and it is precisely the shift that the 2026 Strategic Partnership formalises.

Two further concepts sharpen the framework: sensitivity and vulnerability. Sensitivity interdependence describes how quickly, and at what cost, a policy change in one country is felt by the other, within the existing rules. Vulnerability interdependence describes how costly it would be to adjust the relationship if the rules themselves had to change, that is, if credible alternatives were scarce. The tea and timber dispute, examined in section 4.2, is best read as sensitivity. South Africa reacted within an existing reciprocal framework. Neither government needed to contemplate leaving the partnership.

A related, often overlooked point from Keohane and Nye concerns asymmetry. Interdependence is rarely symmetrical, and the less dependent party in an asymmetric relationship typically holds more bargaining power. This idea is directly relevant to section 4.3, where Kenyan agricultural exporters appear more exposed to the dispute's outcome than South African manufacturers.

Reciprocity as a governance mechanism

Regime theory treats reciprocity as a disciplining device that sustains cooperation without a central enforcer (Axelrod, 1984; Keohane, 1986). Keohane distinguishes two forms. Diffuse reciprocity returns favours over an extended, loosely specified time horizon. Specific reciprocity matches a benefit, tit-for-tat, against a comparable benefit or its withdrawal, within a short and clearly defined period.

AfCFTA's Guided Trade Initiative was designed around diffuse reciprocity. Mutual tariff reduction was intended to build long-run trust across the continent. South Africa's swift suspension of tea, coffee, and spice concessions, matched directly against Kenya's timber duty, is specific reciprocity instead. This raises an empirical puzzle: why did a diffuse-reciprocity regime produce a specific-reciprocity reaction so quickly? Section 4.2 addresses this directly.

Operationalising the variables

Two independent variables and one dependent variable structure the analysis. Table 1 sets out their definitions and indicators.

Table 1. Operationalisation of the independent and dependent variables

Variable	Definition	Indicators	Illustrative evidence
IV1 — Institutional density	Number, formality, and sectoral breadth of bilateral and AfCFTA-linked agreements in force.	Count of MoUs; existence of a named Strategic Partnership; participation in the AfCFTA Guided Trade Initiative.	Six MoUs; Durban–Mombasa consignments.
IV2 — Reciprocity enforcement stringency	Speed and specificity of a partner's response to a perceived breach of a reciprocal commitment.	Time lag between triggering measure and retaliatory measure; scope of the retaliatory measure.	Timber duty followed swiftly by tea/coffee/spice suspension.
DV — Partnership stability	Capacity of the bilateral relationship to absorb disputes without a broader rupture in cooperation.	Continuation of unaffected channels; existence and use of a bounded resolution window; absence of escalation beyond disputed sectors.	Sixty-day resolution track; maritime and aviation cooperation continuing.

The expectation, consistent with complex interdependence, is straightforward. High institutional density (IV1), combined with high reciprocity stringency (IV2), does not drive partnership stability (DV) to zero. Instead, it produces contained, sector-specific volatility around an otherwise stable core. This review labels that pattern resilient friction. Policy coordination between finance and trade ministries is treated as a moderating factor: weak coordination, as in the timber duty case, increases the likelihood that a domestic fiscal measure unintentionally triggers an international reciprocity clause.

Positioning within the literature

Existing scholarship on Kenya–South Africa relations falls into two broad camps. One camp is historical and political, tracing the relationship back to anti-apartheid solidarity and post-1994 diplomatic normalisation. The other is trade-statistical, describing volumes and balances without a strong theoretical lens. Neither camp offers much guidance on a live, unfolding dispute of the kind examined here. The wider AfCFTA literature, meanwhile, has focused chiefly on the gap between the agreement's legal architecture and its practical implementation across the continent (Hartzenberg, 2011; Songwe, 2019; Mold, 2020). This review's contribution is narrower but more immediate: it applies an established interdependence framework to a single, fast-moving bilateral episode, to test whether the theory's predictions hold at the pace at which real policy actually moves.

Methodology

Design

This is a qualitative, desk-based mini review, structured as a single embedded case study of Kenya–South Africa relations in 2026. An embedded design fits the material well: one overarching case, the bilateral Strategic Partnership, is examined through several sub-units of analysis, namely manufacturing, agriculture, logistics, digital trade, and domestic regulatory politics. The review does not test statistical hypotheses. It uses secondary data to build an interpretive, theory-guided narrative, which is standard practice for a mini review intended to open, rather than close, a research agenda.

Search strategy

Sources were located through three channels: government communications, established Africa-focused news outlets, and verified official social media statements. Search terms combined 'Kenya', 'South Africa', 'AfCFTA', 'Strategic Partnership', 'tariff', 'tea', 'timber', and 'Memorandum of Understanding'. The search window covered late May 2026, immediately before the Ruto state visit, through to August 2026, covering the early phase of the tariff dispute and its stated sixty-day resolution period.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Sources were included where they met three conditions: they reported a specific, dateable bilateral event, such as a signature, a shipment, a duty, or a suspension; they named a verifiable institution or official; and they originated from a government ministry, a national news agency, or an established regional outlet with an editorial process. Sources were excluded where they were unattributed social media commentary without institutional confirmation, opinion pieces without a factual basis, or material pre-dating the 2026 partnership that did not serve as background context.

Data

Table 2 summarises the categories of secondary data used, together with their analytical function.

Table 2. Categories of secondary data used in the review

Source type	Examples	Analytical function
Government / ministry statements	Kenya Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Kenya Ministry of Trade; South African government portals.	Confirming formal agreements and their stated purpose (IV1).
National news agency	South African News Agency (SAnews).	Corroborating official announcements independently.
Regional / pan-African outlets	The Africa Report; Polity.org.za; Eastleigh Voice.	Reporting the tariff dispute and sectoral and societal reaction (IV2, DV).
Trade ministry portal	trade.go.ke.	Documenting the SACU-linked tea, coffee, and spice duty suspension.
Verified official social channels	Official presidential communications.	Cross-referencing the stated outcomes of the state visit.

Limitations

Three limitations deserve explicit statement. First, the review relies on journalistic and governmental secondary sources, not on primary trade statistics such as UN Comtrade, the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, or Statistics South Africa. The analysis therefore describes policy events and their sequencing; it does not measure trade-flow effects directly. Second, government-sourced material may carry a positive-framing bias, particularly around the Strategic Partnership announcement. This risk is reduced, though not removed, by triangulating official statements against independent regional reporting on the tariff dispute. Third, the review covers a short and very recent window. It captures the acute phase of a dispute whose resolution, expected within sixty days of the Finance Act measure, may have moved on by the time of publication. The empirical claims below should therefore be read as indicative of a pattern, not as a settled long-run outcome.

Findings

Institutional depth: the architecture of the Strategic Partnership

The headline event is straightforward. During President Ruto's state visit, Kenya and South Africa signed six MoUs and declared a formal Strategic Partnership. The stated purpose was to remove long-standing non-tariff barriers, align industrial standards, and build integrated regional value chains. Both countries moved their first cargo consignments, steel, appliances, and agricultural goods, under the AfCFTA Guided Trade Initiative between Durban and Mombasa.

This satisfies the multiple-channels criterion of complex interdependence with unusual precision. The agreements span trade facilitation, maritime cooperation, and future-industry cooperation, discussed further in section 4.3, rather than a single trade instrument. Institutional density, as defined in Table 1, is therefore high. A named partnership, six formal instruments, and a working AfCFTA trade corridor were all established within a single diplomatic visit. This is fast institutionalisation by regional standards: non-tariff barriers within African regional blocs typically persist for years after a framework agreement is signed (Hartzenberg, 2011). The speed of the Kenya–South Africa announcement stands out against that baseline, even before its durability can be assessed.

Reciprocity as a double-edged instrument: the tea–timber dispute

The institutional achievement was tested almost immediately. Kenya's 2026 Finance Act introduced a 30 per cent duty on South African timber imports. South Africa responded by suspending its duty-free concessions on Kenyan tea, coffee, and spice exports, explicitly invoking the AfCFTA reciprocity principle. Both trade ministries are reportedly working within a sixty-day window to reverse what Kenyan officials have described as an unintended process.

This episode illustrates specific reciprocity in Keohane's (1986) sense. It is a narrowly matched, sector-for-sector retaliation, applied quickly rather than absorbed diffusely over time. It also illustrates sensitivity, rather than vulnerability, interdependence. South Africa's retaliation was rapid and low-cost; it withdrew a concession rather than imposing a new burden. This is consistent with a partner reacting within an existing rule structure, not one contemplating exit from the relationship altogether. The bounded, sixty-day resolution track is itself evidence for the dependent variable. Neither government appears to treat the dispute as a threat to the broader partnership; it is being managed as a technical correction, not a diplomatic rupture.

Sectoral spillover and asymmetric gains

The partnership's effects are uneven across sectors. This matters for the dependent variable, because uneven gains are a plausible source of future friction.

In manufacturing and heavy industry, the removal of non-tariff barriers principally favours South African exporters of steel, automotive components, and industrial goods. These firms gain a stronger foothold in the larger East African market. Development finance is also flowing in this direction: the Development Bank of Southern Africa is scaling up infrastructure and renewable energy investment in Kenya.

In agriculture, the relationship runs the other way. Kenya's long-standing trade deficit with South Africa is meant to be corrected chiefly through greater access for Kenyan tea, coffee, and horticultural exports to the South African consumer market. This is precisely the channel the timber dispute in section 4.2 disrupted. Kenyan agricultural exporters are therefore disproportionately exposed to the outcome of the sixty-day negotiation, in a way that South African manufacturers are not. This asymmetry is consistent with the asymmetric-interdependence point noted in section 2.1: the less exposed party, here South Africa in the timber-tea exchange, holds more short-run bargaining leverage.

In logistics and maritime transport, a dedicated maritime cooperation agreement, together with closer commercial alignment between Kenya Airways and South African Airways, is intended to lower intra-continental freight costs. This channel operates independently of the tariff dispute and continues regardless of its outcome, reinforcing the multiple-channels logic set out in section 2.1.

In digital trade and future industries, the partnership explicitly extends beyond goods trade into green energy, e-mobility, artificial intelligence, and digital financial technology. This extension matters for the

framework: it adds more channels of contact, reducing the relative weight any single sectoral dispute, such as tea and timber, can exert on the overall relationship.

Read together, these four sub-sectors support the review's central claim. Institutional depth is broad enough that a dispute concentrated in two sectors does not threaten the wider architecture. It does, however, generate real short-term costs for the sectors directly affected, and those costs fall unevenly.

Vulnerability at the margins: regulatory frictions and non-state actors

A further, less visible source of friction operates below formal trade policy. Kenya's domestic regulatory tightening requires foreign small-scale traders to formalise work permits. This has raised concerns among Kenyan communities in South Africa, who view it as inconsistent with the free-movement spirit of continental integration.

This case matters theoretically for two reasons. First, it reminds us that complex interdependence operates through domestic channels, not only inter-state ones: a regulatory decision aimed at foreign traders inside Kenya produces a diplomatic echo affecting Kenyan citizens inside South Africa. Second, it shows a milder, societal form of vulnerability interdependence. Individual traders and diaspora members have far fewer alternatives than states do. The practical cost of policy friction therefore falls disproportionately on non-state actors, rather than on governments, who retain far greater room to manoeuvre.

Discussion

The evidence in section 4 broadly supports the review's central claim. Institutional density (IV1) is high and expanding, evidenced by the six MoUs, the named Strategic Partnership, and the AfCFTA Guided Trade Initiative shipments. Reciprocity enforcement (IV2) is real, fast, and narrowly targeted, evidenced by the timber-duty and tea-suspension sequence. The net effect on partnership stability (DV) is neither full rupture nor frictionless cooperation. This review calls it resilient friction: the broad architecture holds, while specific sectors absorb short, sharp shocks. Table 3 summarises this pattern against each variable.

Table 3. Summary of findings against the two independent variables

Variable	Observed status	Key evidence	Theoretical implication
IV1 Institutional density	High and expanding	Six MoUs; named Strategic Partnership; AfCFTA Guided Trade Initiative shipments.	Confirms the 'multiple channels' feature of complex interdependence.
IV2 Reciprocity stringency	High, fast, narrowly targeted	Timber duty answered within weeks by a matched suspension of tea, coffee, and spice concessions.	Consistent with specific reciprocity within a regime built for diffuse reciprocity.
DV Partnership stability	Resilient friction	Bounded sixty-day resolution track; unaffected maritime, aviation, and digital channels.	Supports the claim that interdependence redistributes, rather than removes, conflict.

This pattern refines, rather than simply confirms, complex interdependence theory. Keohane and Nye (1977) predict that interdependent partners will use economic instruments rather than force, and will manage disputes across many channels rather than allowing one channel to dominate the relationship. The Kenya–South Africa case supports this prediction directly. The dispute is being handled through a time-bound trade-ministry process, not through diplomatic escalation. Non-affected channels, maritime, aviation, finance, and digital trade, have continued unaffected throughout.

A more sceptical, realist-inflected reading deserves a fair hearing, since it cannot be dismissed on the available evidence. On this reading, the timber duty and the tea suspension are simply two governments using tariffs as ordinary instruments of national economic advantage, expressed in the cooperative language of AfCFTA. The sixty-day negotiation window would then reflect bargaining leverage rather than genuine regime commitment. This review cannot fully exclude that interpretation from secondary sources alone. What can be said is that the specific, bounded, and quickly time-limited character of the response fits a rules-based reciprocity dispute more comfortably than it fits an open-ended trade war, which a purely realist account would find harder to explain.

A classical trade-theory lens adds a further nuance. Viner's (1950) distinction between trade creation and trade diversion is useful here, even outside its original customs-union setting. The AfCFTA corridor risks

diverting Kenyan demand toward South African manufactured goods that could, in principle, be sourced more cheaply from outside the continent, while simultaneously creating new trade in sectors, such as tea and horticulture, where Kenya holds a genuine comparative advantage. The tariff dispute can then be read as a contest over which of these two effects will dominate the relationship in its early years, rather than as a simple breakdown of goodwill.

Placed within the wider African regionalism literature, the case also speaks to a long-standing concern: AfCFTA's legal architecture may be outpacing its practical implementation (Hartzenberg, 2011; Songwe, 2019; Mold, 2020). The Kenya–South Africa episode is a compact illustration of that gap. A continental trade framework, a new bilateral fiscal measure, and a reciprocity clause interacted in ways that neither government appears to have fully anticipated.

For firms, three practical inferences follow from the analysis. First, bilateral risk under AfCFTA is sector-specific, not partnership-wide. A firm in logistics, aviation, or digital finance faces materially different exposure to the Kenya–South Africa relationship than a firm in agricultural export or forestry products. Second, the speed of reciprocity enforcement observed here, weeks rather than years, means that firms exposed to tariff-sensitive sectors should treat AfCFTA-linked concessions as conditional, not guaranteed, and should build contractual flexibility around duty changes into supply agreements. Third, the breadth of new cooperation channels, particularly in green energy, artificial intelligence, and digital finance, suggests genuine first-mover opportunity for firms entering now, ahead of full regulatory harmonisation.

Conclusion

This mini review has argued that the Kenya–South Africa Strategic Partnership of 2026 illustrates complex interdependence in a compressed and unusually visible form. Deep, multi-channel institutionalisation and fast, specific reciprocity enforcement are occurring together. Their joint effect on partnership stability is resilient friction, rather than either smooth cooperation or outright rupture.

Three implications follow for policymakers and for the wider African regional integration agenda. First, trade ministries negotiating under AfCFTA should anticipate that domestic fiscal measures, such as Finance Act tariff changes, can trigger reciprocity clauses with immediate cross-sectoral effects; better ex ante coordination between finance and trade ministries would reduce the frequency of such episodes. Second, sectors with asymmetric exposure, such as Kenyan agricultural exporters in this case, bear a disproportionate share of the cost when disputes arise, which argues for sector-specific safeguard or compensation mechanisms within AfCFTA protocols. Third, the societal-level friction visible in the small-trader permit dispute suggests that free-movement and labour-market provisions deserve the same institutional attention as goods-trade provisions, since they generate real costs for individuals with limited capacity to adjust.

This review is necessarily limited by its reliance on secondary, largely journalistic sources, and by its short time window. Future research should test the resilient-friction proposition against primary trade-flow data, once available, using a gravity-model or event-study design built around the 2026 tariff dispute. Extending the comparison to other AfCFTA country pairs, such as Nigeria–South Africa or Egypt–Kenya, would help establish whether the pattern identified here is a general feature of African regional trade governance, or a case-specific outcome tied to this particular dispute.

References

- Axelrod, R. (1984) *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Eastleigh Voice (2026a) 'Ruto hails Kenya-South Africa economies as drivers of continental development'. Available at: <https://eastleighvoice.co.ke/news/362972/ruto-hails-kenya-south-africa-economies-as-drivers-of-continental-development> (Accessed: September 2026).
- Eastleigh Voice (2026b) 'Kenyans in South Africa tell Ruto to rethink foreigner crackdown to protect citizens living abroad'. Available at: <https://eastleighvoice.co.ke/news/399177/kenyans-in-south-africa-tell-ruto-to-rethink-foreigner-crackdown-to-protect-citizens-living-abroad> (Accessed: September 2026).
- Hartzenberg, T. (2011) *Regional Integration in Africa*. Geneva: World Trade Organization, Staff Working Paper ERSD-2011-14.
- Keohane, R.O. (1986) 'Reciprocity in International Relations', *International Organization*, 40(1), pp. 1–27.

- Keohane, R.O. and Nye, J.S. (1977) *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Kenya Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2026) 'Kenya and South Africa strengthen bilateral relations through six new cooperation agreements'. Available at: <https://www.mfa.go.ke/kenya-and-south-africa-strengthen-bilateral-relations-through-six-new-cooperation-agreements> (Accessed: September 2026).
- Kenya Ministry of Trade (2026) 'South Africa lifts duties on Kenyan tea, coffee and spices under SACU deal'. Available at: <https://www.trade.go.ke/south-africa-lifts-duties-kenyan-tea-coffee-and-spices-under-sacu-deal> (Accessed: September 2026).
- Mold, A. (2020) *Trade Policy Options for African Countries in a Post-COVID World*. Addis Ababa: United Nations Economic Commission for Africa.
- Polity.org.za (2026) 'Ramaphosa punts future-focused industries in SA-Kenya partnership'. Available at: <https://www.polity.org.za/article/ramaphosa-punts-future-focused-industries-in-sa-kenya-partnership-2026-06-04> (Accessed: September 2026).
- South African News Agency (SAnews) (2026) 'South Africa, Kenya sign six new agreements to deepen cooperation'. Available at: <https://www.sanews.gov.za/south-africa/south-africa-kenya-sign-six-new-agreements-deepen-cooperation> (Accessed: September 2026).
- Songwe, V. (2019) *Intra-African Trade: A Path to Economic Diversification and Inclusion*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, Foreign Policy Brief.
- The Africa Report (2026a) 'Kenya-South Africa trade row puts tea tariff deal at risk'. Available at: <https://www.theafricareport.com/429696/kenya-south-africa-trade-row-puts-tea-tariff-deal-at-risk/> (Accessed: September 2026).
- The Africa Report (2026b) 'Kenya and South Africa push strategic partnership during Ruto visit'. Available at: <https://www.theafricareport.com/420927/kenya-and-south-africa-push-strategic-partnership-during-ruto-visit/> (Accessed: September 2026).
- Viner, J. (1950) *The Customs Union Issue*. New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.