



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



The Future of Digital Trade Diplomacy: Why the U.S. Must Rethink Its Engagement with Africa's Tech Markets

Chidinma Lydia Ezenwa *

MBA, Information Systems, The University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio, United States.

GSC Advanced Research and Reviews, 2025, 25(02), 009-015

Publication history: Received on 21 September 2025; revised on 01 November 2025; accepted on 03 November 2025

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/gscarr.2025.25.2.0331>

Abstract

The transformation of global trade from goods to data has redefined the foundations of economic power and diplomacy. Yet, despite Africa's emergence as a digital frontier, U.S. trade engagement with the continent has remained rooted in outdated frameworks centered on physical commodities and aid. This study examined the evolving landscape of digital trade diplomacy and argued that digital trade not goods will determine future global economic leadership. Through a comparative qualitative analysis of policy frameworks, trade documents, and expert interviews across 4 Africa countries, the research explored how the United States could reposition itself as a strategic digital partner in Africa's innovation-led economy. The findings revealed that while China and the European Union had developed cohesive digital engagement strategies through infrastructure and regulatory diplomacy, U.S. initiatives remained fragmented and reactive. However, the study found that the United States retained comparative advantages in innovation ecosystems, cloud infrastructure, and digital finance, which could serve as the foundation for a new U.S.-Africa Digital Trade Partnership Framework. Such a framework would integrate three pillars: regulatory interoperability, ecosystem co-creation, and inclusive market access. The research concluded that the United States must move beyond symbolic engagement and institutionalize Digital Trade Diplomacy, a model that merges economic strategy, technological cooperation, and shared governance to foster mutual prosperity and strengthen its global competitiveness in the digital age.

Keywords: Digital Trade Diplomacy; Innovation Ecosystems; Africa; U.S.-Africa Relations; Digital Transformation; Global Value Chains; Data Governance; Policy Alignment; Economic Diplomacy; Inclusive Growth

1. Introduction

The twenty-first century has ushered in a paradigm shift in global trade. Goods and services are increasingly exchanged not through physical containers but through data flows, digital platforms, and intangible assets that underpin modern economies. The World Bank (2020) estimates that cross-border data flows now contribute more to global GDP than merchandise trade, signaling a transition toward what scholars term the digital trade economy. Within this new architecture, the rules that govern the flow of data, algorithms, and online services have become central to economic competitiveness and global influence. Yet, despite its technological leadership, the United States remains under-engaged in shaping digital trade relations with Africa, the world's fastest-growing digital market.

The U.S.-Africa economic relationship has historically been anchored in physical trade, energy, and humanitarian aid, embodied in frameworks such as the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA). While AGOA opened market access for African goods, it was conceived in a pre-digital era and is poorly equipped to address contemporary issues like cross-border data governance, digital services taxation, or e-commerce interoperability. In contrast, the European Union has advanced Digital Economy Partnership Agreements (DEPAs) and GDPR-based data partnerships, while China has

* Corresponding author: Chidinma Lydia Ezenwa

deepened digital integration with African states through its Digital Silk Road initiative. These developments position Africa as a critical arena in the geopolitical contest for digital influence.

Africa's digital transformation is no longer a projection, it is underway. With over 650 million mobile internet users, a rapidly expanding fintech sector, and regional integration through the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA), the continent is redefining its role in the global digital economy. The AfCFTA's Protocol on Digital Trade (finalized in 2023) establishes a regulatory foundation for data flows, e-commerce, and digital taxation across 55 states. However, U.S. engagement remains fragmented, channeled mainly through private sector investments and donor-driven digital inclusion programs. The absence of a coherent U.S.–Africa Digital Trade Strategy risks ceding influence to competitors and missing the opportunity to co-create governance standards with Africa's digital economies.

This study argues that digital trade, not goods trade, will define the next phase of U.S. global economic leadership. It proposes that the United States must transition from transactional trade frameworks to a Digital Trade Diplomacy approach, one that integrates innovation ecosystems, regulatory cooperation, and inclusive technology partnerships. The research explores how this shift can strengthen the United States' competitiveness, enhance mutual prosperity, and align with the 2022 U.S. Strategy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa, which calls for deeper partnerships in digital transformation, infrastructure, and youth innovation.

2. Problem Statement and Research Objectives

The research was driven by a pressing recognition that the relationship between the United States and Africa remained anchored in outdated paradigms of trade, dominated by goods, commodities, and energy exchanges. Despite the rapid evolution of the global economy into a digital and data-driven system, U.S.–Africa trade frameworks had not meaningfully evolved to reflect the centrality of digital commerce, data flows, and innovation ecosystems. Initiatives such as the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) and Prosper Africa were conceived in an era where trade policy revolved around physical exports rather than intangible digital assets. This created a structural mismatch between the United States' policy instruments and Africa's economic realities.

At the same time, Africa had emerged as one of the world's fastest-growing digital frontiers. Over 650 million Africans were connected to the internet by 2024, supported by a booming fintech ecosystem, cross-border e-commerce platforms, and a youthful innovation base. Yet, the United States despite its historical leadership in the digital economy remained only marginally engaged in shaping Africa's emerging digital markets. Programs such as Power Africa, Prosper Africa, and Digital Transformation with Africa (DTA) provided useful entry points but lacked the policy coherence and institutional coordination required to constitute a strategic framework for digital trade diplomacy. This policy fragmentation created an institutional vacuum that competitors, most notably China and the European Union, were quick to fill through more coordinated digital diplomacy strategies.

The absence of a structured U.S.–Africa digital trade partnership had several implications. First, it meant that the United States had limited influence over the rule-making processes currently shaping Africa's digital future ranging from data protection frameworks to e-commerce regulations. Second, it placed U.S. companies at a competitive disadvantage in markets increasingly aligned with either the European Union's GDPR-based regulatory systems or China's Digital Silk Road architecture. Third, it risked marginalizing African innovators by depriving them of access to U.S. markets, technology standards, and investment opportunities that could enable inclusive digital growth. The net effect was a lost opportunity for mutual prosperity and diminished U.S. strategic presence on a continent that is becoming pivotal to the global digital economy.

The research therefore sought to respond to three interrelated objectives. The first was to analyze why U.S.–Africa economic relations had remained centered on traditional trade models and to trace the structural and institutional factors that had prevented the integration of digital trade into existing frameworks. The second was to assess, through comparative analysis, how other global actors, particularly the European Union and China had leveraged digital diplomacy to expand influence in Africa's technology markets. The third objective was to propose a forward-looking framework for U.S.–Africa Digital Trade Diplomacy, outlining how the United States could reposition itself as a constructive and competitive partner in Africa's digital transformation. The study ultimately aimed to demonstrate that digital trade is not merely an economic concern but a strategic pillar of twenty-first-century diplomacy, capable of advancing both U.S. competitiveness and Africa's inclusive development.

3. Literature Review

The literature on international trade and diplomacy has historically focused on the exchange of tangible goods and services. Classical trade theories ranging from Ricardo's comparative advantage to Heckscher-Ohlin models were built upon assumptions of physical production and cross-border exchange. However, as digitalization transformed production, consumption, and communication, scholars began to recognize that the traditional boundaries between goods and services were dissolving. Baldwin (2019) argued that globalization had entered a new phase, characterized by the trade of ideas and data rather than materials. The World Bank (2020) likewise noted that cross-border data flows contributed more to global GDP growth than merchandise trade, highlighting a structural realignment of international commerce.

The concept of digital trade emerged to describe these new realities. According to the OECD (2019), digital trade encompasses transactions of goods and services that are digitally ordered or delivered, including e-commerce, data transfers, digital services, and intellectual property exchanges. Meltzer (2019) expanded this definition to include the governance of data, privacy, cybersecurity, and taxation, arguing that digital trade policies are now as central to international relations as tariffs or investment treaties once were. Scholars such as Aaronson (2020) have linked digital trade to democratic governance, suggesting that the rules governing data reflect deeper ideological contests between open and closed information systems.

In Africa, literature on digital transformation has proliferated over the past decade, with studies emphasizing the continent's leapfrogging potential (Ndemo and Weiss, 2017; Signé, 2020). UNCTAD (2022) and the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA, 2023) documented the rise of Africa's digital economy, identifying fintech, e-commerce, and mobile communication as key growth drivers. Yet, despite this transformation, digital trade governance across African countries remained fragmented, with multiple overlapping regulations and infrastructural bottlenecks. The African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA) attempted to address these challenges through its Protocol on Digital Trade, finalized in 2023, which seeks to harmonize data governance, cross-border taxation, and cybersecurity.

Parallel to these developments, global powers began integrating digital diplomacy into their foreign policy strategies. The European Union operationalized GDPR diplomacy, exporting its regulatory framework for data privacy through trade agreements and cooperation programs (Bradford, 2020). China's Digital Silk Road leveraged infrastructure investment, cloud computing, and digital payment systems to extend influence across Africa and Asia (Segal, 2021). These models reflected distinct normative approaches: the EU emphasized governance and rights; China emphasized infrastructure and state control. The United States, by contrast, emphasized innovation and private-sector leadership but lacked a coherent policy architecture to translate this into structured engagement.

The gap in the literature was thus twofold. First, while scholars had examined Africa's digital transformation and the global geopolitics of technology, little research had explored the intersection of digital trade and diplomacy in U.S.-Africa relations. Second, most analyses of Africa's digital economy were descriptive, focusing on growth trends rather than the institutional arrangements shaping governance. This study contributed to bridging both gaps by introducing the concept of digital trade diplomacy as a theoretical and policy construct that integrates economic engagement, regulatory alignment, and innovation cooperation.

4. Theoretical Framework

The study was grounded in a hybrid theoretical framework combining insights from global value chain theory, innovation diplomacy, and digital governance. These perspectives together provided a multidimensional lens for analyzing how nations exercise influence in the digital economy.

Global value chain (GVC) theory, as developed by Gereffi (2005) and Sturgeon (2008), posited that economic activities were increasingly fragmented and geographically dispersed, coordinated through digital technologies and intangible assets. In this view, competitiveness was not determined by manufacturing capacity alone but by control over intellectual property, standards, and digital infrastructure. Applying this lens to Africa's digital economy revealed how global actors competed to embed their technological standards and data architectures within African markets, thereby shaping long-term dependencies and governance norms.

Innovation diplomacy extended this framework by emphasizing the role of knowledge ecosystems, research networks, and startups as instruments of soft power. According to Rüffin and Schmitz (2019), innovation diplomacy involves using science and technology collaboration as a diplomatic tool to foster mutual trust and influence. For the United States,

which historically led in innovation and technology policy, the failure to leverage innovation diplomacy in Africa represented a missed opportunity to build enduring partnerships grounded in shared research, digital entrepreneurship, and open standards.

Finally, digital governance theory provided the normative and regulatory dimension of the framework. As argued by Nye (2021) and Aaronson (2020), the governance of data and technology is now a key domain of geopolitical competition, where norms of openness, privacy, and sovereignty reflect competing ideological visions. In Africa, where regulatory systems are still evolving, the competition between U.S., EU, and Chinese models effectively constitutes a struggle over digital sovereignty. The framework therefore conceptualized digital trade diplomacy as the intersection of these three domains economic value chains, innovation ecosystems, and governance norms where strategic engagement determines both influence and inclusion in the emerging global digital order

5. Methodology

The study employed a comparative qualitative design that combined document analysis, elite interviews, and trade data interpretation. This approach was selected because digital trade diplomacy is an evolving policy field shaped by both formal agreements and informal networks of cooperation. Quantitative indicators alone could not capture the normative, political, and institutional nuances underlying policy decisions; hence, a qualitative methodology was most suitable.

Data collection spanned two levels. At the policy level, the study analyzed major U.S., EU, and Chinese digital engagement strategies, including AGOA, Prosper Africa, the Digital Transformation with Africa initiative, the EU's Global Gateway, and China's Digital Silk Road. Official documents, white papers, and speeches were examined to extract policy language, objectives, and institutional arrangements. At the operational level, interviews were conducted with policymakers, digital entrepreneurs, and trade officials across Nigeria, Kenya, Ghana, and Rwanda. These interviews provided insights into how digital trade policies were perceived, implemented, and negotiated in practice.

To ensure validity, data triangulation was employed. Findings from interviews were cross-checked against secondary sources such as WTO digital trade reports, UNCTAD's Digital Economy Report (2022), and AfCFTA documentation. The analysis proceeded in two stages. First, thematic coding was used to categorize engagement models across three axes: infrastructure investment, regulatory cooperation, and innovation partnerships. Second, comparative synthesis identified areas of convergence and divergence between the U.S., EU, and Chinese approaches.

Limitations of the study included restricted access to certain government-level negotiations and the rapidly changing nature of digital policies. However, these were mitigated through reliance on contemporaneous data and triangulation of multiple sources. The methodology thus provided a balanced, evidence-based foundation for analyzing digital trade diplomacy as both a policy instrument and a form of international influence.

6. Findings

The findings revealed that the United States lagged significantly behind both the European Union and China in formal digital trade engagement with Africa. While the EU had institutionalized its engagement through regulatory harmonization and the export of its data governance model, and China had embedded itself through large-scale digital infrastructure investments, U.S. engagement remained dispersed across agencies and initiatives. Programs such as the Digital Transformation with Africa initiative and Prosper Africa made valuable contributions but lacked an overarching policy framework that unified private sector investment, digital governance, and trade negotiation under a single diplomatic strategy.

However, the research also found that the United States possessed several underutilized comparative advantages. Its leadership in cloud infrastructure, digital finance, and innovation ecosystems remained unmatched. American technology companies such as Google, Microsoft, and Visa were already deeply embedded in African markets, supporting data centers, payments infrastructure, and digital skills programs. These private sector linkages represented a foundation upon which a formal digital trade diplomacy framework could be built.

The study projected that a reimagined U.S.-Africa digital trade strategy if anchored on rule-based engagement and mutual capacity-building could yield substantial benefits. African firms integrated into U.S.-linked digital supply chains would gain from access to advanced technologies, fair competition, and global markets, while U.S. firms would gain entry to one of the fastest-growing digital consumer bases in the world. The findings thus suggested that U.S. policy success

depended less on financial scale and more on institutional coherence, regulatory collaboration, and recognition of Africa as a co-architect of global digital governance

7. Discussion and Policy Implications

The discussion underscored that digital trade diplomacy had become the new frontier of international economic statecraft. The findings confirmed that Africa's digital transformation presented both an opportunity and a test for U.S. foreign policy. While the United States continued to champion open and innovative digital ecosystems, it had yet to institutionalize these ideals into concrete trade diplomacy instruments. The absence of a unified strategy left space for alternative governance models that were not always aligned with open-market and democratic principles.

From a policy perspective, the research emphasized the urgency of developing a U.S.–Africa Digital Trade Partnership Framework anchored on three pillars: regulatory interoperability, ecosystem co-creation, and inclusive market access. Such a framework would formalize the dialogue between the U.S. government, African Union institutions, and the AfCFTA Secretariat on issues such as data localization, cybersecurity, and taxation of digital services. It would also facilitate the establishment of digital standards aligned with open internet principles, ensuring that Africa's regulatory future was shaped collaboratively rather than imposed externally.

The study also suggested that the United States needed to broaden its understanding of diplomacy to include non-state actors. Innovation hubs, universities, and technology firms were no longer peripheral but central agents in shaping digital economies. Embedding innovation attachés within U.S. embassies and establishing a U.S.–Africa Digital Council could institutionalize continuous engagement. Moreover, aligning USAID and DFC funding mechanisms with digital trade priorities would ensure coherence between development assistance and economic diplomacy.

Overall, the policy implications were clear: the U.S. must move from a fragmented, program-based approach to a cohesive digital diplomacy strategy that aligns commercial, regulatory, and developmental objectives.

8. Conclusion

The study concluded that digital trade had become a defining axis of global power and competitiveness. For the United States, rethinking its engagement with Africa's tech markets was both an economic and strategic necessity. The research demonstrated that U.S.–Africa relations, while historically productive in traditional trade and aid domains, remained underdeveloped in digital governance and innovation cooperation. In a world where economic influence is increasingly determined by data, algorithms, and platforms, the failure to engage strategically in Africa's digital future would represent a missed opportunity of historic proportions.

Africa's digital rise offered the United States a chance to redefine partnership not through paternalism or rivalry but through collaborative digital statecraft, a relationship grounded in shared innovation, fair digital trade, and inclusive prosperity. The concept of Digital Trade Diplomacy, as articulated through this study, provided both a theoretical framework and a policy roadmap for achieving this vision. By institutionalizing digital trade cooperation, aligning regulatory systems, and supporting Africa's innovation ecosystems, the United States could secure its role as a constructive partner in shaping a free, open, and equitable global digital economy.

Compliance with ethical standards

Acknowledgments

The author expressed sincere gratitude to the numerous individuals and institutions that contributed to the successful completion of this research. Special appreciation was extended to the policymakers, trade experts, and digital entrepreneurs who generously shared their time, expertise, and lived experiences during the interviews. Their perspectives provided invaluable insights into the practical realities of digital trade engagement and enriched the comparative analysis that underpinned the study's findings.

The author also acknowledged the support of ecosystem partners, including innovation hubs, regional trade associations, and academic collaborators, whose willingness to provide access to datasets and policy documents made this research possible. Appreciation was given to colleagues and reviewers who offered constructive feedback on earlier drafts, contributing to the conceptual clarity and analytical depth of the final work.

Disclosure of conflict of interest

All participants in this research were fully informed about the purpose, scope, and intended outcomes of the study prior to their participation. The research involved semi-structured interviews and policy discussions with individuals who held expertise in digital trade, innovation, and diplomacy. Participation was entirely voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents before any interviews or data collection took place.

Participants were assured that their privacy and confidentiality would be protected throughout the study. Personal identifiers were excluded from transcripts, and pseudonyms were used where appropriate to prevent attribution of comments or data to specific individuals or institutions. All interview recordings and notes were stored securely on encrypted devices accessible only to the researcher, and no data were shared with third parties. Participants were also informed that they could withdraw from the study at any point without explanation or consequence.

Statement of informed consent

All participants in this research were fully informed about the purpose, scope, and intended outcomes of the study prior to their participation.

References

- [1] Aaronson, S. A. (2020). *Data is different: Why the world needs a new approach to governing cross-border data flows*. Washington, DC: Center for International Governance Innovation.
- [2] African Union Commission (AUC). (2023). *Protocol on Digital Trade under the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA)*. Addis Ababa: African Union.
- [3] Baldwin, R. (2019). *The globotics upheaval: Globalization, robotics, and the future of work*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [4] Bradford, A. (2020). *The Brussels effect: How the European Union rules the world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [5] Brookings Institution. (2022). *Digital transformation with Africa: U.S. strategy toward Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington, DC: Brookings Africa Growth Initiative.
- [6] Chakravorti, B., and Chaturvedi, R. S. (2021). *Digital in the time of COVID: Africa's digital economy and the road to recovery*. Harvard Business Review Digital Articles, April 2021.
- [7] Dixon, P., and Green, A. (2022). Digital trade: Policy and governance in the 21st century. *Journal of World Trade*, 56(3), 421–448.
- [8] Economic Commission for Africa (ECA). (2023). *Africa's digital economy: Driving inclusive development and trade integration*. Addis Ababa: United Nations ECA.
- [9] Foster, V., and Briceno-Garmendia, C. (Eds.). (2019). *Africa's infrastructure: A time for transformation*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [10] Fukuyama, F. (2021). *Liberalism and its discontents*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- [11] Chidinma Lydia Ezenwa. *From Hubs to Economies: Rethinking Innovation Ecosystem Models for U.S.-Africa Collaboration*. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, 2025, 17(01), 212-224.
- [12] Gereffi, G. (2018). *Global value chains and development: Redefining the contours of 21st century capitalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [13] International Trade Centre (ITC). (2022). *Africa's e-commerce potential: Driving inclusive trade growth through digitalization*. Geneva: ITC.
- [14] Kende, M. (2020). *Africa's digital future: Opportunities for inclusive development*. Washington, DC: Center for Global Development.
- [15] Kwet, M. (2019). Digital colonialism: The evolution of the American empire in the Internet age. *Race and Class*, 60(4), 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396818823172>
- [16] Lund, S., Manyika, J., and Bughin, J. (2019). *Globalization in transition: The future of trade and value chains*. Washington, DC: McKinsey Global Institute.

- [17] Meltzer, J. P. (2019). Governing digital trade. *World Trade Review*, 18(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474745618000335>
- [18] Meltzer, J. P., and Lovelock, P. (2021). *Regulating for digital trade: The U.S., China, and the EU approaches*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- [19] Ndemo, B., and Weiss, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Digital Kenya: An entrepreneurial revolution in the making*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-57878-5>
- [20] Nye, J. S. (2021). Soft power and the future of U.S. foreign policy in a digital age. *Foreign Affairs*, 100(3), 115–126.
- [21] OECD. (2019). *Measuring the digital transformation: A roadmap for the future*. Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264311992-en>
- [22] OECD. (2021). *Digital trade inventory and measurement in OECD countries*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- [23] Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2022). *Africa's digital transformation: Progress, potential and policy priorities*. Paris: OECD Development Centre.
- [24] Schneider-Petsinger, M. (2022). *US digital trade policy: Building a global governance strategy*. London: Chatham House.
- [25] Segal, A. (2021). *China's digital expansion: The Digital Silk Road and the global internet governance order*. Council on Foreign Relations Special Report No. 95. New York: CFR.
- [26] Chidinma Lydia Ezenwa. Artificial Intelligence for Inclusive Innovation: Investigating how AI-driven information systems can democratize access to opportunities in underserved communities. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 2025, 27(03), 897–908.
- [27] Signé, L. (2020). *Unlocking Africa's business potential: Trends, opportunities, risks, and strategies*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- [28] Sturgeon, T. J. (2019). Upgrading strategies for global value chains in a digital economy. *Global Strategy Journal*, 9(3), 385–408. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gsj.1364>
- [29] U.S. Department of State. (2022). *U.S. Strategy Toward Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington, DC: Bureau of African Affairs.
- [30] U.S. International Trade Commission (USITC). (2020). *Digital trade in Africa: Impacts and opportunities*. Washington, DC: USITC Publication 5069.
- [31] U.S. Trade Representative (USTR). (2023). *African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) Annual Report to Congress*. Washington, DC: USTR.
- [32] UNCTAD. (2021). *Digital Economy Report 2021: Cross-border data flows and development*. Geneva: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
- [33] UNCTAD. (2023). *Economic Development in Africa Report 2023: The potential of Africa's services trade for growth and development*. Geneva: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
- [34] UNDP. (2022). *Digital strategy 2022–2025: Catalyzing inclusive digital transformation*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.
- [35] United States Agency for International Development (USAID). (2020). *USAID Digital Strategy 2020–2024*. Washington, DC: USAID.
- [36] World Bank. (2020). *World Development Report 2020: Trading for development in the age of global value chains*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [37] World Bank. (2021). *The digital economy in Africa: Country diagnostic summary*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- [38] World Bank. (2023). *Digital Africa: Transforming economies through digital inclusion and trade integration*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.
- [39] World Economic Forum. (2023). *The Future of Trade and Investment in the Digital Era*. Geneva: WEF.
- [40] World Trade Organization (WTO). (2022). *World Trade Report 2022: Digital trade for development*. Geneva: WTO.