ABIDJAN - LAGOS CORRIDOR ORGANISATION

OCAL : Organisation du Corridor Abidjan - Lagos

ALCO : Abidjan - Lagos Corridor Organisation

Border Post Classification Framework

Abidjan–Lagos Corridor | Three-Wave Analysis 2023–2025 | n = 1,896 trucks observed

Observation period
2023 · 2024 · 2025

Border posts covered
10 postes frontaliers

Trucks observed (2025)
≈ 1 896 trucks

1. Summary

The three-wave analysis identifies five constraint profiles among the ten border posts of the Abidjan–Lagos corridor, based on three combined dimensions: temporal performance, reliability, and administrative complexity. The crossing time is the difference between end of import formalities and start of export formalities. No weighting is applied across dimensions; assignment rests on the consistency of observed signals. Some posts fall under two profiles; a dominant profile is identified to guide priorities.

TABLE 1 — CONSTRAINT PROFILES

Profile	Border posts (primary)	Border posts (secondary)
P1 — Predictable Structural Slowness	Krake, Aflao	Kodjoviakope
P2 — Slowness with Degraded Reliability	Seme	Aflao, Elubo
P3 — Intermediate Performance, High Unpredictability	Elubo, Noe, Kodjoviakope	Seme, Hillacondji
P4 — Volatile Speed	Hillacondji, Noepe	Akanu
P5 — High and Stable Performance	Sanvee Condji, Akanu	Noe, Noepe

2. Classification Model

Three dimensions derived from 2023–2025 data:

- **Temporal performance:** median, P95, share of crossings exceeding 24 hours.

- **Reliability:** reliability index (P95 ÷ mean). Close to 1: the worst case stays close to the mean, the post is consistent (fast or slow). High: extreme delays diverge sharply from the mean; an unlucky truck waits far longer than a typical one. This unpredictability is what most penalizes scheduling.

- **Administrative complexity:** median number of agencies involved per truck.

3. The Five Profiles

P1 — Predictable Structural Slowness (Krake, Aflao)

Krake and Aflao record the highest medians on the corridor in 2025 (34.8h and 33.3h), with 95% and 97% of trucks exceeding 24 hours. Their slowness is nonetheless predictable: their reliability indexes are among the lowest on the corridor (1.74 and 1.89), allowing operators to plan with reasonable margins. The underlying mechanisms differ: Aflao engages a full chain (7 agencies), while Krake concentrates its delay in a few heavy steps (4 agencies) — Customs and especially freight forwarder, the latter reflecting advance document submission (73% of trucks open their file approximately 12 hours before physical arrival). Krake's trajectory warrants caution: medians of 3.4h (2023), 100.1h (2024), and 34.8h (2025) represent a discontinuity that must be investigated before any longitudinal reading. Aflao deteriorates steadily (21.5h → 30.4h → 33.3h).

P2 — Slowness with Degraded Reliability (Seme)

Seme remains constrained but its median is improving steadily (26.7h → 23.9h → 20.3h). This improvement is nonetheless accompanied by degrading reliability: the index rises from 2.48 to 3.06 between 2023 and 2025. Gains in typical crossing time are not translating into predictability, which is a signal to monitor. As a secondary profile, its trajectory brings it closer to the intermediate profile (P3).

P3 — Intermediate Performance, High Unpredictability (Elubo, Noe, Kodjoviakope)

These three posts have similar 2025 medians (9.6h to 10.2h) but low reliability: an acceptable median conceals a long tail of unpredictability. Elubo is the most striking case: its median dropped from 26.8h (2023) to 10.2h (2025), yet it has the highest reliability index on the corridor (3.66); the regime asymmetry remains pronounced (≈9h for export-side traffic versus ≈27h for transit traffic), linked to its 6:30PM closing time and IT outages.

Noe has a remarkably stable median (9.4h → 10.4h → 10.0h) but a rising index (2.79); its stability brings it closer as a secondary profile to the high-performing posts (P5). Kodjoviakope (median 9.6h, index 2.55, 8 agencies) shows strong cross-wave instability, peaking at 26.4h in 2024, and a high administrative load that aligns it secondarily with structural slowness (P1).

P4 — Volatile Speed (Hillacondji, Noepe)

Hillacondji and Noepe have fast typical crossing times (2025 medians of 6.6h and 4.0h) but low reliability (indexes of 3.31 and 2.98): fast most of the time, but subject to extreme episodes. Hillacondji best illustrates this profile: a high index across all three waves (4.24 in 2023, with a P95 of 100h against a median of 4.9h) and a median spike to 24.6h in 2024 before returning to 6.6h. Noépé is the second-fastest post, but 2025 field observations flag high irregularity rates there, which must be interpreted with caution (see Section 5).

P5 — High and Stable Performance (Sanvee-Condji, Akanu)

Sanvee-Condji and Akanu combine speed and predictability: 2025 medians of 3.6h and 2.2h, and the lowest reliability indexes on the corridor (1.79 and 1.54). Sanvee-Condji is stable across all waves. Akanu is a noteworthy case: it engages the heaviest administrative chain on the corridor (median of 10 agencies per truck) while remaining the fastest post, a sign of high throughput, not a bottleneck. Its slightly rising index (1.27 → 1.54) brings it secondarily toward the volatile profile (P4). Its governance profile nonetheless remains concerning (see Section 5).

4. Cross-Wave Trends (2023–2025)

The overall trend is toward improvement, but trajectories vary considerably. The 2024 wave stands out as particularly degraded at several posts (Krake 100h, Kodjoviakope 26h, Hillacondji 25h, Aflao 30h), before a return to lower levels in 2025. Elubo records the sharpest median improvement (26.8h → 10.2h). Noé is highly stable (≈10h across all three waves). The Krake discontinuity (3.4h → 100h → 34.8h) must be investigated before drawing any longitudinal conclusions.

5. Recorded Irregularities (2025)

For each 2025 crossing, the presence of five types of irregularities was recorded: informal payment requested, unjustified delay, lack of coordination, document refusal/slowness, IT outage. These observations are specific to each truck crossing and reflect the respondents' own judgment.

TABLE 2 — RECORDED IRREGULARITIES BY BORDER POST (2025)

Poste	Prof.	Total irreg.	Payment	Delay	Coord.	Docs	IT	Irregularity profile
AKANU	P5	99,3 %	86,0 %	70,0 %	11,3 %	24,7 %	78,7 %	Composite: payment + IT
NOEPE	P4	98,3 %	38,5 %	79,5 %	79,5 %	77,8 %	29,9 %	Composite: Delay+Coord.
ELUBO	P3	43,4 %	13,8 %	3,1 %	8,2 %	15,1 %	27,0 %	IT and docs dominant
KODJOVIAKOPE	P3	8,3 %	6,0 %	0,5 %	0,9 %	5,5 %	0,0 %	Low, residual payment
HILLACONDJI	P4	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	No irregularities recorded
KRAKE	P1	0,3 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,3 %	Near-zero
NOE	P3	1,3 %	0,0 %	0,6 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,6 %	Near-zero
SANVEE CONDJI	P5	1,1 %	0,5 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,5 %	0,5 %	Near-zero
SEME	P2	0,8 %	0,4 %	0,4 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	Near-zero
AFLAO	P1	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	No irregularities recorded

6. Self-Reported Data from Truck Operators

A supplementary analysis filtered the ENTRAVES 2025 survey to freight operators (Occupation: trucker and equivalent; Purpose: transport or goods delivery; n = 165). The forced payment rate reported by this subgroup is 55.8%, compared with 74.1% for all users. This gap does not necessarily reflect lower exposure: truckers, who are known to border agents and face a higher risk of retaliation, may under-report. QR code data, collected away from the border, should provide a more reliable measure in future waves.

Rates vary considerably across posts, with no clear linguistic pattern: among Francophone posts, Kodjoviakope records the lowest rate (35%, n = 85) and Noépé the highest in the subgroup (86%, n = 44), while Anglophone posts fall in an intermediate range (Aflao 50%, n = 14; Elubo 82%, n = 11; Akanu 75%, n = 8). Given the small sample sizes, these gaps are indicative only and do not support a conclusion about language-based asymmetry. Posts with n < 5 (Noé, Krake, Seme, Sanvee-Condji, Hillacondji) are not interpretable.

7. Recommandations

N°	Recommended actions	Responsible parties
R1	Prioritize Krake and Aflao (structurally slow but predictable) in intervention programs; monitor Seme, whose reliability is degrading despite improvement in its median.	**ALCO / Benin, Ghana, Nigeria**
R2	Target the waiting time outside formalities at Kodjoviakope and Noé (marked gap between physical truck presence and formalities duration) through inter-agency coordination and without regulatory changes.	**ALCO / Togo / Cote d'Ivoire**
R3	Document the practices at Sanvee-Condji and Akanu (fast and stable) as operational benchmarks for the corridor.	**ALCO / ECOWAS**
R4	Extend Elubo's operating hours beyond 6:30 PM to reduce the regime asymmetry affecting trucks in transit.	**Ghana / ALCO**
R5	Incorporate the reliability index (P95 ÷ mean) into the monitoring framework, alongside the median: a post can improve in median while remaining unpredictable (see Elubo, index 3.66, the highest on the corridor).	**ALCO**
R6	Investigate the cross-wave discontinuity at Krake (3.4h → 100h → 34.8h) and the rise in Elubo's index (2.19 → 3.66) before drawing any definitive longitudinal conclusions.	**ALCO /Benin, Ghana**

Methodological note: TEMPS TRAVERSE data (≈ 1,896 trucks in 2025; three waves 2023–2025). The crossing time used is: end of import formalities – start of export formalities. The median is the reference indicator; reliability index = P95 ÷ mean (close to 1 = predictable; high = volatile).

ABIDJAN - LAGOS CORRIDOR ORGANISATION

OCAL : Organisation du Corridor Abidjan - Lagos

ALCO : Abidjan - Lagos Corridor Organisation

The Abidjan-Lagos Corridor Organization (ALCO) is a sub-regional organization established in 2002 by the Heads of State of Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Togo, Benin, and Nigeria. With an operational presence at key border crossings and a network spanning the five member states, it focuses on areas such as cross-border health, road safety, the collection and management of data on key trade and transport facilitation indicators, border hygiene, and the monitoring and documentation of barriers to the free movement of persons and goods.

02 BP 2302 – RUE 235 Camp Guezo Cotonou, Benin
Tel. : +229 01 20 25 03 96 / 01 94 20 16 53
Mail : secretariat@corridor-wa.org
Website : www.corridor-wa.org