



APRM
African Peer Review Mechanism



FOLLOW-UP COUNTRY SUPPORT MISSION TO SOUTH AFRICA

(4-8 DECEMBER 2005)

Table of Contents

- 1 Members of the Country Support Mission to South Africa
- 2 Programme and activities
- 3 Issues discussed and key decisions
 - Governing Council Structure and Function
 - The Reason for the Follow-up CSM
- 4 Stakeholders and their concerns
 - Who is being assessed?
 - Programme of Action
 - Report writing
 - Provincial Governing Councils (PGCs)
- 5 Conclusion

1. Members of the Country Support Mission to South Africa

Professor Adebayo Adedeji, member of the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons, arrived in South Africa on the 4th of December 2005 to conduct a follow up support visit to South Africa. On arrival in Johannesburg, Prof. Adedeji proceeded to Limpopo in preparation for the first meeting.

Prof. Adedeji was accompanied by Dr. Bernard Kouassi, Executive Director of the APRM Secretariat, Mr. Kupukile Mlambo, Chief Country Economist representing the African Development Bank (AfDB); Ms. Zemenay Lakew, a Senior Programme Coordinator at the UNDP; Mr. Patrick Bugembe, a Senior Economic Affairs Officer with the UN's Economic Commission for Africa's Sub-regional Office in Lusaka; and Abdul-Nashiru Issahaku, Senior Governance Expert at the African Development Bank (AfDB).

Staff from the APRM Secretariat was also part of the mission. They included Ms Evelynne Change, Coordinator of Corporate Governance and Ms Nana Boateng, Research Analyst in the Socio-economic Development theme.

2. Programme and activities

Programme of the Mission

Day 1: 5 December 2005

The country support mission (CSM) started its visit in Polokwane where it attended the Provincial Consultative Workshop, which was hosted by the Provincial Focal Point, MEC Thabo Mufamadi. Minister Geraldine Fraser-Moleketi, the Chairperson of the National APRM Governing Council gave a keynote address. The conference was attended by stakeholders from both Civil Society and Government. The Provincial Governing Council (PGC) presented the provincial roadmap and the progress they had made in rolling out the APRM process in the province.

Prof. Adedeji gave a brief review of the APRM at the Consultative Workshop. He said he was impressed by the level of understanding of the APRM process and could tell that a lot of work has been done since the first CSM in early November. The CSM witnessed the formal inauguration of the PGC.

The workshop was followed by a press conference, which was attended by Premier Sello Moloto.

Day 2: 6 December 2005

On the 5th of December the team proceeded to the Eastern Cape where they were received by the Premier, MECs and the provincial secretariat. A brief meeting was held with the Premier and thereafter the Support Mission went to the Hemingway Hotel for dinner with MECs and officials from the province.

On the 6th of December the CSM met with the members of the Eastern Cape Provincial Legislature in Bisho who were led by the Deputy Speaker,

Honourable M. Marasha. In this meeting Prof. Adedeji emphasised that the APRM is about getting member states to mobilise stakeholders within their own countries and that there should be no exclusions. The government is one of the stakeholders and not the only stakeholder. Prof. Adedeji said the National Governing Council has 29 members and he would like to know how representative Eastern Cape PGC is. The PGC was inaugurated at a Provincial Consultative Workshop held later that day.

After this meeting the Mission went to the Great Palace of the Rharhabe King Maxhoba'yakhawuleza Sandile (AAA! Zanasizwe). The King received the Mission and gave his support and permission for the Mission to meet with the stakeholders. The workshop was attended by government and civil society stakeholders, where the Provincial Governing Council was inaugurated at the Rharhabe Community Hall. MEC Thobile Mhlahlo chaired the workshop.

Prof. Adedeji addressed the workshop and introduced delegates to the APRM process. Prof. Adedeji said it was important that the PGC is as representative as possible because the responsibility will be with the PGC to implement the APRM.

The Eastern Cape Premier Nosimo Balindlela met the team at the airport when they departed for the Western Cape.

Day 3: 7 December 2005

On the third day the CSM was in Cape Town. A Provincial APRM stakeholder discussion session with the Country Support Mission was held. Prof Adedeji took the stakeholders through the Peer Review process, stating that the APRM is the most extensive initiative of its kind in modern history.

The Provincial Governing Council had not been fully constituted during the visit. Implementation of the APRM in the Province was overseen by an interim Provincial Steering Committee or Coordinating Committee. The Province said the Provincial Governing Council would only be inaugurated on 15 December 2005 since Premier Ebrahim Rasool was still going through the nominations.

Prof Adedeji emphasised the importance of having the PGC as soon as possible. The civil society representatives were also not happy that the PGC was not inaugurated in that meeting.

Four members of the National Governing Council attended the APRM Western Cape Stakeholder Discussion meeting.

Later the CSM met with Premier Ebrahim Rasool and his Provincial Executive Council at the Western Cape Provincial Legislature and briefed him on the continental APRM process.

A planned meeting with the National House of Traditional Leaders could not happen because the support visit coincided with a national gathering of Traditional Leaders.

Day 4: 8 December 2005

Dr. Bernard Kouassi and Ms. Zemenay Lakew attended the Annual Public Management Conversation held in George. Dr. Kouasi presented the keynote address. He said that the aim of the CSM is to prepare countries to have a robust process and a realistic Programme of Action. He said that self-assessment is not only about government but the country as a whole to determine efficiency and each stakeholder has to assess itself. He also said that the APRM started with funding from African governments and then development partners started to assist as well. The money contributed by the Development Partners is put into a trust fund to avoid compromising governments. He concluded by saying that the way Ghana accepted its report augurs well for the future of the continent.

3. Issues discussed and key decisions

3.1. Governing Council Structure and Function

Prof. Adedeji applauded the initiative taken by South Africa to decentralise the process and said that was an innovation in itself. He reiterated the fact that the Review Panel expects one report from South Africa and that the report should come from the National Governing Council. He said that it was important that provinces produce their own reports that would then be forwarded to the National Governing Council.

PGCs were inaugurated in both Limpopo and the Eastern Cape. The Western Cape promised to inaugurate its own PGC on 15 December 2005. Prof. Adedeji emphasised the fact that PGCs should take responsibility for implementing the APRM in the respective provinces.

3.2. The Reason for the Follow-up CSM

Prof. Adedeji stated that this was an extension of the first CSM and that if they had not come back it was going to give credence to the mistaken belief that the APRM was for people based in major cities. Therefore, going to Polokwane and Bisho was meant to demonstrate the participatory and inclusiveness of the APRM process.

The CSM explained to the National Governing Council Chairperson that although the follow-up mission did not cover all provinces, the other provinces should be assured that the mission will visit all nine provinces during the review visit in 2006.

4. Stakeholders and their concerns

In the second round of the Country Support Mission, the stakeholders were not met individually. All the concerns raised were raised during the provincial workshops. In the Eastern Cape concerns were raised both in the interaction with the members of the provincial legislature (MPLs) and in the workshop. There was concern during the consultative workshop that HIV/AIDS groups were not represented even though the province has high incidents of

HIV/AIDS. An official from the Eastern Cape Office of the Director-General said this sector was contacted, so as labour. She said it was still an open process.

In the Western Cape some stakeholders raised a concern over the selection of members to be represented on the Provincial Governing Council based on the nominations done by the Provincial Development Council (PDC). They felt that this body (PDC) is not representative of all the stakeholders unlike ECOSOCC at national level. But the Provincial Steering Committee argued that the PDC has representatives from all provincial social partners. A member of the National Governing Council also expressed reservations about the fact that the Premier will nominate representatives of civil society. A member of the Youth Commission said that the disabled and the marginalized groups were not represented on the PDC. A member of the Provincial Steering Committee assured the meeting that the Province will critically look at the issue of representation.

Despite all the concerns raised, Prof. Adedeji said that he was impressed with the level of awareness in all the provinces he visited but expressed reservations on the fact that the Western Cape did not have a Provincial Governing Council. He advised the Province to establish the PGC as soon as possible, as the PGC is responsible for both the executive and oversight function in the whole process. He further argued that the PGC will bring some legitimacy to the process when all key stakeholders are involved.

4.1. Who is being assessed?

When Prof. Adedeji addressed the delegates in Polokwane he reminded them that the focus of the APRM is not only on ensuring government accountability. He said that it is important that leaders in business, churches, and other institutions in society are also held accountable. Professor Adedeji emphasised this point as follows: "When we talk about accountability people think we are only referring to politicians, but that's only a fraction of society".

4.2. Programme of Action

Prof. Adedeji said that the self-assessment is a means to an end and the end being the Programme of Action (PoA). The PoA must be time bound. It should indicate who should do what. He said that he knows that the issue of "lack of resources" will crop up but asked stakeholders to plan thoroughly and not allow resource shortage to undermine the quality of planning.

In the Eastern Cape the Deputy Speaker of the Provincial Legislature said that they were not aware that they had to do their own assessment as a provincial legislature. She then said they would write their own self-assess report and then submit it to the PGC for incorporation in the overall provincial report.

4.3. Report writing

There was a concern from civil society on the writing on the report. The key questions were: 1) How are we going to avoid the process becoming a

whitewash since government has the resources compared to NGOs and CBOs. II) Civil society felt that there is a tendency for government to dominate processes because of its resource advantage.

Prof. Adedeji said there were a number of checks and balances in place. He said the responsibility lies with the National Governing Council. He said the NGC is responsible for the whole process. He also emphasised that there were five stages in the APRM process and that South Africa is in the first stage but nevertheless an important one. He said that the APR Secretariat is engaged in its own study (to produce a background paper on South Africa), while South Africa is busy with its own self-assessment report. Prof. Adedeji alluded to the fact that there are bound to be disagreements like in any other similar process where different stakeholders are brought together. These differences should be addressed to ensure consensus in the development of a Programme of Action (PoA).

4.4. Provincial Governing Councils (PGCs)

There was a concern in Limpopo that their PGC was not inclusive enough. The PGC and the provincial Focal Point said it was their intention to have a representative council and will engage those stakeholders who fill they were excluded.

There was a concern raised by Prof. Adedeji that the agricultural sector was not involved in some provinces. Minister Fraser-Moleketi also said that attempts should be made to ensure the agricultural sector is represented in the Limpopo PGC. The PGC said they will consider these suggestions and will explore the possibility of including musicians and disability sector in the Council as well.

When the youth raised the challenge of illiteracy in the rural areas, Minister Fraser-Moleketi said that considering that tertiary institutions were closed the youth could play an important role in that respect. She also emphasised the fact that the CDWs were there to bridge that gap. The youth that was in the workshop went beyond the APRM business and saw the workshop as an opportunity to engage Prof. Adedeji at an intellectual level. Minister Fraser-Moleketi made a suggestion that it would be nice if Prof. Adedeji could visit South Africa after the Peer Review process on a personal capacity to engage the youth.

5. Conclusion

The follow-up Country Support Mission was successful and afforded the mission the opportunity to interact with various stakeholders. The stakeholder workshops organised by the provinces demonstrated the complexity of the APRM and how different provinces have approached the process. The mission also had first hand experience of how far the different provinces are in implementing the APRM.

The substance of the issues discussed, both content and process, illustrated the extent of understanding of the APRM process and the seriousness with which the provinces, and the country as a whole have approached it. It was on the basis of this experience and encounters with a diverse group of

stakeholders that the CSM agreed that the National Governing Council is doing everything possible to mobilise all stakeholders throughout the country.

The CSM expressed confidence over the fact that South Africa will be able to complete the process during the first half to three quarters of 2006, as agreed during the first visit.