



# REPORT ON THE APRM COUNTRY SUPPORT MISSION TO SOUTH AFRICA

9 – 11 NOVEMBER 2005

## *Table of Contents*

- |          |                                    |   |
|----------|------------------------------------|---|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Background and introduction</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The African Peer Review Mechanism and the role of Country Support Missions</li><li>• Details of the Mission to South Africa</li></ul> |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Programme and activities</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Programme of the Mission</li><li>• Stakeholders and their concerns</li></ul>  |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Key decisions</b>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Governing Council Structure and Function</li><li>• Research Strategy</li></ul>  |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Remaining challenges</b>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The role of Parliament</li></ul>  |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Next steps</b>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Activities and timeframes</li></ul>   |

### **Appendix One:**

List of people and organisations consulted.

# REPORT ON AN APRM COUNTRY SUPPORT MISSION TO SOUTH AFRICA

9 – 11 NOVEMBER 2005

|          |                                    |
|----------|------------------------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Background and introduction</b> |
|----------|------------------------------------|

**1.1 The African Peer Review Mechanism and the role of Country Support Missions**

The African Peer Review Mechanism is an African Union system provided by its development programme, NEPAD, for countries to improve their governance.

The Mechanism entails the completion of a self-assessment report and a programme of action by each country involved. These are independently reviewed and later presented to peer Heads of State.

The Mechanism encourages a reflective approach to governance in which citizens and experts are asked consider ways in which governance can be improved.

Embarking on the APRM process is a challenging and exciting step. NEPAD supports countries about to start implementing the Peer Review Mechanism by sending a Country Support Mission (CSM) to review their readiness and assist where possible.

A CSM to South Africa was undertaken from 9 to 11 November 2005. This Report provides an overview of the Mission's programme and the issues it addressed.

**1.2 Members of the Country Support Mission to South Africa**

Professor Adebayo Adedeji, member of the APRM Panel of Eminent Persons, led the Country Support Mission.

Professor Adedeji is a well-known academic working in the area of public administration who has also occupied a number of important positions in the Nigerian government as well as in multilateral institutions.

Prof Adedeji was accompanied by Dr. Bernard Kouassi, Executive Director of the APRM Secretariat; Professor Atsain Achi representing the African Development Bank; Ms. Zemenay Lakew, a Senior Programme Coordinator at the UNDP and Mr. Patrick Bugembe, a Senior Economic Affairs Officer with the UN's Economic Commission for Africa's Sub-regional Office in Lusaka. Staff from the APRM Secretariat was also part of the Mission.

They included Ms Evelynne Change, Coordinator for Corporate Governance, Ms. Nana Boateng, Research Analyst in Socio-Economic Development, and Mr. Dalmar Jama, a Research Analyst in the area of Corporate Governance.

|          |                                 |
|----------|---------------------------------|
| <b>2</b> | <b>Programme and activities</b> |
|----------|---------------------------------|

**2.1 Programme of the Mission**

**Day 1: 9 November 2005**

The country support mission started its visit in Cape Town where it met the speaker of parliament, Ms Baleka Mbete and members of the APR joint coordinating parliamentary committees.

This meeting was followed by a press conference.

The mission then met with Western Cape traditional leaders and practitioners who were introduced to the country assessment process by Professor Adedeji.

**Day 2: 10 November 2005**

On the second day the country support mission met with stakeholders from community based organisations, non-governmental organisations, labour, the faith sector, Chapter 9 institutions, universities, research institutions, Business Unity South Africa as well as the South African National Editors Forum.

Prof. Adedeji addressed the different stakeholders and introduced them to the APRM process. Stakeholders were given the opportunity to ask questions and raise issues and Prof Adedeji and the country support team addressed these.

The Professor provided useful insights, practical advice and clarification.

Several members of the governing council were in attendance and added considerable value to the consultations.

Overall, the country support mission was very well received and interactions were characterised by an authentic desire to participate in the process and make sure it succeeds.

In the evening, the Focal Point invited the country support mission to a working dinner where a robust and full discussion was held to cover areas of concern to the Professor and his team.

The main issues discussed were the research strategy and consultation process, the question of a country trust fund for donated funds to be held and the structure and composition of the national governing council.

### Day 3: 11 November 2005

The CSM met with the Chairperson and members of the national Governing Council and focal points of the provincial national governing councils.

The Mission and the Focal Point then met with President Mbeki for the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between South Africa and the APRM secretariat.

## 2.2 Stakeholders and their concerns

Please see Appendix One for a list of stakeholders who met with the Country Support Mission.

Most stakeholders raised concerns around the short timeframes and speed of the process. Professor Adedeji noted these concerns and stressed the need for the process to be thorough.

The meeting with Business Unity SA indicated a clear enthusiasm to participate and Professor Adedeji welcomed this.

Representatives of the media inquired regarding the possibility of including additional questions on the role of the media. This will be discussed with the Research Sub-Committee of the Governing Council.

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| <b>3</b> | <b>Issues discussed and key decisions</b> |
|----------|---|

## 3.1 Governing Council Structure and Function

The Country Support Missions suggested several ways in which the Governing Council could be strengthened.

At their suggestion, several changes were made to the Governing Council's Terms of Reference, clarifying its executive and oversight role and clearly differentiating its role and function from that of the Secretariat established to support it.

It was also agreed that the Council would include alternate members in its meetings and that they would have the same status as the original primary members. While this makes the Council significantly larger it also makes it easier to convene meetings and disseminate information.

Prior to the arrival of the CSM, the national Governing Council (NGC) agreed to invite provincial representatives to participate in subsequent NGC meetings. Professor Adedeji and his team endorsed this development and encouraged the NGC to support provincial structures in ensuring broad sectoral representation at the provincial level.

### **3.2 Research Strategy**

After their meetings and consultations the CSM was concerned that South Africa's technical and research institutions were not being drawn into the process adequately.

However, once the proposed Research strategy was properly explained and discussed, these concerns were addressed.

In terms of the strategy, all credible institutions will be given an opportunity to contribute submissions as well as to participate in the seminars for preparing the Country Self Assessment and Programme of Action.

Provided this is the case, the Mission was satisfied that our Research Strategy provides our vibrant and dynamic institutions with adequate opportunities to participate and contribute.

### **3.3 CSM meeting with President and Signing of the MoU**

One of the critical issues agreed between the CSM and the President of South Africa is the need to encourage all role players to review themselves as part of the APRM process. Such stakeholders include, among others, Labour, Media, NGO sector, Youth, Women, Interfaith groups, Universities, Constitutional Bodies, Parliament, Cultural and Sporting institutions. Parliament's decision to be proactive in reviewing itself was welcome by the CSM.

Since the list is not exhaustive, the meeting agreed that all stakeholders should be encouraged to review themselves and to submit their report to the NGC for incorporation in the overall country assessment report. In the long term, the additional questions developed by South Africa to inform a holistic review of all role players in the country will inform the enhancement of the APRM questionnaire and process within the continent.

To facilitate the process, it was agreed that additional questions should be developed and attached to the long and short versions of the questionnaires.

The signing of the memorandum of understanding by the President of South Africa and the Professor Adedeji on the 11 November 2005 marked the official beginning of the APRM process in South Africa.

This also served as an endorsement for South Africa's readiness to undertake the review process.

|          |                   |
|----------|-------------------|
| <b>4</b> | <b>Challenges</b> |
|----------|-------------------|

**4.1 The role of Parliament**

The robust way that parliament has been engaging with the APRM was welcomed by the Professor.

The Mission was particularly pleased that the Parliamentary sub committees are addressing new innovative issues that are not covered in the questionnaire.

However, concerns were raised in a number of instances about overlapping responsibilities and a duplication of activities. The Secretariat is engaging with the support staff for the speaker of Parliament on this issue.

There is need for further discussions to resolve this issue with the speaker of Parliament and the Parliamentary sub-committees.

**4.2 Insufficient time to engage with CSM and logistical challenges**

Because of the number of stakeholders that had to meet with the CSM, there was not enough time for all stakeholders to engage with the CSM on the 10<sup>th</sup> November 2005.

Logistical challenges were encountered on the 10<sup>th</sup> November due to changes effected on the programme after the invitations had already been set to stakeholders. The only stakeholders who were affected are the think tanks (Universities and Chapter 9 institutions). Although the Secretariat notified the offices of these institutions to arrive early for the meeting with the CSM, not all received the notification, hence some arrived 30 minutes before the SCM departed for a meeting with Business.

The Secretariat and Council members present apologised and a formal letter of apology is being prepared. In addition, all these stakeholders have been invited to the Public Service Conversation schedules for the 8-10 December 2005.

## 5 Concluding remarks and next steps

### 5.1 Reflection

The NEPAD APRM Secretariat expressed appreciation of the planning and coordination of the CSM at such short notice. The CSM team considered the outcome of the mission to be positive and encouraging.

The CSM and the NGC have agreed to host a follow up visit of the CSM from the 5<sup>th</sup> –7<sup>th</sup> November 2005. The CSM will visit Limpopo and EC, and meet with, among others, the National House of Traditional leaders and Practitioners. A programme of the follow up visit is being developed in collaboration with the identified provinces.

A formal invitation for the Conversation has also been extended to Professor Adedeji and his team through the NEPAD APRM Secretariat.

The Secretariat is awaiting feedback from the NEPAD APRM Secretariat on the details of the follow up support mission and participation in the Conversation.

The CSM and the NGC agreed on the timelines for the completion of the APRM process in South Africa. These are outlined below.

### 5.2 Activities and timeframes

| Activity  | Time frame                                   |
|---|--|
| 1. National Self Assessment and draft programme of action | 31 March 2006                                |
| 2. Issues Paper   | Mid-April 2006                               |
| 3. County Review Team visit                               | 3 <sup>rd</sup> week of April to 30 May 2006 |
| 4. County Review Team Report writing                      | June 2006                                    |
| 5. Submit Report to SA for comments                       | Beginning of July 2006                       |
| 6. Receive comments from South Africa                     | End of July 2006                             |
| 7. Submit Report to APR Forum                             | End of August 2006                           |