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**1340. Dr M J Cardo (DA) to ask the Minister in The Presidency:**

In terms of The Presidency’s Socio-Economic Impact Assessment System, which policies, laws and regulations have been (a) scrutinised and (b) found to have a negative socio-economic impact since 1 September 2015?                                     **NW1440E**

**REPLY:**

1. During the period of June 2015 to end of 2017-18 Financial Year, DPME received 404 SEIAS reports with proposals from Departments of which 375 were analysed and related feedback was provided to departments for improvements. It should be noted that the above figures exclude re-submissions of updated reports and proposals. The table below provides a summary of proposals per each financial year:

| **Period** | **Total SEIAS reports Received by DPME from Departments** | **Proposals that were subjected to the Socio-Economic Impact Assessment System (SEIAS) by Departments and analysed by DPME per stated period.** | | | | | | **Total Processed by DPME** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Bills** | **Regulations** | **Policies** | **Frameworks** | **Strategies** | **Others[[1]](#footnote-1)** |
| **01 June 2015 to**  **31 March 2016** | 117 | 58 | 14 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 4 | **99 (85%)** |
| **01 April 2016 to**  **31 March 2017** | 135 | 39 | 24 | 29 | 1 | 11 | 23 | **127 (94%)** |
| **01 April 2017 to**  **31 March 2018** | 152 | 44 | 37 | 31 | 5 | 13 | 19 | **149 (98%)** |
| **Total** | **404** | **141** | **75** | **81** | **7** | **25** | **46** | **375 (93%)** |

(b) Which ones were found to have a negative socio-economic impact since 1 September 2015?

It should be noted that DPME does not reject proposals. Proposals that were found to have potential negative socio-economic impact were sent back to departments for improvements. Cabinet would not approve any proposal that contradicts the Constitution and the National Development Plan. Examples of key ones in the public domain which were referred back by DPME for further processing and improvements particularly on mitigation of identified risks (possible unintended consequences) are the Regulations of Agricultural Land Holding Bill which still need to be processed by Parliament and the Mining Charter which is being currently being revised.

DPME working together with custodian departments encourages stakeholders to participate and provide factual comments to the Liquor Amendment and the proposed Tobacco Products and Electronic Systems Bills which have been perceived as having unintended consequences by various groupings.

Other common challenges where DPME referred back or intervened on departments’s SEIAS reports and proposals included the following:

* Lack of evidence based policy making including use of evaluations, research and other references to inform amendments or development of new proposals.
* This became evident with challenges around problem identification and choice of policy options to address such problems (articulation on Theory of Change);
* Limited consultation with affected stakeholders both internally within departments and across;
* Inability to quantify costs related to the implementation of the proposals; and
* Poor mitigation strategies to minimise associated costs and identified risks.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Approved | Not  Approved | Approved  as amended |
| Comment: | | |
| Dr NC Dlamini-Zuma  Minister in the Presidency: Planning Monitoring and Evaluation |
| Date: |

1. Others refers to High Impact and cross sectoral Plans, Programmes, Rules, Norms and Standards, Concept Notes, Research Reports and Business Cases [↑](#footnote-ref-1)