

SECRET 12/11/21



PARLIAMENT
OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

COMMITTEES

PO Box 15 Cape Town 8000 Republic of South Africa
Tel: 27 (21) 403 2597 Fax: 27 (21) 403 3205
www.parliament.gov.za

Department of International Relations and Cooperation Annual Report Presentation
Select Committee on Trade and International Relations
21 November 2012

Objective:

States behave the manner they do in international relations in pursuit of specific national interests objectives. In terms of participation/membership to international governmental organisations (IGOs), the life or mortality of IGOs is dependent on the benefit members derive from the organisation.

The assessment of the Department of International Relations and Cooperation's Annual Report is made within the context of the above theoretical principles. To what extent did the Department pursue and achieve South Africa's national interests in the reported bilateral relations and what value was derived in the reported multilateral engagements? What were the national implications – at all levels of government - of such activities?

Selected International Relations and Cooperation (foreign policy) issues:

1. Hosting and participation – there has to be a process or an empirical measure of hosting and participating in these international events and conferences. These can be defined in line with the national interest (national priorities).
- The department hosted and participated in a number of events/meetings. There is need to attach an outcome to participating and attending meetings for proper oversight to take place.

For example:

- What was it that the department and country wanted to achieve by hosting the Global African Diaspora Conference in May 2012?
- Did we meet the intended objective?

- The opportunity cost of hosting; was that the most effective and efficient way of pursuing that national objective?
 - What were the national (domestic) effects of the hosting ie. on tourism, etc?
 - The objectives need not be quantitative, but the point is to establish a system of constantly assessing our behaviour in international relations against an established predetermined national interest.
2. Other national departments, provinces and municipalities are engaged in their own international relations programmes. The annual report does not reflect on these.
- As custodians of South Africa's foreign policy, in terms of coordinating the above and keeping a 'handle' of these programmes, does the department have the capacity to do that?
 - How does the department coordinate, support or supplement provincial and local international relations activities so that RSA is able to speak with one voice?
3. Public diplomacy – plans, strategy and activities aimed at localising foreign policy.
- Beyond the cyber interaction (facebook, twitter etc) what has been the processes and outcomes of the public diplomacy exercise?
 - The current programme reflects a 'one-way' communication exercise, there is a need to redefine that in order to encourage legitimate 'public participation' and so establish a 'two-way' process (ie. how does the public participate and influence foreign policy formulation).
 - Linked to the above; what are the strategies and activities aimed at 'domesticating' foreign policy? South Africans need to understand why RSA behaves the way it does internationally.
4. In the Annual Report, there is no discernable South African foreign policy in the engagements and activities. Defined, precisely, what is RSA's foreign policy; or
- What is RSA's national interest in international relations?
 - What are the national implications of this foreign policy?

5. SADPA + ARF

- What are the issues constraining the progress in the development of these institutions?
- Beyond South Africa's benevolence in the use of the ARF, how is it used to leverage bilateral economic relations? (this may be a policy issue that the participating departments may have to deliberate on).

Some Issues raised in Auditor General's Report

1. Employment outside the DIRCO

How has the department dealt with the extra employment by its officials?

2. Immeasurable predetermined objectives

It is inherently difficult to measure outcomes of international relations engagements, especially quantitatively. However the Committee may have to recommend that the Department develop measurement indicators, including;

- establishing, prior to engaging, the expectations of the Department;
- the extent to which, during the course of specific engagements, what compromises/mandate adjustments have been made?

3. Absence of strategic plans and monitoring of missions abroad,

4. Absence of Security and disaster recovery measures in the IT system.