

CONSTITUTIONAL ASSEMBLY

MEMORANDUM

TO: Hassen Ebrahim
Marion Sparg
Louisa Zondo
Fazela Mohomed
Lucille Meyer
Enoch Sitole
Edward Shalala

FROM: Josh Nathanson

DATE: September 4, 1995

SUBJECT: Public Sector Hearing Evaluation

Attached please find the minutes from our Public Sector Hearing evaluation.

Minutes
Sector Hearing Evaluation Meeting
August 23rd, 1995

Chairperson: Permenthri Pillay

Present:

Edward	Zuleiga
Lucille	Ivan
Saaliegah	Susan
Josh	Una
James	Florence
Thandi	

1. Opening

Permenthri opened the meeting at 10:15 and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to evaluate the execution and success of Public Sector Hearings.

2. Agenda

1. Objectives for Sector Hearings
2. Format of Hearings
3. Translation and Transcription
4. Using NGO vs Doing it ourselves
5. Management
6. Closure

3. Objectives for Sector Hearings

1. Afford Sectors an opportunity to make submissions and become involved in the constitution writing process.
2. Involve CA members in the PPP
3. Involve Civil Society
4. Create a sense of ownership

It was generally agreed upon that the Sector Hearings had achieved this goal based upon the response from those targeted.

4. Format of the Hearing

- 4.1 Some criticism was aired as to the use and choice of speakers for the hearings. However, it was pointed out that speakers would probably not be used in the next phase.
- 4.2 A difficulty arose in coordination with Theme Committees which should be avoided.
- 4.3 It was suggested that we look into how Parliament conducts hearings.

5. Translation

It was recognized that the issue of translation was problematic. However, translation represents a logistical problem that can not easily be overcome. However, it was felt that every effort should be made to secure translation in all official languages.

6. Transcriptions

- 6.1 People were generally unhappy with the quality and turnover time in using IDS for transcriptions. Complaints included:
1. Speed of Delivery
 2. Inability to translate African Languages
 3. Sections left blank stating "inaudible"
- 6.2 A suggestion was made that the CA look into doing transcription in-house or at least having an editing team to oversee work.

7. Using An NGO vs Doing It Ourselves

- 7.1 Strong preferences were expressed against using NGOs for the following reasons:
1. There is no noticeable reduction in the amount of work required by CA staff.
 2. The CA loses control of the process
 3. The NGO takes the credit for the Hearing.
 4. Less expensive to do it ourselves.
- 7.2 Some advantages of using NGOs include:
1. Having a buffer or an excuse for problems.
 2. Involving Civil Society
- 7.3 A suggestion was made that we look into using an outside consulting agency to put on Hearings for us.
- 7.4 It was also noted that it is much easier to do the hearings ourselves if they take place in Cape Town. There are, however, economic advantages to holding them in Gauteng and political advantages to holding hearings in the provinces.

8. Management

- 8.1 Peoples roles need to be defined more clearly so that there are clear lines of control.
- 8.2 Tight control need to be exercised over spending of funds on Hearings (especially transport claims).

9. Closure

Permenthri thanked everyone for the help and input. The meeting closed at 11:20.