

EU-AU RELATIONS: PROSPECTS AND CHALLENGES

Proceedings Report compiled by Dr Lesley Masters and Dr Lara Hierro

Wednesday 4th October 2017

12h30-15h00

Venue: Premier Hotel,
Stanza Bopape Street, Pretoria



National
Research
Foundation



science and technology
Department:
Science and Technology
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

**FRIEDRICH
EBERT
STIFTUNG**

Table of contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Panellist/Contributors profiles

Introduction

Welcome: Professor Mzukisi Qobo, Deputy Chair, SARChI African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, University of Johannesburg

Panel Discussion – Chair, Professor Chris Landsberg, SARChI African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy

Dr Samuel Oloruntoba, Thabo Mbeki African Leadership Institute, UNISA, Pretoria

Dr Lesley Masters, Senior Research Fellow, SARChI African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, University of Johannesburg

Mr Koen Vervaeke, Managing Director for Africa, EU

Ambassador Ghulam Asmal, Director: NEPAD and Partnerships, Department of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO)

Dr John Kotsopoulos, Senior Research Fellow, Centre for the Study of Governance Innovation, University of Pretoria

Discussion

Acronyms and abbreviations

AU	African Union
BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China South Africa
CFSP	Common Foreign and Security Policy
DIRCO	Department of International Relations and Cooperation
ECDPM	European Centre for Development Policy Management
ENP	European Neighbourhood Policy
EPAs	Economic Partnership Agreements
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
ESS	European Security Strategy
EU	European Union
FOCAC	Forum on China Africa Cooperation
GS	Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Strategy
ICT	Information, Communication and Technology
JAES	Joint Africa EU Strategy/Strategic Partnership
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
OAU	Organisation of African Union
PSC	Peace and Security Council
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
UNSC	United Nations Security Council

Panellist/contributor's profiles

HE Ambassador Ghulam Hoosein Asmal

Ghulam Hoosein Asmal obtained his BA LLB at the University of Witwatersrand and is admitted as an Advocate in the High Court of South Africa. Prior to joining the Diplomatic Corps, he practiced Human Rights Law in Johannesburg, South Africa. He established the South African Embassy in Kuwait and the Consulate General in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. He served at South African Diplomatic missions in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Egypt and Comoros, the latter at Ambassadorial level.

Mr. Jobst von Kirchmann

Jobst von Kirchmann holds a degree in law from Erlangen, Nuremberg (Germany), and Aix-en-Provence (France). He has served in the Ministry of Justice in Munich, Germany, between 1989 and 1990, and in 1991 obtained his masters in Information Management from Japan. Jobst has served as an Assistant in the European Parliament, and in the EU Commission Directorate Generals of both Trade and the Internal Market. Since 2002, Jobst has occupied various positions in the External relations services of the EU, including in the EU Delegation to Iraq, the Directorate General for Development Cooperation, as Deputy Head of Unit for Information, Communication worldwide, and Head of the Legal and Financial department for Asia, Central Asia, the Middle East, Gulf and Pacific. He currently heads the Unit for development policy in Southern Africa and the Indian Ocean.

Dr John Kotsopoulos

John is a Senior Research Fellow at GovInn. He holds a PhD in International Relations (University of Kent) with a focus on asymmetrical negotiations between the European Union and Africa. He also has research interests in peace and security, African agency in international relations and foreign policy decision-making processes. Previously, he worked at the Brussels-based European Policy Centre think-tank where he ran the EU-Africa Forum and the European Security and Global Governance programme. Prior to that, he was employed in Ottawa, Canada, as a political desk officer at the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. John also holds Master's degrees from the London School of Economics and Carleton University (Ottawa). He moved to Pretoria in 2015 after a spending two and a half years in Malawi.

Chair: Professor Chris Landsberg

Chris Landsberg is professor and SARChI Chair of African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy at the University of Johannesburg (UJ), and Senior Associate at the UJ School of Leadership. He is the former Head of politics and International Relations at UJ. Landsberg was educated at Rand Afrikaans University (now University of Johannesburg); Rhodes; and Oxford, and holds MPhil and DPhil international relations degrees (Oxon). He studied as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, and is a former Hamburg Fellow at Stanford University in the United States (US). Previously he was director of the Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) in Johannesburg, and co-founder and former co-director of the Centre for Africa's International Relations

at the University of the Witwatersrand in South Africa. He is a co-editor of several books, including *From Cape to Congo: Southern Africa's Emerging Security Challenges*, *South Africa in Africa: The Post-Apartheid Era*. Landsberg's single-authored titles include *The Diplomacy of Transformation: South African Foreign Policy and Statecraft*; and *The Quiet Diplomacy of Transition: International Politics and South Africa's Transition*.

Dr Lesley Masters

Dr Lesley Masters is a senior researcher and lecturer at the NRF Chair of African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy at UJ. Prior to this she was a senior researcher at the Institute for Global Dialogue (IGD), responsible for managing projects on foreign policy and natural resource governance in international affairs. She holds a PhD in international relations from the University of Leicester. She has edited books on South African foreign policy and natural resource governance, and served as joint guest editor of a special issue of the *Journal for Contemporary History on African Diplomacy*, and a special issue of the *South African Journal of International Affairs*. She has published numerous articles in accredited journals.

Dr Samuel Ojo Oloruntoba

Samuel Ojo Oloruntoba is a Senior Lecturer and the Coordinator of the Research cluster on Innovation and Developmental Regionalism at the Thabo Mbeki African Leadership Institute, University of South Africa. He obtained his PhD in Political Science with specialization in International Political Economy of Trade from the University of Lagos, Nigeria, where he is a tenured Faculty member. He was previously a Visiting Scholar at the Program of African Studies, Northwestern University, Evanston and a Fellow of Brown International Advanced Research Institute, Brown University, Rhode Island, United States of America. He has published in journals and contributed to book chapters both locally and abroad. Oloruntoba is the author of *Regionalism and Integration in Africa: EU-ACP Economic Partnership Agreements and Euro-Nigeria Relations*, published by Palgrave Macmillan, New York, United States of America in 2016. He is also the co-editor with Toyin Falola of *Palgrave Handbook on African Politics, Governance and Development* (2017) and co-editor of *Regenerating Africa: Bringing African Solutions to African Problems*, AISA Press, South Africa, 2016. His research interests include: African Political Economy, Resource Governance, Global Governance of Trade and Finance, Democracy and Development and Euro-Africa Relations. Oloruntoba was the recipient of Wangari Maathai Award for Innovative Research Leadership at the, University of Texas, Austin, Texas, USA, in March 2016.

Mr Koen Vervaeke

Mr. Koen Vervaeke has been appointed Managing Director for Africa, since January 2016. He was Director-Deputy Managing Director, responsible for the coherence of EU External Action in the Region and the programming (country strategies and indicative programmes) of the EU's financial cooperation, from November 2011 to December 2015. He has also been appointed Senior EU Coordinator for the Great Lakes region, working closely with the EU Delegations and the European Commission and EU member states to advance our objectives of peace and prosperity in the region as a whole, and stabilisation and reconstruction in the areas most affected by conflict.

Between December 2007 and October 2011, he was the EU Special Representative to the African Union and the Head of Delegation of the European Commission Delegation to the AU in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Ambassador Vervaeke's appointment reflected the common will of the Council of the European Union and the European Commission to combine all instruments of the EU and thereby ensure a coherent approach towards Africa, at all levels. Mr. Vervaeke, a Belgian diplomat, held previously a post as Head of Africa within the Policy Unit of Javier Solana, High Representative for the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy.

For the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, he performed as Ambassador, Special envoy for the Great Lakes Region, Spokesman of the Ministry and held postings in Geneva (UN), Bujumbura and Tunis. Mr. Vervaeke is married and father of four children. He holds a Masters in modern history and art history (Catholic University Leuven).

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

PROF CHRIS LANDSBERG



The EU-AU summit taking place in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire (20-30 November 2017) provides the context for bringing together members of the EU from Brussels, key members of the South African Department of International Affairs and Cooperation (DIRCO), and academics from Africa to take stock, address past concerns and to reflect on the future of the relationship between the two major institutions.

The Joint Africa-EU Strategy (JAES), leading to the Partnership of the same name, has endured 10 years; it has not been without its critics. Questions have been raised about the efficacy of the partnership, the kind of relationship dynamic between the two continents, and its results. Certainly, in the fluid international context today the conditions and dynamics have changed with Africa engaging a number of partners across the globe in pursuit of its goals.

Key issues that were raised during the course of the panel and the following discussion, highlight migration, the connection to civil society and how these concerns would feed into the 5th EU-Africa summit with its focus on investing in the youth. It was agreed that these were important concerns that need to be looked at, in the upcoming summit, and in the partnership going forward. This included the future nature of the partnership against the backdrop of a global order apparently retreating from multilateral based cooperation and increasingly returning to bilateral relations in international politics, reminiscent of a Cold War past.

Participants were invited from the local diplomatic corps representatives from all 55 African and the 28 EU member states were invited to attend, together with key players from the Department of International Affairs and Cooperation (DIRCO) in the South African Government, local youth representatives, advocacy groups.

The panel consisted of Ambassador Ghulam Asmal, Director General of New Economic Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) and Partnerships, Mr Koen Vervaeke, Managing Director for Africa, Dr Samuel Oloruntoba from the Thabo Mbeki Leadership Institute (TMALI), Dr Lesley Masters, Senior Lecturer and Research Fellow at the South African Research Chair Initiative (SARChI) in African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy (ADFP) at the University of Johannesburg, and Dr John Kotsopoulos Senior Researcher at the Centre for the Study of Research Innovation (GovInn) at the University of Pretoria. The Panel was chaired by Professor Chris Landsberg, Chair holder of the SARChI in African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, and the Welcome address provided by Professor Mzukisi Qobo, Deputy Director of the SARChI ADFP.

The following proceedings report presents an edited version from the event that took place on the 4th October, 2017, in the Premier Hotel, 575 Stanza Bopape Street, Pretoria.



The EU-Africa strategic partnership has a sense of longevity, which can be partially attributed to its deeply entrenched institutionalisation. There is no other partnership that can be compared to this one, as deeply grounded and one that has collaboration across a wide range of issue areas such as peace and security, sustainable development, knowledge building, skills development, poverty, and its reduction. The partnership also has an important dimension that touches on ideas, shared values and interests, with respect to the African Governance Architecture, as well as the human rights systems.

This Partnership is, therefore, not just focused on a narrow set of issues, but covers a much broader scope. There have been challenges and tensions, in particular concerning the Economic Partnership Agreements (EPAs), which at times has divided the African continent. As many important [strategic] relationships can attest to, it has not been without its rough patches, but by and large it is a relationship that has a bright future. The JAES Partnership has the potential to make a significant contribution to effective multilateralism for the simple reason that the EU-Africa partnership is grounded in ideas and shared values, and attempts to tackle substantial matters.

The line-up of scholars and practitioners for this discussion reflect on how this relationship has evolved over the past decade, what the critical moments have been, as well as, of course, the next steps needed to deepen the solidity in this relationship. The JAES Partnership is an important pillar for Africa's long-term sustainable development. This relationship has displayed durability, with its building blocks strongly constructed, yet they need to be nurtured. The future

needs to be envisioned, especially in view of the shift in geopolitics broadly speaking and in Europe in particular. The prospect exists that present generations may not share the same sense of gravity and commitment about the partnership that previous generations of African and European leaders had in its beginning.

PANEL DISCUSSION

DR SAMUEL OLORUNTOBA



In discussing the philosophy of integration between the EU and Africa, Adekeye Adebajo refers to the creation of the Tower of Babel through integration. The EU developed from the need to promote peace and security in Europe after the 2nd World War and has continued to expand to include the current 28 members (including Croatia). The African Union (AU) was a continuation of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU), created in 1963, formed to liberate the African continent.

To a greater extent, scholars have agreed that the OAU achieved its fundamental objective of liberating Africans from colonialism, and this led to its transformation into the AU in 2002. With the advent of the AU the focus shifted from not only maintaining peace and security, but intervening where necessary.

It has to be said that the two organisations share the same values. The African integration effort (AU) is modelled along that of the EU, even though there are differences in the formation of the state in both Europe and Africa. For this reason, mimicking European integration may not be ideal. The holistic approach of fostering integration in the EU and Africa is underlined by the need to boost regional integration. The AU, like the EU, recognises regional integration as a milestone and as a means of fostering development. For the AU, the organisation recognises the role for its regional economic communities, even though the problem of overlapping membership continues.

When it comes to trade, the EU accounts for 16 % of global trade, while the AU accounts for approximately 2% of global trade. In the realm of peace and security, prospects and challenges for both the EU and the AU exist. The EU and the AU

share some institutional similarities, such as a Commission, Assembly of head of states versus the European Council, the two parliaments, the African commission of human rights, as well as the European Court of Justice. Even though they share some institutional similarities, however, their capacities are vastly different in aspects such as staffing and funding.

In terms of areas of cooperation, the JAES was agreed in Lisbon in 2007. The intention of both organisations was to move beyond a donor-recipient relationship towards a long-term relationship, based on jointly identified mutual and complimentary interests. The partnership was to be based on the principle of ownership and solidarity, and its adoption marked a new phase in EU-Africa relations. This is at least the rhetoric. In practice the JAES implementation has fallen short of its expectations, although the partnership, set in the global context, has sought to jointly address global common challenges, such as climate change, the protection of the environment, peace and security, to present joint positions in the international arena.

The relationship between the EU and the AU will not fade in the short term due to the geographical proximity, making the Europe and Africa two contiguous continents. The two continents share geographical proximity, shared interests and values, that combined should fuel greater integration, branching into new areas of common interest such as governance, human rights, trade and regional integration energy, migration, mobility and employment, science, ICT and space. The JAES also tries to work towards a people centred partnership, bringing in an effective participation of civil society and the private sector, delivering a direct benefit to African and European citizens. This contributes towards expectations, which had been agreed at the Lisbon conference and the Brussel's conference of 2014 on EU-AU African cooperation, peace and security, democracy, good governance, human development, sustainable and inclusive development, growth and continental integration, global and emerging issues.

The challenges for the EU-AU relations are, however, numerous. Firstly, the concentration of competing interests within the context of new cooperation. Bearing in mind that from an international relations perspective, interstate relations are defined by interests, this is key. Further, when it is embedded within context of unequal power relations it is usually the case that the one who has the strongest power, derives the advantage. It has been argued before that the EU considered Africa as an outpost, and not necessarily as a partner in the context of relations that existed for centuries between the continents. When the AU depends so much on the EU for funding it predisposes it towards setting the agenda and the terms of engagement. Without blaming the AU for its dependency, it is important to acknowledge that this kind of relationship, as a partnership, is unsustainable. It was noted that the AU wished to negotiate as a block with the EU, which set out the EPAs negotiations on a regional basis but eventually returned to negotiations on bilateral basis in some instances.

The EU treats sub-Saharan Africa as a distant neighbour. This is evident in the different frameworks with which it interacts in Africa (for example, the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) with the North African countries and the JAES with the sub-Saharan countries). In addition, the AU lacks the capacity to engage

meaningfully with the EU, even though the AU is modelled after the EU. On both sides, there is a lack of commitment to meet various obligations and financial commitments. Even though the EU is seen as a block, the interests of the member states differ, as well as their philosophies, while the AU member states fail to commit to contributing their financial quota.

The Joint Expert Group also has a limited capacity to involve civil society in the partnership between the EU and AU. The challenge within the negotiations of the EU-ACP EPAs, which have lingered since 2003 to date, has been the most contentious within and between AU member states. Recently, at a meeting with the Director of Trade, it was noted that the AU wished to negotiate as a block with the EU, set out the EPA as a regional economic negotiation, eventually returned to a bilateral EPA arrangement.

The EU's response to the migration crisis through the securitisation of its external borders, through foreign policy and the more physically evident building walls, for example, is cosmetic and artificial. If indeed the partnership between Africa and the EU was supposed to be mutually developmental, the migration crisis will need to be approached differently.

There is considerable market potential for the future of the partnership taking into consideration the 1.2 billion and rising middle class in Africa.

However, if the migration crisis continues, Africa will become, as Tony Blair pointed out 'a scar on the conscience of the world'. It is not an emotional response, nor is it a sentimental response, it is *realpolitik*. However, there should be a different way of defining the relationship between the EU and Africa whereby the relationship becomes win-win, rather than one in where one partner develops at the expense of the other. The continental free trade areas, which are currently being negotiated, and hopefully will be completed by December, will provide the prospect of a higher level of relationship between the EU and the AU. The EU should be the traditional partner of Africa, but if the relationship is not well defined, new partners may emerge – such as China, or Brazil – bringing with them better bargaining prospects. The rhetoric between Africa and the EU needs to move to action.

DR LESLEY MASTERS



In a 2016 policy paper published by the ECDPM a shift in EU-Africa relations was noted. This is attributed to changes in the international milieu - the financial crisis and its impact on both regions, conflict in Syria and Iraq and the changing geo-political context. Previous EU-Africa summits too have faced similar contexts of change, and crisis. In other words, these concerns have always been around to varying degrees of acknowledgement. So, what is new for this summit that points to a shift in relations? It is that both intergovernmental organisations have seen a maturing of their institutions and approach to international relations. They are maturing as international actors, developing foreign policy, and are competing between themselves and with other states, and with non-state actors. They are competing for international influence, for international position, and that is what is changing. It is the institutions themselves, and the ability to engage with the international world.

Both multilateral organisations have developed a foreign policy approach, which in turn defines how they act, how they perceive the world, and how they order the world. It is this which shapes how both engage in bilateral relations. The EU-AU summit is an exercise in bilateral diplomacy between two multilateral organisations, both increasingly looking to carve out their space in the international arena. What then, are the foreign policy elements that these two policy actors will be looking to advance in the 2017 summit?

Both actors are chasing greater agency in wider international relations, and this is being brought to the summit. The EU's foreign policy has developed across four key documents: the European Security Strategy (ESS), the Common Foreign and

Security Policy (CFSP), the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), and more recently the Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy (GS). Each of these reflects a different time and context. For instance, the focus of the ESS was multilateralism where there was some success on the MDGs, and climate change negotiations. This reflected a wider milieu where the spirit of multilateralism was prevalent – good governances and human rights multilateralism was important. The Global Strategy reflects its own particular context. In this approach, regions are emphasised. The EU is positioning itself within an international environment that is witnessing a growing number of actors and regions. The emphasis is on promoting shared responsibility, acknowledging that the many transnational issues cannot be handled alone but have to be tackled with other partners. The core elements of the EU's foreign policy – prosperity, democracy – remain, and while peace and security are a focus, the GS lays plain that the EU will pursue a 'principled pragmatism'. The EU's foreign policy therefore, and according to what may be gleaned from the GS, is that it is no longer guided by just normative values or idealism. At the heart of the EU's project for revamping its external relationships, is the pursuit of the idea of shared or 'co-responsibility'.

Within the EU's emerging foreign policy, there has always been an emphasis on Africa, and the GS is no exception, highlighting the creation of the first Africa-EU summit, Cairo, where the need to have better coordination in order to make the partnership work was acknowledged.

In the GS, the idea of principled pragmatism is also applied to Africa: 'we will invest in African peace and development as an investment in our own security and prosperity.' This reflects the principled pragmatism of the EU's strategy, to advance its position in the world while defining its interests. We are reminded that all actors have interests, however, here we need to note the move from state interest to multilateral and regional organisational interests. The GS also highlights the importance of a networked world, and engaging with Africa in areas of trade and development, security, migration, health and education.

The AU also has a foreign policy, albeit and unwritten one. However, it can be pieced together from various documents. This includes the Agenda 2063, wherein Aspiration number seven specifically refers: 'To have Africa as a strong, united, resilient and influential global player and partner with a significant role in world affairs'. Through its international engagement Africa's legitimacy and its identity as an actor, is being created. As with the EU, the AU too recognises the importance of multilateralism, the importance of peaceful coexistence and partnerships.

This summit will see these two intergovernmental organisations coming together at this point, having defined their foreign policies (to various extents), to discuss their priorities and how they are going to pursue them. The similarities and the differences between both actors, are affected by globalisation and transnational issues. The issues listed in the JAES - peace and security, democratic governance, human rights, trade and regional integration – are no longer just EU-Africa issues. This is something both organisations recognise and are looking to manage transnational issues that go beyond their own bilateral relations.

As a result, both organisations need to discuss how they are going to engage with each other, as bilateral partners, in a multilateral context. Both have a pragmatic

approach to foreign policy. The AU foreign policy is concerned with meeting the other six aspirations, and the emerging issue has become how the AU will need to position itself to accomplish them. Both the EU and the AU recognise the need to re-evaluate their partnership in this newly appreciated multilateral context.

The JAES is left hanging in this equation, with questions already raised about its implementation and efficacy. Going forward, this aspect will be an area of concern. The challenge for individual member states within both organisations will be whether they can move beyond a state-centric approach. There has been much debate on the distance created between the higher levels of bureaucracy in these organisations, and the citizenry. In both, foreign policy has acknowledged the importance of a networked approach. However, the problem remains how to connect the citizenry to the networks, and integrate them with the numerous agreements, partnerships created between the EU-AU, as well as with other regions and other states.

There are within these dynamics, many opportunities. The EU-AU bilateral relations represent engagement between over 80 states. This means there are multiple opportunities for leverage. This has worked in the case of the SDGs negotiations and around climate change. Where the two partners have been at odds within a bilateral agreement, little progress has been achieved at the multilateral level. Both the EU and the AU are seeking to be more environmentally conscious. The AU has been looking to develop its blue and green economies. The EU is much more environmentally conscious in its trade and environmental regulations creating scope for further discussion between the partners. Other areas include ICT where the EU is also looking at becoming a 'cyber actor', and working with the AU, could work towards avoiding a development gap in this area. There are many opportunities in these areas to collaborate in the future.

The 2017 summit is therefore, much more than a bilateral relations exercise. It is about the EU and the AU as partnered international actors, finding their way in the global context.

The challenge is that most of the issues that have been discussed in previous African-European summits have become global issues. Going forward the EU and the AU will have to broaden their approaches, and work together in taking their partnership forward. At the moment, however, the relationship is focused on the bilateral rather than looking at how both foreign policy actors can work together bilaterally within a wider multilateral setting. This is the real challenge. In the upcoming summit, there will be discussions on trade, peace and security (because these are on the agenda). However, the bigger question will be how the AU-EU relationship will be leveraged within the wider global setting, in support of the global system of governance?



This discussion comes at the same time that the EU and South Africa are celebrating 10 years of their Strategic Partnership. Much of what is discussed as part of EU-Africa relations is relevant to EU-South Africa relations. EU-South Africa relations are in many respects a pre-configuration of the EU's relations with Africa as whole.

The relationship between the EU and Africa is changing, and with the upcoming summit there is a huge opportunity to make this one different from the ones before. The notion that the EU-Africa relationship is an indispensable one has become much more prevalent, not only because of shared values between the EU and Africa, but in particular due to shared interests.

Within the GS, 'interests' are very prominent. The world is very challenging. Economic conditions within the EU have greatly improved over the last two years. However, politically speaking challenges remain. The outside world has changed considerably since the EU's first Security Strategy in 2003. The global context is being challenged by insecurity, terrorism, and migration. These issues put Africa, politically, at the centre of a discussion and debate in the EU, not only at the institutional level, but also at the individual, member state level.

The elections in Germany, for example, highlight that at the member state level the issues of terrorism and migration can win or lose elections. Both terrorism and migration are linked to Africa, and this is an important starting point. On the other hand, and also quite a new phenomenon, is Africa's own recent development. Africa's development trajectory has been a positive one, and one that is seen as an

opportunity. Growth on the continent will contribute to result in growth for the EU.

The EU is not, however, blind to the challenges: while there is much potential arising from the continent reaching a tipping point, there are still challenges to take on. In this aspect, the EU can help, and by pursuing the opportunities overcome the challenges.

When looking at the issue of security, over the last two years within the EU there has been a complete turnaround of perspective and approach. The EU acknowledges the proximity of Africa to Europe, and that what happens in the Sahel and in the Horn of Africa has a direct impact on the continent. The EU has realised that it has to invest physically in security on the continent. In Mali, 15 EU member states are involved in security relations, either being part of the UN operations or part of the EU's military or civil operations – Belgium, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands are all involved in Mali.

Migration has profoundly changed the terms of reference, of how the EU and AU work together. It is a challenging issue, and one which is politically extremely sensitive, but one which in the last two years has been acknowledged by both parties to be a shared problem. The EU and the AU can only solve this challenge through co-management. Migration is sensitive because it is about returning people to Africa, opening borders for legal migration, but it is also where the EU and the AU have common goals and responsibilities in combatting human trafficking and avoiding loss of life in the Mediterranean and the Sahara Desert. The EU can work with the AU to invest in attacking the root causes of migration, invest in the fragile zones, in security border controls on the African continent. These are clear shared interests, which can form the best foundations for partnerships.

At the global level there are two contradictory worldviews. Contrary to the Trump administration and its ideas of sovereignty and national interests, President Tusk of the European Council presents the view of a multilateral world order. Only through working together can the EU and Africa confront the challenges together. This message is projected by all EU member states. The EU stands for multilateralism, partnership, and this is how the EU wants to work increasingly with Africa. It is not about competing with Africa, but about working together.

There is, therefore, a completely new realisation and political importance being given to Africa and this is hopefully the case when Africa regards the EU. It would appear to be that there is indeed a change towards the EU from the African perspective. Gone is the time when the world was focused on China. Sometimes, the EU does not communicate well in collectively projecting what it does, but the Sahel and the Horn of Africa are two cases in point where the EU contribution through military and security budget support is self-explanatory: The EU has emerged as a reliable partner of Africa, not only evidenced in the past, but something that can be built upon in the future.

There is one thing in particular that differentiates the EU from other countries that partner with Africa. Europe and Africa are closely connected, so much so that whatever affects one will affect the other. This kind of interconnectivity is not

shared to such a degree with other partners like China or the US. It is this interconnectivity and geographical proximity that defines the relationship between the EU and Africa.

When looking towards the summit, two central themes are the 'youth' and connecting from the 'bottom-up'. This time around, the bottom-up dynamic has been achieved far more than previous summits, and this is largely due to the African Commission and the Africa partners, which have embraced both themes.

Youth is an African theme in and of itself. The demographic reality is such that it needs to be made central. The projected figures for 2050 are 2 billion inhabitants in Africa, versus 500 million inhabitants in Europe. This imbalance will need to be considered. What the EU would like to bring to the summit can therefore be summarised as focusing on the following issues: migration, radicalisation, inclusive economics and creating jobs. The EU wants to address inclusive politics and transformation. In the next few years the African continent will go through rapid and profound transformation.

On matters of peace and security, the EU engages more widely on the continent, and this goes beyond financing peacekeeping operations with the African peacekeeping facility. The setting up of the Peace Fund will balance the EU's funding and lay to rest issues of dependency. The EU will continue to engage, and would like to contribute to the Peace Fund in order to facilitate its set-up and joint use. The UN system is also an avenue for funding African peacekeeping.

The GS also anticipates the creation of a defence organisation, as part of the European Union integration agenda. Europe would become a security provider and Africa would be the first to benefit through its creation.

The perspective that the EU has patronised governance issues in Africa has to be overcome. The EU will maintain its values as part of the EU-AU relationship. Much progress in holding peaceful elections has been made, where concessions have become the norm. The Gambia has been an important illustration of this, as well as in this country [South Africa], and in the region. It is something however, that outgoing leaders will have to come to terms with. The EU will indeed need to find the smartest and best ways to further this agenda without being seen to be imposing these issues.

Migration as a challenge has a continental dimension to it. So far, the EU has developed discussions on challenges that affect its migration agenda in particular regions such as the Horn of Africa, but they need to be extended to the entire continent, which will form part of the political dimension of the summit. The concrete output of these discussions will be job creation.

The EU is Africa's primary partner in investment and development assistance, but there is a need to create jobs. Aid cannot be solely relied on, but investment is crucial and for this reason the European Commission has pledged more than €4 billion with blending, and a guaranteed fund within it that should be able to leverage €40 billion worth of investment. The EU wants these investments to be focused on job creation and not just on infrastructure (although this is not entirely

excluded). The agricultural industry, digital economy and new energy have been identified as key issues.

Finally, in the area of global governance there is significant potential for the partnership, as has been shown on the SDGs, and also on climate change. For the EU, Africa is seen as a 'swing' continent on issues of governance and global governance. As has been made clear already, Africa is almost half the global membership, and that will have a determining factor. The EU way is to balance values and interests, and there is no opposition between the two. From the EU perspective, the partnership will work with Africa and not for Africa.

Only the leaders can direct where the summit will go, and what kind of atmosphere there will be. This will influence the discussion on post-Cotonou relations. Whatever does happen with the ACP and on Cotonou, the EU would like to strengthen the African dimension. The EU is committed to this and there is much anticipation as to the extent Africa will also do so. While it is true to say that the EU is far most institutionally grounded and its integration project more advanced than that of the AU, is Africa ready to partner using the AU as its central interlocutor? This is still yet to be discussed in the near future, but something to be built on.

AMBASSADOR GHULAM ASMAL



The relationship between the two continents reflects the geopolitical realities of the world. It is quite obvious, for instance, that under colonialism that there was an exploitative relationship between Africa and Europe. Some of the division that festered during that period still exists, for example, in the divide between the Anglophone countries, and the Francophone countries. This was further exacerbated by the Cold War, which saw tremendous disunity among nations in Africa, depending on the camps that they belonged to.

The post-Cold War period gave Africa some breathing space, and during that period there was an emergence of African programmes, like the Agenda 2063, NEPAD, which focused strictly on African developmental issues. Now, in the post-post-colonial era, major international players like the US and organisations such as the EU, and including some countries in Europe, are beginning to look inward and disengage from Africa. This provides Africa an opportunity to forge its own destiny.

One issue that needs to be brought forward. This is the issue of skirmishes between the Western Sahara and Morocco. At the last summit it was decided that the partnership be renamed the EU-AU summit. This implies the inclusion of all members of the AU and all members of the EU. Africa will decide its membership. This is an internal issue, and an African issue. There are several AU summit decisions reiterating that the Western Sahara should participate in the AU as an equal member. It is hoped that the turbulence experienced at previous summits will not be repeated, where much time and energy that could have been spent on addressing major issues, was wasted.

There is a crucial disjuncture between the AU and the EU, and this primarily because the EU is a supranational entity in structure, and the AU is intergovernmental. Within the EU and in terms of the Lisbon Treaty, much of the sovereignty of its members has been ceded to the EU. The AU however, is made up of 55-member states each with their own national interests, rights and obligations. This is further complicated by the fact that certain EU member countries are forging independent partnerships outside the EU. For example, France in Africa, Portugal in Africa, and Italy in Africa. It is not clear whether these dynamics are helpful to Africa's multilateral project or not.

Furthermore, the bilateral relations between some EU member states in certain African countries, primarily the major economies, have matured enough to engage. As a collective entity, the smaller member states' needs must be taken into account. The previous AU membership has several strategic priorities. Final preparations are being made on Africa's deliberations, but there needs to be less focus on priorities and more on outcomes. Investing in people, education and skills development, resilience to peace and security and investment in African structural transformation are Africa's focus for the summit. Many of these issues have been recurring ones. There is no evaluation mechanism, or at least a mid-term evaluation to gauge progress.

Regarding peace and security, Africa sees migration from a different perspective. Europe primarily views migration as a securitisation issue, but from the African perspective it is a developmental one. There is a need to get to the root causes and address those issues that aim to prevent migration. The Libyan issue can be linked directly to the current migration crisis. Africa did provide warnings on disintegration, which were ignored. Had they been listened to, insecurities in Mali may not have arisen.

Africa sees the partnership from a developmental perspective. Whereas Africa has previously been on the receiving end of aid, it is now looking for trade and long-lasting developmental means. The African continent has a growing middle class, and is now in the unique position of having many other 'suitors' vying for its attentions. Africa has prospects with Asia, FOCAC, with India. The critical issue for Africa will be to lead with the issues on the 2018 Roadmap, concerning migration, good governance, human rights, and financial cleanliness [integrity], and industrialisation. Africa is focusing more on the ocean economy for development purposes, such as addressing the scourges of unemployment and poverty.



The relationship between the AU and the EU is an important one, and one which is more institutionalised than is often given credit. The AU as an interlocutor for Africa also plays a significant role within Africa's multilateral relationships. This is a theme picked up on in Paul Kagame's report published earlier this year on the future of the AU, where the need to rationalise Africa's international partnerships is highlighted, along with the recommendation that the AU should take over the role as the chief negotiator in many of them. This relates to obvious relationships such as the FOCAC, which is based on the principle of summitry, and which the EU and Africa have deepened as a practice as a result of the JAES. The institutional dimension that the EU-AU relationship offers is worthy of emulating elsewhere, such as in the FOCAC.

One of the main points that has arisen from the presentations has been the idea of moving beyond state-centricity, and the idea of getting much more input from the bottom up in the consultation process. For the past 10 years in the AU-EU relationship, the fleeting attempts to engage both the youth and civil society are again being revived. These aspects tie into the sustainability of the relationship over the 10 years. The upcoming youth summit is only the fourth taking place, in spite of the fact that there have been eight college-to-college AU-EU commission meetings. This is important because there is still a long way to go in terms of bridging the gap with respect to understanding issues in a mutually agreeable way. It is easy to put together a youth summit or a civil society event and not follow up between summit meetings. The initiatives therefore, that are currently happening, should be applauded.

The two main points that need to be brought forward in terms of the partnership and its institutional dimension, is the focus on a bottom-up approach and the

limited interest in Europe and the EU evident in this part of the world [South Africa]. There are present at this meeting, the only two institutions who have dedicated programmes on European studies in South Africa, and arguably in sub-Saharan Africa. There is a one-person operation in Ghana (Accra) that has recently begun a European studies program. At the University of Pretoria, which has the only Jean Monnet Chair in Africa, there were only three students on the regional cooperation and regional integration courses in 2016. There is much more interest in the BRICS group, and in China, but the lack of student interest in Europe and European studies is a fundamental one that needs to be addressed.

There is an inherent negative perception of the EU, and this applies to how the relationship between Europe and Africa is interpreted, which is particularly prevalent in the South African context, where the proximity of history and settler colonialism is still close and resonates strongly. This perception and manner of interpretation is not necessarily present in other parts of sub-Saharan Africa.

There are a few issues that will need to be addressed going forward in relations between the EU and the AU. The first is that there is a need to listen to each other. The relationship between the EU and AU has been established within the context of a 'partnership'. However, it is clearly not a true partnership, but, as Dr Oloruntoba has pointed out, is an asymmetrical one. This aspect is one which needs to be given attention especially as the power in that asymmetrical relationship resides with the EU. There have been over the course of the relationship many sleights and oversights, which have resonated with Africa; for example, even when the EU-AU partnership was being negotiated, high level officials from the EU swept in and walked out an hour later leaving lesser ranked officials to finalise the negotiations.

The other aspect that needs to be pointed out, and ties into what has already been presented, is the avoidance of 'easy own goals'. The EPAs were obviously going to be controversial, but the way that they were packaged continues to resonate in a negative manner. The belief that the EPAs will sway those who are against it is probably incomplete. In the same way the Libyan issue – although not to contradict what has been presented before – is often cited, especially in South African academic circles as proof of the nefarious motivations of Europe, although there are many subtleties; it is well known that South Africa voted in the UNSC for resolution 1973, it is equally well known that South Africa and Africa at the AU vacillated a lot in this process and it could be argued that history has to a certain extent, been re-written on this issue. These are instances where the perception is very negative of the EU, despite this not being an EU initiative. Perhaps, had diplomacy and patience been employed, different results would have been achieved.

DISCUSSION

Receding multilateralism as a trend in the global system of governance should provide an opportunity for closer interactions between the EU and Africa. Multilateralism too, could present Africa with greater opportunities. It was also

highlighted that there is always a question of equality within a partnership where one partner is the lender and the other is a borrower, between a former colonial power and newly independent nations.

The discussion session noted that there are a lot of partnerships between Africa and the EU that are working well at the functional level and that there is a tendency to view these partnerships from the top down, but there are many linkages underneath that support their functioning. This is the case with the science and energy partnerships. However, they are challenged when they become politicised and many questions have arisen around nuclear power. South Africa has been approached to engage on nuclear power issues. But how nuclear energy compares to other options such as to modular green energy, for example, should be considered as nuclear power is very costly and unaffordable in poorer states.

How to coordinate civil society engagement was raised as an important issue and that there are currently no coordination and no networking between them. It was suggested that the institutions need to be more visible and through the University of Johannesburg and the University of Pretoria create a coordination platform to this end. It was noted that not enough research and establishing opportunities for engagement was being done in bringing the voice of non-state actors into multilateral frameworks.

It was pointed out that the EU is very aware of the areas where progress is needed in the partnership and the challenges of the upcoming summit. Agenda 2063 has been used by the EU as a guide in its preparations for the summit, although many issues still need to be addressed at the leadership level. One in particular is the need to have an honest discussion on past bilateral relationships. It was noted that certain common agendas are more advanced on the EU side, but that bilateral relationships were also complimentary.

There is much anticipation to deepen the relationship between the two continents, seen as imbued with much potential by the EU. It is assumed that the AU has much to gain as well. The differences in structure – the AU having a Secretariat rather than having supranational powers – was mentioned and that if Africa wants to be heard at the global level it needs to speak with one voice. This applies to the circumstances of the UNSC. If the AU PSC sets an agenda and takes a position, it is very difficult in New York to refuse. In whichever way it is viewed, it will be a different AU or institutional process than the one which has already past, but speaking with one voice is important. The AU has shown how effective this can be in the case of climate change and the SDGs. This kind of partnering is required elsewhere on areas of shared interest.

The issue of geographical proximity was highlighted as having a direct and inescapable effect on the Africa and Europe relationship. Both continents have a vested interest in maintaining a robust relationship. One of the elements that make the relationship robust is the ability to talk openly and frankly. It is important to ensure that the relationship endures. Where the partnership could maintain its relevance, especially in light of competing attention from other potential partners, is in the areas of science and technology, space, agriculture, the blue economy, and education. The EU provides large amounts of funding support to many research institutions and businesses. Aside from (the historic) trade, and

while aid is contentious as well as the security dimension, these are the most exciting parts of the relationship and will keep the partnership buoyant.

The proceedings were followed by the launch of the special issue of the SAJIA

This Special Issue of the South African Journal of International Affairs Volume 42(2) on the EU-South Africa Strategic Partnership has been guest edited by the SARChI in African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy at the University of Johannesburg. Authors for this selection of articles were drawn from both hemispheres for their perspectives on the EU-South Africa Strategic Partnership over the past ten years. Its production marks a fresh and innovative take on the progresses and challenges encountered, and provides important input for practitioners and academics alike.

South African Journal of International Affairs

Volume 24 Number 2 June 2017

Special Issue: Reviewing the first decade of the EU-South Africa Strategic Partnership

Guest Editors: Lesley Masters and Lara Hierro

Editorial:

Ten years of the EU-South Africa Strategic Partnership - Lesley Masters and Lara Hierro

An Overview of the EU-SA Strategic Partnership 10 years on: Diverging world views, persisting interests - Chris Landsberg and Lara Hierro

Economic, trade and development relations between South Africa and the European Union: The end of a strategic partnership? A South African perspective - Mills Soko and Mzukisi Qobo

The EU-South Africa Strategic Partnership: Waning affection, persisting economic interests - Sven Grimm and Christine Hackenesch

Short term interests, long term perspectives: Balancing South Africa's peace and security approach in the EU-SA Strategic Partnership - Lara Hierro

The undoing of a unique relationship? Peace and security in the EU-South Africa Strategic Partnership - Toni Haastrup

The EU-South Africa Strategic Partnership: From bilateral to multilateral forums and the strategic value for South Africa - Lesley Masters

The EU-South Africa Strategic Partnership and global environmental governance: Towards effective multilateralism after Copenhagen? - Camilla Adelle and John Kotsopoulos

Situating the European Union within South Africa's foreign policy calculus - Philani Mthembu

SARChI in African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy in conjunction with the
Friedrich Ebert Stiftung present a

Panel Discussion on EU-AU Relations: Prospects and Challenges

Wednesday 4th October 2017

12h30-15h00

Venue: Premier Hotel,
Stanza Bopape Street, Pretoria

PROGRAMME

12h00	Registration (tea and coffee available from this time)
12h30	Panel Discussion 'EU-AU Relations: Prospects and Challenges' Welcome: Prof Mzukisi Qobo, Deputy Director, SARChI African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, University of Johannesburg Chair: Prof Chris Landsberg, SARChI African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, University of Johannesburg Speaker: Dr Samuel O Oloruntoba, Thabo Mbeki African Leadership Institute Speaker: Dr Lesley Masters, SARChI African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, University of Johannesburg Speaker: Mr. Koen Vervaeke, Managing Director for Africa, European Union Speaker: Ambassador Ghulam H Asmal, Director: NEPAD and Partnerships, Department of International Relations and Cooperation Respondent: Dr John Kotsopoulos, Senior Research Fellow, Centre for the Study of Governance Innovation, University of Pretoria
13h35-14h00	General discussion/Q&A
14h00	Break

14h15 Launch Special Issue Volume 24, Issue 2:
Reviewing a Decade of EU-SA
Strategic Partnership

Chair: Tamara Naidoo, FES Johannesburg

Remarks: Mr. Jobst von Kirchmann, Head of Unit, Development Policy
Southern Africa and the Indian Ocean, EU

Remarks: Dr Lara Hierro, Post-doctoral Research Fellow, SARChI African
Diplomacy and Foreign Policy

Thanks: Tamara Naidoo, FES Johannesburg

15h00 End: Cocktail reception

Organising / corresponding team

Dr Lesley Masters

lmasters@uj.ac.za;

Dr Lara Hierro

larah@uj.ac.za;

Tamara Naidoo (FES)

Tamara.Naidoo@fes-southafrica.org

Nabila Noor Mohamed

nabilanm@uj.ac.za

NRF Chair of African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy



The NRF SARCHI Chair: African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy is a research and postgraduate research and teaching initiative under the aegis of the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Johannesburg. It seeks to respond to the fluctuating state of Africa's international affairs by developing a research and outreach agenda embedded in strong basic and applied primary research.

The NRF SARCHI Chair is committed to engaging in research that bridges the divide between the worlds of theory and practice/decision making. It adopts an interdisciplinary approach on the nexus between domestic politics and foreign policy, and implements a multi-dimensional research agenda, comprising a focus on South African foreign policy; African diplomacy; African integration at continental, regional and sub-regional levels; and Africa's cooperation with, and search for strategic partnerships with the outside world.

In terms of diplomacy, the emphasis of our work is on investigating the dimensions of African peace and security, development and stability, a continental development agenda, and Africa's international cooperation. This includes issues such as the national challenge of honing and refining South Africa's national interests within its 'African Agenda'; and, the continental challenge of researching Africa's inter-state and international relations with a view to enhancing African agency on the world stage.

The Chair's vision of being "a Pan-African research and post-graduate development centre of international repute engaging in African challenges through rigorous research in diplomacy and foreign policy" is being gradually borne out through the work of the Chair-holder, Professor Chris Landsberg, and his team at the Centre.



National
Research
Foundation



science and technology
Department:
Science and Technology
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung

The Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES) shares a long common history with the African National Congress (ANC) and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU). From the 1980s FES supported not only the ANC in exile but also its liaison office in the then West-Germany. Within South Africa FES gave its support to the nascent black trade union movement mainly through university-based labour support organisations. Towards the late eighties the FES also facilitated dialogue between the opposition in exile and reform oriented quarters within the white establishment.

The FES was able to open in 1991 its first official office in Cape Town, which was subsequently moved to Johannesburg in 1993. Dialogue and consultation but also capacity building was offered by the FES to assist in the process of political transformation and to prepare the ANC for future government.

Before and after the 1994 elections the FES contributed with research and capacity building to the constitution-making process. Simultaneously the FES offered training and advice to the South African trade unions.

In the area of international relations FES was instrumental in setting up a new policy think tank, the “Institute of Global Dialogue” (IGD). The IGD was designed to analyse key issues confronting South Africa and southern Africa in mercurial international environment and to develop appropriate strategies for them.

Up to the present, the FES works in close cooperation with the ANC, COSATU and different civil society organisations for a better socio-economic development and for gender equality in South Africa and with the IGD on issues of international concern.