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Abstract

In this era of globalisation and rapid urbanisation, can city-to-city partnerships provide a unique approach towards contributing to the development needs of South African cities? There is a growing literature dedicated to North-South and South-South municipal international cooperation, exploring impacts on local governance and development, for either or both of the cities. However, there is a paucity of knowledge on this topic in South Africa. This project hopes to address this critical occlusion by examining Johannesburg’s experience of city-to-city cooperation partnerships.

These partnerships will be examined with reference to how they are organised and their implementation. Has cooperation provided social and economic development in Johannesburg as agreements often state? To answer the research questions, an in-depth understanding of city-to-city partnerships in South Africa is required; therefore a qualitative data collection approach was adopted. City-to-city cooperation crosses geographical borders, and this study investigates how it also extends across theories, government spheres and topics.

The research traces policy and practice of international city-to-city cooperation relationships, identifying the salient aspects of these city-level engagements and incorporates a critical view of policy documents that frame municipal international relations in South Africa, specifically in Johannesburg. The research shows that international city-to-city cooperation agreements should be greeted with a degree of scepticism in terms of the disparity between the agreement’s objectives, and the practical experience of implementation. Municipal international relations are an interesting exercise in city autonomy in the global economy, yet they are often conscribed by provincial and national government requirements.
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>AU</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>DTI</td>
<td>Department of Trade and Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERU</td>
<td>External Relations Unit</td>
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<td>GCR</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
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<tr>
<td>GDS</td>
<td>Growth Development Strategy</td>
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<td>GSPCR</td>
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<td>IBSA</td>
<td>India Brazil South Africa Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Integrated Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGR</td>
<td>Governance and Intergovernmental Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIKE</td>
<td>Johannesburg Innovation and Knowledge Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>Local Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIC</td>
<td>Municipal International Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILE</td>
<td>Municipal Institute of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIR</td>
<td>Municipal International Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for Africa’s Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACN</td>
<td>South African Cities Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern African Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALGA</td>
<td>South African Local Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Sister Cities International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATSA</td>
<td>Statistics South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUT</td>
<td>Tshwane University of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLG</td>
<td>United Cities and Local Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLGA</td>
<td>United Cities and Local Governments of Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVSG</td>
<td>Association of Flemish Cities and Municipalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1 – Introduction

In this era of rapid urbanisation, roughly fifty percent of the world’s population are urban dwellers (Bekker and Fourchard, 2013). Saunders (2011: 1) asserts that “we will end this century as a wholly urban species” given the current rate of urbanisation. South Africa mimics this trend. The country is home to roughly 51 million people (Stats SA, 2012: 14), 62% of whom live in cities (SACN, 2013). Because of this large concentration of people, cities have become a critical focal point of development related challenges and opportunities (Pieterse, 2008; Bekker and Fourchard, 2013). Dealing with issues such as service delivery, poverty alleviation, coping with an influx of residents, while also providing social and economic development, has increasingly become the domain of local governments worldwide (UCLG, 2013). It is in this context that city-to-city cooperation has become popular as a means of addressing these issues by learning from other’s experiences, sharing knowledge, and thereby finding solutions to these specifically ‘urban problems’ (Bontenbal and van Lindert, 2009; Municipal International Relations Policy Framework, 1999; UCLG, 2013).

City-to-city cooperation (C2C) is also termed municipal international relations (MIR), cooperation (MIC), twinning, sister city partnership, city link, jumelage1, decentralised cooperation, and strategic alliances (Van Ewijk, 2008: 5; Buis, 2009; De Villiers, 2005). Zelinsky (1991: 1) referred to these international city-level relationships as “something new and exciting if not necessarily revolutionary”. Harie (2012: 6) suggests, these relationships are “complex phenomena” because this international cooperation places the local municipality at the forefront of international relations. They become entrepreneurs applying new and unique methods to encourage interest in their particular city (Cremer et al., 2001: 378). Local governments have not only become international actors, but also development actors as well (UCLG, 2013). It is this embedded complexity in city-to-city cooperation that will be explored in this research project, focusing specifically on Johannesburg’s international relationships.

1 “Jumelage” is the French term for city twinning (L’association Jumelages Ile de France, 2014)
Historically, city twinning arose in the early twentieth century in Europe. These international partnerships were notably buoyed after the Second World War, as they became a mechanism to assist in post war reconciliation and reconstruction, and involved municipalities from previously hostile countries (Furmankiewics, 2005: 146; Van Ewijk, 2008: 6). In the United States of America (U.S.A), President Eisenhower championed a “people-to-people diplomacy” approach in 1956, encouraging city twinning and leading to the establishment of the Sister City International (SCI) organisation (Furmankiewics, 2005: 146; Zelinsky, 1991: 7). While these city twinnings may have appeared “heavily festooned with altruistic objectives,” they were initially designed to fit into the U.S.A.’s cold war strategy (Zelinsky, 1991: 7). National politics and city twinning have always been connected, sometimes more covertly than others.

In more current partnerships, city-to-city cooperation tends to refer to knowledge sharing between municipal staff from the connected cities, and is therefore also known as “colleague-to-colleague” information sharing (Van Ewijk, 2008). It is an approach that often centres on enhancing the capacity of municipalities through this knowledge sharing process (Van Ewijk, 2008). City-to-city cooperation can further be seen in terms of development cooperation, where local governments are the main development actors (Van Ewijk, 2008: 5, UCLG, 2013). This research project focuses on North-South and South-South cooperation by examining a city positioned in the global South and its international city partners as they engage in development cooperation projects.

**Main and related research questions**

This research is framed by my main research question which concerns the development characteristics of the City of Johannesburg’s partnership agreements with designated international cities. Are Johannesburg’s transnational city-to-city cooperation partnerships realistic tools for development? To answer this main question, a number of related queries will be examined. What motivated the city’s particular agreements? Who are the key stakeholders involved? What are some of the variables that affect these relationships? How do these partnerships fit into the city’s development strategies and the larger national policies?
My research project examines a contemporary urban phenomenon that has fairly recently emerged in development discourse; as such there is a paucity of knowledge on transnational city-to-city partnerships in South Africa (Ruffin, 2013). Research on the effect that city twinning has on cities in the global South has expanded as its potential for attaining development objectives, through peer-to-peer exchange, knowledge sharing and capacity strengthening, has been positively identified (see: Breeman, 2012; Bontenbal, 2009; Chapisa, 2011; De Villiers, 2005-2009; Van Ewijk and Buis, 2009). It is a topic calling out for increased investigation, not least because of its possible developmental effects, including contributing towards poverty alleviation and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (Bontenbal and van Lindert, 2009: 131), but also because city-to-city cooperation has been encouraged in South African national policy, most notably in the Municipal International Relations (MIR) policy framework of 1999.

Cities as international actors have not been significantly explored in the South African context. Zondi (2012: 43) mentions, foreign relations studies have only recently moved from a state-centrist approach to an understanding that “states do not enjoy a monopoly of space, voice and influence in international affairs”. Thus South African international relations literature has not significantly dealt with non-state actors such as local or provincial governments and NGOs (Zondi, 2012). City-to-city cooperation can also provide a unique view of the global-local interface through its focus on urban issues and their relevance for development policy and practice (Cremer et al., 2001). My study will situate the experiences of Johannesburg within the wider context of transnational cooperation in South Africa and the global South.

In examining Johannesburg’s experience, an understanding of the nature and role of the city itself is required. The city denotes a specific “administrative status, population size […] or economic function” and demonstrates a particular “urban personality” (Beall and Fox, 2009: 3). Cities are situated at the forefront of the global economy (Ong, 2011) because they are “sources of economic dynamism” and are “crucial sites of social, political and cultural interaction and fusion” (Turok and Parnell, 2009: 160 and 161). According to Van Der Pluijm and Melissen (2007: 6), cities are the “one socio-political unit that is growing in power in the
era of globalisation,” which suggests that other more traditional spaces of power, such as the state, are waning. The worldwide processes of urbanisation, globalisation, decentralisation, and privatisation have prioritised the role of the city and pushed the structures governing urban areas into the forefront; they have also been the impetus behind current city-to-city cooperation (De Villiers et al. 2008: 17; and Turok and Parnell, 2009).

Urban areas serve a variety of essential roles, and can cause dire social, economic and political consequences should they fail to function effectively (Turok and Parnell, 2009). One of the benefits of international twinning is that it can connect cities as partners that are able to tackle urban challenges more effectively together (Bontenbal and Van Lindert, 2009; and VVSG, 2011). The range of actors involved in municipal international partnerships includes both government and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) or representatives, thus broadening the avenues and types of cooperation that are possible to address urban issues (Bontenbal, 2009). Jayne et al. (2013) and Hsu (2003) noted that twinning relationships can illustrate how cities demonstrate their “agency” in the wider national and global, economic and political structure. In my research I examine this “agency” in Johannesburg while also noting that even though local governments in South Africa are autonomous, they are dependent on national and provincial policies and actions and their agency may be somewhat constricted by this.

It is estimated that 70% of cities globally are involved in one or another form of international cooperation, such as: sister city, city twinning, city networks, and municipal international cooperation (Bontenbal and Van Lindert, 2009: 131). Although various terms are used to refer to transnational city level cooperation, there are generally no distinctions in nomenclature, and the terms are used interchangeably (Bontenbal and Van Lindert, 2009). The term ‘city-to-city cooperation’ is often used in this research as it encompasses all of these variants, including municipal level partnerships that cross international boundaries (De Villiers et al., 2007). Cities in the global North have at least historically determined the scope of the transnational cooperation that they engage in with cities in the global South (Buis, 2009). This has created an unequal power dynamic which will be taken into account within this research, while also noting that partnerships do not occur in isolation and therefore research will be situated with the broader national context.
Aims of the study

This research project explores various facets of the City of Johannesburg’s city-to-city cooperation partnerships. The overall objective of this research is to shed some light on which actors/stakeholders are involved in international city-to-city cooperation in Johannesburg and their experiences of the phenomena as a mechanism to address urban development challenges. The motivations and processes involved in the agreements and partnerships will be examined to fulfil this objective. Thus identifying development-related objectives, as stipulated in city-to-city cooperation agreements and the effectiveness of cooperation in delivering these objectives will be examined. How these partnerships are presented in the media and in a variety of reports will show what is expected of these partnerships and how beneficial or successful they are deemed to be. The results of this research will add to the limited area of study in South Africa and may be representative, or at least similar, of the broader experience of North-South and South-South relationships in South Africa and beyond. Since these transnational agreements involve international municipal partnerships between cities of different sizes and development levels, the degree of mutuality and reciprocity of these relationships will be investigated, as it is assumed these dynamics would affect the outcome of the cooperation. The nature of these partnerships is explored from the perspective of those involved in their operationalisation in Johannesburg with the city being the primary research site.

Research site

This research is based on Johannesburg’s experiences of city-to-city cooperation; therefore the research site is the City of Johannesburg. The city is located in South Africa’s most populous province – Gauteng (the Local Government Handbook, 2012b: no page. The city is 1,645km2 in size, with a population of approximately 4,434,827 and its mineral rich surroundings have made it an important gold and diamond mining area (the Local Government Handbook, 2012a: no page). It is a highly “desirable” but complex location with a high rate of migration into the city (Rubin, 2013).

This research is focused particularly on the local government level. It is a self-styled ‘world-class African city,’ as declared on the city’s logo. Bremner (2010: 2) highlights the often
conflicting sides of Johannesburg one is its concern with the “modernist project” of “renewal, reconstruction and empowerment” and the other, the “undisciplined urban practices” such as “extended networks of migration, expanding informal settlements, fortified housing estates and violent crime”. Mbembe and Nuttall (2008: 1) refer to Johannesburg as the “premier African metropolis” and “the symbol par excellence of the ‘African modern’,” suggesting its uniqueness and importance in the continent. Johannesburg is thus positioned as both an African and a global city, framing its partnerships in a potentially unique light as it is not the typical city of the “global South”.

My research takes place within the metropolitan municipality of the City of Johannesburg which is surrounded by two other metropolitan municipalities, namely Tshwane and Ekurhuleni. Gauteng Province is also home to two district municipalities, Sedibeng and West Rand, as well as seven\(^2\) smaller local municipalities (SALGA, 2011: no page). Figure 1 below shows Gauteng Province and the position of the metropolitan municipalities and district municipalities; the City of Johannesburg is shown in the centre of the province.

---

\(^2\) The local municipalities in Gauteng are: Randfontein, Westonaria, Mogale City, Merafong, Emfuleni, Midvaal and Lesedi (SALGA, 2011).
The City of Johannesburg has been involved in a range of long-term transnational city partnerships both prior to and post 1994. Partner cities have been located in almost every continent, including cities from European, North American, Asian and African countries. During the course of this report, a number of these relationships are explored according to their partnership agreements. Past and present officials in local government who have experience developing or maintaining these transnational partnerships make up the interview respondents which included members of the Central Strategy Unit (C.S.U.) within the Executive Mayor’s office, and the Strategy and Relations Unit, as well as other expert respondents.

**Overview of upcoming chapters**

This report continues with Chapter 2, a literature review consisting of the various theories that underpin city-to-city cooperation, and the practical case studies of international city partnerships from South Africa and around the globe. Chapter 3 details the methodology that was employed during this research, a qualitative approach which relied on gathering and analysing both primary and secondary data. In-depth, expert interviews were conducted with individuals involved in or with knowledge of cooperation agreements. An analysis of documents such as formal agreements, policies, frameworks and reports was undertaken. Chapter 4 is the first chapter that deals with the empirical findings. It provides a context to Johannesburg’s international city-to-city partnerships by examining policies, stakeholders and the general experience of these urban partnerships in South Africa. Chapter 5 focuses specifically on Johannesburg’s past and present partnerships and how the city’s approach to international relations has changed. Chapter 6 is the concluding chapter that brings together the key findings of the report and suggests recommendations for future research. Lastly, various appendices are included such as the interview list, consent form, information sheet and tables of relevant empirical data.

The report findings indicate that international city-to-city cooperation is a complex political and economic linkage between two cities and their provincial and national environment. The research shows that international city-to-city agreements, specifically twinning agreements, should be greeted with a degree of scepticism in terms of how the literature and guiding documents describe its purpose and characteristics and how the practical
experience of implementing these agreements can differ from this. While the intention cited in formal agreements may be social and economic development for Johannesburg municipality, it is often unclear if the partnerships can effectively address the stated development goals.
Chapter 2 – Literature Review

Literature on international city-to-city cooperation demonstrates a wide breadth of theoretical and practical perspectives. The phenomena are relatively recent additions to public-management, urban studies, international relations, geography and development cooperation discourses. Further suggesting that this is a growing field, in 2009 Habitat International Journal devoted an entire issue to city-to-city theories and case studies. The theoretical literature examined relates to the emergence of these international engagements in an increasingly globalised and urbanised world. The case studies examined in this chapter highlight the range in perspectives by examining different regions and aspects of city-to-city cooperation. In exploring the issue of city-to-city cooperation, literature on a number of interrelated topics such as the city, global processes, governance and urban development is discussed below. This chapter is divided into sections that define the key concepts, explain the relevant theories and examine a range of local and international case studies.

Emerging concepts

Roughly 70% of cities globally are involved in international cooperation such as “sister city agreements, international city networks, partnerships and programmes” (Bontenbal and Van Lindert, 2009: 131). This dispersion of local-level international partnerships has gained prominence as local urban issues have become increasingly globalised through processes such as democratisation and decentralisation; globalisation and communication improvements; privatisation; as well as the increasing involvement of international NGOs in urban development and service delivery (De Villiers et al. 2008: 17). South Africa is no exception to this global trend of increased city-to-city cooperation. Campbell (2011) asserts that in the increasingly globalised world city-to-city cooperation has become an essential tool. It has forced cities to be more competitive to attract investments, something that city-to-city cooperation can encourage. Furthermore, Campbell (2011) states that because mayors’ terms can be short, learning from the experiences of other cities offers a quick approach to addressing issues.
The term city-to-city cooperation was first introduced by the UNDP in 2000 for World Habitat Day (Bontenbal and Van Lindert, 2009: 131) when it was proclaimed as “an effective way of mobilising large-scale development resources, to actively exchange best practices and to improve the management capacity of cities in the developing world” (Tjandradewi et al., 2006: 359). An underlying assumption has been that municipalities from developing economies could benefit more through engagements with developed cities. According to Tjandradewi and Marcotullio (2009: 165), the term city-to-city cooperation refers to “all possible forms of relationships between local authorities at any level in two or more countries that are collaborating together for mutual interest and benefits, with or without external support.” This definition widens the parameters of cooperation, as it includes all varieties of collaborations. While limiting the focus on developing cities, it insists that cooperation be of mutual benefit to both parties.

City-to-city cooperation may be an “umbrella term,” but international engagements between local governments can occur in a variety of specific configurations. Van Ewijk and Baud (2009: 220) refer to three distinctions in the nature of the engagements:

“networks (defined as relatively loose forms of cooperation, characterised by horizontal exchanges of information of information, lacking a hierarchy and a long-term commitment); cooperation (a form of organised interaction towards a common end for mutual benefit); and partnerships (highly structured forms of cooperation, with long-term commitments, concrete activities, a form of contract, and participating partners able to operate autonomously).”

Within these three configurations city twinning or sister city relationships can fall under partnerships. City twinning began as “a programme of outreach, citizen exchange and friendship ties” between two communities after the Second World War, and has since burgeoned into “an instrument to build regional unity, to learn from others, and to help accomplish development goals” (De Villiers et al., 2008: 16). Twinning has developed from being a kind of symbolic olive branch to becoming functional partnerships that can affect real developmental changes in cities.
Similarly, sister city relationships involve long-distance and long-term city partnerships which are entered into with formal agreements often without an end date (Zelinsky, 1991: 3). However, “some may be cancelled, suspended, or allowed to wither away for lack of lasting interest” (Zelinsky, 1991: 3). Further complicating their longevity and effectiveness is the fact that there are often no predetermined guidelines between the two cities (Zelinsky, 1991: 3). The agreements are signed by local government officials, often the city’s mayor, and can refer to numerous areas of partnership. Sassen (2006: 480) describes sister cities as “a type of foreign policy by and for cities” and asserts that the partnerships transfer focus away from the nation state as the primary implementer of foreign affairs. Sister cities can “illustrate the global-local interface” according to Cremer et al. (2001: 378), yet with the “intricate workings” involved in each relationship they also go beyond this simple distinction. Therefore Cremer et al. (2001: 378) argue that to effectively examine these relationships requires an understanding of the “politics of locality” and the “individualised operation” of each city.

Local-level partnerships can also be referred to as municipal international cooperation (MIC) or decentralised cooperation (De Villiers et al., 2008: 17) and would fall under the cooperation category that Van Ewijk and Baud (2009) highlighted. MIC is defined as a “link between two or more communities from different nation-states, in which at least one of the key actors is a municipality,” and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) may also be involved (Harie, 2012: 4). Given the sometimes subtle differences between agreements, the cooperation partnerships can be further complicated by terminology, which is often used interchangeably, together with terms such as city linking (Bontebal and Van Lindert, 2009). Hafteck (2003: 333) asserts that even though there are various definitions, decentralised cooperation should be seen as referring to local governments cooperating to reach a specific development goal, and to reach this goal requires exchange of knowledge or provision of support.

**Connecting cities to theory**

The theoretical framing of my research is informed by a variety of disciplines as city-to-city cooperation cuts across a range of issues and can therefore be examined using various theories. Social theory and its engagement with “the urban problem” (Savage and Warde,
1993: 32), as well as theories derived from urban studies, geography and international relations, have been consulted towards addressing the research questions. Cities around the world have been significantly transformed by the interconnectedness entrenched in processes of neoliberal globalisation, urbanisation and decentralisation. Globalisation created new configurations of cities while also re-organising existing cities so that they became increasingly interdependent (Knox and Taylor, 1995; and Van Naerssen, 2001). The ‘global city’, ‘world city’ and ‘world systems theory’ form the initial discussion points, not least because Johannesburg has been self-described as a “world-class African city,” but because these theories form the basis of explanations of this interconnectedness between cities and the evolving role they occupy in the global economy. While these theories alone do not sufficiently engage with cities from Africa and Latin America, or the complex relationships that city-to-city cooperation embodies, they are still useful in understanding the relations between cities in the global North and South.

Wallerstein’s world systems theory (1974) influenced Friedmann’s world city hypothesis (1986) and Sassen’s global city theory (1991) and no doubt countless others. While Wallerstein focused on the interconnectedness between nation states in the capitalist structure, Friedmann and Sassen expanded this to an urban setting, where they saw cities located in the global North as having a dominant position in the global economy. Brown et al. (2010: 13) argue that world systems theory is “explicitly transnational” and concerned with “the spatial dynamics of uneven development”. These transnational and development characteristics are embedded in city-to-city cooperation experiences.

Friedmann (1995: 23/42) identified specific relations of power within the world system and argued that power is determined by the major city’s relation to its periphery and proletariat. Alderson and Beckfield (2004: 812) concur, adding that “the power of world cities is inherently relational: cities do not have power in and of themselves; they have power to the extent that they function as command points and centres of planning and thus establish the framework in which other cities operate in the world economy”. There is a degree of dependence between world cities and less influential cities, as their position is only maintained in relation to other cities. Similarly, while global cities such as London, New York and Paris are competitors in the global economy, they are also reliant on each other and
even complementary (Van Naerssen, 2001: 181). Massey (2007: 7/8) found that global cities have a “tentacular stretching of power relations”; their influence and power can be felt around the world and are the “heartland” of neoliberalism. However, Beaverstock et al. (2000: 132) argue that world cities are “rescaling power relations”, not necessarily diminishing the power of the state as they do so.

Nonetheless these theories can be problematic when confronting urban issues in the global South. Grant (2009: 16) argues that by consistently focusing on cities in the global North especially North America and Europe, world city literature is diminishing its overall theoretical relevance. It therefore does not adequately reflect the urban experience in the global South (Grant, 2009). Similarly, postcolonial scholars emphasise that local histories need to be acknowledged in global spaces, essentially providing space for the “subaltern rationality” in the wider contexts of urban planning (Harrison, as cited in Grant, 2009: 153). Brown et al. (2010: 16) concur and add that “what cities are, and how they relate to one another, are questions that are left unexamined except as a vague hierarchical premise” in global city theory (Brown et al., 2010:16). Beaverstock et al. (2000: 45) on the other hand, are also critical of “world city” literature because it does not adequately address world cities’ “relations to one another”. However, Grant (2009: 11) concedes that Johannesburg is often the only city in the global South that tends to be seen as akin to cities in the North (Grant, 2009: 11).

Grant (2009) instead argues that a ‘globalising city’ framework is required to overcome this western bias and to “reassert and reemphasise the role of many ordinary cities in Africa and in the less developed world in terms of the urban consequences of contemporary globalisation processes” (Grant, 2009: 17). Roy (2009: 819) also addresses the Euro-American-centred nature of urban theory, calling for “new geographies of imagination and epistemology” to adequately investigate urban issues from the global South. Roy (2009: 819) examines the global south experiences in terms of “worlding of cities, the production of space, and the dynamics of exurbanity” and calls for an increased area-based focus in urban work. Her argument examines how urban regions and metropolises can be defined and analysed by “dislocating” from the Euro-American models. Robinson (2002: 531) argues that using categories such as world and global cities for cities outside of Euro-American
regions does a disservice by “impos(ing) substantial limitations on imagining or planning the futures of cities around the world”. The Euro-American focused literature falls short on its engagement with democracy by focusing on economic competitiveness, and employing a limited understanding of territory, which does not allow the local urban circumstances to be fully understood according to Roy (2009: 821). According to Mbembe and Nuttall (2008: 3), what the global city models does not take into account is that “a truly global city [...] is composed not only of flows of money, skills, knowledge, security, machinery, and technology, but also of ideas, people, images, and imaginaries- a cultural economy”. The narrow focus of these city theories lessens their applicability to cities in the South, while aspects remain relevant for Johannesburg.

Although the theories relating to world and global cities have been criticised, certain aspects still remain valid and can be used in examining the experiences of a city such as Johannesburg. The theme of increasingly interdependent and networked cities is explored in ‘world city network analysis’ which evolved from world city and global city theories. This network analysis examines urban connections from a global perspective, a departure from city studies that had previously been specifically concerned with national urban systems and strictly “territorialised” studies (Brown et al., 2010). While the world city network analysis sees cities as “highly concentrated command points in the organization of the world economy” (Brown et al., 2010: 15), these points are connected in an “interlocking network” in the world economy (Brown et al., 2010: 14). Brown et al. (2010) argue that globalisation can be understood in terms of world city network analysis and global commodity chain analysis, and can be used to examine transnational spatial relations. While world city network analysis focuses on “worldwide inter-city relations”, global commodity chains examine “production processes in the global economy” (Brown et al., 2010: 13). Yet Brown et al. (2010) assert that research can be enriched by applying aspects of both approaches to “provide a basic spatial skeleton for understanding the processes behind globalisation” (Brown et al., 2010: 13).

The spatial and network aspects of cities is also emphasised by Beaverstock et al. (2000: 123) who examined the metageography, the understanding the world through spatial structures, of world cities by focusing on a network based approach, informed by Castell’s
‘network society’. Beaverstock et al. (2000: 123) examine world cities as areas whose “transnational functions materially challenge states and their territories”. Furthermore the authors agreed that cities are no longer isolated but intertwined in a “world of flows, linkages, connections, and relations”. Beaverstock et al. (2000: 123) argue that this interdependence was brought about through shifts in the economic growth of cities in advanced economies which are increasingly reliant on service industries as well as progress made in information technology.

While the interconnected nature of cities today has been discussed, another significant theory that frames this research is urban regime theory which fits into urban politics discourse (Mossberger and Stoker, 2001). This theory has been used to describe the public-private partnerships, as well as to examine local urban governing coalitions (Mossberger and Stoker, 2001). According to Mossberger and Stoker (2001: 812), in the urban environment, “regime analysis views power as fragmented and regimes as the collaborative arrangements through which local governments and private actors assemble the capacity to govern”. This fragmentation is largely owed to the “division of labour between the market and the state” (Mossberger and Stoker, 2001: 812). This is also an apt theory for Johannesburg as the Gauteng Global City-region (GCR) has recently emerged as a new governance strategy, with the understanding that “city-regions are also connected to a global web of cities” (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 21).

Van Der Pluijm and Melissen (2007) put forward the idea that cities have become uniquely involved in international relations, through what they refer to as “city diplomacy”. With globalisation, cities have infiltrated the domain previously reserved for the nation state. “States have lost their monopoly over social, economic and political activity in their territory” (Van Der Pluijm and Melissen, 2007: 8). Van Der Pluijm and Melissen (2007) focus on a “multicentric world” where non state actors and cities are key actors, as opposed to a “state-centric world” approach. This understanding of cities as international relations actors informs the research.
**Processes shaping cities**

Urbanisation is a global process that will be discussed as the global rate of urbanisation has been occurring at a faster rate than initially anticipated (Davis, M. 2007). Fox (2012: 285) argues that urbanisation, like globalisation, should be seen as a “global historical process driven by population dynamics associated with technological and institutional change”. Urbanisation is a process that has become more rapid recently. Grant’s (2009: 5) examination of Accra, Ghana, found that even though residents may not directly be involved in globalisation activities, “all are affected by it ‘for better or worse’’. Grant (2009: 7) found that globalisation had resulted in “intensified uneven development” brought on by hypermobility of capital and resulting in hyper differentiality of space (Grant, 2009: 7).

The precise role of the city will be discussed according to various authors. Glaeser’s (2011: 1) examination of cities and urban life, finds that to study cities is to essentially study human progress. The author sees mass urbanisation in the developing world in terms of the drive to achieve prosperity (Glaeser, 2011). Raban (1988) sees the city as an almost omnipotent force shaping the lives of those who live in it. According to Mumford, the city is spatially and socially different from other areas; it is “a geographical plexus, an economic organisation, an institutional process, a theatre of social action, and an aesthetic symbol of collective unity” (as cited in Beall and Fox, 2009: 3). Friedmann’s (1995: 22) analysis refers to cities as “spatially organised socio-economic systems”. Cities are the “new strategic nodes” in the globalisation era (Savitch, 2003: 22).

UNHABITAT (2010: 1) found that approximately 40% of Africa’s population live in cities. “Exploding” urban populations and geographies create new agglomerations of cities, megacities and slums as they struggle to fit into the space available in urban areas (Davis, 2007: 5). It has been predicted that by the year 2050, over 10 billion people globally will be in urban areas (Davis, 2007: 2). The majority of these people will be living in cities in the developing world, with 1.23 billion people living in African cities (UNHABITAT, 2010: 1). The smaller cities in Africa will be the fastest growing in terms of population density, and it is these areas that are in need of investment and public policies to deal with this predicted boom (UNHABITAT, 2010). According to a 2007 UN report, as cited in Bekker and Therborn (2012: 4), “in sub-Saharan Africa, urbanisation has become virtually synonymous with slum
growth; 72 percent of the region’s urban population lives under slum conditions, compared with 56% in South Asia. The slum population of sub-Saharan Africa almost doubled in 15 years, reaching nearly 20 million in 2005”. This mass of people will require the implementation of effective local-level service delivery initiatives that may not currently be in place.

In his controversial book, *Planet of Slums*, Davis (2007) emphasises the role that the global economy has played in the exploitation of the poor and increased inequality within cities. In his critique of neo-liberal policies, Harvey (2006) explains that globalisation and neo-liberalisation have resulted in neo-colonial style capitalistic activities in developing countries and cities. While urbanisation plays a significant role in terms of absorbing capital surpluses in the global economy, it also creates an unequal and exclusionary city (Harvey, 2008). Both Davis and Harvey state that these exclusionary practices will not cease until fundamental changes are implemented within this capitalistic system (Pieterse, 2008; and Harvey, 2008).

Cities in the global South cannot necessarily be grouped together easily, neither can African cities. Colonial “idiosyncrasies” had lasting effects on the “municipal government, as well as legal, administrative and planning systems” making it difficult to compare governance systems throughout the continent (Bekker and Therborn, 2012: 2). “Cities are living geology, shaped by and functioning through historical layers of ambitions, efforts and constructions of meaning, set in natural environments of topography and climate, and subject to change” (Bekker and Therborn, 2012: 193). The specificities of each city demand in-depth examinations of the many facets, past and present, of the city. Roy (2009) argues that it is usually in major cities such as Chicago, New York, Paris and Los Angeles where the most influential urban theories are developed. Cities in the South are often examined in terms of urban distress and underdevelopment, as “the other” (Roy, 2009; Mbembe and Nuttall, 2008). “They are the mega-cities, bursting at the seams, overtaken by their own fate of poverty, disease, violence and toxicity” (Roy, 2009: 819) (see Davis’s ‘*Planet of Slums*’). Cities in the South are grouped together as dangerous and depraved. Groupings of cities in the global South can also be problematic as each city has inherent spatial and political differences between these cities. Mbembe and Nuttall (2008: 1) designate Johannesburg as
a “critical node of Southern Hemispheric capitalism and globalisation”, which should make it equivalent to a global city.

Robinson (as cited in Roy, 2009: 820) argues that there is an ‘asymmetrical ignorance’ that needs to be addressed in urban theory; while cities in the global North are used to develop models, cities in the South are seen as areas for concern and in need of improvement. Pieterse (2008: 1) explains that discourses dealing with cities in the global South generally fall under two distinct perspectives, namely “apocalyptic” or “irrepressib(y) optimis(tic)”. Roy (2009: 821) argues that “area studies” which incorporate “the lens of ‘process geographies’” will be more useful to examining cities in the South. It allows for a diversity to be acknowledged and explored (Roy, 2009: 821).

Despite this, examining cities slums in the global South should not be completely dismissed. Mehta (2004: 52) argues that slums are viewed very differently by those who live in them, and by those who do not. Slums can represent as much of a community to slum dwellers in Indian cities, as upmarket housing establishments in Paris may be to its inhabitants (Mehta, 2004: 52). The spatial geography that slums provide can be more desirable to its residents than more developed housing schemes would be. “Any urban redevelopment plan has to take into account the curious desire of slum dwellers to live closely together. A greater horror than open gutters and filthy toilets, to the people of Jogeshwari, is an empty room in the big city” (Mehta, 2004: 52). “Under conditions of crisis, the subaltern subject is simultaneously strategic and self-exploitative, simultaneously a political agent and a subject of the neoliberal grand slam” (Roy, 2009: 827). According to Massey (2007:9) slum inhabitants are indoctrinated by “imagery of consumer contentment” of neoliberal processes, and thus these slums can be sites of “festering anger”. This highlights the complexity of living in lower income, slum conditions. Individuals can adapt and prosper, but in unconditional ways.

Populous cities, slums, growing urban inequality, and competition are all products of a hegemonic neoliberal agenda, according to Massey (2007: 9), “their internal forms reflect its market dynamics”. Ong (2011: 6) has identified cities as “avatars of capitalism cum globalisation”, showing that the city is perhaps uniquely tied to the capitalist agenda, both
in its successes and failures. This is also evident in how the city is designed, how the approach to urban planning can be determined by neoliberal policies that exclude the poor (Sager, 2011). Harvey (2010) emphasised the significance of examining geographical and specifically urban issues as a cause of the global financial crisis.

**Case studies of city partnerships**

A range of experiences will be discussed in this section. According to the case studies collected, the majority are focused on Northern cities and their partners, although this is changing. Much of the literature is written by a small group of Dutch authors, or students at Dutch universities, who seem to be at the forefront of research of this nature. The case studies highlight the varied nature and characteristics of city-to-city cooperation throughout the world.

According to Tjandradewi and Marcotullio (2009: 165), city-to-city cooperation is a “cost-effective” approach to enhancing urban conditions. In the literature, reciprocity is an important aspect of cooperation agreements, with mutual benefit often required by both parties before entering an agreement, but for Van Ewijk and Baud (2009: 218), it is the cities in the global South which will more often benefit from these engagements. Van Ewijk and Baud (2009: 220) refer to aspects of cooperation that can affect the type of experience and knowledge gained as ‘partnership conditions’. These conditions include consistent contact, flexibility and trust (Van Ewijk and Baud, 2009: 220).

Van Ewijk (2008: 6) research on Dutch municipalities’ shows how popular city-to-city cooperation is in that country:

> “72% of Dutch municipalities are involved in international cooperation. Of the municipalities with 50 000 to 100 000 inhabitants, 95% are active in international cooperation, while all municipalities with more then 100 000 inhabitants are also involved. However, only 21% of the municipalities have formulated policies on international cooperation and 10% of municipal efforts in international cooperation are directed to developing countries”.

Van Ewijk and Baud (2009: 218) explain that since the 1990s, Dutch city-to-city projects have centred on improving local government and urban development in municipalities in the
global South. “Central to these relations, in general, are the Northern municipalities assisting the Southern partner municipalities in strengthening local government bodies” (Van Ewijk, 2008: 6).

Research was conducted on partnerships of Dutch municipalities with cities where a high population of Dutch immigrants were born or migrant countries of origin. Their research was carried out through interviews and surveys. The relationships that they examined were centred on “promot[ing] mutual understanding between migrant and host societies, social cohesion and integration of migrants through contacts and the exchange of information” (Van Ewijk, 2008: 5). Within this parameter projects varied from local governance to information management and integration of migrants into Dutch society (Van Ewijk and Baud, 2009: 221). Given its scope, Van Ewijk and Baud’s (2009: 221) research was initially focused on the Dutch side of the involvement. Many of the Dutch municipalities found that they could benefit from the engagement in terms of developing policies that could take into account the migrant population’s background. During the course of the study, they developed models to track and measure the nature of the knowledge that was being disseminated between the municipalities (Van Ewijk and Baud, 2009).

Douglass (2002) examined competition and cooperation between cities in Pacific Asia, noting that the “spatially polarising effects” of globalisation limits economic growth to certain cities, while disadvantaging rural areas (Douglass, 2002: 53). “Most urban growth is concentrated in a small number of metropolitan regions, usually capital-city regions” (Douglass, 2002: 53). “Intercity cooperation within and among nations is proposed, to overcome the ‘grow now, clean up the environment later’ syndrome, by using livability as a means of securing global investment and gaining greater local economic resilience” (Douglass, 2002: 53).

Keiner and Kim (2007) examined how networking can lead to sustainable urban development and they highlight the city network for its knowledge-sharing capabilities. They examined city sustainability networks whose members included local communities from cities around the world directly involved in specific networks. They investigated the characteristics and linkages involved in these sustainability and web-based networks which
have flourished since the 1990s and 2000s, affecting how local governance and urban management in the global context are understood (Keiner and Kim, 2007: 1370).

Tjandradewi and Marcotullio (2009: 165) examined Asian city-to-city cooperation, with a focus on networking, by surveying municipal employees. They discovered that “governments consider four features critical to successful C2C collaboration including: free flows of information, reciprocity, understanding and leadership” (Tjandradewi and Marcotullio, 2009:165). Areas where city-to-city cooperation was seen to have the most value were: the environment, health and education, cultural issues, as well as urban infrastructure (Tjandradewi and Marcotullio, 2009:165). Their study aims to fill a gap in existing acknowledge which generally overlooks the “key elements for success and the functional areas considered best suited for C2C connections” (Tjandradewi and Marcotullio, 2009:165).

Hsu (2003: 2) examined Montreal and Shanghai’s sister city relationship in terms of “the interplay between forces of structure and agency”. The research was also framed by the three levels of inquiry, the “macro aspect of the local-global dialectics, the meso aspect of intergovernmental relations and the micro aspect of agency and cultural values” (Hsu, 2003: 2). Hsu (2003:10) argued that twinning should be seen as strategic city alliances that promote the economic needs of the areas. Additionally these relationships should be viewed as an “entrepreneurial strategy for municipalities to respond to pressure and opportunities generated from the structural forces of economic globalisation”. Projects included providing “information and advice,” as a way for Shanghai to “catch up to the Western processes of industrialisation and urbanisation” as well as “building up political networks” and “economic spinoffs” for the Canadian city (Hsu, 2003:7). This case provides an example for the idea that cooperation can be framed as one partnerin the North assisting another partner in the South to “catch up” to other “modern” cities in the North. It also shows that benefits from these projects can be different for the two cities involved.

Chapisa (2012) investigated city-to-city cooperation between Mutare in Zimbabwe and Haarlem in the Netherlands, a North-South partnership. Chapisa (2012) found that the city linkage could be seen as a viable development tool for sustainable urban development.
During her investigation of the partnership, Chapisa (2011: 2) discovered that city-to-city cooperation agreements “have been somewhat enshrouded in mystery regarding their objectives, operations and the main actors involved [...] so too regarding their socio-economic benefits and the extent of their success or failures”. Similarly my research will attempt to unravel the mystery of these partnerships within the South African context.

Breeman’s (2012) research on a partnership in Botswana compared North-South and South-South municipal international relations. Although Botswana was involved with a large number of cities, many cooperation partnerships were inactive. The research showed that there was often a sizable divergence between what is written in the literature and how the city-to-city cooperation was implemented on the ground, a clear disconnect between theory and practice (Breeman, 2012).

South African case studies are limited by a lack of published research on the topic of city-to-city cooperation. De Villiers has written quite prolifically on city-to-city cooperation and his work has informed this research. Additionally Bontenbal (2010) undertook a study on Dutch and South African municipalities, with some interesting insights.

Dutch city-to-city cooperation partnerships with South African cities (and towns) grew from the 1980s onwards, and specifically as a political stance against the apartheid government (Bontenbal, 2010: 467). After the end of apartheid, cooperation between municipalities became centred on institution building (Bontenbal, 2010: 467). Bontenbal (2010: 467) identified 12 long-term contracts between Dutch and South African municipalities while “a number of links exist between cities carrying the same name, such as the Dutch city of Dordrecht with Dordrecht (Emalahleni, South Africa)”.

De Villiers (2009:150) contends that once the official municipal international relations (MIR) strategy document was introduced in 1999, cooperation ventures were entered into between South African cities, towns and partners. De Villiers (2005) examined the range of twinning partnerships in all of South Africa’s provinces, municipalities and communities. The nature of city-to-city cooperation in South Africa was highlighted in the research which investigated twinning partnerships, or “strategic alliances”, as the author refers to them,
throughout South Africa (De Villiers, 2005). His research pinpointed 130 local government level partnerships with international communities, while a further 41 partnerships were in the process of being confirmed at the time and 35 partnerships were cancelled (De Villiers, 2005, iv). He found that in 2005 Johannesburg had 17 international cooperation relationships (De Villiers, 2005: 300).

De Villiers’s research highlighted the difficulty of monitoring and maintaining these relationships, with only a few deemed successful in meeting their original objectives as stated in C2C agreements. The countries with the most twinnings with South Africa, according to his subsequent research, include: China, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States (De Villiers et al., 2008: 17). De Villiers found that these relationships could provide benefits through knowledge sharing and training as well as financial rewards. However, in a follow-up study, it was found that the expenses involved in maintaining these partnerships often overshadowed the possible positive outcomes (De Villiers, 2009: 150). The statistics De Villiers presents may have changed in the interim, which will be addressed in my study.

The results of De Villiers’s (2005: iii) extensive and unique study in 2005 were to define guidelines for successful twinning partnerships in South Africa and also to redefine the twinning of areas as “strategic alliances” between communities. The guidelines and recommendations for successful twinning included:

“1) Ensure proper partner selection: partners should be committed, show understanding and cultural sensitivity, and display an overall positive attitude; 2) Market the existence of the alliance and its goals to all stakeholders in the community: it is important to make everyone aware of the twinning and to obtain active participation; 3) Commit quality management to the process; 4) Draw up a well-conceived business plan that spells out the key objectives and the plans for their achievement” (De Villiers et al., 2008: 16).

While much of the existing C2C literature focuses on the positive and successful aspects of this type of cooperation, critics have argued that the phenomenon is a mere misuse of government money and creates partnerships predicated on unbalanced power dynamics
De Villier’s research also highlights the implementation difficulties that will similarly be explored in my research.

**Conceptual framework**

The conceptual framework underpinning this research project is illustrated in figure 2 below. The framework builds on the ideas expressed in the literature to address the research questions and is based on issues that affect Johannesburg’s formal city-to-city cooperation partnerships. Aspects of the partnerships that will affect their developmental impact such as the motivations behind the agreements, specificities of the agreements and the results of the relationships, the stakeholders involved and the particular types of cooperation will be investigated. Additionally, the national and global context even though not expressly illustrated in the framework will frame how these relationships are organised and will also be referred to in the research.

![Conceptual framework](image)

The literature discussed in this section shows a range of cross-cutting issues affecting cities and their position in the globalised world. How cities in the global South are often portrayed...
differently from cities in the North has been examined, in terms of where Johannesburg is positioned in the global system. How the city can be seen to be encroaching on the foreign policy role of national governments has been discussed in terms of city diplomacy. The effects that external processes such as globalisation, urbanisation and the global economy can have on how cities are designed or entered into networks has been examined. Various case studies from around the world have been investigated for the insights that they could offer to this study. The research has also been framed by various theories, because city-to-city cooperation cuts across various issues, no one theory adequately captures its driving forces and characteristics.
Chapter 3 - Methodology

This chapter explains the research methods employed. An in-depth understanding of city-to-city partnerships was required, thus a qualitative research approach was selected as the most appropriate to address the questions raised in chapter 1. A qualitative approach allows for a range of relevant information to be collected and was therefore preferable (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). The academic research began with desktop investigations and a literature review of relevant theoretical and practical knowledge both global and local. The research design was descriptive and data was collected in a consistent and coherent manner (Punch, 2000). Both primary and secondary sources were collected and analysed, while a limited amount of quantitative data was also consulted.

One of the specific data collection methods employed was in-depth/semi-structured interviews which included asking open-ended questions. Purposive sampling was used to identify respondents (Greenstein, 2004: 27) as I was interested in hearing the experiences and expert knowledge from those directly involved in city-to-city cooperation. These individuals were identified based on desktop research and were then approached to request an interview. I interviewed individuals who were currently, or had previously been directly involved in organising or overseeing city-to-city cooperation at the local government level. These included officials in municipal units that had been/are involved in developing and maintaining international relationships. This was necessary as the units involved have been recently restructured. Thus hearing a historical and current point of view provided an understanding of the trajectory and characteristics of city-to-city cooperation partnerships. The sample size was limited due to the scope of this study and the lack of active city-to-city cooperation partnerships at the time of research. A lack of interest shown by some individuals in assisting in this research, due at times to scheduling difficulties, meant that it became impossible to interview a wider range of respondents who were involved in supportive roles.

The interview respondents provided first-hand experience of the relevant issues and had years of experience to share, including a broad understanding of the issues affecting the City
of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality. Specifically respondents included the following individuals involved with the municipality: the previous executive director of the Development Planning and Urban Management unit; a previous head of the Central Strategy Unit; the current director of the Strategy and Relations unit. As the local government departments that facilitate and maintain these relationships are quite small in size, those who were/are in a director position were interviewed as they could provide an overview of international city relationships.

In addition to the above interviews, the key informants interviewed included two urbanists/urban planners who could provide expert opinion, as they had been involved in projects or research on the topic and could share anecdotes and practical experience. Three individuals were interviewed to contextualise Johannesburg’s position and experience, while also providing insights into the international relations experiences of municipalities both surrounding Johannesburg and nationally in order to understand if their experiences are unique. An employee of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality was interviewed who provided information on the type of formal city partnerships in which the municipality is engaged. A programme manager from the Governance and Intergovernmental Relations (IGR) unit of the Gauteng office of the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) was interviewed as SALGA is a key facilitator of international relations on the local government level. Lastly, a representative from the City of Johannesburg was interviewed, who provided additional information on knowledge sharing between the city and its international partners. Appendix A contains the full list of respondents interviewed.

Once interviews had been scheduled with willing participants, an interview guide with standardised questions was used as the basis for the questions asked. However, the interview style allowed for deviation from this guide, to engage with markers that were raised by the respondent (Weiss, 1995). Using these standardised questions allowed for comparability of basic data collected during the various interviews. Weiss (1995) was a useful text that provided insights into creating a research guide and schedule, assisting the researcher with interviews.
Face-to-face interviews were conducted with the respondents, the venues generally being the respondent’s office as interviews occurred during working hours. I administered the interviews and provided respondents with an information sheet describing the purpose of my research and the interview. It also included my own, and my supervisor’s contact information should the respondents have any queries; see Appendix B for a sample sheet. I audio recorded interviews if the respondent had provided his permission by signing twice on my research project consent form; see Appendix C for a sample form. As I encountered two respondents who wished to remain anonymous, I did not record the interview or use his/her title or name, as agreed. I collected views that were both complimentary and critical of aspects of Johannesburg’s city-to-city cooperation, which allowed for a more holistic understanding of the topic.

The interviews lasted roughly one hour each, generally long enough to collect the data required and short enough to fit in with respondents’ busy schedules. Helpfully, respondents agreed to be available via e-mail/face-to-face for follow-up questions or requests for documents. Shuman (2000: 47) states “what we learn about society is always mediated by the instruments we use, including our own eyes and ears”. Thus using interviews as my instrument, in addition to audio recording, I also took handwritten notes to ensure that my data was accurate and reliable when I was writing up my recollections. Notes were taken once I had asked the respondents if this was acceptable. Each interview recording was transcribed soon after the interview, combining additional comments from the handwritten notes. The interviews took place between April 2013 and March 2014 according to the schedules of the respondents.

Two initial interviews, with the urban planners, were carried out to experiment with the type and terminology of the questions asked and to see if the topic would potentially translate into meaningful research. Pilot interviews provided an opportunity for “improvement in the crafting of questions” (Weiss, 1995: 223), a lesson that was pivotal for the later interviews with local government representatives. These interviews proved useful as they provided both a context and introduction to the topic, and suggested some routes that the research could take. These particular respondents also provided contacts and relevant literature to explore.
A second research method involved collecting and analysing relevant primary and secondary documents. Document and research analysis can be used to “confront prevailing knowledge - and the structures which underpin it - by providing an alternative reading and understanding of it” (Jupp, no date: 112). Therefore a wide range of documents have been consulted and analysed to provide information on the context and experiences of city-to-city cooperation in South Africa. An overview of the municipalities’ city-to-city cooperation experiences was gathered by evaluating primary documents including: signed agreements between Johannesburg and its international partners, newspaper articles and lists of South African city-to-city cooperation projects.

Additional data that I collected and analysed included the Municipal International Relations (MIR) policy framework, Johannesburg’s international relations agenda document and framework, relevant legislation, annual reports and strategy documents. National and local level policy documents on municipal international cooperation were analysed as they provided a guide for the operationalisation of these partnerships. Previous case studies of South African and neighbouring countries’ transnational cooperation experiences were also analysed in the literature review chapter and referred to when contextualising the Johannesburg experiences. A pilot document analysis exercise was carried out to ensure that the data collected during the actual data gathering stage could be relevant and reliable (Punch, 2000; Weiss, 1995). The data analysis phase involved separating the data into themes and coding of interview transcriptions and documents as required (Weiss, 1995). Results are displayed in chapter 4 and 5, using tables, diagrams and text.

Regarding research ethics, I applied for and received permission from the university ethics committee to carry out this research. No ethical dilemmas were encountered during the data gathering process as consent forms and information sheets, as stated previously, were provided to respondents detailing the study as well their right to anonymity.
Chapter 4 – Contextualising City-to-City Partnerships in South Africa

This chapter departs from the theories and case studies to describe the characteristics of city-to-city cooperation in South African cities. By engaging with instruments such as key documents that guide municipalities’ international city partnerships, as well as interview material, the diverse position that international city-to-city partnerships can and have played in addressing urban development crises is illuminated. Cross-cutting issues that affect these partnerships will be interrogated to ascertain the impact that partnerships can have and the degree of synergy between the concepts and practical implementation. While the post-apartheid era frames the time period being examined, pre-democracy partnerships and characteristics will also be mentioned where appropriate. This chapter is influenced by urban theories which state that the context and histories of cities in the South need to be examined to understand the unique nature of the city linkages. Building on this the specific South African context is discussed.

Guiding legislation and policies

International city level partnerships are encouraged and sanctioned in various national, provincial and local documents. These lay the conceptual groundwork of the approaches to international city-to-city cooperation. However, fundamental limitations and weaknesses can often be observed in the parochial details expressed in these documents, leading to practical difficulties experienced by municipalities in the implementation phase. In this chapter, the more general documents will be discussed first, followed by those which deal specifically with the operationalisation of city-to-city partnerships at the local government level. These documents frequently present the idealised version of how municipal international engagements should operate. Discussion will show that the reality often differs.

Municipal international relations (MIR) in South Africa are framed within the country’s defining guide, the national Constitution. The 1996 Constitution restructured urban governance in South Africa and details the roles and responsibilities of various categories of municipalities, with Chapter 7 laying out how local governments should operate. The Constitution “embodies the core principles that inform the basis for developmental local

Each municipality is entitled to “the right to govern, on its own initiative, the local government affairs of its community, subject to national and provincial legislation, as provided for in the Constitution” (SA Constitution, 1996, Section 151: 3). Thus local governments are equipped with a level of autonomy, yet confined within national and provincial laws. The three spheres of government which are designated in the Constitution are required to share “decision-making, co-ordinate budgets, policies and activities, particularly for those functions that cut across the spheres” through cooperative governance (ETU, no year: no page). The Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act of 2005 was introduced to “establish a framework for the national government, provincial governments and local governments to promote and facilitate intergovernmental relations” (Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 2005: 2). International city-to-city cooperation partnerships can be seen as one such cross-cutting issue that requires intergovernmental cooperation.

The objectives of local government which relate to development and cooperation are listed in the Constitution as: “to ensure the provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner; to promote social and economic development; and to encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in the matters of local government” (SA Constitution, 1996, Section 152: 1). City-to-city cooperation can be seen as a possible tool to attain some of these objectives, including service provision, development and involving various actors in local government initiatives.

South Africa consists of 278 municipalities, with three different categories of municipalities being determined in the Constitution. Metropolitan municipalities are referred to as category A, local municipalities are category B and district municipalities are category C (SA Constitution). The metropolitan municipality is the only category that has “exclusive authority to make rules over its area of jurisdiction”, as the other two categories share
Municipalities’ areas of responsibility include: service delivery incorporating electricity and water, land use, local tourism, municipal roads and transport, as well as recreational areas (ETU, no date: no page). Municipal councils have the power to pass by-laws, develop an integrated development plan (IDP) and budget, introduce rates and certain taxes, demand service delivery fees and fine those who contravene municipal laws (ETU, no date: no page). In the Constitution (Chapter 7: Section 153: 1331(3)) the “developmental duties of municipalities” are stated as “(a) to give priority to the basic needs of the community, and to promote the social and economic development of the community; and (b) participate in national and provincial development programmes”. The White Paper on Local Government expanded these requirements for achieving a “developmental local government” (SALGA, 2011: no page). Development is entrenched in the country’s most powerful document.

In 1998 the White Paper on Local Government was introduced to address the directives set out in the Constitution. One of the defining challenges for local government when the White Paper was released, was that the “system is still structured to meet the demands of the previous era” (White Paper on Local Government, 1998: 22). It also outlines inter-municipality cooperation, formal and informal linkages with international municipalities, as well as public-private partnerships (De Villiers, 2005: 241). The White Paper on Local Government’s section on cooperative governance (1998: 49) explains that during apartheid, because of the country’s isolation, international linkages with other local government structures were largely ignored. Thus a “range of mechanisms” for international cooperation previously unavailable became possible after 1994 (White Paper on Local Government, 1998: 49). The advent of democracy thus situated South African cities in a unique position in the world arena from which it had for so long been excluded.

In establishing and describing the key role that this new “developmental local government” was required to play in the post-apartheid “developmental state”, as stated in the White Paper, local economic development (LED) strategies became the purview of municipalities
(Rogerson, 2011: 150). LED was also a means of coping with the intrusion of global processes once South Africa was no longer a pariah state. “The new emphasis accorded to LED promotion was inseparable from a need to accommodate forces of globalisation in order to ensure South Africa’s re-entry into the global economy, making the country attractive to international investors and to enhance the role of the private sector” (Rogerson, 2011: 157). The 2006 LED Framework document, ‘Stimulating and Developing Sustainable Local Economies’ was developed to energise local economies to the point where the needs of the local community and the development goals of the national government could be achieved (Rogerson, 2011: 151). Encouraging the competitiveness and entrepreneurialism of cities in order to attract investment, improve their economies and entice ‘knowledge-based activities’; are some aspects of urban LED in South Africa (Rogerson, 2011: 159).

Therefore international formal and informal twinnings are described as an opportunity for “facilitating the sharing of international expertise and best practice experience” (White Paper on Local Government, 1998: 49). South African cities could be seen as being in a “catch up” position, as they had never before been geared towards providing for their entire population of urban dwellers, the municipalities could potentially learn a great deal from the experience of larger international cities. That international cooperation at a local government level is legislated, and policy papers devoted to the topic, sets South Africa apart. Every municipality can be an “international actor” (De Villiers, 2005). Municipalities and local government are, however, not the only actors involved as various national departments and associations also play a pivotal role. One such association is SALGA which is a representative body facilitating intergovernmental and international relations. It represents the interests of and advocates for local government (Marokane, interview, 2014).

A document that deals specifically with municipalities as international actors is the Municipal International Relations Policy Framework for South Africa released in July 1999. It is currently the only national MIR framework in post-apartheid South Africa and continues to influence how city-to-city cooperation is developed and maintained. This document is essential to the research project as it forms the basis for municipal twinnings. Certain
municipalities, such as Johannesburg, have also developed specific frameworks for their own cities, which incorporate this MIR policy.

The national MIR policy framework is a twenty page document which was issued by the South African Ministry for Provincial and Local Government (which has since become the Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) ministry). The framework was created based on recommendations in the White Paper on Local Government and stands as a “guide [for] municipalities in the conduct of their international relations” (MIR Policy Framework, 1999: 3). The motivation behind the document was to address the “poorly co-ordinated” and ineffectively planned international municipal engagements (MIR Policy Framework, 1999: 3). Zondi (2012: 42) argues that provincial and local government foreign engagements are curtailed by poor coordination and lack of alignment with national interests. This has largely continued in post-apartheid South Africa because “neither authorities nor civil society have taken much interest in the subject”.

Within the document, MIR refers to “a link between two or more communities from different nation-states, in which at least one of the key actors is a municipality” and can also involve “local non-governmental organisations, community based organisations or private associations” (MIR Policy Framework, 1999: 7). This definition is fairly broad, and mimics international literature which says that MIR involves both municipalities and non-governmental actors. The categories of MIR engagement include being represented in international municipal associations, engaging in twinning agreements, becoming members of various networks and global marketing to bring in investment (MIR Policy Framework, 1999: 9).

One of the main principles of MIR is that it “should be seen as important components of the development strategies of municipalities” and “used as a tool to facilitate a developmental approach in local government” (MIR Policy Framework, 1999:10). The “developmental approach” is often mentioned in the document, yet is not adequately explained in the framework. As each municipality is required to develop an Integrated Development Plan (IDP) stating their socio-economic objectives, it can also detail how the municipality will
approach international cooperation engagements in the coming years and incorporate the needs of the municipality (Harie, 2012: 7).

MIR is an evolving practice that changes focus and actors involved. The framework is located within the recent global trend of decentralising government, putting local government at the forefront of “environmental, economic and social sustainability” (MIR Policy Framework, 1999: 6). MIR policy encourages municipalities “to build collectively on the vast goodwill of the international community, learn from the innovations of other municipalities, and share our unique local government system with the world” (MIR Policy Framework, 1999: 3). The notion of “building” on the “vast goodwill of the international community” seems somewhat naive and overly hopeful, as goodwill alone cannot ensure success in these agreements or in reaching the “developmental priorities”. The link between development and municipal international relations is overtly stated, and mutually beneficial relations are encouraged. Areas highlighted in the framework that can be improved through MIR include: sharing best practice examples, encouraging innovation and investment, improving technical capacity, creating innovative methods to combat global issues, and lastly fostering international goodwill and furthering the national level of foreign engagements (MIR Policy Framework, 1999: 4/7).

While not suggesting exactly which cities are desirable candidates for international agreements, the current MIR policy highlights how to identify potential partners. According to the MIR framework, the partnership should, amongst other things, “benefit the community and country” and “be financially viable” (MIR Policy Framework, 1999: 21). However, whether or not the cooperation has truly benefitted the community can be difficult to quantify given the need to benefit both “community and country”.

The framework encourages cooperation with cities in developing countries, especially with cities in Africa, to foster the African renaissance (MIR Policy Framework, 1999). This cooperation is also encouraged as a means to “develop coherent policy alternatives” for urban development challenges in South Africa (MIR Policy Framework, 1999: 11). SALGA advises municipalities against signing cooperation agreements with cities in countries with which South Africa is not already associated (Marokane, interview, 2014). Partnerships are
encouraged if there is a national bilateral agreement with the country in place or if the city is in an area that shares common interests with South Africa (Marokane, interview, 2014). National politics can determine who partners with South African cities.

While the MIR framework does not differentiate between the three types of municipalities, capacity issues may mean that local and district municipalities are not able to approach MIR in the same way as metropolitan municipalities. According to SALGA, all municipalities, be they metropolitan, district or local, are involved in international relations although smaller municipalities’ relations may be centralised at the district level (Marokane, interview, 2014). SALGA at times even initiates international relationships on behalf of municipalities, as the organisation may be approached to identify suitable municipalities with a particular set of skills and then facilitates the formal engagement between the two municipalities. (Marokane, interview, 2014).

Regarding the role of the national and provincial spheres of government, it is stated that their approach should be “facilitative rather than regulatory” with all spheres sharing access on MIR engagements (MIR Policy Framework, 1999: 13). The framework suggests consultations should occur between the three spheres of government to determine specific MIR priority areas and to ensure they are in line with national policy. Geldenhuys (1998) found that one of the difficulties to overcome with MIR was that there was reluctance by government officials to accept that local municipalities were international actors. They deemed foreign relations to be ‘high politics’ only suitable for national government’s involvement (Geldenhuys, 1998).

The “historical forms” of local and provincial government, the four provinces and ten homelands were completely redesigned after 1994, with a new “institutional framework” (Van Wyk, 1997: 22). Historically, in the early twentieth century, in the provincial regions had minimal, if any, international engagements (Van Wyk, 1997). Van Wyk (1997: 26) argued that several factors in addition to the constitutional obligations and end of apartheid propelled subnational governments in South Africa into international relations, taking away the “monopoly” of the national government. These factors include: local and provincial governments cannot only rely on national government to provide them with services;
partnerships with neighbouring areas are sought after because of ideas of “micro-regionalism” and location convenience; growing global interdependence and communication advancements (Van Wyk, 1997: 26).

Nganje (2012: no page) states that currently a change in policy and attitude on subnational and municipal international relations is required for the three spheres of government to work more effectively together. He argues that changes can be accomplished when a more “progressive conception” of paradiplomacy is followed (Nganje, 2012: no page). This may be one reason why a review of the framework is likely to commence soon, according to a SALGA representative (Marokane, interview, 2014). A new framework will likely be developed and expected changes will most likely refer to extending regulations and adapting certain issues, such as ethics and etiquette (Marokane, interview, 2014). Overcoming bias to have meaningful inter-governmental cooperation is one of many challenges that local governments face in their international relation projects.

Challenges that municipalities and stakeholders may encounter have been highlighted in the MIR framework. They refer to the difficulties of engaging in and maintaining cooperation with suitable international partners. MIR activities can deflect attention away from the municipality’s other objectives and “the range of different associations and initiatives can also result in confusion, duplication and waste” (MIR Policy Framework, 1999: 4). Although advocating for transparency, monitoring and sharing between the spheres, the document does not clearly assign responsibilities or expectations, which could lead to confusion. In a SALGA presentation, it was stated that a “lack of proper coordination” between the various stakeholders involved in municipal international relations in South Africa “has in the past led to: instances of embarrassment to South Africa’s reputation; a strain in relations with other countries whose legislation differs from ours” and “escalating costs of duplicated services when national departments, provinces, and municipalities sign individually” (Harie, 2012: 3). More effective sharing, amongst local municipalities, of knowledge learnt from international cities should lessen some of these challenges (Marokane, interview, 2014).

Another indication of coordination challenges is that municipalities are required to submit signed MOUs to SALGA. However, this process needs to be regulated as documents are not
regularly submitted and therefore keeping a current register of international engagements amongst all stakeholders is difficult (Marokane, interview, 2014). Approval of MIR engagements can be received only after requests have been submitted to the council, as well as relevant provincial and national representatives, including SALGA, COGTA, and the Department of International Relations and Cooperation’s (DIRCO) International Relations Consultative Forum (CFIR) (Harie, 2012: 15). Nganje (2012) argues that this MIR policy can be described as a relative failure because of a continuing lack of coherence and coordination as to how municipal internal relations are handled.

According to Murray and Nakhjavani (2009: 222), national foreign policy can be overlooked by municipal officials when visiting their municipal international cooperation partners. They explain that “although the national policy is for officials to visit Taiwan when visiting China, the flow of South African municipal officials to Chinese sister-cities shows little awareness of foreign policy directives” (Murray and Nakhjavani, 2009: 222). Another example they provide is of municipal officials having their passports seized by Israeli police when attempting to gain entry into Palestinian territories after they had not made the correct diplomatic arrangements (Murray and Nakhjavani, 2009: 222). Marokane (interview, 2014) also highlighted the need to be aware of diplomatic processes when organising visits overseas and for visiting delegates here. Coordination mistakes can fairly easily create international incidents of embarrassment.

International relationships can also be corrupted by poor choice of partner cities. Recently SALGA discovered that certain partnership agreements with some smaller Chinese municipalities were not officially valid (Marokane, interview, 2014). This highlights the importance of thoroughly vetting the overseas cities/municipalities that have been identified for possible twinning. Another example of detrimental partnerships occurred when an overseas delegation used their visit to South Africa to travel with a larger delegation than was required, taking advantage of the local municipality’s budget (Marokane, interview, 2014).
South Africa’s foreign relations and geopolitical allegiances

The legislation which relates to city level development cooperation has been discussed above. In order to ascertain how particular municipal international partners may be more favourable for cooperation than others, an overview of South Africa’s foreign relations allegiances is necessary, as it is the national interests that guide the local international engagements (Marokane, interview, 2014; anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013).

President Zuma stated the following in 2012, regarding why the government wanted to be part of the BRICS alliance: “Our participation in BRICS is designed to help us achieve inclusive growth, sustainable development and a prosperous South Africa” (DIRCO, 2012: 28). South Africa was invited to join the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China) in 2010. The ANC International Relations Policy Discussion document of March 2012 highlights Africa and BRICS countries as important foreign relations areas. The African Union (AU) and Southern African Development Community (SADC) are important partners for foreign relations, while ANC is also concerned with South Africa’s focus of promoting peace and national unity in war torn African countries (ANC International Relations Policy Discussion, 2012). Additional cooperation regions are the Caribbean which shares a historical relationship with the liberation party, and Latin America; with North-South dialogue encouraged as well (ANC International Relations Policy Discussion, 2012).

Habib (2013: 169) argues that South Africa can be classified as a “regional power or hegemon” which “imparts... a set of privileges, obligations and responsibilities that separate it from its African counterparts and from other middle powers”. After apartheid ended, South Africa had to access where to position itself, with Africa or the ‘west’ (Van Wyk, 1997: 31). After 1994 “the country moved from having an isolated, politically belligerent, regionally militaristic and globally defensive agenda to one that supports multilateralism and involves political partnerships, regional leadership, and global engagement” (Habib, 2013: 175).

Habib (2013: 170) states that by examining the political elites in post-apartheid South Africa, it is possible to understand the direction of the country’s foreign policy; this specifically refers to the ruling political party, the ANC, and the national presidents. Post-apartheid
foreign policy can simplistically be characterised as displaying both nationalist and neo-liberal tendencies (Habib, 2013). After 1994, South Africa re-aligned its strategic partnership with Taiwan, instead choosing to align with China as it was seen to offer more in terms of shared interests (Habib, 2013: 183).

Murray and Nakhjavani (2009: 212) maintain that the response of the South African national government to local and provincial level international relations can vary from “indulgence to disapproval”. Murray and Nakhjavani (2009: 212) argue that there is often an “uncertainty” about the particular roles filled by the three government spheres in international relations, as these are “characterised by more questions than answers”. Thus they argue that international engagements by the local government will only ever be “haphazard” unless the entire system is changed (Murray and Nakhjavani, 2009: 212). Furthermore, according to Murray and Nakhjavani (2009: 212) local government’s international activities will also be less important because national government has “asserted control of the most important international relations matter, development aid, and only the wealthiest province, Gauteng, has foreign trade offices”. Gauteng’s and Johannesburg’s experience of international relations may therefore be unique in the country because of their economic strength.

To clarify some of these unequal power relations between the spheres, Nganje (2012) argues that a better understanding of paradiplomacy and how municipalities “exercise their international agency” is required (Nganje, 2012: no page). He argues that a paradigm shift is necessary in the national governments to recognise municipalities as players in the international arena. He further explains that “the source of the misgivings about paradiplomacy in South Africa appears to be located mainly in the country’s political and administrative system, but also in the way foreign policy and international relations have traditionally been conceived globally” (Nganje, 2012: no page).

As the national government is no longer the only player in international relations. Grant (2011) examines both South Africa’s interest in economic diplomacy as an essential element of the country’s foreign policy, as well as the role that business delegations play when accompanying the president on official visits. Grant (2011) also explores the growing role of
the private sector, in a position previously reserved for state officials, in encouraging investment and bilateral partnerships.

Overview of C2C in South Africa
Since the 1980s/1990s city-to-city cooperation has become more formalised, involving exchanging expertise between different cities (Sihlongonyane, interview, 2013). In South Africa city-to-city cooperation has changed dramatically since the end of apartheid (Seedat, interview, 2014; anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2014) and has gained impetus since the release of the national MIR framework policy (De Villiers, 2005). Partnerships are entered into through high level engagements, as opposed to emerging from community level engagement (Sihlongonyane, interview, 2013; and Mabin, interview, 2013). Although municipalities may be the main implementers and drivers, other organisations and departments are involved, such as SALGA, DIRCO, universities, businesses, as well as international organisations (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2014).

With regards to terminology used to describe the partnership agreements in South Africa, some interview respondents argued that certain nuances are implied in the wording, whether using sister city/twin city/municipal international cooperation (Sihlongonyane, interview, 2013; Erasmus, interview, 2013). They can denote a particular characteristic in the relationship and can imply a certain power dynamic, or can refer to the specific geographic location (Sihlongonyane, interview, 2013). In a selection of newspaper articles, partnerships are referred to as “friendships” (see Van Den Heever 2010; Du Preez, 2011; Keogh, 2001; Maqhina, 2007; Ngcukana, 2009). The terminology used is important as it is a basic categorisation of the type of partnership and can refer subtly to the nature of the cooperation. Regarding the focus areas for city-to-city cooperation agreements, Sihlongonyane (interview, 2013) highlighted the fact that legal reform, policy and technology were often the key focus areas of collaboration. Yet, City-to-city cooperation does not happen in a vacuum, it is heavily dependent on the wider political context and nature of diplomatic relations, as well as local and national strategy (Sihlongonyane, interview, 2013; Marokane, interview, 2014; Erasmus, interview, 2013; Mabin, interview, 2013).
International cooperation may not necessarily improve capacity constraints at municipalities; it may even aggravate them as foreign experience and models may not easily be transplantable to every SA municipality. Sihlongonyane (interview, 2013) provided an example from a city in Swaziland, where their GIS systems were upgraded by their European partner city but this upgrade made the system incompatible with other GIS systems in the country, meaning that information could not be easily shared within the country (Sihlongonyane, interview, 2013). However, agreements can also capacitate officials through shared learning experiences (Sihlongonyane, interview, 2013). Monitoring and evaluation of agreements may be heavily reliant on funding, and thus may be ignored if there is no room in the budget (Mabin, interview, 2013).

According to a 2010 list correlated by DIRCO, and based on input submitted by South African Provinces and Municipalities, roughly 250 cooperation agreements between South African and international cities are listed (DIRCO, 2010). These cooperation agreements include not only cities, but specific government departments, universities and provinces, with specific areas of collaboration including housing, education, town planning, health, and youth development. However, many of the engagements are listed as “pending” and have agreements that are yet to be formally signed, or are only in the initial phase of engagement where letters of intent to cooperate have been administered to the prospective partner. Furthermore, the list does not show if these partnerships are active, in that there is current regular contact, or if they have become dormant and communication has ceased. This was an issue also raised by Mr. Marokane (interview, 2014) who mentioned that when compiling their database, SALGA had no way of knowing if partnerships were continuing or had stalled. The list mostly includes partnerships from the post-apartheid era, yet some pre-democracy engagements are listed as well, notably Taiwanese partnerships from the period 1982-1985 (DIRCO, 2010).

Given the provisions that have been discussed above, I adapted the list by separating the partnerships that focused on agreements between cities/municipalities specifically, such as sister city and city twinning agreements. Thus the list was cut down to 92 partnerships (see Appendix D). Of this adapted list, it is clear that Chinese cities have the most partnerships...
with South African cities, a total of 15. These partnerships are spread throughout the country and include cities in Gauteng, Eastern Cape, Western Cape, Kwa-Zulu Natal, Mpumalanga and Limpopo. To further illustrate the dominance of Chinese cities, the country with the next highest amount of partnerships is the U.S.A., with only six, followed by Taiwan and Germany with five partnerships each. Chinese cities are partnered to further the national agenda of seeking links with East Asian countries, encouraging economic development and political allegiance (Shelton, 2012). In terms of partnerships with African countries, Botswana and Mozambique had the most partnerships, namely four each. Figure 3 below illustrates the number of partnerships according to overseas countries.

![Figure 3: Partnerships by countries](image)

This list of city-to-city partnerships also showed that of the nine provinces, Gauteng and Kwa-Zulu Natal had the most partnerships, with 23 for each (see Figure 4 below). Eastern Cape had 17 partnerships which is also a high number compared to the other provinces. This shows that economic activity can be said to play a role.
This section has highlighted the geographic spread of international city partnerships in South Africa. It has shown that there are a great number of agreements throughout the country, and that these agreements are often based on larger national interests.

**Publicising and reporting on city partnerships**

Partnerships with international cities should ultimately attract interest and investment in the South African city (MIR policy framework, 1999); therefore how these partnerships are publicised, both nationally and locally, can affect public opinion and are useful to analyse. Newspaper articles can also provide insights into issues that are not mentioned by government officials or in official documents. City twinings have been written about in the local and national press for almost three decades, even during South Africa’s isolation phases partnerships with Taiwanese and other cities were undertaken. See Appendix E for a table of the articles examined.

The most publicity seems to be generated at the beginning of the cooperation, either at the signing ceremonies or when a visit from a delegation has taken place. Sometimes it is discussed prior to the agreement, during the initial exploratory stage (Ngcukana, 2009). This is noteworthy as it shows that little interest is shown in following up on how these partnerships are able to significantly affect the partner cities, or what they can provide on a daily basis. The interest is limited to official press events. Zondi (2012: 42), when referring to the foreign relations of local and provincial government in South Africa, states that “while there are media reports on international visits, there is hardly any public discussion of this
growing driver of South Africa’s international relations”. Visits are the aspects of partnerships that are most exciting, while the everyday maintenance of agreements by local governments is less likely to appear in a news article.

“Smart cities” and “green projects” have recently become focal points of international cooperation (Du Preez, 2011). Nonetheless, the more traditional areas of cooperation, trade and business interests are still common and sought after priorities (Keogh, 2001). Issues of service delivery backlogs also featured on partnership agendas (Ngcukana, 2009).

Partnerships are often based on existing linkages that have become more formalised or in-depth (Van Den Heever, 2010, Maqhina, 2007). However there is a general lack of uniformity in how partnerships begin and are maintained. South African cities often have multiple sister or twin city partnerships. Durban has 13 twinnings with cities around the globe, such as Chicago, Bremen and Leeds (Van Den Heever, 2010). International partnerships are assessed as needed, for example Cape Town’s city twinnings’ policy was reviewed to focus on encouraging partnerships with strategically relevant cities (Smook, 2010). Additionally the review was necessitated by apartheid era agreements that were still in effect, even though unproductive, for instance Cape Town’s partnership with the Israeli city of Haifa since 1975 (Smook, 2010).

A partnership agreement between Kimberly and Nantou, Taiwan, generated a considerable amount of press coverage with four articles written in the space of a few months in 1987-1988. This partnership proved to be controversial, as the local community was unhappy with the costs involved for delegation visits and maintaining the partnership. Members of the local Kimberly council did not want to allow an upcoming visit from a Taiwanese delegation to go ahead because of dissatisfaction with how the twinning (Diamonds Fields Advertiser, 1988). The 1986 agreement proved controversial in itself as certain council members had voted against the twinning, based on the cost at the time of R20 000 (Diamonds Fields Advertiser, 1985). Moreover, in 1987 when initial reports of a possible visit by the overseas delegation surfaced, many were unhappy with the idea of continued cooperation without seeing results (Diamond Fields Advertiser, 1987).
Nonetheless, in 1988 the mayor of Kimberly voted in favour of the visit, which went ahead later in the year. The visit would require that R25 000 be made available (Diamonds Fields Advertiser, 1988). In August 1988 a 64 member delegation visited to Kimberly to ratify the twinning agreement (Diamonds Fields Advertiser, 1988). This partnership and its coverage provides interesting insights into the local politics at play and highlights that partnerships can be controversial, given the high costs involved and the uncertainty of returns, while according to Hart (2002: 4) “Taiwanese investment in South Africa was [...] a key transnational connection during the relative isolation of the 1980s,” as both countries were seen as “international pariahs” (Hart, 2002: 3). Hart also refers to a “contrast” in how South African-Taiwanese economic relations were understood in certain sectors, as they were seen as both desirable and “distasteful” in the 1990s.

While the overall context of international city-to-city cooperation in South Africa has been briefly discussed, the experience of Tshwane municipality will be more specifically examined as a means of introducing the more detailed examination of Johannesburg’s experiences in Chapter 5. The two cities, together with other municipalities in Gauteng meet to discuss international engagements, share experiences and avoid duplication with city cooperation (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013).

**Tshwane’s experience**

Pretoria is the political capital of South Africa which falls within Tshwane municipality. The municipality’s approach to international city-to-city cooperation, including its active partner cities, as well as areas of engagement and coordination efforts with other South African cities will be discussed. Historically, Pretoria engaged in limited agreements with cities from other isolated countries, such as Taipei, during the apartheid era (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013). After 1994, much like Johannesburg, the city received partnership requests from a wide variety of cities and entered into cooperation based on possible benefits and advice from DIRCO, Department of Trade and industry (DTI) and the Presidency (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013). The International Relations Unit of Tshwane Municipality is itself a fairly new structure which facilitates international cooperation (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013). City-to-city cooperation is seen as a broad-based programme in Tshwane, with additional actors involved in projects, including: the Innovation Hub, private business
universities such as Tshwane University of Technology (TUT) and their students (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013).

Current active partnerships in Tshwane include: Delft (Netherlands); Oulo (Finland); Basel (Switzerland), Washington DC (USA), Kinshasa (DRC) and Kigali (Rwanda). The priority areas of engagement for these partnerships include: housing, capacity building, youth development, safety and crime prevention, education, infrastructure development and even poetry and bicycle donations (see Table 1 below). The geographic spread of partnerships, in comparison to Johannesburg, has no current Asian relationships. However, BRICS cities such as Brasilia, Beijing, Moscow and New Delhi may be sought for cooperation to align with national level engagements (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013). SADC cities such as: Lusaka, Luanda, Maseru and Dar es Salaam have also been identified for possible engagements. While, there are no current agreements in the Middle East, this does not prevent informational linkages between cities from occurring, for example with Palestine, as informal cooperation can be equally effective (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013).

Table 1: Tshwane’s priority cooperation areas (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner City</th>
<th>Areas of Cooperation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delft</td>
<td>Low cost housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basel</td>
<td>Donation of bicycles and books to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oulo</td>
<td>Smart city cooperation and wireless connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>Drama and poetry workshops, youth exchanges, safety and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinshasa</td>
<td>Based on infrastructure development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kigali</td>
<td>Collaboration between academic institutions of higher learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tshwane municipality respondent emphasised the importance of communicating and coordinating with provincial and local government (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013). Relationships also rely on South African business individuals and institutions to take the lead on certain issues, with the municipality providing assistance (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013). Additionally, the respondent stated that there was regular informal communication with Johannesburg and Ekurhuleni; they share best practice lessons and ensure that they do not approach the same cities (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013).
However, this easy flow of communication between Johannesburg and Tshwane was somewhat disputed in interviews with Johannesburg.

This chapter has examined the policy and practice of local government’s international relations cooperation with cities overseas. Various documents have been examined to discuss the general characteristics of city-to-city cooperation agreements and their cross-cutting issues. The advisable and preferred national government strategies for local level international engagements have also been discussed.
Chapter 5 – Tracing Johannesburg’s Partnerships

This chapter discusses the nature of the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality’s international city-to-city partnerships and how they have diversified over time. The characteristics of agreements, as well as choice of city partners will be explored as the City of Johannesburg aims to engage in a “robust international relations programme” involving North-South, South-South and African agenda partnerships (GSPR, 2012: 1). The complexities, challenges and successes of formal international cooperation and partnership agreements within this programme will be addressed in this chapter, in terms of both policy and practice. Johannesburg and partner cities are engaged in a broad range of development areas, incorporating diversified projects and short and long-term goals. However, partnerships are often inactive for years, or entered into because of personal connections that cannot be maintained past mayoral terms. Thus their effectiveness comes into question.

Johannesburg’s past and present partnerships

International city-to-city cooperation arrangements are not a new occurrence in Johannesburg, and city twinnings have been in place since the apartheid era, although city partners and twining objectives have diversified since 1994. The policies and practicalities of these partnerships will be discussed. In the years directly after 1994, international city partnerships were initially organised in an ‘ad hoc’ manner and then later re-focused towards a more strategic approach that could maximise benefits from the partnerships (Harrison, interview, 2013). Yet implementing meaningful partnerships proved difficult for a variety of factors that will be discussed. While apartheid era agreements have since been discontinued, certain behaviours and approaches to partnerships remain quite similar.

In the past, entering into a twinning partnership could be based on rather questionable or unclear motives, including personal connections between the executive mayor of Johannesburg and the mayor or an official from another city (Harrison, interview 2013; and Seedat, interview, 2013). For example in 1983, the desire of the reigning mayor of Johannesburg to twin with an Israeli city is written under the headline: “Gadd wants to twin with Tel Aviv” (Foreign News Service, 1983). Johannesburg’s Mayor, Gadd, visited the Israeli
city and “got on well” with his Tel Aviv counterpart, while also being impressed with the
city’s urban development strategies, and was thus encouraged to twin with the city (Foreign
News Service, 1983). Personal connections of mayors continued to be a possible driving
force of partnerships in the early 2000s. Notwithstanding these personal ties, relationships
were not easier to manage as they were prone to disintegrate if the personal connection
dissipated (Harrison, interview, 2013; and Seedat, interview, 2013).

The death of one foreign official, from a city that was likely to become a partner, dissolved
any potential cooperation projects because it had been driven by that individual (Harrison,
interview, 2013). Conversely, if the mayor exhibited a particular enthusiasm for a city, it
could propel the partnership to success (Harrison, interview, 2013). However, this success
would depend on additional City of Johannesburg officials following up on the initial
enthusiasm which would need to be reciprocated at the partner city (Harrison, interview,
2013). Ultimately partnerships demand the energy and engagement of a range of actors and
officials in order to be effectively maintained and for development-related projects to be
accomplished.

The timing of elections, both municipal and national, as well as mayoral terms, has affected
the length and nature of Johannesburg’s partnerships. In 1989 for example, two Israeli
mayors from Rishon Le Zion and Bnei Brak, approached the then mayor of Johannesburg
about initiating a possible sister city relationship, with the caveat that initiating the
partnership would be dependent on the results of upcoming national elections in Israel
(municipal reporter, 1989). The prospective partnership with Tel Aviv was also dependent
on the outcome of the upcoming local municipal elections; Johannesburg’s mayor stated
that he was going to wait before requesting a formal partnership because he was concerned
that “Israeli-South African relations” would “become an election issue” affecting the
mayor’s chances of re-election (Foreign News Service, 1983). Johannesburg mayoral terms
only lasted one year from the early 1900s until 1994 (City of Johannesburg website, no date)
which made it difficult to follow up with cities which had expressed an interest in twinning
based on a relationship with a particular mayor.
Notably, even in the 2000s, when Mayor Masondo’s term ended, there were partnerships, or potential partnerships, that were not brought to fruition (Harrison, interview, 2013; and Erasmus, interview, 2013). This also shows one way in which national politics affected partnerships. There were also later cases where political instability in an African partner city had caused a relationship to end prematurely (Seedat, interview, 2013). Politics affected partnerships especially during South Africa’s isolation during apartheid, in that there were very few cities who were willing to partner with a South African city (Seedat, interview, 2013; anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013). It was also likely that some international linkages were ‘under the radar’ so to speak (Seedat, interview, 2013). Despite this, Johannesburg had roughly 39 agreements with cities around the world, often based on support for the apartheid government (Siyaphambili Development Consulting, 2002: 1; Singh, 2002). These partnerships have all changed since democracy, but it shows how many different twinnings can go on at a specific time, and how national politics affect the local level. Currently, politics on the provincial government level also plays a role, as Gauteng Province is engaged in twinnings with other provinces around the world. This can affect the international relationships on the municipal level, as they may be interested in the same partners, which could create unease (Erasmus, interview, 2013).

Shortly after apartheid ended, the City of Johannesburg was inundated with an overwhelming amount of twinning offers from around the world (Seedat, interview, 2013; Sowetan correspondent, 1995; Sapa, 1997). Seedat (interview, 2014) stated that requests for delegation visits and twinnings “were coming from everywhere”, including from cities and countries with previous links to South Africa or the anti-apartheid struggle, and those who were eager to forge ties with the newest democracy. While there may have been some twinnings during apartheid years, local government restructuring meant that municipal international relations were beginning anew in the City of Johannesburg metropolitan municipality after 1994, albeit initially in an ad-hoc manner (Seedat, interview, 2013).

Highlighting this wave of partnership requests, “at least ten cities in the United States [...] invited Greater Johannesburg to enter into twin city agreements” in 1995, after nine mayors from the U.S.A. visited, encouraged by the boom of U.S.A. firms in the city (Sowetan correspondent, 1995: no page). The change in the political situation created a huge interest
in the city which could have perhaps been better managed and cultivated towards impressive results. Gauteng Province and Johannesburg, in particular, were attractive to foreign investors and local governments because of the infrastructure and resources (Van Wyk, 1997: 40). Murray and Nakhjavani (2009: 223) state that “during the honeymoon period” after apartheid ended, “many international agreements were concluded by provinces and municipalities, but most focused more on ‘trips, toasts and twinning’ [...] than on substantive projects”. The inexperience of international engagements meant that enjoying trips overseas were sometimes coveted more than purposeful cooperation programmes.

Johannesburg’s twinnings, in addition to being framed by politics and personal connections, also developed from shared circumstances. Birmingham’s (England) desire to twin with the Greater Johannesburg Metropolitan Council in 1997 was based on similarities experienced by both cities in the area of urban and social development (Sapa, 1997). “Birmingham has gone through the same stage as Johannesburg is going through now”, a representative from Johannesburg was quoted as saying (Sapa, 1997: 14). These shared experiences would lead to a “reciprocal development” agreement, with priority areas of engagement being: “human resource development, health and social welfare, sports, and arts and culture”, as well as crime prevention (Sapa, 1997: 14). Birmingham became the City of Johannesburg’s first sister city according to an agreement in 1997, and later an agreement with Berlin was concluded (Siyaphambili Development Consulting, 2002: 1).

Berlin’s partnership was supposedly centred on reunification and transformation, yet a company reviewing the relationship found that “the information received about Berlin City’s relationship does not indicate that the relationship exists” (Siyaphambili Development Consulting, 2002: 9). This suggests that partnerships may be difficult to verify, and although indications exist, there may be no actual partnership. I have come across similar issues in my research. In addition, numerous cities are identified as possible partners but few actually come to fruition as formal partnerships (see for example cities mentioned as possible partners from 2006 in Kariem, 2006).
Partnerships were sought because of the particular knowledge that a city had which could assist Johannesburg in improving its social and economic development. (anonymous City of Johannesburg, interview, 2014). For instance, New York City was attractive for its urban management and anti-crime policies which Johannesburg wanted to emulate (Harrison, interview, 2013). Shared experiences may be a more solid foundation for a partnership, even though the contexts are very different. Johannesburg’s newly democratic status meant that there was a need to address past injustices and exclusion from urban areas and services by the majority of the population.

On the provincial level, Gauteng Province had sister-state agreements with numerous areas after apartheid: Havana (Cuba); North Rhein Westphalia (Germany); Malaysia; Kyoggi (South Korea); and Bavaria (Germany) (Van Wyk, 1997: 52). Van Wyk (1997: 53) characterised Gauteng’s approach to international engagements as “activist”, because the province was an “initiator” of relations, specifically of those which focused on trade and investment. This reflects “agency” at a provincial and local level, which Gauteng and Johannesburg both exhibit. Mayor Masondo stated that twinnings were sought “in terms of promoting trade, investment, tourism and deepening the culture of service to communities”, while purely “symbolic” linkages were to be avoided (Kariem, 2006: no page). Figure 5 below, shows Mayor Masondo signing sister city agreements with the mayor of New York in 2003, and with the mayor of Ho Chi Minh City in 2009. As a sign of goodwill in 2003, Mayor Bloomberg presented Mayor Masondo with a key to the city because of this partnership (The New York Times, 2007). Partnerships with cities that had “strategic links” in Europe, North America and Asia were sought after (Siyaphambili Development Consulting, 2002).
Figure 5: Mayor Mxando signing sister city agreements with New York (top) and Ho Chi Minh City (bottom) (City of New York Official website, 2003: no page; Luan, 2009: no page)

Maintaining active and beneficial city partnerships has proven to be a difficult aspect of municipal international relationships, with various factors affecting the implementation of formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) agreements. Maintaining partnerships may at times benefit from a dedicated staff who could sustain contact and follow up with partner cities to ensure commitment to objectives, according to Seedat (interview, 2013). Some partnership objectives have been unattainable due to a lack of capacity to implement, making them inactive or dormant (Seedat, interview, 2013). It is somewhat ironic that city-to-city cooperation partnerships are often designed to improve municipal capacity, but cannot be implemented because of capacity issues.

Partnerships could be expensive to maintain with the financial cost to the city not reciprocated in kind, in which case it would be less costly to end the partnership (Harrison, interview, 2013). Relationships involve many delegation visits, including by officials and politicians, yet visits would not necessarily bring about a tangible result (Harrison, interview, 2013). However the knowledge sharing gained through these visits would often prove to be
worthwhile, even if a long term partnership did not materialise (Harrison, interview, 2013). The most successful overseas tours in terms of learning were, according to Harrison (interview, 2013), those with specific objectives or based on specific projects. Once partnerships have become dormant or inactive, it is very difficult to re-energise them (Harrison, interview, 2013). During Harrison’s time at the City of Johannesburg, attempts were also made to resuscitate certain earlier partnerships. One way of doing this was to invite representatives to workshops and conferences, yet it was difficult to know exactly which overseas official from the partner city would be the most preferable to invite (Harrison, interview, 2013). Maintaining active international relationships can require a large amount of energy and resources. This highlights the importance of strategically relevant partnerships, with reachable development goals.

Developing a Bus Rapid Transport (BRT) system in Johannesburg was influenced by visits to Latin America, experiences learnt through exchanges, without a formal twinning (Harrison, interview, 2013). Housing issues have been compared with Mumbai’s experience (Harrison, interview, 2013). The hosting of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002 was also facilitated and encouraged, to a degree, by these international partnerships (Seedat, interview, 2013). International cooperation was also important in the run up to the hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup, as Johannesburg could learn from various formal and informal partnerships which had themselves experienced major sporting events (Harrison, interview, 2013). Shorter term projects, as opposed to long-term engagements can prove to be more rewarding. These partnerships can also have important offshoots. If a connection is in place it could be adapted to suit various other issues that may come up, and could therefore create global allegiances that will back the city.

The External Relations Unit (ERU) was the short-lived unit under whose responsibility developing and maintaining local and international city partnerships fell in the 2000s (City of Johannesburg website, 2012: no page). The unit dealt with international cooperation with the understanding that this included twinning agreements involving MOUs, project-based cooperation, or specific information-sharing encounters (City of Johannesburg website, 2012: no page). The head of the External Relations Unit stated that "the twin city
agreements were people-focused projects, removed from politics to people-based needs," highlighting the importance of constituents in these partnerships. Yet, effective coordination of international relations proved to be challenging for the unit (Seedat, interview, 2013). Its mandate later became combined with that of the Strategy Unit to allow the city-to-city cooperation arrangements to be more strategically organised (Erasmus, interview, 2013). Capacity to manage and maintain arrangements is again shown to be a complex task, with many variables affecting the outcome.

Thus international relations became the purview of the Strategy and Relations Unit, with the new strategic objectives only recently outlined (Erasmus, interview, 2013). Erasmus (interview, 2013) states that in the unit’s current approach, “we don’t want to promote a one size fits all model for C2C”. According to Erasmus (interview, 2013) there is a lack of coordination, cohesion and sharing between the three spheres of government which can complicate city twinnings and other forms of city level international engagements, highlighting the need for effective intergovernmental relations. Erasmus (interview, 2013) notes that the National Development Plan tellingly refers to a “spaghetti bowl” of international relations, meaning they are entangled and difficult to separate.

In terms of guiding documents on international relations, Johannesburg became the first city in the country to have a separate municipal international relations policy when the Municipal International Relations Policy was adopted on 16 August 2001 (City of Johannesburg, 2002: 51; City of Johannesburg official website: external relations unit, 2012: no page). Initially twinnings focused on English-speaking cities such as Birmingham and London in the United Kingdom, which shared a “cultural link” with South Africa (Siyaphambili Development Consulting, 2002; and City of Johannesburg, 2002: 51). Language barriers, however, could be overcome especially if cities had a historical anti-apartheid connection (Seedat, interview, 2013).

According to Johannesburg’s 2001 International Relations Policy, any municipal international agreement should fulfil “one or more” of eight requirements, reflecting the desire to be involved in partnerships that could have an impact on development, including poverty alleviation and encouraging investment (City of Johannesburg, 2002: 51). The more
general criteria included capacity building, fostering good governance and contributing to
global peace (City of Johannesburg, 2002: 51). An additional requirement referred to goals
not being limited to the city, but also towards boosting the New Partnership for Africa’s
Development’s (NEPAD) profile (City of Johannesburg, 2002: 51). The criteria are specific to
the city, but also fairly general and similar to the national MIR policy of 1999, yet with an
“African agenda”. Johannesburg was trying to position itself as an “entry point into Africa”
(City of Johannesburg official website: external relations unit, 2012: no page).

This 2001 policy document recognised three kinds of municipal international relations:
sister-city/twinning agreements, project co-operation agreements, and information
exchanges (City of Johannesburg, 2002: 51). Eight twinning agreements were seen as
preferable and research was undertaken to determine which cities were desirable, although
finding cities that were not already engaged in partnerships with South African cities, and
identifying fellow African cities with political stability, presented some of the challenges
(City of Johannesburg, 2002: 51). However, this policy needed to be re-structured a decade
later to address shortcomings.

A redesigned international relations framework was developed in 2012 as the entire
international relations department and strategies were restructured (Erasmus, interview,
2013). Conversely, on the provincial level, Gauteng province has a separate framework on
international relations (Marokane, interview, 2014). A new strategy has divided city-to-city
cooperation into four key pillars: formal MOUs/twinnings; networking; intergovernmental
relations and knowledge management (Erasmus, interview, 2013). This 2012 framework
incorporates knowledge management as one of its key pillars, whereas previously
knowledge management had been organised in a separate framework, known as Municipal
International Relations Knowledge Management Guidelines of 2009 (anonymous City of
Johannesburg, interview, 2014). The main objective of the guidelines was to improve the
“management of information arising from Municipal International Relations (MIR)
engagements, specifically: international study tours, participation at international
conferences and workshops, official delegations, presentations and promotions” (City of
Johannesburg, 2009b: 5). The purpose was to ensure that knowledge learnt through MIR
was being maximised to its full potential and then distributed throughout the municipality.
However, knowledge management techniques have also been difficult to implement as they require cooperation and reports from all overseas engagements, which does not always occur timeously if at all (anonymous City of Johannesburg, interview, 2014). This is another example of how the objectives listed in policies and frameworks are not easily put into action at the local level resulting in a disconnect between operationalisation and policy.

The 2012 international relations framework encourages international programmes to be linked with broader development strategies for the city, as outlined in the Joburg 2040 Growth and Development Strategy (GDS) document (GSPR, 2012: 81; Erasmus, interview, 2013). Joburg 2040\(^3\) “is an aspirational strategy that defines the type of society the city aspires to achieve, by 2040” (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 8). Outcomes of the strategy include “development driven resilience” and a “sustainable urban environment” (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 9). Another outcome refers to ensuring that Johannesburg is part of a “globally competitive Gauteng City Region” (GCR) (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 9). This GCR involves a new perspective on governance and institutional make-up of the Gauteng area (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 21). The strategy assumes that alliances will, because of this new GCR and global trends of city-regions, be “based on new areas of investment identified as aiding city economic growth, alongside knowledge exchanges, city partnerships to reduce the impact of climate change, and social partnerships – as these cities continue to share large numbers of each other’s migrant population” (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 21). Thus partnerships may be re-organised again in the future to suit these new alliances and it is likely to open the door to a range of new areas for cooperation which will be worth examining.

An international relations agenda for 2013-2016 (Erasmus and Ebrahim, 2013) has been developed by the Strategic and Relations Unit, and aligns with national government interests (GSPR, 2012). The document details the types of city-to-city relationships that Johannesburg is currently involved in and suggests potential cities that should be approached for future partnerships (Erasmus and Ebrahim, 2013: 1). The types of

---

\(^3\) Joburg 2040 is an updated version of the city’s 2006 Growth and Development Strategy (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 8).
cooperation agreements that Johannesburg is currently or will be involved in with foreign cities, according to the agenda, include: ceremonial relationships, solidarity relationships, active relationships and networks (Erasmus and Ebrahim, 2013). The agenda shows the wide range of international cities in which Johannesburg is currently, or will be, involved with. The document sheds light on the increasingly complicated list of strategically important cities. It also shows the general long-term nature of relationships.

Seven ceremonial relationships are outlined in the new agenda; they include: London (MOU signed in 2004); St Petersburg (MOU signed in 2009); Shanghai (MOU signed in 2009); Windhoek (MOU signed in 2005); Lilongwe; Kigali; and Bamako. These relationships are described as being maintained because the cities have either a global importance (Shanghai), are BRICS cities (St Petersburg), previous cooperation has received acclaim (Lilongwe), or they are strategically important for furthering an African agenda (Windhoek) (Erasmus and Ebrahim, 2013). Ceremonial relationships can refer to city twinnings or ‘friendships’ which generally do not have a ‘good output record’ (GSPR, 2012).

Cities with solidarity relations, as detailed in the revised agenda, include: Val de Marne (MOU signed 2000); Ho Chi Minh City; Addis Ababa (MOU signed 2003/7); Harare; Matola; Lusaka; and Lumbumbashi (Erasmus and Ebrahim, 2013). The relationships are generally passive, except for Addis Ababa and Matola where more active engagement will be sought. These solidarity relations relate to anti-apartheid struggle (Ho Chi Minh City), location of the African Union (Addis Ababa), or the mayor’s preference (Lumbumbashi) (Erasmus and Ebrahim, 2013). These solidarity relationships are often aligned with the ANC’s solidarity priorities which include Southern African liberation movements (GSPR, 2012:58-9).

Under the third type of relationship, referred to as active, eight cities have been identified for future partnerships and MOUs during the period 2014-2016. These include: Lagos, Maputo, Luanda, Sao Paulo, Mumbai, Shenzhen, Bilbao, and Luxembourg. These include partnerships that already have MOUs, such as New York, Birmingham and Addis Ababa (Erasmus and Ebrahim, 2013).
In addition to cooperation partnerships, this latest agenda advocates joining global and regional local government and city networks, including: UCLG, UCLGA, Metropolis, C40, ICLEI, Africities and GNSC (Erasmus and Ebrahim, 2013:3). Erasmus (interview, 2013) stated that it is not enough to be a member, as the city and its representatives need to be actively involved in these networks. Another aspect of C2C is the hosting of conferences and events, “to enhance the global image of the city and attract further economic growth and development” (Erasmus and Ebrahim, 2013:5).

From the discussion above, it is clear to see that problems of the past persist in the present. Issues with international engagements are not easily resolved. Sometimes current international engagements require a change in the very “culture” of how officials manage international engagements and that is difficult to implement (anonymous City of Johannesburg, interview, 2014). The basis has been provided for how Johannesburg’s partnerships function; next an in-depth look at the agreements will be undertaken.

**Dissecting Johannesburg’s international agreements**

Johannesburg’s formal agreements during the years 2000-2010, which fall under Mayor Maseko’s term (the 2012 international relations framework under Mayor Tau, had at the time of research, not yet led to new formal agreements), will be discussed. The full list of agreements analysed in this section can be found in appendix F and G. During the first decade of this century, ten international agreements were signed with cities located in Europe, North America, Asia and Africa. Harrison (interview, 2013) stated that due to the difficulties encountered with implementing many partnerships and the cost involved, “there were about a handful that were worth it”, adding that the “healthier relationships” are those where the cities were “evenly matched”. The seemingly basic agreements belie a more complicated initial engagement and implementation process. The lack of mention of the role of provincial and national government is perhaps also striking, given the frameworks and policies discussed in the previous chapter.

Figure 6, below, shows the geographical spread of these agreement cities and additionally cites Addis Ababa and Lilongwe which have also had projects with Johannesburg. Lilongwe was described by interview respondents as an example of a very successful cooperation and
a ceremonial relationship remains ongoing (Seedat, interview, 2013; Erasmus, interview, 2013; Erasmus and Ebrahim, 2013). To maximise the learning potential from partner cities, Singh (2002: 17) asserts that Johannesburg’s international partners were chosen from “diverse backgrounds and cultures, as such, at least one city per continent”. Singh also highlights the notion that these partners were chosen to contribute towards South-South cooperation and to promote the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD).

The clustering of cities in Figure 6 shows that Asia and Europe have the most partnerships, with England and China each having two cities partnered with Johannesburg. Another observation is that Johannesburg has been partnered with four capital cities, while not a capital city itself: London, Lilongwe, Addis Ababa and Windhoek. Perhaps Johannesburg’s influence within Southern African can account for the capital city partnerships in the continent. This links to the previously stated idea that the English language cooperation ventures were some of the first partnerships and that China is a strategically important country because of its membership to BRICS and its economic strength in Africa.

Figure 6: Geographic spread of Johannesburg’s partner cities
There are both commonalities and differences in the characteristics of the agreements. Generally the agreements are between one to two pages in length and are written in broad strokes, without an end date. This lack of detail in terms of clarity of objectives and roles means that questions such as how the objectives will be achieved, which specific departments are to be involved, how funding will be allocated, or the setting of a project deadline are not broached in the agreements. However, there is an exception in Val-De-Marne agreement, and St. Petersburg states that the agreement is valid for five years, which is an 18 page agreement including various sub-sections, such as historical background, funding, expected timeline, possible cancelation of agreement, and a specific project agreement that are not present in the other agreements. Yet in the 2012 international relations framework document Val de Marne is seen as a partner no longer succinct with Joburg’s 2040 strategy, this may require re-strategising the cooperation if it is to carry on (GSPR, 2012).

Given the lack of conformity in appearance of the agreements, it is evident that these agreements did not follow a strict template, although there are a few which have a similar structure. Owing to this lack of discernible structure, the tone and language used in agreements also differs, from the basic to technical. According to Singh (2002: 19), the agreements are framed in such a way because local governments are not bestowed with the power to sign international legal treaties that can lead to legal action; that is the domain of the presidency and national executive. Instead:

“what the parties contract upon is based on their bona fides, common interests, trust, understanding, goodwill and cooperation, and based on this, the genuine belief that the initiatives, projects, programmes, and so on, will bring them net benefits. All this is expressed in Memoranda of Understanding rather than treaties and firm contracts” (Singh, 2002: 19).

Hence engagements are most often organised as MOUs.

The terminology used is in agreements is inconsistent, given the range of titles of the agreements, such as MOUs/Cooperation and Friendship agreements/decentralised cooperation agreements. Figure 7 below highlights this variety in categories of agreements.
There were essentially three types of relationships according to Singh’s (2002: 21) experience with MIR in Johannesburg in the early 2000s: sister city/twinning agreements; project cooperation agreements; and information exchange agreements. The latter agreement is informal, whereas sister city partnerships will have broad goals and “indicate and agree on mutual intentions and goodwill” (Singh, 2002: 21), while a project cooperation will be based on a particular cooperation project and the agreement will end when the project is completed (Singh, 2002: 21). There are three agreements that categorise cooperation as a sister city partnership: New York, Windhoek and Ho Chi Minh City. Some agreements are mentioned as being between the two city councils (e.g. Birmingham). The agreements are either signed by the mayor or by a councillor. Agreements are varied with both formal and informal aspects and range in terms of cooperation, partnership and friendships.

Although their titles may differ, no striking differing can be found when the objectives of these agreements are mentioned. It is understood that while the objectives mentioned should be viewed as the mere foundations of the partnership, they can be adjusted and expanded as need be. Cooperation thus appears to be ‘open to interpretation’, perhaps making it easily adaptable to changing contexts. The agreements describe the desired cooperation as being mutually beneficial to each city. The objectives stated in some MOU agreements could be somewhat opaque, making it unclear who or how to approach the
partnership (Harrison, interview, 2013). Objectives declared in these documents include: proactively engage, promote, and support each other under a practical programme-driven partnership; promote social and economic development, cultural exchange, and good governance; contribute to an international culture of human rights, global solidarity and understanding; enhance socio-economic development and create a culture of learning through a programme-driven partnership; enhance further exchanges and cooperation; mutually beneficial, practical cooperation that attains net benefits for both parties. The most striking difference in titles belongs to St. Petersburg’s, ‘agreement on Economic, Scientific-Technical and Cultural Cooperation’ which is the most explicit in stating exactly what the agreement will entail.

Some of the agreements (Ho Chi Minh City, New York, Shanghai, Windhoek) state an objective of attaining net benefits for the two cities and their constituencies, yet how these ‘net benefits’ could be measured and what happens if they are not attained, is not explained. Ruffin’s (2013: 138) study on MIR in eThekwini, found that “there is evidence that people-centred values underlie public service outcomes of municipal international relations”. Ruffin (2013: 138) lists skills and youth development projects as examples of this “people-centred” approach. A range of objectives are mentioned in Johannesburg’s agreements, from social/people focused to the economy.

In the agreements, few guidelines are provided other than the most general steps. This highlights the need for communication on expectations with additional action plans and in-depth discussion. Of the 9 signed agreements, there are only a few that mention that monitoring and evaluation will take place (Ho Chi Minh City, London and Shanghai, although Val De Marne requires evaluation of projects, whereas the others mention monitoring only). Evaluation can also require financial input for which there is no budget, as was experienced by Mabin (interview, 2013). This could also point to a lack of commitment in anything more than a “friendship” relationship.

Table 2 below highlights the focus areas of cooperation and projects. These areas are not always described in agreements and have been sourced from other documents, if not mentioned. These cooperation areas include: economic development, youth development,
safety and crime prevention, and urban planning (City of Johannesburg official website, 2012; and 2009 Mayoral Committee Report). While the collaboration areas from Ho Chi Minh City and Chengdu were not easily apparent from the agreements, the Shanghai agreement states that its partnership with Johannesburg forms part of a greater cooperation between China and South Africa. This is one of a few agreements that overtly mention national interests in local agreements. There is quite a broad range of areas of interest.

Table 2: City of Johannesburg’s areas of cooperation (City of Johannesburg official website, 2012: no page; and 2009 Mayoral Committee report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner City</th>
<th>Areas of Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>Development of land and housing; promotion of city development and planning strategies; enhancement of performance management; development of executive management training; financial management; prevention and treatment of HIV and Aids; and improvement of service delivery approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Youth development and library exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chengdu</td>
<td>Exchange and cooperation in commerce, trade, education, culture, science, technology, environment, governance and civic education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Chi Minh City</td>
<td>Cooperation that will enhance socio-economic development and create a culture of learning through a programme-driven partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>City planning for FIFA World Cup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Safety and crime prevention; HIV and aids prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>Urban planning, infrastructure, trade and tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Economic development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val De Marne</td>
<td>Social development, economic development, early childhood development and housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windhoek</td>
<td>Safety; city planning; water and sanitation; geographic information systems; and councillor training.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the limitations that have been discussed in how agreements are structured, it comes as little surprise that MOUs will probably look very different in the near future. The specific development contexts of the cities and components involved in a partnership agreement are to be more heavily scrutinised before entering into a city-to-city cooperation partnership (Erasmus, interview, 2013). The costs, deliverables, drivers and performance evaluations are also to appear in agreements and action plans are essential (Erasmus, interview, 2013). Box 2 below highlights the steps involved in entering into overseas city-to-city cooperation, according to the 2012 framework document on international relations in
Johannesburg (GSPR, 2012: 85). In addition to work plans and discussions about the partnerships, the various steps involved show that it could be a lengthy period between identification of the potential partner city and eventual signing of the MOU, given the seven steps involved. Well defined work plans and discussions with relevant stakeholders are necessary steps towards an effective relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engaging with International Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong> Confirm relationship: formally or informally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong> Prepare a clear work plan with clear milestones, deliverables and roles and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3:</strong> City of Johannesburg approval of cities selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4:</strong> Lobby the potential city or consider the request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5:</strong> Discussion with stakeholders about the content and intended outcomes of the partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6:</strong> Prepare a clear work plan with clear milestones, deliverables and roles and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 7:</strong> Depending on the arrangement, sign formal MOU between the two cities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 1: Steps involved in cooperation agreements (GSPR, 2012: 85)

Singh (2002: 16), a previous head of the International Relations Department at the City of Johannesburg, called for municipalities, such as Johannesburg, to be seen as “learning institutions,” where human capital, improved through “mutually beneficial international relationships” can be applied to the governance and service delivery needs of the city’s constituents (Singh, 2002: 16). Moreover, learning and knowledge sharing can come about through different contexts and do not necessarily come from formal MOUs or twinnings (Harrison, interview, 2013). University-to-university relationships could also be included in C2C, for example, between a university in Shanghai and Wits, and this could be beneficial in terms of exchanging knowledge (Harrison, interview, 2013).

The respondents interviewed have experienced a range of city-to-city cooperation and have gathered factors that are required for the success of partnerships. These are worth mentioning. It is necessary to be selective when choosing partner cities, as too many partnerships tend to be difficult to maintain or to provide tangible results (Harrison, interview, 2013). Agreements are more effective when they focus on concrete objectives, instead of being overly ambitious, according to Seedat (interview, 2013). This requires
clarity of objectives and deliverables, as well as detailed action plans of how to proceed (Seedat, interview, 2013). Financial resources and a high level of commitment from both parties are needed to facilitate these goals and to maintain a rewarding collaboration (Seedat, interview, 2013). Partnerships need to include a resourceful urban innovation framework and involve searching for ideas from other parts of the world that can be applied in the City of Johannesburg (Harrison, interview, 2013).

Cities need to have the “capability to process knowledge” from elsewhere, so that they can make decisions about whether the approaches used by other cities are appropriate to their situation (Harrison, interview, 2013). South-South relationships are sometimes more effective and desirable because the cities are more equally matched, and they can provide a greater opportunity for knowledge sharing and learning (Harrison, interview, 2013). Potential partner cities need to be fully researched before MOUs are signed; this includes understanding the governance structures of each partner city (Erasmus, interview, 2013).

While the section above has discussed the characteristics of agreements, and how they tend to lack details and objectives, below the nature of partnerships will be discussed.

**Nurturing South-South relationships and geopolitical focus areas**

South-South cooperation has increasingly become a priority area, while more traditional North-South cooperation is becoming less favoured for Johannesburg (Erasmus, interview, 2013). From at least 2006 onwards, building or extending linkages within the African continent, either based on outside requests or investigation by the City of Johannesburg has become more of a strategic priority for the city (Harrison, interview, 2013). Initially the SADC region, then West and East Africa, are the most important locations for partnerships within Africa (Erasmus, interview, 2013). This would then be followed by BRICS countries and then the more traditional North-South pairings, yet with the understanding that “we cannot be everywhere,” (Erasmus, interview, 2013). However, given the list, the linkages can be “almost everywhere”. Partnerships with Francophone and Lusophone cities may be challenging, given the historical differences and language issues to overcome; power relations would also differ from current North-South relations (Erasmus, interview, 2013). These areas match the ANC’s and national government’s international relations agenda.
In Johannesburg’s latest Integrated Development Plan, Outcome 11 is stated as “a better South Africa, a better and safer Africa and world” (City of Johannesburg, 2012: 43). Under this outcome, city-to-city cooperation is seen as “sharing engagements where municipalities can learn from each other and include twinning agreements, project coordination and information sharing” (City of Johannesburg, 2012: 43). Partnerships within Africa are a focus area; a budget of R5 million is to be set aside for the city international relations agenda, specifically focused on Africa and BRICS. The Joburg 2040 strategy document explains how geo-politics are “shifting” towards “emerging economies” such as China, India and Africa (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 14). African economies are expected to grow at a faster rate in the near future, with their economies expected to “double their current size by the early 2020s” (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 14). “Global economic power is shifting” (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 14), and the city-to-city cooperation agenda along with it.

Respondents (Erasmus, interview, 2013; anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013) indicated that cities in BRICS countries were being sought out for future partnerships, if they are not partners already. Habib (2013: 185) states that “the purpose of BRICS is to facilitate cooperation among the member countries, and to enhance their collective leverage with the view to reforming international financial institutions and the global order”. This shows the filtering of national interests down to the local level. The City of Johannesburg has identified Sao Paulo, Shenzhen and Mumbai for future partnerships, with MOUs expected to be signed in 2013/14/15 (Erasmus and Ebrahim, 2013). In the near future, there will be a long list of twinnings, whether these will be sustainable is yet to be seen.

The Lilongwe, Malawi cooperation was one of the more successful recent examples of C2C (although there was no signed MOU) involving Johannesburg and a fellow African city. The cooperation involved the City of Johannesburg playing a mentorship role in assisting Lilongwe to create a City Development Strategy (CDS) (Seedat, interview, 2013). The partnership saw Johannesburg fulfilling its African agenda (according to Erasmus as citied in Thorpe, 2011: 46). Yet it was an interesting learning experience for officials from both cities as, “people didn’t know where to start in Lilongwe as no one here, including the consultants, knew how to undertake a process like this, but once the programme or strategy
is implemented, it’s important to give control of the local government functions back to the city you are working with,” stated Erasmus (as cited in Thorpe, 2011: 46). The partnership was deemed successful because the objectives were reached and also because capacity of the Lilongwe municipality was improved by the intervention and the mentorship programme received international recognition (Seedat, interview, 2013). Johannesburg is in an interesting position on the continent it has the required skill to provide mentorship programmes, but at the same time also requires development related assistance.

Collaboration between the stakeholders
City-to-city cooperation relationships involve a range of intersecting interests between the different spheres of government and various stakeholders. Figure 9 below highlights the range of government stakeholders that have been discussed during interviews with respondents and through additional research. In the empirical chapters of this research, challenges that Johannesburg and other municipalities have experienced were discussed. A lack of coherence in local and national policy and practice, as well as a lack of coordination between the various government stakeholders is evidently one of the most common challenges to overcome locally. Figure 9 illustrates the actors and stakeholders involved in Johannesburg’s cooperation relationships. If all of the 200 plus municipalities in South Africa are involved in international relations, it could put a great strain on these stakeholders.
The Joburg 2040 strategy document states that co-operative governance involving both the spheres of government and other areas in the Gauteng City Region, is “one of the critical tensions – and challenges – facing the City” (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 85). Greater cooperation is required for service delivery to be improved. According to the strategy, this cooperation can be accomplished by all spheres ensuring that commitments made to constituents “match local government capabilities and planning”. Furthermore, the strategy states that “the dislocation between national and provincial priority and policy setting and local government realities at the site of implementation need to be addressed” (City of Johannesburg, 2011: 85). The strategy recognises that going forward requires more transparency and cooperation to affect real change.

One example of lack of cohesion between departments that I personally experienced while undertaking this research was when I requested an updated list of Johannesburg’s current city-to-city cooperation partners from DIRCO. After various communications, I was provided with a list consisting of the two Chinese municipalities and nothing more, which was inconsistent with the list supplied by the strategic relations department at the City of Johannesburg. This could merely be an oversight or an example of lack of interaction and engagement between the different stakeholders.
Coordination and information sharing between national and local departments and amongst Gauteng municipalities, was contradictorily described by some respondents. According to the Tshwane municipality respondent (interview, 2013), local actors have regular contact, including meetings with other Gauteng municipalities to avoid duplication in their international engagements, and also regularly submit reports to DIRCO (anonymous Tshwane, interview, 2013). While Johannesburg municipality respondents’ noted that knowledge sharing with other departments and municipalities as well as on the provincial level left room for improvement, with Erasmus (interview, 2013) stating that he lacked information on other municipalities’ foreign relations activities. This suggests that communication and knowledge sharing proves to be difficult on the both the local and international level.

Government is not the only actor involved in city-to-city cooperation. Figure 10 below highlights the variety of non-governmental actors. An area of disagreement among the respondents was whether business interests should be represented in city delegations. Erasmus (interview, 2013) stated that business interests may not necessarily be compatible with the strategic direction of the city, as big business might not have the best interests of the city at heart. Yet Marokane (interview, 2014) and the Tshwane municipality respondent (interview, 2013) stated that big business should be involved in municipal international engagements. Other stakeholders which were mentioned during interviews and subsequent research included schools and universities (youth were involved in student and teacher exchanges); international and local city networks and alliances; foreign embassies and delegations (they can initiate or facilitate engagements); international organisations and non-governmental organisations may also be involved, as well as project specific beneficiaries.
This chapter has examined Johannesburg’s approach to city-to-city cooperation partnerships. Past and present strategies and twinning relationships have been examined according to certain contexts. The challenges that have been experienced in initiating and implementing cooperation agreements have been discussed. These partnerships cannot be examined in isolation; therefore national level policies and strategies have been mentioned. The complexity of city-to-city cooperation has also been analysed in terms of co-ordination, duplication of activities and the need to monitor and review relationships.
Chapter 6 – Conclusion

This final chapter draws conclusions and inferences from the research conducted by addressing the research questions presented in the introductory chapter. Research points to the fact that city-to-city relations are more complex than they initially appear, and thus some of the research questions may not receive clear-cut answers. Due to the limited scope of this research report, formal recommendations will be avoided in favour of suggesting possible directions for future research on city-to-city cooperation. As the department dealing with international relations had recently been restructured and new international relations strategies introduced, future research may produce a range of options currently unavailable given the lack of activity of partnerships during this current transition phase. I argue that city-to-city cooperation in Johannesburg, and South Africa, is a subject that demands further critical attention, more than it has received thus far.

In this era of globalisation, Johannesburg’s city-to-city experience shows that a city/municipality can distinguish itself as an actor with global reach and power. There is a dichotomy of roles and representations as to how the City of Johannesburg maintains and creates partnerships. It is not simply the beneficiary of knowledge and aid from the global North, but also the benefactor, because its role in South-South cooperation can be different from that in North-South relations. Johannesburg’s experience shows that it is entrepreneurial in its approach to international engagements as it was one of the first South African cities to develop a separate municipal international relations policy. The city has now developed two international relations frameworks, while the national MIR framework policy has remained the same since 1999. Consistency in the city’s strategy towards international collaborations will eliminate disruptions created by the temporary nature of mayoral terms and changes in personnel (Erasmus, interview, 2013). Furthermore, a certain level of adaptability in approach could be useful with these often open-ended agreements.

City-to-city cooperation cannot be examined in isolation as it is embedded in cross-cutting topics and in certain contexts, calling for a broad understanding of a variety of issues, from urban concerns to foreign relations and from local to national government interests. The
reasons why certain cities have partnered with Johannesburg may be based on shared history, for example in liberation struggles. Partnerships are also based on current events and the strategic ambitions of the national government and provincial government. The “ad hoc” nature of earlier city linkages negatively affects the efficiency of partnerships. Respondents generally referred to only one or two partnerships as being successful in terms of reaching their objectives. While agreements may centre on vague social and economic objectives, there are so many other external and internal issues affecting the outcome of relationships. Consequently, without very clear project based goals, partnerships can often remain in indefinite limbo as they are rarely cancelled completely even if underperforming.

Research undertaken suggests that city-to-city cooperation in Johannesburg cannot merely be described as a ‘tale of two cities’. Instead it involves the municipality, the provincial and national government and various additional stakeholders. However, instances of possible tension can be found between these various actors and various objectives. Research has revealed that city-to-city cooperation partnerships demand a great deal of investment: time, staff, money and effort to maintain and even that may not lead to a tangible outcome. The mistakes of the past seem to repeat themselves and the desire for better coordination between stakeholders and more effective management of relations is oft repeated, yet the need is not eliminated.

Using the findings of this research as a starting point, there are a number of future research topics that could be explored. As Johannesburg’s strategy towards city-to-city cooperation has only recently changed, in the upcoming years a full comparison could be undertaken to ascertain how international partnerships have (or have not) changed. This could include examining the city-to-city cooperation from both municipalities’ viewpoints, as was not possible within the scope of this current project. Another study may also focus on non-governmental actors to a higher degree when examining projects. Additionally, a more quantitative analysis of the partnerships that weighs the precise inputs and outputs involved could possibly illuminate the true benefits and costs of international city partnerships in Johannesburg.
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Appendix A: List of interview respondents

- Professor Alan Mabin, Head of School of Architecture and Planning at Wits, April 2013.
- Professor Mfaniseni Sihlongonyane, Director of the Planning Programme in the School of Architecture & Planning, April 2013.
- Professor Philip Harrison – interviewed in his capacity as previous Executive Director of the City of Johannesburg Development Planning and Urban Management unit (2006-2010), August 2013.
- Mr. Rashid Seedat – interviewed in his capacity as previous head of the City of Johannesburg Central Strategy Unit, currently Head of the Gauteng Planning Commission, September 2013.
- Mr. Jan Erasmus – Director Strategy and Relations, City of Johannesburg (Group Strategy, Policy Coordination and Relations), August 2013.
- Anonymous, Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality, September 2013.
- Mr. Sello Marokane - Programme Manager: Governance & IGR, SALGA Gauteng, January 2014.
Appendix B: Information letter

Participant Information Sheet

MA Development Studies Research Project,
University of Witwatersrand

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Galia Buxbaum and I am currently studying towards a Master’s degree in Development Studies at Wits University. I am conducting research on Johannesburg’s transnational city-to-city agreements. The results of my research will be compiled into a research report as part of my degree requirements.

I would like to invite you to participate in this research by being interviewed. I believe that your professional experience could provide valuable insights. However your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you would not like to take part, there will be no repercussions. The information you provide can be anonymous if you so choose. You will be asked to sign a consent form if you agree to be interviewed.

If you have agreed to the interview, it will last between 30 minutes to one hour, and you will have the option of choosing to end your involvement with the research at any time.

If you have any queries or follow up comments, I can be reached via e-mail at galia.buxbaum@students.wits.ac.za. The research is being supervised by Prof. Michelle Williams, who can be contacted at michelle.williams@wits.ac.za.

Thank you,
Galia Buxbaum
Appendix C: Interview consent form

Consent Form for Interview

MA Development Studies Research Project,
University of Witwatersrand

Research topic: Johannesburg’s international city-to-city cooperation partnerships.

- Aim of the study: to examine a South African metro municipality’s city-to-city cooperation agreements with international partner cities and how these partnerships address development challenges.
- Your participation will involve one (or more) interview(s) with the researcher.
- By signing you are agreeing to an interview.

____________________  ______________________
Respondent                Date

____________________  ______________________
____________________  ______________________
Respondent                Date

Please sign below if you provide permission for your name and position to be used in the research report (do not sign below if you wish to remain anonymous).
Please note that some quotes from the interview may appear in the final research report.
### Appendix D: List* of international city partnerships in South Africa

(*list adapted from DIRCO 2010 list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>International City</th>
<th>Local City</th>
<th>Title of Agreement</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Botswana</td>
<td>Francistown</td>
<td>Buffalo City</td>
<td>Agreement on Co-operation between City of Buffalo and Francistown, Botswana</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 France</td>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>Buffalo City</td>
<td>Declaration of Intent between the Buffalo City Municipality and La Rochelle</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>San Pedro Municipality</td>
<td>Buffalo City</td>
<td>Twinning Agreement between Nelson Mandela Metro in the Eastern Cape and the San Pedro Municipality in Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Jinhua City</td>
<td>Buffalo City</td>
<td>Agreement on Co-operation between City of Buffalo and Jinhua City, Zhejiang Province, China</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Taiwan</td>
<td>Tainan City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twinning Agreement</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Netherlands</td>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>Buffalo City</td>
<td>Agreement on Co-operation between Buffalo City and Leiden, Netherlands</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Botswana</td>
<td>Lobatse</td>
<td>Port Elizabeth</td>
<td>Joint Declaration of Friendship and Cooperation by and between The Town Council of Lobatse and the Municipality of the City of Port Elizabeth</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sweden</td>
<td>Gavle</td>
<td>Buffalo City</td>
<td>Agreement of Cooperation between City of Buffalo and Gavle-Sweden</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 United States of America</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>Buffalo City</td>
<td>Agreement on Co-operation between City of Buffalo and Milwaukee, Wisconsin</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sweden</td>
<td>Goteborg</td>
<td>Port Elizabeth</td>
<td>Contract of Partnership between the Municipality of the City of Goteborg and the Municipality of the City of Port Elizabeth</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 United States of America</td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>Port Elizabeth</td>
<td>Agreement of Establishment of Sister City Relationship between the City of Port Elizabeth, Republic of South Africa and the City of Jacksonville, Florida, United States of America</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Daqing</td>
<td>East London</td>
<td>Sister City Agreement between East London and Daqing (Heilongjiang Province)</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Algeria</td>
<td>AnnaBa</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Annaba (Algeria) and the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>International City</td>
<td>Local City</td>
<td>Title of Agreement</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Mozambique</td>
<td>Beira</td>
<td>Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality</td>
<td>Arrangement on Friendship and Cooperation between the City of Beira (Mozambique) and the Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality (South Africa)</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Cuba</td>
<td>Matanzas Province</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twinning Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Switzerland</td>
<td>Canton of Basel-Stadt</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding regarding the Exchange Programme Mutual Learning between the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality in the Republic of South Africa and the Canton of Basel-Stadt (Switzerland).</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Algieria</td>
<td>Algiers</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Sister Agreement between the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality and the City of Algiers</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Netherlands</td>
<td>Delft</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Sister City Agreement on Cooperation</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Belarus</td>
<td>Minsk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Finland</td>
<td>Oulu</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding between City of Oulu and City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Socialist Republic of Vietnam</td>
<td>Hanoi</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Arrangement on Friendship and Cooperation between the City of Hanoi- Socialist Republic of Vietnam and the City of Tshwane Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Socialist Republic of Vietnam</td>
<td>Ho Chi Mihn City</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>Proposed Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality and City of Ho Chi Mihn</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Rwanda</td>
<td>Kigali</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Twinning Agreement on Co-operation between the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality in the Republic of South Africa and the City of Kigali in Rwanda</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>Kinshasa</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Tshwane and the City of Kinshasa</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Republic of Germany</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Declaration of Intent on the Establishment of a Relationship for Co-operation between the City of Tshwane of the Republic of South Africa and the City of Leipzig of the Republic of Germany</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 India</td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>International City</td>
<td>Local City</td>
<td>Title of Agreement</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>Proposed Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality and City of St Petersburg</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taipei</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Twinning Agreement</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Madagascar</td>
<td>Antananarivo</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Agreement on Co-operation between the City of Antananarivo, Republic of Madagascar and the Greater Pretoria Metropolitan Council</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Nablus</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Agreement between City of Pretoria and Nablus (Palestine) on the Establishment of Mechanisms for Exchanging acquired Knowledge and Experience in Social Progress and Urban Development</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Birmingham City</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding between Birmingham City Council (United Kingdom) and the City of Johannesburg</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding entered into by and between City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality and City of New York</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding entered into by and between City Government of Addis Ababa and City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>Friendship Agreement entered into by and between City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality and Greater London Authority</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Tianjin</td>
<td>Pretoria</td>
<td>Agreement on the Establishment of a Relationship for Exchange and Cooperation</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Dongguan</td>
<td>Tshwane</td>
<td>Agreement between Tshwane and Dongguan (Guangdong Province)</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Windhoek</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding entered into by and between City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality and Windhoek City Council</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Wujiang</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>20061213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Chenai</td>
<td>Ethekwini</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding between the Ethekwini Municipality and the City of Chennai</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Curitiba</td>
<td>Ethekwini</td>
<td>Twinning and Co-operation Agreement between City of Curitiba and the Ethekwini Municipality</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>International City</td>
<td>Local City</td>
<td>Title of Agreement</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Daejeon Metropolitan City</td>
<td>Ethekwini</td>
<td>MOU on Cooperation between the Ethekwini Municipality and Daejeon Metropolitan City</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Kaohsiung City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twinning Agreement</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Maputo</td>
<td>Ethekwini</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding entered into by and between Ethekwini Municipality and City of Maputo</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation Agreement</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Taichung City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twinning Agreement</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>19970505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Guangzhou</td>
<td>Durban</td>
<td>Sister City Agreement between Durban and Guangzhou (Guangdong Province)</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Oran</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>20011017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Ethekwini</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding between the Ethekwini Municipality and the Governorate of Alexandria on Friendship and Co-operation</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Zhuzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>20020523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>Zibo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>20020926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>20021107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>20030922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>20031105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Nantes</td>
<td>Ethekwini</td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>2004 or 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reunion Island</td>
<td>Le Port</td>
<td>Ethekwini</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding between the Municipality of Le Port (Reunion Island) and the Ethekwini Municipality (South Africa)</td>
<td>200511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Maputo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>20070131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Reggio Emilia?</td>
<td>Polokwane</td>
<td>Twinning Agreement between Polokwane and the Italian City of Reggio Emilia</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reggio Emmelia?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polokwane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>International City</td>
<td>Local City</td>
<td>Title of Agreement</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Cuba</td>
<td>Holguin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twinning Protocol</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 Germany</td>
<td>Carl Duisberg Gesellschaft (CDW)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 China (Inner Mongolia)</td>
<td>Baotou</td>
<td>Nelspruit</td>
<td>Twining Agreement between Nelspruit and Baotou</td>
<td>2002 or 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 China</td>
<td>Sichaun Henan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twinning Agreement</td>
<td>2002101 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 China</td>
<td>Chongqing Municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twinning Agreement</td>
<td>2002101 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Botswana</td>
<td>South East District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>2008121 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Germany</td>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 Sweden</td>
<td>Municipality of Vaxjo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Canada</td>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td>Rustenburg</td>
<td>Twinning Agreement between Rustenburg and Sudbury</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 Namibia</td>
<td>Keetmanshoop (Upington)</td>
<td>Khara Hais</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding between Keetmanshoop and Khara Hais</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Netherlands</td>
<td>Alphen aan den Rijn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Croatia</td>
<td>Rijeka</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Twining Agreement on the Establishment of Friendly Co-operation between City of Cape Town and the City of Rijeka, Croatia</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 People's Republic of China</td>
<td>Hangzhou</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Agreement on the Establishment of Relations of Friendship between the City of Hangzhou of the People's Republic of China and the City of Cape Town of the Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 United States of America</td>
<td>Miami-Dade County</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Declaration of Intent between the City of Cape Town and Miami-Dade County (USA)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 Ukraine</td>
<td>Voznesensck City Council</td>
<td>Eden District</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding regarding the Establishment of Friendly Co-operation between the Eden District Municipality of South Africa and the Voznesensck City Council of Ukraine</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Taiwan</td>
<td>Hualien City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twinning Agreement</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 South Korea</td>
<td>Pusan Metropolitan City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-operation Agreement</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>International City</td>
<td>Local City</td>
<td>Title of Agreement</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 Russian Federation</td>
<td>St.Petersburg</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Cooperation Agreement between the Cape Town City Council and the Administration of St. Petersburg</td>
<td>2000 or 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Palestine</td>
<td>Nablus</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding between City of Cape Town and City of Nablus on Electricity and Energy Cooperation</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 People's Republic of China</td>
<td>Hangzhou</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sister City Agreement</td>
<td>20050418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 People's Republic of China</td>
<td>Haozhou</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twinning Agreement</td>
<td>20071107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 Germany</td>
<td>Aachen</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement made and entered into between the City of Cape Town and the City of Aachen</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 Uganda</td>
<td>Kampala</td>
<td>Amatole District Municipality</td>
<td>Agreement on Co-operation between the Amatole District Municipality and Kampala (Uganda)</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 Belgium</td>
<td>Bornem</td>
<td>Nquthu Municipality</td>
<td>Memorandum of Partnership and Cooperation between the Municipalities of Bornem and Nquthu</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 Swaziland</td>
<td>Manzini</td>
<td>Uthungulu Municipality</td>
<td>Arrangement between Uthungulu Municipality of the Province of Kwazulu Natal and the City Council of Manzini on Friendship Cooperation</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Botswana</td>
<td>Gaborone</td>
<td>Thabazimbi Municipality</td>
<td>Twinning Arrangement between Thabazimbi Municipality and Gaborone City</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Ghana</td>
<td>Kwahu-Praso</td>
<td>Tshakhuma Village</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Tshakhuma Village and Kwahu Praso Traditional Area in Ghana</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Mozambique</td>
<td>Matola Municipality</td>
<td>Greater Tzaneen Municipality</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding between the Greater Tzaneen Municipality (South Africa) and the Matola Municipality (Mozambique)</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix E: Newspaper articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Partnership Discussed</th>
<th>Contents of Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Aim of trip: strengthen ties and attract investment with U.S. businesses.  
- Agreement includes academic exchanges  
- “...the two cities would promote collaboration and joint ventures among their local businesses, chambers of commerce, and entrepreneurs, with a special focus on growth and development of business investment, trade and tourism. The two cities would also promote collaboration and the exchange of ideas in the areas of government operation, e-governance, smart city projects and green urban development” (Du Preez, 2011:1).  
- Cooperation based on “traditional links of friendship” between the two countries and cities.  
- Written a day after cooperation agreement signed. |
| Partnership: Tshwane and Washington D.C. | - Appears in a local publication: Pretoria News  
(source: Du Preez, 2011) |
| Article title: Chinese Link Celebrated | - Current agreement grew from a 1997 cooperation agreement which involved Chinese investment of R60 million in a “friendship town” housing development in Edenvale (Keogh, 2001:1).  
- Chinese city representative hopeful that cooperation will result in various new business contracts.  
- Includes student exchanges between the cities.  
- Written shortly after agreement signed. |
| Partnership: Ekurhuleni and Harbin (China) | - Appears in a national publication: The Citizen  
(source: Keogh, 2001) |
| Article Title: Durban Adopts Chennai as Sister City | - To promote cultural and economic ties.  
- Partnership based on shared history and existing cultural link as well as industry similarities.  
- “The concept of the sister city is an initiative whereby random cities with similar structures and goals establish links” (Van Den Heever, 2010:1).  
- “Durban had twinned with 13 other cities, including Chicago, Bremen and Leeds, since the inception of the programme in 1996” (Van Den Heever, 2010:1). |
| Partnership: Durban (eThekwini municipality) and Chennai (India) | - Appears in a local publication: Daily News  
(source: Van Den Heever, 2010) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Partnership Discussed</th>
<th>Contents of Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(source: Van Den Heever, 2010).</td>
<td>- Agreement to be signed on day of article’s publication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Title: Twin Cities Pledge to Pull Together.</td>
<td>- Cooperation based on continuing a successful cooperation partnership that began in 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership: Buffalo City and Gävle (Sweden).</td>
<td>- Initial agreement signed “after identifying areas of partnership, prospects of achieving results of mutual benefit and programmes of action” (Maqhina, 2007:1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appears in a local publication: Daily Dispatch</td>
<td>- “...with further generous support and co-operation of the Swedish government through its official local government association” (Maqhina, 2007:1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(source: Maqhina, 2007).</td>
<td>- Article published a day after declaration of intent signed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Title: Chinese Twinning Bid to Jump-start Mthatha.</td>
<td>- Municipality approached the Chinese consulate in Cape Town with cooperation proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential partnership: Beijing (China) and Mthatha.</td>
<td>- Chinese interest in increasing trade links and investment in area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appears in a local publication: Daily Dispatch</td>
<td>- Chinese to assist in construction on roads in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(source: Ngcukana, 2009).</td>
<td>- Mthatha also in talks with a municipality from the French island on Reunion for infrastructure investment in Mthatha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership: Kimberley and Nantou County (China/Taiwan)</td>
<td>- Twinning discussions come amidst major infrastructure backlogs and lack of funding for repairs, in Mthatha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appears in a local publication: Diamond Fields Advertiser</td>
<td>13Mar 1985: Title: ‘Tour Unwarranted – Shuttleworth’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(source: Diamond Fields Advertiser)</td>
<td>- Councillor objects to twinning because of costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10Feb 1987: Title: ‘Going Dutch’</td>
<td>- Ratepayers unhappy about another delegation visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Argue no tangible results from partnership so far.</td>
<td>3 May 1988: ‘Mayors vote clinches visit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Aug 1988: Title: ‘Large Taiwanese Groups Visits City’:</td>
<td>- Council voted a deadlock about upcoming visit and mayor voted it through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Details an upcoming two day visit to Kimberley by a 64 member Taiwanese delegation to ratify the twinning agreement between the two.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title and Partnership Discussed</td>
<td>Contents of Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The delegation included councillors and local government representatives, businessmen and industrialists, as well as their families.</td>
<td>- Visit was part of a larger “familiarisation tour” to South Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article title: Sister City Proposals</td>
<td>Mayors of the two Israeli cities approached Johannesburg mayor, Mr. D. Neppe “about the possible establishment of sister city relations” (Municipal reporter, 1989:1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential partnership: Johannesburg and Rishon Le Zion/ Bnei Brak (Israel)</td>
<td>- Signing of agreement was dependant on the outcome of upcoming elections in Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appears in a national publication: The Citizen</td>
<td>(Source: municipal reporter, 1989).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article title: Gadd wants to twin with Tel Aviv: Israeli city above party politics.</td>
<td>- The article describes Johannesburg’s mayor’s – Mr. A. Gadd - desire to twin with Tel Aviv, however the partnership project would only be addressed after municipal elections in Israel had taken place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential partnership: Johannesburg and Tel Aviv.</td>
<td>- “I don’t want Israeli-South African relations to become an election issue. It wouldn’t do anybody any good” (foreign news service, 1983:1), Mr. Gadd was quoted as saying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appears in a national publication: The Star</td>
<td>- Gadd is described by the Tel Aviv deputy mayor as a “Zionist who opposed apartheid” (foreign news service, 1983:1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Source: foreign news service, 1983).</td>
<td>- Gadd interested in learning from experiences with urban revitalisation processes, dealing with environmental concerns, city budget size and municipal governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article title: Jo’burg high on list for U.S. twinning.</td>
<td>- “At least 10 cities in the United States have invited Greater Johannesburg to enter into twin city agreements” (Sowetan correspondent, 1995:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential partnerships: interest from 10 U.S. cities.</td>
<td>- 9 U.S. mayors were in South Africa to examine possible twinnings with South African cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appears in a local publication: Sowetan</td>
<td>- Meetings took place at a US-SA cities forum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Source: Sowetan correspondent, 1995)</td>
<td>- Any agreements would only be signed at year end, and meetings were described as “exploratory” in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Johannesburg local council and metropolitan area in a “transitional” phase and agreements might be postponed until after the municipal elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title and Partnership Discussed</td>
<td>Contents of Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- U.S. interest had already created economic profits, as “US businesses are opening at a rate of one a week in South Africa with most of these in the Greater Johannesburg area” (Sowetan correspondent, 1995:1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Article title: Birmingham’s plan to link with Jo’burg. | - Officials from Birmingham (U.K.) in Johannesburg for a week-long stay to sign the twinning agreement.  
- Visiting delegation included local government officials and private sector to “establish working links”.  
- “The two cities have selected priority areas for development, including human resource development, educational development, health and social welfare, sports, and arts and culture” (Sapa, 1997:1).  
- Similar urban and social issues in both cities.  
- Seen as an opportunity to learning from Birmingham’s experience.  
- “beneficiaries of the partnership would be the community of Greater Johannesburg as a whole” (Sapa, 1997:1) according to the Johannesburg council committee chairman.  
- Student and teacher exchanges were expected to take place.  
- Agreement would be signed in the upcoming days. |
| (Source: Sapa, 1997) | |
| Article title: Joburg seeks to ‘twin’ with other cities. | - Mayor Masando addressed 16 representatives from various countries, in Johannesburg, “to assist in implementing international partnerships, and establishing good relations with foreign diplomats” (Kariem, 2006:1).  
- Johannesburg does not seek to enter into twinning arrangements with towns and cities merely for symbolic purposes. We prefer strong and productive relationships centred on sharing experiences and exchanging best practices” according to Mayor Masando.  
- Existing links and city partners were listed as New York, London, Addis Ababa, Windhoek and Lusaka (as well as Mozambique and Kenya).  
- “Future possibilities included relations with Ghana, Tanzania, Congo, Uganda and relations with cities as far afield as Moscow” (Kariem, 2006:1).  
- “We can learn from each other in terms of promoting trade, |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Partnership Discussed</th>
<th>Contents of Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>investment, tourism and deepening the culture of service to communities” Masondo added (Kariem, 2006:1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- International representatives present at the meeting included members of the International Consular Corps of France, U.S.A., Belgium, Italy and Greece.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: List of City of Johannesburg’s agreements


- Friendship Agreement entered into by and between City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality and Greater London Authority, 30 April 2004.


- Memorandum on Friendly Cooperation between the City of Johannesburg and the City of Chengdu, 17 May 2010.

- Memorandum of Understanding entered into by and between City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality and City of New York, 6 February 2003.

- Memorandum of Understanding entered into by and between City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality and Windhoek City Council, 28 September 2005.

- Memorandum of Understanding entered into by City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality and Municipal Council of Matola City, (draft copy, no date).

- Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Johannesburg and Birmingham City Council, 4 March 2002.

- Memorandum of Understanding between the People’s Committee of Ho Chi Minh City and the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality, 10 November 2009.

### Appendix G: Agreements contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner City</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Work plan</th>
<th>Signatories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birmingham City, United Kingdom</strong></td>
<td>“Committed to a programme of mutually beneficial, practical cooperation between the two Councils”</td>
<td>Mutually agreed Work programme to be prepared by heads of administration. This is to be reviewed annually.</td>
<td>Signed in March 2002 by Mayor Masondo and Councilor Bore (leader of Birmingham city council)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (Titled as an MOU)               | 1) Strengthen and enhance local government.  
2) Transfer of expertise and experience.  
3) Promotion of the other city, especially in the area of youth and related issues. |                                                                                           | Official responsible for implementing agreement: Heads of administration in charge of work programme. |
| **Chengdu, People’s Republic of China**  | “To enhance further exchanges and cooperation”  | City administrators are to exchange information and discuss concrete projects on mutually beneficial topics. | Signed in May, 2010, by Council Speaker of CoJ and Director-General of Chengdu Municipal Foreign Affairs Office |
| (Titled as a Memorandum of Friendly Cooperation) | 1) Exchange and cooperation in: commerce, trade, education, culture, science, technology, environment, governance and civic education.  
2) Encourage contact and engagements by respective governments and various other groups. |                                                                                           | Official responsible for implementing agreement: The co-ordinating units are: the Chengdu Municipal Foreign Affairs Office and the Department of Economic Development of the CoJ and the South African Foreign Mission in China. |
| **Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation**  | Article 1) “develop economic, scientific and technical and cultural cooperation on the basis of equality, goodwill and mutual benefit”.  
Article 2) Follow national and international laws for bilateral agreements.  
Article 3) Promote investment and wider mutually beneficial cooperation.  
Article 4) Joint scientific studies and assist scientific research.  
Article 5) Encourage creative and cultural contacts; tourist promotion and encourage cooperation between sports organisations.  
Article 6) Promote cooperation between educational and research institutions. | Article 7) Organise working meetings, consultations and negotiations, expert-analytical councils and commissions.  
Timeline: Agreement is valid for five years. | Signed in November, 2009 by the Vice Governor of Saint Petersburg and the Executive Mayor of the CoJ (Masondo) |
<p>| (Titled: Agreement on Economic, Scientific-Technical and Cultural Cooperation – Between Government of St Petersburg and City Council of Johannesburg) |                                                                                           |                                                                                           |                                                                                                |
| <strong>Ho Chi Minh City, Socialist Republic</strong>  | Termed a “mutually beneficial sister city partnership (friendship” | Appropriate representatives of the | Signed in November 2009, by Executive Mayor of CoJ                                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner City</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Work plan</th>
<th>Signatories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>of Vietnam</strong> (Titled: Memorandum of Understanding)</td>
<td>and cooperation relationship)</td>
<td>two cities to create a work programme including projects and initiatives, according to each city’s policies.</td>
<td>Johannesburg (Masondo) and Chairman of the People’s Committee of Ho Chi Minh City. Official responsible for implementing agreement: Heads of Administration in the two cities will oversee joint programme of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London, United Kingdom</strong> (Titled as a Friendship Agreement)</td>
<td>“Aimed at contributing to an international culture of human rights, global solidarity and understanding”.</td>
<td>Appropriate representatives of the two cities to prepare a work programme of projects and initiatives.</td>
<td>Signed in April 2004, by the Executive Mayor of Johannesburg (Masondo) and the Mayor of Greater London Authority (Livingstone).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York City, United States if America</strong> (Titled as a Memorandum of Understanding, referred to as a Sister City partnership in the agreement)</td>
<td>“Proactively promote and support each other, under a programme driven partnership”</td>
<td>Appropriate representatives to prepare a work programme of specific projects and initiatives.</td>
<td>Signed in February 2003, by Executive Mayor of CoJ (Masondo) and Mayor of the City of New York (Bloomberg).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner City</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Work plan</td>
<td>Signatories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Shanghai, Peoples Republic of China**  
(Titled as a Memorandum of Understanding on Friendly Exchange) | “Developing friendship and mutual understanding, and seeking common prosperity and development”  
1) Overall objective: promotion of social and economic development and good governance.  
2) Formulate, maintain and monitor mutually beneficent cooperation to reach strategic priorities and needs of the communities.  
3) Net benefits to cities and constituencies. | Appropriate representatives to prepare a work programme of specific projects and initiatives. | Signed in November, 2009, by the Executive Mayor of the CoJ (Masondo) and Mayor of Shanghai (Zheng). |
| **Val-De-Marne, France**  
(Titled as a Decentralised Cooperation Convention and Memorandum of Agreement) | Common objectives for 6 years, followed by an evaluation.  
Co-operation priorities:  
1) Strengthening mutual understanding, specifically between the youth, cultural exchanges, strengthen communities involvement in local democracy.  
2) Upgrading living standards of communities and contributing to administrative and urban rehabilitation of Johannesburg areas, staff training, and consultative services.  
3) Encourage local economic development in Johannesburg.  
4) Find and mobilise funding for the implementation of the projects.  
5) Approach other institutions to assist in the projects. | Specific projects will be identified and separate agreements signed.  
Each of the projects will be separately evaluated and during the implementation phase and continuation of the partnership will depend on these evaluations.  
The Kliptown project (improvement of living conditions) agreement is far more detailed and is for the construction of 140 housing units and a creche.  
Kliptown pilot project to be managed by the management structure that will be set up by the council and the Val-de-Marne department.  
Addendum agreement: Contribution to the urban restructuring of Kliptown project agreement - Signed in October 2002. | Signed in February 2000, by Mayor of the Southern Metropolitan Local Council of Greater Johannesburg (Mayathula-Khoza) and President of the General of Val-de-Marne (Germa). |
| **Matola, Mozambique**  
(Titled Memorandum of Understanding) | Cooperate on various areas of municipal governance in Matola:  
1) Strategic and urban planning – develop strategic plan, spatial development plan, capacity building.  
2) Finance – development of | Regularly review progress of project implementation and extension of areas of cooperation may be considered. | *Draft - Not a signed copy |

<p>| | | | Mayors will provide political leadership and oversight on the progress and evaluation of agreement. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner City</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Work plan</th>
<th>Signatories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Draft - Not a signed copy</em></td>
<td>property rates system and collection of municipal rates and taxes. 3) Economic development – development of economic development strategy, and promotion of investment. 4) Infrastructure – targeting of key infrastructure projects through funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Management Team will oversee the agreement’s implementation. Steering Committee and Strategic Management Team will be supported by the International Relations teams in Johannesburg and Matola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windhoek, Namibia</td>
<td>Partnership between councils and wider communities. “The cities undertake to proactively engage, promote, and support each other under a practical programme-driven partnership”. 1) Relationship aimed at attainment of councils’ priorities and needs of the communities. 2) Ensure attain net benefits for both parties. 3) Overall objective – social development or poverty eradication “to be achieved through the means of economic development and good governance”.</td>
<td>Jointly prepare and adopt an agreed upon work plan of specific programmes, projects and initiatives reviewed and reported annually.</td>
<td>Signed in September, 2005 by Executive Mayor of Coj (Masondo) and Mayor of Windhoek (Shikongo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>