



DEVELOPMENT PLANNING INDABA REPORT

29-30th MARCH 2004, SUN CITY, NORTH WEST PROVINCE

Contact: Mr.Yusuf Patel or Ms. Michelle Layte
Intergovernmental Planning Directorate
Department of Provincial and Local Government (dplg)
Tel: (012) 334-0824 / (012) 334-0902

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING INDABA

29-30th March 2004, Sun City

1. BACKGROUND

Development Planning is “... *a participatory approach to integrate economic, sectoral, spatial, social, institutional, environmental and fiscal strategies in order to support the optimal allocation of scarce resources between sectors and geographical areas and across the population in a manner that provides sustainable growth, equity and the empowerment of the poor and the marginalised*”. (*Forum for Effective Planning and Development*¹ (FEPD), 1995)

Each sphere of government in South Africa has to see to the optimal allocation and application of resources for its area of jurisdiction. Development Planning is therefore an executive function as it has to be overseen by the highest political office at each sphere and should be ratified by the elected political representatives in that sphere. Development Planning has to determine the way in which each sphere sets its budget. Its influence should extend beyond that of government resources and it must serve to mobilize off-budget resources (State Owned Enterprises, private sector and NGOs). Development Plans also serve to inform the actions of a range of role players, so they have a broader role than merely establishing a one-to-one relationship with budgets. They should also serve to inspire and guide the self-action of communities and residents by presenting a clear vision for the area and long, medium and short-term development priorities and objectives.

¹ FEDP was a government advisory body.

Development Planning is a core part of the service delivery and development process. Service delivery and development cannot occur without identifying relevant actions, programming the activities and setting in place the requisite resources. The relevant actions are the ones that have the most impact on addressing poverty and growing the economy. They are sustainable and lead to long-term benefits for a particular area and its people. It is always a challenge to determine these relevant actions in the face of huge needs and limited resources. It requires formulating strategies that are innovative, inter-sectoral and spatially targeted.

Development Planning is also central to any performance management system. The setting of development objectives and targets is the basis for measuring performance through appropriate monitoring and evaluation steps. Development Planning is therefore a part of an integrated system of planning and delivery and does not sit as an isolated process de-linked from the actual functioning of a municipality, province or the country.

1.1 Local Government Sphere

Development Planning in the Local Government sphere is conducted through the Integrated Development Planning instrument. Each municipality in terms of the Municipal Systems Act (2000) is responsible for formulating, adopting and implementing an Integrated Development Plan (IDP). The Mayor is responsible for the IDP and it has to be adopted by the municipal council. Community participation and involvement is central to IDPs. Communities are encouraged to organize themselves and take care of their own development working together with government. Community/Ward based planning can be a useful way for making more structured inputs in the IDP process and for organizing community/ward based self-action. IDPs are not a mere collection of community needs or plans but are municipal-wide plans that have to take community needs

into account together with wider strategic issues incorporating provincial and national priorities and strategies. Mediating these various interests the IDP should reflect the best possible development decisions and trade-offs that focus on viability and economic, social, environmental, financial and institutional sustainability

1.2 Provincial Government Sphere

Development Planning in the provincial sphere occurs through the Provincial Growth & Development Strategies (PGDSs) that are driven by the Premier's office and adopted by the provincial cabinet. Currently there is no national legislative framework, as is the case with IDPs, that governs the formulation, adoption and implementation of PGDSs. Nevertheless in practice all provinces do formulate an overarching strategic framework. The PGDS should have effect over the entire province and therefore needs to be completed in consultation with municipalities and key provincial stakeholders. The PGDS and IDPs should be aligned so that a common strategic path is followed and there is complementarity in the way resources are allocated and in the way delivery occurs.

1.3 National Government Sphere

Development Planning at national level occurs through the Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF). The MTSF is prepared by the Presidency and approved by the national Cabinet. Like the PGDS, the MTSF currently does not have a legal status. The influencing nature of the MTSF over the national budget is still limited. This will improve as the inter-sectoral, geographical and people-centred focus of the MTSF is deepened, and as institutional preparedness issues are addressed.

Intergovernmental Planning, that is, the coordination of development planning across the three spheres of government is a critical area for improvement² in order to realize the objective of optimal resource allocation and implementation for the state as a whole for the purpose of eradicating poverty and growing the economy. Enhanced development planning across government will contribute to the existing Planning Framework that includes the planning cycle which culminates in the MTSF and annual State of Nation Address.

2. THE INDABA

To this end the Department of Provincial and Local Government (**dplg**) hosted a Development Planning Indaba at Sun City on 29-30th March 2004. The purpose of the Indaba was to review development planning in South Africa over the last decade and to strengthen the ability of government across all spheres and sectors to plan and implement in a unified way.

Practitioners from the local, provincial and national spheres of government participated in the Indaba in an effort to better understand the challenges facing the State and to discuss proposals to enhance and speed-up service delivery and development in the second decade of freedom.

Over 150 delegates participated in the Indaba. This included senior municipal officials, senior and middle managers from provinces and national sector departments, officials from dplg, representatives of Planning and Implementation Management Support Centres (PIMS-Centres), SALGA, and the South African Cities Network (SACN).

² See Annexure 1 for review of development planning over the past decade and the critical areas for improvement.

The programme consisted of (1) a key-note address on Development Planning by the Director-General of dplg, Ms. Lindiwe Msengana-Ndlela, (2) an overview of the Intergovernmental Planning system and an outline of the Intergovernmental Planning support strategy, (3) a presentation on and demonstration of the IDP Nerve Centre system, (4) commission breakaways, and (5) commission report backs, summary and way forward.

Ms. Mosa Molapo (Deputy Director-General: Urban and rural development, dplg), Mr. Elroy Africa (Deputy Director-General: Governance, Policy and Research, dplg) and Mr. Godfrey Mokate (Deputy Director-General: Corporate Services, dplg) chaired the various sessions of the Indaba.

2.1 Key Indaba Messages

Intensify the Implementation of IDPs

On the opening day Mr. Africa emphasised the importance of the Indaba. It provided a platform for various practitioners to assess the development planning instruments and to identify what support is required to see better results on the ground. He indicated that the relative success in establishing Integrated Development Planning (IDP) as a key governance instrument should be consolidated. The focus on implementation of the IDPs should be intensified over the next decade. The engagement between sector departments and municipalities must be deepened so that resources of the state are combined and organized for maximum sustainable development impact in municipalities.

Demystify Planning and Sharpen Efforts to Improve Implementation

In her key-note address the Director-General indicated that the central question for the Indaba is how we can improve the prioritization, sharing and focus of government's planning across the three spheres.

Government has put in place a suite of legislation and inter-governmental structures since 1994 to ensure that the objective of reconstruction and development is realized. In the first five years of our democracy, building governmental structures at national and provincial level was an area of priority in matters of governance. From 1999, greater attention has been given to the transformation of local government.

Central to the mandate of the local government sphere has been the need to accelerate service delivery and development for the benefit of our people. South Africa's IDP system is hailed as a good-practice model in the world. It represents a local pathway to sustainable development and puts into effect the global commitment to the Local Agenda 21 principles and approach.

The Director-General emphasized the importance of the assessment of the road that government has traveled in the last ten years of our Freedom, and the challenges that remain in provincial and local government. She said that as we enter the Second Decade of Freedom, this Development Planning Indaba would sharpen our efforts towards improved levels of implementation.

The Director-General urged all government officials in provinces and municipalities and other practitioners, to demystify the concept of development planning and the instruments that are used in that regard: to improve the lives of South Africans by pushing back the legacy of poverty that has affected so many millions of our people and by restoring human dignity.

She concluded by saying that the Indaba is aimed to provide more clarity on how national priorities are determined and executed, how provinces and municipalities shape those priorities and how all of us will increase the pace of implementation in the Second Decade of Freedom.

Intergovernmental Planning in the Second Decade of Freedom

Dplg's Manager for Intergovernmental Planning, Mr. Yusuf Patel, presented an overview of the intergovernmental planning system and an outline of the intergovernmental planning support strategy. He indicated that in building a developmental state government will in the next 10 years act as one entity, focus on key nation-wide priorities, deliver services and channel resources in the most effective way, and strongly assist in the eradication of the dualistic nature of the South African economy. An effective intergovernmental planning system will be essential to fulfill this purpose. The IDP, PGDS and the MTSF form the core of South Africa's intergovernmental planning system. These instruments focus on the cross-sectoral, spatial and institutional strategies necessary to guide all development in the area of jurisdiction. The interrelation between these instruments and the establishment of a specific mechanism such as Intergovernmental Development Agreements (IDeAs) in different sectors for the 53 impact zones (district and metropolitan municipal areas) determines the extent to which actions of the state get coordinated and aligned.

A Targeted and Differentiated Approach to Support

Mr. Patel indicated that in moving towards a differentiated, targeted and direct intergovernmental planning support approach dplg undertook a study of the specific needs of different municipalities and provinces. The study entailed surveys that were conducted through PIMS-Centres, interviews with various role players and analysis of desk-top material. The study covered all provinces and all municipalities. The result indicates that **28%** of municipalities in the country currently require basic institutional and administrative infrastructure to be established and strengthened before they are ready to undertake, manage and drive proper IDP. These municipalities are currently extremely dependent on consultants and do not own the process because they lack structural capacity.

These municipalities do not have the capability to engage in intergovernmental discussion and activity that would enhance their planning and delivery.

35% of municipalities have the basic structural capacity in place but require support to do a good IDP. These municipalities utilize and manage consultants as resources but typically have IDPs that do not inform implementation. The development strategies outlined in the IDP are weak and do not address the key issues and problems adequately.

28% of municipalities are able to complete a good basic IDP but require support with implementation. These municipalities have IDPs that support a practical programme of implementation. They cannot deliver more than thirty-percent of their planned programmes because of a lack of capacity to manage the implementation whether internally or using external contractors.

10% of municipalities currently are able to formulate and implement a good basic IDP. These municipalities drive and manage the process and characterize a high level of ownership of the process. IDP is mainstreamed into the working of the municipality and decisions are based on the IDP. They use consultants for parts of the planning and implementation but control the consultants and processes internally.

This above analysis together with an analysis of provincial capacities forms the basis of the Intergovernmental Planning support strategy that focuses on an action plan for each province that is specific and relevant to the context of the province and its different municipalities. The strategic objectives of the support strategy are (1) entrench integrated development planning as an approach by improving the perceptions and understanding of key role players, (2) Improve the capacity of municipalities to plan so that they develop realistic and creative strategies that ensures sustainable, integrated and targeted development spending and infrastructure investment in a municipal area, (3) Improve the

capacity of municipalities to implement so that they ensure feasible and effective municipal operation, service delivery and development, monitoring, evaluation and review (4) Improve provincial-municipal as well as inter-sectoral cooperation in prioritization, resource allocation and implementation, (5) Improve the capability of provincial government and districts to give effect to their constitutional and legal obligations to support municipalities, (6) Ensure the coordination and effective implementation of the various support initiatives, and (7) Support the municipalities that have no/very limited structural capacity with frame conditions and establishment processes.

Technology working for Development - The IDP Nerve Centre as a Key Support Tool

Mr. Patel introduced the IDP Nerve Centre (IDPNC) project as a key tool to support intergovernmental planning. He indicated that the IDP Nerve Centre in its basic form is already established. The initial request by Minister Mufamadi to make IDPs easily available and accessible was actioned. Municipal IDPs are electronically available on the website. The IDPNC will continue to serve as an IDP filing system but will go further and add value to intergovernmental planning by having IDPs captured and summarized in template format.

The presentation and demonstration of the IDPNC by Ms Mbali Mposula (IDPNC coordinator, dplg), Mr. Danie Schoeman (Premier's office, North West Province), and Mr. Andre Brits (IDPNC design and implementation support, CSIR) gave a capturing account of the powerful effect that the IDPNC can have in dealing with the lack intergovernmental coordination and alignment. The IDPNC will serve as a vehicle for linking municipalities and sector departments in an intergovernmental business process. The IDPNC will be available shortly at www.idp.org.za.

Improving Localized Hands-on Strategic Support to Municipalities

A paper on the Planning and Implementation Management Support System (PIMSS) was presented as part of the conference pack. The paper provided an overview of the challenges, experiences and problems and laid the basis for a national discussion and debate on the future role of PIMS-Centres. It provides various options for the future role of PIMS-Centres and highlights the areas of improvement if PIMS-Centres are to continue to play a crucial, strategic support role for bringing about and sustaining developmental local government.

2.2 The Commissions

Three commissions were set up focusing on national, provincial and local planning issues respectively. The purpose of the commissions was to give delegates an opportunity to discuss the presentations made at the Indaba and to provide greater insight and proposals on improving development planning at all levels.

National Commission

The National commission discussed national planning challenges and alignment mechanisms. The commission strongly supported an approach to alignment that emphasized discussion, negotiation and agreement between the spheres of government on implementation of nation-wide strategic priorities. This approach should also bring about better engagement between national/provincial sector departments and municipalities. The proposed Inter-Governmental Relations (IGR) policy framework and legislation should enable a platform for negotiation and agreement and establish the “rules of the game” as such. It was emphasized that IGR is about “deal-making” on implementation of priorities and any alignment mechanism must enable agreements to be established that are binding and bring

about the necessary and relevant predictability that fosters better planning and delivery.

It was agreed that the IDP, PGDS and MTSF form the core of an intergovernmental planning system. There should be alignment between these instruments but in practice alignment really means having agreement on specific objectives, targets, strategies, projects and programmes and delivery methods in different sectors that reflect inter-sectoral synergy and cross-cutting dimensions of development. Alignment has to be mainstreamed into the way the state machinery functions and delivers through line departments and by holding line departments accountable. The work of these departments must inform and be mediated by the strategic framework provided by the IDP, PGDS, MTSF in as far as these instruments collectively and in combination and alignment with each other spell out government's vision and objectives for particular impact zones (district and metropolitan municipal areas).

Provincial Commission

The Provincial commission discussed provincial planning challenges and linkages with local government. The commission indicated that critical to improving provincial planning and its alignment with municipalities was the need to re-orientate sector officials on how local government functions. The engagement between sector officials and municipalities should be deepened and strengthened, and sector officials must work in a manner sensitive to local conditions, patterns and trends. The performance agreements of sector officials should include their locally focused responsibilities. The Premier's office should play a strong coordination role to ensure the participation of all sectors in provincial and local planning.

The Premier's offices should be strengthened to drive the Provincial Growth and Development Strategies (PGDSs) so that province-wide planning is effective and

targeted around the potentials and challenges of different district and metropolitan areas. The Local Government departments in provinces should be strengthened to fulfill their legal responsibilities to support municipalities with IDPs, monitor IDPs and align IDPs with provincial and national planning. The MEC process of checking and aligning IDPs must be strengthened. This process must result in a more strategic approach that measures IDPs against the PGDS and sector strategies and agreements (IDeAs).

Local Commission

The Local commission focused specifically on the future role of PIMS-Centres. The commission emphasized that PIMS-Centres should be seen as part of a wider strategy of development planning support to local government. The PIMS-Centres are support centres and should not take on the responsibilities of district or local municipalities. Rather they should enable municipalities to perform their tasks key of which is formulating and implementing IDPs. It is therefore a critical support role as IDPs define the nature, state and pace of service delivery and development in municipalities. As such the support cuts across everything a municipality does. PIMS-Centres should in their support role assist municipalities to stay focused on their strategic thrust and assist with unblocking issues holding up implementation. Their implementation management support role should focus on the strategic preparedness issues that would enable service delivery and development broadly across the municipality. It should not necessarily be a role that focuses on supporting individual projects in detail but should assist municipalities in implementing and monitoring the IDP broadly. PIMS-Centres should also play a key role in linking the municipality with specific specialized support in particular areas as required.

The commission noted that PIMS-Centres were facing numerous challenges. Whilst there is a strong need to continue focusing on planning support,

implementation management of the IDPs is an important role to be fulfilled. PIMS-Centres are becoming a collector of many national programmes that is placing a burden on their capacity. Many Centres are facing rapid staff turn-over. Finding appropriate professionally skilled and experienced people for PIMS-Centres is a major challenge in many areas. The institutional location of PIMS-Centres in the district municipality is still uncertain in many cases. There was also discussion on the semi-autonomous and distinctive nature of the PIMS-Centres within the local government setting and concerns raised about the financial sustainability of PIMS-Centres. There was also a call made for improved monitoring of PIMS-Centres and sanctioning of non-performing Centres.

There was broad consensus that national government should make a long-term funding commitment for the operation of PIMS-Centres. This will address the current uncertainty and anxieties about the long-term future of PIMSS and will create a more stable environment for maintaining, attracting and recruiting skilled professionals. National funding should be treated as a subsidy for the operational costs and additional funds from provinces and municipalities should be made available to either buy-in appropriate level skills and or take full care of operations in the long-term. Cost sharing between district and local municipalities should be investigated. The core tasks of PIMS-Centres should revolve around supporting municipalities with the formulation and implementation of IDPs. This will require PIMS-Centres to emphasize strategic developmental issues within municipalities and aid intergovernmental linkages and coordination, as well as linkages with communities, the private sector and NGOs. The IDP Nerve Centre will be an important instrument that PIMS-Centres can utilize to support municipalities and to make municipalities effective users of the platform itself. PIMS-Centres can play an important role in identifying and linking municipalities with relevant capacity building programmes and actions.

2.3 Summary and Way Forward

Mr. Mokate in summarizing the event indicated that after intense information sharing, deliberation and discussion the Indaba's outputs have engaged all delegates on the key issues of planning that spans across all three spheres of government. In order to strive towards a developmental state that will enhance service delivery and lives of people, the appropriate mechanisms and support will be required from all actors in government.

Issues like alignment and programme linkages, communication in structures, support from national, to provincial and local (financial, procedural and human resources) and sector involvement in development planning all calls for integration at each level of government, horizontal and vertical.

It is imperative that the support needs to be structured at various levels of national, provincial and local structures (political and technical) and the rules of engagement must be clearly communicated for all role players to know what role they are playing and how to play it effectively. There are already tools being developed or implemented that will facilitate the important realization of a developmental state and this process needs to be profiled to a wider audience.

It was decided that dplg should take note of the Indaba discussions and commission reports, follow up on outstanding matters, and develop an action plan that would form the basis for improving intergovernmental planning. The action plan must also ensure that the momentum of the discussions and deliberations at Sun City is maintained and becomes the barometer for measuring our efforts at the end of the 2nd decade of freedom.

3. THE SUN CITY ACTION PLAN

The Development Planning Indaba at Sun City must serve as the basis of action to improve intergovernmental planning in the next 10 years. By the end of the 2nd Decade of Freedom:

- The three spheres of government will function as one integrated cohesive unit
- There will be unified state action representing inter-sectoral integration in the 53 impact zones (district and metropolitan municipal areas) based on negotiation and agreement on the most feasible, viable and sustainable service delivery and development options
- The setting and execution of development priorities will occur in a participatory manner across government and the MTSF will be the over-arching strategic framework for development in the country.
- The IDPs and PGDSs will reinforce development in municipal areas and will reflect synergy in the allocation and application of resources. Targeting of investments will be synchronized and municipal-wide Local Economic Development (LED) based on alignment between the LED strategies of the IDP and the PGDS will result in resilient and vibrant local economies.
- The developmental state with improved inter-sphere and cross-sector functioning will be responsible for halving poverty and unemployment. The state will be working with citizens to find solutions to development problems and all planning and delivery will be based on a thorough understanding and appreciation of people's needs and aspirations.
- Development planning will be responsible for the design of projects, programmes and investments that extract maximum benefits for communities and leave them with greater capability to function in the mainstream economy.

In order to realize this vision the following actions will be rigorously pursued. Many of these actions are already being implemented or are at an advanced stage of conceptualization.

Sun City Action Plan (2004-2014)			
No.	Action	By who	By when
1	Champion the finalisation of the IGR policy framework and Bill inclusive of intergovernmental planning framework and IDEAs	Dplg	2004-2005
2	Implement the Intergovernmental Planning Support Strategy	Dplg	2004-2005
3	Establish Intergovernmental Planning Steering Group consisting of the following work groups: -IDP-PGDS alignment -IDP -PGDS -MTSF -IDPNC -PIMSS -Donor Coordination The Steering Group will include high-level representation from national departments, Premier's offices, LG departments, SALGA, NGOs, business sector, research/academic institutions.	Presidency, Dplg	2004
4	Coordinate municipal and provincial inputs into the Planning Framework and strengthen the MTSF	Presidency, Dplg	2005
5	Establish PGDS learning network and conduct PGDS analysis	Presidency, dplg, provinces	2004
6	Draft MEC guidelines for IDP assessment and alignment.	Dplg	2004
7	Implement MEC guidelines including improved support and monitoring of IDPs by provinces.	Provinces	2004-2014
8	Release IDPNC and start-up implementation in North West Province	Dplg, NW Province	2004
9	Roll-out IDPNC to all provinces and	All	2004-2014

	facilitate usage of IDPNC platform for intergovernmental information sharing, IDP template information, IDP project registration, sector department strategies and plans, IDP filing and tracking, IDeAs filing and tracking.	(national and provincial departments, municipalities)	
10	Conduct PIMSS review and finalise new PIMSS policy	Dplg	2004
11	Implement PIMSS policy	Municipalities, PIMS-Centres, Dplg	2005-2014
12	Design and implement an IDP communication campaign to build deeper awareness and understanding amongst politicians, government officials and the public. Reward IDP best practice and include IDP as part of the criteria for the Vuna Awards. Explore special prize for model IDP in different categories at the Vuna Awards.	Dplg, GCIS	2004-2009
13	Pilot community-based planning, extract lessons and develop guidelines for IDP-community based planning integration.	CBP steering committee	2004
14	Mobilize resources, extend community/ward based planning and monitor implementation.	CBP steering committee	2005-2009
	Establish IDP training framework through registering unit standards and accreditation with LGWSETA.	Dplg	2005
15	Formal IDP training institutionalized and implemented on on-going basis. New LG councilors and officials after 2005 LG elections are inducted and registered onto LGWSETA training system.	Municipalities, provinces	2005-2014

4. CONCLUSION

The Sun City action plan should be embraced by all spheres of government and rigorously pursued to achieve the 2014 vision. It should be widely disseminated and internalized by all roll players so that the 15 listed actions are followed up, monitored and evaluated. The discussions and deliberations at the Indaba together with the numerous studies and background papers over the past few years form the basis for the action plan. The action plan is therefore based on a thorough discussion and understanding of the intergovernmental planning challenges and can be confidently upheld as the most important steps to bring about positive change and results.

The action plan is also based on informal feedback received from a number of the delegates at Sun City. Many felt that the analysis of the intergovernmental planning problems as raised at the Indaba were correct. They also agreed with the emerging intergovernmental planning system described and the practical alignment mechanisms proposed. Rather than debating these issues further many delegates felt that **dplg** especially should act urgently on finalizing the IGR framework and Bill and pursue a host of actions that have now been articulated in the action plan.

The Development Planning Indaba provided exposure to many delegates on intergovernmental issues. It enabled **dplg** to deepen its own learning and understanding of the challenges faced and also served as a learning network in itself for all delegates. It provided an opportunity for colleagues from different spheres of government to share experiences both through the formal proceedings and through informal discussions and networking.

The Indaba was held at a critical point in time on the eve of the second decade of freedom. As such it must through the action plan enable greater commitment on the part of all practitioners to make the intergovernmental system work so that

service delivery and development is enhanced. Provinces, municipalities and national departments each have to strengthen their capacities and establish the necessary attitude and capability to work in an integrated and unified way. Ultimately the system is dependent on individuals and organizations that are dedicated and committed to eradicating poverty and growing the economy, and that have the professionalism to cooperate and collaborate with their colleagues within and across spheres of government.

Dplg already works together with many municipalities and provinces on development planning matters. For example, the intergovernmental planning directorate is currently assisting Mopani District Municipality with its IDP review. The aim is to emerge with a model IDP for the Limpopo Province. This is an intergovernmental effort supported by **dplg**. The Premier's office, the department of Local Government and other sector departments, state-owned enterprises and the Mopani DM and its local municipalities are involved in this collaborative effort.

It is envisaged that this kind of interactive engagement in development planning processes will be strengthened and extended as we move ahead. It represents a challenge for national and provincial departments to approach the task of development in a hands-on manner by working "on the ground" with municipalities.

ANNEXURE 1

An assessment of current intergovernmental planning practices

Intergovernmental Planning Requirement	What was achieved/What worked?	What/Where are the gaps?
<p>The three spheres of government work as one “Developmental State”.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functions and responsibilities were allocated to the respective spheres and to local and district municipalities. • Municipalities were able to involve communities and civil society in IDP processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipalities received only limited support from other spheres in the implementation of development plans. • Due to high mobility rates of officials institutional memory was generally not built and networks between officials not established.
<p>Provincial and national spheres provide adequate strategic direction, which results in aligned objectives and strategic direction.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A host of development planning and sector policies were prepared • National development objectives were set out in the RDP. • The National Spatial Development Perspective (NSDP), which sets out principles for infrastructure investment and development spending, was prepared. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a national strategic direction-statement the MTSF provided very limited guidance to development planning in the provincial and local spheres. Currently the MTSF is largely based on departmental and not development plans. • There is a general lack of awareness of the NSDP and its principles. • Non-compliance with national objectives and the NSDP principles in development and sector planning is not dealt with. • National development objectives are subordinated to specific sectoral and parochial objectives. • PGDSs (where they were drawn up) were largely ignored and did not end up providing strategic direction for provincial departments in their departmental planning or municipalities when preparing IDPs. • In many cases municipalities prepared sector plans in a policy vacuum with limited support from national or provincial sector departments, or guidance from these departments in the form of national or provincial sector plans or strategies.
<p>National, provincial and municipal priorities are aligned.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the case of IDPs prioritisation generally took place in a collaborative fashion with communities having a key say in such exercises. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priorities between the spheres were generally not aligned, which made it difficult to align projects and programmes with each other and with budgets. • Municipalities tended to have an inward and needs-driven focus, which was often isolated from

Intergovernmental Planning Requirement	What was achieved/What worked?	What/Where are the gaps?
		<p>strategic regional, provincial and national strategic priorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal and Provincial Governments, due to numerous circumstances changed priorities after they had been “passed on” to other role players.
<p>Collaboration takes place in planning and budgeting processes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated development planning as philosophy and approach has been embedded in a range of policy and legal frameworks. • Opportunities were created for joint planning, collaboration and resource allocation by all spheres and sectors in municipal IDP processes. • A substantial number of collaborative structures were put in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite numerous pleas from local government participation from national and provincial departments in IDP-preparation processes has remained low. • National and provincial sector and financial planning seems to take place without an engagement with municipal IDPs. • Structures that were created to ensure collaboration within and between the spheres in planning and budgeting processes were generally not effective.
<p>Alignment in the contents of development, sector and departmental plans and budgets takes place within and between spheres.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IDP has been firmly established as the primary development-planning tool in the local sphere. • Alignment between IDPs and local sector plans was achieved in a number of localities. • Most provinces embarked on the process of drafting a PGDS. • The MTSF is aligned with the national MTEF and departmental plans at the national level. • The IDP Nerve Centre, which was developed to enable the flow of planning information and ease alignment was developed and is ready for launch. • Monitoring and review cycles provide adequate opportunity for alignment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even though the IDP has the potential to act as a platform to align development, sector and departmental plans across spheres it is as yet not utilised as such. • The contents of the PGDSs and IDPs were generally not well aligned with each other, or with the MTSF. • The PGDS has as yet not acquired the same status as coordinator in the provincial sphere, as the IDP has done in the local sphere. • The alignment of the contents of IDPs, PGDSs, national and provincial sector and departmental plans and budgets has not taken place. • The contents of IDPs do not seem to feature in national and provincial departmental and sector plans. • Alignment between sector plans is not evident, especially in the provincial and national spheres.
<p>Planning and budgeting cycles are aligned.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An annual development planning cycle has been established in the local sphere. • Budgeting cycles in spheres and the dovetailing of budgeting cycles between spheres has functioned well 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The preparation of IDPs is often done without prior recognition of the financial position of the municipality, which in many highly deprived localities results in a meaningless exercise of seeking to link an IDP brimming with projects and programmes to a very meagre budget. • Alignment between the

Intergovernmental Planning Requirement	What was achieved/What worked?	What/Where are the gaps?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Planning Framework put in place a process and strategic timeframe for aligning national planning in the form of the MTSF and budgeting in the form of the national MTEF. The medium-term development and financial planning horizons have ensured a higher degree of certainty in planning and budgeting throughout government. 	<p>development, sector and departmental planning and budgeting cycles is as yet not taking place effectively within and between the various spheres.</p>
<p>Coordinated implementation and service delivery takes place and the commitment of national and provincial spheres to implement and/or finance projects and programmes in IDPs is secured.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IDP was developed as a mechanism to facilitate commitment of all three spheres of government to projects and programmes in all municipal areas in the country and to ensure that the resulting infrastructure investment and development spending takes place in a coordinated fashion. The IDP Nerve Centre, which was developed under the auspices of the DPLG, should enable joint project management between spheres and sectors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of coordination results in provincial and national departments implementing projects and programmes unilaterally and without consulting municipalities. Sector/sphere-driven infrastructure investment takes place without consideration of the operational and management implications for, in most cases, municipalities. A lack of allocation of responsibilities for infrastructure investment and development spending, as well as lack of coordination in implementation, hampers delivery. The problem of limited resources to fund projects in municipal IDPs is aggravated by a lack of knowledge about available funding and uncertainty as to which projects will be funded.
<p>Monitoring and evaluation of infrastructure investment and development spending takes place as agreed to.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Management Systems have been established as cornerstones of development, sectoral and departmental planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint targets are not set between spheres with the result that the three spheres do not jointly monitor objectives and outcomes.
<p>A shared understanding of the need for intergovernmental planning and development terminology has been established.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IGR Bill and Policy, which seek to nurture such an understanding, are in their final phases of drafting. The IDP experience has left municipalities with a strong realisation that intergovernmental planning is required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A lack of commitment from especially the side of national and provincial officials to local initiatives hampers the work of structures created to ensure greater intergovernmental collaboration. A lack of standardisation in terminology, definitions, monitoring measures and targets is frustrating the ability of role players in different spheres and departments to collaborate.

