

FINAL DRAFT

A POLICY PAPER ON INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

DATE:

October 2000

PREPARED FOR:

The Department of Provincial and Local Government

PREPARED BY:

Dr. Mark Oranje (University of Pretoria)

Prof. Phil Harrison (University of Natal)

Ms Elsona van Huyssteen (University of Pretoria)

Ms Engela Meyer (University of Pretoria)

CONTACT PERSON:

Mr Yusuf Patel (Programme Manager: Decentralised Development Planning, Department of Provincial and Local Government, Pretoria, Tel: 012 344 0805)

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	2
SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 The Rationale for a Policy on Integrated Development Planning	3
1.2 Framing the Policy	5
1.3 The Purpose, Contents and Structure of this Document	10
SECTION 2: INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING	12
2.1 A Brief Background to the Emergence of Integrated Development Planning	12
2.2 Characteristics of Integrated Development Planning	14
2.3 Towards an Intergovernmental System of Integrated Development Planning	17
SECTION 3: THE INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IDP)	19
3.1 What is the IDP?	19
3.2. Developmental Roles of the IDP	19
3.3. The Benefits of Having an IDP	23
3.4 Core Components of the IDP	24
3.5 Preparing, Adopting, Managing and Implementing the IDP	25
3.6 The Legal Status of the IDP	29
3.7 Post-Demarcation Issues	29
SECTION 4: ALIGNMENT AND LINKAGE	31
4.1 Intra-Spherical Alignment and Linkage	31
4.2 Inter-Spherical Alignment and Linkage	36
SECTION 5: CAPACITY BUILDING AND SUPPORT	39
5.1 The Need for Capacity Building and Support	39
5.2 The Nature and Format of Capacity Building and Support	39
5.3 Roles and Role Players in Capacity Building and Support	41
SECTION 6: SUMMARY	42
GLOSSARY OF TERMS	45
ANNEXURES	
Annexure A: International Examples of Intergovernmental Planning Systems	47
Annexure B: Legislation Relevant to Integrated Development Planning	50
Annexure C: Policy Documents Relevant to Integrated Development Planning	51
Annexure D: Useful Sources of Information for Integrated Development Planning	53
Annexure E: Names and Addresses of Some Providers of IDP-Training	55

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DDP:	Decentralised Development Planning
DFA:	Development Facilitation Act, Act No 67 of 1995
DLA:	Department of Land Affairs
DPLG:	Department of Provincial and Local Government
GEAR:	Growth, Employment and Redistribution: A Macro-economic Strategy
GTZ:	German Agency for Technical Co-operation
IDP:	Integrated Development Plan
IGS:	Intergovernmental System
LDO:	Land Development Objective
LED:	Local Economic Development
LGTA:	Local Government Transition Act Second Amendment Act, Act No 97 of 1996
LUM:	Land Use Management
MEC:	Member of the [Provincial] Executive Council
MSB:	Municipal Systems Bill, 2000
MTEF:	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
NGO:	Non-Governmental Organisation
PGDF:	Provincial Growth and Development Framework
PGDS:	Provincial Growth and Development Strategy
PIMSS:	Planning and Information Management Support System
RDP:	Reconstruction and Development Programme
SALGA:	South African Local Government Association
WPLG:	White Paper on Local Government

SECTION ONE

INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW: This section sets out the rationale for the policy, the subject matter of the policy and the legislative and other parameters within which the policy has been developed.

1.1 THE RATIONALE FOR A POLICY ON INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

In November 1996 the preparation of Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) became a legal requirement for local councils in terms of the Local Government Transition Act Second Amendment Act, 1996 (LGTA). The Act provided only a very broad indication of the purpose and subject matter of these Plans. This lack of detail was not an oversight, but a conscious decision on the part of the then Department of Constitutional Development to limit legislation to *minimum requirements*, in so doing, providing the opportunity for *maximum flexibility* and local innovation. This “minimalist approach” was however complemented by the commitment of the Department, in line with constitutional obligations, to provide local councils with support and guidance in fulfilling their IDP-mandate.

This assistance, which was the primary responsibility of the Decentralised Development Programme (DDP) in the Department, and which is still continuing, took a variety of forms, *viz.:*

- the production and dissemination of a User-friendly Guide and a Manual on Integrated Development Planning;
- hosting “road shows” throughout the country at which the concept of Integrated Development Planning was promoted and discussed;
- monitoring and reporting on Integrated Development Planning-Pilot Studies in seven of the nine provinces;
- the establishment of Support Centres in District Councils throughout the country; and
- the formulation of a curriculum framework for the provision of training on Integrated Development Planning for councillors, officials and professionals.

The significance of Integrated Development Planning within the broader system of municipal government was highlighted by the White Paper on Local Government that was issued by the then Ministry for Provincial Affairs and Constitutional Development in March 1998. This key policy document provided content to the new developmental roles and responsibilities for Local Government as set out in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996. The policy statements on

Integrated Development Planning in the White Paper provided valuable guidance for the subsequent preparation of IDPs and strengthened the case for Integrated Development Planning as a key tool for developmental local government together with performance management and participatory processes. In addition to this the Department produced a draft policy discussion document entitled “Towards Policy on Integrated Development Planning” in October 1998 that dealt with some of the debates and concerns around the newly legislated concept of Integrated Development Planning.

The White Paper was followed by the key pieces of legislation that are to frame the new system of local government: the Municipal Structures Act, 1998, the Municipal Demarcation Act, 1998, the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000, the Municipal Finance Management Act, 2000, and the Property Rates Bill, 2000. Whilst all this legislation is relevant to a system of planning that is focussed on the operations of local government, the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000, deals directly with the statutory requirements for IDPs. Integrated Development Planning for local government is, however, a form of planning that involves linkage and co-ordination between all sectors of activity that impact on the operation of a local authority. This means that all policy and legislation produced by line departments (e.g. Water Affairs, Land Affairs, Transport, Housing and Environmental Affairs) that demand a planning action or development activity in the local sphere, must be considered in developing policy for Integrated Development Planning and IDPs¹. It should also be noted that a number of provincial governments have taken up their constitutional competency with regard to planning and have produced legislation that provide for variant forms of IDPs². The KwaZulu-Natal Planning and Development Act, 1998, for example, makes provision for local, sub-regional, regional and provincial development plans that must, in addition to meeting the requirements of IDPs in terms of national legislation, also meet requirements that are specific to the province in terms of environmental management and land use management.

As indicated above, the necessary legislative framework for IDPs was gradually put in place during the period 1996 to 2000 and there has been some progress towards developing policy and guidelines. In addition, many local authorities have prepared their first IDPs, and have been provided with assistance such as training and financial support. However, despite all the capacity building endeavours, and the widespread support for the concept of Integrated Development Planning, the developmental outcome of the first four years of the IDP-initiative has been disappointing in places. In many instances the practical impact of IDPs has yet to be shown. In others the first rounds of Land Development Objectives (LDOs) and IDPs are still due. Recent assessments of IDPs suggest that the problems are largely attributable to:

- resistance to change by local officials;
- poor management of consultants by local councils;
- inadequate human and financial capacity within municipalities;
- limited knowledge and understanding of the “new” concept of Integrated Development Planning;

¹ A list of all relevant legislation is included in Annexures A and B to this document.

² Examples include the KwaZulu-Natal Planning and Development Act, 1998, the Western Cape Planning and Development Act, 1999, the Northern Cape Planning and Development Act, 1999 and the Gauteng Development Planning Bill, 1999.

- IDP-documents that provide only limited guidance to municipal officials and the private sector;
- a lack of commitment to local initiatives on the side of provincial and national departments; and
- inadequate integration between the strategies, plans, programmes and budgets *within* and *between* the three spheres of government.

Most of the reasons given for “IDP-failure” are related to a lack of knowledge of and/or commitment to IDP processes and to institutional deficiencies within local government. These problems are being addressed through capacity building initiatives being undertaken by the DDP and provincial authorities. There are, however, certain “structural” problems that need to be resolved by national government if the IDP initiative is to be successful in the future. The *first* is the current lack of a clear national policy on Integrated Development Planning. While there is legislation on IDPs, and also a detailed Manual that provides guidance on how to prepare IDPs, there is, as yet, no coherent statement of policy that sets out national government’s position on Integrated Development Planning. The *second* is the lack of an effective mechanism for Integrated Development Planning at an inter-governmental scale. While municipalities are required to co-ordinate and prioritise their activities in terms of the framework provided by IDPs, many of the problems confronted at local level arise from a lack of co-ordinated planning and implementation within the national and provincial spheres of government, as well as between the three spheres. Clearly the idea of Integrated Development Planning needs to be extended beyond the local sphere to include planning processes within provincial and national government, and appropriate procedures need to be developed if the ideals of “co-operative governance” are to be realised.

In order to address these and other problems and challenges the Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG) has embarked on a policy-writing process which is intended to culminate in a *White Paper on Integrated Development Planning*. The White Paper will provide a framework within which IDPs can be prepared and will also indicate the mechanisms and procedures to promote integration within and between spheres of government in the development planning process. This framework will, however, not be static as the DPLG recognises that Integrated Development Planning is a complex and evolving process that should involve ongoing mutual learning, and should have the flexibility to adapt to changing conditions and to weaknesses as they become apparent. The policy prepared by national government will therefore not include unnecessary prescription and detail, and will discourage the mechanistic application of techniques and processes in IDP-preparation.

1.2 FRAMING THE POLICY

Before commencing with the production of a policy it is necessary to construct the frame within this activity is to place. This frame consists of:

- the specific *policy issues* that demand attention and that need to be dealt with in the policy; and
- the *parameters* that structure the way in which the policy issues should, or could, be dealt with.

While the policy issues are typically derived from problems or tensions that have been experienced in practice, the parameters are derived primarily from:

- formal sources, such as legislation and policy statements (in this case including the White Paper on Local Government and local government legislation); and
- informal sources, such as international practice, theory (planning theory in this case), and lessons from experience.

1.2.1 POLICY ISSUES

Three main groups of issues have been identified through IDP-Assessments, “Frequently Asked Questions” and “Road Shows” hosted by the DDP. These are dealt with under the headings as provided.

A: Conceptualisation

Despite the production of manuals, and various forms of training, there is still confusion around the meaning of Integrated Development Planning, and such matters as to why it is necessary, who is responsible for it, and what the legal status of an IDP is. Questions have even been raised about the benefits of Integrated Development Planning relative to competing, more action oriented/project-focussed planning approaches. These views have been given some impetus through the perceived inability of IDPs to deliver on the sought-after developmental outcomes. Concerns have also been raised that IDPs are too ambitious for a context in which there is limited capacity and a lack of funds for planning *and* implementation. In the light of this it has been suggested that under-capacitated local authorities would do better to focus attention on a few key areas or projects, without concerning themselves with the myriad of inter-institutional and inter-sectoral linkages. There is also a general uncertainty as to what degree of integration is required and what level of detail should be dealt with in the process, especially when it comes to project and programme definition. The latter has significant impacts when it comes to linking IDPs to the budgets of local councils.

Many local authorities also experience problems with community participation, especially with regards to making participation useful and meaningful. This area requires special attention given the definition of ‘municipality’ in Section 2. (b) of the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000, as an entity consisting of “(i) *the structures, functionaries and administration of the municipality; and (ii) the community of the municipality*”.

B: Alignment and Linkage

As a result of government’s wide-ranging agendas for reconstruction and development there is a growing list of sectoral and issue-based plans and activities that are being demanded from local government by national and provincial legislation, policy frameworks, strategies and programmes. These include, for example, water plans, transportation plans, land use management systems, local economic development strategies, and land reform strategies. While it is relatively easy to make statements about the need for local authorities to use a single planning process and to

adopt a holistic and integrated approach to development, translating these intentions into practice is far more difficult given such problems as:

- the continued lack of co-ordination amongst national and provincial departments and programmes;
- the varying time-frames of different planning processes;
- the sometimes conflicting policy agendas; and
- the different legislative requirements for planning in different sectors.

There are also particular areas where linkage has proven to be particularly problematic, for example, between environmental management and other planning processes, and between the broad economic and spatial frameworks of an IDP and the details required of a land use management system.

The recent demarcation process will also result in a very particular problem of alignment and linkage, i.e. the need to bring together existing plans for different settlements as single plans for the new, and generally larger, consolidated municipalities. The larger municipal areas will of course also bring a rural dimension and a regional scale to municipal planning, for which many officials, consultants and councillors may be ill prepared.

C: Institutional and Organisational Arrangements

Many IDPs have performed poorly because of the inadequate institutional and organisational arrangements of local authorities and a lack of clarity on role-divisions in plan preparation, management and implementation. Some of the problems have included:

- local councils handing over their responsibilities to consultants rather than using consultants to support a local authority-led process;
- poor linkage between planning processes at district and local scales (e.g. priorities and programmes which are not dovetailed);
- lack of clarity as to the respective roles of officials and councillors in the IDP process;
- inadequate mechanisms to bring together line function departments within the local authority; and
- a continued poor linkage between planning and budgeting processes and actors/agencies.

In addition to these issues the recent demarcation process has created cross-boundary municipalities which will require policy guidance in addition to the provisions contained in the Cross-Boundary Municipalities Bill, 2000.

1.2.2 PARAMETERS

There are two general “parameters” that can be derived from formal and informal sources. These are the following:

A: The policy framework must allow for maximum flexibility and ingenuity in the local sphere of government, without compromising the crucial tasks of alignment and co-ordination of planning, budgeting and delivery/spending within and between spheres.

In contrast to more centralist and hierarchically structured countries, in which municipalities are created through an Act of Parliament and hence made subservient to [the whims of] other *tiers* of government, the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, establishes local government as a distinct *sphere* of government³. However, together with this level of autonomy, local government is given a distinct responsibility to promote developmental outcomes, and national and provincial governments are given the responsibility for monitoring and assisting local government in pursuing their mandates, as well as for providing the legislative framework for local scale planning.

The broad principle that follows from the doctrine of “co-operative governance” is that the integrity of each sphere should be respected, and that there should be minimum interference in the performance of the tasks allocated to each sphere. In relation to Integrated Development Planning this suggests that policy frameworks and legislation produced by national and provincial government should be of a minimalist nature and should not unnecessarily constrain the freedom of local authorities to develop their own contextually appropriate forms of planning. There is indeed convincing international experience to show that this form of freedom allows for experimentalism and innovation and also for more effective systems of planning in the long run. There are, however, certain realities in South Africa at present that may require national government to play a more active role in developing policy frameworks than may be ideally appropriate. These include:

- the need to promote transformation of local government and address macro-inequalities;
- the limited capacity and planning experience of many local authorities; and
- the need to ensure the proper integration of planning, and the alignment of development priorities, between the different spheres.

The need to address past legacies requires efficient and co-ordinated action across spheres of government, and compels different agencies to take into account the actions and concerns of other. It is because of this need for synergy and co-ordination that some level of uniformity (in system, product, and even terminology) is necessary. National government does have a responsibility to provide a broad framework within which co-ordinated action can take place. It can do this by prescribing the *minimum* level of uniformity necessary to allow for effective linkage within and between spheres.

The South African challenge is to find mechanisms for integration that are not too hierarchical and prescriptive, and that remain within the spirit of co-operative governance. Internationally, there is experience that can be drawn upon, for example⁴:

³ This South African arrangement is in line with more progressive international tendencies towards decentralisation and the devolution of responsibilities for planning and development.

⁴ See also paragraph 2.4 of this document.

- the use of national and supranational spatial frameworks (e.g. the European Spatial Development Perspective, the national spatial frameworks for The Netherlands and Denmark, and the proposed national frameworks for India and the United Kingdom);
- processes for the ‘*cross-acceptance* of plans’ used in the American State of New Jersey⁵;
- the ‘counter-current’ principle which applies to planning in Germany⁶; and
- the increasing use of district-scale planning as the interface between local planning and provincial/ national planning (e.g. India and Sri Lanka).

In South Africa, there have recently been some attempts at promoting better-aligned infrastructure and development spending. These have included proposals from the Office of the President for a National Spatial Development Perspective and a mechanism to link IDPs to national and provincial spending decisions, and the consideration that has been given by the Department of Provincial and Local Government to an Intergovernmental System of Development Planning. Unless these pressing issues of co-ordination are resolved, IDPs will remain limited instruments for local integration.

B: The policy framework must recognise the differences in capacity between provinces and the various types of municipality without compromising the need for a set of minimum outcomes

The South African reality is one of enormous variation in capacity and levels of development between different municipalities and areas of the country. For example, a metropolitan council for one of the “Megacities” would be likely to have a level of technical skill, and human and financial resource that far exceeds that of a newly established council in a rural area of the country. Large, well-resourced local authorities would generally have the capacity to develop their own plans with limited support from national and provincial government, and may also be in a good position to experiment intelligently with new and innovative forms of planning⁷. The system should give space to these local authorities to develop their own tailor-made approaches to planning, provided that these are consistent with overall national goals and policies. Other local authorities may need far stronger guidance from the other spheres of government, and may also require higher levels of monitoring. It makes sense to consider a system of asymmetrical support and regulation, that takes these differences into account and that directs the scarce resources of national and provincial governments to those areas most in need. Note that there is international precedent for asymmetrical systems⁸, and that recent trends in social and planning theory support systems that accommodate diversity and recognise the requirements of different circumstances.

⁵ See Annexure A for an exposition of this system.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ For example, Durban Metropolitan Council is current experimenting with “outcomes-based planning” as part of a Long Term Development Plan that incorporates the medium term objectives of the IDP with strategic planning for a long-term horizon.

⁸ For example, in a number of countries different regional authorities (e.g. Spain and Italy) are provided with different roles and functions. In the case of the United Kingdom devolution has seen the Welsh Assembly being granted some executive, but not legislative powers, as in the case of the Scottish Parliament – a practice called “asymmetrical devolution”.

In the final event, the IDP is a tool to improve the quality of governance. It should therefore be evaluated in terms of its usefulness in achieving the objectives of developmental local governance. An overly elaborate and complex IDP may be inaccessible to many of the less capacitated councils, just as an overly simplistic IDP may contribute little to the development processes in a more sophisticated context. The variations in content and detail requirements for IDPs prepared for different types of local authorities could be dealt with through the regulations to the Municipal Systems Bill and/or through provincial legislation.

The challenge for policy is to provide for differences in capacity in creative ways, while still ensuring that the planning processes and products are able to deliver the much-needed developmental outcomes in a way that is consistent with national policies and priorities.

1.3 THE PURPOSE, CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This document has a dual purpose. On the one hand it brings together two years of policy work on Integrated Development Planning in the process of moving towards a White Paper. On the other it provides policy guidance for the next round of IDPs that have to be prepared and adopted by all newly elected local councils within a time frame that is still to be set in terms of the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000. This document takes a “middle-position” between the minimum requirements contained in enabling legislation on local government and the detailed technical guidance that will be provided in the forthcoming revised IDP Manual.

In performing this dual purpose the document provides:

- a *rationale* for preparing a White Paper on Integrated Development Planning;
- a *framework* for the production of the White Paper, consisting of the policy issues and the parameters within which the issues have to be addressed;
- a *clarification of concepts*, including that of Integrated Development Planning;
- *policy positions*, in the form of clear statements to substantiate and elaborate on the minimum requirements regarding Integrated Development Planning and IDPs as contained in the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000;
- *proposals* for those issues that should be attended to in Regulations and Guidelines in terms of the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000; and
- *policy guidance*, in the form of non-prescriptive suggestions or options in relation to a number of issues that will be addressed in detail in the forthcoming revised version of the IDP Manual.

To address these roles, the document has been structured as follows:

- **Section One** contains the rationale for the proposed White Paper and the frame in which the policy has been produced;
- **Section Two** is devoted to the concept of Integrated Development Planning, providing a brief historical narration of its emergence, a description of its main characteristics, and an introduction to the concept of an “Intergovernmental System of Integrated Development Planning”;

- **Section Three** deals with the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) and contains policy positions, proposals and guidance regarding the definition of the IDP, its developmental roles, benefits, core components, procedures for preparation, adoption, management and implementation, and legal status, as well as a section dealing with specific post-demarcation IDP-issues;
- **Section Four** deals with intra- and inter-spherical alignment and linkage, and contains policy positions and proposals as to the way in which the alignment and linkage must/can be attended to;
- **Section Five** sets out the need for, nature and format of, and roles and role players in capacity building and support for Integrated Development Planning; and
- **Section Six** summarises the main policy positions and lists those areas in which it is proposed that Regulations and Guidelines be prepared, or in which the revised IDP Manual should provide more guidance.

SECTION 2

INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

OVERVIEW: In this section the concept of Integrated Development Planning is clarified through a brief historical narration of its emergence and a description of its main characteristics. This section also provides an introduction to the concept of an “Intergovernmental System of Integrated Development Planning”.

2.1 A BRIEF BACKGROUND TO THE EMERGENCE OF INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

2.1.1 PLANNING PRE-1994

For more than five decades after the advent of municipal planning in South Africa in the 1930s, planning at the local level was in most cases:

- done on a racially segregated basis and within a top-down Apartheid superstructure;
- concerned with the perceived needs of the privileged groups in society;
- sectorally fragmented, with transport, land use and engineering services plans and the budget being prepared in isolation by departments structured in accordance with areas of technical, professional competence;
- of a master plan-nature, the domain of the technical expert (with the privileged sectors of society in some cases allowed little more than a once-off input via a questionnaire and/or a view of the plan at the end of the road);
- silent on issues of environmental sustainability, economic viability, poverty alleviation and social health and welfare;
- focussed on control or on sectorally-structured infrastructural delivery programmes by the public sector; and
- weak on the facilitation of private sector investment.

Provincial governments had no clear role in regard to provincial and regional planning, but were responsible for controlling local level planning through the provisions of the various Town Planning Ordinances. Municipalities stood in a subservient position to provinces, and plans prepared by municipalities, as well as applications for land development, were in most cases submitted to the provincial administrations for approval.

National government exerted considerable indirect control over local planning through a dense web of racially based legislation, and also through “Guide-plan processes”. In relation to planning for “black settlement” the control was direct, although in the later years of apartheid, some planning powers were delegated to homeland governments.

By the 1980s the dire consequences of fragmented apartheid-based planning were becoming apparent even to agents of the state. There was a limited attempt to use planning to overcome some of the spatial and institutional divides through, for example, integrated rural development initiatives which cross-cut homeland boundaries, and regional economic planning on the basis of functional development regions. In terms of practical outcome, however, these initiatives proved to be marginal as the political and institutional basis for development continued to undermine any attempt towards integrated development.

By the late 1980s, the civic movement and progressive NGOs were mobilising around the need to achieve integrated urban areas, as evident, for example, in the slogan “one city, one tax base”. During the transitional phase in the early 1990s the notion of integrated development planning began to crystallise within various negotiating forums that had been set up to forge agreement around development concerns (e.g. the Local Negotiating Forum and the National Housing Forum). At the same time, the idea of integrated planning was gaining currency internationally as a reaction to the fragmented *ad hoc* project based approaches to planning in the 1980s, and also in response to a move towards integration in technology, and the environmentalists’ concern for a holistic perspective on development. The emergent notion of integrated development planning also drew on well established traditions within planning theory that had been propagated by progressive planning departments in South Africa’s universities, and on the “new public management” which focussed internationally on the more effective and efficient delivery of public services.

2.1.2 PLANNING POST-1994

The outlines of a new approach to planning were evident in a 1992 document entitled the *ANC Policy Guidelines for a Democratic South Africa* which proposed that municipal planning should:

- ensure maximum involvement of all communities and stakeholders;
- be directed at those in greatest need;
- strive to break down Apartheid privilege, geography and institutional structures;
- be aimed at ensuring integrated and sustainable development; and
- be focussed on delivery.

These ideas were developed further in the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), concretised in the Constitution and articulated further in a range of policy documents including the White Paper on Local Government and the Green Paper on Development Planning. They were also given legal substance in legislation such as the Development Facilitation Act, 1995 and the Local Government Transition Act Second Amendment Act, 1996.

By 1995 “Integrated Development Planning” had emerged as a distinct approach to planning and was being promoted by the RDP Office and the intergovernmental Forum for Effective Planning and Development (FEPD). At that time Integrated Development Planning was conceived mainly as a tool to support the co-ordinated delivery of reconstruction and development by *national and provincial* government departments. However, with the closure of the RDP Office, and the creation of transitional local councils, the focus had shifted by 1996 to the role of Integrated Development Planning in the local sphere of government.

2.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

In 1995 the FEPD defined Integrated Development Planning as:

“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”.

Encapsulated in this definition were the key elements of Integrated Development Planning that were to be formalised and elaborated upon in later years: participation, strategic focus, integration, prioritising those in greatest need, and a delivery-orientation. Each of these elements is discussed in turn below.

2.2.1 PARTICIPATION

All development-related legislation passed since 1994 by national and provincial governments has required participative processes in plan formulation. As pointed out in the White Paper on Local Government, participation is about the *deepening of democracy*, as well as about ensuring that all affected parties have a say in determining and prioritising needs, preparing strategies to address them, and monitoring the delivery and outcomes of such strategies.

In recent years the well-established concept of community participation has been linked to the idea of “governance”. In terms of this linkage the new local government legislation has reconceptualised the idea of participation. It is no longer about a local authority (or another body of government) engaging “its subjects” through processes of participation devised by the local authority, but it is rather about collaborative relationships in policy formulation and delivery. In terms of a new definition in Section 2 of the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000, a municipality consists of “(i) *the structures, functionaries and administration of the municipality; and* (ii) *the community of the municipality*. Municipal planning therefore requires the “*structures, functionaries and administration of the municipality*” to act in **partnership** with “*the community of the municipality*”. This redefinition of “municipality” and, by implication, of participation in municipal planning, will require a fundamental rethink of the organisational and procedural aspects of plan preparation, management and implementation.

2.2.2 STRATEGIC FOCUS

The White Paper on Local Government, as well as the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000, refers explicitly to the need for municipal planning to be “strategic”. By this is meant that planning should have a long-term horizon, and that planning should be focussed on those prioritised interventions that will have maximum impact on the development of a locality. The call for strategic planning follows from a recognition that resources are limited and that not all problems can be resolved in the short or medium term. The current South African focus on strategic planning is also informed by an international shift away from comprehensive planning, in which an attempt is made to “understand everything and to intervene in everything”, to more targeted, realistic, action-oriented and outcomes-focussed forms of planning. Strategic plans avoid unaffordable and unattainable comprehensiveness, while still containing sufficient analysis and technical detail to enable the formulation and implementation of programmes that are sustainable, and are able to maximise developmental impacts within financial and other resource constraints.⁹

It should be noted that the strategic planning approach was initially developed in the corporate sector and that adjustments will have to be made within municipalities to make it a success in the public sector. A strategic, outcomes-based approach will require a transformation of the bureaucratic nature of most municipalities to facilitate the speedy adjustments required by strategic planning and the building of appropriate managerial capacity.

2.2.3 INTEGRATION

Integrated planning requires a holistic approach that takes account of linkages between sectors and of linkages between various stages in the planning process (including visioning, strategic development, project development, and the monitoring of implementation). Integrated Development Planning has taken a particular form in South Africa, but it is also an increasingly important approach internationally. Important areas of integration internationally include:

- integrated environmental planning (as in Local Agenda 21);
- the links between land-use and [especially public] transport planning;
- the integration of planning with participatory budgeting (e.g. in Brazil);
- integrated regional development planning approaches (e.g. in Brazil, Turkey and Switzerland);
- integrated rural development planning approaches (e.g. in Indonesia and Papua New Guinea); and
- integrated infrastructural provision (as promoted by the United Nations Development Programme).

Integrated Development Planning in South Africa has similarities with many of the international cases, but is also informed by the requirements of addressing the apartheid legacy. So, for example, one of the goals of South African-style Integrated Development Planning is the promotion of integrated urban and rural development.

⁹ This shift should, however, not be seen as an excuse to abstain from rigorous investigation and analysis or for the selection of projects on purely political criteria or on the whim of powerful/vocal individuals in the municipality or community.

Other specifically South African concerns relate to the system of ‘co-operative government’ and the need to link the actions of the many government agencies in the implementation of the RDP.

Among the requirements of Integrated Development Planning in South Africa is the need to:

- link the many sectoral planning requirements placed on local governments by national legislation;
- overcome line-function divisions within government agencies;
- link and balance environmental, equity and economic growth requirements within planning processes;
- co-ordinate the delivery of infrastructure and services in specific localities;
- link visioning, planning, budgeting and the management functions of local authorities (and other government agencies);
- bring together rural and urban areas within the context of re-demarcated local authorities;
- co-ordinate developmental actions between local authorities and between local and district councils;
- link government’s funding programmes with the priorities of local communities;
- restore the distorted, dysfunctional apartheid landscape; and
- promote spatial integration of urban and rural settlements.

It must be noted that integration is undeniably a very ambitious goal that will be difficult to achieve and will require staff numbers and capacities that do not exist as yet in all municipalities. Certainly, *full levels of integration* cannot be expected in the short to medium term. However, in the long run “integrated development” is more effective and sustainable than an approach that relies on isolated *ad hoc* interventions, and that fails to secure the synergies between the different actors in the development field. Rather than shying away from the challenge, municipalities should begin the process that will *over time* lead to higher and deeper levels of integration.

2.2.4 FOCUS ON THOSE IN GREATEST NEED

The primary goal of the RDP and other government policies is to address the severe social and economic imbalances that characterise South African society. These include imbalances that exist in relation to the urban/rural divide, race and gender. The National Constitution in fact requires that “*a municipality must structure and manage its administration and budgeting and planning processes to give priority to the basic needs of the community and to promote the social and economic development of the community*”¹⁰. The strategies, projects and programmes that are generated through the process of Integrated Development Planning must therefore be tested in terms of the extent to which they assist in empowering and improving the living conditions of the disadvantaged. This drive towards greater equality will, however, have to be done in such a way that it does not alienate other segments of the community from the process, or becomes detrimental to the building of partnerships for development.

¹⁰ Taken from Section 153 of the Constitution.

2.2.5 OUTCOMES AND DELIVERY-ORIENTATION

The White Paper on Local Government clearly states that Integrated Development Planning is not an end in itself, but that it is a tool to assist local government to achieve the developmental outcomes specified in the Constitution. The success of Integrated Development Planning must therefore be assessed in terms of the extent to which it has promoted:

- democratic and accountable government;
- the provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner;
- social and economic development;
- a safe and healthy environment; and
- the involvement of communities in matters of local government¹¹.

The Constitution also indicates that these objectives should be pursued “*within the financial and administrative capacity of a municipality*”¹², and so ‘financial sustainability’ should be included as another key consideration in preparing and evaluating an IDP. This is precisely what the measurement and monitoring of outcomes through a system of *performance management*, as required of local authorities in terms of the MSB, has in mind.

2.3 TOWARDS AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL SYSTEM OF INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Despite the Constitutional requirement calling for a system of co-operative governance, and legislation providing for measures to facilitate this, the level of integration between the three spheres of government in the arenas of planning, budgeting and implementation has been far from satisfactory. Numerous attempts at bringing about greater integration in the spatial location of infrastructure investment and development spending have been embarked upon since the dawning of the new democracy in 1994, but to little avail. The most recent of these exercises, co-ordinated by the Office of the President, resulted in a proposal which would see IDPs becoming the cornerstone in a system by which localities would engage via their IDPs with the provincial and national spheres in order to secure funding for development programmes. This mechanism has, however, not been given any official status leaving the situation unchanged.

In another initiative also aimed at addressing the continued problem of poorly co-ordinated planning and action between spheres of government, the DPLG has proposed that an ‘Intergovernmental System (IGS) of Integrated Development Planning’ be developed. It is proposed that in developing such a system cognisance is taken of international examples¹³ (see Annexure A for a selection of five such systems

¹¹ See Section 152 of the Constitution.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ The problem of inter-governmental alignment is not specifically South African. The Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) makes the point that, internationally, systems of government are becoming more fragmented as the number and variety of actors increases, and there is more interdependence between levels of government as problems become more complex and difficult

and some lessons that can be learned from these cases), and that the system be informed by the following principles, *viz.* that it must:

- respect the principle of co-operative governance;
- provide for the skilful marriage of national priorities, provincial objectives and local preferences;
- as far as possible, make use of existing procedures (such as the provisions in the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000 which could improve levels of inter-governmental integration and co-ordination) and structures rather than creating costly parallel systems;
- avoid the creation of a “super-agency” for co-ordinating state planning;
- avoid overly elaborate systems and mechanisms of ‘inter-spherical’ co-ordination;
- encourage both more autonomy at lower levels of government and clearer overall direction from the national sphere¹⁴;
- allow for differentiation through flexibility, yet ensure some minimum degree of uniformity;
- cater for more responsiveness to local needs, but not to the detriment of efficiency and economy;
- remain within the capacity-constraints of all spheres of government;
- avoid unnecessary complexity;
- recognise the principle of *subsidiarity*, whereby national and/or provincial government should only take action if local government is unable to do so;
- recognise and respect the value of the IDP in representing the interests and programmes of municipal government;
- avoid “unfunded mandates”, and promote maximum possible fiscal decentralisation;
- make innovative and cost-effective use of available technology, including the Internet; and
- ensure that the system is operated and managed in all three spheres by senior officials and politicians who should be held accountable for its success and not be delegated to junior officials with limited [decision-making] powers.

to resolve unilaterally. The OECD has conducted an extensive study of inter-governmental relations within 26 countries that can be accessed on their website: www.oecd.org/puma/malg/malg97/.

¹⁴This bullet and the next two bullets are taken from OECD (2000, p.3-4) which can be accessed on their website: www.oecd.org/puma/malg/malg97/.

SECTION 3

THE INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IDP)

OVERVIEW: This section discusses what the IDP is, and what its developmental roles, benefits, core components, procedures for preparation, adoption, management and implementation, and legal status, are, and deals with some specific post-demarcation IDP-issues.

3.1 WHAT IS THE IDP?

The IDP, which was first called to life by the Local Government Transition Act Second Amendment Act, 1996 (LGTA), is a specific legally prescribed product of an Integrated Development Planning process in the municipal sphere of government. In terms of the definition contained in this Act the IDP was to be a plan aimed at enabling the integrated development and management of a municipal area by a municipal council. **The IDP was thus conceived as a tool to assist municipalities in achieving their developmental mandates.** In defining the IDP, the Act also made a direct link between the IDP and the DFA, stating that the IDP had to be prepared “*having regard to*” the General Principles in that Act and, where applicable, the subject matter of the LDOs called for in Chapter 4 of that Act¹⁵. This close relationship between the IDP and the LDOs not only resulted in much confusion as to what the difference between the two plans really was, but also raised concerns of duplication and lack of co-ordination between departments in the national sphere. After having clarified the position of the two plans vis-à-vis each other, the DPLG, as well as the Department of Land Affairs (DLA), went to great lengths to publicise this¹⁶. In terms of their position, the LDOs and their preparation were not to be seen as a separate product and process, but were to be part of a municipality’s IDP and were thus to be prepared as part of the process of compiling an IDP.

3.2. DEVELOPMENTAL ROLES OF THE IDP

In terms of the WPLG and the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000, the IDP has six broad roles to play which have been grouped together under the following headings:

¹⁵ See Section 10B in Part VIA of the Local Government Transition Act Second Amendment Act, 1996.

¹⁶ The DPLG not only did so in its White Paper on Local Government (WPLG) and a Draft Policy on IDP, both published in 1998, but also used the IDP Manual to do so.

3.2.1 PROVIDING A STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR MUNICIPAL MANAGEMENT, BUDGETING, DELIVERY AND IMPLEMENTATION

As indicated in paragraph 3.1 of this document the IDP was, from the outset, regarded as a tool to assist and enable municipalities in meeting their developmental mandate. Both the WPLG and MSB provide a clear indication of what this should entail in practice, *viz.* to:

- link, integrate and co-ordinate plans and development proposals and other strategies, plans and frameworks for the municipality in the IDP;
- act as the policy framework and basis on which the annual budget for the municipality must be based;
- align the financial resources and human capacity of the municipality with the implementation of strategies, projects and programmes that will address the prioritised needs of the most deprived, and maintain the existing infrastructure and economic activities in the municipality; and
- assist municipalities to focus on the environmental sustainability of their delivery and developmental strategies.

The IDP thus not only acts as a “template” guiding the activities of a municipality over a five-year term, but also acts as a framework to link all sectoral plans and issue-based policies required of local authorities by national and/or provincial legislation and policy. What this means is that although the IDP is a “plan in its own right”, with a vision statement, a set of strategies, and projects, it is also a composite of other plans in the sense that it:

- refers to, summarises, integrates and co-ordinates proposals developed in the other plans/policies;
- captures, co-ordinates and aligns all the proposed infrastructural investments in other plans/policies in a Municipal Infrastructure Investment Programme; and
- provides a complete picture of the financial implications of the proposals in other plans/policies.

For the IDP to perform this function there is a need for a carefully constructed planning process that will enable as much co-ordination and integration in the generation of the proposals as is possible. Initially, there was an ambitious idea of a *single planning process* that would generate a range of plans/policies, as required by different pieces of legislation. It is now recognised that different types of plans have different planning cycles and time horizons, and also require varying degrees of detail and prescription, and that a *single planning horizon* in which various processes run their own courses, but regularly “cross paths”, is far more attainable. Whatever form such processes take, it is imperative that the IDP captures the outcomes of these various planning processes at a particular point in time and also addresses the question of linkage and intersection between them, especially the budgetary implications of the different plans and policies.

Examples of inter-linked, but at least partially separate, planning processes that have to be captured in the IDP include:

- Spatial visioning/frameworks which require a long term time horizon (perhaps more than twenty years), and a relatively low level of detail;

- “Structure planning”, or a set of statements on longer term spatial planning imperatives (to provide the linkage between the spatial vision and the land use management system), which requires a medium term time horizon and a moderate level of detail;
- A Land Use Management System which requires a level of detail sufficient to guide short-term decision-making;
- Transportation planning which needs to include a long term perspective on the structure of the city, as well as short and medium term strategising;
- Water planning which requires a long term perspective;
- Planning for the delivery of infrastructure and services which may be linked to a Medium Term Budgeting Framework (MTEF), but which would also have to be related to longer term development perspectives, and to annual budgeting processes;
- Environmental management and planning processes which range from long term integrative forms of planning such as Local Agenda 21 and Strategic Environmental Assessments to short-term project-based assessments;
- Institutional planning which is likely to be of a short to medium term nature given the uncertainties in the institutional environment; and
- Local economic development planning which would include the development of long term economic visions and strategies, and the planning for short to medium term economic programmes.

Whilst there is a level of complexity in the timing and sequencing of planning that will frustrate any attempt to achieve easy co-ordination and neat overlap, every effort should be made to synchronise different forms of planning and, where possible, to bring different processes together. The long-term goal should be to reduce complexity, and to move towards single processes with multiple outcomes without compromising the particular requirements of different forms of planning.

3.2.2 ENSURING POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONTINUITY

In terms of the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000, a municipal council must either prepare and adopt a new IDP within a period to be prescribed in Regulations, or adopt the IDP of the preceding council. In tying the plan to a political term of office the IDP becomes the vision for a municipal council and councillors can be held accountable for its implementation. For the electorate the IDP becomes an instrument to evaluate the performance of politicians, while for councillors, it becomes a way of giving effect to their political mandates.

There are, however, problems with linking the IDP to the life-span of an elected council. In particular, there are development processes with long-term horizons that may be disrupted by regular changes of policy and strategy. It should be noted that internationally many large cities have both a long term development plan *and* a medium term strategic plan that is directly linked to the programmes of an elected administration. In the South African context, it is suggested that the long-term planning elements (e.g. the spatial framework and the economic vision) be clearly identified in an IDP and that a new council be required to give strong motivation for changing or deviating from these aspects of a prior IDP.

3.2.3 FACILITATING INTERACTION, ENGAGEMENT, COMMUNICATION AND THE BUILDING OF ALLIANCES

In terms of the Constitution, the Municipal Systems Bill, and the White Paper on Local Government, municipalities are required to work together with national and provincial organs of state in development programmes and to align their developmental actions with those of neighbouring municipalities. The IDP plays a vital role in this regard as it serves as a basis for communication and interaction by providing an explicit statement of a particular municipality's developmental needs, goals and spending priorities. Although the principle of co-ordinated action across municipal boundaries is clear, mechanisms need to be developed to ensure that this linkage actually happens. The district councils can and must play an important role in negotiating differences between local councils, perhaps in terms of specified processes of *cross-acceptance*¹⁷.

Alliances and collaboration can happen between local authorities that are not spatially contiguous, and the IDP can play a role in this regard. The IDP can, for example, deal with "municipal international relations", and also with municipal networking within the country. Particular attention should be given to facilitating mutual learning processes involving the metropolitan councils in South Africa, and also other municipalities that share common problems or potentials.

Within the municipality the IDP plays the role of providing a basis for engagement between officials, councillors, citizenry and other stakeholders. Since this engagement is focussed around practical concerns such as budget allocation it should do far more than providing a talk-shop. In the longer term this engagement should promote more strongly networked localities, and also the building of the type of alliances that would make the new definition of "municipality" in the Municipal Systems Bill a reality.

3.2.4 TRANSFORMING LOCAL GOVERNMENT INTO A VEHICLE FOR DEVELOPMENT

The IDP and the transformation of local government are to some extent in a "chicken and egg situation". On the one hand, the IDP requires a transformed local governmental structure to ensure that it can be properly prepared and implemented, whilst, on the other hand, the IDP has as one of its aims the transformation of local government into a developmental unit/structure. In order for the IDP to play this role the LGTA required all municipalities to include an Institutional Plan that would set out how the particular municipality would be transformed and how its human resources would be deployed and developed. The Institutional Plan is no longer a requirement in terms of the MSB, but there is still a requirement that IDPs contain an indication of the municipality's transformation needs. IDPs thus still need to promote institutional transformation and will have to be subjected to performance management to ensure practical outcomes in this regard.

¹⁷ See Annexure A for a description of this process.

3.2.5 PROMOTING SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The IDP can assist in the promotion of socio-economic development in at least three ways. First, it can assist in leveraging-in funds from the other spheres of government, donor organisations and investors through defining and packaging attractive projects and programmes. Secondly, it can facilitate the creation of an environment that is conducive to private sector investment and the general promotion of local economic development. Thirdly, it can propose direct interventions in the economy through, for example, providing incentives, developing economic infrastructure, and buying, developing and leasing/selling land.

3.2.6 ASSISTING MUNICIPALITIES IN PRODUCING HOLISTIC STRATEGIES FOR POVERTY ALLEVIATION AND THE CREATION OF LIVELIHOODS

The holistic, integrated and participatory nature of IDPs allows poverty alleviation to be addressed in a multi-faceted way. In terms of the developmental mandate for local government, planning processes must give priority to poverty alleviation. The IDP can do this through:

- prioritising projects that address the basic needs of the poor;
- supporting the creation of livelihood-opportunities through Local Economic Development (LED) programmes;
- preparing spatial frameworks that allow for the spatial integration of the poor into the urban fabric, and
- generally ensuring that every component of the IDP is focussed on the issue of poverty alleviation.

3.3 THE BENEFITS OF HAVING AN IDP

The value of an IDP needs to be proven in practice and in terms of outcome. To date, many IDPs have been less effective than originally envisaged. However, with the benefits of experience and hindsight, the practice of integrated development planning in South Africa can be made more effective. The major benefits to a municipality of having a well-constructed IDP are that:

- it assists a municipality in allocating its scarce resources in a focussed and sustainable way;
- it provides a municipality with a tool to access funds for development projects;
- it provides a basis for co-ordinating policies and action within the municipality, and between other agents and spheres of government; and
- it provides a public arena for the discussion and making of trade-offs and for the building of partnerships around development.

For the other spheres of government, and for donor agencies, the value of an IDP is that the resources they allocate to local government are used more effectively, and in line with prioritised developmental goals and objectives.

3.4 CORE COMPONENTS OF THE IDP

The MSB sets out the minimum content requirements of an IDP. These are:

- the **vision** for the long term development of the municipality, with special emphasis on the municipality's most critical developmental and internal transformation needs;
- **an assessment of the existing level of development** in the municipality, which must include an identification of communities which do not have access to basic municipal services;
- the council's **development priorities and objectives for its elected term**, including its local economic development aims and its internal transformation needs;
- the council's **development strategies** which must be aligned with any national or provincial sectoral plans and planning requirements binding on the municipality in terms of legislation;
- a **spatial development framework** which must include the provision of basic guidelines for a land use management system for the municipality;
- the council's **operational strategies**;
- applicable **disaster management plans** (which are a new addition to the IDP requirements and which are to be prepared in terms of the requirements as set out in the White Paper on Disaster Management and the Disaster Management Bill, 2000);
- a **financial plan**, which must include a budget projection for at least the next three years; and
- a set of **key performance indicators and performance targets**.

In addition to this the MSB requires that the IDP of a district municipality must include **a framework for the preparation of IDPs for the local municipalities** that fall within its area of jurisdiction. This framework binds both the district municipality and the local municipalities and must contain at least:

- an identification of all plans and planning requirements binding in terms of national and provincial legislation on the district municipality and the local municipalities, or any specific municipality;
- an identification of the matters to be included in the IDPs of the district municipality and the local municipality that require alignment;
- the approach to be adopted for co-ordination and a statement of the principles to be applied in respect of those matters; and
- procedures for consultation between the district municipality and the local municipalities during the process of drafting their respective integrated development plans and for ways in which essential amendments to the framework can be effected.

It should be noted that these are *minimum requirements* and that local authorities may decide to introduce other elements that may be contextually appropriate. It is also possible for additional elements to be added for particular types of municipalities through Regulations made in terms of either the MSB or provincial Acts. Some local authorities may need assistance in the development of certain of these required elements and so supportive Guidelines should also be prepared. For example, there is

an apparent need for Guidelines that would assist in the formulation of the framework that has to be prepared by the district councils.

It is important to add that while capacity building and support will enable municipalities to produce more effective IDPs, municipalities should not become despondent if they do not come up with a perfect IDP the first time round. Rather than a static once-off exercise the IDP should be regarded as a “living document” that is constantly improved and that becomes more effective over time.

3.5 PREPARING, ADOPTING, MANAGING AND IMPLEMENTING THE IDP

3.5.1 PROCEDURE

The MSB and most provincial planning and development acts/bills deliberately avoid detailing the planning process that should be followed in the preparation, adoption and review of IDPs. This allows for considerable variation in process, and should promote experimentation, innovation and the flexible evolution of the planning system in South Africa. The MSB does, however, set out certain principles that should underpin the process (e.g. the use of participatory methods) and requires of municipalities to give careful and explicit attention to the process that they decide to follow. The MSB requires that the process must:

- be set out in writing and formally adopted by the municipal council;
- only be adopted after the local community has been properly consulted;
- be in accordance with a predetermined programme specifying timeframes for the different steps in the process;
- be structured to allow for the community to be consulted on its development needs and priorities, and to participate in the drafting of the IDP;
- allow for the identification of and consultation with other role-players in the drafting of the IDP; and
- provide for the identification of all plans and planning requirements binding on the municipality in terms of national and provincial legislation.

While legislation and policy does not detail procedures, the revised IDP Manual should provide guidance on the “typical procedures” that could be used in preparing IDPs in different types of municipality, without discouraging local creativity and variation. In addition to such guidance, capacity building exercises (see Section 5) should be used to ensure that worthwhile procedures are developed and pursued.

The MSB also makes special provision for dealing with the relationship between district and local IDPs in the planning process. It indicates that local IDPs have to be aligned with the framework adopted by the district municipality, and have to take into account the development proposals included in the district IDP. However, district municipalities are also required to take into account the IDP processes and proposals submitted by local municipalities.

Given that district and local plans may be prepared simultaneously, the mechanism for integrating these two scales of IDP is not entirely clear-cut, and an ongoing

process of mutual adjustment may be necessary. It is suggested that particular attention be paid to Germany's *counter-current principle* and New Jersey's system of *cross-acceptance*¹⁸ in developing the protocols for the relationship between local and district scale municipalities, and also for the relationships between the different local municipalities within a single district council area. More detailed guidance in this regard will be provided by the revised IDP Manual and will be further supported through capacity building as discussed in Section 5.

3.5.2 INSTITUTIONAL/ORGANISATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND ROLES

The MSB states that the authority responsible for the management of the IDP process is to be either the executive committee or executive mayor of a municipality, or, in cases where a municipality has neither, a committee of councillors appointed by the municipal council for the task. Whoever is given this task, must:

- manage the drafting of the municipality's IDP;
- assign responsibilities for the drafting of the IDP to the municipal manager; and
- submit the draft IDP to the municipal council for adoption by the council.

This legal stipulation prevents situations where the management of the IDP process is outsourced to a consultancy or to some other body, or where the management of the IDP is given to a junior official or to a line function department. The general principle is that the IDP deals with the integration and co-ordination of all development functions of a municipality and should therefore be managed at the highest possible level, and in a way that will allow for maximum intra- and inter-sectoral linkage.

The IDP manager has the power to allocate specific roles and responsibilities to other individuals, departments and agencies in a municipality. Legislation does not prescribe how the manager should allocate functions as it takes into account the enormous variation across the country. As a general recommendation, however, IDP managers are advised to begin the IDP process by conducting a municipal audit that would identify the range of skills and experience within a municipality. This process should be supplemented with Guidelines outlining generic role divisions and the allocation of responsibilities in the IDP-preparation and implementation process for various types of municipalities.

One aspect that is not addressed in the MSB is that of the involvement and role of traditional leaders in IDP-preparation. This critical issue will have to be addressed either in the form of Regulations or Guidelines.

3.5.3 THE USE OF CONSULTANTS

The WPLG explicitly states that the management and overall drafting of IDPs must not be "farmed out" to consultants. While the clear definition of the management role in the MSB reduces the possibility of consultants being left to their own devices in the drafting of IDPs, as has often happened in the past few years, this will not necessarily prevent abuse. Consultants may add significant value to an IDP, but the attentive management of consultants is necessary. This management should include careful

¹⁸ See Annexure A for a description of these two processes/systems.

consideration as to where the consultants should make inputs. It is also important for consultants to support the building of capacity *within* municipalities through training programmes, and through the close involvement of officials within those areas of planning that are undertaken by consultants.

3.5.4 COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

As indicated in Section 2 one of the key characteristics of Integrated Development Planning is its participatory nature. It was also pointed out that this participation serves a number of purposes, especially that of the deepening of democracy. Reference was also made to the new definition of “municipality” in the MSB and the implication that this has for both the concept and the practice of community participation. The MSB has already made some movement towards accommodating the implications of the new definition of municipality by stating that local communities must be consulted in the *formulation of the process*, including decisions around the form that community participation will take in the preparation of the IDP.

The MSB has a chapter that deals specifically with community participation within all processes of municipal governance. This chapter requires municipalities to develop a form of municipal governance that will complement formal representative government with a system of participatory governance. The one area where there is clear potential to do this is in the preparation, monitoring and review of the IDP. Another is in the preparation of the municipal budget, which is to be prepared in accordance with the IDP. At the same time, however, the MSB makes it clear that this form of participatory governance must not be interpreted as permitting interference with the council’s right to govern and exercise its functions and powers. The final accountability for IDP processes rests with the elected council. It would nevertheless be sensible if every municipality could come to an agreement with the community and its organisations as to what the specific roles, privileges and responsibilities of the elected council vis-à-vis other agents are in the IDP process. Guidance to this effect could be issued in the form of Guidelines.

The MSB does not prescribe the form of participation that a council should follow, but the chapter on participation does stipulate certain principles such as:

- the need to consider the special concerns of people with physical disabilities and other disadvantages when devising community participation procedures and mechanisms;
- the need to take note of gender issues and concerns in participatory processes as highlighted in the *Framework for Transforming Gender Relations in South Africa*, released in August 2000;
- the importance of taking into account language preferences within a municipality; and
- the need to ensure the participatory processes are in line with the financial and administrative capacity of the municipality.

The chapter also makes provision for the passing of Regulations and the issuing of Guidelines setting out minimum standards for participation.

In addition to this, the MSB provides for the publication of the IDP within 14 days after it has been adopted, to ensure that the community, other stakeholders, and other organs of state have direct access to the plan. This accessibility will also enable

individuals and agencies within the community to monitor the implementation of the IDP. While the MSB does not require it, it would be useful if IDPs could be made available on Internet websites and/or in other public places, such as municipal and provincial offices. Regulations in terms of the MSB may need to be promulgated to ensure this level of accessibility.

As indicated in Section 1, community participation is one of the areas in which many municipalities have experienced problems. To use a policy document to prescribe detailed ways in which participation *should* be done will not address these problems, nor will it assist in the creation of a culture of participatory democracy. Municipalities should use the requirements and the broad guidelines for participation as set out in the MSB to apply their own minds in developing contextually appropriate, and perhaps unique, ways of involving all segments of the municipality, and in building partnerships. Past experience is, however, useful and it is recommended that the revised IDP Manual include examples of good practice with participation. As general pointers towards 'good participation' municipalities could take into account the following:

- mass meetings are not always the best way to get people to talk;
- there are many different, creative techniques of participation (e.g. focus groups and participatory rural appraisal) that can be used at various stages in the process;
- the Internet may be of use as one of a number of ways of interacting with communities and stakeholders, although it should be noted that many individuals and communities are still without access to electronic forms of communication; and
- participation needs to be carefully and efficiently structured as it may become a very time-consuming and costly process, particularly in newly demarcated districts that are of a large physical size or have a large and highly differentiated population.

3.5.5 MANAGEMENT: MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REVIEW

There are many dimensions to the *management of the IDP* but these can be broken down into three broad tasks:

- The management of the drafting of the IDP, where the task is that of monitoring the procedure to ensure that it is done in accordance with the process as initially adopted. Included in this task is ensuring that community participation is effective and done in accordance with the adopted process.
- Ensuring that realistic performance indicators and targets are set for each aspect of the IDP.
- Managing the implementation of the IDP, including ensuring that the strategies, projects and programmes are implemented in time, and that the council conducts all its activities (including budgeting) in accordance with its IDP. This would also entail a monitoring of outcomes in terms of the performance indicators and targets. (As highlighted in paragraph 3.4.4 of this document, this task must entail active involvement by the community of the municipality.)

The task of managing the implementation of the IDP can be made easier if, during the earlier phases, enough effort is put into the definition of the projects and programmes,

and the construction of clear and realistic indicators and targets. In terms of the MSB a municipal council must review its IDP annually in accordance with its performance measurements and may review and amend its IDP in accordance with a prescribed process at other times during the year should circumstances have changed. Indeed, regular reviews and ongoing amendment and development of an IDP will reduce the need for councils to prepare entirely new IDPs (with all the cost and time that this entails).

3.6 THE LEGAL STATUS OF THE IDP

The MSB explicitly states that the IDP is the principal strategic planning instrument in a municipality which guides and informs all planning, development and management actions and decisions in the municipality. The municipality must also conduct all its affairs in a manner that is consistent with the IDP and all its actions must be directed at giving effect to the IDP. In terms of the MSB the municipality is bound by the IDP, except in cases where there is an inconsistency between a municipality's IDP and national or provincial legislation, in which case such legislation prevails. The IDP also binds all other persons to the extent that those parts of the IDP that impose duties, or affect the rights of persons, have been passed as by-laws.

Regulations as to what may be passed as a by-law, the process for doing so, including community participation in such processes, and ways of amending such by-laws, will need to be passed in order to avoid confusion and misplaced fears.

3.7 POST- DEMARCATION ISSUES

The re-demarcation of municipalities presents a set of particular challenges for Integrated Development Planning. These include the need to:

- integrate and consolidate existing plans, and portions of plans, to relate to the newly defined boundaries;
- deal with local planning areas that are generally much larger and more complex and diverse than those dealt with in the past;
- deal with matters relating to rural development, and the rural-urban linkage; and
- deal with matters relating to traditional governance.

It is not possible to anticipate all the issues, problems and opportunities that will arise from the new forms of municipal government, but it is important to monitor these closely, and provide guidance to municipalities in dealing with them. An immediate problem will be the integration of plans with differing levels of quality and detail, and also with different areas of focus. It is recommended that the new municipalities undertake an assessment of all plans within their new areas, in terms of a set of criteria that could be developed by the Department within Guidelines. This assessment should identify areas of weakness and strength in each of the plans, and also the disjunctures between plans, and should provide guidance for phase two, which would be the consolidation and revision of plans or, if necessary, the reworking

of plans. Capacity building should give particular attention to the needs of post-demarcation local authorities and should include, for example, training around matters concerning rural development. The issue of the involvement of traditional leaders in planning processes requires attention, and guidance should be derived from the current policy process dealing with the role of traditional authorities. Reference should also be made to the *Discussion Document towards a White Paper on Traditional Leadership and Institutions*, 2000. Once a greater level of consensus and clarity has been achieved in this area, the Department should issue Guidelines and, if necessary, promulgate Regulations dealing with the matter.

SECTION 4

ALIGNMENT AND LINKAGE

OVERVIEW: In this section the two types of alignment and linkage, intra- and inter-spherical, are discussed.

4.1 INTRA-SPHERICAL ALIGNMENT AND LINKAGE

Three types of institutional alignment and linkage are needed *within* the local sphere of government, *viz.:*

- in a municipality, between the IDP and other local government functions;
- between a local municipality and a district municipality; and
- between neighbouring municipalities.

Each of these types is discussed below.

4.1.1 ALIGNING AND LINKING THE IDP WITH OTHER LOCAL GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

The IDP is both a municipality's principal planning and implementation instrument and the framework that deals with the alignment of, and linkage between, the various functions and requirements of the municipality. The paragraphs below deal with the ways in which these various functions and requirements can be aligned.

4.1.1.1 SECTORAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

As indicated in Section 1 of this document a number of national acts and policies require local governments to produce sectoral plans, or to fulfil certain planning requirements when preparing an IDP. These plans and planning requirements include the following:

- Water Services Development Plans, required in terms of the Water Services Act, 1997;
- Integrated Transport Plans, required in terms of the Land Use Transport Bill, 2000;
- Land Development Objectives, required in terms of the Development Facilitation Act, 1995;
- Planning for housing provision as required in terms of the Housing Act, 1997;
- Disaster Management Plans, required in terms of the White Paper on Disaster Management, 1999 and the Disaster Management Bill, 2000;
- Preparing Waste Management Plans and Coastal Management Plans and incorporating statutory requirements regarding environmental sustainability in terms of environmental legislation, such as the National Environmental Management Act, 1998, in IDPs; and
- Land Use Management Plans in terms of provincial planning legislation.

The position of the DPLG is that these sectoral plans and other statutory requirements should complement each other and the IDP, and that effective synchronisation in their preparation should be sought, ensuring greater developmental impact and cutting out wasteful duplication. Some practical ways in which this ideal could be attained, is by:

- ensuring that members of the various sectoral plan-preparation teams serve on each other's teams;
- working from the same base data set;
- sharing draft plans/strategies throughout the planning horizon;
- sitting-in on each other's strategy formulation sessions; and
- using the spatial framework to co-ordinate and integrate plan proposals.

Further and more detailed guidance in this regard will be provided in the revised IDP Manual.

It is important to note that while the various plans produced in the inter-linked processes will lead to sectoral plans that will exist in their own right, the IDP must at least:

- summarise the major features of these different plans/strategies;
- deal with the linkages between them; and
- specify and integrate all the spending implications for a five year period in a Municipal Infrastructure Investment Programme.

4.4.1.2 ISSUE-BASED STRATEGIES

In terms of its developmental mandate, and in accordance with the objective of decentralised government, local government must take on a number of new tasks. These include the preparation of strategies on local economic development, poverty alleviation, public private partnerships, crime prevention, tourism promotion, land reform, rural development strategies and gender equity. In addition, it is likely that municipalities will be tasked with developing and implementing strategies around HIV/AIDS and on illegal immigration.

By incorporating the preparation of these strategies within the IDP process it is possible to:

- co-ordinate and integrate the various issues into the broad spectrum of municipal development activities;
- ensure that these issues are taken account of in the annual and medium term budgeting processes;
- ensure that the issues are given priority within the ongoing functioning of the municipality; and
- ensure improved delivery by making councillors accountable for their execution/implementation.

Municipalities must thus ensure that, wherever possible, the preparation of these issue-based strategies is linked to IDP processes and time-frames, and that the strategies are properly incorporated within the IDP. Where requirements are such that it is not possible to make this direct linkage (e.g. a new policy or legislative

requirement that follows the completion of the IDP), the IDP should be updated/amended as soon as is practically possible¹⁹.

4.4.1.3 THE BUDGET OF THE MUNICIPALITY

Municipalities are required to prepare their budgets in accordance with the IDP. For this reason the MSB stipulates that IDPs must include a financial plan, which must include a budget projection for at least the next three years.

Despite the importance of the planning-budgeting link and the fact that it has been required of municipalities since the inception of IDPs, this has been one of the least successful aspects of the post-1996 system of Integrated Development Planning. Some of the most common reasons given for this failure are that:

- the IDP and the budget-preparation cycles were not synchronised;
- the municipal Treasury Department was not involved in the IDP process and had little, or no knowledge of it;
- the IDP process was perceived to be “just another of the Town Planning Department’s plans” and was not taken seriously;
- some of the departments that had built up “empires” over the years resisted a process of re-prioritisation which may have eroded their positions;
- in many municipalities there was very little money left for the developmental activities associated with an IDP as most of the expenditure was directed to the normal operations of the municipality; and
- the planners involved in the preparing of IDPs had insufficient knowledge of municipal finances, and were unable to make the necessary linkages.

The above reasons point to the historical record of failure, but also suggest the ways in which the linkage can be strengthened, for example:

- careful attention should be paid to the sequencing of planning and budgetary processes so that the budget can be properly informed by the outcome of planning;
- all departments, and especially the Treasury, should be incorporated at a very early stage in the IDP -preparation process;
- the financial limitations of the municipality must be taken into account from the outset of preparing an IDP, in so doing facilitating the production of a prioritised list of interventions (i.e. strategies, projects and programmes) that are affordable and sustainable²⁰.
- the perception that the IDP is a Plan that belongs to the Town Planning Department should be actively countered by making it clear that the responsibility for management rests with the executive committee, the executive mayor or a committee of councillors;

¹⁹ An interesting case that may be useful is that of the Rhode Island State Guide Plan which takes a framework-format as the Plan consists of about thirty different elements, each of which exists in its own right but which is summarised in a Plan Overview. As each element is adopted, a corresponding adjustment is made to the Overview. However, this updating happens only once a year so that all changes made in the previous year can be incorporated without the disruption of continual incremental change.

²⁰ Equally important is to remember that the implementation of strategies and projects does not only have to come out the budget of the municipality, but that the other spheres, the private sector and donors, can [and should] also be of assistance.

- the developmental priorities of the municipality should be clearly stated in the IDP and these should inform the allocation of expenditure and, if and where necessary, the internal structure of the municipality should be revised to reflect new priorities; and
- the planning team should include persons with a sound knowledge of municipal funding and budgetary processes and, if necessary, training should be provided.

Once again, the DPLG believes that it is not its task to prescribe to municipalities how they should ensure the planning-budgeting link. What it will however do, is to include advice on how to establish and strengthen this link in the revised IDP Manual.

While not specifically dealt with in the MSB, it is imperative that municipalities should, in the process of preparing their IDPs, seek innovative ways and/or additional sources of funding for development projects. In this regard the MSB and the White Paper on Municipal Services Partnerships provide clear policy positions and useful guidance. At the same time municipalities need to determine the detail with regards to the tax rates that they will be levying in their municipal areas in terms of the Property Rates Bill, 2000, as this is an important way of ensuring sufficient income for implementation of developmental projects. Care should of course be taken that the rates do not impact negatively on the ability of the municipality to for instance create and maintain a climate conducive for investment.

4.4.1.4 LAND USE MANAGEMENT

There is a crucial need to establish a strong link between the broad spatial framework provided by an IDP and the system of Land Use Management (LUM). To date this link has been weak and often ignored, with the result that traditional forms of LUM have continued without the direction provided by a developmentally-oriented IDP.

The MSB specifies that the Spatial Framework contained in an IDP must include the provision of basic guidelines for a Land Use Management System²¹. While the Bill does not specify the nature of such a system some guidance is provided in the DFA, the Green Paper on Development and Planning and in certain of the new provincial planning and development acts/bills.

One of the problems with current practice is that Spatial Frameworks are of such a broad and general nature that they provide very little useful guidance for LUM. So, for example, a Spatial Framework may identify major nodes and corridors, but give little or no indication of what type of development is appropriate between these designated areas. To resolve this problem there are three possibilities. *First*, that the Spatial Frameworks be elaborated with greater detail (running the risk that they may become too cluttered to serve as a broad long term vision for the spatial structuring of a municipality). *Secondly*, that an intervening scale of spatial planning be developed. The *second* option may involve a return to the scale and level of detail associated with

²¹ In terms of the status the MSB grants the IDP it would not be possible for a council to approve a land development application that was not in accordance with an IDP. Were a land development opportunity to be presented to a municipality that could be of significant benefit to that municipality, it would be possible for that municipality to amend its IDP, as provided for in the MSB. This would, of course only be used in very extraordinary cases, and would in practice be a very seldom occurrence.

the “Structure Plan”. *Thirdly*, that a goal based approach to land use management be developed, and that the IDP contain goal statements that are of sufficient specificity and clarity to provide meaningful guidance for day-to-day decision making.

Unless a mechanism is found to firmly link the land use and land development decisions with the goals and objectives of the IDP, the ideals of spatially integrated development may remain elusive. One of the advantages of the IDP has been to broaden the planning system away from its entirely spatial focus to address the full range of developmental concerns within a municipality. There is a danger, however, that the spatial content of planning may be ignored or marginalised in this process, and that the role of the municipality in ensuring that *land* is developed in a sustainable and responsible way, in terms of broader developmental objectives, may be lost.

4.1.2 ALIGNING LOCAL AND DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY IDPs

The satisfactory alignment of the IDP of the district municipality and local municipalities has been another area of historical weakness. With the MSB providing far greater clarity on how this alignment is to take place, improvement can be expected, although many difficulties will still be encountered. The most significant innovation in the MSB is the requirement that the district municipality must provide a framework showing how the integration is to happen. As previously indicated, this framework must, as a minimum requirement, indicate:

- all matters within the district IDP and local IDPs that require alignment;
- the approach that is to be adopted and the principles that must be applied in respect of those matters that must be aligned; and
- procedures by which the district municipality and the local municipalities will consult each other in the process of IDP-preparation.

The consultation between a district municipality and local municipalities is not to be a window-dressing exercise, as the MSB specifies that the district municipality must prepare its IDP by taking into account the development processes and the proposals submitted to it by the local municipalities, and *vice versa*. The MSB does provide reasonably specific guidance as to what the framework must contain, but, at the same, provides considerable freedom for municipalities to decide how best to align their IDP-preparation processes. Hopefully, effective (and innovative) systems will evolve during the next round of IDP-preparation with the setting up of Planning and Information Management Support System (PIMMS) centres at the district level. In looking for ways to achieve this alignment, municipalities are advised to consider good practice internationally, for example, the New Jersey system of *cross-acceptance*²².

4.1.3 ALIGNING THE IDPs OF NEIGHBOURING MUNICIPALITIES

Clearly, the activities of a municipality do not take place in isolation, and do effect neighbouring, and even more distant, municipalities. These externalities may be positive or negative. The DPLG’s intention was always that municipalities should seek ways of aligning their IDPs with those of their neighbours, but this has been rarely achieved. The reasons cited for this include the lack of time, staff and/or funds.

²² See Annexure A for a description of this system.

This failure to align the IDPs of neighbouring municipalities will inevitably lead to conflicts and inefficiencies. The MSB therefore states that the planning undertaken by a municipality must be aligned with and complement the development plans and strategies of other affected municipalities, but again leaves considerable flexibility in terms of the processes to achieve this. It does, however, provide that the MEC for local government in the province may:

- take steps to resolve disputes between municipalities; and
- facilitate the co-ordination and alignment of the IDPs of different municipalities.

The intervention of the MEC should however be regarded as a last resort. It would be far more productive if municipalities developed their own mechanisms to ensure that alignment is achieved, before destructive and costly disputes arise. Processes of alignment may do much to building inter-locality partnership and collaboration.

4.2 INTER-SPHERICAL ALIGNMENT AND LINKAGE

While *inter*-spherical alignment and linkage is about the realisation of the principle of “co-operative governance”, it also has the pragmatic purpose of ensuring that efforts of all spheres of government are efficiently integrated and directed towards the accomplishment of shared developmental objectives. To date, much has been said about the need for this form of alignment, but relatively little has been achieved. In the following paragraphs this requirement is dealt with in more detail in terms of what exactly must be aligned and linked, and how this can be achieved.

4.2.1 WHAT MUST BE ALIGNED AND LINKED?

There are four areas in which alignment and linkage between spheres are necessary. These are in relation to:

- plans, programmes and strategies;
- plan/programme/strategy-preparation;
- budgeting; and
- the implementation of plans, programmes and strategies.

This alignment is multi-directional, as it requires the local sphere to take account of legislation, policies, plans and programmes developed in the national and provincial spheres, but also requires the national and provincial to take seriously what is prepared by the local sphere.

Local/national alignment has been complicated by such factors as:

- the lack of co-ordination within the national sphere (i.e. between sectoral/line departments);
- the multiplicity of funding and other programmes that local authorities have had to relate to;
- limited capacity within national government departments to communicate directly with the many local authorities; and
- the limited capacity within local authorities to maintain communication with the many government departments.

There have been similar problems in relation to local/provincial alignment which have sometimes been exacerbated by poor national/provincial alignment. In relation to the local/provincial linkage there has been some attempt to link IDPs to Provincial Growth and Development Strategies/Frameworks (PGDS/Fs). In many cases, the PGDS/Fs' have been too broad to provide meaningful guidance for local level development, and there have even been contradictions in the policy positions between national and provincial government²³. In addition to this there have also been technical problems in relation to different budget cycles between provinces and municipalities. The following policy positions present some ways of ensuring better practice in terms of alignment and linkage.

4.2.2 HOW CAN ALIGNMENT AND LINKAGE BE ACHIEVED?

Ways in which alignment and linkage can be done have been grouped together under three headings: alignment in the plan preparation phase, alignment through monitoring processes, and alignment through sequencing and timing.

4.2.2.1 ALIGNMENT IN PLAN-PREPARATION PHASE

The Constitution requires that local government must participate in national and provincial development programmes. The MSB gives substance to this principle by placing requirements on both municipalities and on national and provincial governments. The role of municipalities is to ensure that their planning is aligned with the legislation, policies, plans and programmes of the other spheres. The provincial MEC for local government may use his or her powers to supervise local government to ensure that this alignment occurs. National and provincial governments, on the other hand, must align their planning requirements with the relevant provisions of the MSB and must take reasonable steps to assist municipalities in meeting the time limit that will be set for the preparation of IDPs in terms of the MSB. Alignment is facilitated by the fact that all these planning actions must take place within the principles set out in national and provincial legislation, including those in the DFA.

In order to ensure that alignment in the plan preparation phase works both ways, national and provincial government should ensure the involvement of the local sphere in the preparation of any policies and plans that will affect municipalities. For example, local involvement should be included in the preparation of Provincial Development Plans/Strategies/Frameworks, and in the preparation of any National Development Plan/Framework/Perspective in accordance with the "counter current principle" as applied in Germany²⁴. The South African Local Government Association (SALGA), and its provincial branches, provides a structure through which local government can participate in planning within the other spheres.

Mechanisms should also be established to ensure that the *counter-current principle*' operates also in relation to provincial/national linkages, as the lack of integration at

²³ For example, a PGDS may propose that development expenditure should be directed to particular growth axes whereas the policy of national departments may be to direct the expenditure to the expenditure to areas of greatest need, which are mainly rural and not within designated corridors.

²⁴ See Annexure A for a description of this system.

that level often has negative outcomes for action in the local sphere. Achieving a meaningful linkage between the nine province's Provincial Growth and Development Strategies/Frameworks and/or Provincial Development Plans and a National Plan/Framework/Perspective would greatly assist in providing a co-ordinated framework within which IDPs can be prepared and implemented.

4.2.2.2 MONITORING

Co-operative governance makes any form of hierarchical assessment and approval of plans problematic. In terms of the MSB local authorities may adopt their own plans, although provision is made for provincial monitoring of local planning processes. The MEC for local government may monitor an IDP process both informally and through a legal mechanism that requires a municipality to submit its IDP to the MEC in a specified format. The MEC can then request a municipality to adjust or amend its IDP on two grounds, i.e. if the IDP:

- does not comply with a requirement of the MSB; or
- is in conflict with, or is not aligned with, or negates any of the development plans and strategies of affected municipalities, or organs of state.

In the case of a municipality not complying with the requirements for the IDP-preparation process as set out in the MSB, the MEC may require that the municipality adjusts its process, and the product of any planning that happened in terms of a non-compliant process.

It is important to note that a municipality that has received a request for adjustment of its IDP from the MEC is not compelled to concede to the request. The municipality may object in writing to the MEC, provided that it provides reasons for doing so. In such cases the MSB provides for the setting up of an *ad hoc* committee, consisting of members of the three spheres of government, to attend to the objection. The committee decides a matter if at least two spheres of government agree on it, and the decision of the committee is final. This technical procedure, with its various time limits, will have to be specified in more detail in Regulations.

These somewhat complicated processes for dealing with the provincial oversight of local planning are necessary in view of the ethos of co-operative government, which does not allow a 'direct and control' style of operation. In the long run these mechanisms should lead to negotiated resolution of difference, although there may be conflicts in the short-run.

4.2.2.3 SEQUENCING AND TIMING

In order for budgeting and implementation of projects, programmes and strategies to be aligned and linked, it is imperative that:

- the sequences of the budget cycles in local, provincial and national government are aligned; and
- the implementation of projects in the local sphere is aligned with the requirements and time-frames of the infrastructure, investment and development spending programmes of national and provincial government (that will hopefully have been prepared with the participation of the local sphere).

The MSB does not put in place a specific mechanism to ensure such alignment, but this does not preclude the future development of a formalised system of Integrated Development Planning that would address these issues.

SECTION 5

CAPACITY BUILDING AND SUPPORT

OVERVIEW: In this section the need for, the nature and format of, and the roles and role players in, support and capacity building are discussed.

5.1 THE NEED FOR CAPACITY BUILDING AND SUPPORT

Over the last four years the lack of capacity in municipalities has not only been highlighted in a number of IDP/LDO-assessments, but has also been voiced by municipalities themselves. While most metropolitan municipalities have [access to] the required *conceptualisation, planning, management* and *communication* skills, many smaller municipalities and even district municipalities do not. This lack of capacity has contributed to many IDPs failing to live up to expectations, and also to the inappropriate use and management of consultants. This in turn has often led to a lack of a sense of ownership of the IDP by municipalities, and an inability or unwillingness to use the IDP as the primary mechanism to guide the transformation and developmental activities of such municipalities. Furthermore, the demarcation process and the establishment of new municipalities makes the issue of capacity building and support especially critical.

5.2 THE NATURE AND FORMAT OF CAPACITY BUILDING AND SUPPORT

The Department of Provincial and Local Government has taken up the challenge of capacity building in co-operation with the South African Local Government Association (SALGA). The outcome of this initiative has been a three-pronged support and capacity building-initiative consisting of the following components: the provision of guidance and information, training and the establishment of a one-stop support centre. In addition to this, the MSB provides for active support by *provincial governments* to municipalities. These various forms of support are discussed below.

5.2.1 GUIDANCE AND INFORMATION

The legal and policy frameworks, including this policy document, will contribute to the guidance and information provided to the post-demarcation municipalities. The revised IDP Manual will supplement this policy guidance by providing detailed (non-prescriptive) advice on planning, management and implementation issues. In addition to this, the DPLG will continue its dissemination of information in the form of additional policy Guidelines, regular newsletters, and information sessions throughout

the country. These will also be of assistance in the building of community-capacity as required in the MSB.

5.2.2 TRAINING

The Decentralised Development Planning Task Team in the DPLG is currently preparing an 'IDP Training Framework' to assist in the provision of training for the immediate short term needs (i.e. for 2001), but also to provide a longer term structure in which sustained IDP training can take place. In order to achieve this aim the IDP Training Framework seeks to assist IDP training-service providers in the development of appropriate and high quality, on-the-job training programmes in order to enable officials, councillors and professionals to perform the following tasks:

- the management and co-ordination of the IDP process - a typical function of the municipal managers and senior officials, such as Town Clerks, but which could in future also include the executive mayor;
- the provision of specialised planning services to municipalities in the preparation of their IDPs, which is most often done by development planners and urban and regional planners;
- the provision of specialist sector/domain-inputs in the IDP process by municipal engineers, treasurers or financial managers, spatial planners, environmentalists, social scientists and organisational development experts; and
- the task of representing constituencies in the process of IDP-preparation and the utilisation of the IDP as a tool for the management of, and decision-making on, municipal affairs, which is exclusively performed by councillors.

It is important to note that the IDP Training Framework is not aimed at prescribing the content or the format for training programs, courses, modules or qualifications to respective service providers, nor is it aimed at regulating and controlling IDP training and/or private initiative. It does, however, require that all training efforts aimed at IDP-capacity building should:

- be focussed on the specific requirements of the IDP as set out in the MSB;
- adhere to the principles of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF);
- not only address the immediate IDP-related training requirements, but also provide for IDP-related training over the longer term; and
- address the personal/human resource development path of individuals targeted for training.

5.2.3 THE PROVISION OF SUPPORT SERVICES

A major initiative of the DPLG is the setting up of a Planning and Information Management Support System (PIMSS) at district level. The purpose of the PIMSS is to provide support professional and administrative services to local and district councils, especially in the preparation and implementation of IDPs. The PIMSS will not be established in all district municipalities, but only in those that were successful in their applications for the setting up of such systems. The Department, through the DDP and GTZ, will initially fund PIMSS in terms of staff, office equipment and other logistical requirements, but it is anticipated that the centres will become self-supporting systems over the medium term.

The Department is making progress at implementation of the PIMSS concept and the appointment of the PIMSS managers is currently in process. It is anticipated that the PIMSS will become operational in time to provide assistance for the next round of IDPs, which is to commence in 2001.

5.2.4 PROVINCIAL SUPPORT

The MSB provides for a provincial role in assisting and supervising local government in the preparation of IDPs (or the provincial variant of the IDP such as the KwaZulu-Natal “Local Development Plan”). This role includes the facilitation required in the alignment of local and district plans to each other, and to the plans, strategies and programmes of national and provincial organs of state. A number of provincial authorities have support programmes in place and these should complement the support provided by the DPLG.

5.3 ROLES AND ROLE PLAYERS IN CAPACITY BUILDING AND SUPPORT

While the DPLG has been extensively involved in the production of a training framework its role is not that of providing training. Tertiary institutions, private training providers and NGOs will attend to training²⁵. Provincial and local governments who so choose may also become involved in the training field, providing in-house training where capacity for training purposes exists. Likewise the funding for training will not be provided by the DPLG. This will come out of the budgets of employers, municipalities and/or SALGA in the case of training for councillors, and/or be sought from donor agencies. It is anticipated that the funding mechanisms provided for in the Skills Development Act, 1999, will also make a contribution to the practical realisation of IDP training.

Training does of course not only refer to the training of the officials, councillors and professionals that will be involved in the preparation and implementation of the IDP. In terms of the MSB training must also be provided to members of civil society to ensure that their participation is useful and meaningful. Municipalities will have to take responsibility for this task and ensure that they budget for it in terms of funds, staff and time, as far as the time frame for preparation of the IDP is concerned.

As in the case of training, support for IDP in the form of information will also not be the sole domain of the DPLG. Provincial and local governments should produce and disseminate their own information documents and create awareness among officials and communities of the importance of the IDP for their futures and the roles they can, and have to, play in making those futures become a reality.

Lastly, in the case of provincial government, the MSB has given the mandate to this sphere to provide active support to municipalities in the IDP-endeavour. The exact format of this support may vary between provinces, and may differ in respect of different types of municipalities.

²⁵ See Annexure D for the names and addresses of a number of providers of IDP-training.

SECTION 6

SUMMARY

OVERVIEW: In this Section the main policy positions, as well as those areas in which it is proposed that Regulations and Guidelines have to be prepared, or in which the revised IDP Manual should provide more guidance, are summarised.

6.1 MAIN POLICY POSITIONS

The main policy positions are as follows:

- The Integrated Development Plan (IDP) is a key tool in assisting municipalities to fulfil their developmental mandates but Integrated Development Planning is also the approach that should be used in the preparation of plans and programmes *within all the three spheres of government*.
- There is an urgent need for an Intergovernmental System of Integrated Development Planning, which will give substance to the ideal of co-operative governance. The IDP should be a key instrument in this system as it represents the goals and programmes of local government (the sphere closest to the people).
- National and provincial government should ensure the involvement of the local sphere in the preparation of any policies and plans that will affect municipalities.
- Planning should happen within the financial and administrative capacities of local government, and recognition should be given to differences in capacity between municipalities.
- The planning system should promote flexibility and innovation without compromising the crucial tasks of alignment and co-ordination of planning, budgeting and delivery/spending within and between spheres.
- The IDP should be “transformative”, and should thus focus on issues such institutional change, spatial fragmentation, job creation, poverty alleviation, and the addressing of backlogs in services and infrastructure.
- The IDP should be participative, strategic, integrative, focussed on areas and communities of greatest need, and outcomes- and delivery-oriented.
- The IDP must act as the policy framework on which the medium term and annual budget for the municipality must be based, and careful attention should be paid to the sequencing of planning and budgetary processes.
- The financial limitations of the municipality must be taken into account from the outset of preparing an IDP, in so doing facilitating the production of a prioritised list of interventions that are affordable and sustainable.
- While the IDP should provide a clear vision for a locality and clarify the goals and councils of an elected municipal council it should also act as the framework to link all sectoral plans and issue-based policies required of local authorities by national and/or provincial legislation/policy. It must at least: summarise the major features of these different plans/strategies, deal with the linkages between them

and specify and integrate all the spending implications for a five year period in a Municipal Infrastructure Investment Programme.

- The IDP should contain a clearly developed spatial framework that would provide for the spatial co-ordination of sectoral activity.
- There is a crucial need to establish a strong link between the broad spatial framework provided by an IDP and the system of Land Use Management (LUM). This link may be established in a number of ways including, for example, through the elaboration of the spatial framework, the introduction of an intermediary plan such as a Structure Plan, or the development of a goal-based system for making land use decisions.
- Although the IDP is linked to the term of office of a particular municipal council, there are elements of the IDP that have a long term planning horizon and these should be clearly identified in an IDP, and a new council should be required to give strong motivation for changing or deviating from them.
- Every effort should be made to synchronise different forms of planning and, where possible, to bring different processes together. The long-term goal should be to reduce complexity, and to move towards single processes with multiple outcomes without compromising the particular requirements of different forms of planning.
- The district municipality must prepare its IDP by taking into account the development processes and the proposals submitted to it by the local municipalities, and *vice versa*. Municipalities are advised to consider good practice internationally, for example, the New Jersey system of *cross-acceptance*. Similarly, the planning undertaken by a municipality must be aligned with and complement the development plans and strategies of other affected municipalities.
- The authority responsible for the management of the IDP process is to be either the executive committee or executive mayor of a municipality, or, in cases where a municipality has neither, a committee of councillors appointed by the municipal council for the task.
- The management and overall drafting of IDPs must not be “farmed out” to consultants, but consultants may be used for particular aspects of the planning process, provided that the nature of their involvement is given careful consideration and is well-managed.
- Local communities must be consulted in the *formulation of the process*, including decisions around the form that community participation will take in the preparation of the IDP.
- Clear and realistic indicators and targets should be constructed during IDP-preparation and a municipal council must review its IDP annually in accordance with its performance measurements.
- Capacity building, consisting of the dissemination of information, training and the PIMMS-centres, will be provided and/or managed by the DPLG. Provinces, local authorities and SALGA have an important part to play in the building of the capacity of councillors, officials and civil society.

6.2 REGULATIONS

It is proposed that Regulations be passed on the following areas in terms of the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000 or applicable provincial legislation:

- The content and detail requirements for IDPs prepared by different types of municipalities (i.e. A, B and/or C types).
- Mechanisms for inter-spherical co-ordination.
- The involvement and role of traditional leaders in IDP-preparation.
- Minimum standards for community participation in IDP-preparation and the monitoring of IDP-implementation.
- Ways of making IDPs available and accessible to communities, other stakeholders and other organs of state in public places and on the Internet.
- Detail regarding what may be passed as a by-law, the process for doing so, including community participation in such processes, and ways of amending such by-laws.
- The procedures by which the *ad hoc* committees that are to be set up to resolve conflicts between municipalities and provinces on the contents of IDPs have to perform their duties.

6.3 GUIDELINES

It is proposed that Guidelines be produced on the following areas in terms of the Municipal Systems Bill, 2000:

- The development of the core components of the IDPs required of various types of municipality, for example, the formulation of the framework that has to be prepared by district councils.
- The integration and consolidation of existing plans for the newly demarcated local authorities.
- The relationship between local and district scale planning.
- The nature of the linkages between sectors, and means to promote inter-sectoral integration (e.g. between economic development and environmental management).
- The involvement and role of traditional leaders in IDP-preparation.
- The link between the IDP and land use management.
- The specific roles, privileges and responsibilities of the elected council *vis-à-vis* the community and its organisations in IDP-processes.
- The use and management of consultants.
- Generic role divisions and the allocation of responsibilities in the IDP-preparation and implementation process of the various types of municipalities.
- Minimum standards for community participation in IDP-preparation and the monitoring of IDP-implementation.
- Assessing existing IDPs by newly demarcated municipalities with a view towards integrating these plans into new IDPs.

6.4 THE REVISED IDP MANUAL

It is proposed that the revised IDP Manual should provide detailed technical advice and guidance on the following aspects:

- Typical procedures for preparing, managing, implementing, monitoring and reviewing an IDP in various types of municipalities.
- The alignment of sector plans and planning requirements.
- The linking of planning and budgeting in local governments.
- Techniques for participation and good practice internationally.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS²⁶

Alignment:	Within a system of co-operative governance it is important to ensure that the different spheres and departments of government complement each other in achieving nationally accepted developmental goals. Alignment is a process of ensuring that the rules and procedures of various plans, policies, programmes and strategies do not contradict one another and work in the same direction.
By-law:	Legislation passed <i>by</i> the council of a municipality in terms of Sections 156 and 160 of the Constitution binding in the municipality on the persons to whom it applies.
Community:	A term that includes the residents of the municipality, the ratepayers of the municipality, community organisations and any other organisations having an interest in the affairs of the municipality, and any persons who happen to be in the municipality at a given point in time.
Development:	Means sustainable development, and includes integrated social, economic, environmental, spatial, infrastructural, institutional, organisational and human resources-upliftment of a community aimed at improving the quality of life of its members with specific reference to the poor and other disadvantaged sections of the community.
Disaster:	Means a progressive or sudden, widespread or localised, natural or human-caused occurrence causing a catastrophic situation whereby the day-to-day patterns of life are, or are threatened to be, disrupted and people are, or are threatened to be, plunged into helplessness and suffering.
Disaster management:	Means a continuous and integrated multi-sectoral, multi-disciplinary process of planning, and implementation of measures, aimed at – a. preventing or reducing the risk of disasters; b. mitigating the severity or consequences of disasters; c. emergency preparedness; d. a rapid and effective response to disasters; and e. post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation.
District Municipality:	A category C municipality contemplated in section 155 (1) (c) of the Constitution.

²⁶ This list was compiled from the glossaries and list of definitions in the MSB, the WPLG, the White Paper on Municipal Service Partnerships, 2000 and a publication entitled Case Studies on LED and Poverty.

Guidelines:	Guidelines that can be issued by the MEC in terms of the MSB or other relevant legislation.
LED:	Local Economic Development is primarily about harnessing local resources and energy to consolidate and build local economic growth and development. As a development strategy its strength lies in harnessing a wide spectrum of local capacities to work in a co-ordinated and integrated manner to achieve benefits that can be dispersed across an entire locality.
Local Municipality:	A category B municipality contemplated in section 155(1) (b) of the Constitution.
MEC for Local Government:	The MEC responsible for local government in a province.
Minister:	The national Minister responsible for local government.
Municipal council:	A municipal council referred to in section 157 (1) of the Constitution.
Municipal manager:	A person appointed in terms of section 82 of the Municipal Structures Act, 1998.
National organ of state:	An organ of state functioning within the national sphere of government.
Organised Local Government:	An organisation recognised in terms of section 2 (1) of the Organised Local Government Act, 1997 (Act No. 52 of 1997), to represent local government nationally or provincially.
Provincial organ of state:	An organ of state functioning within the provincial sphere of government.
Regulations:	Regulations that can be made by the MEC in terms of the MSB or other relevant legislation and which are as legally binding as the legislation in terms of which they are made.
Sustainable:	A sustainable activity is one that utilises resources and builds capacity in such a way that it ensures that the activity can be maintained over time.
Tax rate:	The tax rate is that percentage of the value of the tax base to be paid by the subject of taxation. In the case of property tax it usually refers to so many cents per R1 of the value of the tax base.

ANNEXURE A

International Examples of Intergovernmental Planning Systems

A number of countries have attempted, with varying degrees of success, to develop a planning system that co-ordinates across spheres of government. Some of the examples and some lessons that can be learned from them are outlined below²⁷.

1.1.1 INDIA

In India, as in many other developing countries, intergovernmental integration is achieved in a top-down way. A central advisory body – the Planning Commission – chaired by the Prime Minister and comprising economists, statisticians and each State's Minister for Planning and Finance, prepares an inter-sectoral Five-Year National Development Plan. Once approved, the Plan becomes the key guideline and policy document for planning and policy formulation by all Central and State Government Ministries. While the States used to be key players in planning at the local level, a Constitutional Amendment in 1992 provided for the substantial devolution of functions, including that of urban planning to Urban Local Bodies. However, these local plans are prepared within the framework provided by the National Development Plan.

1.1.2 GERMANY

Germany has a fairly hierarchical system of planning: the Federal Government prepares General Regulations to direct Spatial Development policy throughout the country, and the Länder/States are empowered to pass their own spatial planning acts, but must take the provisions of the Federal Spatial Planning Act into account. Similarly Local Authorities prepare their own plans, but they must be consistent with plans prepared by higher tiers. Despite this hierarchy, lower tiers have a significant influence on plans prepared by higher tiers. This happens in terms of the 'counter-current principle' which requires that, while each planning level must take account of the objectives of higher-level plans, every lower-level authority must be allowed to participate in the preparation of higher-level plans.

1.1.3 MALAYSIA

In the case of Malaysia the Federal Government prepares a National Development Policy and Outline Perspective Plan containing programmes and strategies to achieve set objectives, while the State Governments and Local Authorities prepare plans and projects that address local needs and that complement the national proposals. The

²⁷ The information in these paragraphs is taken from (1) Harrison, P and Oranje, M (2000) *Provincial planning policies and guidelines: Some examples and lessons from international experience*. Prepared for the KwaZulu-Natal Town and Regional Planning Commission; and (2) Poppe, Manfred (1998) Decentralised regional development planning in Indonesia. *Third World Planning Review*, Vol 20 (4): 331-50.

national development plans and policies are, however, prepared in terms of a system that secures inputs from the local and regional levels, and that ensures a close linkage between planning agencies in all spheres of government. Local committees and councils, for example, have participating representatives from federal and state governments whilst there is also an interesting practice involving the rotation of personnel between the federal, state and local planning departments.

1.1.4 INDONESIA

Indonesia's annual bottom-up regional development planning process consists of a succession of formal meetings to discuss and integrate project proposals and to allocate budgets to lower levels of government for implementation. Starting at the village level, the process goes through four co-ordination and integration sessions, the first of these at the sub-district level. The next level of integration is the district level, followed by the provincial, and finally the national level. At the end of the process those projects that were identified for implementation are fed into the national budgeting process. While the process seems highly decentralised and democratic it is apparently far less so in practice. As sub-national governments are creatures of the central government they often merely carry out its wishes at the lower levels. The planning process, especially at the lower levels, also tends to be frustrated by a lack of qualified staff.

1.1.5 THE AMERICAN STATE OF NEW JERSEY

New Jersey's planning system relies on *negotiated processes of cross-acceptance* in which state agencies and local authorities jointly participate to achieve consensus around the content of plans, and negotiate any differences that they may have. This system is defined by the State Planning Act, 1985 as:

“A process of comparison of planning policies among governmental levels with the purpose of attaining compatibility between local, county and State plans. The process is designed to result in a written statement specifying areas of agreement and areas requiring modification by parties to the cross-acceptance”.

The planning process happens in three stages. First, the planning authority (the state, county or local council, as the case may be) prepares a Preliminary Plan which is then subjected to the *cross-acceptance* process which involves:

- the comparison of the plan with other plans; and
- negotiations to resolve differences with the agencies that have prepared the other plans.

The second phase is the production of an Interim Plan that reflects negotiated changes and provides the basis for impact assessments that consider the likely effect of the plan on the natural environment, and on the economy and society. If necessary, amendments are made and the plan is accepted.

Through these carefully spelt out procedures local authorities are able to influence plans prepared by State and county governments, and are not simply the recipients of directives from above. At the same time the system ensures that planning is co-

ordinated and integrated throughout the State, as all agents of government bind themselves to each other's plans.

1.2 LESSONS FROM INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE

The following lessons can be gleaned from international experience:

- Complex, bureaucratic mechanisms of integration and co-ordination have generally failed internationally but states with more flexible processes of iterative top-down bottom-up planning (e.g. Malaysia) have sustained relatively successful systems of integrative development planning.
- Although planning is increasingly being devolved to the local level, a national framework for development serves a useful purpose in setting the parameters for planning by other spheres/tiers, and in clarifying national goals and priorities for local authorities.
- Even where there are relatively hierarchical systems, successful planning requires mechanisms to ensure bottom-up input in higher levels of planning (e.g. Germany's *counter-current principle*).
- It is possible to design a system for co-ordinated planning that avoids hierarchical relationships and protects the integrity of different spheres of government (e.g. New Jersey's system of *cross-acceptance*).

ANNEXURE B

Legislation Relevant to Integrated Development Planning

NATIONAL LEGISLATION

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act No 108 of 1996

Local Government

Local Government Transition Act Second Amendment Act, Act No 97 of 1996

Local Government: Municipal Demarcation Act, Act No 27 of 1998

Local Government: Municipal Structures Act, Act No 117 of 1998 and its amendments

Local Government: Municipal Systems Bill, 2000

Local Government: Municipal Finance Management Act, 2000

Local Government: Property Rates Bill, 2000

Local Government: Cross-boundary Municipalities Bill, 2000

Disaster Management Bill, 2000

Land & Agriculture

Development Facilitation Act, Act No 67 of 1995 (DFA)

Natural Environment

Environmental Conservation Act, Act No 73 of 1989

National Environmental Management Act, Act No 107 of 1998

EIA Regulations: Implementation of Sections 21, 22, 26 of the Environment Conservation Act, April 1998

Transport

National Land Transport Bill, 1999

National Land Transport Transitional Act, 1999

Urban Transport Amendment Act, Act No 14 of 1992.

Housing

Housing Act, Act No 107 of 1997

Water Affairs & Forestry

Water Services Act, Act No 108 of 1997

National Water Act, Act No 36 of 1998

National Water Amendment Act, Act No 45 of 1999

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION

KwaZulu-Natal Planning and Development Act, 1998

Western Cape Planning and Development Act, 1999

Northern Cape Planning and Development Act, 1999

Gauteng Development Planning Bill, 1999

ANNEXURE C

Policy Documents Relevant to Integrated Development Planning

NATIONAL POLICIES

Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), 1994
Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR): A Macro-economic Strategy, 1996
Urban Development Framework, 1997
Rural Development Framework, 1996

Local Government

White Paper on Local Government, 1998
Towards a Policy on Integrated Development Planning, 1998
White Paper on Municipal Service Partnerships, 2000
Policy Framework on Municipal International Relations, 1999
Green Paper on Municipal Service Partnership, 2000

Land & Agriculture

White Paper on South African Land Reform, 1997
Green Paper on Development and Planning, 1999
White Paper on Agriculture, 1995

Natural Environment

White Paper on Integrated Pollution and Waste Management, 2000
White Paper on the Conservation and Sustainable use of South Africa's Biological Diversity, 1997
White Paper on an Environmental Management Policy for South Africa, 1998
White Paper on Sustainable Forest Development in South Africa, 1996

Transport

Moving South Africa, September 1998
Moving South Africa, the Action Agenda, 1999
White Paper on National Transport Policy, 1996

Tourism

White Paper on the Development and Promotion of Tourism, 1996
Tourism in GEAR, 1997

Water

White Paper on Water Supply and Sanitation, 1994
White Paper on a National Water Policy for South Africa, 1997
National Water Policy for South Africa, White Paper, 1997.

PROVINCIAL POLICIES

Gauteng

Gauteng Rural Development Strategy

Gauteng Spatial Development Framework Second Draft, 1999

Mpumalanga

Mpumalanga Growth and Development Strategy, 1996

Northern Cape

Northern Cape Development Strategy, 1998

North West Province

North West Settlement Strategy

North West 2001

North West 2001 Update and Review

KwaZulu-Natal

Policy on Rural Integrated Development

KwaZulu-Natal Provincial Growth and Development Strategy (PG&DS)

ANNEXURE D

Useful Sources of Information for Integrated Development Planning

Integrated Development Planning

DCD and GTZ. August 1999. *DDP Integrated Development Planning Pilot Projects: Assessment Study*.

Department of Constitutional Development. Undated. *Integrated Development Planning for Local Authorities: A User-friendly Guide*.

German Development Institute. 1999. *Integrated Development Planning A New Task for Local Government in South Africa: Participatory Planning for Socio-Economic Development in two municipalities in Mpumalanga*. Reports and Working Papers 9/1999.

CSIR, DCD & GTZ. 1998. *An Integrated Development Planning Process Manual*.

National Development and Planning Commission. 1999. *Resource Document on the Chapter 1 Principles of the Development Facilitation Act 1995*.

Planact: 1998. *Integrated Development Planning*. Johannesburg.

Foundation for Contemporary Research: 1998. *Legislation impacting on IDP*. Cape Town.

Local Government

Urban Sector Network. Undated. *Case Study on Community Participation in Local Government in South Africa*.

Website for Local Government in South Africa:
<http://www.local.gov.za>.

Local Economic Development

Isandla Institute. Undated. *Linking Local Economic Development to Poverty Alleviation*. Department of Constitutional Development, Pretoria.

Isandla Institute. Undated. *Case Studies on LED and Poverty*. Department of Constitutional Development, Pretoria

Department of Provincial and Local Government. 2000. *Local Economic Development Manual Series, Volumes 1-5*. Department of Provincial and Local Government, Pretoria.

Natural Environment

DBSA. 1998. *Streamlining of Environmental Assessment Procedures*.

Website for State of the Environment Report:
<http://www.environment.gov.za/soer/index.html>.

Land & Agriculture

Land and Agriculture Policy Centre. 1997. *Environment and Land Reform in South Africa* (Joint publication with DLA).

Land and Agriculture Policy Centre. 1996. *Economic Policies and the Environment in South Africa: the Commercial Farming Sector*.

Land and Agriculture Policy Centre. 1995. *Land and Local Government*.

Land and Agriculture Policy Centre. 1995. *Rural Local Government and the RDP*.
Land and Agriculture Policy Centre. 1995. *Rural Local Government and Housing*.
Oranje, M.C, Oosthuizen, E.M. and van Huyssteen, E. 1999. *An investigation into the LDO-endeavour in the provinces of Gauteng and the Northwest*. Department of Land Affairs, Pretoria.
Planact: Undated. *A Community Guide to the Development Facilitation Act*.
Website of the Development and Planning Commission:
<http://www.dpc.gov.za>
Website of Department of Land Affairs:
<http://www.land.pwv.gov.za>.

Trade & Industry

Platzky, L. 1999. *Can South Africa's New Spatial Development Initiatives Turn Cumulative Disadvantages into Competitive Advantages?*
Arkwright, D, De Beer, G. and Mmatli, R. 1999. *Spatial Development Initiatives in South Africa – Progress Achieved and Future Objectives*.

ANNEXURE E

Names and Addresses of Some Providers of IDP-Training

Institution & Contact Details
<p>AFESIS/CORPLAN</p> <p>Glen Hollands P.O.Box 7101 East London 5200 Tel: (043) 743 3830 Fax: (043) 743 2200</p>
<p>BORDER RURAL COMMITTEE (BRC)</p> <p>Ashley Westaway 16 St Georges Street Southernwood East London 5201 Tel: (0431) 420 173 Fax: (0431) 420 173</p> <p>BORDER TECHNIKON</p> <p>Mrs. Mtala Tel: 0431-439400</p>
<p>CAPE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL</p> <p>Chrisin Swart Human Resources Department Corporate Services Cape Metropolitan Council PO Box 16548 Vlaeberg 8018</p>
<p>CAPE TECHNIKON, TOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNING DEPARTMENT</p> <p>Vic Theunissen School of Civil Engineering PO Box 652 Cape Town 8000 Tel: (021) 460-3911</p>

CITY COUNCIL OF PRETORIA

Johnny Coetzee
P.O. Box 3242
Pretoria
0001
Tel: (012) 308-7710
Fax: (012) 308-4646
E-mail: johnnie.pl@ccp.co.za

CSIR, DIVISION OF BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TECHNOLOGY (BOU TEK)

Maria Coetzee
P.O. Box 396
Pretoria
0001
Tel: (012) 841 2552
Fax: (012) 841 4036

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT, NORHTERN CAPE
(NORTHERN CAPE LOCAL GOVERNMENT TRAINING COMMITTEE)**

Michelle van Zyl & Moosa Molopo
Subdirector: Town and Regional Planning
Private Bag x5005
9 Cecil Sussman Road
Kimberley
8300
Tel: (0531) 806 320 & (0531) 809538
Fax: (0531) 812 904

DEPARTMENT OF LAND AFFAIRS

Mr. Chris du Plessis
Private Bag x833
Pretoria
0001
Tel: (012) 312 9357
Fax: (012) 312-9348
E-mail: hcduplessis@sghq.pwv.gov.za

**DEPARTMENT OF TOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNING AND SENRIO,
POTCHEFSTROOM UNIVERSITY FOR CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION**

Prof. A. Nieuwoudt
Private Bag x6001
Potchefstroom
2520
Tel: (018) 299-2458516
Fax: (018) 299-2487

**DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING, SCHOOL OF
ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF VENDA**

Dr. Godfrey Anyumba
University of Venda
Private Bag x5030
Tohoyandou
0950
Tel: (015) 962-8000

DURBAN METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

Craig Allan
Durban Metropolitan Council
P.O. Box 680
Durban
4000

FAIR SHARE

Elroy Paulus
Springtime Building
1 Scott Road
Observatory
7925
Tel: (021) 488-8208
Fax: (021) 448-7945
E-mail: Fairshare@netactive.co.za

FOUNDATION FOR CONTEMPORARY RESEARCH

Fowzia Achmat
PO Box 1489
Cape Town
8000
Tel: (021) 418-4173
Fax: (021) 418-4176

IDASA – LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION CENTRE (LOGIC)

Benji Mautjane
P.O. Box
Arcadia
0007
Tel: (012) 320-3820
Fax: (012) 320-2414

JOINT UNIVERSITIES AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT EDUCATIONAL TRUST (JUPMET)

Ivan Samdan
School of Government
University of the Western Cape
Private Bag x17
Bellville
7535
Tel: (021) 946-2888
Fax: (021) 946-2864

JOINT CENTRE FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC STUDIES

Elizabeth Ninan
P.O. Box 23881
Joubert Park
2044
Tel: (011) 403-8641/2
Fax: (011) 339-8386

LOCAL GOVERNMENT TRAINING COMMITTEE - EASTERN CAPE

Johann Greyling, Loyiso Dumalisile
Postnet X5311
Ste 216
Umtata
Tel: (0471) 22296
Fax: (0471) 22459

MANGOSUTHU TECHNIKON, PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Mr. J.T. Simelane
Department of Public Management
Mangosuthu Technikon
P.O. Box 12363

ML SULTAN TECHNIKON, DEPARTMENT OF TOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

G. Lincoln
P.O. Box 1334
Durban
4000
Tel: (031) 308-5111
Fax: (031) 308-5194

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT (NIPAM)

S.C. Le Roux
P.O. Box 7964
Halfway House
Midrand
1685
Tel: (011) 312-1017
Fax: (011) 312-1019

OCTAGONAL DEVELOPMENT

Alewijn Dippenaar
PO Box 2355
Somerset West
7129
Tel/Fax: (021) 8521122

PENINSULA TECHNIKON, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC MANAGEMENT AND LAW

Dr HH Ballard
Department of Public Management and Law Business Faculty
PO Box 1906
Bellville
7530
Tel: (021) 959-6184
Fax: (021) 959-6097

PLANACT

Hassan
P.O. Box 93540
Yeoville
2143
Tel; (011) 403-6291
Fax: (011) 403-6982

POTCHEFSTROOM UNIVERSITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FACULTY OF LAW

Prof. T.E. Scheepers
Department of Law
Private Bag x6001
University of Potchefstroom
Potchefstroom
2520
Tel: (018) 299-1968
Fax: (018) 299-1923

**RAND AFRIKAANS UNIVERSITY (RAU)
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**

Prof. C.S. de Waal
P.O. Box 524
Auckland Park
2006
Tel: (011) 489 2859
Fax: (011) 489 2859

**SANLAM CENTRE FOR METROPOLITAN AND LOCAL GOVERNANCE, RAND
AFRIKAANS UNIVERSITY**

Prof. W. Zybrands
P.O. Box 524
Auckland Park
2006
Tel: (011) 6744122
0836310667
Fax: (011) 617 8346
E-Mail: wernerzy@iafrica.com

**SCHOOL FOR PUBLIC MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION (SPMA), UNIVERSITY
OF PRETORIA**

Dr. Enslin van Rooyen
Faculty of Economic Management Science
University of Pretoria
Pretoria
0002
Tel: (012) 420-3474
Fax: (012) 342-4964

SCHOOL OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF NATAL

Prof. M. Morris
School of Development Studies
University of Natal
Durban
4041
Tel: (031) 260-2287
Fax: (031) 260-2359

TECHNICAL COLLEGE, JOHANNESBURG

Mr. W. Huss
P.O. Box 17000
Doomfontein
Johannesburg
2028
Tel: (011) 402 2990
Fax: (011) 402 2991

TECHNIKON PORT ELIZABETH

Prof. V.G. Hilliard
Private Bag X 6011
Port Elizabeth
6000

THE DEVELOPMENT FACILITATION AND TRAINING INSTITUTE, (DevFTI), THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP, FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF THE NORTH

Dr. D.J. Matshabaphala
Private Bag x1106
Sovenga
0727
Tel: (015) 268 9111

UNIVERSITY OF PORT ELIZABETH

Carol Christi
Tel: (041) 5042146

UNIVERSITY OF DURBAN WESTVILLE, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Prof. M. Wallis
University of Durban Westville
School of Governance
Private Bag x54001
Durban
4000
Tel: (031) 2044137
Fax: (031) 2044577

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN, SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE AND PLANNING

Fabio Todeschini
Department of Town and Regional Planning
UCT
Private Bag
Rondebosch
7701
Tel: (021) 650 2366

UNIVERSITY OF FORT HARE

Dr. Sipho Buthelezi
Tel: 0822003587
Fax: 04065 31007

UNIVERSITY OF NATAL, SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE, PLANNING AND HOUSING

Prof, M, Kahn
School of Architecture, Planning and Housing
University of Natal
Shepstone Building
Room 8596
Durban
4041
Tel: (031) 260-2689

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH-WEST, MBA/MPA PROGRAMME

Dan Setsetse
Private Bag x2046
Mmabatho
2735
Tel: 0183 89231/2183
Fax: 0183 892090

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA (UNISA), DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Prof. Frik de Beer, Ms Derica Kotze & Prof Linda Cornwell
P.O. Box 392
Pretoria
0003
Frik de Beer & Linda Cornwell
Tel: (012) 429-6813
Dbeercc@alpha.unisa.ac.za
Derica Kotze
Tel (012) 429-6590
Fax: (012) 429-3646

UNIVERSITY OF STELLENBOSCH, TOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Prof. Colin Welch
Town and Regional Planning
Private Bag x1
Matieland
7602
Tel: (021) 808 2152
Fax: (021) 808 2085
E-mail: cdm@maties.sun.ac.za

UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE , DEPARTMENT OF TOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

Mr. Piet Potgieter
P.O. Box 339
Bloemfontein
9300
Tel: 051 401 2486
Fax: 051 447 3929
E-mail: agpjp@rs.uovs.ac.za

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND (WITS), DEPARTMENT OF TOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

Martin Drake
Department of Town and Regional Planning
University of the Witwatersrand
Private Bag X3
2050
Tel: (011) 717 1000
Fax: \9011) 403 2519

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR PUBLIC AND DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Prof. Alan Mabin
WITS Business School
Box 98
WITS University
2050
Tel: (011) 484 5895
Fax: (011) 484 2729

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN CAPE, SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT

Dr. Lisa Thompson
Private Bag x17
Bellville
7535
Tel: (021) 959 3525
Fax: (021) 959 2208

UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND

Mr. Nhlanathi
Private Bag x 1001
Kwa-Dlangezwa
3886
Tel: (0351) 92516
Fax: (0351) 93420

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA, DEPARTMENT OF TOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

Dr. Mark Oranje
University of Pretoria
Pretoria
0002
Tel: (012) 420-3822
Fax: (012) 420-3537
E-mail: mcoranje@postino.up.ac.za

WESTERN CAPE PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION, LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING

Phillip Grobler
Private Bag x9083
Cape Town
8000

WITS TECHNIKON, DEPARTMENT OF TOWN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

Mr. Rob Facio
P.O. Box 17011
Doomfontein
2028
Tel: (011) 406 2183/2170 (secretary)
Fax: (011) 406 2760