

## CHAPTER FOUR

### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING (IDP)

#### POLICY IN SOUTH AFRICA

##### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter three of this study presented a conceptualization of the role of traditional authorities in policy implementation within the discipline of public administration. It has been shown that the aspect of policy-making has been the focus of a number of studies of international politics. The focus of this has been within national states or through international policy-making bodies. The aim of the international public administration was to promote good governance in the world, and in the Third World countries – particularly, since they have emerged from colonialism – as newly independent States. Public administration at the international level has been promoted by various bodies, such as the World Bank and the IMF.

These bodies formulated policies, which have led to the implementation of development projects to alleviate poverty, but without the participation of those countries which, were the recipients of such projects. The recipient countries were only expected to implement them. The approach followed by the World Bank and the IMF was clearly based on top-down theory. There was a clear separation of policy formulation and its implementation. Implementation took place in the North, and implementation in the South. This resulted in the failure of those projects; and a new paradigm shift toward promoting participation of stakeholders in policy formulation and its subsequent implementation was proposed. It was also proposed that traditional authorities should participate in policy-making and implementation, thereby adopting a bottom-up theory. This would make policy-making an interactive process.

The end of colonialism in Africa has ushered in a new institutional context of development, with the emphasis on participatory forms of governance at national public administration level. This followed the failure of the World Bank and the IMF's Structural Adjustment Programme (SAPs) – to bring development in the Third World – due to the lack of any meaningful participation by the recipients of the programmes (Prah and Ahmed 2000:30).

The need for participation by the recipients of the public administrative efforts to improve the lives of the African population was a break with the past, in which the State had enjoyed the monopoly on policy formulation. The focus has now moved to the participation of multiple role-players in public administration (Materu *et al.* 2000:14).

Public administration in South Africa is mostly associated with Cloete, who is regarded as the father of public administration. According to (Cloete 1994:63), public administration is an independent work discipline, since it requires those who practised it to comply with certain guidelines. Public administration also expects public representatives and officials to understand that Parliament and legislatures have authority over their areas of jurisdictions. Therefore, in short, public administration refers to the systematic execution of public law (Geldenhuys 1988:14).

This chapter will discuss the implementation of IDP at both national and provincial levels; and it concludes by focusing on Vhembe District, which could be an example to the rest of South Africa – in line with the main heading of the chapter.

#### **4.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PLANNING IN POLICY IMPLEMENTATION**

Planning is the key in the implementation of policies including the IDP. All activities need to be presented with a plan on how they should be realized. As a local government activity, planning refers to the processes of assisting in the taking of decisions on the allocation and the use of the existing resources (Mabin in Parnell *et al.* 2002:40). During the time of resistance in the 1980s, there was a demand for planning to be a participatory process – by the people of South Africa – and not just a unilateral process (Mabin in Parnell *et al.* 2002:44-45).

The **Local Government Transitional Act** (LGTA), 1993, can be regarded as the source of new planning in South Africa. This Act was amended in 1995; and this paved the way for a concept of developmental planning in South Africa. The amendment of the LGTA compelled local governments to engage in a different way of planning. According to the **White Paper on Local Government**, 1998, Integrated Development Plan is one of the three tools of developmental local government. The other two are performance management and partnership with citizens.

It directs municipalities to establish a development plan for short, medium and long-term. Thus, IDP is not confined to a single actor, but combines a broad range of participants (White Paper on Local Government 1998:26-27).

#### **4.3 THE NEED FOR MUNICIPAL PLANNING**

The **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa**, 1996, Section 152 provides that the purpose of local government is to promote social and economic development. It further provides for the developmental duties of the municipalities. In order to achieve the mandate of developmental duties, the municipality is required to structure and manage its administration, its budgeting and its planning processes to give priority to the basic needs of the community, to promote the social and economic development of the community, and to participate in national and provincial development programmes (**Constitution of the Republic of South Africa** 1996:84-85).

#### **4.4 DEFINITION OF INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING**

Integrated Development Planning process is a process that is undertaken to produce IDP, which is a developmental plan for a municipal area containing short, medium and long-term objectives and strategies. The IDP serves as a principal strategic management instrument for municipalities. It is legislated by the **Municipal Systems Act** 2000 (Act 32 of 2000). Oranje and Huyssteen in (Fox and Van Rooyen 2004:131-132), see integrated development planning as a crucial instrument of development planning in the local sphere, and as a process that helps municipalities to prepare strategic development plans on the basis of a five-year period (**Municipal Systems Act** 2000 (Act 32 of 2000), Section 35 (1)).

The IDP has to be prepared in such a way that it must run with the term of office of a particular council. It is incumbent upon the new council to either adopt the IDP of the previous council, or to develop a new one, in order to achieve its own policy objectives. The preparation of Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) became a legal requirement in South Africa for local councils, according to the **Local Government Transition Act Second Amendment Act** 1996 (LGTA). Integrated Development Planning, as it is enshrined in the **White Paper on Local Government**, 1998, provided that IDPs must be a tool for developmental local government, together with performance management and participatory processes.

The Integrated Development Planning policy is implemented under the leadership of the Department of Co-operative Governance, Settlement and Traditional Affairs. It is a valuable mechanism for the promotion of co-operative intergovernmental relations among the three spheres of government.

In order to ensure co-ordination of the three spheres, municipalities are compelled to align their planning activities with those of national and provincial spheres, as well as those of municipalities that might be affected by their planning (Cloete and Thornhill 2005:119-121). The IDP is a principal strategic instrument that guides and informs all planning, budgeting, management and decision-making in a municipality. The IDP comprises various phases / processes, whose execution should include traditional authorities, as discussed briefly below.

#### **4.5 THE IDP PROCESSES**

The **Municipal Systems Act, 2000** (Act 32 of 2000) lays down some processes of integrated development planning, which comprise phases that the municipality undertakes, in order to formulate integrated development plans. These phases are discussed below. The **Municipal Systems Act, 2000** (Act 32 of 2000) section (29) compels municipal councils to identify and consult organs of State, including traditional authorities, on the drafting of the integrated development planning. These phases are areas where they should participate in IDP planning.

##### **4.5.1 The analysis phase**

The analysis phase deals with the current situation. In this phase, any problems faced by communities in the municipal area are profiled. These problems range from lack of basic services to criminal activities and unemployment. Thereafter, the needs are prioritized in the order of the attention they need, and the available resources from the municipality. In this stage of identifying problems, it is where stakeholders, such as traditional authorities should be involved, because they have some experience of the development problems their communities face. Municipalities are not supposed to make assumptions – otherwise real problems would not be clearly identified.

#### **4.5.2 The strategies phase**

The analysis phase gives municipalities the opportunity to understand the problems that affect the people and the causes of those problems. From here, municipalities must develop a priority list and the solution to address the challenges identified. The municipalities must now formulate a vision, development objectives, development strategies and project identification. In this phase, traditional leaders must articulate the problems and solutions.

Public debates must include the role of the traditional authorities, since they have had considerable experience of delivering services to their communities. They will be in a position to share their experience with the elected leaders and with the municipal officials.

#### **4.5.3 The project phase**

The Municipal Infrastructure Grant (2004-2007:34) shows the project phase as the one in which projects are identified. Project proposals are also decided in this phase. The most important project is the infrastructure. The basic infrastructure projects are listed. The proposals for basic infrastructure are also made in this phase, and particularly following the listing of the infrastructural projects. If traditional authorities are involved, the designed projects would be able to target people who need it most. Traditional authorities and community members would be able to highlight those areas where such projects should be located, and even nominate beneficiaries where necessary. This phase is concluded by developing a monitoring plan. Traditional leaders would also need to check whether the projects are being implemented according to the plan.

#### **4.5.4 The integration phase**

Mathye (2002:30) is of the opinion that municipalities must ensure that the projects are in line with the objectives and strategies of municipalities. Traditional leaders who represent traditional authorities in municipal councils participate in the debates. The whole plan in terms of the initiation of the project, and its implementation through to monitoring should be planned in this phase. The municipality is able to design a programme for a period of five years, as required by law.

In order to implement projects in a successful manner, key performance indicators would need to be developed.

#### **4.5.5 The approval phase**

According to Mathye (2002:31), after the completion of IDP, it must be submitted to the municipal council, so that it can be considered and approved. It must be presented to the public for their comments; and thereafter it should be submitted to council for approval. It is incumbent on the council to check whether the document has identified the problems analyzed, and how they are to be resolved. The most important area that council must apply its mind to is the compliance with existing legislation. There is no doubt that council should check whether communities and traditional authorities have participated in the debates that led to the final document, as it is required by legislation.

The extent to which the participation of traditional authorities takes place in these phases will depend on their understanding of public policies and the IDP itself. In all fairness, their participation will be evaluated on whether they play an active role in making meaningful contributions, or whether they prefer to play a passive role – in the sense of the mere attendance of meetings in whatever form.

#### **4.6 THE PARTICIPATION OF TRADITIONAL AUTHORITIES IN INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING**

The recognition of the institution of traditional authorities by the **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa**, 1996, could imply that it was an admission by the government that traditional authority was integral to the African society; and therefore, that it has a role to play in terms of customary law. The **White Paper on Local Government**, 1998, provided that they should participate in the affairs of local government. The **Municipal Structures Act**, 1998 Section 81 and subsections (1) - (4) provided that traditional authorities should be consulted, so that they could participate in decision- making in those municipalities presiding over areas that fit the definition of a traditional community. The **Municipal Systems Act**, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000), which was later passed, granted traditional authorities the right to be represented through their leaders, who should attend and participate in local municipalities and district municipalities.

It prescribed that their number in each municipality should not exceed 30% of the total number of the councilors of that municipality. However, they have an ex-officio status in municipal councils (Bank and Southall 1996:409).

Section (29) of the **Municipal Systems Act**, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000), demanded that organs of the State should identify and consult with traditional authorities to participate in the drafting of the IDP policy processes.

The **Traditional Leadership and Governance Framework Act**, 2003, granted them powers to participate in the promotion of social and economic development. In order to play this role, there should be a partnership that must be established between local government and traditional authorities, thus characterizing South Africa's social and political landscape as a dual society. This dual character affords traditional authorities an opportunity to be part of policy implementation in local government.

In South Africa, the survey that was conducted by the South African Social Attitudes Survey (2005) on the level of trust on traditional authorities has revealed that the perception of respondents in Eastern Cape to be 52%; while in Limpopo Province, the perception is 68%. Table 4.1 shows the relationship per province in trust in spheres of governance in South Africa.

Table 4.1: Relationship per province in trust in spheres of government in South Africa

Level of governance	WC	EC	NC	FS	KZN	NW	GT	MP	LP
Traditional Authority	44	52	25	63	64	59	41	63	68
Local Government	24	80	42	54	53	52	39	59	48
Provincial Government	36	86	50	73	74	64	50	71	67
National Government	37	95	72	74	74	77	67	78	72

Source: 2005 South African Social Attitudes Survey

Table 4.1 above shows that, with the exception of Eastern Cape and Northern Cape, the level of trust in traditional authorities is higher than in each of the provinces.

However, it is interesting to note that even in the Western Cape, which does not have traditional authorities, the respondents put their trust in the traditional authorities, rather than in other spheres of government. Table 4.1 shows that traditional authorities are popular structures; and this should, therefore, justify that they be permitted to play a role in the policy implementation, particularly in the IDP policy implementation in South Africa.

Various pieces of legislation have recognised and granted traditional authorities the right to attend and participate in IDP policy processes. South Africa is a diverse country of various set-ups. For example, some provinces, such as Limpopo, Mpumalanga, EC and KZN are increasingly very indigenous; and they have the vast majority of the traditional authorities in this country.

Despite the fact that the law governing traditional authorities in South Africa is the same in all the provinces, it should be noted that various factors, such as characterization, and endowments, for example, might impact on the implementation of policy differently, the focus of this study is Limpopo Province, and a profile of this province with regard to its traditional authorities' policy issues will now be discussed.

The participation in the decision-making process is an approach founded on political democracy that promotes a bottom-up approach. The people and communities who will be affected by the decisions made must be afforded the opportunity to participate in decision-making process (Cloete *et al.* 2006:114). The **White Paper on Local Government**, 1998, compels municipalities to ensure citizen participation in policy initiation and formulation, the monitoring and the evaluation of decision-making, and also the implementation of IDPs.

Traditional authorities must be consulted to participate as an organized structure, because they represent communities and also their structures. If they are not consulted, there could be no effective implementation of government policies (Cloete and Thornhill 2005:123).



Section (81) of the **Municipal Structures Act** (Act 117 of 1998) stipulates that traditional authorities – who traditionally observe a system of customary law in the area of a municipality – must be allowed to attend and participate in any meeting of the council. The traditional leaders must also be consulted by the council before any decision that affects their traditional authority can be taken. The number of traditional leaders is not supposed to exceed 20% in relation to the total number of the elected councils. There are various models of participation, which could enhance effective policy implementation.

#### **4.7 MODELS OF PARTICIPATION**

According to Arnstein (1969:216-224), there are eight types of participation, which will now be briefly discussed below.

##### **4.7.1 Citizen control**

The people who are not in power are given an opportunity to have the majority decision-making seats or full managerial power. This means that the people are able to participate in a meaningful manner.

##### **4.7.2 Delegated power**

Delegated power gives people the power and the opportunity to hold the government and its officials accountable. The people also have decision-making authority over specific projects. In order to make it more effective, this also includes the veto rights to resolve issues.

##### **4.7.3 Partnership**

Partnership refers to the redistribution of power to the people, who are usually referred to as the citizens. This distribution is negotiated with the authorities. In this case, they form structures, which promote joint planning and the implementation of the projects.

##### **4.7.4 Placation**

In placation, the people are given some degree of power and influence, but not real power: just enough to placate them. It is merely a token to please or manage them.

The act is for window-dressing only. The people do not have the power to take any decision, but can merely promote the decisions taken.

#### **4.7.5 Consultation**

In consultation, the people are consulted. But the problem arises when their proposals are not taken into consideration, or sufficiently valued for implementation. The participation is only measured by the number of people who attend the meetings – if invited. Of course, the government officials would have proof that they sent out invitations; and also the attendance register would attest that people came to the meeting.

#### **4.7.6 Informing**

In informing as a type of participation, the people are informed of their roles and rights in the decision-making processes. This is desirable because it empowers them. The problem arises when their involvement is limited to receiving information without their inputs being taken seriously. They should make inputs into projects for their benefit. Meetings should not be a one-way communication for making them the mere corroborators of decisions already taken.

#### **4.7.7 Therapy**

In therapy, the people are made to believe that they are involved in participation. The aim is to silence them in challenging the status quo, but not to give them any real power. They are made to believe that they have power and influence over the decisions, while in actual fact, they do not have any real power at all.

#### **4.7.8 Manipulation**

Manipulation as a type of participation does not give people any real chance of participating. They just rubber-stamp those decisions that are passed by government and its officials. They are merely given advisory positions.

As a measure to achieve the research problem of this research, the researcher selected a consultation model. The consultation model was selected on the basis that legislation compels municipalities to consult community structures; and the extent to which they are consulted needs to be determined.

This model cuts across all the processes of IDP implementation; and if properly implemented, there is no doubt that it could promote the effective implementation of government policies – including the IDP implementation.

#### **4.8 LEGAL MANDATE FOR INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING**

The **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa**, 1996, can be regarded as the source of origin of IDPs, since it enjoins local government to:

- Provide democratic and accountable government to all communities;
- Ensure the provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner;
- Promote social and economic development;
- Promote a safe and healthy environment, and encourage the involvement of communities and community organizations in regard to matters of local government.

Section 40 of the **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa**, 1996, emphasizes that all of the three spheres must observe co-operative relationships, and they must support one another. The **Municipal Systems Act**, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000) provides for the goals, processes, role-players and requirements for integrated development planning.

In order to fulfil the mandate of co-operative government, the **Municipal Systems Act**, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000) requires that all the three spheres must integrate their plans. Local government is a local democracy that requires community and other stakeholders to be involved through active participation in community-development processes (Fox and Van Rooyen 2004:112). Traditional authorities remain a strategic institution in the fabric of stakeholders – whether by law or default. Communities are not able to make any meaningful contribution directly to national and provincial governments, since these spheres are functionally often removed from them. There are good chances that traditional authorities can represent communities better, since the community members respect their traditional leaders.

The **Municipal Structures Act**, 1998 (Act 117 of 1998) provides that local government is a sphere created for the purposes of bringing government to the local population, and assisting communities to participate and be involved in the political

processes, in order to improve the quality of their lives. The **Traditional Leadership and Governance Framework Act, 2003** (41 of 2003) provides that, in addition to playing a role for the promotion of socio-economic development of their communities, traditional leaders must also disseminate information on government policies and programmes. Section 5 (1) provides that there must be partnerships between municipalities and traditional leaders. This implies that traditional authorities have representative powers for their communities.

The **White Paper on Local Government, 1998**, provides for a vision of 'developmental local government' whose achievement lies in the co-operation with local communities to facilitate sustainable ways to meet their needs and to improve the quality of their lives. The **White Paper on Local Government, 1998** therefore, provides the following approaches that are set to assist municipalities in their efforts to become more developmental: integrated development planning and budgeting; performance management; and working together with local citizens and partners.

Integrated development planning in South Africa is a process through which municipalities, together with their constituencies, various stakeholders, interested parties including traditional authorities and affected parties, compile a strategic planning instrument for municipalities. It is a process that is aimed at arriving at decisions on issues, such as municipal budgets, land management, the promotion of local economic development and institutional transformation in a consultative, systematic and strategic manner.

The IDP, which is a strategic plan emanating from the process, informs the municipal management and also guides the activities of any agency from the other spheres of government, corporate services providers, NGOs and CBOs, and the private sector within the municipal area.

The IDP is a strategic planning instrument for a five-year period; and it is used by the municipality to fulfill its role of developmental local governance, as well as to promote co-ordination and the integration of planning and development between all spheres of government. The IDP planning is the process through which municipalities prepare a strategic development plan, for a five-year period. The IDP is the principal strategic planning instrument, which guides and informs all planning, and development in the municipality (**Municipal Systems Act, 2000** (Act 32 of 2000)).

Both the District and Local Municipalities have to undertake an IDP process to produce IDP. The **Municipal Systems Act, 2000** (Act 32 of 2000) lists the main principles to be adhered to in the IDP process, namely:

(i) Planning must be developmentally oriented. (ii) Planning must support the role of local government as an agent of development; and therefore, an IDP is a tool for developmental local government. (iii) Planning must take place within the framework of co-operative government. (iv) Municipal planning must be aligned with the plans and strategies of national, provincial, as well as with those of other municipalities.

The **Municipal Systems Act, 2000** (Act 32 of 2000) lists some minimum requirements, which would allow for an IDP to be legally adopted: (i) A vision for long-term development with special emphasis on the municipality's development and internal transformation needs. (ii) Development provides priorities and objectives, including local economic development aims. (iii) The development strategies must be aligned with national and provincial plans and planning requirements. (iv) A spatial development framework, including basic guidelines for land-use management. (v) The operational strategies.

(vi) Disaster-management plans. (vii) A financial plan, including a budget projection for at least the next three years. (viii) The key performance indicators and key performance targets.

#### **4.9 THE IMPLEMENTATION OF IDP IN LIMPOPO PROVINCE**

The implementation of IDP in Limpopo is informed by Section (152) of the **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996**, which requires municipalities to involve community organisations in the affairs of the municipalities. Section (29) of the **Municipal Systems Act, 2000** (Act 32 of 2000) provides that organs of the State, including traditional authorities, need to be identified and consulted in the drafting of the IDP.

Policy implementation, as part of the whole policy-formulation process, means that traditional leaders must also participate in the deliberations of municipal councils, where community decisions are taken. The **Municipal Systems Act, 2000** (Act 32 of 2000), Section (81) provides that traditional authorities, which traditionally observe a system of customary law in the area of a municipality, may participate through their

traditional leaders, identified in terms of sub-section (2), in the deliberation of the council of that particular municipality; and those traditional leaders must be allowed to attend and participate in any meeting of the council.

#### **4.10 PARTICIPATION OF TRADITIONAL AUTHORITIES IN LIMPOPO IDPs**

The **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa**, 1996 (section 152) requires municipalities to involve community organisations, which by implication includes traditional authorities, in the affairs of the municipalities. Section (29) of the **Municipal Systems Act**, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000), specifically mentions that organs of the State, including traditional authorities, ought to be identified and consulted in the drafting of the IDP.

Policy implementation, as part of the whole policy-formulation process, means that traditional leaders must also participate in the deliberations of municipal councils, where community decisions are taken. The **Municipal Systems Act**, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000), Section (81) provides that traditional authorities, which traditionally observe a system of customary law in the area of a municipality, may participate through their traditional leaders, identified in terms of sub-section (2), in the deliberation of the council of that particular municipality, and those traditional leaders must be allowed to attend and participate in any meeting of the council.

The research conducted by Oomen (2005:239) in the Sekhukhune area shows that 80% of those interviewed still had a high regard for their traditional leadership. This high support might suggest that traditional authorities should be fully integrated within the democratic structures.

In South Africa, traditional authority competes with elected democratic leadership (Beall 2004:1). In the Sekhukhune area, communities support traditional authorities, because elected leadership has failed to deliver on their mandate (Oomen 2005: 238). Chieftaincy is world-wide viewed as a strong political force at the local level. In terms of previous research on traditional leadership, there is a convergence of ideas that in much of the Sub-Saharan Africa, and South Africa in particular, that communities continue to rely on the traditional authorities to address their daily social challenges (Logan 2009; Beall 2006; Bratton, Mates and Gyimah-Boadi 2005; Oomen 2005).

The Draft MEC's IDP Assessment Report 2009/2010 serves as the source of the public participation discussed in this section/study. Participation of traditional authorities in the implementation of IDPs is critical to this study. This investigation takes place at one of the five districts, which make up Limpopo Province. Highlights of all the districts, in terms of public participation are however, only briefly discussed here, while details will be reserved for the Vhembe District, which is the focus area.

#### **4.10.1 Capricorn District Municipality**

The Capricorn District comprises Aganang, Blouberg, Lepelle-Nkupi, Molemole and Polokwane local municipalities. According to the 2009/2010 MEC Assessment Report, these municipalities in the Capricorn District have all established their IDP Coordination Units, which are placed within municipal departments – with the exception of Aganang, which places the units in the office of the Municipal Manager.

Under the heading: “Good governance and public participation”, Capricorn District Municipality shows its participation processes. These processes were analysed through the following IDP processes.

##### **(i) Strategies phase**

In the strategies phase, there is no mention of public participation in the IDP documents for Molemolle, Lepelle-Nkupi and Blouberg municipalities.

This means that traditional authorities are not involved, as required by the **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996** and **Municipal Systems Act, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000)**. The comment that the MEC made confirms that there is no public participation indicated in the IDP document submitted.

##### **(ii) Projects phase**

In the projects phase, the local municipalities of Blouberg, Molemole and Lepelle-Nkupi do not show that there is any public participation by the traditional authorities – let alone any legislative requirement of public participation.

(iii) Integration

The two local municipalities of Blouberg and Molemole do not show the participation of traditional authorities, nor that of the communities, as required by the **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996** and the **Municipal Systems Act, 2000** (Act 32 of 2000). The two municipalities do not have any communication strategy that is central to any organization, particularly for inviting stakeholders to meetings.

#### **4.10.1.1 Implementation structure for Capricorn District Municipality**

The Capricorn District Municipality has a good relationship with its stakeholders, with whom it has a partnership for the creation of economic development to promote service delivery. This is confirmed by its motto which reads thus: “To provide quality services, in a cost- effective and efficient manner, through competent people, partnerships, information and knowledge management, creating sustainability and economic development in the interests of all of all stakeholders” (CDM final IDP 2007/2011:i). This motto shows that Capricorn District Municipality is determined to work with other stakeholders, which implies that traditional authorities are also in partnership.

#### **4.10.2 Mopani District Municipality**

The Mopani District consists of Greater Giyani, Greater Letaba, Greater Tzaneen, and Baphalaborwa local municipalities.

(i) Analysis phase

In Mopani District Municipality, no effective ward committees exist in all the municipalities in terms of their IDPs. The Assessment Report of the MEC has put an emphasis on the ward committees in the district of Mopani; they must be made functional, and they should have a relationship with the traditional authorities. This, by implication, means that there is no participation by traditional authorities in the IDP implementation in this district.

(ii) Strategies phase

In the strategies phase, Greater Tzaneen and Greater Letaba's IDPs do not reflect public participation. Greater Tzaneen does not have effective ward committees.



This implies that public participation, even by traditional authorities, would be impossible. In Mopani District, the strategies phase is co-ordinated by consultants.

(iii) Projects phase

In terms of the projects phase, Mopani District and Baphalaborwa, Greater Giyani, Maruleng have all indicated that they involve the public in the implementation of their projects. It is only Greater Tzaneen and Greater Letaba, which do not reflect their public participation.

(iv) Integration phase

The integration phase in the Mopani District local municipalities shows that there are no effective ward committees.

#### **4.10.3 Sekhukhune District Municipality**

The Sekhukhune District is made up of Greater Tubatse, Makhuduthamaga, Elias Motsoaledi, Mable Hall and Fetakgomo local municipalities.

(i) Analysis phase

In the analysis phase, public participation and participation by traditional leaders is reflected in the IDP document.

There are also effective ward committees in all the local municipalities. The comment of the MEC stressed that more should be done in the improvement of the relationship with traditional authorities.

(ii) Strategies phase

In the strategies phase, there is a mention of public participation in the IDPs, except for Greater Mable Hall. The assessment by the MEC has emphasized that there must be strategies for the proper promotion of public participation.

(iii) Projects phase

In the projects phase, all the identified projects show that there is a fairly public participation in the IDPs. The comments by the MEC also urged municipalities to make sure that there is public participation in all the projects.

(iv) Integration phase

In the integration phase, there is an indication by all the local municipalities that there are ward committees, and that public participation strategies are in existence. The comment by the MEC says that there must be strategies for public participation and that the DLGH will give their support to this.

#### **4.10.4 Waterberg District Municipality**

The District of Waterberg comprises Modimolle, Mogalakwena, Mokgopong, Lephalale, Thabazimbi and Belabela local municipalities.

(i) Analysis

There are ward committees in all the local municipalities, and they are forums for participation by stakeholders, even though there is a poor relationship with traditional authorities in Modimolle, Mogalakwena and Mokgopong municipalities.

(ii) Strategies

The IDPs indicate that there is a public participation strategy that exists in the municipalities of Waterberg.

(iii) Projects

As far as participation in this phase, only in Belabela and Lephalale is there any public participation, although it has not yet become clear that traditional authorities are participating.

(iv) Integration

There are ward committees in all the local municipalities in the Waterberg District. The assessment by the MEC stressed that the issue of public participation must be prioritized, which implies that traditional authorities should be invited to participate.

## **4.11 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANNING**

### **(IDP) POLICY IN VHEMBE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

The Vhembe District Municipality was established in 2000 by the **Municipal Structures Act, 1998** (Act 117 of 1998). Vhembe District Municipality is the research area of this study. It is made up of Makhado, Thulamela, Musina and Mutale local municipalities. In terms of **Municipal Systems Act, 2000** (Act 32 of 2000) municipalities are directed to undergo the process of IDP planning that should result in an integrated development plan; and Vhembe is no exception to this. The implementation of IDP policy in Vhembe District comprises various structures for IDP implementation. The mechanisms and procedures for public participation will also be discussed. This will be followed by the implementation of intergovernmental relations. Finally, the participation of traditional authorities in IDP policy implementation in Vhembe District Municipality will also be discussed.

#### **4.11.1 Implementation structures for Vhembe District Municipality**

The implementation structure for Vhembe District Municipality comprises three components, namely: political, administrators, and the community.

#### **4.11.2 Political structure**

This comprises the Executive Mayor, the mayoral committee, the council, the portfolio councillors / committees. All these structures have been responsible for carrying out any decision-making functions within the IDP process.

#### **4.11.3 Administrative structure**

The administrative structure is headed by the Municipal Manager. There are heads of department, IDP steering committees, IDP progress committee, project task teams, and cluster conveners, who are all required to perform their functions in terms of the IDP process plan. The IDP office and PIMS centre personnel are responsible for the co-ordination of the process of compiling the IDP and reviews.

#### **4.11.4 Community**

The IDP Representative Forum and ward committees at local municipalities carry the mandate for public participation at the community level.

Stakeholders, such as traditional authorities, are members and take part in the IDP Representative Forum and ward committees. The compilation of an IDP had been made a legislative mandate for each municipality in South Africa. The **Municipal Systems Act**, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000) requires that the IDP be implemented. Effective implementation of IDP requires institutional arrangements and resources to be available in the municipality.

The nature and the extent of the re-organization of the human resources depends on the existing organization capacity to cultivate its developmental objectives (Vhembe IDP 2007/2008-2011/12:7). This challenge did not seem to be resolved, since its 2009/10 IDP review analysis report (1<sup>st</sup> draft) showed that the challenge for VDM was a lack of staff, due to the lack of any recruitment policy or employment. There is a serious challenge of lack of monitoring and the evaluation of a supply-chain management policy implementation (Vhembe 2009/10 IDP Review Analysis Report (1<sup>st</sup> Draft)).

#### **4.11.5 Mechanisms and procedures for public participation**

Public participation has become one of the key features of developmental government. This aspect has been entrenched in the **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa**, 1996 and Chapter 4 of the **Municipal System Act**, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000), which then becomes a legislative requirement. Participation of affected and interested parties ensures that the IDP addresses real issues that are experienced by communities within the District. Participation of the public in local government matters takes place through a structured manner, hence the establishment of the IDP Representative Forum.

A review of existing representatives will be made, in order to involve those stakeholders that were not included during the initial stage of the planning process. At the district level, participation will be restricted to local municipalities, provincial and national sector departments, representatives of marginalized groupings and organized stakeholders. During the planning process, the local municipalities were responsible for the arrangements and were seen as the major link between the municipal government and communities, while continuous meetings to discuss their progress were held as the District Development Planning Forum. Table 4.2 below shows the activities and mechanism for participation in terms of the planning phase.

Table 4.2: Activities and mechanism for public participation per planning phase

Planning Phases	Activities	Mechanisms
<b>Preparation phase</b>	Inputs into the Process Plan & Framework for IDP Review	Workshop and meetings
<b>Analysis</b>	To participate in identification of gaps.  -To ensure that identified gaps are in line with developmental issues.	Workshops and meetings
<b>Strategies and developmental objectives</b>	-Ensure that developmental objectives are realistic.  -Ensure that reviewed strategies are in line with the Localized Strategic Guidelines.  -To ensure that developed reviewed strategies are in line with developmental priorities.  -Participate in discussions to formulate and adopt alternatives	Workshops, meetings and working sessions
<b>Projects</b>	Discussion on developed project proposals.	Workshops, meetings and working sessions
<b>Integration</b>	Integration all developed activities & programmes.	Working sessions and meetings
<b>Approval</b>	Comments	Council meetings

Source: Vhembe IDP 2007/2008-2011/12

The 2009/2010 Draft MEC's IDP Assessment Report has shown that Vhembe District and Makhado municipalities do not have a good working relationship with the traditional authorities. The MEC demands responses to alleviate the problems of the relationship with traditional authorities.

#### **4.12 IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS IN THE VHEMBE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

Thornhill **et al.** (2002:8) define intergovernmental relations as all the actions and transactions of politicians and officials among national and sub-national units of government and organs of State. This definition could refer to all the activities within the spheres of government, which assist bureaucrats to perform their public administrative functions.

The **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa**, 1996, provides for intergovernmental relations to promote integrated policy implementation for service delivery. These structures give South Africa a unique character distinct from other countries. These structures confirm that South Africa has matured in terms of democracy. Chapter 2, Section (5) (1) of **Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act**, (2004) provides for a number of intergovernmental structures.

Municipalities that fall under its area of jurisdiction have formed an intergovernmental protocol framework. That gave effect to the interdependence of the levels of provincial, district and local municipalities. The intergovernmental arrangement within which Vhembe District Municipality operates is shown below in Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3:** Intergovernmental protocol

<b>Key Performance Areas</b>	<b>Vhembe District</b>	<b>Musina Local</b>	<b>Mutale Local</b>	<b>Thulamela Local</b>	<b>Makhado Local</b>
Participation in Provincial IGR structures	<p>-Premier's Mayoral Forum</p> <p>-Ex co Lekgotla</p> <p>-Governance &amp; Administration Technical Committee</p> <p>-District and Provincial Government's Communication Forum</p>	<p>-Premier's Mayor Forum</p> <p>-Governance &amp; Administration Technical Committee</p> <p>-Provincial Government's Communication Forum</p>	<p>-Premier's Mayor Forum</p> <p>-Governance &amp; Administration Technical Committee</p> <p>-Provincial Government's Communication Forum</p>	<p>-Premier's Mayor Forum</p> <p>-Governance &amp; Administration Technical Committee</p> <p>-Provincial Government's Communication Forum</p>	<p>-Premier's Mayor Forum</p> <p>-Governance &amp; Administration Technical Committee</p> <p>-Provincial Government's Communication Forum</p>



-District Mayor's Forum	-District mayor's Forum	-District Mayor's Forum	-District Mayor's Forum		
- District Municipal Managers' Forum	-District Municipal Managers' Forum	-District Municipal Managers' Forum	-District Municipal Managers' Forum		
-District Technical Committees	-District Technical Committees	-District Technical Committees	-District Technical Committees		
-District CFO Forum	District CFO Forums	-District Technical Committees	-District CFO Forums		
- District Skills Development Facilitators' Forum	-District Skills Development Facilitators' Forum	District CFO Forums	-District Skills Development Facilitators Forum		
		-District Skills Development Facilitators Forum			

Source: Vhembe IDP 2007/2008-2011/12



Vhembe District implements IDP through IGR structures. Implementation structures also include the Premier's Mayors' Forum, governance and administration technical committee. The District Mayors Forum is also in place in Vhembe. There are also IGR structures that have been formed with district departments. There is an IDP progress committee that monitors the successful implementation of IDP in the district. Therefore, IGR had been put in place to promote successful IDP implementation through the bottom-up and participatory approach.

#### **4.13 TRADITIONAL AUTHORITIES AND IDP POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN**

##### **VHEMBE DISTRICT MUNICIPALITY**

Despite the view that traditional authorities should not be afforded the constitutional right to participate in the developmental role – due to the perception of them collaborating with apartheid policies (Kotze and Davies in Seminar Report: 1999:43), their participation is legalized by section 152 of the **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa**, 1996, which stipulates that municipalities should ensure community participation in the affairs of the municipality.

Chapter Two of the **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa**, 1996, enshrines the right of the people to participate in governance and government processes. The **White Paper on Local Government**, 1998, emphasizes the need for citizens to contribute into local politics. Subsequent to this, Section 16 (1) of the **Municipal Systems Act**, 117 (Act 117 of 2000) calls upon municipalities to create a culture of municipal governance that promotes participation by local community and stakeholders. Section 20 (2) (c) empowers all sections of the community – including traditional authorities – to participate in the municipality's integrated development plan, or its amendment, when it is presented to the municipal council for consideration.

The participation of traditional authorities in policy implementation is emphasised by section 29 (1) (iii), which compels municipalities to identify State organs, and also traditional authorities, so that they could participate in the drafting of the IDPs. Section 29 (1) (iii) also binds Vhembe District Municipality to ensure that traditional authorities participate in the processes of IDP in its area of jurisdiction.

It should be noted that the survey conducted by Markinor (1997) showed respondents in Limpopo Province believing very strongly that traditional leaders should participate in local government by 45%, while in KwaZulu-Natal the percentage is 44%. Traditional leaders should participate in the local government councils, since they have some knowledge of the challenges and solutions for their communities (Khwashaba in Seminar Report 1999:49).

In order to participate in local government councils, there is a need for the co-operation between traditional leaders and elected councillors (Khwashaba in Seminar Report 1999: 50). This co-operation between traditional leaders and elected councillors is stressed by the **Traditional Leadership and Governance Framework Act** (Act 41 of 2003). Despite the need for gender representation in municipal councils, the survey revealed that in Limpopo Province only 20% of the municipal councillors were women.

In Vhembe District Municipality, there are various structures, which should enable traditional leaders to participate in the Integrated Development Planning policy processes, such as Integrated Development Planning (IDP) and ward committees (Vhembe District Municipality 2007/8-2011/12:8).

#### **4.13.1 Ward committees**

The **Municipal Structures Act** (Act 117 of 1998) gave rise to the concept of the ward committee system. The aim of ward committees was to enhance local democracy (Ward Committee Resource Book 2005:42). Ward committees consist of 10 members and the ward councillor, who is the chairperson.

The survey conducted by Piper and Deacon in Msunduzi Municipality (2008:44), however, found that the rigid prescribed representation was unfair, given that some wards were much bigger than others. Although ward committees are the instruments of promoting local democracy, they serve as advisory structures to council through the ward councillors. Section 17 (1) of the **Municipal Systems Act** (Act 32 of 2000) provides that ward committees are the forum for the participation of local community. The members of the community meet with the municipality through the ward councillor to discuss development plans and programmes of that specific ward.

The ward committees are expected to promote bottom-up decision-making processes, since it is the members of that particular ward who decide what they want. This is in line with the requirements of the **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa**, (1996) section (152), which compels local government to provide democratic and accountable government for local communities, and also to encourage the involvement of communities and community organizations in the matters of local government.

The Guidelines for the Establishment and Operation of Municipal Ward Committees 2005 (Notice 2005) provided for the uniform guidelines on the establishment and operation of ward committees. In terms of the guidelines, ward committees should be advisory bodies, representative structures, independent structures and impartial bodies. However, the study conducted by Piper and Deacon in Msunduzi Municipality (2008:44) revealed that ward committees were highly politicized, particularly where it was difficult to differentiate between ward committees and branches of political parties, since at times ward councillors combined ward committees and branch meetings of political parties.

The ward councillors do not communicate effectively and consistently with communities (SACP 2009:28). The ward committees are not able to function properly, since some members do not have experience in reporting back to communities. The study conducted by Himlin (2005) in the City of Johannesburg found that many ward committee members did not understand their responsibilities. The lack of understanding of responsibilities by ward committee members and the inability to make any effective impact on council decision-making in the city of Johannesburg frustrated them.

A skills audit of 373 ward committees in the Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality by Bendle (2008) found that 34 of the members (9%) had tertiary training, while 59 members (16%) did not even have a matric certificate. There is a problem that some of them do not have any experience of participating in committee meetings (Ward Committee Resource Book 2005:6). This is where traditional leaders can complement ward committees, since they have experience of reporting back to their communities through territorial council meetings.

Some of them were former ministers in the homeland governments, and have vast experience of working with people. Therefore, unless traditional authorities can be properly involved and participate, ward committees will not function well; and this would impact on the IDP processes.

These ward committees are currently operating in most of the communities in South Africa. However, the functionality, effectiveness and efficiency remain largely untested and unaccounted for (SACP 2009:28).

Ward committees are established for all the local municipalities: Makhado, Thulamela, Mutale and Musina of the Vhembe District Municipality. Ward committees are used as a barometer for promoting good governance and public participation in Vhembe District Municipality. They have been established in Vhembe to serve as the conduits between the municipality and the community, which includes traditional leaders (Vhembe Draft IDP Analysis Report 2010/11:26). The ward committees also serve as the instrument for the promotion of participatory democracy. They are also used to solicit the views of the community, which must be included in the IDP (Vhembe Draft IDP Analysis Report 2010/11:28).

According to Section 72 and 74 of the **Municipal Structures Act**, 1998 (Act 117 of 1998), ward committees should enhance the participation of communities in local government. The mandate of ward committees is to function as advisory committees to the ward councillors, and most importantly, as a resource to municipal councils (Good Governance Learning Network 2008:23). However, the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) (2005) showed that only 63% of the respondents in Limpopo had any knowledge of the ward committees.

#### **4.13.2 IDP Representative Forum**

The IDP Representative Forum is a structure that is responsible for the promotion of public participation in Vhembe District Municipality. It is chaired by the Executive Mayor. The composition of the IDP Representative Forum includes traditional leaders. However, the participation of traditional leaders is viewed as being minimal when it comes to planning processes. This is attributed to the lack of training and capacity on the understanding of IDP (Vhembe District Municipality 2009/10 IDP Review Analysis Report (1<sup>st</sup> Draft):10).

However, Vhembe District Municipality has committed itself to ensure that traditional leaders are involved and participating in local governance (Vhembe District Municipality 2008/2009 Review Approved Version. 2008: 20).

#### **4.13.3 Attendance of municipal council meetings**

In South Africa, the **Municipal Structures Act**, 1998 (Act 117 of 1998) gave traditional leaders, who represent traditional authorities, the right to attend and participate in municipal council meetings. Traditional leaders are, however, given ex-officio status in council meetings and do not even have voting rights (Municipal Structures Act 1998). Municipal councils are responsible for the adoption of IDP, while traditional leaders by virtue of being ex-officio status do not participate in the debates beyond their mere attendance. This means that they can do no more than just listen to councillors debating and adopting IDP.

Yet, they derive comfort from the fact that they have participated in ward committees of the IDP Representative Forum and Development Planning Forum. The final IDP is the culmination of the decisions taken at these structures.

The municipal councils have a responsibility in driving the implementation of IDP policy processes. The Vhembe District Municipality councils decide and adopt the process plan and framework for the development of IDP. Municipal councils invite stakeholders, including traditional leaders, to attend and participate in the IDP processes. The municipal councils adopt the IDP Review Documents for the District Municipalities (Vhembe District Municipality IDP Training Guide).

#### **4.13.4 Submission of IDP proposals to municipal council**

The study by Himlin (2005) in the City of Johannesburg found that ward committees are frustrated because the proposals that they submit to councils are not even considered.

According to Arnstein (1969:216-224), stakeholders, such as traditional leaders, should be able to submit items or proposals for implementation. This is what should happen when people are consulted.

The consultation process should not be just another form of window-dressing, but a real one, which empowers the people. Participation should not be measured by the number of people who attend the meetings, if they are even invited.

Of course, the government officials would have proof that they sent out invitations, and also the attendance register would attest to the fact that people came to the meeting. According to Arnstein (1969:216-224), this is a form of manipulation, since there is no real participation. However, it should be appreciated that even if they do not participate, they listen to deliberations amongst the councillors.

#### **4.13.5 IDP Steering Committee**

The IDP Steering Committee is a structure, which comprises municipal officials; but no traditional leaders are represented; thus they do not participate in any of the IDP processes through this structure. The IDP Steering Committee is responsible for driving IDP within the District municipality. This structure is chaired by the Municipal Manager of the District Municipality (Vhembe District Municipality IDP 2010/2011 Review. 2010:2).

#### **4.13.6 Vhembe District Development Planning Forum**

Traditional leaders and other stakeholders, such as IDP managers, institutions of higher learning, district and local municipalities, among others, comprise this forum. Vhembe District Development Planning Forum is responsible for intergovernmental development planning and the facilitation of stakeholders. Vhembe District Development Planning Forum is chaired by the Development and Planning General Manager (Vhembe District Municipality IDP 2010/2011 Review 2010:2-3). The purpose of Vhembe District Development Planning Forum is to align and co-ordinate the planning activities, the implementation, the monitoring and the evaluation of municipalities and sector departments in the province ((Draft MEC's IDP Assessment Report 2009/2010. 2009:82).

#### **4.13.7 Challenges of Vhembe District Municipality**

Despite the fact that traditional authorities participate in some of the IDP forums in the District Municipality, there are still challenges, which the municipality yet faces. Below are some of these challenges.

On the aspect of “Good Governance and Public Participation”, the District Municipality had informed the MEC that it was not co-operating with any of the traditional leaders. Makhado Municipality of the District Municipality also indicated the same (Draft MEC’s IDP Assessment Report 2009/2010. 2009:74).

#### **4.14 CONCLUSION**

This chapter has discussed that Integrated Development Plan is the product of integrated development planning process; and it is a development plan for a municipal area containing short, medium and long-term objectives and strategies. The integrated development plan serves as the principal strategic management instrument for municipalities. It is legislated by the **Municipal Systems Act, 2000** (Act 32 of 2000). The preparation of Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) became a legal requirement in South Africa for local councils according to the **Local Government Transition Act Second Amendment Act, 1996** (LGTA).

The implementation of IDP in Limpopo Province is directed by the **Municipal Systems Act, 2000** (Act 32 of 2000), which compels them to identify and consult traditional authorities. Traditional authorities must be represented in municipal councils by traditional leaders. The **Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996** compels municipalities to involve community organizations in the drafting of IDP. The participation of traditional authorities and communities can be seen as the promotion of bottom-up decision-making.

In Limpopo Province, IDP implementation is regulated by intergovernmental relations. The district municipalities have established implementation structures for the IDP. However, the involvement of traditional authorities in the formulation and implementation of IDP is not uniform. In some district municipalities, traditional authorities are not involved at all, while in others they are involved. There are structures created for the promotion of bottom-up decision-making, such as ward committees and community development workers (CDWs) in local municipalities. However, these structures are weak; and they are easily manipulated for political reasons. The next chapter will discuss the case study of Vhembe District focusing on organisation of the case study and its context.