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Abstract
The article provides an overview of the post-apartheid experience of initiatives by the South African government at ensuring greater intergovernmental harmonisation, coordination, integration and alignment in the period 1994 to 2007. Written in narrative format, the article weaves its way between legal and policy frameworks, technical and assessment reports and academic publications on the subject. As such it highlights not only the intentions of government as captured in Acts and Policies, but also provides an indication of what was achieved during this time, and what was done to rectify the gaps. The narrative is followed by a brief discussion of main trends identified in this endeavour. The article is concluded on a positive note, with a suggestion that the tide might be turning for what has thus far been an elusive ideal.

1. INTRODUCTION
Few concepts have been so elusive in practice, yet so frequently used in the discourse of post-apartheid planning as those of ‘harmonisation’, ‘coordination’, ‘integration’ and ‘alignment’ associated with the collective term of intergovernmental development planning. Under these concepts have been understood some or other form of collaboration, sequencing, programming, putting together and/or pursuit of synergy in the actions of different actors in the development arena. Key to understanding the need for these actions is the intricate governing model created by the 1996-Constitution with its three “distinctive, interdependent and interrelated spheres” of government (local, provincial and national), each with its own set of [distinct] sector functions/ departments (e.g. transport, health, education). Alignment, integration and coordination were thus not only required between the developmental actions of spheres of government, but also in and between the sectors in such spheres.

Despite the frequent use and definite need for it in the South African planning discourse, the concept of intergovernmental development planning has received very little attention in the academic literature. Most of the attention in academe and published reports from contract research has focused on the five-year strategic Development Plan (IDP) (see inter alia Harrison, 2001, 2002; Todes, 2004; Meicklejohn & Coetzee, 2003; Williams, 2005; Visser, 2001 and Oranje, 2002a, 2003c). While this work has by default tended to also touch on coordination, integration and alignment between spheres and sectors, it has not explored or recorded these concepts in particular, or the way in which they have been conceptualised, legally entrenched or pursued.
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Internationally there is of course a whole body of knowledge that deals with the concept of ‘intergovernmental relations’ and similar constructs such as ‘joint-up planning’ and ‘multi-level governance and planning’ on a myriad of levels, ranging from that of the European Union to the local (see Faludi, 2002, 2003a, 2003b; de Rooij, 2002; Faludi & Waterhout, 2002; Albrechts et al., 2003; Gualini, 2003 and Horgan, 2002, 2004). Of late a number of these papers (notably those by Faludi & Albrechts et al.) have also stressed the use and limits of spatial planning in drawing together the myriad of investment and spending decisions of an ever-growing number of role-players in space. As interesting and useful as these papers may be, they are all focused on, and products of the unique constitutional and legal paradigms in which they are located, with none of them dealing specifically with the unique South African situation.

This dearth of information on the local situation requires attention, not only as a crucial phase in the development of the new planning system in South Africa is going by unrecorded, but also as the wealth of learning that can be gained from the local situation for the benefit of an international audience is not being harnessed. In this paper a slice of the gap is filled by providing a cursory overview of the way in which the concept of ‘intergovernmental development planning’ has been conceptualised and pursued, both through the legal and policy frameworks that have been put in place by government since April 1994, as well as by ‘actors in the machine’. In this pursuit, as such the paper rests on a historical analysis and categorisation of findings, presented in a narrative style. The findings on which the narrative is built are the result of analysis of relevant texts, including policy and legal documents, personal interviews and the involvement of authors in many of these initiatives (see e.g. Adam & Oranje, 2002; CSIR, 2006, 2007; Oranje, 2002a, 2003b; Harrison, 2002; Rauch, 2002; Oranje et al., 2003, 2000; van Huyssteen & Meyer, 2003; Robinson et al., 2003 and Oranje & van Huyssteen, 2004).

In terms of structure the article starts off with the democratic transition in the middle-1990s and ends (for now) in mid-2007. This is followed by a discussion on key trends in intergovernmental coordination, integration and alignment in the South African context as deduced from the narrative. The article is rounded off with a brief conclusion in which an optimistic view on the prospects of these endeavours, based on promising recent developments, is voiced.

2. THE NARRATIVE

2.1 New modes of governance and governing

Both internationally and at home, the era in which South Africa embarked on its first footsteps of democracy, was marked by the demise of the simple modes of government and ‘governance’ and the introduction of new levels and spheres of government with their own often, as yet un- and under-articulated modes of governance (see inter alia Wong, 2001: iii; Hodos, 2002: 365; Allmendinger, 2001b; Sellers, 2002: 623; Lloyd & Ilsey, 1999; Shaw, 1999: 273; Simmons, 1999: 164; Nedovic-Budic, 2001: 44 and Gilg & Kelly, 2000: 275). Often this also resulted in an increase in the number of government entities planning and investing in the same geographical space and taking decisions that have impacts on spaces outside their areas of jurisdiction (Cameron & Ndhlovu, 2001: 334; Faludi, 2003a, 2003b; Allmendinger, 2001b; Roberts, 1999: v and Wong, 2001: iv). In the case of South Africa with its intricate Constitution — quasi-federal in form, but unitary in function — this resulted in an intensive process of crafting new forms of intergovernmental development planning (in terms of institutions and procedures) to use its newly established semi-autonomous, independent three spheres of government to achieve pressing development objectives. In practice this meant that intergovernmental processes of prioritisation, resource allocation and implementation to achieve shared development objectives in the same territory/geographical space had to be conceptualised, codified, implemented and made to work.4

Achieving this was not going to be an easy task, as in the five decades of apartheid rule preceding the democratic transition in the middle-1990s, planning in South Africa was practised along clearly defined lines in clearly demarcated, isolated boxes created by apartheid legislation, with as its primary concerns being control and giving spatial expression to the ideology of apartheid (see Oranje, 1998a and Oosthuizen, 2001). Provinces and municipalities were administrative entities, organised in a hierarchical format in relation to an all-powerful central state, and subservient to its objectives. In addition to their already curtailed manouevring space the activities of municipalities were severely constrained by artificial race-based divisions of otherwise functionally integrated activities and spaces. While planning for Whites was comprehensively and meticulously done in terms of legislation based on primarily British and North American planning systems, planning for Africans was done in a fragmented and incomplete way by national government departments and discredited Bantustan authorities (see Muller, 1983 and Mabin & Smit, 1992). Only towards the end of the life of the regime (in the second half of the 1980s) did provinces also begin to play a role in the planning of areas set aside for Africans, especially with regards to planning for housing (see Oranje, 1998a: 234).

It was against this backdrop that the first tentative steps out of the old and into the new were taken with the adoption of the 1993-Interim Constitution, a product of the negotiations with the federally inclined National Party, and a last ditch

---

3 ‘Governance’ can be described as the complex interactions between state institutions and a diversity of role-players in the management/governing of public affairs (see Finders, 2002). It has also been defined as ‘... the action, manner or system of governing in which the boundary between organizations and public and private sector has become permeable ... The essence of governance is the interactive relationship between and within government and non-governmental forces’ (Rakodi, 2001: 216). See Pinson (2002) for a detailed exposition of the differences between “government” and “governance”.

4 In countries with federal constitutions, such as Australia, Belgium and Canada, as well as in “unbundling unitary ones”, such as the United Kingdom, one outcome of this has been a move towards the development of intergovernmental agreements between various levels/spheres of government on a wide range of issues affecting more than one level/tier or sphere, or sector of government (see Wayenberg, undated; McEwen, 2003; Horgan, 2002 and 2004; UTS Centre, 2000 and Samson, 2002).
attempt to secure the participation of the predominantly KwaZulu-Natal based Inkatha Freedom Party in the 1994-elections (Muthien, 1998 and Oranje, 2003a). In terms of this Constitution nine new provinces were created with:

- certain exclusive powers and functions and
- a range of shared competencies with national government. This signified a novel departure from the strong unitary state the African National Congress (ANC) had had in mind (see ANC, 1992: 45).

The ANC had at first envisaged a unitary state with limited powers devolved to the regions, and where the centre held concurrent and overriding powers over the regions. Through the process of negotiations, the ANC had to cede increasing powers to the regions (Muthien 1998: 77).

Through the retention of strong fiscal powers at the centre, the powers of the provinces were however kept in check (Khosa, 1998: 129; Robinson, 1995 and Bird & Smart, 2002: 905).

2.2 Going local (sideways)

The next key paragraph in the unfolding narrative was the passing of the Local Government Transition Act, 1993, which for the first time in the country’s history created multi-racial, multi-party transitional interim urban and rural local councils, with their powers remaining those granted to them in legislation passed by either national or provincial government, or devolved to them from the two other spheres of government (Republic of South Africa, 1993). This was followed by the first democratic elections held on the 27th of April 2004, in which the ANC achieved a huge majority and immediately set out to give effect to its Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) in which government would perform the role of a third sphere ‘Developmental State’ (see ANC, 1994). In terms of this model national government would drive the reconstruction and transformation project from the centre, while provinces and municipalities play supporting, ancillary roles.

One of the first actions in giving effect to this vision entailed the setting up of a central RDP Office, followed by similar offices and units in national line departments, provincial governments and municipalities. This was very much an action driven from a belief that there was adequate goodwill in the country to many disparate backgrounds and perspectives on the future behind a collective unifying vision of an ideal, ‘shared future’. In the following two years government put in place a number of new Acts and policies, in so doing laying the foundation for the massive reconstruction and development project it had in mind (see Platzky, 1998a: 8 and 1998b: 5). Key amongst these was the Development Facilitation Act, 1995 (DFA), which inter alia:

- put in place a set of normative guidelines to guide all planning and land development actions (a first for the country) and
- provided for municipal strategic planning in the form of Land Development Objectives (LDOs). These LDOs had as their explicit aim the targeted and programmed healing of the scars, divisions and inequalities created by apartheid in settlements throughout the country (see Oranje, 1998b and Republic of South Africa, 1995). They were, however, still subject to provincial approval, to some extent a response to the reality that many of the interim councils were still dominated by conservative white political parties (Personal interview: Bernisford, Stephen; interview March 1998). However understandable the action was, it essentially maintained the ‘big brother’ relationship that had existed between provinces and municipalities during the apartheid years.

Running diametrically opposed to the positive intent of the Act, the DFA resulted in a ‘New Regionalist furor’ around the powers and functions of provinces vis-à-vis those of national government in the two provinces that were not ANC-controlled at the time — the Western Cape and KwaZulu-Natal (Oranje, 2003a: 78). This led to an intergovernmental squabble and intensive debate on the right of provinces to pass their own planning legislation and the pros and cons of such actions (Oranje, 2003a: 80). Important for this narrative, it also clearly established the fact that intergovernmental relations were not going to be a conflict-free environment in which benevolence would reign.

2.3 Some tentative prods and composite maps from the centre

At about the same time (circa 1996) the national Department of Trade and Industry launched a programme of Spatial Development Initiatives (SDIs), which entailed the focused and coordinated investment of State infrastructure in specific nodes and/or corridors in areas with [perceived] massive latent potential, in so doing hoping to tempt the private sector into doing likewise (Platzky, 1998a: 4) and a belief that lessons for the development of other areas with latent potential could be learnt from these SDI-pilots. The SDIs, however, also sparked intergovernmental tension, as it was argued that the SDIs were prepared in the absence of negotiation with affected provinces and municipalities. Again this initiative in no uncertain terms signalled a rough ride in intergovernmental relations, even between office bearers in the same political party.

During this time (circa 1995/6) the RDP Office launched another initiative at ensuring greater spatial integration in infrastructure investment between the three spheres of government, in particular between provinces and the national government, by preparing the National Physical Development Framework (see Oranje, 1998a: 186). This framework was essentially little more than a GIS-map indicating the location of major current and envisaged public investments by provincial and national government. The initiative ground to a halt, largely as a result of a lacklustre attitude towards the process from the side of provinces. At play here was a clear indication from provinces, barely three years old, that they were willing and able to flex their muscles, in this case by shuffling their feet in intergovernmental relations when and where it did not suit them.
2.4 From national reconstruction to ‘local developmentalism’

During the first half of 1996 the RDP Office closed down, but not the ideal of reconstruction and development, or that of the Developmental State, which now took on a new dimension. Key to its new form was:

- the concept of decentralised development planning, coupled with
- the policy imperative of ensuring collaboration, coordination and integration in and between the three spheres of government (see Harrison, 2002).

Both these ideas were in line with the 1996 Constitution, which:

- enshrined the notions of cooperative governance, and government as ‘one entity consisting of three interdependent spheres’ and not levels/tiers;
- maintained the increased powers and functions of provinces as granted in the interim 1993 Constitution — largely the result, not of pressure by opposition parties as in the negotiations between 1990 and 1993, but of national government not wanting to alienate ANC-administrations in the provinces; and
- endowed local government with a novel and specific developmental role (see Oranje, 2003a).

Even more importantly, this role was granted in terms of the Constitution and not assigned to it by legislation passed in one of the other spheres (Republic of South Africa, 1996b). The notion of ‘developmental local government’ in the Constitution did not end here and was later given further substance in the White Paper on Local Government, 1998 and the Municipal Systems Act, 2000. In accordance with this new intergovernmental development planning ethos local government was to become the main/frontline planning arm of government, provinces would support and monitor this activity, and national government would create the framework of norms and standards in which these developmental actions would be played out. Collectively, and with each sphere fulfilling its specific mandate, the actions of the three spheres would dovetail into a joint governmental effort aimed at achieving key developmental objectives for the country.

Not only was the developmental role a novel departure for local governments, but also the kind of planning that was to be done. In contrast to the traditional roles of development control and the sector-based land use, transport and infrastructure master planning of the past, a different approach to planning was proposed. Called ‘integrated development planning and culminating in an Integrated Development Plan (IDP), this new ‘integrated’ style of planning, which had semblances of similar tendencies in the international planning arena (see Harrison, 2002 and Oranje et al., 2000), was meant to:

- be holistic, span and integrate all sectors though a focus on cross-cutting issues;
- assist in reintegrating the fragmented landscapes and communities left in the wake of apartheid;
- facilitate economic development, primarily through a focus on Local Economic Development (LED); and
- ensure that projects and programmes contained in the plans were included in the budgets of the municipalities and/or provincial and national sector departments (see the Municipal Systems Act, 2000 in Republic of South Africa, 2000 and Jewell & Howard, 2000: 2).

In essence this new approach entailed a deft exercise in balancing:

- equity and efficiency;
- strategic planning, speedy delivery and extensive public participation; and
- local and technical knowledge traditions.

Along with the rise of the New Public Management’s battle cries of ‘good governance’ and ‘urban management’ in South Africa as elsewhere (see inter alia Healey, 1997; Southall & Wood, 1996: 51; Asibuo, 1998: 152; Harrison, 2001; Mabin, 2000; Post, 1997: 348 and SAPC, 1998: 26), IDPs, linked to a municipality’s Performance Management System, would also provide the frameworks/business plans in terms of which municipalities were to be managed and the performance of municipal officials and councillors assessed. And, in the spirit of cooperative governance, IDPs were also meant to play a key role in ensuring greater intergovernmental cooperation, integration and alignment. Not only were they conceptualised as the inventories of local needs and lists of desired projects and programmes, but they were also viewed as the tools by which intergovernmental relations could be strengthened by providing arenas for representatives from the different spheres to come together and debate issues of shared concern and ways of addressing them. In the case of municipalities this was especially important, as the absence of fiscal devolution in the Constitution — a downside for municipalities of the compromise reached during the discussions on the new dispensation in the early 1990s — meant that there would be little chance of addressing the huge developmental needs as articulated in their IDPs from own funds (Muthien, 1998).

2.5 A rocky start for IDP Version I

Between 1997 and 1999 the preparation of the first IDPs got underway. Generally this was a far cry from what had been envisaged. This was largely as a result of IDPs having been legislated in the absence of an enabling and guiding policy framework and the legacy of a past in which municipalities were geared for administration and service delivery and not for taking the lead in [local] development. With specific reference to the subject mat-

---

5 The Local Government Transition Act Second Amendment Act, 1996, required of all municipalities in the country to prepare IDPs and 2000 and a set of requirements regarding plans for housing provision in terms of the Housing Act, 1997.
8 It differed from the ESDP in a number of ways as well. Key amongst this was that it proposed a mechanism by which intergovernmental collaboration in planning and decision-making could take place, and that the NSDP departed from the more traditional place-based search for balance and equity in regional planning as signified in the ESDP to a more people-based search for equity (see Oranje, 2002 and also Faludi & Waterhout, 2002, on the ‘history’ of the ESDP).

9 This is now (2007) down to 283 due to the disestablishment of the Bothaibela District Municipality in 2006.
and Constitutional Development, 1998). This was followed in 2000 by the Municipal Systems Act, in terms of which a new breed of IDPs was to be prepared, reviewed, managed and implemented. In addition to that the role of IDPs in deepening democracy by:

- securing far more involvement and partnering in municipal strategic planning;
- improving municipal management; and
- improving intergovernmental collaboration through participation in the preparation and review of IDPs, was emphasised.

As for the province-local relationship, the role of province as big brother made place for provincial monitoring, support and guidance in the preparation and review of these plans. And again the national Department of Provincial and Local Government embarked on a process of extensive capacity building and launched a series of detailed Guide Packs (Volume 0 to 6) to assist municipalities in the preparation and annual review of their IDPs. While many described them as useful, serious concerns were also expressed about their stifling impact on creativity and local ingenuity (see Adam & Oranje, 2002).

2.8 Enter the pervasive “lack of intergovernmental coordination, integration and alignment”

Despite all these efforts the outcomes and impact were in most cases still disappointing. While stakeholder participation improved significantly in most municipalities, with representatives from communities, local politicians, traditional leaders and officials from municipalities coming together to carve out a shared understanding of the challenges facing them and the instruments that needed to be developed to address these, intergovernmental collaboration in planning remained a long way off from the Constitutional ideal (see inter alia Oranje et al, 2003; Adam & Oranje, 2002; MCA Planners & Oranje, 2003; Rauch, 2002 and Harrison, 2002). In many localities municipalities were still fighting a lone developmental battle, with provincial and national sector departments responding in a lukewarm way to:

- calls for collaboration in planning processes and
- for consideration of the proposals captured in IDPs in their development, sector and financial planning.

Where provincial and national line departments sent representatives to workshops/meetings, these were often young, inexperienced officials lacking in decision-making powers (see Adam & Oranje, 2002). In others, municipalities found their calls for collaboration from the two other spheres going largely unanswered, only to find unannounced, uncoordinated and uncalled for spurs of investment by national and provincial sector departments in their municipal areas, often in a desperate last-minute dash to spend budgets (see Oranje et al, 2003). Such inconsiderate and ad hoc actions resulted in a lack of continuity and limited development of intergovernmental networks and institutions. In numerous cases municipalities had to embark on the almost impossible task of sourcing funding for projects and programmes based on local priorities from national and provincial sector departments with different (nationally determined) targets, sets of priorities and accompanying funding regimes. In general, the ideal, envisaged cooperative intergovernmental development model by which the provincial and national spheres would budget for, and provide funds for the implementation of proposals captured in local IDPs, did not materialise. While provinces clearly were in most cases not ‘coming to the table’, this state of affairs contributed to, and was exacerbated by, a general lack of financial planning in most IDPs. In a number of IDPs the ‘financial plan’ seemed to be focussed on seeking funding from provincial and national budgets without an indication of the size of the fund that was to be targeted, nor any certainty of what had been earmarked for spending by line departments or state owned enterprises in the municipal area (Adam & Oranje, 2002).

This situation remained the case up to the present (mid-2007), despite numerous calls emanating from the Presidential Coordinating Council (PCC)10 for national and provincial sector departments to direct and align investment in format, place and time as called for in the IDPs (see DPLG, 2005; CSIR, 2006, 2007 and The Presidency, 2006). Lack of engagement with parastatals and the private sector also resulted in similar outcomes, with investments by these role players in many municipalities not taking place in accordance with IDPs. As for the much vaunted alignment, this in most cases meant little more than a checklist style assessment by Provinces of:

- the extent to which municipalities had considered provincial policies and strategies in the IDPs; and
- legal compliance of the IDPs with the requirements as set out in the Municipal Systems Act, 2000, and the 2001 Regulations passed in terms of this Act.

In many instances municipalities were reprimanded months after submitting their IDPs to these provincial departments for the shortcomings in their plans without the offer of assistance to address the [often valid] areas of concern. Of the legally-required “provincial monitoring and support of IDPs”, little transpired, with only certain provinces, notably the Western Cape and KwaZulu-Natal, providing municipal capacity building and support. This not only left municipalities out at sea with their IDPs, but has also been blamed for municipalities becoming inwardly focused and in losing sight of bigger national and provincial development challenges (see Oranje & van Huyssteen, 2004). To complicate matters further, in the local sphere the lack of an arrangement regarding powers and functions of district and local municipalities led to growing intergov-

---

10 The PCC, which comprises the President, the Minister for Provincial and Local Government and the nine Premiers, seeks to ensure alignment and integration between actions of common interest to the three spheres of government (Government Communications, 2001). The PCC has over the last couple of years taken a number of decisions regarding the role and importance of IDPs in the broader system of intergovernmental development planning. Recently it also called on provinces to complete the review of their PGDSs and to work closer with municipalities to ensure greater coordination, integration and alignment in planning, budgeting, implementation and the monitoring of government programmes.
governmental tensions and the souring of relations, which detracted from the developmental promise of IDPs (Adam & Oranje, 2002; Harrison, 2002 and MCA Planners & Oranje, 2003).

Fully aware of all these shortcomings the DPLG embarked on a process (circa 2001/2) of setting up Planning, Implementation and Management Support (PIMS) Centres in district municipalities in a joint venture between itself, foreign donors and the host municipalities. The primary aim of these centres, which were located at the district municipal level, was to act as a key point of integration of the actions of national, provincial and municipal governments by providing support with the preparation, implementation management, monitoring and review of IDPs (see DPLG, 2002). In many districts these centres played a strong role in district and local municipal integration and in setting up meetings between officials in the three spheres of government (DPLG, 2002 and see also Adam & Oranje, 2002).

Within this context of:

- newly established municipal and provincial government structures,
- the introduction of the novel development and planning approach and supporting systems,
- efforts aimed at ensuring the opening up of professions and
- the speeding up of affirmative action in municipalities and provinces, DPLG also embarked on a programme of skills development and capacity building throughout the country (DPLG, 2000).

At about the same time (the end of 2000) the DPLG embarked on the process of establishing a Web-based ‘IDP Nerve Centre’ with the aim of providing municipalities with critical development information from the other spheres of government, and vice versa. It was also envisaged that it would house copies of every municipal IDP for use by the other sectors of government and neighbouring municipalities.

2.9 Provinces, some pushed, others pulled, state their strategies

In the provincial domain, a number of provinces embarked on the process of preparing so-called Provincial Growth and Development Strategies (PGDSs) in accordance with their powers to do so in terms of the 1996-Constitution (Oranje & Biermann, 2002). As these strategies were in most cases located in one of the sector departments in the provincial governments, other provincial sector departments and national line departments generally did not acknowledge or use them, and municipalities generally did not consider them when preparing their IDPs (Adam & Oranje, 2002). This resulted in a lack of implementation of these provincial plans, further exacerbating the uncoordinated nature of local government planning proposals and infrastructure investment and development spending in provinces (Oranje & van Huyssteen, 2004).

Also in the provincial sphere, departments dealing with planning and local government to set up forums comprising of representatives from all sector departments and in most cases district and metropolitan municipalities (Adam & Oranje, 2002). Generally the envisaged role of these forums was to:

- ensure greater collaboration of sector departments in the process of IDP preparation in the municipalities in the province;
- align the infrastructure investment and development spending actions in the various provincial sector plans with those proposed in the IDPs in the province;
- ensure greater incorporation of proposals captured in IDPs in the sector plans and budgets of provincial sector departments;
- ensure greater coordination and integration in the implementation of provincial sector plans with the implementation of IDPs; and
- monitor and support municipal development initiatives.

These mechanisms had mixed results. In many provinces irregular meetings, weak attendance, fluctuating membership, lack of leadership, power-struggles, an unclear mandate and a perceived or actual lack of power of such structures meant that they did not live up to the expectations. In a number of cases physical distance, such as that between the officials in the provincial capital and dispersed district municipalities, also worked contra the good intentions. However, where taken seriously and used as intended, these structures proved to be invaluable in ensuring intergovernmental collaboration (Adam & Oranje, 2002).

2.10 Another “new dawn” for intergovernmental alignment

Amidst all of this (circa 2001/2) the draft NSDP was discussed in senior government circles where it got the thumbs up from many quarters, but also elicited grave critiques, especially for its perceived urban bias and its use, definition and/or mapping of the concept of development potential, which was seen as relegating certain areas of the country to a certain death. Three years would drag on without the perspective getting Cabinet approval when, somewhat unexpectedly, Cabinet endorsed the NSDP at the January 2003 Cabinet Lekgotla and called on all provincial governments and national line departments to comment on the perspective. While the NSDP now enjoyed ‘official status’, its existence was not well communicated and hence did not start feeding into planning and decision-making processes regarding infrastructure investment and development spending.

Nine years into the new democracy (early 2003) earlier concerns regarding the lack of integration and coordination remained largely unaddressed, and a consensus began to emerge that the required scale of development would not be achieved in the country in the absence of effective intergovernmental relations. This led to:

- the preparation of a Bill and policy document on Intergovernmental Relations by DPLG, which proposed the introduction of a system of intergovernmental development planning and the creation of a number of intergovernmental structures and procedures to assist in establishing and maintaining effective intergovernmental relations and support the envisaged intergovernmental development planning system; and
The Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) is both a reflection of government's assessment of, and perspective on, key development challenges at a particular point in time, as well as a statement of intent as to the way it envisages addressing the challenges over the medium (three year) term. This statement of intent is then taken further and elaborated upon in the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), which sets out government's resource allocation to address the identified key developmental challenges in the three-year period. Together the MTSF and the MTEF provide a framework of development objectives and funding commitments in terms of which national and provincial line departments, provincial governments and municipalities have to do their planning and budgeting.

This framework, which is essentially a proposal for a chronological sequence of actions/steps in the planning cycles of the three spheres of government, was designed to integrate and align strategic planning processes in government (in the form of the Medium Term Strategic Framework) with financial planning (in the form of the Medium Term Expenditure Framework). It also made provision for linking up IDPs in the framework/system by requiring of provinces to submit reports to The Presidency and the Department of Provincial and Local Government that:

- contained summaries of all the IDPs prepared in their provinces and
- set out their plans and priorities that should have been informed by both the policy priorities of Cabinet and the municipal IDPs prepared in their province (The Presidency, 2002a and 2002b; and Government Communications, 2001).

While the documentation on the Framework set out the time frames in which certain steps have to be completed, it did not specify the detail regarding the format and content of the information that had to be submitted or reported on.

Research conducted on skills requirements and capacity constraints in support of integrated development planning also highlighted the critical need for, and importance of, intergovernmental coordination and alignment (Van Huyssteen & Meyer, 2003). Standards developed and accepted for qualifications in the field (i.e., the Unit standards for the Learnership and Certificate-course in Municipal Integrated Development Planning respectively by the LGWSETA and DPLG in 2005) therefore subsequently required that substantial components of capacity building initiatives and training material had to be devoted to understanding and streamlining coordinated intergovernmental resource allocation, prioritisation, implementation and monitoring.

Towards the end of 2003 government published its Towards a Ten Year Review (The Presidency, 2003). In this document it highlighted the huge successes it had achieved in improving the lives of the previously disadvantaged, but stressed that more had to be done to:

- address the huge challenges, such as the dual economy, still facing the country;
- and consolidate the gains that were made (see The Presidency, 2003 and Oranje, 2003b).

Concern was also expressed about the lack of a unifying vision such as the one that had ensured the peaceful transition back in 1994 (The Presidency, 2003).

2.11 The new mantra: Intergovernmental dialogue, understanding and agreement

Roughly about the same time the DPLG commissioned an analysis of the South African Planning Framework and the challenges facing intergovernmental coordination in response to an instruction from Cabinet (Orange & van Huyssteen, 2004). Work on this analysis included an assessment of the effectiveness of existing planning and resource allocation instruments in all spheres of government and lead to the preparation of a protocol in support of intergovernmental planning (Oranje & van Huyssteen, 2004) and the introduction of the concept of ‘Intergovernmental Development Agreements’, for which there is a precedent in the Australian system (see UTS Centre, 2000 and Samson, 2002). These agreements are meant to ensure focused and joint action by the three spheres of government in shared geographical spaces or ‘impact zones’ — the 46 district and 6 metropolitan municipalities in the country. In terms of the proposal it was envisaged that national and provincial sector departments would take responsibility for:

- driving the preparation and signing of the Agreement in parallel with the processes of IDP and PGDS preparation and review; and
- capturing the contents of such an Agreement in a way accessible to all roleplayers.

In addition to these agreements the DPLG commissioned the preparation of Guidelines on the engagement between municipalities and provincial government early in 2003 (DPLG, 2003). The aim of these guidelines was to ensure:

- more productive intergovernmental collaboration between municipalities and provinces and
- to make the engagement process less of a ‘checklist affair.’ Increasingly so, municipalities amongst themselves, municipalities and provincial line departments and national line departments, provinces and municipalities set up structures and systems by which they could share information, work together and reach agreements on collaboration with the aim of

---

11 The Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) is both a reflection of government’s assessment of, and perspective on, key development challenges at a particular point in time, as well as a statement of intent as to the way it envisages addressing the challenges over the medium (three year) term. This statement of intent is then taken further and elaborated upon in the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), which sets out government’s resource allocation to address the identified key developmental challenges in the three-year period. Together the MTSF and the MTEF provide a framework of development objectives and funding commitments in terms of which national and provincial line departments, provincial governments and municipalities have to do their planning and budgeting.
achieving shared development objectives (Oranje & van Huyssteen, 2004).

In order to address challenges related to pressures for development, the relative infancy of the local government system and the need for a sound platform for cooperative governance, the DPLG put out a tender for targeted IDP Support in 2003, within the context of a broader National Capacity Building Strategy for local government. Work on this project kicked off early in 2004, with assessments by the CSIR (in the establishment phase of the project), once again indicating that the success of municipal integrated development planning and service delivery was largely dependent on effective intergovernmental cooperation (see CSIR, 2006: 11). In the light of this, the initial project focus on municipal support was expanded to also include support to provincial departments dealing with municipal integrated development planning. The actual project, aimed at enhancing the ‘Integrated Development Planning System’ at both provincial and municipal levels, including various forms of capacity building and support, was rolled out during 2004 and 2005 throughout the country (see CSIR, 2006: 12).

2.12 Harmonisation and alignment and/via the return of ‘space’

The need for integration and alignment was, however, not only recognised and dealt with by officials who often felt that theirs was an unseen cause, but also by the President, who in his State of the Nation Address on 21 May 2004, following on from the ANC’s landslide election victory earlier that month, specifically mentioned the critical need for coordination and integration between the three spheres of government to strengthen the developmental impact of the State. In support of the President’s commitment, the Presidency launched an initiative known as the Harmonisation and Alignment Project in September of that year to ensure that municipal IDPs, PGDSs and the NSDP would be harmonised and aligned by the end of that year.

Whereas earlier studies had already made clear statements to this effect (see Oranje et al., 2003, Rauch, 2002, Oranje & van Huyssteen, 2004), workshops held in the course of the project in each of the nine provinces clearly indicated that a continued focus on integration and coordination procedures in itself would not result in the desired outcome (The Presidency, 2004). As a direct result of this, the report prepared after completion of the project [boldly] stated that:

...a consensus-position is developing, which holds that coordinated government priority setting, resource allocation and implementation requires:

- alignment of strategic development priorities and approaches in all planning and budgeting processes;
- a shared agreement on the nature and characteristics of the space economy; and

In the proposal resulting from this initiative (which also included consultations with district and metropolitan municipalities, sector departments and the offices of the Premier in the respective provinces) the NSDP was posited as providing such a framework to discuss/deliberate the future development of the national space economy. With this perspective as base it was subsequently argued that, prioritisation and resource allocation by the three spheres of government [has to be] aligned in the preparation and review of PGDSs and IDPs through:

- Reaching agreement on the spatial location of development potential and need/poverty in provinces and district/metropolitan municipalities;
- Aligning infrastructure investment and development spending in the 47 district and 6 metropolitan municipalities in accordance with the NSDP principles in this regard; and
- Mutually monitoring and assessing government development planning and implementation” (The Presidency, 2004: 12).

Key to ensuring such alignment was the use of ‘space’ and that which happens (and not) in space as arena for stating, contesting, mediating and crafting agreement on investment and development spending — a notion inter alia supported by the experience in area-based initiatives in the KwaZulu-Natal province (see Masson et al., 2004).

2.13 The IDP Hearings and Intergovernmental Structures to the rescue

During this time (2004/5) a good working relationship developed between DPLG and the Presidency out of which emerged a growing focus on not only pursuing integration through alignment of process, and the building of the capacity of officials and councilors, but also the pursuit of tangible, material improvements in the lived experiences of people. A direct outcome of this ‘new’ focus on material outcomes saw the conceptualisation of IDP Hearings towards the end of 2004 in each of the nine provinces. Initially the focus was clear — to determine whether IDPs had made any material change in the lives of people, and why (not)? The title of ‘hearings’ also spills out in no uncertain terms what the tone of the interaction was to be. As the actual ‘hearings’ came closer the tone changed and DPLG adopted a softer approach, referring to the meetings as ‘intergovernmental engagements’ without changing the name of the events — these still being referred to as ‘hearings.” During these events which took place between April and June 2005 senior managers and politicians from district and metropolitan municipalities and provinces were ‘questioned’ by a panel of experts in a number of areas related to local government planning, budgeting and implementation. Appointed by the Minister of Provincial and Local Government, senior officials from DPLG and the Presidency, Provincial Heads of Departments, and representatives from SALGA, the DBSA and national sector departments (see DPLG, 2005).

The IDP Hearings once again highlighted the need for improved intergovernmental coordination and the complex challenges faced by municipalities in:

- delivering services in a sustainable way;

---

• meeting national development objectives; and
• facilitating the development of sustainable human settlements and viable local economies (DPLG, 2005).

In addition to this they also strengthened the focus on the strategic role of the district and metropolitan IDPs in organising service delivery in their areas of jurisdiction and in directing and facilitating economic growth and development in the pursuit of national targets (DPLG, 2005). What also emerged from these sessions, and which was in essence nothing new, as it had already emerged in the Harmonisation and Alignment Project in 2004, was the need for stronger guidance from provincial governments for infrastructure investment and development spending for provincial sector departments and municipalities through their Provincial Growth and Development Strategies.  

This resulted in the publication of a non-statutory set of guidelines on:

• the process of drafting these provincial strategies and
• their content, aimed at improving the PGDSs in a joint initiative by The Presidency and DPLG in mid-2005 (see The Presidency, 2005).

In a process of self, peer (counterparts from other provinces in similar positions) and independent assessments, existing PGDSs where evaluated using these guidelines. Key recommendations emanating from the exercise included requirements for:

• a more robust and rigorous analysis of the provincial space economy;
• strategic engagement on the development trajectory of provinces and contextualisation of the NSDP principles;
• the making of trade-offs and strategic choices; and
• positioning the PGDS at the highest political level (The Presidency, 2005).

During the IDP hearings the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 2005 that DPLG had been working on from the middle of 2003 onwards, but which had drifted off the radar for some time, was passed by Parliament. The Act primarily gave content to Chapter 3 of the 1996-Constitution dealing with Cooperative Governance, essentially by placing an obligation on municipalities and provinces to create a set of structures/forums to facilitate intergovernmental relations. While the Act was welcomed by many, it was a far cry from the Bill which, as indicated earlier on in this narrative, had a whole chapter devoted to putting in place a system of intergovernmental development planning from the national to the local sphere, with structures and forums ‘playing a supporting role’ to this intergovernmental development planning process. Without this planning system the structures stood every chance of becoming structuring structures and having meetings without any real, substantive developmental challenges to address via the planning apparatus.

Later that year (2005) DPLG also embarked on a process of reviewing the Municipal Systems Act to ensure that this crucial piece of legislation reflected the ‘new thinking’ around the strategic role of the District and Metropolitan IDP, and to assist municipalities in preparing ‘more credible IDPs.’ This process continued into the following year (2006), and saw the development of a framework around what constitutes a more credible IDP and the appointment of a legal expert and a number of planning experts to assist the department in this endeavour. However, by mid-2007 no amendment to the existing Act, or a new Act had emerged. According to officials in the department the process had been placed on hold pending a much bigger process of reform of the state architecture of a highly sensitive nature and involving the very nature, powers and functions, and functioning of the 1996-Constitution.

2.14 The NSDP updated and contextualised in a select number of districts

From its side The Presidency, taking the view that the NSDP has to provide the platform for intergovernmental dialogue and decision-making on infrastructure investment and development spending at municipal, provincial and national level, undertook the update of the 2003-NSDP, resulting in the publication of the updated NSDP 2006 in May 2007.  

While presenting a far more nuanced reading of the national space economy than the 2003-NSDP on the back of more advanced mapping techniques, the NSDP 2006 by and large retained the initial normative principles of the 2003-NSDP, as well as its basic logic.

Running in tandem with this review, The Presidency embarked on a pilot process during the middle of 2006 aimed at contextualising the NSDP in District and Metro areas and to seek to in the process, position and use district and metropolitan areas as shared areas of intergovernmental coordination, and explore ways in which the district/municipal IDP could become more credible by reflecting the development plans of the three spheres of government (The Presidency, 2006). Thirteen district municipalities, supported by project teams participated in the first phase roll out. An early learning report from the project has (once again) highlighted the challenges involved in focussing intergovernmental debate around a specific geographical area within the context of the NSDP principles (CSIR, 2007: 23). More importantly, however, it demonstrated the value that spatial guidelines and a shared, robust understanding of development challenges and priorities in a ‘shared area of impact’ can add to intergovernmental development planning (CSIR, 2007: 26).

To conclude the story for now, in contrast to the tentative start in the middle-1990s, The Presidency was by mid-2007 arguing that national spatial guidelines were to be used as means to coordinate intergovernmental infrastructure investment and development spending. Furthermore it has

---

13 In accordance with the earlier Harmonisation and Alignment Framework developed as an outcome of the project the NSDP, PGDS and district and metropolitan IDPs were to form the spine of the strategic intergovernmental development planning circuit.

14 The status of the NSDP has been confirmed at the January and July 2006 Cabinet Lekgotlas.
argued that for these guidelines to play their part, a rigorous and robust analysis of the provincial and municipal areas is required, as these provide the base on which an intergovernmental dialogue could be had, with the NSDP-principles of need and development potential as structuring device. Through such interaction a shared understanding on the development challenges and prospects, as well as the development trajectory and future of the area could then be reached and strategic actions by the three spheres of government for the development of the area identified, resourced, programmed and undertaken. The contextualisation of the NSDP is set to continue, with further roll-outs planned for the latter half of 2007.

3. A REJOINER: MAIN TRENDS

In this overview a number of trends have been discerned:

- it has seemed that the new system of ‘spheres’, instead of tiers of government has not sunk in, is not understood, or is simply ignored. Furthermore, even though the system speaks of interdependence, the relationship is in practice very one-sided, with most municipalities dependent on provinces and state-owned enterprises, and the latter two not being tied in a similar dependency-relationship to municipalities. This reality has major implications for the underlying assumption that powerful players will feel or see the need for meeting with perceived less powerful ones, or actually take on board their proposals in their own plans or budgets — something which is simply not happening (see Rauch, 2002: 23; Khosa, 1998: 48 and Pieterse, 2002 for similar perspectives). Even recent attempts at changing this from the side of provinces, involving especially Offices of the Premier in district-wide planning, and measures forcing provincial sector departments to ensure that their infrastructure investment and development spending decisions are included in IDPs, has met with limited success. Instead it has in some cases resulted in provincial departments ‘blackmailing’ municipalities into including their projects in their IDPs without any consultation — failure to comply resulting in the investment simply not being made (CSIR, 2007). A culture of governance in which ‘a government of spheres’, and not levels or sectors prevails, is seemingly still some way off.

Power plays [in municipalities] are also not assisting the endeavour, as both anecdotal evidence and recent research suggests that powerful actors tend not to give the IDP-initiative, one of the cornerstones of the intergovernmental planning system, their full support if it is perceived to threaten existing power regimes/relations (see Homann, 2005: 167 and Coetzee, 2006). Likewise, the research suggests that the IDP is, due to the power it holds, abused to advance the interests of individuals or groups in municipalities (see Homann, 2005: 168 and Coetzee, 2006).

- it has seemed that the new system of ‘spheres’, instead of tiers of government has not sunk in, is not understood, or is simply ignored. Furthermore, even though the system speaks of interdependence, the relationship is in practice very one-sided, with most municipalities dependent on provinces and state-owned enterprises, and the latter two not being tied in a similar dependency-relationship to municipalities. This reality has major implications for the underlying assumption that powerful players will feel or see the need for meeting with perceived less powerful ones, or actually take on board their proposals in their own plans or budgets — something which is simply not happening (see Rauch, 2002: 23; Khosa, 1998: 48 and Pieterse, 2002 for similar perspectives). Even recent attempts at changing this from the side of provinces, involving especially Offices of the Premier in district-wide planning, and measures forcing provincial sector departments to ensure that their infrastructure investment and development spending decisions are included in IDPs, has met with limited success. Instead it has in some cases resulted in provincial departments ‘blackmailing’ municipalities into including their projects in their IDPs without any consultation — failure to comply resulting in the investment simply not being made (CSIR, 2007). A culture of governance in which ‘a government of spheres’, and not levels or sectors prevails, is seemingly still some way off.

- there is a clear lack of indigenous systems and institutions, or lack of recognition for such institutions in planning and governance processes. Over the last couple of years a definite attempt was made in a number of academic fields in South Africa to shift the gaze from Western models, worldviews and solutions to “the African” and the indigenous. Work in the planning field on this topic is a recent phenomenon and very little has been produced to date (for two of the papers in the field see Oranje, 2001 and Watson, 2002). Based on the very limited research base it could, however, be wagered that the institutions developed in, around, and for a more home-grown form of planning, learnt and took too little from the indigenous and could, as a result
of this, have contributed to the insufficient support for, and involvement in these institutions.

• there is a lack of a spatial dimension in the pursuit of intergovernmental coordination, integration and alignment. In many cases of municipal planning in South Africa spatial planning was/is more of an afterthought than a key part of the prioritisation and resource allocation in the preparation of municipal Integrated Development Plans and Provincial Growth and Development Strategies (see Harrison, 2002 and MCA Planners & Oranje, 2002). The powerful role that space can play as an integrator between the developmental actions of different actors has thus as yet not been adequately utilised (see Faludi, 2003a and 2003b and Albrechts et al., 2003).

• the fundamental lack of strategic direction, as well as differences between the planning instruments used in the various spheres frustrate the process of intergovernmental collaborative planning, and seem to be frustrating attempts at marrying them. While the various planning instruments (IDP, PGDS, NSDP and the Planning Framework) all share the same set of progressive development objectives, i.e. the eradication of past disparities and absolute poverty through basic service provision, human skills development, sustainable economic growth and the deepening of democracy, there is often very little, if any indication of strategic and context-specific initiatives and options. Instead the focus usually is on targets and projects and programmes aimed at achieving these.

Further to this, these instruments differ in terms of the timeframes in, and development approaches through which these objectives and targets are to be met. For example, the municipal IDPs have a five-year timeframe, PGDSs (in most cases) have a ten-year timeframe, the MTSF and the Planning Framework a three-year focus and the NSDP a more ‘timeless dimension.’ The various tools also differ on which of the objectives the specific focus falls, which frustrates alignment.

While the IDPs, PGDSs and NSDP have as an objective a more efficient, equitable and sustainable spatial configuration of human settlement and infrastructure investment and development spending than is currently the case, the scale at which this is envisaged to take place, varies. In practice this means, that irrespective of the fact that an area/region that may span a number of municipalities may be defined on the national/macro scale in the NSDP as ‘without potential’, a more local reading of the space economy may result in an identification of the same area/region as one of major significance for the local economy. Given that all municipalities have to, in terms of the Municipal Systems Act, 2000, prepare developmental strategies for their areas of jurisdiction, local political rationality, economic rationality and macro-political rationality would surely clash.

Another area of concern revolves around the level at which appropriate analyses can be done and intervention in economies be made. A large body of knowledge suggests that ‘the region’ is the appropriate level for sub-national economic planning, which would in most cases be an entity much larger and institutionally better capacitated than our local municipalities (see Boyle, 2000; Lechner & Dowling, 1999; Gualini, 2003 and Lazerzon & Lorenzoni, 1999). District municipalities might be better positioned (albeit in many cases also not adequately capacitated) to engage issues at this level, and come up with creative developmental strategies.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The first decade or so of intergovernmental coordination, integration and alignment in South Africa has not only seen a myriad of legal and policy action in its pursuit, but has also provided a fertile environment for learning about the ups and downs of such initiatives and the reasons for their trajectories. While the downs have by far outweighed the ups during this period there are promising signs that the tide is turning, with a new set of planning measures and instruments in the offing. Supporting these is a growing realisation of the grave consequences of inadequate levels of coordination, integration and alignment in and between spheres of government, as well as a ‘growing appreciation’ of their potential benefits. Key to these measures achieving their desired impact will, however, inter alia be the development and utilisation of indigenous institutions to assist in the reaching of shared understandings and binding agreements on:

• the strategic options/paths and priorities for regions (district and metropolitan municipalities), as well as

• the required resources from the various spheres of government to develop these localities in a sustainable and equitable way over a specified period of time (see Albrechts et al., 2003 and Faludi, 2003b for a similar position regarding planning in a European context).

In addition to this, it is important to ensure that each sphere, sector and state owned enterprise (at least) performs the planning functions it is responsible for competently (see Gilg & Kelly, 2000 for a similar perspective regarding planning in the UK).

That the effectiveness and efficiency of the State is high on the government agenda, even if this mean drastic interventions, is evident in recent announcements by the DPLG around re-evaluating the role of provinces, and in the process the State planning system. In so doing a repeat of what happened in the UK between 1997 and 2002 can be prevented, where through a process of decentralisation, or so-called “central government localism” (Jones, 1998: 960), a situation was created by which (by 2002) there were “… over 60 centrally prescribed plans and strategies that a ordinary local authority had to submit to central government!” (Stoker, 2002: 424).

15 It may of course by that, in terms of Giddens’ “structuration theory”, the involvement of Africans in these institutions will over time result in the Africanisation of these institutions, which should lead to the evolution of more acceptable and legitimate institutions, and greater support for, and involvement in them (see Giddens, 1984). The worrying question is, in terms of Giddens’ “structuration theory”, to which extent different individuals and groups are actually allowed to craft the institutions in which the various planning actions are framed, or whether the institutions are allowed to evolve.
At a time in which global warming and energy utilisation are fast making their way to the top of also the South African development planning agenda, intergovernmental coordination, integration and alignment is more important than ever before. Through the endeavours described in this narrative, it is evident that a new language and set of systems for intergovernmental collaborative planning is slowly but surely being developed, and even to some extent, implemented. At the same time numerous lessons are being learnt, which provide a very useful platform for enhanced and improved intergovernmental cooperation.
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