

A brief history of intergovernmental development planning in post-apartheid South Africa

Mark Oranje & Elsona van Huyssteen

Peer reviewed and revised

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.

'N KORT GESKIEDENIS VAN INTER-REGERINGS ONTWIKKELINGSBEPLANNING IN 'N POST-APARTHEID SUID-AFRIKA

Die artikel verskaf 'n oorsig van die post-apartheid ervaring met inisiatiewe deur die Suid-Afrikaanse regering om sterker inter-regeringsharmonisasie, koördinerende, integrasie en belyning te bewerkstellig in die tydperk 1994 tot 2007. Geskryf in 'n narratiewe formaat weef die artikel 'n weg tussen wetlike en beleidsraamwerke, tegniese en assesseringsverslae en akademiese publikasies oor die onderwerp. As sulks plaas dit nie net die fokus op die bedoelings van die regering soos vergestalt in wette en beleidstukke nie, maar verskaf ook 'n aanduiding van wat bereik is in hierdie tydperk en wat gedoen is om die gapings te oorbrug. Die narratief word gevolg deur 'n kort bespreking van hoofneigings geïdentifiseer in hierdie regerings-onderneming. Die artikel word afgesluit op 'n positiewe noot met die suggestie dat die gety aan die draai mag wees vir wat tot dusver 'n ontwykende ideaal was.

NALANE E KGUTSHWANYANE YA MERALO YA NTSHETSOPELE MAFAPHENG A MMUSO NAKONG YA AFRIKA BORWA E LOKOLOTSWENG KGETHOLLONG

Sepheo ka kgatiso ena ke ho nehelana ka kakaretso ya tseo mmuso wa Afrika Borwa o fetileng ho tsona nakong ya mekutu ya ona ya ho netefatsa hore ho ba le kamahanyo e ntle tshebetso ya mafapha a mmuso nakong ya 1994 ho fihla ho 2007. Jwalo ka ha le ngotswe ka mokgwa wa ho pheta pale, kgatiso ena e bua ka dintho tse jwalo ka meralo ya tshebetso le ya semolao, diphelelo tse ikgethileng le tsa tekolo mmoho le diphatlalatso tse mabapi le dingolwa tsa thuto. Ka hoo, kgatiso ena ha e totobatse feela maikemisetso a mmuso jwalo ka ha a hlahella ka hare ho Melao le Maano, empa hape e bontsha tse fihleletsweng nakong ena, le se entsweng ho kwala dikgeo tse teng. Ka mora ho qoqa pale ena, ho latela dipuisano tse kgutshwanyane tse mabapi le mekutu e hlauweng jwalo ka ha e hlahella maitekong ana. Kgatiso ena e phethelwa ka mokgwa o tshepisang, e leng o nang le pontsho ya hore e ka nna ya ba dintho jwale di fetohela botteng ho fihla maemong ao pele e neng e se a kgotsofatsang.

Prof. Mark Oranje, Head of Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, 0001, <mark.oranje@up.ac.za>.

Elsona van Huyssteen PhD-student, Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, 0001 and Principal Urban and Regional Planner, CSIR, Pretoria, 0001, <evhuyssteen@csir.co.za>.

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 plan required of municipalities in terms of legislation, the Integrated 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.

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'³ 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 & Illsey, 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 governing 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, interdependent 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 manoeuvring 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 Flinders, 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 way '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 simi-

lar 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 marry 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: Berrisford, 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 furore' 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 inter-

governmental 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, 1998b). Underlying this policy option was a realisation that "Big reconstruction and development without growth was not possible" (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),⁵ 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;⁶
- 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: 511; Asibuo, 1998: 152; Harrison, 2001; Mabin, 2000; Post, 1997: 348 and SACP, 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 (Republic of South Africa, 1996a). In terms of this Act IDPs were meant to ensure "... the integrated development and management of the area of jurisdiction of the municipality concerned in terms of its powers and duties..." and had to be compiled having regard to a set of equity, sustainability and efficiency-principles set out in the *Development Facilitation Act* (see Republic of South Africa, 1995).

⁶ The IDPs are also intended to reflect, capture or contain any other sectoral municipal planning requirement or plan in terms of sectoral legislation. These include, in terms of the *Water Services Act*, 1997, *Water Services Development Plans*, *Integrated Transport Plans* in terms of the *National Land Transport Act*, 2000 and a set of requirements regarding plans for housing provision in terms of the *Housing Act*, 1997.

ter of our narrative, it was especially in the area of:

- securing involvement of officials from the national and provincial spheres of government and in
- providing a vehicle for intergovernmental and inter-stakeholder debate that little transpired, other than sporadic spurts of provincial or national interaction, with no clear rationale or pattern.

In the end most IDPs became inventories of ambitious objectives and extensive lists of programmes and projects [in many cases never] to be implemented in the five-year time horizon of the plan. In response to this the DPLG, supported by a range of foreign donors (prominent amongst which was the German technical aid organisation GTZ), introduced national policy guidance and a range of capacity building initiatives. Notwithstanding this, IDPs remained a low-key event, viewed in many municipalities as just another of the [unimportant] Town Planning Section's overambitious plans (see Oranje *et al.*, 1999).⁷

2.6 National returns to the fray (somewhat)

While the IDPs were being attended to by the DPLG, the Office of the Deputy President launched an initiative to:

- explore the problem of uncoordinated infrastructure and investment spending and the resulting perpetuation of the apartheid space economy and
- generate guidelines to address it.

The outcome of the initiative was a draft set of *Spatial Guidelines for Infrastructure Investment and Development* (SGIID) in mid-1999, which never made it beyond the Office of the Deputy-President, followed at the end of 1999 by a far more elaborate and nuanced draft *National Spatial Development Perspective* (NSDP) (Merrifield, 2007: Personal interview). This output, which had some semblances with the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP),⁸ was conceived as

an indicative development perspective that would have Cabinet approval, but would not be legally binding.

The key components of this perspective were:

- a set of four normative principles to govern decisions to be adhered to by all spheres of government when making decisions on infrastructure investment and development spending;
- a set of electronic maps highlighting the development potential of every district in the country in terms of seven specified categories of development potential, as well as areas of poverty and need; and
- a mechanism by which intergovernmental collaboration in planning and implementation would be ensured. While the principles were not cast in stone, it was indicated in the perspective that those actors that chose to stray from them had to explain why they did so and on what their investment/spending decisions were based. The maps were also to be regularly updated and amended in accordance with feedback in the form of new data and grassroots-inputs received from provincial and national line departments and municipalities.

Key amongst the NSDP-principles was the concept that fixed investment should be focused in areas where the greatest development potential and greatest need coincide, and investment in people in areas with limited development potential. The NSDP thus placed the focus on "people and not place", arguing that the focus must be on eradicating inequalities between people and not on getting/making places [more] equal. A key reason for this was that many of the places of dense settlement in rural South Africa are areas with very little potential, which were carefully selected with this attribute in mind, and to which Africans were banished as part of the draconian practice of forced removals during the apartheid years (see Oranje, 1998a). As

such the NSDP sought to ensure more rational, more considered and more sustainable, as well as more equitable infrastructure investment and development spending, instead of simply spending resources on the basis of administrative boundaries, parochial lobbying or political expediency (The Presidency, 2003).

Insofar as labels have meaning, the NSDP could be described as an attempt at crafting a post-modern national spatial planning instrument, in that it:

- opted for being indicative instead of prescriptive;
- combined unity on key principles, while allowing for a large degree of local interpretation and "alteration from below"; and
- sought to open up debate rather than close it down (see *inter alia* Allmendinger, 2001a; Dear, 2000; Oranje, 2002 and Sandercock, 1998 on what a 'post-modern form of planning' would look like).

However, in its privileging of certain kinds of potential over others, some argued, it was destroying the chance of allowing places to be defined in unique/different ways — be it in terms of potential or in any other way — and in inadvertently privileging more urbanised areas over more rural areas.

2.7 New local legislation, transformed and less municipalities and IDP- Version II

In the local sphere a major change in municipal government was brought about in 1998 by the passing of the *Municipal Structures Act, 1998*, and the *Municipal Demarcation Act, 1997*, which provided for the creation of a system of 'wall-to-wall municipalities' and three types of municipality, viz. Metropolitan, District and Local Municipalities. This also resulted in the reduction in the number of municipalities from 843 to 284,⁹ of which 47 were district municipalities, 6 metropolitan municipalities and 231 local municipalities (see Ministry for Provincial Affairs

⁷ While this experience is sure to differ throughout the country, it was certainly the case in the provinces that were part of the former "Transvaal Province", i.e. Gauteng, Limpopo, Northwest and Mpumalanga.

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, 2002b and see also Faludi & Waterhout, 2002, on the 'history' of the ESDP).

⁹ This is now (2007) down to 283 due to the disestablishment of the Bothabelo 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 luke-warm 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 spurts 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 a 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 (middle-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.

ernmental 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 2001) 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 publication by The Presidency of *The Planning Framework of the Republic of South Africa* (The Presidency, 2002a: 17).

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*).¹¹ 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 coor-

inated 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 agree- ment

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 (Oranje & 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 forge [such]

Intergovernmental Development Agreements with every district and metropolitan municipality in the 53 (now 52) 'impact zones.' It was furthermore anticipated that these agreements would ensure that the three spheres of government deliberate and reach a shared understanding on:

- the state of development;
- key development priorities;
- the required and available resources; and
- the implementation of the required actions by each sphere of government in each of the impact zones.

While the proposal suggested that the preparation of an Intergovernmental Development Agreement could be triggered by any one of the participating role-players, it was proposed that national 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 role players.

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), work-sessions 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*
- *strategic principles for infrastructure investment and development spending (The Presidency, 2004: 11).*

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.¹² 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 spelt 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;

¹² The Local Government MinMec of 12 November 2004 initiated the nationwide 2005 IDP Public Hearings Process.

- 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.¹³ 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 were 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 inter-governmental 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 structures created for the sake of creating 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 middle-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 2007.¹⁴ 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/metro 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 REJOINDER: MAIN TRENDS

In this overview a number of trends have been discerned:

- it emerged that, despite numerous attempts to introduce and facilitate intergovernmental coordination, integration and alignment this is still more the exception, than the norm. Whereas the preparation and review of IDPs, one of the key components of the new intergovernmental development planning system has seen huge advances in local stakeholder-involvement (see *inter alia* CSIR, 2005; Adam & Oranje, 2002; Robinson *et al.*, 2003; Rauch, 2002 and Harrison, 2002) the same cannot be said of the interaction between the three spheres and the sectors in the same and other spheres (CSIR, 2007: 28). While the inconveniences of uncoordinated spatial investment have already been felt by communities throughout the country, these are becoming more apparent on a macro-scale as well, as are the long-term effects of fragmented and uncoordinated service provision on settlements and municipal operational budgets (see CSIR, 2007 and Adam & Oranje, 2002). Equally so are the implications for long-term social stability in a society where expectations for a better life have been raised, while the quality of life in both urban and rural settlements, as a key component of this, is falling far short of it.
- 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 — 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).
- naivety, and over-inflated idealism still prevails, which results in misplaced beliefs such as that:
 - sound planning processes will automatically result in sound plans and beneficial outcomes (see also GTZ-Review Team, 2002: 7);
 - greater alignment and coordination between plans, between planning and budgeting, between sectors and between the priorities of the various organs of state, will automatically ensure improved developmental outcomes; and
 - a plan, plus sufficient human endeavour, technology and investment of infrastructure in an area will either unlock latent potential or result in the sufficient injection of effort to result in economic development of that area, irrespective of the realities of its geography, demographics or history.
- a lack of appropriate capacity is still a major problem, with most organs of the state simply lacking the necessary capacity, either in numbers of persons, or in persons with the required skills to confidently and competently undertake the complex task of intergovernmental coordination, integration and alignment (see also GTZ Review team, 2002 for a similar finding).
- 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.¹⁵

- 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 trajec-

tories. 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 unitary local authority ha[d] to submit to central government" (Stoker, 2002: 424).

¹⁵ It may of course be 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.

REFERENCES

- ADAM, A. & ORANJE, M. 2002. A Report on Engagements with District and Metropolitan Municipalities on the First Round of Integrated Development Plans Produced in Terms of the *Municipal Systems Act, 2000*. Prepared for the Municipal Demarcation Board and the Department of Provincial and Local Government.
- AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS (ANC). 1992. *ANC Policy Guidelines for a Democratic South Africa*.
- AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS (ANC). 1994. *The Reconstruction and Development Programme*. Umanyono Publishers: Johannesburg.
- ALBRECHTS, L., HEALEY, P. & KUNZMANN, K.R. 2003. Strategic spatial planning and regional governance in Europe. *APA Journal*, 69(2), pp. 113-129.
- ALLMENDINGER, P. 2001a. *Planning in postmodern times*. Routledge: London.
- ALLMENDINGER, P. 2001b. The future of planning under a Scottish Parliament. In *Town Planning Review*, Vol. 72(2): pp. 121-148.
- ASIBUO, S.K. 1998. Funding strategies for local governments in Africa. *Africa Insight*, 28(3/4), pp. 146-53.
- BERRISFORD, S. 1998. Personal interview: March.
- BIRD, R.M & SMART, M. 2002. Intergovernmental transfers: International lessons for developing countries. *Political Geography*, Vol 30, pp. 899-912.
- BOYLE, M. 2000. Euro-regionalism and struggles over scales of governance: the politics of Ireland's regionalisation approach to Structural Fund allocations 2000-2006. *Political Geography*, Vol 19, pp. 737-769.
- CAMERON, J & NDHLOVU, T. P. 2001. The comparative economic of EU "Subsidiarity": Lessons from Development/Regional Economic debates. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25(2), pp. 327-45.
- COETZEE, P.J van V. 2006. A reading of power relations in the transformation of urban planning in the municipalities of the Greater Pretoria region (now Tshwane): 1992-2002. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Pretoria.
- CSIR (SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH ORGANISATION). 2006. Final Report: Municipal IDP Support Programme. Prepared for the DPLG.
- CSIR (SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH ORGANISATION). 2007. Project Feedback presentation at Project Workshop, provided on 15 May 2007, Holiday Inn Garden Court, Arcadia, Pretoria.
- DE ROOIJ, R. 2002. The impact of the European Union on Local Government in the Netherlands. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9(3), pp. 447-467.
- DEAR, M.J. 2000. *The Postmodern Urban Condition*. Blackwell Publishers: Oxford.
- DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT (DPLG). 2002. A review of the PIMS centres. Pretoria.
- DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT (DPLG). 2003. National Guidelines for Provincial-Local Engagement. Department of Public Service and Administration. Pretoria.
- DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT (DPLG). 2000. National Short Term Training Framework for the training of Councillors, Municipal Managers, IDP Specialists/Planning Professionals & Sector specialists on integrated development planning.
- DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT (DPLG). 2005. IDP Hearings 2005: National Report. Pretoria.
- FALUDI, A. 2002. Positioning European Spatial Planning. *European Planning Studies*, 10(7), pp. 897-909.
- FALUDI, A. 2003a. The application of the European Spatial Development Perspective: Introduction to the special issue. *Town Planning Review*, 74(1), pp. 1-9.
- FALUDI, A. 2003b. Unfinished business: European spatial planning in the 2000s. *Town Planning Review*, 74(1), p. 121-140.
- FALUDI, A. & WATERHOUT, B. 2002. *The making of the European Spatial Development Perspective: No Masterplan*. Routledge: London.
- FLINDERS, M. 2002. Governance in Whitehall. *Public Administration*, 80(1), pp. 51-75.
- GIDDENS, A. 1984. *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory*. University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- GILG, A.W. & KELLY, M.P. 2000. Managing change in the new millennium. *Town Planning Review*, 71 (3), pp. 269-288.
- GOVERNMENT COMMUNICATIONS. 2001. Cooperative Governance. Available from: <<http://www.gov.za/structure/coop-gov.htm>>.
- GUALINI, E. 2003. Challenges to multi-level governance: contradictions and conflicts in the Europeanization of Italian regional policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 10(4), pp. 616-636.
- GTZ-Review Team. 2002. Project Progress Review of DDP. South Africa.
- HARRISON, P. 2001. The genealogy of South Africa's Integrated Development Plan. *Third World Planning Review*, 23(2), pp. 175-193.
- HARRISON, P. 2002. *Towards integrated inter-governmental planning in South Africa: The IDP as a building block*.
- HEALEY, P. 1997. *Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies*. Macmillan Press Ltd: London.
- HODOS, J.I. 2002. Globalization, regionalism and urban restructuring: The case of Philadelphia. *Urban Affairs Review*, 37(3), pp. 358-379.
- HOMANN, D. 2005. A critical analysis of the transformation of the city planning function in the city of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality.

- Unpublished Masters Thesis. University of Pretoria.
- HORGAN, G.W. 2002. Intergovernmental relations in the Devolved Great Britain: A comparative perspective. Paper presented at the PSA Annual Conference, 5-7 April, University of Aberdeen, UK.
- HORGAN, G.W. 2004. Inter-institutional relations in the devolved Great Britain: Quiet diplomacy. *Regional and Federal Studies*, 14(1), pp. 113-135.
- JEWEL, P. & HOWARD, J. 2000. Editorial. *Monitor*, No. 25, p. 2.
- JONES, M. 1998. Restructuring the local state: economic governance or social regulation? *Political Geography*, 17(8), pp. 959-988.
- KHOSA, M. 1998. "A ship full of holes"?: The culture of governance in South Africa's nine new provinces. In: Khosa, M. & Muthien, Y. (eds.). *Regionalism in the New South Africa*. Ashgate: USA.
- LAZERSON, M. & LORENZONI, G. 1999. Resisting organizational inertia: The evolution of industrial districts. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 3(4), pp. 361-377.
- LECHNER, C. & DOWLING, M. 1999. The evolution of industrial districts and regional networks: The case of the biotechnology region Munich/Martinsried. *Journal of Management and Governance, Special issue*, Vol. 3, pp. 309-338.
- LLOYD, M.G. & ILLSEY, B. 1999. Policy Forum: Planning and devolved government in the United Kingdom. *Town Planning Review*, 70(4), pp. 409-431.
- MABIN, A. 2000. What's left of reconstruction — the rise and fall of a planning ideology. Paper presented at a Symposium entitled Planning for Reconstruction and Transformation, 29-31 May 2000, Durban, South Africa.
- MABIN, A. & SMIT, D. 1992. Reconstructing South Africa's cities 1900-2000: a prospectus (Or a cautionary tale). Paper presented at African Studies Seminar, 18 May 1992.
- MASSON, A., FERGUSON, F & ODENDAAL, N. 2004. Spatial Planning as a tool for integration. In: Robinson, P.J., McCarthy & C. Forster (eds.). 2004. *Urban Reconstruction in the Developing World: Learning through an International Best Practice*, Sandton: Heinemann.
- MCA PLANNERS & ORANJE, M. 2003. An assessment of the 2001/2002 IDP-process in the NorthWest Province. Prepared for the MEC of the Department of Developmental Local Government and Housing, Mafikeng.
- McEWEN, N. 2003. Governments in opposition? A comparative study of intergovernmental relations in Canada and the UK. Paper presented at the Political Studies Association Annual Conference, 15-17 April, University of Leicester, UK.
- MERRIFIELD, A. 2007. Personal interview. May.
- MINISTRY FOR PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT. 1998. *The White Paper on Local Government*. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- MULLER, J. 1983. Theory and Practice: The Janus face of Planning. Inaugural lecture, 2 September 1982. Johannesburg, Witwatersrand Press.
- MUTHIEN, Y. 1998. Politicised ethnicity and regional political economy in Kwazulu-Natal. In: Khosa, Meshack & Muthien, Y. (eds.). *Regionalism in the New South Africa*. Ashgate: USA.
- NEDOVIC-BUDIC, Z. 2001. Adjustment of planning practice to the new Eastern and Central European Context. *APA Journal*, 67(1), pp. 38-52.
- ORANJE, M. 2003a. Should provinces/regions have their own planning acts? An exploration of the debate using the post-1994 South African experience. In: Rydin, Y. & Thornley, A. (eds.). *Planning in a Globalised world*. Avebury: United Kingdom.
- ORANJE, M. 2003b. A Comparative analysis of 1996 and 2001-Census data on vulnerable and special target groups. Prepared for the Department of Social Development and The Presidency as part of the Ten Year Review.
- ORANJE, M. 2002. The Postmodern Turn. In: Tewdwr-Jones, M. & Allmendinger, P. (eds.). *New Directions in Planning Theory*. Routledge, United Kingdom.
- ORANJE, M. 2002a. Municipal Integrated Development Planning, Intergovernmental Integration and Development: In: Search of Connections. Prepared for The Presidency and GTZ as part of the Ten Year Review.
- ORANJE, M. 2002b. South Africa's National Spatial Development Perspective (NSDP): Learning from and Comparing to International Precedents. Produced for The Presidency and GTZ.
- ORANJE, M. 2001. In search of 'the African' in the post-1994 South African planning system. Paper presented at the Planning Theory conference, 20-21 June, Oxford-Brookes University, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- ORANJE, M. 1998a. The language game of South African urban and regional planning: A cognitive mapping from the past into the future. PhD in Town and Regional Planning, University of Pretoria.
- ORANJE, M. 1998b. A brief record of and some reflections on political intentions and planning interventions in South Africa 1994 to 1998: News or not in New Labour's New Britain? Paper presented at the 5th Planning Academics Conference, 6-8 April, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, Newcastle Upon Tyne, United Kingdom.
- ORANJE, M. & BIERMAN, S. 2002. Background Document: Mechanisms for the planning and management of spatial development, infrastructure investment and development spending on national and supranational level. Prepared for the CSIR as part of the NEPAD-infrastructure thrust.
- ORANJE, M. & VAN HUYSTEEN, E. 2004. A Protocol for Intergovernmental Development Planning. Prepared for the national Department of Provincial and Local Government.
- ORANJE, M. & VAN HUYSTEEN, E. 2002. The planning process as an exercise in the construction of a shared institutional narrative about and for delivery. Paper presented at the 16th AESOP conference, Volos, Greece: 10-15 July.
- ORANJE, M., & VAN HUYSTEEN, E. & MEYER, E. 2003. An overview of the 2002/2003 IDPs. Prepared for the Gauteng Department of Development Planning and Local Government.
- ORANJE, M., HARRISON, P., VAN HUYSTEEN, E. & MEYER, E. 2000. A Policy Paper on Integrated Development Planning. Prepared for the Department of Provincial and Local Government, Pretoria.

- ORANJE, M., VAN HUYSSTEEN, E. & OOSTHUIZEN, R. 1999. An investigation into the Land Development Objectives-endeavour in the provinces of Gauteng and the Northwest. Prepared for the Department of Land Affairs, Pretoria.
- PIETERSE, E. 2002. From divided to integrated city? Critical overview of the emerging metropolitan governance system in Cape Town. *Urban Forum*, 12(1), pp. 3-37.
- PINSON, G. 2002. Political government and governance: Strategic planning and the reshaping of political capacity in Turin. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26(3), pp. 477-93.
- PLATZKY, L. 1998a. Reconstructing and developing South Africa: The role of Spatial Development Initiatives. Ruth First Lecture, University of Durham, UK, 5 May 1998. Paper available from the author.
- PLATZKY, L. 1998b. Can South Africa's Spatial Development Initiatives turn cumulative disadvantages into comparative advantages? Paper read at a seminar in the Department of Geography and St Amry's College, University of Durham, 28 May 1998. Paper available from the author.
- POST, J. 1997. Urban management in an unruly setting: The African case. *Third World Planning Review*, 19(4), pp. 347-66.
- THE PRESIDENCY. 2004. Harmonisation and Alignment Report: Executive Summary. Prepared by the CSIR for PCAS, The Presidency and funded by GTZ.
- THE PRESIDENCY. 2003. *National Spatial Development Perspective*. Pretoria.
- THE PRESIDENCY. 2002a. *The Planning Framework for the Government of the Republic of South Africa: Implementation Guidelines*. Pretoria.
- THE PRESIDENCY. 2002b. *A planning framework for government: Managing Strategic Policy Priorities*. Pretoria.
- THE PRESIDENCY, 2005. *The role and state of PGDSs in South Africa*. Pretoria.
- THE PRESIDENCY 2006. *Project Charter: Contextualisation of the NSDP in District/Metro Areas*. Pretoria.
- RAKODI, C. 2001. Forget planning, put politics first? Priorities for urban management in developing countries. *JAG*, 3(3), pp. 209-223.
- RAUCH, T. 2002. *Principles of Integrated Development Planning and Assessment of the Process: 2001/2002*. DDP, Pretoria.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA. 1993. *Draft Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA. 1995. *Development Facilitation Act, Act 67 of 1995*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA. 1996a. *Local Government Transition Act Second Amendment Act, Act 97 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA. 1996b. *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA. 2000. *Municipal Systems Act, Act 32 of 2000*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- ROBERTS, P. 1999. Viewpoint: Sub-regional planning: The missing link? *Town Planning Review*, 70(1), pp. iii-vi.
- ROBINSON, J. 1995. Federalism and the transformation of the South African State. In: Smith, G. (ed.). *Federalism: the Multi-ethnic challenge*. Longman: London.
- ROBINSON, P.S., BROWN, A.L., TODES, A.E. & KITCHIN, F. 2003. Methods of achieving integration in development planning. *IDPR*, 25(3), pp. 263-281.
- SAMSON, G. 2002. *Three weddings, a loveless marriage and a rich uncle: Local government reform and inter-governmental relations in Australia*. UTS Centre for Local Government.
- SANDERCOCK, L. 1998. *Towards Cosmopolis*. London: John Wiley.
- SELLERS, J.M. 2002. The nation-state and urban governance: Toward multi-level analysis. *Urban Affairs Review*, 37(5), pp. 611-641.
- SHAW, J.M. 1999. A national spatial planning framework. *Town Planning Review*, 70(3), pp. 271-274.
- SIMMONS, M. 1999. The revival of regional planning: Government intention; local reality? *Town Planning Review*, 70(2), pp. 159-172.
- SOUTHALL, R. & WOOD, G. 1996. Local government and the return to multi-partyism in Kenya. *African Affairs*, 95(381), pp. 501-27.
- SOUTH AFRICAN COMMUNIST PARTY (SACP). 1998. A socialist approach to the consolidation and deepening of the National Democratic Revolution. *The African Communist*, Second Quarter, pp. 17-37.
- STOKER, G. 2002. Life is a lottery: New Labour's strategy for the reform of devolved governance. *Public Administration*, 80(3), pp. 417-434.
- TODES, A. 2004. Regional planning and sustainability: Limits and potentials of South Africa's Integrated Development Plans. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 47(6), pp. 843-861.
- UTS CENTRE. 2000. *Advancing Local Government: Partnership for a New Century*. New South Wales, Australia.
- VAN HUYSSTEEN, E. & MEYER, E. 2003. Scoping of Integrated Development planning Training Programmes. Conducted for Department of Provincial and Local Government & GTZ.
- VISSER, G. 2001. Social justice, integrated development planning and post-apartheid urban reconstruction. *Urban Studies*, 38(10), pp. 1673-1699.
- WATSON, V. 2002. The usefulness of normative planning theories in the context of Sub-Saharan Africa. *Planning Theory*, 1(1), pp. 27-52.
- WAYENBERG, E. (undated). The Flemish Central-Local policy agreement: Towards more efficient and legitimate two-level policy-making? Available from the author at ellen.wayenberg@soc.kuleuven.ac.be
- WILLIAMS, J.J. 2005. Development planning and citizenship in Cape Town. *Development Southern Africa*, 22(1), pp. 47-65.
- WONG, C. 2001. Viewpoint: The case for a YK Spatial Planning Framework. *Town Planning Review*, 72(1), pp. iii-vii.