

Tracing a decade of drafting, reviewing and assessing integrated development plans in KwaZulu-Natal: Some key reflections

Mogie Subban & Henk Theron

Peer reviewed and revised

It has anonymously be said that, 'if planning did not exist, the logic of the times would demand its intervention'.

Abstract

The next decade of planning in South African municipalities under democracy has dawned. The previous decade was characterised by drafting, reviewing and assessing outcomes of Integrated Development Plans (IDPs). Through the Local Government Municipal Systems Act, 32 of 2000 and Sections 152/3 of the South African Constitution, 1996, local government is responsible for development processes and municipal planning. It requires from municipalities to formulate and review IDPs. Two "generations" of IDPs were drafted and reviewed from 2001 to 2011 by KwaZulu-Natal municipalities. The Department of Co-operative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) and its predecessors evaluated and measured legal compliance of drafting, approval and submission processes. Identification of factors critical to planning, observations and recommendations for IDPs, are captured in this article. Direction, formulation and evaluation of third-generation IDPs for periods 2012/13 to 2016/17 municipal financial years is a focus of this article. The article also examines compliance, by focusing on quality and improvement of IDPs.

NASPEUR VAN 'N DEKADE VAN FORMULERING, HERSIENING EN EVALUERING VAN GEÏNTEGREERDE ONTWIKKELINGSPLANNE IN KWAZULU-NATAL: GESELEKTEERDE OORSIGTE

Die tweede dekad van beplanning vir Suid-Afrika se munisipaliteite onder demokrasie het aangebreek. Die vorige dekad is deur die formulering, hersiening en evaluering van die uitkomst van Geïntegreerde Ontwikkelingsplanne (GOPE) gekenmerk. Ooreenkomstig die Plaaslike Regering: Munisipale Stelsels Wet, Wet No. 32 van 2000, en artikels 152/3 van die Grondwet van Suid-Afrika, 1996, is plaaslike regering vir ontwikkelingsprosesse en munisipale beplanning verantwoordelik. Dit word dus van munisipaliteite verwag om GOPE op te stel en te hersien. Vanaf 2001 tot en met 2011 is twee "generasies" GOPE deur die munisipaliteite van KwaZulu-Natal opgestel en hersien. Die Department van Samewerkende Regering en Tradisionele Sake (DSRTS) en sy voorgangers het planne geëvalueer en gekyk of dit aan die wetlike vereistes vir opstel, goedkeuring en indiening voldoen. Faktore van deurslaggewende belang vir beplanning, waarneming en aanbevelings vir GOPE word in die artikel beskryf. Daar word op die beleidsrigting, opstel en evaluering van die derde generasie GOPE vir die tydperk van munisipale finansiële jare vanaf 2012/13 tot 2016/17 gefokus. Die artikel ondersoek die nakoming van faktore soos kwaliteit en verbetering van die GOPE.

UKUHLAZIYWA KWEMINYAKA ELISHUMI YOKULOTSHWA, UKUBUYEKEZWA KANYE NOKUHLOLWA KOHLELO LWENTUTHUKO OLUDIDIYELWE ESIFUNDAZWENI SAKWAZULU-NATALI : EZINYE ZEZIMPAWU EZISEMQOKA

Iminyaka elishumi ezayo komomasipala Eningizimu Afrika esizweni sonkana ngaphansi kwentando yeningi isifikile. Iminyaka elishumi eyedule beyiphathelene nokulotshwa, ukubuyekwezwa kanye nokuhlolwa kwemiphumela yoHlelo Lwentuthuko oludidiyelwe ngokomthetho: iMunicipal Systems Act, uMthetho nombolo 32 kanyaka u2000, kanye nengxenyane yekhulu namashumi amahlanu nambili kuya engxenyane yekhulu namashumi amahlanu nantathu omthetho weNingizimu Afrika iConstitution

eyabhalwa ngo-1996, ohulumeni basekhaya begunyawazwe ekuthuthukiseni nasekuleleni komasipala. Kuligunya komasipala ukusungula kanye nokubuyekwezwa koHlelo Lwentuthuko oludidiyelwe. Ukudidiyelwa kabili kwaloluHlelo Lwentuthuko okudidiyelwe kwalotshwa, kwabuyekwezwa, kusuka ngonyaka ka-2001 kuya enyakeni ka-2011, ngomasipala besifundazwe saKwaZulu-Natali. Umnyango wakwa-Cogta namalunga awo amakhulu babekene ngokuhlola baphinde babalula nokuvumelana nomthetho kokulotshwa kwezinhlelo Zentuthuko. Lombhalo ubuka ukudalulwa kwamaphuzu abalulekile ekuhlelweni nasekubhekisweni kanye nasekunconyweni kwezinhlelo Zentuthuko. Uphinde ubuke udlela, ukulotshwa kanye nokuhlolwa kokudidiyelwa kwesithathu kwezinhlelo Zentuthuko oludidiyelwe lweminyaka yezimali yomasipala ka-2012/13 kuya ku-2016/17. Leliphelpha libuye libhekisise nokuvumelana nenhloso noma nenjongo kwizinga kanye nasekuthuthukeni kwezinhlelo Zentuthuko oludidiyelwe.

1. THE ORIGIN AND VALUE OF INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Prior to 1994, municipalities were mainly concerned with service provision and implementation of regulations (DTLGA, 2001: 14). However, with the introduction of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 and related new legislative and policy frameworks for local government, the role of local government was greatly expanded. Municipalities were required to be developmental in approach and activities.

The value of the integrated development planning process for municipalities lay in formulating focused plans and developmental priorities. The approach would assist in avoiding wasteful expenditure and perpetuating past spending patterns, viewed as common challenges in municipal governance. The notion of adopting a more business-based approach was, therefore, not to run councils like companies, but to ensure that scarce resources were spent effectively, efficiently and economically, as it impacts on the triple bottom line for municipalities.

In addition, to ensure that all citizens have access to at least a minimum level of basic

Dr Mogie Subban, Lecturer: Discipline of Public Governance, School of Management, IT and Governance, College of Law & Management Studies, University of KwaZulu-Natal, University Road, Westville, Phone: 031 260 7763, Fax: 031 260 7577, email: <subbanm@ukzn.ac.za>, Mobile: 082 373 4303.

Dr Henk Theron, Acting Senior Manager: IDP Co-ordination, KwaZulu-Natal Department of Co-operative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 271 Church Street, Pietermaritzburg, 3200, South Africa. Phone: 033 355 6431, Fax: 033 355 6425, email: henk.theron@kzncogta.gov.za, Mobile: 079 227 0827.

services, municipalities were obliged to take a leading role in addressing poverty and inherited inequities, thus promoting local economic and social development and democracy. Municipalities must not only deliver on present demands for services, but also anticipate future demands, while finding ways to improve service delivery over the short, medium and long term.

In this respect, municipalities are required to work closely with provincial and national spheres of government in the delivery of national and provincial development programmes at the local sphere. In addition, municipalities had to incorporate a wide range of sector programmes (for example, water, health and small business development) into their own development programmes, and to comply with requirements of national legislation.

According to DTLGA (2001: 15), some of the terminology and planning discourse used to describe integrated development planning in the municipal sector is different to that generally used by the business sector, when it refers to strategic planning. Integrated development planning and strategic planning are inextricably linked and viewed as management tools which enable municipalities to take strategic views of development requirements, and to address all key issues in a holistic, integrated development plan.

Within the municipal context, the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) is, therefore, regarded as a single inclusive and strategic plan integrating and coordinating a municipality's sector-specific plans, and aligning resources and capacity of the municipality to its overall development objectives (South Africa, 2000). In order to ensure IDP compliance to legislation, IDPs are annually submitted to the KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) Province for assessment.

2. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN ASSESSMENT

Development plan assessment is a global phenomenon and is informed by international practice. A brief discussion of the international influence follows, with the emphasis on assessment and evaluation.

2.1 Over 60 years of plan assessment/evaluation

Undertaking of the assessment or evaluation of development plans in South Africa and specifically KwaZulu-Natal is in line with ongoing international practice since the introduction of development planning after the Second World War. The work done by, among others, Conyers & Hills (1994: 156-159) and Todaro & Smith (2006: 530-531) reflects in a manner that impacts on plan-making. Mensah's (2005: 245-270) study undertaken in 2005 on plans in Ghana confirms ongoing difficulties experienced with plan formulation after more than sixty years, as the examples attested to in discussion in the article.

With reference to insufficient and unreliable data, Todaro & Smit (2006: 530) emphasise that the value of any development plan is directly related to the quality of the data on which it is based. The authors further emphasise this integral aspect in the following quotation:

When (statistical) data (is) weak, unreliable, or simply non-existent, as in many poor countries, the accuracy and internal consistency of economy wide quantitative plans are greatly diminished (Todaro & Smit, 2006: 530).

Some plans are based on unrealistic expectations (Todaro & Smit, 2006: 530). Therefore, plans are overambitious and grandiose. Plans have too many objectives, some of which are sometimes inconsistent with each other. The requirements of the World Bank and IMF range from 60 to 100 or more issue areas to be included in plans, if countries want to qualify for conditional donor funding. Plans with unrealistic targets are doomed, as they do not correspond with the available resources required for implementation (Conyers & Hills, 1994: 157).

Conyers & Hills (1994: 157) argue that development plans, which are presented in a complex manner and do not indicate the role of individuals and/or organisations clearly, will not secure the necessary support from implementing agencies.

Conyers & Hills (1994: 157) further highlight that without community participation in all stages of plan-making, such plans will, without a doubt, not succeed. Mensah (2005: 264) found that, well into the era of public participation, the majority of stakeholders were not

consulted during plan formulation, as it is too expensive and time-consuming to embark on a consultation process.

Conyers & Hills (1994: 158) and Mensah (2005: 264) advocate that development plans are not implemented, because of a severe lack of funding and other resources required in the right quantity, place and time. This is caused by a lack of co-ordination between the drafting of plans and the procurement procedures used for resource allocation, such as the long processes to appoint staff in government institutions, expressed by Oranje & Van Huyssteen (2007: 4). This was also attributed to IDPs having been legislated in the absence of prior enabling and guiding policy frameworks, and to the legacy of apartheid when municipalities were geared for administration and service delivery, and not for taking a strategic lead in matters concerning local government.

2.2 Two categories of plan evaluation

Baer (1997: 322-344) investigated a type of evaluation pertinent to the strategic management of integrated development planning, by asking what good plans constitute. Two categories of evaluation from Baer's work are discussed in the article, namely plan assessment while plans are prepared, and post-ad hoc plan outcomes.

Plan assessment is undertaken while plans are prepared (Baer, 1997: 337). Assessments evaluate professional expertise by focusing on the plan as a document to communicate the methodology used to formulate the plan, reasoning behind the plan and plan content. Assessments are applicable at the moment when plans are brought into being.

The assessment criteria should be designed to indicate what the plan should include and how the professional competence should be judged (Baer, 1997: 337). The author further argues that the assessment criteria should be positive to specify what plans should contain in order to meet professionally approved standards similar to the accounting profession, "Generally Accepted Accounting Principles" (GAAP). Furthermore, assessments could serve a second purpose by comparing assessments of plans to determine whether the art of plan-making has improved over time.

Upon the adoption and implementation of plans, they should be empirically evaluated in accordance with their outcomes, asserts Baer (1997: 332). The purpose and criteria are to be defined clearly to determine what was expected versus what happened, which is quite pertinent to the assessment of IDPs in KZN, as the case study under discussion in this article hereunder demonstrates.

3. ASSESSMENTS OF INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANS

The reflection on the assessment of IDPs in KZN is demonstrated by highlighting three key assessment periods, namely 2001/2002, between 2002 and 2004, and 2010/2011.

3.1 Assessment of Integrated Development Plans drafted in 2001/2002 for implementation during 2002/2003

The Local Government Municipal Systems Act (MSA) of 2000 requires that the MEC for Local Government assesses the council-adopted IDPs within 30 days of their submission to the KZN Provincial Department of Local Government (DTLGA, 2004a: 1, 7-9). For the purpose of assisting the MEC with the assessment of the 2001/2002 IDPs, the Department of Traditional and Local Government Affairs (DTLGA) established the Multi-Sectoral IDP Forum during 2002. This Forum consisted of national and provincial departments, municipalities and other organisations and service providers, and also co-ordinated and monitored the participation of sectors in the IDP process and made recommendations to the MEC for the improvement of the quality of the IDP.

During the first round of assessing the 2002/2003 IDPs, various assessment issues were highlighted by the Forum (DTLGA, 2003: 3-4). These assessment issues were categorised in accordance with the identifiable phases of the IDP process. Bearing in mind that the new municipal dispensation was established on 5 December 2000, the assessment concluded that in the pre-drafting (preparation) period, the IDP managers were appointed too late, resulting in their belated familiarising with the national IDP Guidelines, as well as the lack of sufficient time to draft and adopt Framework and Process Plans and the final IDPs. So much so that by the cut-off date of 31 March 2002, only the Utrecht Local Municipality IDP was

submitted for assessment to the DTLGA. By 1 November 2002, four of the 61 KZN 2001/2002 IDPs were awaiting assessment by the Forum. Taking into account that the Framework and Process Plans for the first review (2002/2003 IDP) were to be adopted by 1 September 2002, it demonstrated that the IDP process in general in KZN was on its 'back-foot' from year one. This posed major challenges for municipalities in KZN.

The Forum (2002: 1-2) identified pertinent issues related to IDP assessments. Concern was also expressed of the lack of participation by Traditional Authorities in the IDP process as required by the Municipal Systems Act (MSA), taking into account that 30% of land in KZN is under Traditional Authorities. The issue of Traditional Authorities poses several contestations regarding participatory governance, which is an important focal point in integrated development planning. Further to the detriment of the quality of IDPs was a serious lack of alignment between IDPs of District Municipalities (DMs) and Local Municipalities (LMs). Consequently, municipalities were 'doing their own thing' and were even competing with one another for scarce resources. In addition, the vague visions guiding the IDPs did not help to give strategic direction to council in determining developmental priorities. Consultants who formulated the first generation of IDPs were not properly briefed on how to compile quality IDPs and they also duplicated information in IDPs of various municipalities impacting on the quality of the end-product.

There was also a general lack of participation of sector departments in the IDP process. In the drafting phase, assessments found that the IDP Guide Packs were too complex and not user-friendly (DTLGA, 2003: 4-5). Contents of the IDPs were not uniform and made a comparative evaluation between IDPs impossible. Unavailability of service delivery guidelines made it difficult to benchmark service standards for basic services. Belated publication of the MSA Regulations requiring a 21-day period for advertising the draft IDP put further strain on the time frames for the completion of the IDPs, hence "corners were cut" to meet deadlines, thus impacting on the quality of IDPs. This was a further challenge for municipalities in KZN.

Assessments revealed that, during the alignment phase, there was also a lack of/or limited participation by Sector Departments (DTLGA, 2003: 6).

Therefore, limited financial support was made available for sectoral programmes, and non-sectoral guidelines were available in support for municipalities in drafting IDPs and making sector-related decisions. There was, therefore, limited alignment between municipalities and sector departments that led to *maladroit* planning.

During the assessment phase, it was impossible to assess the IDPs within the required 30-day MSA time frame, as this was unrealistic (DTLGA, 2003: 7). There was limited participation by Sector Departments in the assessment process itself, which led to generic comments on different IDPs. The DTLGA staff drafted comments on what they perceived should be included into the IDP, and the National Assessment Guidelines came too late to influence the first assessment process in KZN. The DPLG Assessment Guidelines (2002) was a comprehensive guideline that covers various key focus areas, including organisational arrangements, public participation, application of sector guidelines, integration dealing with the financial plan, SDFs, capital investment programmes, water services plan, organisational performance management system, institutional programme, and integrated environmental programmes.

Municipalities did not want to progress with the review process until they received the MEC letter (DTLGA, 2003: 7). Lengthy delays were experienced from what the Forum discussed and when the MEC letters were dispatched to municipalities. There was a lack of clarity on the contents of sector plans, and sector departments did not make funding available to municipalities for the drafting of these plans.

The National Department of Provincial and Local Government (as DPLG's Assessment and Analysis of IDPs, 2001/2002 Process and the Provincial Planning Commission, 2010: 1) made a high-level assessment of the IDP process by monitoring the provincial IDP assessment processes, and found positive aspects concerning the IDPs developed thus far. Of importance, was that municipal councillors and officials took ownership of their IDP process, and municipalities internalised IDPs as part of their business system. One outstanding element of this was that IDPs informed the budget of municipalities, and implementation of the plans was already underway, which is the ultimate goal of the IDPs. A highlight was that many communities and ward committees

had participated in the IDP process, as required by law and good common practice for successful IDP formulation and implementation.

However, the DPLG (2003: 1-2) expressed concern that entire IDPs of most municipalities could not be implemented, because of insufficient funds or lack of commitments made by sector departments and other agencies for certain projects. It was noted that there was inadequate involvement of key stakeholders and national/provincial sector departments in the IDP process. Of significant note was the non-engagement between the Provincial Growth and Development Strategies and IDP. This has a significant impact on the strategic alignment of these two important aspects for municipalities.

3.2 Drafting IDPs between 2002 and 2004

There were several developments during this phase of the IDPs. A succinct discussion of the phases follows.

3.2.1 The 'catch-up' phase

The MSA requires that an IDP be formulated in the financial year prior to its implementation. However, during the first part of the first cycle of five years, many municipalities in KZN found it difficult to compile their IDPs in such fashion. In the spirit of co-operative governance, the IDP Forum agreed on 26 May 2004 that municipalities could 'catch-up' with the review process; this, therefore, ensured that IDPs would be aligned with the MSA requirements.

Municipalities had to consolidate the work done for the review period covering the 2003/2004 and 2004/2005 financial years into a reviewed IDP, reflecting the year of implementation, namely 2005/2006. For assessment purposes, the "consolidated 2005/2006 Reviewed IDPs" were submitted as draft documents, including draft budgets, to the IDP Forum via the DTLGA by November 2004 for assessment. The draft documents had to be advertised for 21 days during October 2004 and had to have Council's formal approval.

3.2.2 Decentralisation of KZN Provincial Multi-Sectoral IDP Forum

Following on decentralisation in municipal service delivery, it is noted that, on 26 May 2004, the IDP forum further resolved that the 2005/2006 reviewed IDPs would be assessed as

"a family of municipalities" by the IDP Forum. Municipalities were requested to submit draft IDPs during December 2004 to the DTLGA for assessment and preparation of the Decentralised Forums (DTLGA, 2005a).

The principle of decentralising assessments was that the forum would be brought closer to local stakeholders. The participating municipalities could perceive how the locally available material, financial and human resources were mobilised to enhance municipal delivery (Madzivhandila & Asha, 2012: 371).

For the assessment of draft IDPs, a requirement for sector departments was that the operational staff member(s) responsible for the particular family of municipalities had to attend Forum meetings. Staff attendance was to strengthen alignment of strategies, programmes, projects and budgets between the DCs and LMs with service providers.

The IDP Forum, therefore, did not convene in Pietermaritzburg for IDP assessment purposes (DTLGA, 2005/2006: Annexure B). However, it held meetings within the administrative centres of the district municipalities. The DLGTA made it its task to prepare municipalities and sector departments to participate meaningfully in decentralised forums by conducting three training sessions (DTLGA, 2005b) in November 2004 in KZN, covering topics on the IDP process and how sectors should align with municipalities (DLGTA, 2004). It is noted that the department prides itself that the training guideline was done internally to obviate any further challenges.

DLGTA also drafted guidelines and format on how these decentralised forums were to be conducted (DTLGA, 2005c: 1-12). In essence, at the decentralised forums, municipalities made presentations on IDPs not necessarily covering the preceding areas. Eskom, the Provincial Transport Department and DTLGA generally followed the guidelines in making comments and handed copies of the completed questionnaire to the Secretariat. The DLGTA planning staff drafted a report containing the assessment findings per municipality, entitled "Assessment of the 2005/2006 KwaZulu-Natal IDPs" which was submitted to the DTLGA (2005d).

To complete the 'catch-up' phase, municipalities were required to advertise the final draft IDPs at the beginning of May 2005 for a 21-day period,

whereafter it was to be adopted before the end of June 2005. Implementation of the 2005/2006 reviewed IDP formulated during the 2004/2005 financial year would commence on 1 July 2005. As part of the drafting process, DPLG participated in the formulation of the draft 2005/2006 reviewed IDP through the IDP Hearings in April 2005. Thereafter, those municipalities that did not adhere to the MSA requirement, namely that the draft reviewed IDPs were to be completed by the end of March with the final adopted IDP by the end of June annually, were forced to do so.

3.3 Assessment of draft IDPs during 2006 and 2007 at a national central venue

For two consecutive years (2006 and 2007), the assessment of draft IDPs in South Africa was done nationally at a central point under the auspices of the DPLG (KZN COGTA, 2011: 5-8). In 2006, the assessment was done at Broederstroom, in the Northwest Province. From 2 to 7 April 2006, the draft 2006/2007 IDPs were assessed by Provincial Assessment Teams in accordance with the Credibility IDP Evaluation Framework 2006 (DPLG, 2006a). The comprehensive framework was drafted by the DPLG. In order to make the assessment manageable, KZN resolved to assess the IDPs in four clusters that related to the assessment questions in the IDP Evaluation Framework. The clusters were the following, namely economic development and finance; spatial development; infrastructure and service delivery, and governance and institutional arrangements (DPLG, 2006b). The department assembled a multi-sectoral/departmental team whose members were allocated to each cluster.

Copies of the IDPs circulated among the clusters only received an allocated time to assess their particular cluster topics. The process led to comments on a particular topic, as well as a score out of 5. The scores were aggregated and, for the first time, quality and ranking of IDPs were determined in this controversial manner. The completed credibility frameworks, including the final scores, were disseminated to all municipalities for their use in improving their IDPs. Low-ranking municipalities were disputing the scoring system as subjective, as it impacts on how councillors perceive the performance of the municipality and IDP managers.

In 2007, the national IDP assessment process was repeated, this time at Broederstroom in the North West Province from 16 to 20 April 2007 (DLGTA, 2007). The KZN Province again participated in the event and this time the assessment groups were divided in accordance with the national Key Performance Areas (KPA's), as set out in the MSA Regulations of 2001, namely:

- Municipal Transformation and Institutional Development.
- Local Economic Development.
- Basic Service Delivery and Infrastructure Investment.
- Financial Viability and Financial Management.
- Good Governance and Community Participation.

In addition, KZN added an additional KPA, namely "Spatial and Environmental Planning" for assessing the IDPs.

From 8 to 14 May 2007, the DLGTA arranged 10 feedback sessions to convey the results of the assessments of the draft 2007/2008 reviewed IDPs to a delegation of the district 'family of municipalities' (DLGTA, 2007).

3.4. Provincial assessment of Integrated Development Plans, 2008 to 2012

The national (draft) IDP assessment process was very resource-intensive and posed extremely logistical challenges for all stakeholders. Hence, it was resolved that future assessments would be decentralised to the provinces.

Since 2008, all provincial sector departments as well as key municipal representatives have been invited to attend the KZN draft assessment sessions, make final input and recommendations for improving the adopted IDPs. A main focus was to improve alignment between sector departments and municipalities, but also to improve alignment within district 'families of municipalities'. Comments and recommendations generated at the Draft IDP assessments were provided to all municipalities in a report format. These inputs had to be worked into the Draft IDP before adoption by Council in June of each year. In the KZN 2008/2009 IDP Assessment Report (2008: 12-13), some key challenges were observed per KPA during assessment of the 2008/2009 draft IDP assessments: These challenges are briefly highlighted as follows:

- Municipal Transformation and Institutional Development: Performance in municipalities is what one would call outcomes, which are dependent on transformation and institutional development in the current context, asserts Asmah-Andoh (2009: 201). Most municipalities, in this instance, indicated powers and functions in their adopted IDPs. No indication on capacity and capability for implementation was given.
- Local Economic Development: Most municipalities mentioned that LED plans are in place. No mention was made in the IDPs of objectives, programmes and projects contained in LED plans.
- Basic service delivery and infrastructure development: Almost all municipalities indicated backlogs in service delivery. However, information from community surveys in 2007 provided backlog information that needed to be extensively utilised as the official and primary statistical data. All IDPs provided information on service delivery such as water, sanitation and electricity, but did not give detailed targets for one, three and five years for all its key services.
- Financial viability and management: Municipalities demonstrated the existence of financial management systems in place, although not all the municipalities responded to the Auditor General's financial oversight. Several municipalities are cash-strapped, and are facing the threat of financial viability. Some of the pertinent issues include lack of financial skills, number of financial non-viable municipalities, and unspent grants and/or donor funding. Following on the financial viability perspective is the equally important notion of sustainability of the IDP. Valeta & Walton (2008: 379-380) assert that sustainability of an IDP within the municipal context entails ensuring that costs, resources and impact of policy be borne within local government.
- Good governance and community participation: Community participation is widely viewed as a key component in the planning process, asserts Brody, Godschalk & Burdy (2003: 245). However, the IDPs indicated that municipalities are in varying stages of developing their organisational performance management system. However, alignment of the performance system

with the IDP is not clear. In addition, intergovernmental and sector departments' involvement were still to be improved. All IDPs showed good progress on public participation through ward committees. This form of community participation is designed to increase local commitment to the principles of democratic governance. However, the issue of ward committees does pose challenges for municipalities, and in this context, were not informed on final IDPs.

- Spatial Development Framework: Nearly all municipalities indicated that they developed SDFs, but failed to clearly identify nodes and development corridors linking to the provincial spatial economic development strategy. It was generally observed that all the municipalities did not clearly indicate the relationship with their land-use management system or framework into IDP documents. Municipalities did not spatially represent priority expenditure in development nodes and corridors. It was noted that 35 out of 61 KZN municipalities attained the IDP credibility benchmark of 60%. It is encouraging to note that all district municipalities were within the required credibility benchmark. Whilst the Provincial IDP management in KZN is rated the best in the country, there are still serious challenges in a number of areas, including the standardisation of IDP documents for all municipalities, lack of sector department participation in IDPs, and the alignment of IDPs with plans for provincial and national spheres. A new assessment approach was introduced in 2010 and each district municipality together with its local municipalities' draft IDPs was assessed as 'families of municipalities'. There were no assessments of individual draft IDPs. The same approach was followed in 2011 and 2012, and the main aim was to recognise alignment or expose the lack thereof within the 'family of municipalities'.

Draft IDPs of the family were placed on the individual district's websites a week prior to the assessment week in order for stakeholders to scrutinise the draft IDPs in advance.

Families were required to prepare six presentations, one for each of the above KPAs, and to address the family issues for each of the specific KPAs. An IDP analysis template was developed

which required the family to report for each KPA on:

- Family development challenges.
- Key interventions in place.
- Key interventions recommended.
- Outline of family priorities.

The IDP Stakeholders then evaluated the family based on the content of the presentations and the content of the draft IDPs. During 2008, all 61 municipalities were given specific feedback on the observations made by the assessment team on their draft 2008/2009 IDPs. A series of IDP engagement and feedback sessions were conducted with each district family of municipalities. These were started off by a province-wide meeting which took place at Didima Camp on 22 April 2008. IDP assessments findings were discussed with each district family of municipalities. A provincial feedback session on the 2009 draft IDP assessments was conducted on 3 April 2009 at the Richards Hotel, Richards Bay. A comprehensive report on the findings, discussions and recommendations of each of the six assessment subgroups was compiled and circulated. It is significantly noted that the report was also forwarded to the then DPLG and it served as the KZN Provincial input on reviews of IDPs assessment credibility framework, and that all 61 municipalities were given feedback reports for their specific family on their draft 2009/10 IDP assessment.

A provincial feedback session on the 2010/2011 draft IDP assessment process was held on 22 April 2010 at the Natalia Building, Pietermaritzburg. The results from the assessment analysis were presented per KPA. A provincial feedback session for the 2011/2012 draft IDP assessment procedure was held on 4 April 2011 at the Ebandla Hotel, Ballito.

The Ilembe, Amajuba and Sisonke Families together with eThekweni Metro had the highest overall scores. The session focused on feedback on observations for each of the six KPAs in terms of challenges and key interventions in place, as well as recommendations in order to improve the draft IDPs.

KPA presentations were made by each of the six KPA team leaders. Feedback was also provided on the outcome of the assessment of the pilot simplified IDPs. Municipalities were also reminded to re-focus on climate change in the IDP context and the inputs they could make towards the Conference of Parties, No 17 (2011: COP 17) through participation in the Pre-COP 17 events. Municipalities were provided with detailed feedback assessment reports for their specific family. These comments and recommendations had to be re-incorporated into the draft IDPs prior to submission to Council for adoption.

At the 30 March 2012, the draft IDP assessment feedback session took place after the assessment of the draft 2012/13 IDPs at Ballito, and the KPA Groups reported on their major findings. Based on these reports, the main points or "gaps" were highlighted per KPA and reported to the Provincial Governance and Administration Cluster on 1 June 2012 (KZN COGTA, 2012). These gaps included the lack of improvement of Inter-Governmental Relations (IGR) to the advantage of Service Delivery and Infrastructural Development. In LED programmes municipalities lack skills. From a 'good governance' perspective, IDPs should be user-friendly. In addition, a lack of spatial referencing and appropriate mapping exists in many IDPs. Institutional challenges by specific strategies, programs, budgets and performance indicators still exists, with a further number of financially non-viable

municipalities. This is cause for concern for the future of the status of local government in the current dispensation.

3.5 Assessment of the 2006/2007 to 2011/2012 adopted IDPs

While the draft IDPs received attention over the years, as demonstrated above, similar attention was paid to the assessment of adopted IDPs for 2005/2006 to 2011/2012. The main aim was to determine whether key issues identified during draft assessments were included in adopted IDPs. This task was undertaken by appointment of the MEC panel that assessed the 2005/2006 to 2011/2012 IDPs annually, which resulted in a letter addressed from the MEC for Local Government to the mayors of the various municipalities commenting on the quality and credibility of the 'adopted' IDP. The letters were used as a basis for scoring and ranking the IDPs per KPAs and an overall rating per municipality.

According to the KwaZulu-Natal 2011/2012 IDP Assessment Report (2012: 18), the highest scoring/ranking municipalities of the 2011/2012 reviewed IDP were the following, as reflected in table 1:

Some main issues identified in the 11/12 MEC Panel assessment process of all 61 individual IDPs are reflected hereunder per KPA (KwaZulu-Natal 2011/12 IDP Assessment Report, 2012: 20-27):

The KPAs group dealing with basic service delivery and infrastructure reported that municipalities need to provide budget details and plans pertaining to energy and electricity in order to meet national targets. Due consideration would be given to alternative and renewable energy, as these options need further attention, given the current context of energy consumption levels. Furthermore, municipalities need to include a HR Strategy to respond to long-term development plans. This was the major finding of the Municipal Transformation and Institutional Development Group. Issues concerning LED were not very well articulated, the LED KPA Group reported. It was important to note that many of the other areas of development are closely intertwined with economic development. Economic development issues are streamlined throughout the IDP, and municipalities had to review the institutional framework in order to accommodate LED.

Table 1: Ten highest ranking municipalities based on the 2011/2012 reviewed IDPs

Municipality	Credibility
1 Amajuba	93%
2 Ethekwini	91%
3 Ugu	89%
4 KwaDukuza	89%
5 Ilembe	86%
6 Umhlathezi	83%
7 Emnambithi-Ladysmith	81%
8 Umdoni	80%
9 Umgungundlovu	80%
10 Uthungulu	80%

Source: KwaZulu-Natal 2011/2012 IDP Assessment Report, 2012: 18

It is important for municipalities to reflect indications of corrective steps for qualified reports or reports with matters of emphasis (where appropriate) to work towards achieving Clean Audits in 2014. In addition, IDPs need to reflect a clear indication of national and provincial allocations. Many municipalities provided financial plans with relevant cash flow, debtor control and revenue generation, according to the Financial Viability and Financial Management KPA Group.

Municipalities should establish feedback mechanisms for their communities. The role of ward committees is acknowledged. Increasing awareness of the role and involvement of Traditional Councils in IDP processes and municipal affairs is noted. The Spatial Planning and Environmental Planning KPA team reported that there is good alignment between LM (SDFs) and high-level SDFs of the DMs. The SDFs do promote a concentration of interventions and development within identified nodes and along strategic corridors. SDFs make good reference to and considered the provisions and proposals within the provincial spatial and economic development strategy.

4. ACHIEVEMENTS OF AND CHALLENGES FACING THE IDP ASSESSMENTS IN KWAZULU-NATAL

4.1 Achievements

Since 2000, in KZN, progress was reported during the assessment process. Where the minority of municipalities had IDP managers, currently 2/3 of municipalities have IDP managers to formulate IDPs. Where most municipalities were late with the submission of IDPs, virtually all municipalities are complying with time frames. The majority of municipalities use provincially designed IDP Format Guide to draft their IDPs in standardised formats. Furthermore, senior staff in sector departments were more aware of IDP processes than other staff.

4.2 Challenges

Challenges still faced through IDP assessments in KwaZulu-Natal include the desirability of scoring IDPs as they are drafted only for legal compliance, and lack of synergy between adopted IDP and implementation. Raga, Taylor & Albrecht (2011: 150) highlight that planning must be integrated and developmental and municipal performance

must be measured and judged by municipalities themselves, by residents and by the provincial and national governments. Davids (2009: 228) advances that the capacity of municipalities to opt to mere compliance with legislative prescriptions instead of giving effect to policies remains an ongoing challenge, as is the case in point. Another challenge is the influence of human development in integrated planning that may retreat strategically from the process of regulating development, asserts Balasascu (2011: 297).

5. GLIMPSE INTO THE FUTURE

In KZN, the future of 3rd-generation IDPs lies with the formulation, assessment and implementation of outcomes-based IDPs.

5.1 Outcomes-based approach for IDPs

With the election of 18 May 2011, new municipal councils were established and as such, these councils have a mandate to draft new 5-year IDPs (KZN COGTA, Draft Memorandum to Cabinet. Analysis of Sector Departments in IDP process, May 2012). The national and provincial plans or major policy informants that are pertinent for the new five-year IDPs are the following as set out in Figure 1.

At the IDP stakeholder meeting on 9 February 2012 and at the start of the IDP assessment week on 26 March 2012, municipalities were informed that the above-mentioned policy imperatives would be crucial in formulating the 2012 to 2017 3rd-generation IDPs. During the assessment week, the following was

found on how municipalities in KZN have dealt with each component, and that improvement is necessary in order to meet the outcomes-based IDP requirements, as outlined in Table 2.

Following on from the table illustration, Ingle (2007: 16) states that there is arguably no better 'yardstick' by which to measure a municipality's competence than *via* critical assessment of its IDP. Therefore, according to Brand & Klein (2012: 20), to ensure sustainable development and service delivery, a paradigm shift is needed away from "business as usual", and a redefinition of the way in which municipalities develop and implement their strategic objectives, outcomes and indicators included in their IDPs, while improvement must be linked to the outcomes-based approach.

5.2 Success factors for outcomes-based IDPs

According to Marais, Human & Botes (2008: 395-396), it can be mentioned that the absence of trend analysis is closely linked to the issue of the availability and accessibility of information on the performance, review and assessment of IDPs. The absence of time-series data in the IDPs can be ascribed both to the inadequacy of the data collection in the analysis phase, where information is requested from sector departments for one year only, and to lack of understanding in respect of the use of timeline information. What is perceived as 'old' information is simply replaced with the latest information, instead of comparing results and establishing trends. Therefore, a review




Figure 1: Outcomes-based approach for 3rd generation IDPs
Source: Bhengu, 2012: PPT, Slide 9.

Table 2: Policy imperatives versus number of IDPs

Policy imperatives	Total number of IDPs reflecting/integrating policy imperatives
Cabinet Lekgotla Resolutions	1
M and E Frameworks	61
SOPA	14
SONA	10
Outcome Nine	27
PGDS (the seven goals)	45
Municipal Turn Around Strategy (MTAS)	22
COP 17 or Climate Change	4
District Lekgotla Resolutions	2

Source: Duze, 2012: PPT, Slide 7

of IDPs tracing beyond a decade is essentially going forward.

The authors further advocate that DPLG and the provincial office of COGTA should play a leading role in acquiring baseline information for municipalities, which the latter would otherwise not be able to afford.

According to Brand & Klein (2012: 23), in going forward, a number of key factors should be addressed if the overall sustainability and environmental performance of municipalities is to be improved. These factors must be prioritised as issues for discussion. These include the municipality's level of commitment to sustainable development and a healthy natural environment; issues of environmental accountability and responsibility within all municipal line functions; an organisational design that facilitates sustainability (which by its nature is an integrating and cross-cutting discipline); risk of a business as usual approach; availability of resources for urban sustainability and environmental management; availability of financial incentives and disincentives to drive behavioural change; effective use of by-laws and municipal ordinance to govern; improved environmental law enforcement and policing, and counteracting perceptions that environmental management and development are mutually exclusive or even competing agendas.

Thornhill (2008: 502) emphasises that it should be obvious that the new approach to democratising local government goes far beyond the normal practice of only elected representatives acting on behalf of a community. Communities are no longer excluded from the governing function and do not only play a role at elections and are side-lined. They could actively participate in a variety of issues.

Subban (2008: 10) holds the view that the trajectory of community participation is implicit and serves to infuse the discussion and increasing significance of participation in local governance. Both local government and citizens must join hands to ensure that the social, physical and economic assets of municipal delivery form part of a symbiotic and co-operative sociability. The emergence of new forms of reciprocity for local communities through wider political processes is envisaged. The intention is to contribute knowledge when 'making the place and mediating the space', is what author Kunzmann (2004: 396) suggests when engaging in development planning.

6. CONCLUSION

From the afore-going discussion and literature review, conclusions are drawn from the literature, evaluation and discussion of the 1st- and 2nd-generation of IDPs, with a paradigm shift on the 3rd-generation of IDPs going forward in the planning discourse, as discussed earlier. Parnell & Poyser (in Naidoo 2007: 60) state that, in response to the changing political and socio-economic climate, new and demanding requirements have been placed on local governments throughout the world. Municipalities, in particular, have become increasingly relevant. Evidently, integrated development planning processes have introduced unprecedented challenges in municipal service delivery. In this decade of review, valuable lessons were learnt and knowledge was generated among KZN municipalities on plan-making and the need for continuous and comprehensive development planning.

According to Maxatshwa (in Subban, 2008: 63), a legacy of community

participation is embedded as a benchmark for institutionalising good local governance wherein community participation features as a central theme. Subban, Reddy & Pillay (2011: 132) emphasise that the IDP has, therefore, become a strategic framework, while community-based planning processes have become vehicles for participation in the IDP within all sectors of the communities. As a result of global trends in local government, there is a need for municipalities to transform, restructure and re-configure the manner in which they function and offer services. Therefore, the review and assessment of IDPs is integral to this process, to ensure that municipal governance is less generic and more public participatory, less descriptive and more prescriptive, less institution-oriented and more client impact-oriented (Subban, 2008: 112). Sharing information and insights into the lessons learnt and observations made from the commencement of IDPs in the KZN Province has significance within the context of assessments, in particular, and comprehensive planning, in general.

REFERENCES LIST

- ASMAH-ANDOH, K. 2009. Mainstreaming municipal performance management for efficient and effective service delivery. *Administratio Publica*, 17(4), pp. 200-214.
- BAER, W.C. 1997. General plan evaluation criteria. An approach to making better plans. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 63(3), pp. 329-344.
- BALASESCU, A. 2011. Introduction. Urbanism and sustainability. *Development*, 54(3), pp.293-300.
- BHENGU, T. 2012. Presentation on analysis of sector departments participation in municipal IDP processes and integration of national and provincial plans into municipal IDPs. Provincial Executive Council of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg: 18 May.
- BRODY, S.D., GODSCHALK, D.R. & BURBY, R.J. 2003. Mandating citizen participation, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(3), pp. 245-264.
- BRAND, K. & KLEIN, R. 2012. Embedding urban sustainability into IDPs and SDBIPs. *IMFO*, 12(4), pp. 20-26.
- COGTA (DEPARTMENT OF CO-OPERATIVE GOVERNANCE AND TRADITIONAL AFFAIRS). 2008. KZN

- 2008/09 IDP Assessment Report, 31 August.
- COGTA (DEPARTMENT OF CO-OPERATIVE GOVERNANCE AND TRADITIONAL AFFAIRS). 2011. KZN 2011/2012: IDP Assessment Report, October.
- CONYERS, D. & HILLS, P. 1994. *An introduction to development planning in the third world*. (Reprinted). New York: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- DAVIDS, G. 2009. Policy implementation capacity challenges. The case of Saldana Bay Municipality. *Administratio Publica*, 17(4), pp. 215-231.
- DLGTA (DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND TRADITIONAL AFFAIRS). 2007. Letter to Municipal Managers, 30 April.
- DPLGA (DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT). 2003. Assessment and analysis of IDPs, 2001/2002 Process, Presentation to Technical PCC, 14 February.
- DPLG (DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT). 2006a. IDP Evaluation Framework Version 1.1, 30 March.
- DPLG (DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT). 2006b. Documentation for National IDP Assessment Broederstroom 2006, KZN Departmental Clusters for 06/07 National IDP Assessment.
- DTLGA (DEPARTMENT OF TRADITIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS). 2001. Comprehensive Information Package for KwaZulu-Natal Municipalities on Interim IDPs.
- DTLGA (DEPARTMENT OF TRADITIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS). 2002. Summary of Issues regarding IDPs in KwaZulu-Natal, Annexure A, Draft TOR for Multi-Sectoral IDP Forum, 30 July.
- DTLGA (DEPARTMENT OF TRADITIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS). 2003. Summary of issues regarding IDPs in KwaZulu-Natal, March, Section 1.
- DTLGA (DEPARTMENT OF TRADITIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS). 2004a. Guidelines for the submission of IDPs drafted for implementation during the 2005/2006 FY for assessment by the KZN Provincial Multi-Sectoral IDP Forum, 3 August.
- DTLGA (DEPARTMENT OF TRADITIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS). 2005a. Letter to Municipal Manager, 10 January).
- DTLGA (DEPARTMENT OF TRADITIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS). 2005b. Proposed IDP Assessment Calendar for the 2005/2006 IDP Review process, Annexure B.
- DTLGA (DEPARTMENT OF TRADITIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS). 2005c. Letter to Municipal Manager, 17 January.
- DTLGA (DEPARTMENT OF TRADITIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS). 2005d. Service providers – Municipal alignment: Existing status quo: A determinant for an improved, sustainable future through the application of the provincial IDP Assessment and DPLG Hearing Guidelines informing the 05/06 IDP Review, 17 January 2005: 1-12.
- DUZE, M. 2012. Presentation on outcomes of IDP Analysis Week, KZN Governance and Administration Cluster, Pietermaritzburg, 19 June.
- INGLE, M. 2007. Exercising the mind with Integrated Development Planning. *Politea*, 26(1), pp. 5-17.
- KUNZMANN, K.R. 2004. Culture, creativity and spatial planning. *The Town Planning Review*. 75(40), pp. 383-404.
- MADZIVHANDILA, T.S. & ASHA, A.A. 2012. Integrated Development Planning process and service delivery challenges for South Africa's local municipalities. *Journal of Public Administration*, 47(1.1), pp. 369-378.
- MARAIS, L., HUMAN, F. & BOTES L. 2008. Measuring what? The utilization of development indicators in the Integrated Development Planning process. *Journal of Public Administration*. 43(3), pp. 376-400.
- MENSAH, J.V. 2005. Problems of district medium-term development plan implementation in Ghana. The way forward. *International Development Planning Review*, 27(2), pp. 245-270.
- NAIDOO, P. 2007. Service delivery excellence: Benchmarking local government. *Management Today* (March), pp. 58-62.
- ORANJE, M. & VAN HUYSSTEEN, E.V. 2007. A brief history of intergovernmental development planning. *Town and Regional Planning*, no. 51, pp.1-15.
- RAGA, K., TAYLOR, J.D. & ALBRECHT, W. 2011. Challenges for developmental local government and public participation for contemporary South Africa. *Administratio Publica*, 19(1), pp. 149-168.
- SUBBAN, M., REDDY, P.S. & PILLAY, P. 2011. Integrated Development Planning and the primacy of public participation - A case study of eThekweni's municipality's Integrated Development Plan. *Administratio Publica*, 19(1), pp.121-148.
- SUBBAN, M. 2008. Evaluation of the Long-Term Development Framework (LTDF): A case study of eThekweni municipality's Integrated Development Plan. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis (PhD). Durban, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Public Administration and Business Management.
- THORNHILL, C. 2008. The transformed Local Government System: Some lessons. *Journal of Public Administration*, 43(3.2), pp. 492-511.
- TODARO, M.P. & SMITH, S.C. 2006. *Economic development*. 9th edition. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- VALETA, L. & WALTON, G.K. 2008. Integrated Development Planning and budgeting at local government. *Journal of Public Administration*, 43(3.1), pp. 373-384.