


# Local Government TURNAROUND STRATEGY

Working together, Turning the tide in Local Government

NOVEMBER  
2009



cooperative governance  
& traditional affairs

Department:  
Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



## Table of Contents

1.	The importance of local government	3
2.	An ideal Municipality	4
3.	Current profile of municipalities and service delivery	6
4.	Examples of good and best practices	14
5.	What are the main problems and root causes?	17
6.	What we will do to tackle these problems?	19
7.	Implementation of the Local Government Turnaround Strategy	25
8.	Intervention framework	28
9.	Outline of key intervention areas	29
10.	The process going forward	48
	<b>Annexure A:</b> Institutional Maps	49
	<b>Annexure B:</b> A methodology for understanding spatially differentiated support needs	57
	<b>Annexure C:</b> Table of backlogs per priority function per municipality	71
	<b>Annexure D:</b> CoGTA departmental agenda for possible legislative measures to enhance governance systems and structures	79

## 1. The Importance of Local Government

Local Government is a key part of the reconstruction and development effort in our country. The aims of democratizing our society and growing our economy inclusively can only be realized through a responsive, accountable, effective and efficient Local Government system that is part of a Developmental State.

The establishment of a South African Developmental State is grounded in the vision of the State and Society working together at all levels to advance social justice, economic growth and development. Developmental local government is central to building the developmental state.

Nine years into the new Local Government system there are worrying trends and signs that are undermining the progress and successes achieved thus far. The country faces a great development risk if Local Government fails.

This Local Government Turnaround Strategy (LGTAS) is therefore aimed at counteracting those forces that are undermining our Local Government system. Root causes for some of these problems include:

- i. Systemic factors, i.e. linked to model of local government;
- ii. Policy and legislative factors;
- iii. Political factors;
- iv. Weaknesses in the accountability systems;
- v. Capacity and skills constraints;
- vi. Weak intergovernmental support and oversight; and
- vii. Issues associated with the inter-governmental fiscal system.

With this in mind, the key question government undertook to reflect on with a range of role players over the past few months was *'what is the state of local government in 2009, and what must be done to restore the confidence of our people in this sphere of government by 2011 and beyond?'*

To begin to answer this question, nine province-wide assessments of each of the 283 municipalities were carried out by the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (CoGTA), during the course of the year, led by Minister, Mr Sicelo Shiceka together with the respective MECs responsible for Local Government. The purpose of the provincial assessments was to ascertain the key problem statement in different thematic areas and to establish the root causes for poor performance, distress or dysfunctionality in municipalities. From these assessments, the consolidated State of Local Government Report<sup>1</sup> was compiled and widely consulted over with stakeholders.

---

<sup>1</sup> State of Local Government Report, CoGTA 2009, available on website: [www.dplg.gov.za](http://www.dplg.gov.za)

Following the analysis of the results of these assessments and from the issues covered in the overview report, the 'force motif' for the turnaround strategy (LGTAS) was created. This means that government wants to create a country-wide programme, mobilizing all of government and society to embark upon a concentrated effort to deal with the factors undermining Local Government and to restore good performance in the country's municipalities.

The Strategy also draws on the discussion that happened at an extraordinary sitting of the three spheres of government involving the entire Cabinet led by the State President on 20 October 2009 in Khayelitsha, Cape Town. It also draws on the discussions and declaration of the Local Government Indaba. This Strategy therefore, represents the views of a wide variety of stakeholders who participated in, what is arguably the most consultative process ever undertaken on local government in this country.

The LGTAS applies largely to those forces undermining Local Government including those municipalities who have evidence of performance failures, or difficult social and economic circumstances to manage. The Report points to the need for a number of adjustments and reforms in the leadership, policy, regulatory and oversight environments of municipalities.

Thus government wants to turn around municipalities from struggling with failure to ones that are confident in their abilities to execute their service delivery mandates. All of us must rise to the challenge of ensuring our municipalities are sites of excellence and they are led and staffed politically and administratively with office bearers and public servants who are responsive, accountable, efficient, effective, and carry out their duties with civic pride.

This LGTAS must be read together with the State of Local Government Report, 2009 and the Framework for the Local Government Turnaround strategy, discussed at the National Indaba on Local Government. The SLGR provides a comprehensive picture of the problems and challenges facing Local Government. These problems are summarised in the LGTAS.

## **2. An Ideal Municipality**

Since the establishment of the local sphere, a number of measures to support and strengthen local government have been undertaken. These measures included training on various aspects of the system, the Local Government Support Programme, ISRDP & URP, specialized training by professional institutes, Project Consolidate including Siyenza Manje, and the Five-Year Local Government Strategic Agenda.

All of these measures of support were intended to enable municipalities to fulfill the 'ideal' for local government as envisaged in the Constitution (1996), and the White Paper for Local government (1998), which cites that *'Developmental local government is local government committed to working with citizens and groups within the community to find sustainable ways to meet their social, economic and material needs and improve the quality of their lives.'*

The LGTAS acknowledges and confirms the above overall vision for local government.

The LGTAS is premised on key assumptions:

- **Local Government is everyone's business.** The Strategy extends beyond government and must be owned across society. Municipalities can be made to work better for everyone by everyone.
- **The structure of local government system remains.** Notwithstanding certain changes that may have to be effected, the overall architecture of the system of local government is still sound. Certain policy and legislative reforms have been proposed by the Policy Review on Provincial and Local Government (COGTA 2009), and these are connected to the longer-term proposals in the LGTAS. Other proposals are still under consideration.
- **The local government system is still new and is evolving.** The new system of local government was always intended to be phased in over time and the current problems must be seen as part of an effort to learn and correct as we continue with implementation.

An **ideal municipality** in our system will strive to contribute to building the Developmental State in South Africa and draw from the constitutional and legal framework established. An ideal municipality would:

- i. Provide democratic and accountable government for local communities
- ii. Be responsive to the needs of the local community
- iii. Ensure the provision of services to communities in a sustainable manner
- iv. Promote social and economic development
- v. Promote a safe and healthy environment
- vi. Encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in the matters of local government
- vii. Facilitate a culture of public service and accountability amongst its staff
- viii. Assign clear responsibilities for the management and co-ordination of these administrative units and mechanisms.

*The outcomes of meeting these objectives include:*

- The provision of household infrastructure and services
- The creation of liveable, integrated and inclusive cities, towns and rural areas
- Local economic development
- Community empowerment and distribution

These outcomes should create a healthy local environment in which vulnerable groups are supported and protected. It should also mitigate the growing social distance between government and communities.

This sets the benchmark for the turnaround strategy. Municipalities must aspire to deliver on these outcomes. The rest of the state and society must ensure that there is an enabling environment and proper support for municipalities to deliver effectively.

The 283 municipalities in the country have different capacities and are faced with different social and economic challenges. Depending on the different challenges it will be necessary for the municipalities to focus on those responsibilities that they are able to deliver on. This would mean that certain municipalities ought to focus on a smaller set of functions while other municipalities could expand their focus. In order to determine the level and kind of support needed from National and Provincial Government and other stakeholders to achieve the ideal municipality, the different capacities and circumstances of municipalities need to be taken into account.

### 3. Current profile of municipalities and service delivery

To reach developmental objectives for municipal areas, the government’s priority since 1994 has been meeting the basic needs of the millions of South Africans living in poverty. This target has been a cornerstone of government’s redistribution and poverty-eradication effort. In line with the Millennium Development Goals, government’s target is to ensure that by 2014 all households have access to the minimum standard for each basic service.

#### Targets for Service Delivery

The table below depicts the current targets set by the South African government in order to accelerate service delivery to meet basic needs and to promote growth.

*Minimum standards for basic services, source vision 2014*

Sector	Minimum standard 2014 target
Water	All households to have access to at least clean piped water 200 m from household.
Sanitation	All households to have access to at least ventilated pit latrine on site.
Electricity	All households to be connected to national grid.
Refuse Removal	All households to have access to at least once-a-week refuse removal services.
Housing	All existing informal settlements to be formalized with land-use plans for economic and social facilities and with provision of permanent basic services.

Other (education, health, roads, transport, sports and recreation, street trading, parks, community halls, etc	Standards for access for all other social, government and economic services must be clearly defined, planned, and where possible implemented by each sector working together with municipalities in the development and implementation of IDPs.
--	---

A related 2014 goal is to halve unemployment and poverty. Through their procurements of services and by using labour-intensive methods to maintain and build infrastructure, municipalities both broaden participation in the local economy and create work opportunities for the poor.

It is important to consider at this point, the potential of differentiated approaches to service provision. It is possible that current standards and expectations may have to be reviewed. Highly urbanized areas, with formal settlements can reasonably expect their own standpipes, whilst tiny rural area such as Bizana in the Eastern Cape, may need, realistically to have service delivery focusing on greater access to state provided boreholes, or rain tanks and water harvesting, and alternative energy for cooking, as in the bio-fuel example cited under 'good practices' in the section below.

In considering alternative service delivery models, positive political leadership and optimal communication would be critical. Here, structured, directed and regular communication with communities plays a key role.

### Progress in access to priority services

The table below demonstrates that municipalities have contributed significantly to reducing infrastructure backlogs and delivering services. Despite this progress there remain significant constraints to accelerated service delivery. These relate to municipal capacity and the ability of the state to provide adequate infrastructure, particularly in areas of rapid growth, or which are remote geographically. It will also be important to put the focus on the governance arrangements in traditional areas, where access to land for dwellings and access to municipal services are often in disjuncture, leaving citizens without access to basic services.

*Percentage access to household services, source: Community Survey 2007*

Access to electricity for lighting	Access to piped water	Access to full & intermediate sanitation	Access to refuse removal service
W Cape (94.0%)	W Cape (98.9%)	W Cape (93.4%)	W Cape (91.1%)
N Cape (87.3%)	Gauteng (97.9%)	Gauteng (87.8%)	Gauteng (86.2%)
F State (86.6%)	F State (97.5%)	N West (81.6%)	F State (76.1%)
Gauteng (83.5%)	N Cape (94.8%)	F State (69.4%)	N Cape (72.1%)
N West (82.3%)	N West (89.9%)	S Africa (67.6%)	S Africa (61.6%)
Mpumalanga (81.7%)	Mpum (91.3%)	KZN (63.9%)	N West (54.8%)
Limpopo (81.0%)	S Africa (88.6%)	N Cape (54.5%)	KZN (51.9%)

<b>Access to electricity for lighting</b>	<b>Access to piped water</b>	<b>Access to full &amp; intermediate sanitation</b>	<b>Access to refuse removal service</b>
S Africa (80.0%)	Limp (83.6%)	Mpum (53.9%)	Mpum (41.5%)
KwaZulu-Natal (71.5%)	KZN (79.4%)	E Cape (48.9%)	E Cape (40.0%)
E Cape (65.5%)	E Cape (70.4%)	Limp (30.8%)	Limp (18.7%)

Apartheid divided South Africa into separate and unequal spaces and that design remains imprinted on settlements throughout the country. This table clearly reflects that the two provinces that struggle the most with reaching service delivery targets are the Eastern Cape and Limpopo. Poor results for access to refuse removal services in a number of provinces also reflect the vulnerable socio-economic conditions prevailing particularly in the more rural provinces, and especially those regions marked by Bantustan legacies.

These marked differences in poverty, wealth and institutional capacity in South Africa's 283 municipalities has made it necessary to begin tailoring policies and approaches to suit their circumstances. Municipalities have a key role in spatial development. They must plan and manage their built environments in ways that promote social cohesion, inclusive growth and sustainable development.

The direct relationship between municipal service delivery and spatial development is reflected in the fact that the 2014 targets are linked to the broader objective to upgrade informal settlements to become sustainable human settlements.

### **Classification systems**

The Constitution provided for the legislative framework for local government and established three categories of municipality:

A – which provided for metros

B – which provided for local municipalities

C – which provided for district municipalities


6 Metropolitan (Category A) and 231 Local Municipalities (Category B) and an additional 46 District Municipalities (Category C) were established.

During the establishment phase of local government (post-2000), a system of categorisation was introduced (A-C2), to more accurately understand the differentiated challenges facing the 283 municipalities (For a detailed breakdown of the municipal classification, refer to Annexure B). This category refers to the size of municipalities in terms of population, percentage of urban population and size of municipal budgets. These characteristics are relatively fixed over time, and assist with understanding of municipal profiles. However they are not a rational indicator for performance and capacity or for the key economic drivers within a municipality.




- **A:** Metros (6): Large urban complexes with populations over 1 million and accounting for 56% of all municipal expenditure in the country
- **B1:** Local Municipalities with large budgets and containing secondary cities (21)
- **B2:** Local Municipalities with a large town as a core (29)
- **B3:** Local Municipalities with small towns, with relatively small population and significant proportion of urban population but with no large town as a core. (110)
- **B4:** Local Municipalities which are mainly rural with communal tenure and with, at most, one or two small towns in their area (71)
- **C1:** District Municipalities which are not water service authorities (25)
- **C2:** District Municipalities which are water service authorities (21)

A graphical depiction of the classification of district municipalities is the following:



A graphical depiction of the classification of local municipalities is the following:



- Overlaid on to this are four classes of municipalities derived from spatial, social, municipal capacity and economic indicators. This index is indicative of municipalities' vulnerability:
  - Class 1: Very high vulnerability (Local Municipalities:57) (District Municipalities: 12)
  - Class 2: High vulnerability (Local Municipalities:58) (District Municipalities: 11)
  - Class 3: Medium vulnerability (Local Municipalities: 58) (District Municipalities: 13)
  - Class 4: Low vulnerability (Metro's: 6, Local Municipalities: 58) (District Municipalities: 12)
- The National Treasury classification of municipal capacity to implement the MFMA and the audit opinions are also taken into consideration. These indicators provide an indication of financial and management capacity in the different classes of municipalities.

This new classification system will guide the kinds and levels of support and interventions developed for the LGTAS. It will also lay the basis for determining the appropriate

responsibilities, powers and functions that different municipalities ought to ideally provide to their communities and guide how greater state involvement must take place to ensure that all communities receive quality services, irrespective of which municipality they live in.

The table below, using this categorization as a 'neutral' spatial baseline, summarises profiles of municipalities in South Africa. The column on the left depicts the spatial classification with the number of municipalities entered that feature in each of the A-C2 categories. Set against these, firstly, are the number of households (i.e. demographic information for planners), the percentage in poverty and the amount of economic activity generated within the area as indicated by GVA (Gross Value Add) per household. What is already immediately apparent is that:

- 56% of South Africans are living in poverty, most of which reside in B4 areas, reflecting the urgency of targeted poverty alleviation measures
- The gap between household economies in urban and rural areas is highly disparate, with B3 and B4 municipal households well under the A and B1 urbanised percentages, conveying the urgency of small town and rural development initiatives.

Secondly, the results per municipal class for the COGTA methodology are derived from municipal assessments according to three indicator sets: performance functionality (powers and functions performed), backlogs status and socio-economic conditions. Class 1 municipalities are the most vulnerable in this respect, thus requiring that differentiated support approaches prioritise the needs of these areas.

Thirdly, from the indicator results for access to basic services, and financial performance, it is also apparent that:

- The majority of financially distressed municipalities fall within the B3 category, indicating that targeted differentiated support is needed in this area
- That B4 municipalities suffer from the least access to basic services, indicating the priority support areas for this category (MIG and service delivery)

The columns on the far right illustrate the results per category for audit opinions received. It is once more apparent that:

- B3 municipalities have the highest percentage of disclaimers, linking the findings of financial distress and poor audit outcomes.

The Auditor-General's report has identified a lack of controls, mismanagement and lack of governance principle as the key reasons for the state of despair in municipalities.

## **Understanding municipal difference in the LGTAS**

This approach to understanding municipal difference is intended to assist municipalities to reflect on their respective strengths and weaknesses and to take responsibility for identifying and managing appropriate interventions. Taking data and spatial conditions as evidence, and putting it together with the assessment findings, will enable municipalities to prioritise their

support needs. This in turn will allow for a differentiated approach to national and provincial interventions, based on both the common characteristics of particular categories, and the specific challenges identified during the assessments.

Summary table: location of services and performance results, Cogta research

Municipal Infrastructure Investment Framework (MIIF) Classification	No. of Municipalities	Total nr of households	% Poverty	TOTAL GVA (2004)	TOTAL GVA (2004)	GVA (2004) per household	COGTA MUNICIPAL SPATIAL CLASSIFICATION				NT FINANCIALLY DISTRESSED MUNICIPALITIES	Universal household access to Basic Services 2007				ADVERSE AUDIT OPINIONS 2007/08	DISCLAIMER AUDIT OPINION 2007/08	AUDIT REPORTS NOT SUBMITTED 2007/08
				%	R'000		Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4		More than 90%	Between 60-89%	Between 30-59%	Less than 30%			
A	6	4,714,021	35.5	58.9%	725,541	154,000				6	0	1	5			0	0	0
B1	21	2,207,005	41.5	18.4%	226,593	103,000			7	14	14	1	13	5	2	0	6	2
B2	29	1,095,454	43.9	6.9%	84,972	78,000		4	8	17	17	3	13	10	3	1	6	5
B3	111	1,605,681	51.8	9.1%	112,557	70,000	7	34	43	27	27	4	53	34	20	4	39	19
B4	70	2,878,449	73.5	6.4%	79,022	27,000	50	20			0				70	3	25	8
C1	25	3,837,597	44.4	0.3%	3,131		1	2	10	12	4					0	3	1
C2	21	3,948,992	66.1	0.00%	96		11	9	1		3					0	6	4
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>12,500,610</b>	<b>55.9</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,231,912</b>	<b>98,548</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>39</b>

In summary, this Turnaround Strategy recognises a number of indicators that profile municipalities in respect to key findings as outlined above. The aim therefore is to implement a comprehensive but differentiated programme of action to reach the objective of ensuring that municipalities can meet the basic service needs of communities.

This objective requires supporting interventions in performance and professionalism, process efficiencies, and clean government. It will also require that partnerships between local government, communities and civil society are strengthened.

#### **4. Examples of good and best practices**

A random sample of some of the best-performing municipalities in the country and why they are credited thus, gives an indication of the direction the ideal, sustainable municipality would take. The success of some of these municipalities may be leveraged going forward. Knowledge-based engagements can assist in the establishment of possible support mechanisms for weaker municipalities.

Table: Examples of municipalities moving in sustainability mode

Municipality	Area of performance	Reasons
Gamagarra (Northern Cape)	Service delivery	Backlogs eradicated Strong economic centre
Overstrand (Western Cape)	Financial viability	Good credit rating Outstanding collection rates Good CAPEX budget spend
Thabazimbi (Limpopo)	Local economic development	Strong economic sectors Good engagement with business sector
Cape Winelands DM	Planning facilitation	Facilitate economic growth in district Excellent approach to PMS, IDP Innovation to district IGR
West Rand DM (Gauteng)	Good governance	Focusing on development facilitation

## **Lessons learned and governance turned around: the case of Mbombela Local Municipality**

Mbombela local municipality lies in the heart of Mpumalanga – Nelspruit is its major town. It is a host city for the World Cup and strategically located regarding tourism and trade routes.

However in 2008, during an investigation into the affairs of the municipality, the province identified a range of governance-related problems which were promoting instability and poor service delivery. As a consequence, the municipality was placed under section 139 (1) (b) of the Constitution, meaning that a temporary administrator was put in place by the province to stabilize the municipality. The newly-placed Mayor had described the municipality as ‘dysfunctional, with challenges to cooperative governance and low staff morale’. He reported that the new administration also discovered external interests in employment and tender opportunities.

A total overhaul was then undertaken by the caretaker administrator, who had the administrative powers of the municipal manager and the executive powers of the council, that is, from the mayor and the mayoral committee. The process undertaken was a form of re-calibration of the municipality – a re-engineering of the structure, systems and operations.

Within a six month period, the province had returned the executive powers back to a newly constituted council, due to the intense learning curve of change the municipality went through. The new mayor has reported that ‘we are on the road to recovery – it is now a matter of being able to institutionalize and internalize the intervention so that we close the gap between us (the executive) and the administrative side of the organisation’.

In terms of lessons learned, one of the Director’s reported that ‘municipalities can be very sensitive about interventions, but, he said, every institution has its own challenges, even the high-capacity ones; ‘it is important to recognize what these are, because when we did we learned a lot of things we didn’t previously, regarding systems and business operations’<sup>2</sup>.

## **Best practices in metro and local municipalities: City of Tshwane Waste Management**

The importance of replicating, or sharing knowledge and skills in projects designed to overcome service delivery challenges cannot be under-estimated. For example, managing waste in large sprawling cities is a typical challenge, added to by the rapid urban growth of many South African cities and towns. With the constant influx of people comes a steady increase in the volume of waste, and cities now need to somehow service an increasing number of customers with the limited resources and capacity that already face many municipalities.

With most new arrivals living in informal settlements on the outskirts of towns and cities, waste removal is difficult and more expensive. But not doing it properly creates a very real health

---

<sup>2</sup> Information derived from Delivery Magazine article ‘Turning Mbombela Around, October 2009

hazard in these vulnerable communities. The pressure is on not only to be more efficient by doing more with less, but also to find innovative ways of reducing waste, recycling more of it to keep it from the landfills. While many municipalities are not responding well to these challenges, some cities like Tshwane have taken a creative approach that relies on a well equipped fleet, doing things smarter and with the assistance of communities. As a result, the city is now being recognized as one of the best in terms of waste management, prompting a number of international visits from people looking to learn from Tshwane's experience.

Tshwane's approach includes efficient waste collection, managing disposal facilities and also a major focus on public awareness around waste management. The metro has now partnered with private contractors to remove refuse in townships and with communities who are now being trained in waste management to also help service townships. The model is labour intensive and aimed at creating jobs and facilitating skills development in communities, while ensuring that residents receive functional waste management services and surrounding streets are kept clean.

It also provides small business development opportunities, job opportunities and ownership of trucks to small business owners, as well as skills in running small businesses. An added advantage is that it has instilled awareness and helped to change behaviour patterns.

### **Differentiating approaches to service delivery: the case of Umdoni Local Municipality, KwaZulu-Natal**

The project described below was showcased at the 2008 national Vuna Awards ceremony as one of five examples of best practice in alternative forms of service delivery.

Strain on the energy grid coupled with Eskom's lack of capacity to provide electricity infrastructure to rural households and informal settlements in the Umdoni area of KwaZulu-Natal prompted some lateral thinking on the part of the municipality, which came up with a plan to supply a clean alternative energy source for cooking. It is a safer alternative to paraffin and unhealthy wood-burning fires, which residents previously relied on for cooking. The Umdoni Municipality is now supplying indigent households with stoves and flammable gel for instant and safe cooking energy.

The idea for this sustainable energy project arose from the municipality's indigent policy, as poor residents could not benefit from the free basic electricity they were entitled to. Instead, the municipality reallocated the funds for this to purchasing stoves and an ongoing supply of bio-fuel gel for cooking purposes. The Municipal Manager had reported that it could be a while before these households got electricity and that they were not going to 'just sit back'. They were proactive and provided the gel and stoves to improve quality of lives while demonstrating their commitment to alternative energy.

The municipality purchased a customized van to cater for distribution needs. Gel that has not been fetched is left with ward committee members where possible, to be collected at a more convenient time.



Reportedly, at first, communities were not very happy because they feared that they would not ever get formal electricity infrastructure. But following an education and awareness drive, the municipality received unanimous buy-in from these same communities and continues to receive positive feedback from the beneficiaries. The municipality has also appointed a community development officer to deal with issues that arise, and act as a mediator between the municipality and the communities. Thus a simple and informative communication drive addressed the initial scepticism of residents and helped the municipality gain widespread buy-in from the community.

This example demonstrates how alternative energy sources can be integrated within communities with effective consultation, negotiation and community involvement. This lessens the stress of trying to deliver conventional universal access to basic services within budgets and time-frames that many municipalities in rural areas simply cannot manage.

Replication and adaptation of good practices in service delivery, as exemplified above in regard to waste management and alternative energy, are critical for sustainable responses to potential services crisis areas. Such responses need to be considered as options within government programming for support to municipalities going forward.

## **5. What are the main problems and what are their root causes?**

The State of Local Government Report highlights the rapid progress made by many municipalities in extending basic services since 2001. It also highlighted many good practices and examples of successful municipalities. It acknowledges the many hard working and dedicated municipal councilors and officials that continue to serve their communities well.

However, the Report also points out that these good practices can be overshadowed by a range of problems and challenges that is placing the local government system in distress. It is important to point out that the problems identified per thematic areas are not applicable equally across the board to all municipalities. They have emerged to varying degrees in different municipalities and all the problems are not applicable to all municipalities. Also, some problem areas may be external to municipalities and require solutions beyond their scope.

In order to categorise the assessment findings, key thematic areas were identified. These were:

- a) **Service Delivery**<sup>3</sup> – this area refers to the delivery of basic services in municipal areas. These are primarily water, sanitation, refuse removal, electricity and roads.
- b) **Spatial conditions** – these include geographic considerations such as characteristics of urban areas, conditions in former 'Homeland' or 'Bantustan' areas (e.g. Ciskei), location of poverty, and types of economies in the area, such as mining or agriculture.

---

<sup>3</sup> The functional responsibilities of municipalities are referred to in Schedules 4 and 5 of the Constitution

- c) **Governance** – this covers elements such as political leadership, institutional organization, administration, capacity and skills, oversight and regulation, monitoring and reporting)
- d) **Financial Management** - Municipality budget and income management (e.g. from water, rates, electricity charges. The Intergovernmental Fiscal System distributes grants to municipalities for service delivery. These include the Equitable Share (ES) and the Municipal Infrastructure Grant (MIG).
- e) **LED** – Local Economic Development refers to the approach a municipality and region may take to encouraging investment by big business, small local business development, tourist industries or large sector economy management in mining, manufacturing or farming.
- f) **Labour Relations** – the way the management of municipalities and the workforce of the municipality organize and cooperate together.

The section below highlights the core areas of concern from the evidence-based findings:

- a. There are serious leadership and governance challenges in municipalities including weak responsiveness and accountability to communities;
- b. The financial management of many municipalities is very poor;
- c. Many municipalities are unable to deliver basic services or grow their economies;
- d. The legacy of apartheid spatial development patterns and inequity continues; and
- e. There is inadequate human resource capital to ensure professional administrations, and positive relations between labour, management and Councils.

These findings, whether they relate to the external environment or problems of municipalities own making, have fuelled public perception and concern within government that the entire Local Government system is in distress wherein it is seen that:

- a. Local government is failing the poor
- b. Local government is not working properly
- c. Local government is unaccountable to the citizens
- d. Local government is marred by excessive levels of corruption, fraud, maladministration
- e. Municipalities are centres of factional conflicts, political infighting and patronage

The root cause of much of municipal failure has been determined as being due to:

- a. Inappropriate national and provincial government policies, practices and onerous requirements;
- b. Socio-economic conditions prevailing in many municipalities that are not been adequately addressed through macro, micro-economic and industrial policies and plans of the State;

- c. Political parties that are undermining the integrity and functioning of municipal councils through intra and inter-party conflicts and inappropriate interference in councils and administration;
- d. A breakdown of values at a societal level that is breeding unethical behaviour, corruption, culture of non-payment, and lack of accountability;
- e. Communities that are engaging in destructive forms of protest including withholding of payment for local taxes and services;
- f. Those municipalities that are not geared for delivering basic services and are not responsive and accountable enough to residents; including to failure to involve communities in their own development;
- g. Absence of communications resources (people, technology, equipment processes) and no accountability for how and when municipalities communicate to communities

These realities have led to many negative responses towards those municipalities that are struggling with complex social and legacy-based issues, or that are failing with performance or governance issues. The Turnaround Strategy is therefore a high-level government-wide response to stem this tide. It is an effort to stabilize local government and put municipalities back on a path of responsive and accountable service delivery.

## 6. What we will do to tackle these problems?

Five strategic objectives are identified that will guide the LGTAS interventions and support framework. These are aimed at **restoring the confidence of the majority of our people** in our municipalities, as the primary expression of the developmental state at a local level.

These are:

- 1) Ensure that municipalities meet the **basic service needs** of communities
- 2) Build clean, effective, efficient, **responsive and accountable** local government
- 3) Improve performance and **professionalism** in municipalities
- 4) Improve **national and provincial policy, oversight and support**
- 5) Strengthen **partnerships** between local government, communities and civil society

These objectives have been identified as the key drivers in order to **rebuild and improve the basic requirements for a functional, responsive, effective, efficient, and accountable developmental local government.**

In achieving these objectives we will **mobilise government and society** to protect and enhance the Local Government system by addressing the forces undermining the system and addressing relevant areas for improvement. The key interventions are discussed below.

**6.1 National Government (including state enterprises) will organize itself better in relation to Local Government:**

- i. Review policies and legislation to make Local Government work better
- ii. Create a clearing house for policy impacting on Local Government
- iii. Establish a single window and entry point for the coordination of local government support and monitoring in the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA)
- iv. Address the “one size fits all” approach by enabling municipalities to focus on functions that are suited to their different sizes and capacities
- v. Mobilise greater state involvement in rural development and address socio-economic and institutional vulnerability of the relevant municipalities
- vi. Facilitate an intergovernmental agreement with targeted set of municipalities and direct relevant conditional grants to incentivise and fast-track upgrade of informal settlements
- vii. Ensure a more enabling environment for service delivery including a funding strategy for municipal infrastructure provision, operation and maintenance.
- viii. Improve spatial prioritization of budgets and investments, and delivery of national functions and inter-sectoral alignment in municipalities.
- ix. Organised participation in IDP processes

**6.2 Provinces will improve their support and oversight responsibilities over Local Government:**

- i. Align with the above National Government approach and similarly undertake the applicable actions at a provincial level
- ii. Allocate more resources towards the Local Government function
- iii. Improve performance and accountability including better communication and involvement of municipalities and communities in planning and execution of provincial functions

**6.3 Municipalities will reflect on their own performance and identify their own tailor-made turnaround strategies<sup>4</sup> focused on achieving the following:**

- i. Stable Councils with visionary and accountable leadership

---

<sup>4</sup> Municipalities will receive guidelines on structuring their Turn-Around Strategies; the five thematic areas will provide a guide to key focus areas for intervention.

- ii. Undertake appropriate set of powers and functions and identify and establish relevant agency arrangements with national and provincial government within current policy framework
- iii. Professional administration that supports the political vision contained in the electoral mandate
- iv. Properly constituted corporate services, technical services and financial management functions, including recruitment and skills retention policies ensuring 'right people in the right job'
- v. Provision of basic services and ensuring every cent spent is well considered and accounted for – 'value for money'
- vi. Through the municipal Spatial Development Frameworks, each municipality is aware of and is able to guide the land use activity on every square meter and kilometer in its area of jurisdiction
- vii. Optimised revenue collection and improved billing, customer care, indigent and credit control policies – 'balance the books'
- viii. Work towards sustaining clean audit outcomes by 2014. Those that can achieve the target earlier must do so.
- ix. Improved public participation and communication including effective complaint management and feedback systems

**6.4 All three spheres of government will improve Inter-Governmental Relations (IGR) in practice:**

- i. IGR structures must be tasked with addressing the forces undermining the Local Government system
- ii. There must be a review of all IGR structures across government
- iii. IGR structures must meet regularly and be effective in supporting and monitoring the overall LGTAS including the municipal turnaround strategies
- iv. Any support and interventions in municipalities will be guided by the differentiated approach

**6.5 Political parties will promote and enhance the institutional integrity of municipalities by ensuring that:**

- i. Political management does not destabilize and place inappropriate pressure on councils and administration
- ii. Political office bearers deployed in municipalities are well trained, inducted and have the capacity and integrity to provide leadership in the best interest of communities
- iii. A performance management system for Councilors is established and managed
- iv. Councilors are responsive and accountable to communities

**6.6 A good citizenship campaign will be designed and launched, at the core of which is Ubuntu. All citizens including public officials at all levels, those in the private sector, trade unions, professional bodies and traditional leaders will be guided in their actions by a common set of values.**

- i. Good citizenship centered on involvement in Local Government affairs – “Local Government is Everyone’s Business”. The LGTAS serves as a social compact across all sectors of society to contribute to building responsive, accountable and effective municipalities.
- ii. Ethical behavior by all
- iii. Poorest and vulnerable are a priority
- iv. Loyalty to the Constitution
- v. Volunteerism and community service
- vi. Transparency and accountability of Public Office
- vii. Responsiveness of Public Officials
- viii. Support and partnerships are necessary
- ix. Common national patriotism
- x. Rights and responsibilities are inseparable

### **LGTAS Implementation Priorities**

**The immediate pre-2011 priorities are to:**

- a) Address immediate financial and administrative problems in municipalities
- b) Regulations to stem indiscriminate hiring and firing

- c) Ensure & implement a transparent municipal supply chain management system
- d) Strengthen Ward Committee capacity & implement new ward committee governance model
- e) National and provincial commitments in IDPs
- f) Differentiated responsibilities and simplified IDPs (Agreement with each municipality on the ideal scope of functions to be provided and how best the State can support service delivery through intergovernmental agency arrangements)
- g) Funding and capacity strategy for municipal infrastructure (Funding and capacity strategy for municipal infrastructure in rural areas including extending MIG grant to 2018 and utilising annual allocations to municipalities for repayment of loans in order to accelerate delivery)
- h) Intergovernmental agreement with metros on informal settlement upgrade including alignment of MIG (Cities) and Housing Subsidy grants
- i) Review and rearrange capacity grants & programmes, including Siyenza Manje support for a more effective support and intervention programme including Rapid Response Teams and Technical Support Units
- j) Upscale Community Works Programme to ensure ward based development systems;
- k) Implement the Revenue Enhancement – Public Mobilisation campaign
- l) Launch the “good citizenship” campaign, focusing on governance values to unite the nation and mobilize involvement in local development affairs
- m) Preparations for next term of local government inspire public confidence including commitment by political parties to put up credible candidates for elections.

**The post 2011 priorities - Vision 2014:**

- a) A single election for national, provincial and local government (benefits: single manifesto, one financial year, single public service, common 5 yr medium term planning, aligned human resource and budgeting frameworks)
- b) All citizens must have access to affordable basic services
- c) Eradication of all informal settlements
- d) Clean cities, through the management of waste in such a way that it creates employment and wealth
- e) Infrastructure backlogs should be reduced significantly
- f) All schools, clinics and hospitals and other public facilities have access to water, sanitation and electricity;
- g) Each of the wards has at least one sporting facility

- h) Each municipality has the necessary ICT infrastructure and connectivity
- i) All provinces and municipalities should have clean audits
- j) Violent service delivery protests are eliminated
- k) Municipal debt is reduced by half
- l) Empowered and capacitated organs of people's power (Street, Block / Section, Village & Ward Committees)
- m) Trained and competent councillors, traditional leaders, officials, Ward Committee members, CDWs and community activists

### ***Doing things differently and more effectively***

The approach to managing local government support and intervention must have a greater and more sustainable impact than previous interventions such as Project Consolidate and the Five-Year Strategic Agenda. During the course of 2009, the assessments process allowed CoGTA and its stakeholders to analyse the **root-causes** of the challenges within our municipalities – thus allowing for the concept of a **social compact** between government and broader society to develop. This will direct targeted, relevant and sustainable intervention and support across the country.

Arising from this, CoGTA believes that the central force for change driven by the nation, will reconstitute the principle of **municipal 'own' accountability**. This, combined with the concept of **differentiated support**, and necessary legislative and policy adjustment will create a binding yet supportive force around municipalities.

In terms of monitoring and oversight, there will be **annual assessments** of the performance of government as played out at municipal level. These direct and 'hands-on' assessments will guide the accuracy of S46 and S47 reporting (as provided for in the Municipal Systems Act, 1998) going forward, as well as provide for evidence-based lessons for adjustments to policy and programmes. All other reporting systems must be aligned to this process.

The concept of a **single window of coordination** will drive the approach to the LGTAS. This means there is a single entry point, via CoGTA for any government programme, policy directive, or other initiative for support that moves into a municipal area. This will assist to lessen the fragmentation within the cooperative governance arrangements impacting on local government. It will also provide for a more focused oversight and support role for provinces and provide for a greater knowledge bank on municipal environments.

In the implementation of the LGTAS, those municipalities that are leading in examples of good practices, innovation and performance will be requested to assist those that have fallen behind. Replication of good practice must also become institutionalised and managed across government. This must be incentivised through a **revamped Vuna Awards** system that focuses on innovation and recognizes achievement and performance according to the annual hands-on assessment process which will become the basis of the section 46 and 47 reporting system.



**Key instruments** will be utilized by CoGTA to ensure that there are dedicated resources for implementation of the LGTAS. These include:

- A number of working structures to guide and steer the LGTAS (see section on Implementation Framework)
- A working group for donor relations, stakeholder management, resource acquisition, contract management and monitoring
- Ensuring **Siyenza Manje** is under the leadership of CoGTA for the purpose of coordinating and organizing support to Local Government
- Re-organizing the way the **Municipal Systems Improvement Grant** (MSIG) is structured and complementing this with the establishment of Rapid Response Teams and Technical Support Units
- Implementing the **MIG policy review** proposals including:
  - Institutional arrangements to support infrastructure planning, project preparation and management and contract management
  - Leveraging of MIG allocations to fund and finance infrastructure at required scale
- Establishment of national Communications Task Team for coherent, coordinated messaging campaign.

## **7. Implementation of the Local Government Turnaround Strategy**

One of the main aims of the Turnaround Strategy is to renew the vision of developmental local government. To do this the LGTAS seeks to improve the organizational and political performance of municipalities and in turn the improved delivery of services. The goal is to improve the lives of citizens, and progressively meet their social, economic and material needs, thereby restoring community confidence and trust in government.

Implementation of the LGTAS Strategy will be premised upon the methodology that **there must be a differentiated and targeted support system for local government** (see Annexure B).

Measures will be taken to ensure that in those parts of the country, especially rural areas, where severe poverty and underdevelopment sits side by side with weak municipal capacity, there is a dedicated focus to augment municipal capacity with delivery through capable institutions at either provincial or national level.

A differentiated support system will therefore be established to manage the support system to be provided by the LGTAS. The support system will focus on two interrelated streams:

- Institutional measures to facilitate improved delivery of infrastructure and services
- Structural, policy, legislative and capacity building measures over the longer-term

Because a number of deficiencies have been identified in the current structures and institutional systems of the municipalities, there will therefore be a need to review appropriate procedures and practices to effect the necessary changes. This may result in the possible relaxation of some regulatory requirements and policy and legislative reviews (see *Annexure D*).

The following factors underpin the implementation of the LGTAS:

***a) The impact of uniform regulatory frameworks***

Due to the assumption that municipalities are the same, government introduced uniform requirements, norms and standards, financial regime and service delivery targets. The reality however shows that some of these have placed onerous burden on low capacity municipalities. Also municipalities have been overregulated or inappropriately regulated without due consideration to cost-benefit and risk analysis on different municipalities.

***b) Municipalities focus on compliance***

Due to the onerous compliance regime referred to above, many municipalities have tended to focus much of their energies on fulfilling compliance requirements rather than focusing on the critical issues of service delivery and enhancing performance.

***c) Untargeted and ineffective support;***

The state must improve its capacity to regulate, oversee and support municipalities at all levels. The lack of proper differentiation of municipalities has undermined government's efforts to support municipalities. The state must seek to ensure that all citizens are provided with basic services irrespective of which municipality they live in. This means the state may have to play a more central directive role in the administration of some municipalities in future (e.g. those that may be described as non-viable).

***d) The combination of internal factors with external impacts***

The problems in Local Government are a result of both internal factors, those that are within the direct control of municipalities (e.g. financial management, billing systems, human resource management, and external factors. These refer more to the impact of national policies, unemployment, poverty and recession on municipalities and their populations. These are factors over which municipalities do not have much control.

The internal factors also relate to political issues such as undue political interference in councils which can cause instability in the administration. Further, external factors are also influenced by

the way the three spheres<sup>5</sup> of government work together to provide services (e.g. housing, hospitals, roads) within the system of cooperative governance and these are reflected in poor intergovernmental relations (IGR). Communities are often not aware that there are many constraints on service delivery caused by the complexity of coordinating service related functions across government, and this is an area that demands urgent attention.

The failure to appreciate these realities has led in part to a convergence of pressures that have created dangerous conditions for social instability. The violent attacks against foreign national that swept through the country in 2008 started in informal settlements. Public protests have become common, widespread and are often violent. The majority of these have taken place in urban areas.

Thus the implementation of the LGTAS will be supported by national government concomitantly addressing a range of longer-term and more systemic issues that have contributed to failure or distress within local government.

These include:

- ***Intergovernmental coordination and support***; The State of Local Government Report highlighted the fragmented nature of the local government capacity building and support measures of national and provincial government.
- ***Supervision, monitoring and interventions***; The constitution and legislative frameworks allow for different forms of measures to be taken, including interventions in the case of governance and service delivery failures. But it may be necessary to review current practice and allow for 'early-warning' systems re municipal failure, and provide for sharper and more immediate preventative interventions.
- ***Incentives and disincentives***; Municipalities have constitutional rights to exercise powers and make decisions within their realm of operations. It would therefore be necessary to look at how incentives and disincentives are used and built into our fiscal and support frameworks to incentivize change.

In the case of municipalities that are dysfunctional, a special set of measures based on stronger state intervention must apply to ensure that these municipalities achieve a basic level of functionality. In the case of municipalities whose performance is persistently and materially on the borderline of becoming dysfunctional, stronger support measures must incentivize a return to basic functionality. This should involve these municipalities reorganizing their operations to focus on providing only the most essential services, determined in that context.

In these areas, national government and provinces will step up their capacity to involve citizens in service delivery and development to compensate for municipal failure - through increased use of community partnerships and EPWP. These measures should be coordinated with the Rural Development Programme.

---

<sup>5</sup> The three spheres of government are the national, provincial and local governments

In the case of municipalities that are functional but not performing effectively due to institutional problems, support measures must be linked to incentives to achieve higher levels of performance. High performing municipalities must be encouraged through policy and incentives to do more where they can and to sustain and improve on high performance.

Infrastructure and service delivery facilitation: the interventions in financially vulnerable municipalities will be more direct and include special delivery measures. For municipalities with less vulnerability the focus will be on removing barriers and constraints, and on organising and aligning built environment conditional grants better in order to address informal settlement upgrading, housing and public transport.

Through their turnaround strategies, municipalities will indicate what their needs are and they will have the option of buying into the support measures to ensure that there is proper commitment to utilise support measures to good effect. In cases where municipalities feel that they can accomplish the rationalised functions by themselves then they will be held to account accordingly. If they fail they will then have to accept obligatory support measures as an opportunity to avoid intervention measures according to the legislation and Constitution.

Special hubs of professional service functions (Technical Support Units) will be established at provincial or regional level if needs be to ensure on-going and day to day care and support for vulnerable municipalities.

## **8. Intervention Framework**

Section six of this LGTAS identified actions towards mobilizing government and society to improve the local government system. The following section provides an outline of the specific priorities required to ensure successful implementation of the LGTAS:

## LGTAS – OUTLINE OF KEY INTERVENTION AREAS

Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
1. Service Delivery	1. Better Planning and Oversight over Local Service Delivery	<p>1.1 Remove constraints to service delivery:</p> <p>a) Identify legislation and practice that constrains service delivery</p> <p>b) Current package of free basic services to be reviewed</p> <p>c) All basic services should urgently be devolved to local government</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen regional planning and identify constraints</li> <li>Participate in reviews, consultations and oversight</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen collective municipal plans</li> <li>Consultations on FBS</li> <li>Mobilise urgent support for provision of basic services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify constraints to service delivery</li> <li>Effect priority amendments</li> <li>Ensure support for provision of basic services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved planning, service provision</li> </ul>
		d) Ensure necessary resources are allocated to address service delivery MDG priorities within the defined time-frames (2014)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget and grant reviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring of MIG expenditure and infrastructure planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthened community oversight and monitoring over service delivery projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutionalization of new approaches at each level of government</li> </ul>
		e) Continue to strengthen intergovernmental and municipal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional intergovernmental and sector coordination</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IDPs must be endorsed by community organizations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social Compact concept initialized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legislation enacted that will make IDPs the only authorizing</li> </ul>

Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
		<p>planning - the IDP must be followed by all, and be applicable to all spheres of government, SoE's and stakeholders outside of government</p> <p>f) Radically redress apartheid spatial planning: urban / rural divide, townships and suburbs</p> <p>g) Spatial Development Frameworks must enable municipalities to know and guide what is happening in every part of a municipal space</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional role in development planning and coordination</li> <li>Oversight and approval of IDPs</li> </ul>	<p>and stakeholders as local social compacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthened community oversight and monitoring over service delivery projects</li> <li>Implement support programmes for improved spatial planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for new IDP process</li> <li>Strengthen role of communities</li> <li>Ensure communication between role-players for coherent IDPs</li> </ul>	<p>instrument for development in local areas</p>
		<p>h) Restructure the Municipal Infrastructure Grant (MIG)</p> <p>i) Establish a Special Purpose Vehicle for Infrastructure Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oversight and support for infrastructure investment management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement support programmes for improved MIG performance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accelerated infrastructure development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutionalization</li> <li>Compliance</li> <li>Monitoring and reporting</li> </ul>

Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
		j) All small business must be registered so that taxation may be enforced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring and enforcement measures to be improved</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All small business must be registered so that taxation may be enforced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement new regulatory environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement and monitor new regulatory environment</li> </ul>
2. Governance	21. Address Constitutional and Legislative Weaknesses in Municipal Governance	<p>2.1.1 Legislative reform programme for local government:</p> <p>a) Clearer separation between the legislative and executive functions</p> <p>b) Develop a clear policy on delegations for the troika and MM</p> <p>c) Full review of system of full and part-time councillors that includes remuneration and accountability implications</p> <p>d) Place legally mandatory timelines</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation</li> <li>Improved oversight of implementation</li> <li>Policy feedback</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information, support, consultation</li> <li>Legislative compliance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for reform processes</li> <li>Undertake targeted legislative reforms</li> <li>Monitor implementation and compliance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutionalization of reforms</li> <li>Support processes</li> <li>Monitoring and evaluation</li> <li>Policy feedback</li> </ul>

Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
		<p>for feedback to communities on issues raised for councils to improve information flow</p> <p>e) Develop a protocol to ensure cooperation between the institutions of traditional leadership / Traditional councils and local government</p> <p>f) Review all by-laws that are not contributing to development</p> <p>g) Review powers of Municipal Demarcation Board to align with political processes</p> <p>h) Policy on safety of councilors and their property to be developed</p>				



Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
		i) Identify which municipalities are not viable and where amalgamation is required				
	2.2 Professionalisation and Administrative Stabilisation of Local government	<p>2.2.2 Undertake steps to strengthen professionalism of local government:</p> <p>a) Section 57 managers must belong to a professional organization</p> <p>b) Ensure that professional associations monitor the Code of Conduct of their members in local government</p> <p>c) If S57 managers suspended all municipalities must get concurrence on the proposed suspensions from the MRC for Local</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation</li> <li>• Implementation &amp; Support</li> <li>• Compliance</li> <li>• Oversight</li> <li>• Monitoring and evaluation</li> <li>• Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation</li> <li>• Implementation</li> <li>• Compliance</li> <li>• Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support programmes</li> <li>• Amended policy, guidelines</li> <li>• Monitoring</li> <li>• Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support programmes</li> <li>• Institutionalization</li> <li>• Monitoring and evaluation</li> <li>• Reporting</li> </ul>

Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
		<p>government and the national Minister; and suspend without remuneration</p> <p>d) ICT systems must be put in place across all municipalities to accelerate service delivery, improve efficiency and accountability</p> <p>e) Strengthen internal capacity of municipalities to reduce reliance on external consultants</p> <p>f) Qualified and skilled staff to be appointed to oversee the implementation of by-laws</p> <p>g) The induction of new councilors to be standardized and overseen by local government</p>				

Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
3	Establish a Single Window of Coordination for Local Government	<p>3.1 Establish a single point of entry for the support, monitoring and intervention in Local government:</p> <p>a. Ministers to inform sub-national spheres when going to municipalities</p> <p>b. National and provincial government must provide increased and better coordinated oversight and support to local government</p> <p>c. The Constitutional status of councils to be respected by all political parties</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provincial COGTA's must be the single point of coordination for local government</li> <li>• Intergovernmental communication and information systems</li> <li>• Consultation</li> <li>• Oversight and support</li> <li>• Monitoring and reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intergovernmental communication and information systems</li> <li>• Implementation systems</li> <li>• Compliance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Interim Measures on Cooperative Governance approved by Cabinet (October 2009)</li> <li>• Support programmes</li> <li>• Institutional arrangements</li> <li>• Compliance</li> <li>• Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutionalization</li> <li>• Intergovernmental structures</li> <li>• Compliance</li> <li>• Monitoring and reporting</li> </ul>

Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
		<p>3.2 Weak Communication between Government and Communities:</p> <p>a) Institutionalize communication structures, processes and systems for structured, direct and regular communication with local communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participation and oversight</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council to implement and oversee</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify priority issues in TAS to communicate to communities and stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutionalize processes for improved government / community communication</li> </ul>
	<p>4. Deepen People-Centred Government through a Refined Model of Ward Committees</p>	<p>4.1 Priorities of all three spheres of government must find expression in the work of Ward Committees</p> <p>a) Ward Committees must be coordinated at a municipal, district, provincial and national level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ward Committees must be coordinated at a municipal, district, provincial and national level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ward Committees must be coordinated at a municipal, district, provincial and national level</li> <li>Prepare Ward Development plans and prepare household profiles</li> <li>Ward Committees must establish Street, Block and Village committees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support programmes to prepare systems, plans and projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutionalize systems for plans and projects</li> <li>Monitoring, reporting</li> <li>Evaluation and policy feedback</li> </ul>

Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ward Committees must be established for various sectors</li> <li>• The Ward councilor is the 'governor' of the Ward and new CDW is Ward CEO</li> <li>• Community oversight of development projects</li> <li>• Each ward to have LED project and product that is driven by local cooperatives</li> <li>• Programmes to mobilize society and people on the ground and be accountable</li> </ul>		

Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
5. Local Economic Development	5.1 Dedicated LED focus urgently needed across local government sphere	a) Application of LED Framework b) Ongoing monitoring of LED in municipalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional economic growth assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support programmes to assess LED approaches and work with Ward Committees on economic products</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Combined intergovernmental support for LED</li> <li>Share best practices on LED</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of LED spatially</li> </ul>
		c) Intergovernmental focus from DSD; Rural Development, dti, CoGTA; DHS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intergovernmental support for LED</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support programme for LED</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work with EPWP and sector clusters on job creation and poverty alleviation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ward Committees, Traditional leaders and municipalities and local business working collectively</li> </ul>
		d) Facilitate the establishment ward-based economic planning Develop policy on ward-based economic planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure alignment of provincial economic plans with municipal and ward-based economic plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitation of ward-based economic planning</li> <li>Each Ward to have at least one economic development product</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop ward-based economic planning guidelines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of ward-based economic planning</li> </ul>
6. Labour Relations	6.1 Strengthen local Labour Relations to support Developmental Local Government	a) Develop a tool to monitor the functionality of the LLFs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oversight role</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revive LLFs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regulations enforced</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen political and executive oversight over the LLFs</li> </ul>

Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
		b) Undertake an audit of Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) in all municipalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support and oversight of Audit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cooperation with Audit; reform as needed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment for OHS reforms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved OHS environment</li> </ul>
		c) Undertake a national review of compliance with the current grading system of municipalities and its impact on labour and HR matters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation</li> <li>Research</li> <li>Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation</li> <li>Research</li> <li>Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research and information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of new approaches</li> </ul>
		d) Local government School (LOGOLA) should be revived and strengthened  e) Ongoing skills development and capacity-building programme to be implemented with refresher training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation</li> <li>Implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation</li> <li>Implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Selection processes for training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutionalization and standards setting</li> </ul>
7. Intergovernmental Fiscal System	7.1 Reform the Intergovernmental Fiscal System	a) .Long-tem fiscal planning (5-20 years) to be balanced with the current skills base to bring greater predictability to local government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve coordination of various grants to local government and address equity and compliance challenges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial oversight strengthened</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement short-term plan for grant expenditure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supervisory and early-warning systems established</li> </ul>

Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
		b) Develop targeted and differentiated financial instruments to support municipalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve coordination of various grants to local government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support programme for differentiated approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalise proposals for a new set of differentiated financial instruments &amp; municipal grants</li> <li>• Implementation of differentiated accounting and reporting requirements and application of revised financial instruments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised intergovernmental fiscal system</li> </ul>



Focus Area	Intervention	Responsibility			Timeframe	
		National Sphere	Provincial Sphere	Local Sphere	Pre-2011	2011 Onwards
		<p>c) Implement a programme on revenue collection and a campaign on public mobilization to pay for services:</p> <p>d) Implement priority programmes on municipal financial management; e.g. Operation Clean Audit; Revenue Enhancement,</p> <p>e) Review of Municipal Supply Chain Management legislation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaboration and implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation programmes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobilization and programme implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutionalization of improved financial environment</li> </ul>
		<p>f) Support to poor municipalities with finance and bail out measures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intergovernmental roles and responsibilities: oversight and support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation, liaison on measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop conditions for bail-out of municipalities</li> <li>• Support implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop norms and standards for financial systems and record keeping</li> </ul>
		<p>g) Ward Committees should be given budgets to undertake their developmental responsibilities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation</li> <li>• Oversight and support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budgeting and planning</li> <li>• Accountability</li> <li>• Reporting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costing models and training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intergovernmental and cooperative processes for LED and service delivery priorities</li> </ul>

The intervention areas identified above provide an overview of critical actions required. Detailed plans and inputs from stakeholders will also inform the process going forward.


## **Municipality-Specific LGTAS Guidelines**

1. The Turnaround Strategy provides an opportunity for all municipalities in the country to reflect on their own performance and concentrate on removing constraints.
2. Each municipality will define its improvement areas in consultation with the province. The critical thing is for there to be ownership by municipalities of the process. It should not be compliance driven. The use of consultants in this process is not necessary.
3. Municipalities are expected to develop own turnaround strategies working together with communities. All municipalities must develop their Turnaround Strategies by the end of March 2010. Each municipality will develop own Strategy based on own priorities, local circumstances and financial and administrative capacities, but taking into consideration the relevant plans of national and provincial departments.
4. The local strategies should however be guided by the strategic objectives of the national strategy. To this effect, it would be expected of municipalities to review weaknesses in their policies, systems, structures approaches and operations and seek ways to improve and advance national aims and objectives.
5. Institutional Maps will be distributed to the following: national and provincial sector departments, state-owned enterprises, statutory bodies, stakeholder groupings and Ward Committees. These groupings will input their responsibilities and their commitments onto these maps which will provide an audit of where support is committed, located and its value. These inputs will inform the municipal TASs.

## **Institutional Arrangements for the LGTAS**

1. A special Ministerial Advisory and Monitoring structure will be established to ensure that all role players are effectively contributing to the Turnaround Strategy.
2. The longer-term phases of the LGTAS will be steered by the development of the macro-organisational processes within government and the improved application of sector policy within local areas. The coordinating role of CoGTA is central to the oversight and monitoring of the LGTAS.
3. A National Coordinating Unit (NCU) will be set up in CoGTA, and will oversee, monitor and report on the progress of the LGTAS across government and society.
4. An Intergovernmental Working Group has been established to support the implementation of the LGTAS. It consists of officials from National sector departments and from the Offices of the Provincial Premiers and the Departments of Local Government / COGTA as well as SALGA. Its purpose is to provide intergovernmental perspectives to the development and implementation of the LGTAS. Other functions include the provision of resources and advice.
5. Technical Services Units (TSUs) will be established provincially, and also be coordinated by the NCU.
6. A Rapid Response Team will be established within the NCU to attend to critical interventions across the country in municipalities.

## INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE LGTAS



## Success Factors for the Implementation of the LGTAS

### 1. Political Ownership and stewardship at different levels

Existing institutional arrangements should be utilized at national, provincial and local level lead by the Minister of COGTA, Premiers, MECs responsible for Local Government and Mayors to oversee the implementation of the Strategy. This will take into account the current structures including Cabinet Committees, MinMecs, and Premier's Coordination Forums etc.

### 2. Effective knowledge management

An effective IT-based knowledge management platform will be needed to store and disseminate multiple data and information streams. This will be critical for effective coordination and management of the strategy.

### 3. Effective monitoring and reporting systems

An effective system of monitoring and reporting will be put in place to allow for systematic gathering of credible data that will support implementation. This will be preceded by a detailed set of indicators to be developed in order to measure performance of this Strategy. The measures may include the development of a Citizen's Report Card (CRC) to ensure community involvement and oversight of the effectiveness of the Strategy. Monitoring, assessment and reporting on results will require a dedicated focus within CoGTA. Some of the indicators under consideration include the following:

#### **(a) To what extent is there delivery on the ground in a municipality?**

- Is the municipality able to spend a reasonable amount per resident, as compared to similar municipalities? (comprehensive infrastructure plans)
- How much new infrastructure is the municipality providing, as compared to similar municipalities? (comprehensive infrastructure plans)
- At the end of the year has a municipality been able to spend at the level at which it planned to spend at the beginning of the year? (coherent IDP and budget)

#### **(b) To what extent is the municipality optimising its revenue base?**

- Is a municipality able to collect revenue at a level which reflects the size of its local economy? (revenue generation measures)
- Is a municipality able to collect revenue at the rate at which it planned to at the beginning of the year? (revenue generation measures)

#### **(c) Is the municipality able to meet its developmental mandate as reflected in the provision of Free Basic Services?**

- Is a municipality able to deliver Free Basic Services at a level which reflects the lack of basic services in the municipality? (comprehensive plan to deliver Free Basic Services)

**(d) Is the municipality able to comply with national legislation as well as reflecting good governance?**

- Is the municipality complying with national legislation/regulations, specifically in producing IDPs, water plans and HIV/Aids plans? (coherent IDP and budget)
- Is the municipality able to spend grant revenue? (revenue generation measures/ identify short and long term measures/ identify and declare support measures)
- What is the Auditor General's opinion of the municipality? (create audit compliant environment)
- Is the municipality able to table its annual budget to the local council in time? (coherent IDP and budget)

**(e) Is the municipality recruiting and retaining enough municipal officials and are these officials qualified and experienced?**

- What are the vacancy rates in a municipality against averages? (organisational development and filling of critical posts/ recruitment and retention policies)
- What is the level of experience (number of years) of the municipal manager and CFO? (professionalise administrations)
- Do the municipal manager and CFO have a tertiary qualification? (professionalise administrations)

**4. Effective communication**

A comprehensive communication strategy is under development to heighten public awareness of the developments around the implementation and to ensure that there is proper messaging throughout the implementation of the LGTAS. This role requires political leadership.

**5. Resource allocation**

This Strategy would require government to unlock resources for implementation to be successful. Consideration is being given to redirecting or tapping into and reorganizing existing resources like the Municipal Systems Improvement Grant (MSIG), Siyenza Manje and other similar facilities.

**6. Preparing for implementation**

The department will need to complete the necessary consultation processes with various stakeholders. Following this, meetings will need to be held with provinces to explain the Strategy, clarify how it relates to the ongoing local government programmes, and discuss the setting up of provincial teams and overall management of the implementation of the Strategy.

## 9. PROCESS GOING FORWARD

NO.	TASK/EVENTS	RESPONSIBLE	DUE
1	Presentation & Discussion to the Cabinet	Cabinet	2 December 2009
2	Development of individual Municipal Turn-Around Strategies	All Municipalities	January-March 2010
3	Government Departments and State Owned Enterprises (SOEs) include their plans in the municipal IDPs	All Departments and SOEs	January-March 2010
4	Finalisation of individual municipal Turn-Around Strategies	All Municipalities	March 2010
5	Consultation with 3 895 wards	CoGTA	April/May 2010
6.	Municipal IDPs & budgets are adopted	All municipalities	June 2010
7.	Report back to all wards on adopted programmes and projects	All wards	August/September 2010
8.	Adopted programmes and projects of wards implemented	CoGTA national; CoGTA provincial; local municipalities. Civil society formations playing advisory role	July 2010 and beyond



**ANNEXURE A: INSTITUTIONAL MAPS: FOR INPUT FROM NATIONAL AND PROVINCIAL SECTOR DEPARTMENTS; SOE'S KEY STAKEHOLDERS, WARD COMMITTEES TO IMPROVE SERVICE DELIVERY**

**Sample map to invite national sector department input**

<b>National Departments</b>	<b>High level activity</b>	<b>Deliverable/Output</b>	<b>Existing commitments to province/local government</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Additional commitments for 2010/11</b>
1. The Presidency					
1.1 National Planning Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alignment of national, provincial and local planning with government priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long-term National planning</li> <li>National Spatial Development Perspective (NSDP)</li> </ul>			
1.2. Performance Monitoring and Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework for performance monitoring and evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring and evaluation of key developmental outcomes</li> </ul>			
2. Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordination of government policy</li> <li>Coordination of LGTAS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy review and legislative changes to fast track service delivery</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate implementation of LGTAS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on implementation of LGTAS</li> </ul>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Align monitoring, reporting and evaluation (MR&amp;E) of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a Monitoring, reporting and evaluation policy</li> </ul>			

National Departments	High level activity	Deliverable/Output	Existing commitments to province/local government	Target date	Additional commitments for 2010/11
	LG				
3. National Treasury (NT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitor intergovernmental fiscal system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation and monitoring of fiscal legislation and policy</li> </ul>			
4. Department of Human Settlements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and implement policy for Human settlement patterns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop implementation plan for 2014 target for eradication of Informal Settlements</li> <li>Provision of low cost housing</li> </ul>			
5. Water Affairs (DWA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalise and confirm backlog figures for water and sanitation per municipality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt differentiated approach to water services and sanitation management</li> <li>Implement the Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan (CIP) according to differentiated needs of municipalities</li> </ul>			
6. Dept of Environmental Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm the number of households that must receive solid waste services</li> <li>Conservation and protection of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of solid waste services to all households</li> </ul>			

National Departments	High level activity	Deliverable/Output	Existing commitments to province/local government	Target date	Additional commitments for 2010/11
	environment				
7. Department of Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop strategies to reduce energy consumption</li> <li>Finalise and confirm backlog figures for electricity per municipality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of alternative energy sources to meet the 2013 target</li> <li>Provision of bulk electricity infrastructure to enable electricity connections to households</li> </ul>			
8. Department of Transport (DoT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy and planning for roads and transport infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrated National roads master plan to meet the 2013 target</li> <li>Provision of integrated transport system.</li> </ul>			
9. Public Works (DPW)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Roll out Construction Industry support to local government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction Industry support to municipalities</li> <li>Monitor implementation of the EPWP programme</li> </ul>			
10. Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Macro-sector planning</li> <li>Coordinated planning with Rural</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joint LED and Local sustainable livelihood projects</li> </ul>			

National Departments	High level activity	Deliverable/Output	Existing commitments to province/local government	Target date	Additional commitments for 2010/11
	Development for economic planning				
11. Economic Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of national economic development plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeted economic development</li> </ul>			
12. Trade and Industry (DTI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate the implementation of the accelerated and shared growth initiative in municipalities</li> <li>Facilitate direct investment and growth in the industrial and services economy, with particular focus on employment creation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Economic Development initiatives</li> <li>Support to SMME and Cooperatives</li> </ul>			
13. Higher Education and Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create partnerships between municipalities and universities and FET colleges to develop technical and managerial skills</li> <li>Management of SETAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Upscale skills development in LG</li> <li>Master sector plan for scarce skill in LG</li> </ul>			

National Departments	High level activity	Deliverable/Output	Existing commitments to province/local government	Target date	Additional commitments for 2010/11
14. Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure implementation of Municipal Health services</li> <li>• Provision of water and sanitation to clinics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of Environmental Health services in municipalities</li> <li>• Develop and implement a plan for water and sanitation to clinics with particular focus on Rural Clinics</li> </ul>			
15. Basic Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of water and sanitation to schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and implement a plan for water and sanitation to clinics with particular focus on rural schools</li> </ul>			
16. Government Communications and Information Systems (GCIS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG communication strategy</li> <li>• Management of Thusong Centers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity building of Politicians on Public Participation and communication</li> <li>• Improve access to information on and government services</li> </ul>			
17. Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Safety and Security Plans for municipal areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support plans for Community Policing Forums linked to the Ward and Street committees</li> </ul>			

National Departments	High level activity	Deliverable/Output	Existing commitments to province/local government	Target date	Additional commitments for 2010/11
19 Sport and Recreation SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm the number of sport and recreational facilities required per municipality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sports and recreational facilities master plan to meet 2013 target</li> </ul>			
18. Arts and Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirm the number of libraries required per municipality</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve access to libraries in municipalities</li> </ul>			
19. Public Service Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring Public Service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anti Corruption</li> <li>Annual report on the state of public service with a specific focus on LG</li> </ul>			
20. Public Administration and Leadership Management Academy (PALAMA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capacity building of Public Service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and implement appropriate courses to mitigate skills shortage in public service</li> </ul>			
21. Public Service and Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management of Public Service</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of Recruitment and retention strategy for LG (concurrence with CoGTA)</li> </ul>			
22. Science and Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop standards and guidelines for technological innovations in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitation of technological innovations in</li> </ul>			

National Departments	High level activity	Deliverable/Output	Existing commitments to province/local government	Target date	Additional commitments for 2010/11
	municipalities	municipalities			
23. Statistics South Africa (STATSA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation of service delivery data</li> <li>• Knowledge bank of information on LG</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collection and management</li> <li>• Provision of ward-based data per municipality</li> </ul>			
24. Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development, support promotion of LG tourism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial and regional approaches developed</li> </ul>			
25. Women, Children and People with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build gender and disability sensitisation strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main-stream Women, Children and People with Disabilities programmes into LG plans</li> </ul>			
26. Social Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of LG social welfare policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Differentiated poverty reduction strategies in municipalities</li> </ul>			
27. Rural Development and Land Reform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LG rural development strategy</li> <li>• Effectively manage land reform, post settlement support and land distribution policies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan for access to land, resources and poverty reduction in municipalities</li> </ul>			

<b>National Departments</b>	<b>High level activity</b>	<b>Deliverable/Output</b>	<b>Existing commitments to province/local government</b>	<b>Target date</b>	<b>Additional commitments for 2010/11</b>
28. Public Enterprises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitate SOE infrastructure development and delivery in municipalities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure development and delivery</li> </ul>			
29. Mineral Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring of CSI responsibilities of mines to municipalities</li> </ul>				
30. Labour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring of Occupational Health and Safety conditions in municipalities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports on municipal occupational health and safety conditions</li> </ul>			
31. Home Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved service standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsive and efficient services across LG</li> </ul>			
32. Defence and Military Veterans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of technical skills to municipalities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deployment of engineers, accountants and other specialists to municipalities</li> </ul>			
33. Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the development of communication infrastructure in municipalities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Functional websites in all municipalities</li> </ul>			



## **ANNEXURE B: METHODOLOGY FOR UNDERSTANDING SPATIALLY DIFFERENTIATED SUPPORT NEEDS**

### **1. Introduction**

This Annexure focuses on demonstrating the basis for differentiated approaches to identifying required areas of support. This has been found to be necessary due to the unintended consequences of the uniform approach to applying grant and policy instruments. The state has tended to make uniform policies and regulations rather than relating them to specific circumstances and conditions, reinforcing the gap between policy and reality. The expectations of the public and the policy-makers far exceed the capacity of the local government system to deliver those expectations. Because municipalities are facing different kinds of problems, these must be confronted in their own right, thus a much more realistic, differentiated and effective approach is needed over the longer-term, and the LGTAS is beginning to lay the tracks for this new model beginning with the approaches described below.

### **2. Categories of municipalities**

Over the past few years, there has been increasing acknowledgement of the differential nature of municipalities. Indeed, the local government system at the outset differentiated between three sets of municipalities: Category A (metropolitan municipalities), Category B (local municipalities) and Category C (district municipalities).

A number of departments have developed different ways of differentiating or classifying municipalities. These are discussed under three groups:

- Contextual characteristics
- Performance
- Hybrid

### **3. Characteristics relating to the space economy**

These characteristics are relatively fixed – in other words they, in aggregate, are unlikely to change dramatically during the period of a year or two. For this reason, this categorisation can be used as a fairly good base categorisation.

Four approaches are presented in this section: the Municipal Infrastructure Investment Framework (MIIF), Project Consolidate, CSIR and CoGTA.

MIIF uses the legal categorisations of municipalities and further disaggregates them into particular typologies based on spatial characteristics, size of institution and budget, population and percentage urban population.

- A: Metropolitan municipalities
- B1: Local municipalities with largest budgets, also referred to as the secondary cities
- B2: Local municipalities with large towns at their core

- B3: Local municipalities with small towns and relatively small populations
- B4: Local municipalities which are mainly rural with communal tenure
- C1: District municipalities which are not water service authorities
- C2: District municipalities which are water service authorities

This method of categorisation is useful to understand the different types of municipalities and what their characteristics are likely to be, but it is not a rational indicator of capacity, nor does it provide any indication of the primary economic/livelihoods drivers in a municipality.

CoGTA's Municipal Spatial Classification System develops municipal profiles according to functionality, socio-economic profile and backlog status. Four classifications are identified:

- Class 1: Most vulnerable (57)
- Class 2: Second most vulnerable (58)
- Class 3: Second highest performing (58)
- Class 4: Highest performing (58)

#### 4. Performance characteristics

The other element relates to performance. Here there are a number of methods, relating primarily to the extent to which municipalities deliver functions as per the Constitution (Municipal Demarcation Board), comply with financial regulations (National Treasury – classified as high, medium or low), deliver services (5YLGSA) and have the required resources in place (MDB Assessments, Local Government Skills Audit, LG SETA assessments, 5YLGSA, SALGA in terms of governance) to potentially deliver on their mandate.

It is only the Auditor General (AG) that measures actual performance of organisations. It gives the following opinions based on its audits:

- **Unqualified.** This is an audit opinion without significant concerns on any other matters, including audit reports with emphasis of matter (matters of information) only.
- **Qualified.** The financial statements are satisfactory, except for certain information or parts thereof.
- **Disclaimer.** The audited entity could not provide information or evidence to support the information, transactions and balances in the financial statements. This opinion is highly undesirable.
- **Adverse.** The financial statements are fundamentally unreliable, because the information of records on which the financial statements are based do not agree with those held by the auditors. This opinion is highly undesirable.
- **Other matters.** The audit opinion is unqualified financially, but auditors had concerns which require the focussed attention of the leadership, audited entities and oversight to be eliminated.

## 5. Hybrid

One hybrid method, developed by National Treasury, combines both space economy characteristics with performance characteristics, to identify the relative resourcing of municipalities using seven indicators:

- Percentage of households without access to basic services (from 2001 census)
- Property rates per capita (NT local government database and 2001 census). Seen to be good proxy of viability.
- Poverty rate (from 2001 census)
- Percentage staff vacancy (MDB and StatsSA).
- Municipal debt per capita
- Municipal densities (population density of a municipal area using 2007 StatsSA Community Survey).
- National contribution to Gross Value Add (GVA) (based on 2004 stats).

Using this information, it classifies municipalities into six groups:

- Very high (18)
- High (25)
- Medium high (48)
- Medium low (65)
- Weak (62)
- Very weak (65)


## 6. Issues Emerging

**Existing classification systems:** different classification systems have been developed by different departments and these focus on different variables. However by a process of testing and comparing differentiation systems, it is possible to arrive at an informed framework within which to manage difference – for levels of capacity need, and intervention and support as well as deriving pointers for the cross-cutting policy implications.

**Credible data:** the MIIF categories (for the space economy) and a combined spreadsheet of results of differentiated assessment processes that may be set against the neutral spatial backdrop of the A – C2 is here proposed as the most appropriate to use.

**There is a correlation between municipal category and households living in poverty.** The municipality's location within the space economy is a determinant of its backlogs and its vulnerability. This then has important implications for where the national spotlight should fall. Thus, if a municipality is in an area of high backlogs and is consistently performing poorly, it may well be prioritised (in the national interest) above an area that has relatively small populations and low levels of backlog. (See *Annexure B for tables of backlogs per priority service delivery area, per municipality.*)

**CONCEPT FOR LEVELS OF INTERVENTION AND SUPPORT  
PER DIFFERENTIATED CATEGORY**



## The CoGTA spatial analysis framework: methodology

4 Indices, each with a number of underlying indicators were used:

- The first one is the CoGTA municipal infrastructure classification of A (metro's; B1-4 for local municipalities and C1 and 2 for district municipalities) A's and B1's were given a green colour; B2 were given yellow; B3 were given an orange and B4 were given a red colour. This index is indicative of municipalities' capacity to roll out infrastructure for service delivery and their ability to optimally use infrastructure grant funding.
- The second index is the CoGTA index for socio-economic vulnerability classifying municipalities from class 1 to class 4 according to spatial, social and economic indicators. This index is indicative of municipalities ability to raise revenue (in term of poverty levels for example) and the GVA of the area – Class 1 (most vulnerable was given a red colour and class 4 least vulnerable a green colour).
- The third index is the NT classification of municipal capacity to implement the MFMA and is indicative of financial and management capacity in municipalities – three capacities were used – high (green; medium – orange and low red).
- The fourth index used was the audit opinions for 2007/8. In this case adverse opinions received red, disclaimers orange, qualified were yellow and unqualified green. This index indicates municipalities' ability to exercise sound governance and good management practices.

For each of the above indices the median in the quartile was allocated and these numbers were summed to get a total (see legend). The total was averaged and a final decision was made as to the overall status of the specific municipality. This overall status could be indicative of the need to prioritise this specific municipality for support.

When support packages are developed they should be tailored/differentiated to the areas where support is most needed, the table below demonstrates how this may be understood and applied.

Municipality	Category A, B1,B2,B3,B4 and C1 and C2	COGTA Research (socio-economic vulnerability) Class 1-4 Class 1 least performing	NT Capacity Classification (High Medium Low)	Audit Outcomes
Mnquma	B4: 12.5	12.5	37.5	12.5
Msinga	B4: 12.5	12.5	12.5	87.5

Both these municipalities could be identified as high priority areas. The first one has serious infrastructure capacity constraints combined with high socio-economic vulnerability. It has however, the classification of medium MFMA capacity, but with negative audit outcomes; this could justify further investigation in terms of governance issues such as councillor interference and/or possible corruption. The other interventions developed around this municipality will require long term issues such as management of infrastructure, service delivery, powers and functions etc.

The second municipality has received a positive audit report, indicative of a management that is implementing sound governance principles – interventions here might be totally unnecessary and support should be given to improve the capacity for management (as per column 3) even more. However there are clearly socio-economic and spatial concerns re the low scores for spatial vulnerability and backlog status categories.

## MUNICIPAL CLASSIFICATION

The Municipal Infrastructure Investment Framework (MIIF), uses the legal categorisations of municipalities and further disaggregates them into particular typologies based on spatial characteristics, size of institution and budget, population and percentage urban population.

- A: Metropolitan municipalities
- B1: Local municipalities with largest budgets, also referred to as the secondary cities
- B2: Local municipalities with large towns at their core
- B3: Local municipalities with small towns and relatively small populations
- B4: Local municipalities which are mainly rural with communal tenure
- C1: District municipalities which are not water service authorities
- C2: District municipalities which are water service authorities

A detailed breakdown of the 283 municipalities is provided hereunder:

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Mun Code</b>	<b>Category A, B1,B2,B3,B4 and C1 and C2</b>
City of CapeTown	CTMM	A
City of Johannesburg	JMM	A
City of Tshwane	TMM	A
Ekurhuleni	EMM	A
eThekwini Metro	DMM	A
Nelson Mandela Bay	NMMM	A
Buffalo City	EC125	B1
City of Matlosana	NW403	B1
Drakenstein	WC023	B1
Emalahleni	MP312	B1
Emfuleni	GT421	B1
George	WC044	B1
Govan Mbeki	MP307	B1
Madibeng	NW372	B1
Mangaung	FS172	B1
Matjhabeng	FS 184	B1
Mbombela	MP322	B1
Mogale City	GT481	B1
Msunduzi	KZ225	B1
Newcastle	KZ252	B1
Polokwane	NP354	B1
Rustenburg	NW373	B1
Sol Plaatje	NC091	B1
Stellenbosch	WC024	B1
Steve Tshwete	MP313	B1
Tlokwe	NW402	B1
uMhlathuze	KZ282	B1
Breede Valley	WC025	B2
Dihlabeng	FS192	B2
Emakhazeni	MP314	B2
Emnambithi/Ladysmith	KZ232	B2
Hibiscus Coast	KZ216	B2
liKhara Hais	NC083	B2
King Sabata Dalindyebo	EC157	B2
Knysna	WC048	B2
Kokstad	KZ433	B2
Kungwini	GT462	B2
Kwa Dukuza	KZ292	B2

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Mun Code</b>	<b>Category A, B1,B2,B3,B4 and C1 and C2</b>
Lukhanji	EC134	B2
Mafikeng	NW383	B2
Makana	EC104	B2
Merafong	NW405	B2
Metsimaholo	FS204	B2
Midvaal	GT422	B2
Mogalakwena	NP367	B2
Moqhaka	FS201	B2
Mossel Bay	WC043	B2
Msukaligwa	MP302	B2
Nokeng Tsa Taemane	GT461	B2
Oudtshoorn	WC045	B2
Overstrand	WC032	B2
Randfontein	GT482	B2
Saldanha Bay	WC014	B2
Umdoni	KZ212	B2
uMngeni	KZ222	B2
Westonaria	GT483	B2
Abaqulusi	KZ263	B3
Amahlathi	EC124	B3
Ba-Phalaborwa	NP334	B3
Baviaans	EC107	B3
Beaufort West	WC053	B3
Bela-Bela	NP366	B3
Bergrivier	WC013	B3
Bitou	WC047	B3
Blue Crane Route	EC102	B3
Breede River Winelands	WC026	B3
Camdeboo	EC101	B3
Cape Agulhas	WC033	B3
Cederberg	WC012	B3
Delmas	MP311	B3
Dikgatlong	NC092	B3
Dipaleseng	MP306	B3
Ditsobotla	NW384	B3
eDumbe	KZ261	B3
eMadlangeni	KZ253	B3
Emthanjeni	NC073	B3
Endumeni	KZ241	B3



<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Mun Code</b>	<b>Category A, B1,B2,B3,B4 and C1 and C2</b>
Gamagara	NC453	B3
Gariiep	EC144	B3
Ga-Segonyana	NC452	B3
Great Kei	EC123	B3
Hantam	NC065	B3
Hessequa	WC042	B3
Ikwezi	EC 103	B3
Inkwanca	EC133	B3
Inxuba Yethemba	EC131	B3
Kai ! Garib	NC082	B3
Kamiesberg	NC064	B3
Kannaland	WC041	B3
Kareeberg	NC074	B3
Karoo Hoogland	NC066	B3
Kgatelopele	NC086	B3
Kgetlengriver	NW374	B3
Khai-Ma	NC067	B3
!Kheis	NC084	B3
Kopanong	FS162	B3
Kouga	EC108	B3
Koukamma	EC109	B3
Kwa Sani	KZ432	B3
Laingsburg	WC051	B3
Lekwa	MP305	B3
Lekwa-Teemane	NW396	B3
Lephalale	NP362	B3
Lesedi	GT423	B3
Letsemeng	FS161	B3
Mafube	FS205	B3
Magareng	NC093	B3
Maletswai	EC143	B3
Maluti a Phofung	FS194	B3
Mamusa	NW393	B3
Mantsopa	FS173	B3
Maquassi Hills	NW404	B3
Masilonyana	FS181	B3
Matzikama	WC011	B3
Mier	NC081	B3
Mkhambathini	KZ226	B3

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Mun Code</b>	<b>Category A, B1,B2,B3,B4 and C1 and C2</b>
Mkhondo	MP303	B3
Modimolle	NP365	B3
Mohokare	FS163	B3
Mooi Mpofana	KZ223	B3
Molopo	NW395	B3
Mookgophong	NP364	B3
Mthonjaneni	KZ285	B3
Mtubatuba	KZ275	B3
Musina	NP341	B3
Nala	FS185	B3
Naledi (Free State)	FS171	B3
Naledi	NW392	B3
Nama Khoi	NC062	B3
Ndlambe	EC 105	B3
Ngwathe	FS203	B3
Nketoana	FS193	B3
Nkonkobe	EC127	B3
Nxuba	EC128	B3
Phokwane	NC094	B3
Phumelela	FS195	B3
Pixley ka Seme	MP304	B3
Prince Albert	WC052	B3
Ramotshere Moila	NW385	B3
Renosterberg	NC075	B3
Richtersveld	NC061	B3
Sakhisizwe	EC138	B3
Setsoto	FS191	B3
Siyancuma	NC078	B3
Siyathemba	NC077	B3
Sunday's River Valley	EC106	B3
Swartland	WC015	B3
Swellendam	WC034	B3
Thaba Chweu	MP321	B3
Thabazimbi	NP361	B3
The Big 5 False Bay	KZ273	B3
Theewaterskloof	WC031	B3
Thembelihle	NC076	B3
Tokologo	FS182	B3
Tsantsabane	NC085	B3

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Mun Code</b>	<b>Category A, B1,B2,B3,B4 and C1 and C2</b>
Tsolwana	EC132	B3
Tswaing	NW382	B3
Tswelopele	FS183	B3
Ubuntu	NC071	B3
Umjindi	MP232	B3
Umsobomvu	NC072	B3
Umtshezi	KZ234	B3
uMuziwabantu	KZ214	B3
Umvoti	KZ245	B3
Ventersdorp	NW401	B3
Witzenberg	WC022	B3
Aganang	NP352	B4
Albert Luthuli	MP301	B4
Blouberg	NP351	B4
Bushbuckridge	MP325	B4
Dannhauser	KZ254	B4
Dr JS Moroka	MP316	B4
Elias Motsoaledi	NP472	B4
Elundini	EC141	B4
Emalahleni (Eastern Cape)	EC136	B4
eNdodakusuka	KZ291	B4
Engcobo	EC137	B4
Ezinqoleni	KZ215	B4
Fetakgomo	NP474	B4
Greater Giyani	NP331	B4
Greater Letaba	NP332	B4
Greater Marble Hall	NP471	B4
Greater Taung	NW394	B4
Greater Tubatse	NP475	B4
Greater Tzaneen	NP333	B4
Hlabisa	KZ274	B4
Imbabazane	KZ236	B4
Impendle	KZ224	B4
Indaka	KZ233	B4
Ingwe	KZ431	B4
Intsika Yethu	EC135	B4
Jozini	KZ272	B4
Kagisano	NW391	B4
Lepelle-Nkumpi	NP355	B4

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Mun Code</b>	<b>Category A, B1,B2,B3,B4 and C1 and C2</b>
Makhado	NP344	B4
Makhuduthamaga	NP473	B4
Maphumulo	KZ294	B4
Maruleng	NP335	B4
Matatiele	EC441	B4
Mbhashe	EC121	B4
Mbizana	EC151	B4
Mbonambi	KZ281	B4
Mhlontlo	EC156	B4
Mnquma	EC122	B4
Molemole	NP353	B4
Moretele	NW371	B4
Moses Kotane	NW375	B4
Moshaweng	NC451	B4
Msinga	KZ244	B4
Mutale	NP342	B4
Ndwedwe	KZ293	B4
Ngqushwa	EC126	B4
Nkandla	KZ286	B4
Nkomazi	M324	B4
Nongoma	KZ265	B4
Nquthu	KZ242	B4
Ntabankulu	EC152	B4
Ntambanana	KZ283	B4
Nyandeni	EC155	B4
Okhahlamba	KZ235	B4
Port St Johns	EC154	B4
Qaukeni	EC153	B4
Ratlou	NW381	B4
Richmond	KZ227	B4
Senqu	EC142	B4
Thembisile	MP315	B4
Thulamela	NP343	B4
Ubuhlebezwe	KZ434	B4
Ulundi	KZ266	B4
Umhlabuyalingana	KZ271	B4
Umlazi	KZ284	B4
Umshwathi	KZ221	B4
Umzimvubu	EC442	B4

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Mun Code</b>	<b>Category A, B1,B2,B3,B4 and C1 and C2</b>
Umzumbe	KZ213	B4
uPhongola	KZ262	B4
Umzimkhulu	KZ435	B4
Vulamehlo	KZ211	B4
Bojanala Platinum District Municipality	DC37	C1
Cacadu District Municipality	DC10	C1
Cape Winelands District Municipality	DC2	C1
Central Karoo District Municipality	DC5	C1
Dr Kenneth Kaunda	DC40	C1
Eden District Municipality	DC4	C1
Ehlanzeni District Municipality	DC32	C1
Fezile Dabi	DC20	C1
Frances Baard District Municipality	DC9	C1
Gert Sibande District Municipality	DC30	C1
Kgalagadi District Municipality	DC45	C1
Lejweleputswa District Municipality	DC18	C1
Metsweding District Municipality	DC46	C1
Motheo District Municipality	DC17	C1
Namakwa District Municipality	DC6	C1
Nkangala District Municipality	DC31	C1
Overberg District Municipality	DC3	C1
Pixley ka Seme	DC7	C1
Sedibeng District Municipality	DC42	C1
Siyanda District Municipality	DC8	C1
Thabo Mofutsanyane District Municipality	DC19	C1
Waterberg District Municipality	DC36	C1
West Coast District Municipality	DC1	C1
West Rand District Municipality	DC48	C1
Xhariep District Municipality	DC16	C1
Alfred Nzo District Municipality	DC44	C2
Amajuba District Municipality	DC25	C2
Amathole District Municipality	DC12	C2
Bophirima District Municipality	DC39	C2
Capricorn District Municipality	DC35	C2
Central District Municipality	NW38	C2
Chris Hani District Municipality	DC13	C2

<b>Municipality</b>	<b>Mun Code</b>	<b>Category A, B1,B2,B3,B4 and C1 and C2</b>
Greater Sekhukhune	DC47	C2
Ilembe District Municipality	DC29	C2
Mopani District Municipality	DC33	C2
O.R.Tambo District Municipality	DC15	C2
Sisonke District Municipality	DC43	C2
Ugu District Municipality	DC21	C2
Ukhahlamba Distict Municipality	DC14	C2
Umgungundlovu District Municipality	DC22	C2
Umkhanyakude District Municipality	DC27	C2
Umzinyathi District Municipality	DC24	C2
Uthukela District Municipality	DC23	C2
uThungulu District Municipality	DC28	C2
Vhembe District Municipality	DC34	C2
Zululand District Municipality	DC26	C2

**ANNEXURE C: BACKLOGS PER MUNICIPALITY PRIORITY SERVICES**

2007 CS Municipality	Total Households	Households without access to				Households in informal dwellings
		Water	Sanitation	Electricity for Heating	Refuse Removal	
		%	%	%	%	%
!Kheis	4487	6.9%	28.2%	49.2%	35.6%	10.8%
//Khara Hais	20939	2.6%	18.6%	19.8%	5.2%	16.4%
Abaqulusi	39867	27.6%	48.9%	64.6%	60.9%	5.8%
Aganang	33826	6.3%	80.0%	60.5%	99.3%	4.3%
Albert Luthuli	46035	10.6%	67.9%	70.8%	84.5%	5.4%
Amahlathi	36387	16.6%	55.1%	71.5%	82.8%	8.5%
Ba-Phalaborwa	33791	0.7%	46.7%	39.2%	58.7%	5.7%
Baviaans	3739	4.1%	21.5%	50.4%	21.2%	0.3%
Beaufort West	9148	0.2%	2.2%	30.1%	7.1%	2.0%
Bela-Bela	14291	3.6%	19.2%	34.7%	23.1%	25.4%
Bergrivier	12196	0.0%	2.8%	2.7%	11.8%	7.5%
Bitou	12645	1.1%	10.8%	42.8%	4.7%	28.4%
Blouberg	35597	4.9%	61.4%	77.4%	90.5%	1.8%
Blue Crane Route	9656	5.2%	28.2%	43.2%	19.0%	13.4%
Breedee River/Winelands	21857	1.8%	7.4%	9.1%	32.1%	3.6%
Breedee Valley	36494	0.2%	6.4%	12.6%	21.4%	14.1%
Buffalo City	208388	1.6%	30.5%	50.8%	28.3%	24.9%
Bushbuckridge	124595	8.3%	86.5%	69.9%	95.5%	1.3%
Cacadu	1950	2.4%	44.9%	56.2%	59.5%	12.0%
Camdeboo	8994	0.8%	4.1%	10.6%	5.3%	3.5%
Cape Agulhas	7616	1.3%	5.1%	7.2%	10.4%	11.1%
Cape Winelands	2558	1.5%	13.3%	35.6%	89.0%	47.8%
Cederberg	9212	2.8%	10.7%	12.7%	38.0%	3.8%
Central Karoo	1845	0.0%	5.8%	50.0%	21.7%	0.5%
City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality	902279	0.4%	7.0%	17.8%	4.8%	16.6%
City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	1165017	0.6%	7.6%	13.7%	8.2%	22.3%
City of Tshwane Metropolitan	686640	1.0%	25.2%	25.4%	22.9%	28.7%

2007 CS Municipality	Total Households	Households without access to				Households in informal dwellings
		Water	Sanitation	Electricity for Heating	Refuse Removal	
		%	%	%	%	%
<b>Municipality</b>						
Dannhauser	18057	4.8%	65.7%	70.8%	88.1%	4.9%
Delmas	15129	1.6%	14.3%	61.4%	23.5%	28.5%
Dihlabeng	31836	2.9%	22.4%	46.4%	18.1%	11.7%
Dikgatlong	10014	4.1%	15.7%	45.3%	31.0%	26.3%
Dipaleseng	12321	1.4%	29.0%	58.6%	22.4%	45.9%
Ditsobotla	38608	0.7%	37.4%	35.8%	43.8%	25.4%
Dr JS Moroka	56875	3.0%	78.8%	48.9%	89.1%	10.7%
Drakenstein L	51614	0.2%	4.8%	17.7%	26.7%	22.1%
Eden	3637	0.7%	13.2%	48.3%	39.4%	1.8%
eDumbe	15146	29.9%	58.9%	76.3%	82.9%	2.1%
Ehlanzeni	89	-1.1%	0.0%	6.7%	4.5%	-1.1%
<b>Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality</b>	849350	0.4%	13.4%	27.5%	11.2%	28.8%
Elias Motsoaledi	46839	27.5%	82.9%	65.5%	90.6%	7.8%
Elundini	35553	54.2%	67.0%	88.2%	89.2%	2.3%
Emadlangeni	5212	34.6%	55.1%	62.8%	65.9%	3.9%
Emakhazeni	12128	3.1%	11.9%	53.0%	22.3%	13.4%
Emalahleni	31196	16.2%	76.4%	91.9%	90.9%	0.8%
Emalahleni	105594	1.3%	35.1%	47.4%	42.5%	34.5%
Emfuleni	196479	0.4%	9.9%	11.3%	14.1%	16.5%
Emnambithi-Ladysmith	50259	6.7%	38.3%	55.4%	45.7%	3.4%
Emthanjeni	9489	1.5%	10.4%	24.4%	16.1%	4.0%
Endumeni	13753	5.7%	17.6%	31.7%	21.0%	18.1%
Engcobo	35186	47.1%	86.0%	86.4%	93.5%	0.8%
<b>eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality</b>	833859	1.5%	24.4%	15.4%	11.4%	21.4%
Ezingoloni	10951	14.4%	60.6%	73.6%	99.6%	6.3%
Fetakgomo	21852	23.0%	78.7%	77.2%	93.2%	3.9%
Frances Baard	1314	13.7%	53.7%	58.7%	89.2%	23.4%
Gamagara	7640	0.3%	13.7%	11.3%	4.9%	33.3%
Gariep	8208	1.5%	22.3%	61.4%	20.8%	3.9%
Ga-Segonyana	17107	0.7%	60.6%	49.6%	74.6%	12.5%



2007 CS Municipality	Total Households	Households without access to				Households in informal dwellings
		Water	Sanitation	Electricity for Heating	Refuse Removal	
		%	%	%	%	%
George	42795	1.6%	13.8%	27.4%	6.4%	26.9%
Govan Mbeki	79190	1.8%	5.4%	37.4%	16.8%	40.5%
Great Kei	11956	7.1%	57.8%	76.1%	60.3%	10.1%
Greater Giyani	57537	8.1%	81.3%	76.9%	86.8%	2.9%
Greater Kokstad	14321	3.2%	27.9%	60.7%	32.0%	7.0%
Greater Letaba	59539	3.3%	75.7%	77.4%	87.9%	6.9%
Greater Marble Hall	28216	10.3%	72.4%	62.7%	86.0%	5.7%
Greater Taung	42954	0.8%	64.8%	59.7%	93.2%	4.5%
Greater Tubatse	66611	17.7%	85.1%	57.5%	91.8%	12.8%
Greater Tzaneen	89831	10.2%	71.2%	59.1%	84.8%	4.3%
Hantam	5818	1.8%	19.6%	23.3%	12.2%	6.1%
Hessequa	12481	1.4%	4.7%	9.3%	17.8%	4.1%
Hibiscus Coast	50650	10.4%	53.9%	25.4%	64.9%	2.6%
Hlabisa	29260	36.3%	75.5%	77.4%	99.0%	1.4%
Ikwezi	2566	3.6%	46.5%	30.9%	13.8%	2.4%
Imbabazane	24558	24.5%	72.6%	82.2%	99.1%	1.3%
Impendle	7338	16.6%	73.3%	86.0%	97.6%	1.1%
Indaka	21081	19.4%	57.5%	77.9%	87.5%	0.4%
Ingwe	22288	51.1%	81.0%	91.4%	94.7%	2.2%
Inkwanca	5301	3.2%	8.8%	78.4%	15.3%	1.7%
Intsika Yethu	43501	45.9%	90.5%	92.2%	98.2%	1.5%
Inxuba Yethemba	14490	0.6%	7.3%	51.6%	13.1%	0.6%
Jozini	38529	28.8%	59.4%	69.4%	81.4%	3.9%
Kagisano	19888	4.1%	74.5%	73.7%	99.0%	5.7%
Kai !Garib	17392	9.1%	12.4%	29.7%	48.6%	25.5%
Kamiesberg	3882	3.4%	25.5%	24.4%	14.6%	22.1%
Kannaland	6343	4.5%	13.3%	24.9%	28.0%	3.7%
Kareeberg	2727	0.4%	52.7%	31.4%	18.8%	5.6%
Karoo Hoogland	2981	1.2%	18.5%	22.7%	29.2%	1.6%
Kgalagadi	1927	0.7%	17.1%	13.8%	28.0%	39.9%
Kgatelopele	5255	-0.1%	8.0%	16.3%	3.3%	33.3%
Kgetlengrivier	10533	1.9%	26.9%	42.1%	39.5%	40.7%
Khai-Ma	3788	1.0%	20.6%	10.5%	12.2%	20.6%
King Sabata Dalindyebo	93384	46.5%	64.9%	79.8%	74.2%	3.4%
Knysna	17418	4.5%	25.2%	36.0%	5.3%	31.3%

2007 CS Municipality	Total Households	Households without access to				Households in informal dwellings
		Water	Sanitation	Electricity for Heating	Refuse Removal	
		%	%	%	%	%
Kopanong	15439	0.0%	18.8%	46.7%	17.0%	11.6%
Kouga	19082	0.5%	15.7%	14.4%	11.5%	13.1%
Kou-Kamma	10372	4.6%	18.2%	37.0%	36.7%	6.5%
Kungwini	31665	3.5%	37.5%	32.6%	47.6%	22.0%
Kwa Sani	4420	26.9%	42.4%	57.7%	63.4%	9.1%
KwaDukuza	44481	4.8%	38.5%	18.5%	43.2%	23.1%
Laingsburg	1966	4.3%	8.0%	39.0%	23.6%	2.0%
Lekwa	25354	-3.4%	19.2%	51.0%	19.9%	27.2%
Lekwa-Teemane	9951	0.9%	19.9%	42.7%	13.6%	25.0%
Lepele-Nkumpi	58484	3.9%	62.3%	50.9%	86.6%	6.1%
Lephalale	23744	13.6%	61.7%	35.4%	73.4%	20.0%
Lesedi	20479	0.7%	15.8%	24.9%	17.3%	16.6%
Letsemeng	11588	4.1%	16.9%	53.0%	35.6%	19.6%
Lukanji	49674	1.9%	30.5%	77.5%	39.7%	6.6%
Madibeng	96359	2.3%	56.6%	32.6%	66.6%	41.4%
Mafikeng	68698	1.2%	66.7%	39.9%	79.6%	15.8%
Mafube	14006	2.0%	10.6%	54.4%	14.9%	28.5%
Magareng	5670	4.5%	19.5%	26.5%	27.3%	17.0%
Makana	18864	1.7%	20.5%	39.4%	5.0%	7.5%
Makhado	114060	2.8%	77.2%	68.3%	91.0%	2.8%
Makhuduthamaga	53655	31.1%	84.7%	61.0%	98.5%	5.3%
Maletswai	11442	0.6%	26.4%	54.6%	18.6%	23.0%
Maluti a Phofung	97173	0.9%	63.4%	55.2%	71.7%	8.1%
Mamusa	10429	1.1%	23.4%	49.7%	26.9%	19.0%
Mandeni	33703	10.4%	54.8%	26.0%	71.9%	21.0%
Mangaung	202762	0.4%	29.5%	39.6%	17.5%	18.4%
Mantsopa	15984	0.9%	39.5%	49.3%	17.7%	15.4%
Maphumulo	19933	62.9%	96.6%	79.3%	99.7%	2.3%
Maquassi Hills	20330	0.6%	44.1%	55.1%	24.4%	32.9%
Maruleng	24590	8.2%	64.5%	73.2%	90.3%	8.6%
Masilonyana	27243	1.1%	33.9%	52.8%	39.5%	48.2%
Matatiele	54210	26.2%	77.0%	85.4%	88.6%	2.0%
Matjhabeng	131623	0.6%	20.1%	33.4%	10.8%	31.7%
Matlosana	115969	0.9%	20.7%	27.4%	9.6%	31.4%
Matzikama	12882	0.7%	9.5%	10.0%	25.4%	4.4%

2007 CS	Total Households	Households without access to				Households in informal dwellings
		Water	Sanitation	Electricity for Heating	Refuse Removal	
Municipality		%	%	%	%	%
Mbhashe	59705	72.8%	92.1%	89.7%	94.5%	0.9%
Mbizana	48407	94.3%	95.4%	86.9%	98.0%	0.8%
Mbombela	137353	5.6%	51.5%	27.5%	70.8%	9.8%
Mbonambi	21631	14.9%	72.1%	44.0%	91.4%	19.2%
Merafong	88156	0.4%	21.0%	29.6%	25.2%	58.6%
Metsimaholo	37321	0.2%	11.5%	26.6%	4.2%	19.5%
Mhlontlo	49860	59.7%	79.8%	93.9%	94.7%	5.0%
Midvaal	24264	1.4%	9.6%	19.0%	21.8%	13.4%
Mier	1707	2.5%	35.9%	63.4%	39.8%	14.5%
Mkhambathini	11970	35.9%	41.1%	61.8%	85.8%	21.8%
Mkhondo	29927	10.9%	41.1%	57.3%	57.5%	0.5%
Mnquma	75410	57.3%	77.9%	75.6%	90.1%	9.2%
Modimolle	15827	1.7%	34.4%	31.6%	43.3%	28.4%
Mogalakwena	75312	1.8%	64.7%	52.6%	76.9%	5.9%
Mogale City	94289	1.2%	12.7%	21.8%	18.1%	30.8%
Mohokare	10216	2.6%	38.9%	70.6%	20.8%	30.1%
Molemole	27296	1.0%	80.5%	49.0%	84.5%	13.6%
Molopo	3173	5.9%	47.1%	50.8%	96.6%	21.7%
Mookgopong	7674	0.8%	20.8%	42.1%	40.8%	17.5%
Moqhaka	64899	0.1%	7.4%	24.9%	9.3%	46.9%
Moretele	43210	0.6%	83.2%	32.4%	12.4%	22.2%
Moses Kotane	60558	0.1%	76.5%	39.9%	8.4%	26.7%
Moshaweng	15479	4.1%	61.8%	84.2%	99.5%	2.8%
Mossel Bay	28348	2.2%	4.1%	23.6%	5.4%	11.1%
Mpofana	7801	13.8%	27.8%	50.1%	46.4%	9.7%
Msinga	32591	59.3%	76.2%	92.9%	99.1%	0.6%
Msukaligwa	31750	4.6%	23.0%	68.2%	31.4%	9.6%
Msunduzi	134389	3.3%	28.2%	14.0%	27.6%	4.5%
Mthonjaneni	10671	32.4%	67.0%	71.1%	66.0%	23.0%
Mtubatuba	11339	2.7%	34.4%	23.7%	72.5%	16.9%
Musina	14204	5.7%	28.6%	29.3%	33.6%	22.7%
Mutale	21075	11.1%	87.2%	85.0%	94.3%	2.7%
Nala	23424	2.1%	65.0%	57.6%	15.4%	42.9%
Naledi	8278	0.2%	10.7%	69.9%	20.2%	20.6%
Naledi	13674	3.0%	17.4%	34.3%	19.6%	17.6%

2007 CS Municipality	Total Households	Households without access to				Households in informal dwellings
		Water	Sanitation	Electricity for Heating	Refuse Removal	
		%	%	%	%	%
Nama Khoi	15656	1.7%	19.9%	4.5%	5.4%	9.5%
Namakwa	359	0.8%	34.5%	73.0%	85.0%	9.7%
Ndlambe	14733	3.3%	27.9%	31.6%	7.1%	5.6%
Ndwedwe	26408	46.0%	86.4%	80.4%	99.4%	12.1%
Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality	275259	0.4%	12.0%	23.2%	11.5%	13.7%
Newcastle	77784	1.8%	27.3%	34.9%	26.5%	6.8%
Ngqushwa	25565	5.9%	82.4%	74.1%	93.5%	4.3%
Ngwathe	32874	1.0%	22.2%	20.3%	14.2%	21.6%
Nkandla	22386	25.9%	88.6%	82.7%	93.2%	0.5%
Nketoana	16749	0.2%	69.7%	67.8%	35.2%	33.5%
Nkomazi	78254	6.8%	54.8%	53.4%	68.5%	1.4%
Nkonkobe Local Municipality	34891	16.8%	70.5%	83.1%	81.2%	1.4%
Nokeng tsa Taemane	14837	3.1%	32.5%	32.6%	55.3%	27.8%
Nongoma	35293	69.0%	72.9%	71.3%	98.4%	1.6%
Nquthu	32168	23.1%	76.4%	87.7%	91.4%	2.6%
Ntabankulu	27930	58.0%	93.2%	89.2%	98.8%	2.6%
Ntambanana	14846	24.6%	73.6%	62.4%	98.8%	12.5%
Nxuba	6279	4.9%	49.1%	75.6%	23.0%	8.8%
Nyandeni	56851	62.4%	87.8%	86.2%	98.1%	0.7%
Okhahlamba	28506	20.2%	77.8%	78.9%	93.2%	2.5%
Oudtshoorn	17915	0.7%	10.5%	13.9%	12.5%	11.0%
Overberg	65	-1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-1.5%
Overstrand	21952	0.7%	1.7%	18.5%	1.9%	13.7%
Phokwane	13770	1.8%	20.7%	35.8%	40.5%	20.6%
Phumelela	11531	3.7%	46.7%	54.2%	29.1%	16.4%
Pixley ka Seme	913	8.0%	56.7%	76.9%	96.6%	3.3%
Polokwane	130362	1.6%	59.9%	40.6%	62.9%	12.8%
Port St Johns	30952	75.2%	72.9%	94.4%	97.9%	1.6%
Potchefstroom	35524	2.0%	13.7%	17.8%	20.3%	21.1%
Prince Albert	2748	3.4%	13.3%	34.2%	17.6%	6.0%
Qaukeni	48702	63.0%	87.4%	86.2%	95.4%	4.5%
Ramotshere Moiloa	30302	2.1%	72.9%	62.6%	81.4%	9.9%
Randfontein	40458	1.0%	6.0%	24.8%	28.2%	28.6%

2007 CS	Total Households	Households without access to				Households in informal dwellings
		Water	Sanitation	Electricity for Heating	Refuse Removal	
Municipality		%	%	%	%	%
Ratlou	23592	2.6%	91.2%	72.2%	98.1%	7.6%
Renosterberg	2719	2.0%	38.9%	64.8%	15.8%	11.3%
Richmond	12679	16.4%	60.4%	50.4%	89.7%	5.9%
Richtersveld	3953	1.5%	16.0%	7.0%	10.8%	20.8%
Rustenburg	146541	2.4%	37.9%	28.7%	52.0%	48.4%
Sakhisizwe	15624	17.7%	59.3%	77.2%	78.9%	5.2%
Saldanha Bay	20785	0.4%	3.5%	2.9%	3.9%	7.8%
Seme	21606	2.3%	26.0%	67.8%	42.7%	8.0%
Senqu	35103	18.4%	67.7%	86.2%	88.8%	5.2%
Setsoto	29828	0.8%	53.8%	68.0%	32.3%	32.5%
Siyancuma	8852	5.5%	30.6%	35.4%	19.2%	16.7%
Siyanda	3018	7.7%	46.0%	73.2%	88.6%	7.2%
Siyathemba	5070	0.8%	12.9%	41.4%	17.0%	10.5%
Sol Plaatjie	52120	0.2%	10.6%	23.5%	8.0%	11.2%
Stellenbosch	36412	0.8%	4.1%	4.9%	11.6%	8.8%
Steve Tshwete	50449	3.1%	13.8%	31.1%	15.2%	20.2%
Sunday's River Valley	9872	11.8%	37.1%	40.1%	23.0%	10.4%
Swartland	19939	0.6%	5.6%	6.9%	13.1%	6.0%
Swellendam	6958	3.3%	5.3%	20.0%	16.4%	6.4%
Thaba Chweu	28258	5.8%	32.6%	52.1%	39.1%	30.7%
Thabazimbi	23871	0.3%	29.1%	7.2%	39.0%	41.0%
The Big Five False Bay	6658	49.3%	20.1%	66.6%	75.0%	6.0%
Theewaterskloof	23464	0.9%	10.6%	22.4%	8.3%	10.1%
Thembelihle	3597	0.7%	25.8%	60.3%	20.0%	19.2%
Thembisile	65394	1.9%	92.2%	47.5%	89.1%	12.7%
Thulamela	137852	5.9%	80.9%	72.7%	85.5%	1.6%
Tokologo	7477	1.9%	56.0%	49.2%	50.7%	26.9%
Tsantsabane	7098	3.5%	26.8%	33.5%	22.1%	26.4%
Tsolwana	8067	1.7%	58.4%	83.0%	77.4%	3.2%
Tswaing	22203	1.6%	64.3%	44.7%	74.1%	10.1%
Tswelopele	12624	1.6%	36.6%	47.7%	19.7%	26.9%
Ubuhlebezwe L	21085	39.1%	51.9%	75.5%	92.9%	0.0%
Ubuntu	4274	0.9%	20.5%	23.7%	22.7%	10.5%
Ulundi	39838	35.9%	52.6%	51.6%	77.3%	4.4%
Umdoni	16383	1.6%	29.1%	45.1%	50.5%	6.3%

2007 CS Municipality	Total Households	Households without access to				Households in informal dwellings
		Water	Sanitation	Electricity for Heating	Refuse Removal	
		%	%	%	%	%
Umhlabuyalingana	27006	24.9%	50.2%	89.0%	98.5%	1.0%
uMhlathuze	81005	2.4%	43.7%	14.1%	55.7%	3.9%
Umjindi	18767	27.1%	33.3%	31.9%	19.5%	27.4%
Umkhanyakude	2182	27.5%	20.0%	82.4%	92.9%	18.5%
uMlalazi	33965	37.9%	74.2%	64.9%	86.7%	5.2%
uMngeni	21588	3.6%	31.8%	40.7%	37.0%	19.3%
uMshwathi	22109	23.9%	57.5%	69.4%	88.0%	10.0%
Umsobomvu	5646	3.0%	24.7%	56.1%	17.6%	14.3%
Umtshezi	15232	18.4%	32.8%	50.1%	40.9%	10.3%
UMuziwabantu	20312	31.5%	72.8%	74.5%	84.6%	4.0%
Umvoti	26018	25.2%	45.2%	68.3%	64.7%	22.6%
Umzimkhulu	43545	58.9%	77.0%	91.2%	94.6%	1.6%
Umzimvubu	47803	36.0%	75.3%	91.4%	94.3%	1.3%
Umzumbe	40579	53.5%	72.5%	79.0%	99.8%	0.6%
UPhongolo	25742	35.7%	43.9%	55.1%	78.2%	19.8%
Ventersdorp	10468	1.4%	34.0%	46.3%	56.9%	28.1%
Vulamehlo	12744	39.2%	67.8%	75.8%	96.6%	0.9%
West Coast	1200	1.8%	28.5%	6.2%	36.2%	3.9%
West Rand	1429	3.4%	26.4%	37.3%	94.5%	13.2%
Westonaria	50674	0.3%	10.0%	35.0%	6.9%	75.3%
Witzenberg	24412	4.5%	7.7%	37.6%	48.9%	30.0%

## **ANNEXURE D: COGTA DEPARTMENTAL AGENDA FOR POSSIBLE LEGISLATIVE MEASURES TO ENHANCE GOVERNANCE SYSTEMS AND STRUCTURES**

1. Development of the White Paper on Cooperative Governance
2. Legislative Review on the Functionality of the Two-Tier System of local government
3. Review Legislative and Executive functions of Council
4. Provide statutory recognition of the position of the Chief Whip
5. Review the functionality (strengthening) of the Office of the Speaker
6. Provide for the abolition of the Plenary System of Local Government wherein the Speaker/ Mayor is in one position
7. Consider employment of Ward Councilors on a full time basis
8. Abolition of the position of the Executive Mayor
9. Strengthen Performance Management in Local Government
10. Reform of the Regulatory funding regime of Ward Committees
11. Reform of Regulatory regime for Supply Chain Management in Local Government
12. Review of Legislation on anti-corruption as it relates to Local Government
13. Review of Legislative Framework for Fire Services
14. Review of unviable Municipalities
15. Review of Section (139) of the Constitution
16. Review the Single Public Service Bill
17. Equitable Share: The role of National Treasury and CoGTA
18. Adoption for the Policy on Organised Local Government Act
19. Strengthen the Capacity of the Municipal Demarcation Board
20. Demarcating the Provincial Boundaries
21. Develop a legislation on section 125 of the Constitution that will address the Monitoring and Supporting role of the National Government to Provincial Government
22. Strengthen section 100 of the Constitution
23. National Legislation to govern the core structures and systems of Provincial Government
24. Reform of regulatory regime for supply chain management in Provincial Government
25. Review of Legislation on anti-corruption as it relates to Provincial Government
26. Review the Distribution of Powers and Functions / consider national legislation
27. Review of the Intergovernmental Relations Fiscal Systems
28. Reform of the IGR Forums dealing with Finance
29. Review of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act (2005)
30. Supporting the review/enactment of the new legislation on Development Planning
31. Strategic Context for the role of Traditional Leadership: –
32. National Legislation
33. Legislative Context
34. Provincial Legislation
35. The Traditional Leadership and Governance Framework Bill
36. Review of Legislation on section 185 of the Constitution.