



the dplg

Department:
Provincial and Local Government
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

the dlq

Department of Local
Government
Western Cape Province
Republic of South
Africa



IDP HEARINGS 2005

PANEL REPORT

WEST COAST DISTRICT (DC1) WESTERN CAPE

Panel Members	Organisation
Ms Shanaaz Majiet (Chairperson)	HOD, Department of Local Government, Western Cape
Mr. Yusuf Patel (Co-Chairperson)	dplg
Mr. Ashraf Adam	Independent (MCA)
Mr. A. Lombard	DBSA
Ms. K. Mapanga	DEAT
Dr. Sihle Moon	Provincial SALGA
Dr. Laurine Platsky	Office of Premier
Mr. Albert Van Zyl	Provincial Treasury

VENUE: Municipal Council Chambers, Stellenbosch

DATE: 18 May 2005 (Afternoon session)

1. BACKGROUND TO THE HEARINGS

The Local Government MINMEC meeting held on the 12th November 2004 mandated government to hold nation-wide Hearings on Development Planning. These are scheduled for every district and metro between April and June 2005.

The main objectives of these hearings is to engage with district municipalities and metros to discuss the achievement of national goals, municipal development strategies and the capacity and support measures that may be needed in order to successfully drive the development agenda.

IDP hearings for the Western Cape Province took place from the 18th – 20th May 2005 April in Stellenbosch.

This report highlights the main issues raised during the West Coast District Hearings. It acknowledges the context and capacity of the District and provides a

panel response to development challenges raised. It also proposes actions, which may need to be taken up by District, national or provincial spheres, ensuring a collective responsibility for service delivery.

2. THE PANEL VIEWED THE MAIN DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES FOR THE DISTRICT AS BEING:

- a) Dealing effectively with issues related to conflict and competition of resources brought about by the large economic disparities between the people of the region, (despite the huge efforts by the municipalities in the District to expand infrastructure and service delivery in especially the urban areas of the District).
- b) Building community cohesion and dealing with social dynamics.
- c) Issues of labour migration and finding appropriate ways to accommodate migrant farm workers in the District.
- d) Water resource management in the light of huge water scarcity in the District, especially in the way it pertains to services (water and sanitation) expansion to rural communities as well as the eradication of the bucket system in some of the more remote and water poor areas of the District.
- e) Dealing effectively with challenges such as migration, urbanisation in especially some parts of the District such as Cederberg and Saldanha.
- f) Effectively implementing the sustainable human settlement concept as a means to address the housing need, build social cohesion, create opportunities and provide services in an economically and environmentally sustainable way in water poor area.
- g) Addressing a wide range of health issues and finding sustainable ways of expanding health services and facilities throughout the District in especially the more remote communities.
- h) Dealing effectively with issues related to financial management and viability (various qualified audit reports) in some of the local municipalities with particular emphasis on Cederberg.
- i) Dealing effectively with the impacts of the booming property market and its impact on issues of social cohesion and economic access in the District.
- j) Translating the capacity, energy, commitment and innovation around planning in general and environmental planning into tangible action and delivery. (Effectively bridging the gap from planning to implementation.)

3. THE PANEL VIEWED THE KEY DRIVING FORCES FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AS BEING:

- a) Optimising local processing opportunities in relation to agriculture, fishing and mariculture.
- b) Identifying and developing sustainable tourism.
- c) Promoting SMME development.
- d) Optimising opportunities around the South Saldana Bay Industrial Development Zone (IDZ)
- e) Managing the rapid development around the Olifantsriver area.
- f) Building on and incorporating the research, investment and energy around the West Coast Spatial Development Initiative into the macro-economic strategy of the District.

4. PROPOSED INTERGOVERNMENTAL ACTIONS

4.1 WATER, SANITATION, INFRASTRUCTURE

The panel notes:

- a) The District's concerns regarding deteriorating roads infrastructure due to funding constraints related to maintenance.
- b) Problems associated with the eradication of the bucket system due to water scarcity.
- c) The plans of the District to rationalise localised waste management sites into three regional sites, which will serve the area as a whole and assist in mitigating environmental impacts and reducing the costs associated with operating numerous sites.

The panel wishes to acknowledge and commend:

- a) The excellent progress of the District and local municipalities with regard to the extension of infrastructure and provision of services in especially the urban areas of the District.
- b) Excellent progress of the District and local municipalities with regard to the implementation of the free basic services policy.
- c) The District and the DBSA on the application of the Regional Prioritisation Model to allocate the funding for infrastructure spending in an equitable way.
- d) The development, district wide adoption and implementation of the District-wide Infrastructure Strategy, which operates on a preferred scenario for service delivery with delivery targets and milestones as well as projections for capital and operational expenditure required over a 10-year period.
- e) Saldanha Municipality in particular with making great strides with regard to service delivery under very difficult conditions.
- f) The appreciation of the District in respect of the limitation of water resources and its attempts to explore other water resources and technologies such as the desalination of water from boreholes as well as water free sanitation options.

The panel is however concerned about:

- a) The various service delivery challenges facing Cederberg and Saldanha in relation to rapid urbanisation in a water poor area.
- b) The comparatively slow progress of the District and municipalities to extend basic services to the rural areas due to inter alia, the concerns expressed by the District in relation to infrastructure expansion on privately owned land.
- c) The lack of information on rural areas, which has also been cited as one of the reasons for slower infrastructure and services expansion in the rural areas. (e.g. Swartland)
- d) The fact that the District is perceived not to have a clear spatial or economic strategy to deal effectively with service delivery to the poor communities located in the District Management Areas. (such as Rietpoort and Kliprant)
- e) That despite the progress of the municipalities regarding the expansion of infrastructure and services, communities still expressed a predominantly negative perception regarding service delivery. This raises questions regarding the extent to which service delivery has positively impacted on the quality of life of people in the District.
- f) The issues related to non-permitted solid waste disposal sites as cited by the District.
- g) The deteriorating road network due to budgetary constraints.

- h) The lack of adequate housing and shelter as raised by the District.
- i) The challenges of providing health services and facilities to remote rural communities in a sustainable way.

The panel recommends that:

- a) The District and local municipalities, in view of their excellent rate of progress, take up the challenge of reviewing their current targets (contained in Scenario 3) and set themselves more challenging targets.
- b) The District should fast track their studies on service delivery in the rural areas, obtain guidance from **dplg** and the provincial Department of Local Government on utilising the provisions of Section 78, to enter into agreements which will facilitate the provision of services on privately owned land.
- c) The District engages Kgalagadi and Namaqua DMs to learn from their experiences on the issue of service delivery on privately owned land.
- d) The District reviews its infrastructure strategy to develop a clear strategy for service delivery in rural areas and to remote settlements in a sustainable manner.
- e) **dplg**, the provincial Department of Local Government and the District support local municipalities to fast track service delivery and budget implementation plans.
- f) The District and local municipalities proceed with their initiatives to improve infrastructure expansion and service delivery including:
 - The implementation of effective project management systems;
 - The identification of alternative sources of revenue;
 - The classification of roads;
 - Fast tracking studies regarding service delivery in rural areas; and
 - Placing increased emphasis on preventative maintenance.

4.2 LAND MANAGEMENT

The panel notes:

- a) That the West Coast Regional Spatial Plan was completed and approved in 2000.
- b) Spatial Plans exist for all category B municipalities.
- c) The need for these plans to be updated with regard to more recent developments such as the NSDP and PGDS as well as sector plans of national and provincial departments.
- d) That the proposals as formulated in the Spatial Plan stem from the principle of sustainable development and imply that “community needs be met in such a way that the ability of future communities to meet their needs is not impaired”
- e) That the District has adopted a bioregional planning approach to guide planning and implementation in 5 bioregional zones.
- f) The participation of the District in Bioregional Planning as espoused by the Provincial Administration of the Western Cape consists of:
 - Adopting the sustainability principles in district and local municipal spatial plans;
 - Participating in SKEP, CAPE, Greater Cederberg Biodiversity Corridor, and Sandveld Task Teams;
 - Participating in a number of environmental monitoring committees (Saldanha Bay Municipality – Saldanha Bay Water Quality Forum, Ground Water Monitoring Committees, Cities for Climate Protection, ICLEI);
 - Participating in catchment management agencies;

- Participating in general with structures and activities of Cape Nature;
 - Ensuring the implementation of bioregions and biosphere reserves; and
 - Bioregional planning.
- g) That the average duration of the evaluation and decision-making process by the local municipality, from receiving an application until completion would be about six months after which release and development of land can commence.
- h) The concerns espoused by the District that the rate of land release is negatively impacted on by the slow processing of environmental impact assessments by the relevant provincial department.
- i) That the District and local municipalities intend to refine planning at a sub-municipal level.

The panel commends

- a) The excellent capacity and track record of the District in relation to planning.
- b) The mainstreaming of sustainability in the Integrated Development Plan of the District.
- c) The District on the completion of the urbanisation strategy, which also includes a hierarchy of towns
- d) The District on the completion of the West Coast Strategic Vacant Land Study, which provides guidance on:
- Spatial expansion of towns;
 - Placing of low cost housing;
 - Identify and uphold unique character of towns/settlements;
 - Settlement of farm workers;
 - Land Reform;
 - Urban Densification; and
 - Urban Integration.
- e) All category B municipalities for addressing the development of commonages in order to ensure:
- Access to business opportunities for small farmers;
 - Access to housing; and
 - Promote economic development such as Vleiland.
- f) The Saldanha Bay Municipality on the process of drafting a policy with regard to the usage of public land.
- g) The District on recognising the strategic value of public land as an instrument of change.

The panel is concerned about:

- a) The ability of the District to translate their understanding around public land as a an instrument of change into tangible strategies and actions to utilise publicly owned land to address issues of land reform and spatial restructuring.
- b) The fact that despite the numerous effort of the municipality to facilitate the transfer state owned land for housing purposes, progress is delayed by the relevant national department.
- c) The lack of a clear strategy and the ability of local municipalities to deal with issues of labour migration.
- d) The absence of an audit of state owned land in the District.

The panel recommends that:

- a) The Department of Land Affairs assists the District in fast tracking the completion of a detailed land audit and land reform strategy for the District.
- b) The Presidency and the Office of the Premier need to co-operate on launching an aggressive approach to building a solid understanding on the

- NSDP, and translating it into provincial and district-wide agreements on the space economy and areas of need and potential.
- c) The Province needs to finalise its PGDS.
 - d) The provincial Spatial Development Plan be finalised as a matter of urgency.
 - e) Support should be given to Districts and local municipalities to ensure alignment of spatial priorities.
 - f) The District and local municipalities need to develop a shared agreement on the unique natural and other characteristics within the region, which provides comparative and competitive advantages, and develop clear long-term strategies to harness these for long-term sustainable development.
 - g) That the District and local municipalities develop the region's natural resources in conjunction with line functionaries in a way that distributes the benefits equitably to all the communities.

4.3 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The panel notes:

- a) That the guiding principles and strategies within which to further economic development in the region are derived from the District's work within the following:
 - Facilitation of the development of sustainable job opportunities;
 - Supporting the development of a more competitive labour force;
 - Supporting the development of an agricultural and industrial production system;
 - Development of an effective economic support system; and
 - Maximisation of economic empowerment opportunities for all residents within the region.
- b) That the District identified the following key projects to further economic development and job creation in the region:
 - Development of the small farmers and fishermen;
 - Development of agricultural markets and unions;
 - Identification and promotion of local processing opportunities;
 - Coordination of existing training programmes;
 - Initiation of a SMME database;
 - Development of a training and monitoring system for SMMEs;
 - Supporting tourism development;
 - Supporting and coordinating appropriate training and education programmes; and
 - Development of an appropriate economic information system.
- c) That WCDM's approach to economic development includes:
 - Facilitating economic development through strategic infrastructure investment;
 - Applying equitable procurement policies;
 - Providing direct support to historically disadvantaged-communities through economic development projects;
 - Supporting the RED-Door (Real Enterprise Development) initiatives; and
 - Supporting the EPWP initiative.
- d) That the District provides regional development funds to local municipalities to provide economic infrastructure and services through which economic development can be supported or unlocked.
- e) The District and the Western Cape Provincial Government intends to establish an economic development unit to support municipalities and all role-

players in the region with regard to economic information and guidance on economic development.

- f) The District intends to update its economic development strategy during June of 2005.
- g) The active involvement of the Department of Science and Technology in the District regarding exploring technologies to support:
 - Oil and Gas Exploration;
 - The Ship Building Industry;
 - Alternative Energy Installations;
 - Desalination of Water;
 - Waterless Sanitation Technologies; and
 - Unlocking Mari-culture opportunities in the marine farming industry on the West Coast.

The panel acknowledges and commends the District on:

- a) The clear shift in emphasis from infrastructure expansion to social and economic issues as denoted in the District IDP as well as the District presentation.
- b) Completing the West Coast District Municipality Economic Development Strategy during 2000.
- c) Its active involvement in the RED-Door initiative from the provincial government with possible sites for these support centers being considered at present with a view to opening their doors within the foreseeable future.

The panel is concerned about:

- a) The perceived lack of a clear perspective on the economic drivers that should underpin the growth of the District into the future, despite the existence of a regional economic strategy.
- b) The perceived lack of a macro-economic strategy component as part of the regional economic strategy.
- c) The lack of clarity on how the District will leverage the research and investment related to the West Coast SDI for the purposes of promoting economic growth in the region.
- d) The lack of engagement by the relevant departments in the process of identifying the levers of economic potential in the District.
- e) The general lack of and inadequate sharing of economic information across spheres and sectors.
- f) The vacuum created by the lack of a finalised PGDS and PSDP in terms of getting to a common agreement on the role and contribution of the District in the provincial space economy.

The panel recommends that:

- a) The relevant departments (DTI, DME, S&T, DPLG, Premier's Office, provincial departments responsible for local government and economic development) support the District in the process of developing a district-wide agreement on the space economy of the District, areas of needs and potential, the levers for unlocking economic potential and the role and contribution of the District to the economy of the province.
- b) The District considers and, where appropriate, incorporates the work and research that has been completed in relation to the West Coast SDIs.
- c) The Premier's Office, in co-operation with relevant departments and the Districts in the province, ensures that relevant economic information required for rigorous economic planning is compiled and shared.
- d) The Province fast tracks the finalisation of the PGDS.

- e) The Provincial Spatial Development Plan be finalised as a matter of urgency.
- f) Relevant agencies (education, labour, SETAs) assist the District with the refinement and implementation of its skills development strategy.

4.4 RESOURCE STREAMS

The panel notes:

- a) That 60% of levy income from levies are distributed to local municipalities in line with the prioritisation model for provision of basic infrastructure.
- b) The concerns raised by the District regarding the implications of doing away with the establishment levy.
- c) The effective utilisation of MIG as evidenced by the numerous service delivery achievements with regard to maintenance and economic infrastructure.
- d) That the majority of municipalities in the District have reviewed their procurement policies and tender procedures in order to contribute to BEE, the promotion of small contractors, facilitating training workers, and ultimately contributing to job creation in the District.
- e) The Office of the District Roads Engineer for the West Coast Region in the province is responsible for utilising the EPWP funds for road maintenance outside of the urban areas in the District.
- f) The District assists the District Roads Engineer of the Province in identifying the need for maintenance of roads in the rural areas.
- g) That the municipalities in the District also utilise other sources of funding for economic infrastructure projects

The panel acknowledges:

- a) That the District and local municipalities have defined and identified potential economic infrastructure that may leverage job creation and economic development in the District.
- b) That in line with the above they have re-allocated MIG funding to projects which can impact positively on the economy as follows:
 - Direct impact: Labour Intensive projects, roads that improve access.
 - Indirect impact: Unlocking of dormant/ potential economies
- c) That the District has adjusted its prioritisation models to provide a bigger weight to economic criteria.
- d) That the District ensured that project design and impact focus on more sustainable employment in contrast with temporary employment.

The panel commends the Swartland Municipality on:

- a) Its exemplary implementation of the EPWP.
- b) The innovative utilisation of the LED grant. (Established a legal person that provided interest free loans to 6 entrepreneurs); and
- c) Its ability to leverage the property boom to improve the financial viability.

and the District on:

- d) Its intention to apply EPWP requirements to all projects funded by the District.

The panel is concerned about:

- a) The fact that all the municipalities in the District contend that the conditions pertaining to the use of grant funding, such as MIG and MFMA requirements, impede negatively on the rate of delivery in the District.
- b) The apparent lack of understanding of the EPWP, its objectives, definitions, methodologies, conditions outcomes and targets prevailing in the province as a whole and the West Coast District in particular.

- c) The fact that only the District and Swartland municipalities are using the EPWP and the fact that the majority of the local municipalities expressed dissatisfaction with the communication and support for EPWP from Public Works.
- d) The concerns expressed and the examples cited of DORA allocations not being realised. (DORA indicated that R4.5m will be allocated to the District but only R2m was eventually transferred) The unpredictability of resource allocations by the provincial and national spheres severely impacts on the ability of the municipality to draft realistic plans and to implement its intentions.
- e) The District expressed the perception that some of the MFMA provisions prohibit them to act developmentally. (When Swartland Municipality presented a case to Treasury to fund three developmental projects, (MPCC Support, Darling Focus and a Night Shelter) it received a response that indicated that the District should rather focus on its core functions.

The panel recommends:

- a) The establishment of an EPWP unit at the District to assist local municipalities to access and assist with the execution of EPWP.
- b) That the National Department of Public Works fast track their intentions to undertake a series of workshops on the EPWP in the province and the District in particular and review their current support programme in order to render it more effective.
- c) That the province spearheaded by the Office of the Premier appoint a small task team representing relevant national and provincial departments as well as relevant SETAs to provide clarity and support on the ways and means in which MIG and the EPWP are intended to compliment each other especially with the view to:
 - support the establishment of sustainable small contractors or small medium and micro enterprises;
 - leverage economic growth; and
 - create sustainable employment opportunities.
- d) That the EPWP targets allocated to province need to be translated into municipal targets and that the Premier's Office needs to incorporate them into the provincial monitoring mechanism to track progress and mobilise remedial action where required.
- e) That the Premier's Office fast tracks its approach to embark on a road show to all municipalities on a wide range of local government issues as a follow up to the main themes and problem areas emerging from the Hearings and the budget review process.
- f) That the provincial department of local government in co-operation with the department responsible for economic development, kick start a process to encourage innovation in municipalities on issues ranging from infrastructure and service delivery to economic development such as tourism. It was proposed that provincial pilot projects should be considered as a possible approach to achieve this.

4.5 ENVIRONMENT, NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND ENERGY

The panel notes:

- a) The District's planning and management approach to "bio-regional planning", which implies "an organised process that allows people to co-operate, give careful consideration to potential problems threatening the area, identify collective goals and objectives, identify activities, implement projects, take

- action acceptable to the communities, evaluate progress and refine their approach.”
- b) That the District has various environmental management policies and plans in place.
 - c) That various place and sector specific planning documents (such as the Velddrif / Elandbay Coastal Plan, Piketberg / Porterville Development Plans and the Saldanha Bay Coastal Area Plans) are in place.
 - d) That the District and various of the local municipalities apply and/or enforce adherence to environmental legislation in the evaluation of land use applications as well as the implementation of projects that can impact on the environment.
 - e) That the District has a waste management strategy in place.
 - f) That the District is participating actively in the Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve, the Knersvlakte Bioregion and various other entities involved with environmental management in the District.

The panel is concerned about:

- a) The fact that the District and local municipalities still need to address issues related to some non-permitted or unlicensed, solid waste disposal sites.
- b) That the District is finding it difficult to deal with the eradication of the bucket system in areas where there are dire water shortages.

The panel recommends that:

- a) The Department of Water Affairs, the Department of Science and Technology, DEAT and the Provincial Department of Local Government support the District to find sustainable waterless sanitation technologies that are suitable for the area.
- b) That DEAT and its provincial counterpart assist the District in dealing with the remaining issues related to unlicensed solid waste management sites in the District.

4.6 GOVERNANCE and INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY

The panel notes the plans of the District to develop institutional capacity in the District by:

- a) Refining the communication strategy of the District.
- b) Conducting workshops and sharing information across municipalities in the District.
- c) Developing and implementing strategies to share technology across municipalities in the District.
- d) Accessing the skills development levies more successfully.
- e) Enhancing project management capacity at District level.

The panel notes the following issues raised by the District in relation to its financial viability:

- a) The primary revenue source of the municipality is the Regional Services Council (RSC) levies, which will be phased out by 30 June 2005.
- b) The expected income from RSC levies for 2005/2006 is estimated at around R30m.
- c) The revenue budget is, however, conservatively prepared to accommodate any volatility that could arise.
- d) The other major sources of revenue are interest earned on investments and bulk water sales to local municipalities in its area, of which the bulk water

sales are due to change subject to the Section 78 investigation that is being undertaken at present.

- e) The balance sheet of the Council reflects a low debt burden and sound liquidity.
- f) The services levy demonstrated gradual growth but in 2004 increased substantially by 33%, reflecting a strong growth in the salary bill of the region.
- g) The salary bill of the District is considered low for its current activities and comprises only 25,29% of the budget.
- h) Maintenance costs are low but the District does not have major infrastructure assets to maintain.
- i) Sound financial planning and disciplined expense management assisted the District to realise substantial surpluses on its operating account over the past three years.

The panel notes that the District (along with Matzikama and Cederberg Municipalities) also supports and participates in **Project Consolidate** where the aim is to specifically:

- a) Promote public participation, establish ward committees and deploy community development workers;
- b) Expand on the indigent policies, free basic services, billing systems and to reduce municipal debt;
- c) Find linkages to the Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP), the Municipal Infrastructure Grant (MIG) and Local Economic Development (LED);
- d) Counter corruption and put in place anti-corruption mechanisms;
- e) Develop performance management and service delivery indicators as well as a communications strategy;
- f) Refine delivery orientation of local government;
- g) Establish trouble-shooting capacity to identify and remove bottlenecks inhibiting acceleration of service delivery and local government transformation;
- h) Provide more focused and targeted support; and
- i) Build the capacity of the District to engage and interact more directly with local municipalities, communities and key stakeholders.

The panel is concerned about:

- a) The ability of the District to sufficiently support the municipalities in the northern parts of the District.
- b) The ability of the local municipalities to contend effectively with the operations and maintenance implications of current infrastructure expansion and other forms of capital investment throughout the District.
- c) The lack of an accurate and shared information base to support planning, decision-making and implementation, throughout the District.
- d) The District wanting to create a profile for the region to construct a database to go forward;
- e) Perceived inadequacies in the capability of the District and local municipalities to analyse and interpret available information and to link the findings to the business processes of the municipality.
- f) The prevailing perception that Project Consolidate is intended to unblock blockages impeding delivery.

The panel recommends that:

- a) The Project Consolidate initiatives in the District incorporate an overt focus on building the capacity of participating municipalities to develop appropriate fiscal and institutional capacity.

- b) All municipalities, especially those with qualified audit reports, implement strict financial control mechanisms and adhere to GRAP;
- c) The District, in co-operation with key provincial and national departments, proceeds to develop a reliable and accessible information base and GIS-system to improve planning and decision-making in the District.
- d) The District and local municipalities, fast track the process of defining clear targets and indicators for development in the District.

4.7 INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION

The panel notes that:

- a) The District has made a concerted effort to engage with the NSDP and evolving PGDS.
- b) The District has developed a hierarchy of towns as a rationale for infrastructure investment and that it informs the infrastructure strategy and the prioritisation model.
- c) The West Coast Integrated Development Plan (2004/2005) is distributed to all Provincial and National Departments and all development role-players in the region.
- d) Local municipalities look to the District to develop strategies on issues related to tourism, infrastructure, and urbanisation, which provide direction and enables local municipalities to take appropriate action.

The panel notes the impressions of the District regarding general issues of inter-governmental alignment and joint work:

- a) Insufficient coordination and cooperation between institutions at strategic level and functional level between national and the municipalities, province and municipalities as well as the District and local municipalities.
- b) Sector departments regard municipalities as “dumping grounds” for both funds and investments and to meet spending targets.
- c) Municipalities have virtually no interaction with the provincial budgetary process and only received information on the provincial budget in March 2005, with the exception of Saldanha Bay.
- d) The District rates the participation of the following departments in municipal matters in the District as good:
 - Provincial Department of Local Government and Housing (Engineers), DWAF, Agriculture, Social Services, Land Affairs, Community Safety, Internal Affairs, Education, Economic Development and Tourism
- e) The District recommended that the frequency and purpose of most meetings and workshops be reconsidered.
- f) The District recommends that the province co-ordinates initiatives and devises appropriate mechanisms to obtain information from municipalities (e.g. too many questionnaires on related issues).

The panel acknowledges and commends:

- a) The District on the fact that planning and development concepts are clear and well understood and that the District at a principle level operates within the sustainable development paradigm.

The panel is concerned about:

- a) The perceived lack of an up to date socio-economic analysis for the District as a whole.
- b) The fact that various sector departments used the IDP Hearings as a platform to inform municipalities about sector related issues for the first time.

The panel recommends that:

- a) The national and provincial spheres of government provide timeous feedback to municipalities on:
 - projected allocation of funds within the context and time frames of the MFMA provisions.
 - Programmes and projects to be implemented throughout the District.
- b) The District and local municipalities with the support of sectors and utilities continue to align and integrate planning and development in the District with provincial and national policy and guidelines.
- g) The province constitutes a cross-sectoral team to engage and interface with districts in a predictable manner and to assess IDPs around common benchmarks and criteria.
- h) National (The Presidency, dplg, DTi) and provincial (Premier's Office, DH&LG, and Economic Development) spheres co-ordinate messages on economic development and establish an integrated team to drive and build capacity in the province to engage on the space economy and to support economic development within the Districts in the province.
- i) This team provides specific support to this District in relation to the "economic boom" projections and predications for the region and to support the District to move from strategy to execution.
- j) The province fast tracks the completion of the PGDS including the PSDP with the participation of the local sphere in the province.
- k) The District is encouraged to play an even more strategic role in the region and continue to mobilise local municipalities in the region to cooperate more pro-actively around economic development initiatives.

4. 8 COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

The panel notes the concerns and needs expressed by ward committee representatives:

- a) A need for training related particularly on the legal and policy environment related to development and local government.
- b) Concerns about the lack of visibility of councillors in the wards as well as a perceived lack of cooperation of ward councillors with ward committees.
- c) A need for greater visibility of political leaders (responsible for housing and job creation, e.g. imbizos)
- d) A need for improved access to information and greater accessibility to complaint facilities.

The panel notes that:

- a) The District started with the implementation of ward committees in 2004.
- b) No ward committees have been established for the District Management Areas.
- c) The establishment, implementation and training of the Ward Committee System and ward committees within each category B municipality has been approved as part of the IDP Process Framework (approved in August 2004) and is being implemented accordingly.
- d) Although ward committees are in place, they have varying degrees of functionality.
- e) The local municipalities have opted for adopting varying strategies for communication and community participation.
- f) The District envisages further training of ward committees.

- g) The role and purpose of community development workers vary greatly from one municipality to the next within the District.

The panel acknowledges and commends:

- a) The District and local municipalities on mobilising a large and seemingly representative contingent of community and ward representatives to participate in the IDP Hearings.
- b) The ward representatives participating in the Hearings on their useful and insightful inputs.
- c) The District on the completion of a communication and participation strategy during 2004 and that the strategy is being implemented and that the District conducts a perception analysis as part of its communication strategy.
- d) The District and the provincial administration on progress with regard to community development workers.

The panel is concerned about:

- a) The perceived lack of judgement of the broader community on the effectiveness of public participation strategies.
- b) The perceived lack of knowledge of communities to participate effectively in municipal processes as identified by research in 2003 and expressed by the District in its presentation.
- c) The lack of availability of information regarding the activity of other role-players such as sector departments and government agencies in the municipal area.

The panel recommends that:

- a) The District proceeds to implement the training program for various role-players in the District. (Officials, councillors, ward committee members)
- b) The District proceeds with the re-evaluation of research findings emanating from the communication strategy and perception survey on a continuous basis.
- c) The District proceeds to train and empower public engagement structures with regard to municipal functioning and local government.
- d) The District promotes the standardisation of consultation processes within the District to ensure greater legitimacy and synchronization.

5. POLICY/ ISSUES AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

- a) The concept of Community Development Workers is generally poorly understood in the majority of the municipalities. This contributes to tensions between CDWs and ward committees in some instances.
- b) There is a general lack of understanding of the EPWP and its goals and intended outcomes amongst the majority of municipalities in the District. The majority of municipalities perceive that the EPWP can only create temporary jobs and have a lack of understanding of the social, environmental and economic possibilities of the EPWP. Furthermore, municipalities are unclear on how to monitor and report on the achievement of targets in terms of the EPWP.
- c) Much work needs to be done to build the capacity of municipalities in the province regarding the implementation of the EPWP.
- d) There is evidence of a broad based lack of understanding of MIG and its conditions, and various municipalities have expressed concern about the conditions attached to MIG. District municipalities that have established

Project Management Units at district level have expressed concerns about the allocation of MIG funding. Feedback from municipalities seems to point to the need for a review of the operations and maintenance component of the MIG.

- e) The District can benefit greatly from exploring alternative technologies as a means to bring services to communities in remote areas or areas of water scarcity. The departments of Science and Technology and Water Affairs could potentially play a meaningful part in supporting municipalities to explore viable and sustainable options in this regard.
- f) The Province needs to finalise its PGDS and provincial spatial development plan. One driver is needed for the management of this process and strong municipal participation and ownership of this process is recommended.
- g) A provincial and national debate is needed around the role of districts and how it relates to economic, social and infrastructure investment, and needs to include a review of the powers and functions of this sphere.
- h) There is a need for a special provincial-wide debriefing on the role of districts.

6. CONCLUSION

The panel acknowledges the challenges facing the District but wishes to emphasise the critical role that this district has to play in the economy of the province and the country as a whole.

The District is to be commended on:

- Its comprehensive and thorough report and presentation.
- The quality of and dedication to thorough planning in the District.
- The serious attempt of the District to mainstream sustainability considerations into all aspects of planning and delivery.
- Good progress with infrastructure expansion, service provision and the roll out of the free basic services policy in urban areas of the District.
- The District's commitment to deepening democracy and progress with ward committees and CDWs.
- Its pro-active commitment to make social and economic development an integral part and a new area of focus within the District IDP.

The District and local municipalities are encouraged to build on the excellent platform that is in place and should challenge themselves with:

- Setting more challenging targets for service expansion in the urban areas of the District.
- Making concerted progress to also extend basic services in rural areas of the District.
- Improving where necessary on issues of financial management.
- Improving upon and implementing their long-term economic strategies.
- Systematically exploring sustainable alternative technologies especially for service delivery in remote and water scarce/poor areas.

The District and local municipalities are encouraged to embark on a challenging road of joint work in search of extraordinary measures to meet their remaining challenges. The participation of the municipality in this inter-sphere dialogue is highly appreciated.

SIGNED

**Signature of
Chair:**

Name: Ms Shanaaz Majiet

Date: HOD, Department of Local Government, Western Cape

**Signature of
Co-Chair:**

Name: Mr Yusuf Patel

Date: National Department of Provincial and Local Government