

Keynote Address: Mr. Marius Fransman - MEC

Integrated Development Planning Conference 2005

Venue: Hermanus

Date: 10 - 11 March 2005

Chairperson,

Honourable Premier of the Western Cape,

Executive Mayors,

Municipal Managers,

Heads of provincial and municipal departments,

Members of non-governmental organizations and municipal service providers,

Ladies and gentlemen

We have just celebrated ten years of freedom and indeed when we look back we can safely say we have achieved a lot. As I alluded earlier on, we have managed and solved complex problems around issues of house provision, job creation etc, and we need to be proud of all those achievements. But what we must not loose sight of is the fact that life evolves. As we successfully resolve today's challenges new and different challenges always emerge in the horizon. An example of this and clear case studies are recent occurrences in Joe Slovo and Bokmakierie where we try to solve one issue and another one erupts. Adding and complicating our challenges is the changing migration, spatial, economic, socio-cultural patterns the world over, not only in the Western Cape. But in that context, we must plan!

For our planning to be successful, we need to think differently from the way we have done things in the past. We need to be innovative, generate new ideas, new building concepts and new management strategies to benefit and better the lives of our people. Above all, we need to action those new innovations, if we don't, they become useless. In this regard Hebert Prochow said, "Ideas are such funny things; they never work unless you do".

We are here in Overstrand Municipality to talk about integrated planning in the Western Cape. We are here to celebrate our successes, for much has been achieved. More importantly, we are here to assess whether integrated development planning has achieved its intended purpose, and that is to transform our landscape of inequality and division to one of integration and wholeness.

To assess integrated development planning, we must understand the ideal against which we measure our success or failure. Let me remind you of the origins of integrated development planning in South Africa.

Municipalities were first required to prepare Integrated Development Plans by the Local Government Transition Act of 1996, and the deadline for the completion of the first plans was November 1997. The deadline came and went. Few municipalities completed their IDPs and even fewer produced plans of substance. Municipalities were, of course, undergoing significant restructuring, and at that time national and provincial government were providing minimal support to municipalities for integrated planning.

That first attempt at integrated planning was also compromised by the lack of a coherent vision of local government's role. This vision was provided by the White Paper on Local Government of 1998. The White Paper stated that the mandate of local government was to work with communities to transform their living environments into places that affirm their dignity, support their livelihoods, and heal the rifts within and between communities.

So this is the first ideal against which we must measure our success, namely fundamental transformation of the apartheid legacy. It is a legacy of communities divided according to racial classification, communities still essentially divided into African, Coloured, and White residential areas. It is a legacy of poverty and unemployment, with a tremendous gulf between the haves and the have-nots. It is a legacy of community breakdown, with residents not feeling safe in their neighbourhoods and women and children not feeling safe in their own homes and communities.

Where does one begin in fulfilling this developmental mandate? The White Paper and subsequent legislation have provided the means to fulfill this mandate, namely integrated development planning. Through such plans, municipalities can assess the socio-economic needs of their area, develop a vision for the future, formulate strategies to achieve these goals, and implement projects related to those goals. In short, the plans should address our historical legacy in a fundamental way. If they do not, then they are not developmental.

The success of any plan rests on the quality of that plan. We must be honest about whether our plans contain the essential elements of integrated planning and whether the quality of research, analysis, and strategy is good enough. As Winston Churchill said, "It is no use saying, 'We are doing our best.' You have got to succeed in doing what is necessary."

The responsibility for producing a coherent vision and sufficient direction in an IDP is great, as it is supposed to involve all spheres of government and form the basis for planning across the spheres. Many municipalities complain that provincial and national departments do not take sufficient account of IDPs when they plan their projects. But were they effectively involved, and are we confident that our IDPs are good enough to form the basis for intergovernmental planning?

For me a good IDP has to be clear about what the municipality wishes to achieve and how it will achieve it. We may think that our development plans make this clear, but in fact most IDPs are not sufficiently focused. We have IDPs that contain long lists of suggested development projects, but these projects are not necessarily linked to what we wish to achieve. When we prioritize projects, we must ensure that the projects are contributing to the achievement of the strategic priorities outlined at the beginning of the IDP. And of course, our strategic priorities must actually reflect the aspirations of our communities.

As we enter the next cycle of integrated planning and produce new IDPs, great attention must therefore be paid to reviewing our strategic priorities and ensuring that they directly inform the choice of programmes and projects.

Once we are clear about what we wish to achieve, we should know how we will measure our success. This is a great shortcoming in our development plans. We may say that we wish to create a vibrant local economy through tourism, but how will we know if we have succeeded? There are many on-going studies and surveys that can provide the necessary indicators to assess this. It is important to identify these measures or indicators in our IDPs, as this will enable us to chart our progress, assess our impact, and take remedial action if necessary.

So that is the **first** ideal against which we should measure our success: do our IDPs spell out what we wish to transform, how we will achieve transformation, and how we will assess whether we have succeeded?

The **second** measure of our success is whether we are working together in an integrated manner. The White Paper states that municipalities will not be able to formulate and implement their plans unless they are multi-sectoral in their approach. This means that departments within municipalities should work together, and municipalities as a whole should work together with provinces and national departments and other stakeholders.

This is an entirely new way of working and thinking. It is no longer acceptable that the various parts of a municipality should function in separate silos, or that a municipality should develop a plan without referring to the relevant district or local plan or to the provincial or national plan. Integrated planning requires a new mindset whereby the various parts of a municipality work together to achieve the vision of the plan. This is not easy, as it requires people who are trained in one area, such as engineering or finances, to listen to, understand, and work with people from other areas. But if we are not integrated in our process, we cannot move forward and be integrated in our implementation.

It is not only the written plan that must be integrated, then, it is the entire process. IDP is **not a document** that is developed and implemented by the IDP manager. IDP is a process that should be led by the Council and driven by the municipal manager. We

have found that in many municipalities, the Council and municipal manager do not take direct responsibility for IDP in the municipality. Rather, they abdicate this responsibility and it then falls to the IDP co-coordinator or the Planning and Implementation Management (PIMSS) Centre to drive the process. The lack of co-ordination and integration amongst departments in many municipalities is often due to a lack of leadership from the top. To emphasize the importance of leadership, two of the speakers at this conference will be directly addressing this issue.

This is the **second** component, then. The IDP process requires political and administrative leadership and a new mindset of integrated planning and action within the administration and between spheres of government.

This brings us to the **final measure** of success. The Constitution and the White Paper on Local Government are very clear that local government must be democratic, transparent and accountable, and public participation is therefore the cornerstone of any successful IDP process. Public participation should not be seen as only a compliance issue. It provides the basis for building partnerships with community and other local stakeholders. Meaningful public participation ensures that the development plan is authentic, that it reflects the aspirations of local residents. Meaningful public participation provides the plan with legitimacy. If local residents, community organizations, and businesses actively participate in the process, they will own the plan and can then be mobilized as partners in delivery.

It is important for the municipality to use all the means at its disposal to maximize public participation. IDP forums and consultation meetings are only one way of getting participation. We have to become more creative and use ward councilors and ward committees to reach out to all sectors and interest groups to consult about development priorities and projects.

Where we want to target specific groups for development, we have to make special efforts to reach them and draw them in, whether they are organized or not. For example most women in the second economy are working in what we could call survivalist enterprises, with no assets, no finance and no support. When we consult the

local business community they will not be there. They are not organized and are therefore excluded from the formal consultation processes that focus on stakeholders. We should be going to them at the taxi ranks and the informal markets. We should call meetings and ask them to speak about their needs and problems and to elect people to represent them. Our ward committees and community development workers should be at the forefront of our efforts to reach the marginalized.

These, then, are the **three measures of our success**: a transformative plan that is clear about what it seeks to achieve, a new way of working together under political and administrative leadership, and a meaningful process of public participation and partnership.

We must recognize that achieving this success is not the responsibility of municipalities alone. Integrated planning is where cooperative governance starts. Support from national and provincial government is indispensable, both in providing capacity and ensuring alignment of national, provincial, and local plans. Almost all our development projects need different spheres of government to come to the table. For example a new housing development will not become a sustainable community without schools and clinics and police stations. These are functions of provincial and national government.

National government has shown its commitment in this regard. It is co-coordinating the IDP hearings that will take place throughout the country in May. National government has also ensured that there is a PIMSS Centre in every district. This capacity has been valuable, particularly with respect to the alignment of local and district development plans.

My Department has also contributed to municipal integrated planning. It has provided day-to-day support in the planning, drafting, adoption, and review of IDPs. It has provided assistance on IDP issues that require co-ordination between local, district, and the province. We have assisted in the establishment of the PIMSS Centres in each of the 5 district municipalities, and we convene this IDP Conference in March each year. We set up an IDP Assessment Committee consisting of all provincial departments to see if

each IDP was doing the basics right. The assessment process revealed that the real strategic questions were not being answered, and that the absence of ward committees was an issue. Participants found the assessment process extremely valuable. It was an important step to start working together and unpacking the development realities for each municipality.

The Department is committed to providing further support in order to deepen and strengthen the IDP process in municipalities. I said earlier that integrated development plans should be clear about what they wish to achieve and how. This requires a high level of strategic planning ability and the ability to use indicators to assess whether we have succeeded. My Department will develop the capacity to provide more detailed assessments in this regard. We will also continue with our IDP training programmes. This training will still provide technical support, but will be expanded to address the strategic planning challenges of integrated planning.

The province is committed to providing broad-based support in process of implementing the vision of "A Home for All". This vision will be achieved through the careful implementation and monitoring of the "Ikapa Elihlumayo" strategy. This strategy, colleagues is envisaged to as one of its priorities fundamentally transform and extricate the poorest of the poor from conditions of abject poverty exacerbated by high levels of unemployment without taking anything away from the haves. Simultaneously, the strategy seeks innovative ways to grow the economy so wealth can be enjoyed by 'All'. My department is ready and prepared to provide inspirational leadership that will galvanize our collective wisdom to achieve the milestones we have set for ourselves. We are geared to manage the resources at our disposal in a manner that promotes effectiveness and efficiency of municipalities in the Western Cape.

In terms of municipal capacity, it is reassuring to see there is less reliance on consultants than in the early days of IDP. Municipalities have developed internal capacity, particularly with the appointment of IDP co-coordinators. When municipalities consider building further capacity, the focus should not necessarily be on hiring additional people. Rather, municipalities should ensure that the way in which they are structured facilitates integrated planning and implementation. IDP must be

mainstreamed in municipalities, not cloistered away in an IDP office. Careful thought should therefore be given to the relationship between integrated planning and the organogram of municipalities.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I also believe what Ralph Gerard said, "Reason can answer questions, but imagination has to ask them!"

So, I am going to pose **some questions**. I must mention that I don't have the answers. I have some ideas about what the answers should or ought to be.

If the assumption is that we are developing IDPs that are going to be sustainable in the future:

To what extent do IDPs contribute to economic growth, job creation and the alleviation of poverty?

Do we have the means and the capacity to measure the impact of our IDPs?

To what extent do IDPs meet the basic needs of our people?

To what extent do IDPs develop our human capital?

To what extent do IDPs assist in the process of democratizing our province and provincial institutions?

Do IDP projects benefit the Previously Disadvantaged?

For us to be able to answer these questions we need a paradigm shift. A change of mind-set. A change of focus. We need to remove our barriers that block our freedom to think, explore and manipulate ideas. These barriers also inhibit our mental playfulness, fantasy and reflectiveness that are essential for innovations to take place. For example, a 4 - year old who amuses himself or herself with an imaginary friend, with whom he/she shares his/her experiences and communicates, is cute. A 30 -year old with an imaginary friend is something else again! (Couger, 1995).

In this respect we are reminded of our human fragilities in a poem by Emily Dickson, which I would like to read to you.

We Never Know How High

*We never know how high we are
Till we are called to rise
And then, if we are true to form,
Our statures touch the skies,
The heroism we'd recite
Would be a daily thing,
Did not ourselves the cubits warp
For fear to be a King.*

In **closing**, it is appropriate to acknowledge the successes of the integrated planning process thus far. IDP has become the principal planning document in most municipalities. The integrated planning process has begun to bring together the three spheres of government. There has been significant participation in the process by communities. Consultants are no longer writing our IDPs and there has been development of significant internal capacity within municipalities. Innovative ideas have been generated regarding the prioritisation and implementation of projects. Key development priorities have been identified by municipalities, and infrastructure backlogs have been quantified and to some extent addressed.

In spite of our successes, I am sure that not one of us can say we are fully satisfied with the results of integrated planning in the Western Cape. We have not fulfilled the aspirations of the Constitution, the White Paper, and local government legislation. We aspire to the transformation of societies characterized by division, inequality, and poverty. We aspire to a planning approach that draws us together into one team to achieve a common vision. And finally, we aspire to transform our previously divided communities into communities that are harmonious, integrated, and prosperous. Ultimately it is against these aspirations that we must measure our success.

I thank you.