



Cooperative Governance & Traditional Affairs

Department:
Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Municipality Name: Thabo Mofutsanyana DM - water and sanitation – Johan Fourie – Lloyd Maimela

Date: 20/4/2010

Introduction

This Analysis Framework is intended to serve as a tool to guide the crafting, design, improvement and analysis of a credible IDP. Core criteria to demonstrate municipal strategy, vision and compliance with both legislative and policy intent have been crafted to assist the joint planning and analysis process. This Framework is not intended to serve the purpose of a performance measurement tool, but rather as a tool or guide for differential and simplified IDP's.

Key Focal Areas

1. Spatial Considerations
2. Service Delivery and Infrastructure Planning
3. Financial Planning and Budgets
4. LED
5. Good Governance: Public Participation, labour, IGR etc.
6. Institutional Arrangements

A Credible IDP

The Integrated Development Plan must therefore both comply with relevant legislation (see Appendix B) and convey the following:

1. Compliance and adherence to constitutional and policy mandate for developmental local government
2. Awareness by municipality of its role and place in the regional provincial and national context and economy. The Municipality must also show how it would contribute to the fight against poverty, the creation of jobs and improving the quality of lives of its citizens.
3. Awareness by municipality of its own intrinsic characteristics and criteria for success
4. Comprehensive description of the area – the environment and its spatial characteristics including backlogs
5. A clear strategy, based on local developmental needs on a ward-by-ward basis. The IDP must not be a 'wish-list' but subjected to the realities of what can be delivered by the budget over the three to five year horizons.
6. Insights into the trade-offs and commitments that are being made re: economic choices, establishment of SHS, integrated service delivery etc
7. The key deliverables for the next 5 years
8. Clear measurable budget and implementation plans aligned to the SDBIP
9. A monitoring system (OPMS)
10. Determines capacity of municipality
11. Communication, participatory and decision-making mechanisms

12. The degree of intergovernmental action and alignment to government wide priorities.
13. Reporting timeframes and the regulatory periods for reporting
14. Alignment with, and indication of, an aligned organogram
15. Alignment between the SDBIP and the performance contracts of section 57 managers.

A Credible IDP Analysis Framework 2010

KPA 1: Spatial Considerations

The understanding of the economic, physical and social space that the municipality inhabits is the most critical starting point for a credible IDP. For additional reference, some core evaluative criteria for Spatial Development Frameworks may include the following:

- MSA Regulations – assess contents of SDF in terms of the MSA Regulations.
- SDFs should reflect principles of the NSDP and PGDS at district and local levels.
- Does the SDF reflect adequate research into regional natural, demographic realities, the potential for economic activity, and advancing Sustainable Human Settlements?
- Does the SDF provide a basis for the Land Use Management System and an implementation plan?
- Are Infrastructure Projects, including those for Service Delivery, planned on the basis of the SDF?
- Spatial development analysis must be also be targeted to the needs of communities and reflect these needs on a ward-by-ward basis.

Note:

- For B3 – B4 municipalities:
 - The District SDF should be adopted by the Local Municipality
 - Spatial Considerations should be considered but will not determine the municipalities ranking.
- For B1, B2, C1, C2 and metros:
All spatial considerations must be considered in detail

A Credible IDP Analysis Framework

2. Service Delivery and Infrastructure Planning						
2.1: General Questions						
Evidential Criteria / KPIs	Applicable to	Y/N	Comments and Improvement Measure	Who will assist the Municipality?	By when?	Comments expected from <small>Names of officials needs to be added</small>
- Has a holistic and comprehensive (all sectors) infrastructure delivery plan been developed to indicate institutional requirements and financial viability of service delivery						
- To what extent does the Comprehensive Infrastructure Plan inform the above delivery plan?						
- Does the integrated development plan make provision for infrastructure reticulation and bulk infrastructure for water and sanitation?						

Evidential Criteria / KPIs	Applicable to	Y/N	Comments and Improvement Measure	Who will assist the Municipality?	By when?	Comments expected from Names of officials needs to be added
a) Infrastructure Investment Planning (IIP) - has the municipality undertaken medium term IIP (3-5 year minimum) to determine affordable and sustainable multi-year infrastructure targets and the capital and operating expenditure to meet those targets?						
b) Does investment planning utilize the MIG grant over the next MTEF?						
c) Is there indication of own revenue usage for infrastructure?						
d) Are other vehicles being used to aid investment in infrastructure. (e.g. private / public sector partnerships,)						
e) Other revenue sources (if applicable).						

Evidential Criteria / KPIs	Applicable to	Y/N	Comments and Improvement Measure	Who will assist the Municipality?	By when?	Comments expected from Names of officials needs to be added
2.2 Water						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the WSDP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Adopted ? b) has it been reviewed in last year.? 		No	Module 1 of WSDP completed – not adopted by Council. Funding shortfall to complete rest of WSDP modules. Municipality to complete WSDP and submit to Council for Adoption. WSDP mentioned on p90 as a legislative requirement but no mention of adoption status	DWA		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do the IDP reflect knowledge, implementation, strategies and target programmes w.r.t. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Backlogs b) Basic services provision c) Free basic water d) Higher levels of service requirements e) Associated services eg. Schools and clinics f) Water for growth and development. 		Yes	Backlog indicated on p16 / 19 / 45 – but not reflecting all challenges as per each LM IDP. Water resources i.t.o. water conservation and demand management not addressed at all. Financial viability of services not ring fenced and revenue base not reflected as input into financing aging infrastructure or O&M			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Did the IDP integrate other sector programme's water requirements and specially address the impact on water planning. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Housing b)Agriculture c)Mining d)Tourism e)Public Works programmes 		No	No clear indication of inter relationships and or inter dependencies between different Sectoral water needs			
Evidential Criteria / KPIs	Applicable to	Y/N	Comments and Improvement Measure	Who will assist the Municipality?	By when?	Comments expected from Names of officials needs to be added
- Did the IDP provide a proper project list that addresses all the needs as identified in the future plans and implementation strategies?		Yes	P45 – but not all projects as per WSA WSDP's reflected in IDP project lists			
- Are there approved budgets in the MTEF allocations for all these projects?		No	Projects and programmes incompletely listed and thus no MTEF			
- Is there a plan and budget for Operations and Maintenance for Water services and infrastructure?		No	Operation and maintenance not addressed in the IDP. Information is available in the WSDP per LM and should be extracted and presented on a higher level in the IDP of the DM.			
- Is the water services programme financially viable w.r.t. Cost recovery, Metering and billing with an associated budget that is ring fenced?		No	P96 – financial non viability discussed but no clear road to action or strategy indicated			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the IDP address water resources development w.r.t. demand management, water balance issues and ecological reserve? 		No	No reference to conservation or demand management indicated. On p16 reference is made to ground and surface water quality without reference to solutions or strategy to improve situation			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there specific references to the status of all contracting and licensing issues? 		No	None indicated			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the IDP reflect the status of water quality monitoring w.r.t. drinking water quality, water resources quality and WWTW releases? 		No	Drinking water quality is not mentioned at all in the IDP.			
Evidential Criteria / KPIs	Applicable to	Y/N	Comments and Improvement Measure	Who will assist the Municipality?	By when?	Comments expected from Names of officials needs to be added
2.3. Sanitation						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the IDP reflect knowledge, implementation, strategies and target programmes w.r.t. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Backlogs b) Basic services provision c) Free basic sanitation d) Higher levels of service requirements e) Associated services eg. Schools and clinics 		Yes	Backlog indicated on p16 / 19 / 45 – but not reflecting all challenges as per each LM IDP. Water resources i.t.o. water conservation and demand management not addressed at all. Financial viability of services not ring fenced and revenue base not reflected as input into financing aging infrastructure or O&M			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the WDSP reflect multi - year projects to address the backlog? 		No	P96 – financial non viability discussed but no clear road to action or strategy indicated			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the municipality have a sanitation implementation plan put in place? 		No	But not addressed in the IDP. Information is available in the WSDP per LM and should be extracted and presented on a higher level in the IDP of the DM.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the municipality have the CAPEX Plan which indicates allocation for sanitation for the next three years? 		No	But not addressed in the IDP. Information is available in the WSDP per LM and should be extracted and presented on a higher level in the IDP of the DM.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the municipality manage (a) waste water treatment? 		No	Waste water treatment is mentioned in the project list on p46. But none of the challenges as identified in the LM WSDP's are reflected in the DM IDP.			
Evidential Criteria / KPIs	Applicable to	Y/N	Comments and Improvement Measure	Who will assist the Municipality?	By when?	Comments expected from Names of officials needs to be added
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a plan to manage untreated effluent? Has this Municipality determined the need / extent for basic services, (a) free basic and (b) higher level service? 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the sanitation service financially viable and is there a budget that is ring fenced? 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the licencing/contractual arrangement i.t.o of (a) WSA, (b) WSP, (c) WWTW working? 						

- Is there a plan and budget for Operations and Maintenance for sanitation services and infrastructure?						
2.4 Human Settlements Housing (Human Settlements)						
▪ Have the housing demand aspects e.g demand data base or waiting list information been determined by the municipality?						
Evidential Criteria / KPIs	Applicable to	Y/N	Comments and Improvement Measure	Who will assist the Municipality?	By when?	Comments expected from Names of officials needs to be added
▪ Is the municipality able to address the housing demand challenges highlighted while taking into account the growth trends such as population, economy, etc?						
▪ Has the municipality indicated an ongoing process for identification of suitable land for housing development?						
▪ Has the municipality indicated the nature of service levels on these land parcels through CIP?						
▪ Does the IDP Informal Settlements section align to the Migration Plan of the municipality?						

▪ Has the municipality identified current and planned housing projects that are ready for implementation?						
▪ Has budgetary provision being made for planned housing projects?						
- Has the social viability of the settlements been determined/ indicated?						
Evidential Criteria / KPIs	Applicable to	Y/N	Comments and Improvement Measure	Who will assist the Municipality?	By when?	Comments expected from Names of officials needs to be added
2.5 Roads, Transport and Storm Water						
▪ Is there a Transport Plan?						
▪ Is there a budget to operate and maintain roads and storm water?						
▪ Has the municipality determined the extent of need i.t.o roads?						
▪ Has the municipality made provision for non-motorised transport?						

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a budget and a plan for the operations and maintenance of all roads? 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What's the relevant question in terms of storm water? 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a budget and plan for integrated roads and transport system (including non-mechanized,)? 						
Evidential Criteria / KPIs	Applicable to	Y/N	Comments and Improvement Measure	Who will assist the Municipality?	By when?	Comments expected from Names of officials needs to be added
2.6. Waste Management Services						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the IDP supported by an Integrated Waste Management Plan? 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Municipality operating a licensed landfill site? 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Municipality having a waste or refuse removal services? Indicate level of service? 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the Municipality have a Trade Effluent Policy? 						

- Is there evidence of implementation of sustainable environmental practices for re-cycling, is this service financially viable and is there a budget for Operations and maintenance ring fenced?						
Evidential Criteria / KPIs	Applicable to	Y/N	Comments and Improvement Measure	Who will assist the Municipality?	By when?	Comments expected from <small>Names of officials needs to be added</small>
2.7 Environment: Air Quality Management						
▪ Is the IDP supported by an Air Quality Management Plan?						
▪ Is the municipality a licensing authority?						
▪ Is there a budget ring fenced for operations and maintenance and new capital projects?						
▪ Are these projects viable and sustainable?						
2.8 Energy						

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has this Municipality determined the need / extent for basic services,(a)free basic and (b) higher level service? 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there a budget and a plan for providing grid and non-grid energy sources? 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the municipal investigated alternative sources and renewable energy 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there a budget ring fenced for operations and maintenance and new capital projects? ▪ How far is the Reds Redistribution Policy 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the plan make provision for infrastructure reticulation and bulk infrastructure for electricity? 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What provision has been made for upgrading facilities? 						
<p>2.9. Public amenities and community facilities</p>						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the Municipality determined the extent of need for public facilities and amenities? 						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Has the municipality done an audit on the community facilities and public amenities? 						

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there a budget ring fenced for operations and maintenance and new capital projects? 						
<p>General Point In the introductory section, the IDP must point out the kind of responsibilities it has (i.e: that they are a RED or a WSA etc)</p>						

Appendix A: Processes supporting the crafting of a credible IDP:

1. The conduct of intergovernmental relations

The IGRF Act requires that there are provincial and district intergovernmental forum to promote and facilitate IGR between provinces and local government and district and local municipalities.

The Forums must provide the enabling platform for liaison and decision-making for effective intergovernmental planning.

2. Cooperative governance

The MSA (s3) defines how local government must develop cooperative approaches to governing, resource sharing and solving of disputes within the context of IGR. It is important there is a commitment to these principles in implementing the the IDP.

3. The role of sector departments

The role of sector departments in local delivery must be clearly articulated. This input should come from both national and provincial sector departments. It must reflect awareness by sectors of the strategic focus of the IDP, and the steps taken to support the meeting of targets, or the plan to do so in future.

4. Institutional

Project Consolidate (Use new term as PC no longer exists) intervention areas and Municipal Action Plans (MAPs) should be incorporated into the IDP project plans. Izimbizo issues should have been addressed, as well as issues identified in the 2005 IDP Hearings Reports.

4. Processes, tools and mechanisms

Successful implementation of the IDP relies upon effective IGR, procurement and production processes to deliver projects within timeframes that are sustainable and regionally integrated. It also requires the alignment of capacity and the municipality's organogram with the IDP's strategy and projects.

Appendix B: Supporting documentation for Assessment Teams

Legislation

The RSA Constitution

Municipal Systems Act

Municipal Structures Act

Municipal Public Finance Management Act

Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act

Property Rates Act

Regulations and standards and processes as set out in sector legislation

Policy Documents

MIG Policy

NSDP

PGDS guidelines

PGDS's

Government annual MTSF

State of the Nation Address

Other

Izimbizo Reports

IDPH Panel Reports
National Skills Development Strategy
National LED Framework
Sample of sector strategies
EPWP Guidelines
Asgi-SA presentation
MEDS Strategy W Cape
Provincial organograms
Media articles

Glossary of Terms

ABP: Area Based Plan
BBBEE: Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment
DPW: Department of Public Works
DM: District Municipality
DEAT: Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism
DLG: Provincial Department of Local Government
DME: Department of Minerals and Energy
DoT: Department of Transport
dplg or the dplg: Department of Provincial and Local Government
dti or the dti: Department of Trade and Industry
DWAF: Department of Water Affairs and Forestry
EPWP: Expanded Public Works Programme
ES: Equitable Share
FBS: Free Basic Services
GIS: Geographic Information System
IDP: Integrated Development Plan
IGR: Intergovernmental Relations
ITP: Integrated Transport Plans
KPA: Key Performance Area
KPI: Key Performance Indicator
MFMA: Municipal Finance Management Act, Act 56 of 2003

MIG: Municipal Infrastructure Grant
MSA: Municipal Systems Act, Act 32 of 2000
NSDP: National Spatial Development Perspective
OPMS: Organisational Performance Management System
OTP: *Office of the Premier*
PGDS: Provincial Growth and Development Strategy
RF: Representative Forum
SDBIP: Service Delivery Budget Implementation Plan
SDF: Spatial Development Framework
SMP: Sector Master Plans
WSDP: Water Services Development Plan