

https://dspace.org/

Meaningful citizen engagement in the IDP and budgeting processes as a means to improve municipal service delivery

Ndima, Zenzo Michael

2017

http://hdl.handle.net/10539/23042

Ndima, Zenzo Michael (2017) Meaningful citizen engagement in the IDP and budgeting processes as a means to improve municipal service delivery, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, <http://hdl.handle.net/10539/23042>

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis on **MEANINGFUL CITIZEN ENGAGEMENT IN THE IDP AND BUDGETING PROCESSES AS A MEANS TO IMPROVE MUNICIPAL SERVICE DELIVERY** is my own, unaided work. It is submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other University.

_____

Zenzo M. Ndima

_____ 2017

DEDICATION

To my mother who left us many years ago, I dedicate this product of hard labour to you. To my father who did not abandon us when our mother had challenges, I say thank You! I have learned how to take responsibility for my own family from you,

LEMBEDE!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr Ivor Sarakinsky, without your patience and continued guidance; I wouldn't have finished this journey. You have been there from the beginning and I believe you will always be there even in future, my greatest gratitude. Thanks for allowing me to express myself and for your continuous encouragement when things became though.

Dr Thabo Mabogoane, for your faith and expression of humanity, you believed in me without asking many questions. You rallied behind me and patiently supported me. Thank you very much for being you, may you continue doing good to others as well.

The various defence panellists, including Dr Zandamela, Professor Anne McLennan, Professor Muller, Professor Susan Booysen, Professor Pundy Pillay, Dr Matshabaphala, Professor Everrat, and others I may have left out. Thank you for keeping me on my toes, always. Your comments were always on the spot, always pointing at the elements that I have missed out. I appreciate your pointers for useful literature and authors in my field of study, which I may not have accessed had it not been for your assistance.

My wife and kids, for allowing me to be away from your presence during my studies. Your support and belief in me have always been my inspiration to face all odds. Thank you for always being there for me, and for taking care of things whilst my attention was devoted to the research.

My fellow students from the beginning, thank you very much for your encouragement and support. When loneliness crept in, I always drew strength from the knowledge that I am not alone in this journey, that you are also battling it to the finishing line. To those who are still at it, I wish you good luck and success in all your endeavours. *Yinde lendlela!*

I wish to thank my current and previous colleagues for your continued support and belief in me. You have been cheering me on ever since I started, and you kept following up on my progress. Thank you very much

To my siblings, you have always expected great things from me, and you supported me in all my attempts at life. Thank you for always motivating and pushing me to realise my dreams.

TO GOD BE THE GLORY!

ACRONYMS

ADSA-	Alternative Development Strategies for Africa
AGSA -	Auditor General of South Africa
ANC -	African National Congress
BRICS-	Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa
CBD-	Central Business District
CBP –	Community-based Planning
CCC-	Customer Care Centre
CDW –	Community Development Worker
CoGTA –	Co-operative Governance and Traditional Affairs
Co J –	City of Johannesburg
CPI (M) –	Communist Party of India – Marxist
CS-	Community Survey
CSIR –	Centre for Science and Industrial Research
DIT –	Department of Information Technology (India)
DMA-	District Management Area
DLG –	Developmental Local Government
DMF –	District Municipal Fund
DPC –	District Planning Campaign
DPLG –	Department of Provincial and Local Governance
ELM-	Emfuleni Local Municipality
EMM –	Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality
EPG-	Empowered Participatory Governance
ETU-	Education and Training Unit

GCR-	Global City Region
GCRO-	Global City Region Observatory
GDP-	Gross Domestic Production
GDS-	Growth and Development Strategy
GPG-	Gauteng Provincial Government
GVA-	Gross Value Added
GRAP –	Generally Recognised Accounting Practices
HSIPC –	Head Start Information and Publication Centre
IDP –	Integrated Development Planning
ISS-	Interpretive Social Science
KDP –	Kerala Developmental Planning
KZN-	Kwa Zulu-Natal
LGTA –	Local Government Transitional Act
LGTAS-	Local Government Turn Around Strategy
MBC –	Municipal Budget Council
MECLM-	Merafong City Local Municipality
MCE -	Meaningful Citizen Engagement
MCLM-	Mogale City Local Municipality
MEC –	Member of Executive Council
MFMA –	Municipal Finance Management Act
MIIF –	Municipal Infrastructure Investment Framework
MLM-	Midvaal Local Municipality
MMD-	Method of Majority Decision
NT –	National Treasury
OECD –	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

PB –	Participatory Budgeting
PCAS –	Policy Co-ordination and Advisory Services
PDO –	Predetermined objective
PSC –	Public Service Commission
PP –	Participatory Planning
PPC –	Peoples Planning Campaign
PPP -	Public Participation and Petitions
PSS-	Positivism Social Science
RDP –	Reconstruction and Development Programme
RDSU –	(Peninsula) Research and Development Support Unit
RLM-	Randfontein Local Municipality
RSA –	Republic of South Africa
Stats SA-	Statistics South Africa
TAC –	Technical Advisory Committee
UNDP –	United Nations Development Programme
UN-HABITAT –	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
WC –	Ward Committee
WG –	Working Group
WLM-	Westonaria Local Municipality
WRDM-	West Rand District Municipality

ABSTRACT

Since the inception of the democratic era in South Africa, citizen engagement has been a contentious issue for the local government sphere. In hardly a decade of democracy, cracks began to manifest on the newly-ushered system of public participation in the country, which saw communities embarking on various acts of protests around the country. Sadly, the ugly actions of dissatisfaction by the citizenry have been the order of the day since the early days of democracy, and some have been labelled it 'a cry for attention by the disgruntled citizens'.

As evidence of the disconnection in the local discourse, the aforesaid factor was regarded as a starting point in this research. As such, numbers of, and various reasons for the violent protests were examined thoroughly to establish the truth behind same. Public conversations and discussions, albeit informal, were held wherever possible, and all these pointed to the crisis of democracy in the local government. The research explored the notion of meaningful citizen engagement as a panacea for alleviating service delivery backlogs in the local government. To avoid challenges of the cause-effect scenario in analysing the processes, measurements of meaningful citizen engagement in the local government, named 'condition', were developed in this research. Focusing on five different categories of municipalities, fifteen officials and ten councillors were interviewed using in-depth, semi-structured interviews. Further to that, two focus group discussions were held with ten community members and eight ward committee members each, using unstructured interview questions as focal themes. Apart from the interviews, four non-participant observations (IDP/Budget meetings) were conducted in order to get a sense of the current engagement processes. Furthermore, various public documents, both internal and external of the organisations, were analysed and utilised as part of the literature review. Data from the above sets of sources were explored and analysed using the basic interpretive qualitative design and phenomenological methods to make meaning of same.

The research findings suggested that current mechanisms of engagement lacked depth, and are limited in terms of opening meaningful engagement spaces for the citizens. These findings pointed to the dire need to move away from the normal, passive public participation towards the engaging, deliberative notions wherein the citizens would have opportunities to influence the final outcomes of planning and budgeting.

CONTENTS AND TABLES

DECLARATION ..... **i**

DEDICATION ..... **ii**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **iii**

ACRONYMS ..... **iv**

ABSTRACT ..... **vii**

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **viii**

LIST OF TABLES ..... **xiii**

LIST OF FIGURES ..... **xiv**

CHAPTER ONE **1**

1. INTRODUCTION **1**

1.1.BACKGROUND **2**

1.2 CONTEXT OF THE STUDY **7**

1.3 THE RESEARCH PROBLEM **8**

1.3.1 Problem Statement **8**

1.3.2 The Knowledge Gap. **10**

1.3.3 Purpose Statement **11**

1.3.4 Research Questions **12**

1.4 SCOPE **12**

1.4.1 Significance of the Study **12**

1.4.2 Limitations of the Research **13**

1.4.3 Delimitation of the Research **15**

1.4.4 Summary of the Study **18**

1.4.5 Chapter Organisation **19**

CHAPTER TWO: CONTEXTUALISING THE STUDY **22**

2.1 Introduction **22**

2.2 Auditor-General of South Africa: 2010-2011 Audit Findings on municipalities' performance **23**

2.3 Overview of the Gauteng Province 25

2.4 South African Local Government Overview 29

2.5 Conclusion 55

2.6 Relationship between the incidents of service delivery protests and participatory governance 56

2.6.1 Introduction 56

2.6.2 Conclusion 61

2.7 PROBLEMATISING PASSIVE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 62

2.7.1 Introduction 62

2.7.2 The brief history of participation in development 64

2.7.3 The effects of the dominant political ideology of South Africa 72

2.7.4 The case for Meaningful Citizen Engagement 80

2.7.5 Conclusion 82

CHAPTER THREE: SURVEY OF LITERATURE 84

3.1 Introduction 84

3.2 Conceptual Framework 84

3.2.1 Integrated Development Planning 84

3.2.1.1 Development 86

3.2.1.2 Planning 90

3.2.2 Critical analysis of different conceptions of democracy 98

3.2.2.1Aggregative democratic model and its deficits 99

3.2.2.2 Deliberative Democracy as participatory governance 103

3.2.3 Deliberative democratic theory and deliberative (political) cultures 110

3.2.4 Against deliberation 114

3.2.5 Theoretical foundations of Meaningful Citizen Engagement 116

3.2.6 Public deliberation as a tool for meaningful citizen engagement 118

3.2.7 Conditions for deliberative democracy 123

3.2.7.1 Political Inclusion 125

3.2.7.2 Political Equality 127

3.2.7.3 Reasonableness and public accountability 129

3.3 Conclusion 131

3.4 LITERATURE REVIEW 132

3.4.1 The significance of governance in the local development planning 132

3.4.2 Democracy and Public Participation in the local government 135

3.4.3 Public Engagement unpacked 139

3.4.4 International experiences and lessons of PB and PP - The cases of Brazil and India 142

3.4.5 Citizen engagement in the budgeting and formulation of the IDPs in the context of SA 152

3.4.5.1 Legal Framework for citizen engagement in the IDPs and Budgeting processes 153

3.4.5.2 Institutional Framework for citizen engagement in the IDP and Budget processes 160

3.4.5.3 The Budget Cycle of the local government in South Africa 162

3.5 Conclusion 165

3.6 Chapter Summary 166

CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY 168

4.1 Introduction 168

4.2 RESEARCH DESIGN OVERVIEW 169

4.2.1 Research approaches in social science 169

4.2.2 Rationale for qualitative approach 171

4.2.3 Deliberative theory as a form of basic interpretive qualitative framework for the study 173

4.3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 176

4.3.1 Research sample 177

4.3.2 Data Collection Methods 185

4.3.2.1 Primary data 185

4.3.2.2 Secondary data 190

4.4 Data analysis and synthesis 191

4.5 Ethical considerations 193

4.6 Reliability and Validity 195

4.7 Chapter Summary 197

CHAPTER FIVE: PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS 198

5.1 Introduction 198

5.2 Findings from the in-depth interviews and focus groups discussion 200

5.2.1 Understanding of the concept of Meaningful Citizen Engagement 200

5.2.2 Conclusion 205

5.3 Citizen engagement mechanisms and meaningful citizen engagement nexus 206

2.3.1 Conclusion 214

5.4 The potential of MCE to promote better planning in the local government 214

5.4.1 Understanding of community based planning (CBP) as a means to achieve MCE 215

5.4.2 MCE as a tool to address service delivery backlogs in the local government 221

5.4.3 Conclusion 225

5.4.4 Perceived and real major challenges to meaningful citizen engagement 226

5.4.5 Conclusion 233

5.5 Legislative imperatives to maximise the roles of citizens in the IDP & Budget processes 234

5.5.1 Senior Officials' and Ward Councillors' perspectives on the roles of citizens in the IDP & Budget processes 235

5.5.2 Community perspectives and awareness (understanding) of their legal roles in terms of the applicable legislation in regard to the formulation of IDPs and Budgets 242

5.5.3 Ward Committee members' perspectives on the roles of citizens in the IDP and budgeting processes 244

5.5.4 Conclusion 247

5.6 Findings from the Non-Participant Observations in relation to the conditions for MCE 248

5.6.1 Introduction 248

5.6.2 IDP and Budget meetings at the West Rand District Municipality, Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality, Midvaal and Emfuleni Local Municipalities 248

5.6.3 Conclusion 253

5.6.4 Chapter Summary 254

CHAPTER SIX: INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS 256

6.1 Introduction **256**

6.2 Understanding the notion of meaningful citizen engagement **256**

6.3 Citizen engagement mechanisms and meaningful citizen engagement nexus **262**

6.4 The potential of meaningful citizen engagement to promote better planning in the local government **269**

6.5 Legislative Imperatives to maximise the roles of citizens in the process of Formulating, Implementation and Monitoring of the IDP and Budget in the local government **278**

6.6 Chapter Summary **285**

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSION **288**

7.1 Introduction **288**

7.2 Contribution to knowledge **289**

7.3 Recommended plan of action **291**

7.4 Implications of the Research Findings **292**

7.4.1 Implications for the Institutional Arrangements **293**

7.4.2 Implications for the Citizenry **294**

7.5 Future Directions **295**

7.6 Concluding Remarks **296**

REFERENCES **299**

APPENDICES ..... **xv**

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Priority functions of local government 5

Table 2: Service Levels 6

Table 3: Population and percentage change by Province: Census 1996, 2001 and 2011, and Communty Survey 2007 25

Table 4: Consolidated Fact Sheet for the sampled municipalities 34

Table 5: Individual income distribution in the City of Johannesburg 44

Table 6: West Rand District Municipality Total Population distribution by race 47

Table 7: Sector contribution per percentage: 2011 Average Growth in GDP 48

Table 8: Emfuleni Local Municipality Population distribution by race groups (2001-2011) 54

Table 9: Participation in development & practice: a selective history 66

Table 10: Four Styles of Planning……..92

Table 11: Typology of participation by Arnstein & Pretty..... 136

Table 12: Ladder of Citizen Participation 137

Table 13: A Typology of Participation 138

Table 14: The Three types of engagement 141

Table 15: Participatory Planning, Budgeting to improve Local Government in Brazil…….144

Table 16: Steps in a Municipal Budget Process in South Africa……...164

Table 17: Qualitative and quantitative methodologies 172

Table 18:Summary of Analyses: Understanding the notion of MCE 261

Table 19: Summary of Analyses: Citizen engagement mechanisms and MCE nexus..... 268

Table 20: Summary of Analyses: The Potential of MCE to promote better planning in the LG..... 275

Table 21: Summary of Analyses: Legislative Imperatives to maximise the roles of citizens in the Formulating, Implementing and Monitoring the IDPs and Budgets in the LG……..281

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Map of provincial boundaries since 2001 25

Figure 2: Percentage distribution of population by province (2006-2011) 27

Figure 3: Unemployment rate by district municipality (1996, 2001 & 2011) 29

Figure 4: Map of seven regions of the City of Johannesburg 37

Figure 5: Three Regions of the Ekurhuleni Metropilitan Municipality 38

Figure 6: Customer Care Centres of the Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality 39

Figure 7: Economic growth patterns for South African Metros (1997-2014) 42

Figure 8: Map of the West Rand District Municipality with all transportation networks 46

Figure 9: Total population per municipality 47

Figure 10: Sector contribution to the economy as a percentage 49

Figure 11: Percentage of Average Annual Growth (Constant 2005 prices) 50

Figure 12: Percentage of Unemployed People in 2010 51

Figure 13: Locality Map of Sedibeng District Municipality with adjacent Gauteng municipalities 52

Figure 14: Major Service Delivery Protests by year (2004 - July 2012) 58

Figure 15: Service Delivery Protests by Province (1 Jan - 31 July 2012) 59

Figure 16: Mechanisms for citizen participation as envisaged by the Ten Year Review Process 78

Figure 17: Advantages of Participatory Planning 97

Figure 19: Yearly Participatory Budgeting Cycle 147

Appendix 1: Research Questions & Interview Matrix (Interview Guide)

RESEARCH QUESTION AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS MATRIX			
Primary Research Question: Will the implementation of meaningful citizen engagement mechanisms lead to the alleviation of service delivery and developmental backlogs (better service delivery) in the local government of South Africa?			
Research Questions	**Interview Questions**		
	Senior Officials & Ward Councillors	**Focus Group – Community Members**	**Focus Group – Ward Committee Members**
1. How is the notion of meaningful citizen engagement understood by the various local government stakeholders?	What do you understand by the notion of meaningful citizen engagement?	What does meaningful citizen engagement mean to you?	What is your understanding of the notion of meaningful citizen engagement?
2. Can the citizen engagement mechanisms that are employed during the IDP and budgeting processes be regarded as meaningful?	a) Do you think mechanisms that are currently employed by your municipality in the IDP and budget processes promote meaningful citizen engagement? b) If yes, do you consider the said mechanisms adequate for the citizens to influence final IDP and budget? If yes, please elaborate. If no, which area(s) do you think needs to be amended or improved?	Do you think the mechanisms currently employed by your municipality in the IDP and budgeting consultation process promote meaningful citizen engagement? If yes, do you think they are adequate? If not, how can they be improved?	Do you think the mechanisms currently employed by your municipality in the IDP and budgeting consultation process promote meaningful citizen engagement? If yes, do you think they are adequate? If not, how can they be improved?

RESEARCH QUESTION AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONS MATRIX			
Primary Research Question: Will the implementation of meaningful citizen engagement mechanisms lead to the alleviation of service delivery and developmental backlogs (better service delivery) in the local government of South Africa?			
Research Questions	**Interview Questions**		
	Senior Officials & Ward Councillors	**Focus Group – Community Members**	**Focus Group – Ward Committee Members**
3. In what way will meaningful citizen engagement help in the alleviation of service delivery and developmental backlogs in the local government?	a) What do you understand by community-based planning (CBP)? Have you ever organized / facilitated / been involved in such an initiative? If yes, do you think citizens are engaged meaningfully during the CBP process? b) Do you think implementing meaningful citizen engagement mechanisms in the IDP, budgeting and CBP processes may help to alleviate service delivery backlogs? If yes or no, why do you think that is the case?	a) What do you understand by community-based planning (CBP)? Have you ever participated in such an initiative? If yes, do you think citizens are engaged meaningfully during the CBP process? b) Do you think meaningful citizen engagement in the IDP, Budget and CBP processes may lead to better planning in the local government? How so? c) What do you think are the major challenges to meaningful citizen engagement?	a) What do you understand by community-based planning (CBP)? Have you ever participated in such an initiative? If yes, do you think citizens are engaged meaningfully during the CBP process? b) Do you think meaningful citizen engagement in the IDP, Budget and CBP processes may lead to better planning in the local government? How so? c) What do you think are the major challenges to meaningful citizen engagement?

	c) What do you think are the major challenges to meaningful citizen engagement?		
4. What are the roles of local citizens in the process of IDP and Budget formulation, implementation and monitoring in terms of the legislation?	a) Are you aware of any legislation, policies or directives other than the Council's policy that promote citizen engagement in the formulation of IDPs and budgeting in the local government? b) Do you think the community members in your area of jurisdiction are aware of such legislation and the Council policy that promote citizen engagement? c) In your opinion, do you think such legislation or policies are observed during the IDP and budgeting consultations? d) In your understanding, what are the roles of the citizens in the formulation,	a) As members of the community, do you think you have a role to play during the formulation of the IDP and the budget for your municipality? If yes, what are your roles, and why do you think you should be involved? b) Is there any legislation that compel the municipalities to engage you before and during the finalization of the local plans and budgets and monitoring thereof? c) In your experience / opinion do you think communities are engaged meaningfully during the IDP and budget processes? If yes or no, how so?	a) Are you aware of any legislation, policies or directives other than the Council's policy that promote citizen engagement in the formulation of IDPs and budgeting in the local government? b) Do you think the community members in your area of jurisdiction are aware of such legislation and the Council policy that promote citizen engagement? c) In your opinion, do you think such legislation or policies are observed during the IDP and budgeting consultations? d) In your understanding, what are the roles of the citizens in the formulation, implementation and

	implementation and monitoring of the IDPs and budgets? e) Do you consider it possible to engage citizens meaningfully, considering prescribed timeframes and other legislative constraints?		monitoring of the IDPs and budgets? e) Do you consider it possible to engage citizens meaningfully, considering prescribed timeframes and other legislative constraints?

Appendix 2: Interview Schedules

Appendix 2.1: Interview with Senior Officials and Ward Councillors

1. What do you understand by the notion of meaningful citizen engagement?

2. Do you think mechanisms that are currently employed by your municipality in the IDP and budget processes promote meaningful citizen engagement?

3. If yes, do you consider the said mechanisms adequate for the citizens to influence final IDP and budget? If yes, please elaborate. If no, which area(s) do you think needs to be amended or improved?

4. How do you understand the community-based planning (CBP)? Have you ever organized / facilitated / been involved in such an initiative? If yes, do you think citizens are engaged meaningfully during the CBP process?

5. Do you think implementing meaningful citizen engagement mechanisms in the IDP, budgeting and CBP processes may help to address and alleviate service delivery backlogs? If yes or no, why do you think that is the case?

6. What do you think are the major challenges to meaningful citizen engagement?

7. Are you aware of any legislation, policies or directive other than the Council's policy that promote citizen engagement in the formulation of IDPs and budgeting in the local government?

8. In your opinion, do you think such legislation or policies are observed during the IDP and budgeting consultations?

9. Do you think the community members in your area of jurisdiction are aware of such legislation and the Council policy that promote citizen engagement?

10. In your understanding, what are the roles of the citizens in the formulation, implementation and monitoring of the IDPs and budgets?

11. Do you consider it possible to engage citizens meaningfully, considering prescribed timeframes and other legislative constraints? (Follow-up question)

Appendix 2.2: Focus group interview with Community Members

The focus group consisted of open-ended questions that facilitated conversation and discussion amongst the participants. However, the questions still followed major themes that emanated from the interview guide and observations. Below are some of the questions that were used to facilitate discussions.

1. What does meaningful citizen engagement mean to you?

2. Do you think the mechanisms currently employed by your municipality in the IDP and budgets consultation processes promote meaningful citizen engagement? If yes, do you think they are adequate? If no, how can they be improved?

3. What do you understand by community-based planning (CBP)? Have you ever participated in such an initiative? If yes, do you think citizens are engaged meaningfully during the CBP process?

4. What do you think are the major challenges to meaningful citizen engagement?

5. As members of the community, how are you informed of the IDP, budgeting and CBP processes before they take place? Are the announcements / advertisements of such initiatives done adequately to allow every interested person to attend?

6. Do you think meaningful citizen engagement in the IDP, budget and CBP processes may lead to better planning in the local government? If so, how?

Appendix 2.3: Focus group interview with Ward Committee Members

The focus group consisted of open-ended questions that facilitated conversation and discussion amongst the participants. However, the questions still followed major themes that emanated from the interview guide and observations. Below are some of the questions that were used to facilitate discussions.

1. What is your understanding of the notion of meaningful citizen engagement?

2. Do you think the mechanisms currently employed by your municipality during the IDP and budget consultation process promote meaningful citizen engagement? If yes, do you think they are adequate? If not, how can they be improved?

3. What do you understand by community-based planning (CBP)? Have you participated in such an initiative? If yes, do you think citizens are engaged meaningfully during the CBP process?

4. What do you think are the major challenges to meaningful citizen engagement?

5. Do you think meaningful citizen engagement in the IDP, budget and CBP processes may lead to better planning in the local government? If so, how?

Appendix 3: Non-participant Observation

Appendix 3.1: Framework for guiding observations of meetings

OBSERVATION GUIDE		
Location		
Event		
Date		
RESEARCH ASPECT		**FINDINGS**
Inclusion	-Attendance estimate	
	-Age groups	
	-Gender parity	
Equality	-Interactions amongst participants	
	-Level of participation	
	-Power relations	
	-Decision-making on Issues	
	-General climate for deliberation	
	-Level of cooperation	
Reasonable & Accountability	-Communication and presentation skills	
	-Encouragement of participation/deliberation	
	-Flexibility & adaptability -Use of aids	
Physical surroundings	-Venue size	
	-Comfort	
	-Suitability	
	-Amenities	
	-Seating arrangements	
Record of proceedings	-Minutes taking	
	-Attendance register	
	-Time-keeping	
Product of the meeting	-Brochures	
	-Documents	

Appendix 3.2: Naturalistic Observation Field Notes

OBSERVATION ONE

Location: Ward 32, Boksburg Civic Centre, Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality

Date: 16 April 2016 (18h00 – 21h15)

Purpose: Presentation and discussion of the draft IDP and Budget

Physical surroundings: Sizable auditorium with sufficient seating space; access to toilets, water and electricity.

Attendance: Six wards invited, venue full, but attendance was poor considering the number of wards invited.

Characteristics of participants: Adequate mix of age and gender, given the location, conspicuous absence of white race, only blacks in attendance.

Inclusion: Satisfactorily in terms of age/gender mix, participation only after the presentation. No opportunity for deliberation.

STANDARD WITH ALL MEETINGS OBSERVED:

Equality: Interactions: No direct interactions observed, except at question time after the presentation

Attitude of participants/Climate of the meeting: formal and observance of all protocols, no deliberative opportunities. All cooperated with the program directors.

Power relations: leaders treated with much veneration, denoting unequal power-share.

Decision-making on issues: no opportunity as there was no deliberation.

Reasonableness & Accountability: relevant docs on IDP and Budget were drafted elsewhere, and not made available in the meeting. In some instances, only copies of presentations were made available. No opportunity to participate in the agenda setting.

OBSERVATION TWO

Location: Ward 36, Paul Tsotetsi Sports Centre, Sebokeng, Emfuleni Local Municipality

Date: 30 April 2016 (15h30 – 17h30)

Purpose: Presentation and discussion of the draft IDP and Budget

Physical surroundings: Venue not sufficient to handle all the invitees. There was insufficient seating space for the capacity. Also access to toilets, water and electricity was available.

Attendance: Eleven wards were invited, which filled the venue to its capacity, but attendance was poor in terms anticipated communities from eleven wards.

Characteristics of participants: Sufficient mix of age and gender,

Inclusion: Satisfactorily in terms of age/gender mix, participation only after the presentation. No opportunity for deliberation.

STANDARD WITH ALL MEETINGS OBSERVED:

Equality: Interactions: No direct interactions observed, except at question time after the presentation

Attitude of participants/Climate of the meeting: formal and observance of all protocols, no deliberative opportunities. All cooperated with the program directors.

Power relations: leaders treated with much veneration, denoting unequal power-share.

Decision-making on issues: no opportunity as there was no deliberation.

Reasonableness & Accountability: relevant docs on IDP and Budget were drafted elsewhere, and not made available in the meeting. In some instances, only copies of presentations were made available. No opportunity to participate in the agenda setting.

OBSERVATION THREE

Location: Ward 11, De Deur Primary School, Midvaal Local Municipality

Date: 30 April 2016 (18h30 –20h30)

Purpose: Presentation and discussion of the draft IDP and Budget

Physical surroundings: Venue was adequate in size, and had access to toilets, water and electricity.

Attendance: Only one ward was invited to the meeting. However, attendance was poor in numbers, perhaps due to the location of the area. The area is semi-rural, with sparse small family holdings (farms), which is different from a dense residential township.

Characteristics of participants: Satisfactory mix of age and gender, with a lack other races except blacks in the audience.

Inclusion: Satisfactorily in terms of age/gender mix, participation only after the presentation. No opportunity for deliberation. Main issues raised by the citizens during question time include the lack of consistent engagement on the IDP and Budget, that is, not IDP review meetings took place in the period leading to the current meeting. Citizens also complained that the municipality was not keeping promises made in previous meetings, and that it had a tendency of changing or removing service delivery issues without consulting the citizens. The Senior Officials in attendance admitted this and mentioned that this result from the lack of funds, and non-payment for rates by the citizens.

STANDARD WITH ALL MEETINGS OBSERVED:

Equality: Interactions: No direct interactions observed, except at question time after the presentation

Attitude of participants/Climate of the meeting: formal and observance of all protocols, no deliberative opportunities. All cooperated with the program directors.

Power relations: leaders treated with much veneration, denoting unequal power-share.

Decision-making on issues: no opportunity as there was no deliberation.

Reasonableness & Accountability: relevant docs on IDP and Budget were drafted elsewhere, and not made available in the meeting. In some instances, only copies of presentations were made available. No opportunity to participate in the agenda setting.

OBSERVATION FOUR

Location: Ward 2, Glenharvie, Westonaria LM, West Rand District Municipality

Date: 25 May 2016 (17h00 –19h30)

Purpose: Presentation and discussion of the draft IDP and Budget

Physical surroundings: Venue was adequate in size, and had access to toilets, water and electricity.

Attendance: Only one ward was invited to the meeting. However, attendance was poor in numbers, perhaps due to the fact that the area consists largely mining quarters that housed migrant labour. Furthermore, the area is semi-rural, with small town as a core economic hub.

Characteristics of participants: Satisfactory mix of age and gender, with a lack older people as most people in attendance are part of a workforce in the surrounding mines.

Inclusion: Satisfactorily in terms of age/gender mix, participation only after the presentation. No opportunity for deliberation.

STANDARD WITH ALL MEETINGS OBSERVED:

Equality: Interactions: No direct interactions observed, except at question time after the presentation

Attitude of participants/Climate of the meeting: Formal and observance of all protocols, no deliberative opportunities. All cooperated with the program directors.

Power relations: Leaders treated with much veneration, denoting unequal power-share.

Decision-making on issues: No opportunity as there was no deliberation.

Reasonableness & Accountability: Relevant docs on IDP and Budget were drafted elsewhere, and not made available in the meeting. In some instances, only copies of presentations were made available. No opportunity to participate in the agenda setting.

Appendix 5.1: Request to conduct research in the municipality



Research Office:

Phindile Mohanoe
Tel: 011 717 3133
Email: phindile.mohanoe@wits.ac.za
PhD Convener:
Dr. Horacio Zandamela
Tel: 011 717 3692
Email: horacio.zandamela@wits.ac.za
Research Director:
Prof Anne MacLennan
Tel: 011 717 3519
Email: anne.maclennan@wits.ac.za
Thursday, 09 April 2015

To: City Manager: Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality
City Manager: Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality
Municipal Manager: West Rand District Municipality
Municipal Manager: Randfontein Local Municipality
Municipal Manager: Westonaria Local Municipality
Municipal Manager: Mogale City Local Municipality
Municipal Manager: Merafong Local Municipality
Municipal Manager: Midvaal Local Municipality
Municipal Manager: Emfuleni Local Municipality

This confirms that **Mr. Zenzo M. Ndima** student number **0711720M** is registered for the Doctor of Philosophy in Management at the Wits School of Governance.



The title of the Research proposal is: ***Meaningful Citizen Engagement in the IDP and Budget as a means to improve municipal service delivery.***

It is recommended that he be given assistance in terms of information for research purposes towards his PhD Degree. The information will be used for research purposes only.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Horacio Zandamela
Degree Convenor
School of Governance

Appendix 5.3: Request to use municipal facilities

To the Municipal Manager

REQUEST TO UTILISE THE OFFICE SPACE AT THE MUNICIPALITY FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES

Research Title: Meaningful citizen engagement in IDP and Budget formulation processes as a means to improve municipal service delivery.

Good day, my name is Zenzo Ndima; I am doing a PhD with the School of Governance at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am doing a study to explore whether the practice of meaningful citizen engagement during the formulation of Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) and budgets by the sampled municipalities may lead to better service delivery.

I would like to request your permission to access and use the office space in one of the municipality's building in order to conduct my interviews with the officials, the councillors as well as the members of the community. The interviews will take place separately, and the dates for such will be communicated with you in due course.

For questions related to the study, please contact me, Mr. Zenzo Ndima at 083 430 1651 / 011 999 5956 (w) or email me at Zenzo.Ndima@ekurhuleni.gov.za or ndimazenzo@gmail.com . You may also communicate any study-related concerns with the PhD Convenor at Wits School of Governance, Dr Zandamela at horacio.zandamela@wits.ac.za or 011 717 3692.

Should my request be approved, please forward me your consent at Zenzo.Ndima@ekurhuleni.gov.za and ndimazenzo@gmail.com .

Yours faithfully

Zenzo M. Ndima (Mr)
083 430 1651

Appendix 5.4: Participant information sheet

Participant Information Sheet (Interviews)

Information Sheet for Informed Consent: Interviews with Senior Municipal Officials and Ward Councillors

Good day, my name is Zenzo Ndima and I am doing a PhD with the School of Governance at the University of the Witwatersrand. I am doing a study to explore whether the practice of meaningful citizen engagement during the formulation of Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) and budgets by the sampled municipalities may lead to better service delivery. It is anticipated that the study would result in the development of new ways of thinking and approaches to citizen engagement initiatives during the formulation of IDPs and budgets in your municipality. I am inviting you to participate in this study, which consists of semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions.

You have been invited to take part because of your involvement in and knowledge of the budgeting, IDP formulating and public participation processes within your municipality or ward. I believe that your involvement in the above-mentioned processes will yield useful insights and data to my enquiry. Should you agree to participate, I will **ask** you to sign the informed consent form below and return it to me prior to the date of interview. Then you will be **requested** to attend to the venue where the interviews will take place. The interview will be conducted by me and its duration will be between one (1) and two (2) hours at the most. The name of the venue, the date and time of the interview will be forwarded to you in due course. Where necessary, I will provide transportation to the venue. Please note that there will be no payment whatsoever that will be made to you for your participation in the study. Please note further that you may refuse to answer any question that you are not comfortable with, and that you may withdraw your participation at any time during the study. Your refusal to answer any question and/or your decision to completely withdraw from the study will not lead to any punishment or penalties as your involvement is purely voluntary.

Please note also that you will not be identified by name in the final thesis and your contribution will be kept confidential. Confidentiality and anonymity will be ensured, amongst others, by storing interview data separate from your personal details. Only grouped data will be reported upon so as to ensure that identification of individual's viewpoints is not possible. The interview data will be stored safely, that is, in a locked cabinet, and electronic records will be protected by a password. All the data will be kept for as long as needed, but not less than 5 years.

Research findings or results will be reported in the following manner: in my PhD thesis, academic publications in open access journals; and conference presentations. I will also report back to all participants and the report summary may be made available should you so required. Please note also that the thesis will be available at the university's website. For questions related to the study, please contact me, Mr. Zenzo Ndima at 083 430 1651 / 011 999 5956 (w) or email me at Zenzo.Ndima@ekurhuleni.gov.za or ndimazenzo@gmail.com . You may also communicate any study-related concerns with my supervisor, Dr. Ivor Sarakinsky at 011 717 3645 or e-mail at Ivor.Sarakinsky@wits.co.za. For questions about ethical issues in the study, you may contact the Research Ethics Committee Secretariat of the Witwatersrand University at 011 717 1408. Please fill the attached consent form and scan and e-mail it to me at Zenzo.Ndima@ekurhuleni.gov.za and ndimazenzo@gmail.com .

Appendix 5.5: Consent form

DECLARATION (CONFIDENTIAL)

Consent to take part and to be recorded with a voice recorder in the following study:

Research Title: Meaningful citizen engagement in IDP and Budget formulation processes as a means to improve municipal service delivery.

I, _____ (full names and surname of participant) confirm that the nature of the study has been explained to me and I understand this consent form and agree to take part in:

Type of interview	Insert X
I agree to participate in the in-depth interview on the abovementioned study.	
I agree to participate in the focus group discussion on the abovementioned study.	

Furthermore, I agree / disagree to have my interview/group discussion recorded with a voice recorder (please select one of the above in accordance with your consent).

I understand that my involvement in the study will be kept anonymous and my contribution therein is confidential.

I understand that I can decline to answer any question and/or to completely withdraw from the study at any time.

SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT: _____

DATE: _____

Assigned code: _____