

https://dspace.org/

The role of coordination and inter-governmental relations in building sustainable human settlements, Gauteng Province

2022
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/37260

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

The Role of Coordination and Inter-Governmental Relations in Building Sustainable Human Settlements, Gauteng Province

Precious Ditlhage

0420279R

Supervisor: Dr John Khumalo

Wits School of Governance

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Management, University of the Witwatersrand, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public and Development Management).

October, 2022

ABSTRACT

This study set out to examine the role of coordination and intergovernmental relations in the delivery of sustainable human settlement in Gauteng. It aimed to answer how the interaction between the provincial and local spheres of government could be improved for better housing delivery. Effective intergovernmental relations are recognised in the Constitution and in the different pieces of legislation governing human settlements. In examining intergovernmental relations and coordination, the study followed a qualitative approach by interacting with provincial and local officials involved in the delivery of housing together with the method of observation by attending intergovernmental relations meetings. In addition, the study reviewed relevant primary and secondary documents. Calls for shifting the function of delivery houses to the City together with the fine tuning of associated fiscal flows were made. The findings note the critical role of intergovernmental relations in the delivery of housing developments. Appropriate intergovernmental relations norms and values that are applicable in a multi-level government are exercised and adhered to on an inconsistent and irregular basis. Joint work between spheres, aligned plans and effective leadership are some of the recommendations made in the study. Other recommendations include the promotion of non-hierarchical relations and ongoing assessment of intergovernmental relations to determine maturity and effectiveness.

Declaration

I hereby declare that this report is my own, unaided work. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Management (in the field of Public and Development - Monitoring and Evaluation) in the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

_____

Precious Ditlhage
October 2022

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this research report to my loving and supportive husband, Goodwill Ditlhage. To my, two daughters (little sunshine's): Olorato and Reitumetse Ditlhage. Thank you to my family, colleagues and friends, for the love and support at all times.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to God Almighty. I am grateful to my husband for his support and encouragement throughout this research process. I am thankful to Mr Moyahabo from City of Joburg Municipality for guiding me through the process of piloting my research study. Without their assistance, this research would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration i

Dedication ii

Acknowledgements iii

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES vii

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS viii

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1. Context of Study 2

1.2. Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development 4

1.3. Problem Statement 7

1.4. Knowledge gap 8

1.5. Rationale 9

1.6. The Research Question 9

1.7. Research Objectives 10

1.8. Research Purpose 10

1.9. Chapter Outline 11

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 13

2. Theories of Intergovernmental Relations 13

2.1. Law of Appropriateness Theory 14

2.1.1 Criticisms and Shortcomings 15

2.2. Dual Polity Model 16

2.2.1 Criticisms and Shortcomings 16

2.3. Power Dependence and Organization Theory 17

2.3.2 Shortcomings and Criticism 18

2.4. Rational Choice Theory 19

2.4.1 Criticisms and Shortcomings 20

2.5. Neo-Marxist Theories 20

2.5.1 Criticisms and Shortcomings 22

2.6. Network Theory 22

2.6.1 Shortcoming and Criticism 24

2.7. The Overlapping Authority and Multi-Level Governance Models 25

2.7.1 Shortcomings and Criticisms 26

2.8. Empirical Literature 26

2.8.1 History and Emergence of Intergovernmental Relations 26

2.8.2 Intergovernmental Relations in South Africa 29

2.8.3 IGR in South Africa: Framework and Challenges 31
2.9. Sustainability: Unpacking the Concept in the Human Settlement Space 38
2.10. Conceptual Framework 40
2.11. Conclusion 47
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH APPROACH, DESIGN, DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYIS METHODS 49
3.1. Approach 49
3.2. Research Design 49
3.3. Data Collection Techniques 50
3.4. Participant observation 51
3.5. Target Population and Sample Size 52
3.6. Data analysis 53
3.7. Reliability and Validity Measures 54
3.8. Ethical Considerations 56
3.9. Limitations of the research 57
3.10. Feasibility 58
3.11. Positionality 58
3.12. Conclusion 59
CHAPTER 4: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTEPRETATION 60
SECTION A: PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS 60
4.1. IGR practices 60
4.1.1 Involvement in Structures 60
4.1.2 Value and Worth 61
4.1.3 Inter-dependence 62
4.1.4 Information flows 63
4.1.5 Effectiveness of meetings/forums 63
4.1.6 Support for IGR 66
4.1.7 Deepening IGR practices 67
4.2. On Planning 67
4.2.1 Misalignment of plans 67
4.2.2 Impediments to joint planning 68
4.2.3 Joint planning 68
4.2.4 Consultation 69
4.2.5 Integration 70
4.3. Policy 71
4.3.1 Policy gaps 71

4.3.2 Getting policy right 72
4.4. Fiscal Flows 73
4.4.1 Funding instruments 73
4.4.2 Funding increment 74
4.5. Spheres and functions 74
4.5.1 Autonomy 74
4.5.2 Dependency eradication 76
4.5.3 Accreditation and function shift 76
4.5.4 Municipal capacity 77
4.6. Ethos 78
4.6.1 Instilling professionalism 78
4.7. Conclusion 78
SECTION B: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION 79
4.8. Housing policy framework 80
4.8.1 Breaking New Ground, National Outcomes and National Development Plan 82
4.9. Function Distribution and Housing Delivery Implementation 84
4.9.1 National Functions 84
4.9.2 Provincial Functions 85
4.10 Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development 89
4.11 Resuscitating Cooperation 94
4.12 Improved Planning Through IGR 96
4.13 Mainstreaming Integration 97
4.13.1 District Development Model and One Plans 98
4.14 Funding of housing developments 100
4.15 Accreditation: what accreditation? 102
4.16 Conclusion 104
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 105
5.1. Recommendations 108
REFERENCE LIST 110
Appendix A – Interview Schedule 119

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Table 1: Gauteng Province - Housing Demand…… page 3

Figure 1: Housing Delivery from 1995 -2018…… page 3

Figure 2: Geographic Location of Lufhereng …… page 4

Table 2: Lufhereng Planned Housing Yields…..…… page 5

Table 3: Lufhereng Housing Development Delivery to date…… page 6

Figure 3: Synoptic Illustration of the Law of Appropriateness Theory……..... page 13

Table 4: Function Distribution Across Spheres……. page 85

Figure 4: Flowchart of Housing Development Process…… page 87

Figure 5: Township Establishment Process…… page 88

Figure 6: The Intervening Nature of IGR…… page 93

Table 5: Historical Delivery of Housing Opportunities Funded from the Human Settlement Development Grant (HSDG)…… page 101

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ANC - AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

APP - ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN

BNG - BREAKING NEW GROUND

COJ - CITY OF JOHANNESBURG

DDM - DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT MODEL

DoRA - DIVISION OF REVENUE ACT

GDP - GROWTH AND DOMESTIC PRODUCT

HDA - HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

HSDG - HUMAN SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT GRANT

IDP - INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

IGR - INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

PRT - PROFESSIONAL RESOURCE TEAMS

MEC - MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MMC - MEMBER OF THE MAYORAL COMMITTEE

MINMEC - MINISTERS AND MECS COMMITTEE

NDP - NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

RDP - RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

SONA - STATE OF THE NATION ADDRESS

USDG - URBAN SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT GRANT

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The South African Constitution of 1996 established three spheres of government. They are the national, provincial and local spheres. In the effort to have access to power in a future democratic South Africa, participants at the multi-party negotiated settlement saw the multi-level form of government as the best way to proceed (De Villiers, 2012). Not only does the Constitution establish the three spheres of government, but it also further calls for cooperative governance among them. In the language of the Constitution, these three spheres are distinctive, interdependent and interrelated. In pursuit of this objective, the 1996 Constitution has a chapter dedicated to cooperative governance.

Following the advent of democracy in South Africa in 1994, the new democratic government backed by the Constitution, undertook to redress imbalances of the past through the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) as its blueprint. The African National Congress (ANC) committed to providing free housing to all those who qualify. The Constitution also entitles everyone to adequate housing. To be precise, access to adequate housing is enshrined as a right, in the Constitution. In addition, the Constitution calls on the state to take reasonable steps in ensuring the progressive realisation of this right.

With the three spheres of government having been established and the governing party having committed to providing free housing to all those who qualify, the Constitution spells out the distribution of functions when it comes to the delivery of housing. In the first instance, housing is a shared function. *Schedule 4 of the Constitution*, mentions housing as a concurrent functional area between national and provincial governments. Certain functions carried out by local government, such as bulk infrastructure engineering have a bearing on the delivery of housing by provinces, making intergovernmental relations (henceforth IGR) a critical aspect to its delivery.

Housing as a function is distributed in this manner in the Constitution, the national sphere is responsible for policy development, setting of norms and standards, project execution and implementation and overseeing of the process to package land through the Housing Development Agency (HDA). The provincial sphere, on the other hand is responsible for the development of its own tailor-made policy, capacity support to municipalities, coordination of housing developments and finally, executing and administering national and provincial housing programmes.

The local sphere is responsible for certain housing-related functions. These include installation of bulk infrastructure. Among such infrastructure is water and sewer connection, roads and storm water construction and the intricate township establishment/proclamation process. With the function of housing distributed in this manner, collaboration, and cooperation among the three spheres becomes critically important – placing IGR at the centre of the housing delivery process. At the outset of assuming power, the ANC government promised to deliver 1 million housing within five years (Goebel, 2007).

The Institute of Race Relations (2015) notes that even though more than 2 million houses have been delivered since 1994, the housing backlog has increased. The delivery of housing has therefore trailed behind its demand. Not only this but the type of human settlements resultantly built left much to be desired. Probing how IGR can contribute to changing this situation is worth looking into.

1.1. Context of Study

Evidence indicates that the province of Gauteng is not spared from the pressure arising out of the high housing demand. According to Statistic South Africa's (StatSA) Mid-year Population Estimates of 2020, Gauteng remains the biggest province in terms of population. StatSA approximates Gauteng's population share to be 15, 5 million people making 26% of the country's population (Cheruiyot, 2018). As a province, Gauteng occupies a unique position. It is the financial hub of the country and contributes significantly to South Africa's growth and domestic product (GDP). Due to

its economic importance individuals are attracted to Gauteng in search of better job prospects. As a result, migration and urbanization are amongst the provinces' major challenges, putting pressure on its already-strained infrastructure (Harrison, Gotz, Todes and Wray, 2014).


Table 1: Gauteng Province - Housing Demand

Municipality	Demand/Backlog	Future demand / backlog					Percentage (%)
		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	
City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	256 480	275 146	325 146	375 146	425 146	475 146	37%
Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality	203 361	218 161	218 161	218 161	268 161	318 161	30%
City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	120 498	129 268	129 268	129 268	179 268	229 268	18%
West Rand District Municipality	44 186	47 402	47 402	47 402	97 402	147 402	6%
Sedibeng District Municipality	62 490	67 038	67 038	67 038	117 038	167 038	9%
Total	**687 015**	737 015	737 015	737 015	787 015	837 015	100%

Source: GDHS (2014), https://gpgonline.sharepoint.com/sites/gdhs/Sustainable%20Human%20Settlement/

The above table clearly shows that Gauteng Province, especially the City of Johannesburg (CoJ) is and will comparatively continue to contend with an increased demand for housing. In the effort to address the past and present demand for housing, the following performance in the delivery of housing was achieved over the years:

Figure 1: Housing Delivery, 1995-2018



The above graph on housing delivery shows an upward trajectory between 1995 and 1999 in the delivery of housing but a decline since 2011 implying challenges with housing delivery mechanisms including IGR. This points to the critical nature of IGR in the delivery of housing. There is no doubt that fine-tuning different efforts and getting relations among spheres right is imperative. It is for this reason that this research study gives attention to the role coordination and IGR in the delivery of sustainable human settlements.

1.2. Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development

In examining the role of IGR, this study focuses on interactions to implement housing developments between the provincial and local spheres. It examines relations between the Gauteng Department of Human Settlements and CoJ's Housing Department. In examining IGR and coordination of efforts between the two, specific attention is given to the Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development which, among other was conceived to address backlogs especially the Long Waiting List emanating from 1996/1997 housing applications (Durojaye, Mirugi-Mukundi and Tissington, 2013). This Greenfield[1] housing development plans to deliver 24 000 mixed housing typologies. The project takes place under the aegis of the National Housing Strategy. It is being implemented by the CoJ, as the developer.

Figure 2: Geographic Location of Lufhereng



Source: https://www.google.com/search?q=Detailed+map+of+Lufhereng+Map

[1] . Green-field projects are housing developments implemented from any identified and unoccupied piece of land before such a development occurred.

Lufhereng Housing Development caters for different aspects of housing provision. Among these is the attempt to integrate diverse uses of land including varied housing typologies. These opportunities cater for differing levels of household income. It offers a wide option of accommodation needs and tenure types (COJ, 2015). In addition to the 24 000 housing opportunities, 17 schools, numerous clinics, and sport fields. Other supportive social and recreational amenities are also planned. It is hoped that through provision of these housing opportunities and social amenities, necessary economic opportunities would result via the development of agricultural land situated in the area. The latter introduces this aspect as an additional sustainability component of the project.

Table 2: Lufhereng Planned Housing Yields

THE HOUSING MIX OF THE INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT IS AS FOLLOWS:

Descriptions	**Approved Units**
Fully subsidized Housing units on freehold stands	8 008
FSH units built on higher density zone stands	3205
Flisp houses built on sold freehold stands	5865
Flisp houses on higher density zone stands	2399
Bonded houses built on sold freehold stands	1575
Bonded houses built on higher density zone	715
Total	21 879

Source: COJ Report, 2015

In terms of implementation, the project is planned and designed to occur in phases, since it is envisaged to have an eight-to-ten-year lifespan (CoJ, 2015). It has 18 to 20 phases. Having begun in 2008 (CoJ, 2015), the land parcels on which the project is implemented, initially comprised of farms. With an output of 24 000 housing

opportunities, the anticipated magnitude of houses to be delivered makes Lufhereng mixed housing a mega development implemented on a land size of 2 000 hectares. Conceived as an urban development and situated west of Soweto, Lufhereng is anticipated to integrate with Soweto economically and physically making it its natural extension (CoJ, 2015). The below table reflects delivery to date.

Table 3: Lufhureng Housing Development Delivery to Date

Type	Yield	Developer
RDP houses	1832	GDHS
RDP houses	350	CoJ
Residential stands	2213	CoJ

Source: Department of Human Settlements Report, 2022

Among the challenges Lufhereng project contended with in delivering the housing opportunities listed above, responsibility for implementation dillydallied between CoJ and Gauteng Provincial Department of Human Settlements, underscoring uncertainty concerning which sphere of government should implement the project. Also, performance and the slow pace of delivering the expected number of houses is and remains a concern. This led to the project being subsumed under Strategic Integrated Projects (SIP 24) and now "follow[ing] an expedited path to delivery...to ensure that any delays and blockages are addressed speedily" (Sunday World, 2021: par 2). Improved and better performance is thus aspired.

In its implementation, IGR concerns also took centre stage, with the Chairperson of the Presidential Infrastructure Coordinating Commission[2] (PICC) calling for faster implementation with "all three spheres of government working together much closer" to ensure Lufhereng project succeeds (SA Government 2021: par 6). This places IGR as critical in achieving better-quality settlements and it is 'the-much-closer-working' that this project takes interest in. Like many others, the project is situated on the

[2] . This is a body established to oversee the country strategic infrastructure projects to ensure blockages are resolved and their implementation is smooth and hastened.

periphery of Johannesburg municipality. Those residing in this part of CoJ often complain of how far away it is from the city. Lufhereng also suffers inadequate amenities such as clinics, libraries, community halls, etc. Sustainability as an aspect of the project is thus glaring in its absence.

1.3. Problem Statement

In newly developed settlements like Lufhereng communities still contend with the challenges of poverty, unemployment and inequality (Charlton & Meth, 2017; Culwick & Patel, 2020). Many new settlements lack sustainability and the necessary amenities, such as clinics, police stations and recreational centres. A research study was conducted by Culwick and Patel (2020) on the building of sustainable cities through government housing developments in Lufhereng Township. Interviews were conducted to understand access by the poor to social services and economic opportunities. Culwick and Patel (2020: 17) note that one interview lamented that “it is hard to to get things from Lufhereng” and another said that “you have to travel far if you want something.

Due to government’s lack of coordination and proper IGR, the poor in Lufhereng, found themselves spending more money on transport as they are located further away from economic opportunities and found it difficult to survive. Another interviewee said, “we pay money we don’t have”, also, “you waste the small amount you have looking for money” (Culwick and Patel, 2020: 17) In some settlements, Charlton & Meth (2017: 102) note that the “lack of synchronisation of government departments impacted on access to schooling for children”. This means that the interface among housing delivery agents to collectively work together for the delivery of sustainable settlements is an issue of concern and interrogating this hazy and unclear interaction holds the potential to reverse and ameliorate lacklustre housing delivery accompanied by non-viable settlements.

Constitutionally, the delivery of housing is also a shared function as alluded to earlier. It is not the exclusive preserve of any one sphere of government (Constitution, 1996)

and this thrusts spheres of government and other stakeholders into ongoing and imperative relations with each without which some of their specific roles may not be realised. As already seen, in Gauteng Province, there is a high demand for housing due to the province's economic significance. Even Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development was conceived with the objective to arrest housing backlogs in mind (Durojaye, Mirugi-Mukundi and Tissington, 2013). However, to date housing delivery performance has lagged.

In addition, the quality of human settlements constructed in the effort to catch up to the high demand has been poor. It is a well-known truism that within the South African housing sector, spatial inequality, and the perpetuation of urban sprawls along with new settlements built at the periphery of existing ones persists (Burinskiene & Rudzkiene, 2004; Keivani, 2010; Du Plessis, 2007; Huchzermeyer, 2001 and Goebel, 2007). In summary therefore, with housing being a shared function and its demand outstripping supply together with the challenge to build sustainable human settlements, how stakeholders coordinate their different roles and responsibilities to build harmonious relations becomes key. Thus, studying the interaction between and the interplay among housing delivery agents, especially spheres of government can unearth areas in the delivery chain susceptible to blockages. Where this becomes known this would in turn lead to better housing delivery.

1.4. Knowledge gap

The absence of effective links to reinforce horizontal and vertical coordination between and among spheres of government has become an issue of concern where improved housing delivery performance is a pressing policy imperative. "[M]ore in-depth analysis of actual policy processes that constitute the real IGR are still rather limited" (Voets 2005: 5). Therefore, there is a gap of knowledge and understanding on additional ways to facilitate coordination and IGR among stakeholders for the building of sustainable human settlements through improved housing delivery.

1.5. Rationale

By undertaking a study with a focus on coordination and IGR, working in silos stands to be mitigated and collaborative efforts among stakeholders strengthened. In the end, effective interventions for improved planning and integration of efforts by the different spheres, may emerge. In essence the idea behind this study is to contend for open, ongoing and harmonious relations, that eventually lead to improved IGR. More significantly, in examining coordination and IGR the intention is to contribute to efforts that ultimately make government function as a unified whole for enhanced housing delivery. Thus, building sustainable human settlements with improved living conditions and a better quality of life for those benefitting from much-needed housing.

Unless the housing delivery machinery functions efficiently especially where relations among spheres is concerned, housing delivery performance may remain slow, settlements substandard, and the demand for shelter high. Where spheres of government and their units fail to continuously work to build harmonious relations and improved interaction, they will work at cross-purposes. Failure to coordinate their specific contribution in the housing delivery value chain means the implementation of the country's housing programme will occur in a fragmented manner. Spatial inequality of the past and urban sprawls will remain perennial problems, driving the building of sustainable human settlements into the distant future with no hope of recovery.

1.6. The Research Question

1.6. Main Research Question

In exploring the role of coordination and IGR in building sustainable human settlements, this research project seeks to answer the following question:

1.6.1. In what ways can interaction and collaboration among housing delivery stakeholders, especially the interplay between the local and provincial spheres, be leveraged upon to maximise their specific roles and contribute to improved housing delivery performance that incorporates better quality human settlements?

1.6.1. Secondary Questions

1.6.2.1 What politico-legal, technical and operational blockages prevents the local and provincial spheres from building durable vertical and horizontal coordination when executing housing developments?

1.6.2.2. Which IGR-related aspects of the housing delivery process are especially difficult to resolve and what are some of the mechanisms that can be introduced to arrest institutional fragmentation for a unified and integrated approach in the delivery of housing?

1.7. Research Objectives

The research objectives of this study are:

1.7.1. To identify challenges and major impediments preventing government from achieving effective coordination through improved IGR practises, norms and values.

1.7.2. To determine the effectiveness of existing IGR platforms, structures and forums in facilitating improved housing delivery within the human settlements space.

1.8. Research Purpose

In studying the contribution of coordination and IGR, the purpose is to identify what they can potentially offer in furthering the improved delivery of integrated housing developments. The study hopes to inform policymakers and or decision-makers on ways to achieve better planning and implementation when it comes to the execution of housing developments. In proposing solutions, the study will identify appropriate strategic options available to the state and relevant institutions on how best to go about coordinating efforts and forging better relations for the building of sustainable human settlements.

1.9. Chapter Outline

This report consists of 5 chapters, structured as follows:

Chapter 1: This (current) chapter began by pointing to the establishment of the three spheres in the Constitution. It then referred to cooperative governance as encapsulated in the Constitution. It went on to discuss housing as a right to be progressively realised. After this, it touched on the distribution of housing as a function among the three spheres emphasising the critical nature of IGR. Lastly, the chapter discussed the unique position occupied by Gauteng as a province, the demand for housing and why IGR as an area of study deserves attention.

Chapter 2: This chapter is the literature review. In this chapter IGR theories are discussed. Among the theories discussed is the law of appropriateness theory, dual polity state model, power dependence/organization theory, public choice theory, Neo-Marxist theory and coordination theory. The chapter also discusses empirical IGR literature. The empirical literature gives attention to the history and emergence of IGR in America. Secondly, IGR in South Africa is discussed especially the introduction of the IGR Framework Act of 1995. IGR challenges in South Africa also receive attention. In conclusion, the chapter discusses the importance of sustainability by unpacking the concept in the human settlement space.

Chapter 3: This chapter is the research strategy, design, technique and procedures chapter. In this chapter, the methodological approach of this study which is qualitative gets discussed. The chapter also discusses data collection methods. A combination of interviewing, attending IGR meetings and the reviewing of government documents is employed in this study. The non-probability sampling approach undertaken as part of this study is also among aspects deliberated on in this chapter. Ethical concerns, as well as reliability and validity of this study are discussed last in this chapter.

Chapter 4: This chapter presents research results and issues that emerged from fieldwork. Content analysis is utilized to unearth and understand the inherent

meanings of responses received and offered by individuals interviewed. These are then arranged thematically based on patterns and trends in the data.

The second section of this chapter discusses issues central to IGR in the delivery of housing. It begins with a discussion of how housing is governed by looking at its policy framework, the distribution of housing functions and their interplay in the IGR space. The central role of IGR in the planning of housing development, the need to mainstream the integration of efforts and associated funding flows are discussed last in the chapter.

Chapter 5: The last chapter is the conclusion and recommendations. Among others it is recommended that there be opportunities for joint working between spheres, aligned plans and effective leadership. It is further recommended that the effectiveness of the IGR is continuously monitored and assessed.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Drawing from Hart's (2018) definition of literature review as entailing the process where an assortment of relevant material on a specific topic are collected with the objective to explore ideas on how research could be undertaken, this chapter dedicates itself to examining IGR. It begins with a theoretical discussion of IGR. Among theories discussed is the law of appropriateness, the dual polity model, power dependency/organization, neo-Marxist, network and multi-level governance theories. The content, shortcomings and relevance of all theories to the research question together with their significance for South Africa are highlighted. A combination of networks and multi-level governance theory is advanced as the most useful theories capturing what occurs in a healthy IGR environment.

Empirical literature on IGR is subsequently looked at by briefly discussing its historical emergence, followed by a focus on IGR in South Africa and within the housing sector. The last section provides a synopsis highlighting concepts relevant to the study and by demonstrating how effective IGR can positively impact housing delivery. IGR is conceived as an instrument or means through which a society attempts to achieve its developmental goals. Its substantive elements especially where a flourishing IGR obtains are listed and discussed.

2. Theories of Intergovernmental Relations


IGR presupposes a multi-layered government. Numerous authors (Wright, 1967; Opeskin, 2001 and Stoker, 1995) maintain that IGR was derived from the United States' (US) federal system and the British system of devolved powers. According to Opeskin (2001) and Stoker (1995), under old practices spheres of government concentrated on exercising power separately. This meant that roles and responsibilities/functions performed by government entities had little opportunities for effectiveness as there were few interactions between spheres. The reason for the development of IGR was triggered by complexities emanating from financial constraints; the mixed economy of welfare and the ideology of the citizen as customer

(Wright, 1967 and Stoker, 1995). In this sense IGR emerged in the effort to close resources gaps and effectively address societal problems.

Resultantly, the federal system saw a greater need for interactions between spheres and units of government, which Opeskin (1995) described as a marble cake (culinary metaphor), meaning embracing principles of a strong functioning government with "control, cooperation, conflict resolution and responsiveness" (Agranoff, 2004: 443). Scholars (Opeskin 2001, Agranoff, 2004 and Stoker, 1995) thus maintain that the rise of IGR produced greater interaction among levels of governments and their units leading to more effective governance. This led to a completely new area of study in the form of IGR. Some of the theories comprising this area of interest are discussed in the next section with the view to distil lessons for this study and show applicability in the South African human settlement's context.

2.1. Law of Appropriateness Theory

Figure 3: A synoptic illustration of the nature and context of IGR



Source: Kennedy, DM. (1972). The Law of Appropriateness an Approach to a General Theory of Intergovernmental Relations, Journal of American Society for Public Administration Review, Volume 32, Issue No. 2, pp. 135 -143.

In his analysis of IGR in the US, Kennedy (1972) offers the law of appropriateness as a useful approach to understanding IGR. Kennedy (1972: 135) describes the law of appropriateness as: “the level of government most appropriate to deal with a given problem is that level by which one is presently employed”. Meaning that in policy implementation everyone is important and all should play their role because individuals in the public service system have the capacity to address policy challenges irrespective of where they are stationed. In essence public officials must always, when confronted with a policy scenario, consider its implementation from their vantage point by immediately discerning their own role.

Kennedy (1972) concludes by saying as a system, IGR was seemingly borne through the conscious efforts of different government units and layers to collectively tackle varied problems. This also included government units providing whatever expertise, skills, and funding was necessary in the process. In conclusion, he advances the system that functions on the basis of the willingness by levels of government to cooperate and make their own unique contribution. It can be surmised then that where there is a culture of trust and the willingness to cooperate, then the likelihood of IGR’s positive effect on government’s service delivery will be experienced including in the human settlements space.

2.1.1 Criticisms and Shortcomings

The law of appropriateness leaves the importance of engaging in IGR practises squarely on the shoulders and discretion of individual public servants or bureaucrats. Where public officials do not see the need to cooperate and collaborate with their counterparts and other levels of government, a culture of healthy and effective IGR may not emerge. Thus, by assuming actors within the public service system see the need for interacting with counterparts when implementing policy, the theory undermines the need for deliberately introducing IGR and its associated practises by leaving them to the whims of individual officials. The utility of the theory however lies in recognising the potential for IGR and its associated practises to emerge organically.

In the South African context, the usefulness of the law of appropriateness theory lies in making the building of IGR an initiative of bureaucrats albeit a non-obligatory one. Thus, it is worth asking for the purpose of this study if officials in the human settlements space do possess the willingness or even operate from this perspective? It is actually uncertain whether healthy and effective IGR that facilitates policy implementation can emerge in a context when left to individual officials. The dual polity model is discussed next.

2.2. Dual Polity Model

The dual polity model separates between the interests of national and local government (Stoker 1995). In understanding IGR, this theory "takes as its starting point the authority of the centre" (Stoker 1995: 101). Under this model central government focuses on wider national issues such as foreign policy whereas local government concerns itself with the "low politics of providing…other services" (Stoker 1995: 102). As administrative units, local governments respect the centre. While noting the power of central government, the model recognises local government discretion especially when it comes to its local-only politics. The utility of the dual polity model lies in offering explanations for the rise and decline in both centralization and local government autonomy.

2.2.1 Criticisms and Shortcomings

In Stoker's (1995) view, the dual polity model is invaluable to our understanding of IGR especially the attention it gives to the distinction between central and subnational levels of government. On the downside however, its assumption of central government as a unison actor that always takes well-thought-out actions is questionable. For Stoker (1995) not much proper research on the behavior of central government towards other layers of government exists. Thus, this model over-states central government's independence, particularly the poor attention it gives to challenges that confront this level of government when trying to reconfigure IGR.

2.3. Power Dependence and Organization Theory

According to Stoker (1995) organization theory is inspired by inter-organizational analysis. Stoker (1995) cites Rhodes (1988) that dependence/organization theory is about the power of dependence and how to reduce if not eliminate it. Under dependence/organization theory all IGR activities are a “manoeuvre for advantage” (Stoker, 1995: 106, citing Rhodes, 1988). Whatever activities governments and their units undertake in relation to each, these are intended to place them in unfettered positions compared to their counterparts. In essence, the theory looks at the way resources are deployed by state organs in order to gain influence on others to the fullest extent. Decision-makers seek to achieve their goals to avoid being dependent on other key role-players. Dependence/organization theory rejects the usual centralist perspective by focusing on the constraints “in and on the centre” (Stoker, 1995 quotes Rhodes, 1988: 08).

According to this theory, relations between the centre and local structures happen within policy networks. As a result, there are constraints on the centre caused by internal fragmentation and its limited coordinating capacity (Stoker, 1995). Quoting Rhodes (1988) Stoker offers an example of the post-1979 Conservative US government where imposed priorities led to the inability to achieve objectives, due to the failure of networking within organizations. Six networks within which local authorities are immersed when interacting with the centre are mentioned such as territorial communities; policy communities; organized local government; professional networks; producer networks; and issue networks.

According to Stoker (1995: 107),

> *[t]hese networks reflect a series of discrete policy, service or area interests within the national local government system and draw together the organizations that interact within particular fields.*

The networks have a limiting effect on central government because of its “non-executant nature” (Stoker 1995: 107) where the delivery of some services is carried out by other providers instead of central government itself. Thus, according to Stoker drawing from Rhode as the father of this approach, the central state does not

necessarily always hold sway over sub-national governments but operate within a web of policy networks that require navigating. Networking theory is given attention later in this chapter and together with the multi-level governance theory serve, for purposes of this study, as the most feasible theory for understanding and building effective IGR.

Organizational theory sees effective leadership as critical to the success of any organization. In particular, the theory also gives attention to the managerial styles of organizations. Successful organizations are efficient in their operations and possess a culture that supports such efficiency. They are organizations characterised by a high level of communication between units or divisions comprising them (Market Business News, 2021). Moreover, in terms of organizational theory, team dynamics and group behaviour contribute positively to their success. Individuals in successful organizations are highly motivated, hence their ability to achieve any set goals. The aspects of efficient operational process, management style and communication ought to be underlined as they point to aspects of what an effective IGR culture should display.

2.3.2 Shortcomings and Criticism

Power dependence/organization theory draws its explanatory power from its ability to point out the intricate network environment in which the interaction between government units happens. It notes implementation failures but not the “micro and macros forces” or direction of that change (Stoker 1995: 109). Equally, the power dependence and organization theory fail to consider the diverse interests of individuals as if the organization is driven by a dominant coalition (Stoker, 1995). Otherwise, the theory provides insights relevant to understanding IGR.

In the South African context, the theory may help to explain why the nature of IGR is the way it is through the attention it gives to the internal organization of government units. Could a poor IGR culture and the failure by spheres of government to operate in unison be a function of the internal disorganization of their units? Moreover, are there constraints affecting spheres of government, especially the ‘non-executant’ spheres with limited coordinating capabilities when it comes to activities located further down the housing delivery value-chain when implementing projects?

Put differently rather, since provinces do get involved in carrying out housing developments projects, does their practical involvement and a 'doer's' perspective resulting from it help in any way to lubricate their relations with the local sphere? What network communities exist in the human settlements space that require navigating? All these are critical.

2.4. Rational Choice Theory

Rational choice theory moves from the premise that the market is the ideal mechanism for the best allocation of goods and services. This means that in interacting with other levels of government, bureaucrats choose or behave in ways that maximise their interests such as fully spending their budgets. "The individual rational actor is at the heart of all public choice account" (Stoker 1995: 109). The market determines outcomes through demand and supply, with individuals looking to maximize their own profits, thus maximizing benefits for themselves. In the public sector or for bureaucrats such benefits, among others, mean maximally spending their budgets. At times this is done irrespective of whether this honours relations with other spheres of government or is in advancement of service delivery objectives, essentially a deviation from what could be considered a healthy form of IGR.

Stoker mentions Dunleavy's (1991) bureau-shaping model as a further development of the public choice model since it builds on interest maximization and looks at the motives driving the behaviour of bureaucrats and how this shapes policy developments. Under this model "bureaucrats operate in very different settings", they "face not one but a choice of maximizing strategies" and are "motivated by a broader bureau-shaping conception of their welfare rather than a narrow focus on pecuniary benefits" (Stoker 1995: 111-12). It is these considerations that underlie the behaviour of bureaucrats when they interact with other bureaucrats representing other organs of government.

In essence, rational choice models place focus on what informs the behaviour of bureaucrats and "speak up for the public interest that is trampled upon by self-interested bureaucrats and others" (Stoker 1995: 115). To summarise, Stoker notes

that bureaucrats and the public institutions they lead, tend to over-provide services required by communities yet fail to adequately act in tackling the needs raised by the very citizens. He further observes the self-seeking behaviour of politicians to exaggerate the state's capacity when electioneering. Just as interest groups push for their own interests, technocrats similarly set exhausting their budgets and increasing activities associated with them as a target to be achieved.

2.4.1 Criticisms and Shortcomings

Under the bureau-shaping version of rational choice theory, the interests of taxpayers are consigned to the back of the agenda as motives that should inform the behavior of public officials in their engagement with other spheres of governments and their units when implementing policy. In all their undertakings, the tax-paying public loses out as their interests are rode roughshod upon (Stoker 1995). Although rational choice models emphasize the importance of spheres maximizing their specific roles through the conduct of technocrats, they neglect the critical importance of engaging in IGR activities from the perspective of acting collectively to drive unity.

In South Africa, this is underlined as important in Chapter 3 of the Constitution. Could this inward-looking perspective with no consideration of the role played by others be the reason behind the country's state of IGR in the human settlement sector? What about bureaucrat's concern for their careers and welfare? Could the desire to bask in the glory of having built a successful public service career with no shared vision be among factors inhibiting healthy and effective IGR? These and other related questions are worth pondering from the perspective of this theory.

2.5. Neo-Marxist Theories

Included under this category of theories to explain IGR are the dual state, social relations and regulation theories. In analysing IGR, these theories give attention to the "broad social economic and political context" within which they happen (Stoker 1995: 115). Moreover, gaps and divisions are considered normal to any socio-political interaction (Stoker, 1995). According to dual state theory, the state is separated

between being a social investment or a social consumption state. The one wants to ensure goods production and private profits and the other to meet the “consumption needs of diverse groups” (Stoker 1995: 115).

The two are in conflict and when it comes to IGR, due to corporatist arrangements at the top the national government is beholden to business at the expense of the needs of local government (Stoker, 1995). Local government suffers domination by the centre because of the disjointed nature of consumption interests. The social relations theory explains IGR in terms of the way the state undertakes its activities. The primary purpose of the state is to oversee and understand interactions among social actors in an environment characterised by inequality. Consequently, when it comes to IGR

> *[t]he local state finds itself involved in a complex balancing act. It has to represent local interests to the centre but equally so, has to present and promote national policies within localities. This dual role creates an underlying tension in central-local relations* (Stoker 1995: 116).

In essence, under this theory the local state is conflicted and has its back against the wall when it comes to IGR or engaging other spheres in the effort to address the needs of their communities. The choices made by the local state and the constraints they face resultantly inform the type of IGR that prevail, effective or not.

Regulation theory looks at the crucial role of the state as an arbiter. It “views the role of the state and local government not as the product of a functional imperative but rather as the product of social struggle in an unstable society” (Stoker 1995: 117). Whenever a state exists at a particular time it is because of its ability to regulate social production at that time. It is as Stoker (1995: 117) puts it, “chance discoveries” and the combination of a particular socio-political ordering that determines the type of state existing at any time. Thus, in terms of explaining IGR, any mode of state that exists can be dismantled and analysis of historical process can help point out how changes came about.

2.5.1 Criticisms and Shortcomings

While it is difficult to see any fault with neo-Marxist theories because of the existence of conflict and inequality as pressing problems in today's world, theories subsumed under this category seem to put harmonious relations among spheres beyond reach. They simply cannot be attained. Under these theories, spheres seem to never pursue similar interests but to belong to different camps, either consumption or investment groups. However, this may not always be the case. In South Africa for instance, for a considerable period, both provinces and municipalities pursued the governing ANC's agenda.

Did this situation necessarily produce better IGR or were there, as per neo-Marxist theories, other underlying divisive factors making harmonious relations difficult? What fissures exist that make policy implementation in the human settlement space difficult for the local state via healthy IGR with other spheres? What contradictions do local governments face in their relations with provinces? What interests prevent the local state from building healthy and effective IGR with provinces in the delivery of housing and human settlements? All these are relevant issues to consider from the perspective of neo-Marxist theories.

Stoker (1995) concludes that to achieve and implement policies, there should be contemporary change in how relations are established, i.e., the establishment of IGR should not only consider relations on the vertical dimension but also to create relations on the horizontal front. Such a shift is pivotal to understanding other related interdepartmental organizations. Therefore, Stoker (1995: 20) advances that "to think narrowly in terms of central-local relations, focusing on central government and local authorities, is no longer acceptable". Other parallel actors to the central and local state organs require consideration. It is in this sense that networks become important.

2.6. Network Theory

Networks have since become important in analysing how different units of government interact to implement policy. Agranoff (2004) mentions network theory as a theory introduced in the US government, to deal with the gap between policy determination

and the task of administration. Taking from Emanuel Castells, networks are seen as a form of an exercise in power. Castells (2011) highlights that network theory explains the way power in society is exercised through networks. According to network theory, power relationships are the foundational basis of society. Thus, institutions and norms that exist reflect the importance and values of the powerful.

So, this means that power relations share networks with common traits such as ideas, vision, projects and a frame to generate programs (Castells, 2011). In networks, culture is generated through the process of communication to share ideas. According to Castells (2011: 5) “ideas are processed in society according to how they are represented in the realm of communication”. Network theory is thus about communication and how this helps in the assimilation of thoughts and messages. Agranoff (2006) asserts that networks are created through collaborative efforts. As a result, networking can take place through horizontal and vertical collaborations within the public management space. Networking should therefore be regarded as a serious element in public management.

Agranoff (2006) defines “network” as a term to translate the supply of any service through the creation of friendship or by broadcasting, meaning communication. As a result, a network requires reaching out and building cooperation. Agranoff (2006: 57) defines cooperation as the “act of working jointly with others, usually to resolve a problem”. This can occur occasionally or regularly. It can happen within, between or outside organizations. Thus, the individuals who represents organizations outside their boundaries are regarded as part of a collaborative management process. In network theory, collaborative management is seen as a process of “facilitating and operating in multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be solved or easily solved by organizations” (Agranoff, 2006: 57). This is management that tackles persisting policy problems by internally and externally working with others.

Network theory argues that hierarchies persist to fulfil the legal and policy function of government and it illustrates that not all the public networks are alike, as they are

differentiated by what they do - or more precisely, by what powers they have. As many have few or no powers (Agranoff, 2006: 64). In addition, Agranoff (2006, citing Agranoff and McGuire, 2003; O'Toole, 1997: 64) affirms "today's wicked policy problems, dispersed knowledge and resources, first- and second-order effects, and intergovernmental overlays guarantee that managers must engage other governments and nongovernmental organizations". Policy challenges and information asymmetries require public officials to come out of their institutional confines and to go interact with others beyond their immediate surroundings.

Resultantly, the benefit of having networks in public administration institutions is durable and cooperative relations that increase government capability for even more joint-working (Agranoff, 2006). In essence networks emerge as result of the interdependence of resources and otherwise but also due to power. Finally, "[t]he networks approach is clearly multilateral, collaborative, and attacks issues that transcend bilateral intergovernmental concerns" (Agranoff and Radin 2014: 7). Networks thus go beyond institutional boundaries to touch and draw in everyone relevant to their sphere of influence.

2.6.1 Shortcoming and Criticism

Useful as they may be, networks are not the end all and be all of building healthy and effective IGR that ensure successful policy implementation. They also, suffer limitations. In their attempts to formulate solutions, they sometimes come up against "operational, performance or legal barriers" that render them ineffective regarding the next step to take in tackling policy challenges (Agranoff and Radin, 2014). As a result, their ability to translate solutions into sustainable policy processes and proposals is not a given. They often do not have decision-making powers and interacting in small groups sometimes leads to deviation from the purported mission they were initially set and established for (Agranoff, 2006). They stand the risk of overrunning legislated legal processes.

Building networks however approximates the most effective way of developing an effective IGR culture and represents the best approach this study is aligned to. In South Africa where cooperative governance is espoused, a networks approach with its activist public official is fitting. From networks approach it is also useful asking how often officials belonging to different spheres come into contact and communicate with each other in the human settlement space? If there are any networks, do their activities find their way up and feed into any decision-making structures? Is 'collaborative management' with its practice of building external partnerships and working together part of the human settlements IGR culture?

2.7. The Overlapping Authority and Multi-Level Governance Models

The two models of overlapping authority and the multi-governance one, are discussed together because of their interrelatedness. According to Redaelli (2016) the multi-level governance model of IGR relies on relations governments build to bargain among themselves and non-state actors. This means that as a model it places levels of government and critical role-players squarely in the external environment where they interact with others. Furthermore, bargaining among government units and its infusion of governance across is a prominent feature. So, the overlapping authority model views IGR "as a set of overlaps between national, state, and local units simultaneously" (Agranoff and Radin, 2014: 2). Moreover, the overlapping authority model, portrays relations as characterised by limited independence and options in one single space. It thus views the leverage and power possessed by different levels of government as quite constrained (Agranoff and Radin 2014).

In this model, the different levels, tiers or spheres of government cannot escape each other but are stuck together and have to perforce work together. Initially developed by Deil Wright (1978, 1988), the model has six main features, listed as, limited and dispersed power; modest and uncertain areas of autonomy; high degree of potential or actual interdependence; simultaneous competition and cooperation; bargaining-exchange relationships and negotiation as a strategy for reaching agreement. The model therefore "moves us to think about differences in relationships by program area, differences between states, and differences between state-local relationships", thus

underpinning the contextual nature of IGR (Arganoff and Radin, 2014: 2). In this sense there is no one generic way of regarding IGR as they are nuanced by differences in program and the distinct manner in which spheres relate with each other from context to context.

2.7.1 Shortcomings and Criticisms

One of the criticisms levelled at the overlapping authority model is that it hollows out institutions by forcing public officials and the institutions they lead to extend their activities outward as they venture to build relations (Arganoff and Radin ,2014). Similarly, to network theory by moving officials outside their institutional confines, it comes with the risk of undermining government structures or their authority. As much as the building of external relations with non-state actors has helped expose government officials, the operation of programs sometimes makes it difficult to distinguish “other efforts at all three levels of government” (Wright, 2014: 143).

Interacting with more actors, may also create increased struggles in addressing their varied viewpoints. In the South African context, the theory is quite apposite. It is useful for acknowledging the interdependence and distinctiveness of spheres as recognized in the Constitution. For purpose of this research, asking what limitations affect spheres and what bargaining do they enter into as a result is important. In which areas of housing delivery do local government and provinces negotiate, cooperate or compete? While together with network theory, the multilevel governance could undermine legal institutions, this can be solved through maintaining a strong feedback loop of decisions reached back up to authoritative structures. The two theories best approximate what prevails in a healthy and effective IGR context.

2.8. Empirical Literature

2.8.1 History and Emergence of Intergovernmental Relations

The American system, as alluded to earlier, provides a good example for learning about IGR and its evolution. According to Kennedy (1972) those following the

American Federal system initially spoke commendably about it, particularly the way levels of government worked in concert. The evolution of IGR in America showed that levels of government, such as states and cities were initially independent to a large extent and suspicious of each other. However, with the onset of disasters, economic or otherwise “the three levels amalgamated into a working whole that achieves results” (Kennedy, 1972: 135). Meaning the need to interact with each was realised by all including understanding that they are part of one government and are working towards the same goals and objectives.

In the end what resulted was “a residual structure of relations between levels of government” (Kennedy 1972: 136). As the many government goals were achieved out of interacting with each other, all involved began seeing the value of IGR and lasting relations were developed. This main feature of the system saw different names being used to describe it, viz., “New Deal” or “Fair Deal” or “New Frontier” or “Great Society” (Kennedy, 1972: 136). All these captured the unified vision under which all levels of government worked. Under this system of working together inter-relations were forged through meetings, communication documents such as memorandums and working sessions in the form of workshops. Already these indicate what could be considered features of a flourishing and healthy IGR culture where continuous interaction and communication are key.

Wright (1967) outlines five main features of IGR, such as relations among units of government; relations among human beings in the form of public officials; continuous interaction both formal and informal; a focus on the role of public administration and policy implementation and associated fiscal flows. Wright (1967) emphasizes that with effective IGR, consistency of interaction should be maintained, both formal and informal. Furthermore, Wright (1967) traces the different phases, of IGR in US. The first phase was the conflict phase with its main concern being to define boundaries with IGR participants holding adversarial and exclusivist perceptions about the system. The second phase was the cooperative phase and entailed participants holding collaborative, complementary and supportive perceptions – implying progress and change from the first phase.

The third phase mentioned by Wright is the concentration phase characterized by the problem of trying to address program needs with IGR participants exhibiting professionalism, objectivity and neutrality. In the fourth phase, the creative phase, IGR participants wanted to create a 'great society' where the needs of all especially the disadvantaged were addressed. The last phase Wright called competitiveness with the main concern being coordination. Program effectiveness, service delivery and access by citizens were highly sought under this phase. The critical nature of coordination in IGR cannot be overstated since its lack poses a risk to good governance which may result in underperformance, non-transparency and a government that is non-responsive and lacking in accountability.

Coordination refers to the way activities are harmoniously executed (Malone and Crowston 1990). It describes the way in which various activities are arranged to achieve a common goal. Coordination also implies attending smoothly to functions or activities by taking note of the well-orchestration of action of a group of people. Central to coordination is the way activities depend on each other to achieve a particular overarching goal or objective. According to Malone and Crowston (1990: 358) coordination should be seen as "a body of principles about how activities can be synchronized, that is about how actors can work together harmoniously". Its main feature is the flow of activities and how the interdependency among them can be best tailored to achieve the main goal.

In coordination, the actors involved may or may not agree but because of blockages and the inability by each to proceed alone, their activities get orchestrated to achieve goals in which they are interested in (Malone and Crowston, 1990). Coordination entails the process of achieving goals through proposing alternatives, based on communication established in understanding. It can be concluded then that, coordination occurs when actors work together, through setting of goals, group discussions and all in all, performing all activities that need to be done coherently (Malone and Crowston, 1990). Coordination is thus especially critical to effective and healthy IGR. It is of research interest knowing if coordination exists or is practiced in

the execution of human settlements projects. In particular, where in the housing delivery value chain is this the case?

To conclude this section, Peters and Pierre (2001) make observations similar to Wright's regarding the evolution of IGR in a multi-level government. They note how opened the system has become and the novel ways of interacting among spheres that became the norm. In particular, IGR in multi-level government has largely become open to exchanges and context-bound with declining control and hierarchy. For purposes of this research, how the evolution of IGR in South Africa compares with experiences somewhere else becomes important. Are IGR practices between the provincial and local spheres open and less hierarchical or not? How far has the IGR system in South Africa come?

2.8.2 Intergovernmental Relations in South Africa

In the democratic dispensation and being faced with numerous challenges due to a divided past, the South African government developed several documents and publications on IGR and cooperative governance (Malan, 2005, 2009 and 2012); (Phago, 2014) and (Kanyane, 2016). A need to shift from the fragmented administration of the past which entailed spending resources along racial lines, to a more inclusive government, was considered imperative and a framework developed for it. Before discussing the evolution of IGR in South Africa, understanding what is meant by it is necessary.

Malan (2005: 228) defines IGR as

> *encompassing all the complex and interdependent relations among various spheres of government as well as coordination of public policies (including policies on sustainable development) among national, provincial and local government through programme reporting requirements, grant-in-aid, the planning and budgetary process and informal communication among officials.*

In addition, Opeskin (2001) sees IGR as government acting in concert and finding solutions to problems that cannot be solved when each sphere of government acts

alone. In a nutshell, IGR refers to practices, especially the manner and approach in which spheres of government and their constituent parts interact with each other. It is about the nature of interaction amongst spheres of government meant to further one overarching objective.

Based on this definition of IGR, the intention is to promote and facilitate co-operative decision-making and ensure policies are implemented to achieve service delivery and meet the desired needs of citizens in an effective approach. Thus, effective IGR is imperative and it is achieved through the coordination of efforts of key role players. It is of acute importance that coordination works like a machine/link to drive the success of IGR. This however depends greatly on the depth of participation by key role players and the extent of involvement of key decision-makers.

As Malan (2005: 229) asserts, the type of participation that emerges, whether conflictual or collaborative, is a function of the capabilities and material needs peer officials and government units require to make policy real in providing services for the benefit of all. In essence, it is interdependencies together with the conduct, disposition and temperament of officials and decision-makers that matters in any system of IGR that develops. For purposes of this study therefore, exploring and interrogating the views of public officials involved in IGR practices becomes relevant. This makes a qualitative approach, where the subjective views of these individuals are explored, necessary and relevant.

Is there willingness among provincial and local government officials to interact on an ongoing basis to further sustainable human settlements? Do public officials see the value of constantly exchanging ideas and communicating on housing development projects, planned or underway? All these are of relevance in answering the research questions of this study.

2.8.3 IGR in South Africa: Framework and Challenges

At the apex of documents calling for IGR is the 1996 Constitution which establishes three spheres of government and contains a dedicated chapter on cooperative relations. The Constitution endorses a need for co-operative governance while recognizing the autonomy of spheres at the same time. According to Malan (2009: 1140) and Malan (2012: 117) co-operative government implies working side by side or partnering with others. Its associated beliefs and norms include harmonious existence, unity among constituent parts and efficient relaying of information relevant to policy implementation. It also means doing this via parts and units of government and through other platforms in a non-hierarchical fashion. In essence de-centring policy implementation.

The Constitution also called for the passing of legislation on IGR. In 2005 through the Constitution an Act of Parliament was introduced to provide appropriate structures and institutions to promote and facilitate IGR, including mechanisms for the settlements of IGR disputes (Kanyane, 2016). An act of Parliament, the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act (IGRFA, No. 13 of 2005) was introduced. Before providing a summary on this act, de Villiers (2012) offers a useful way for understanding IGR in South Africa by breaking its evolution into two phases. The first phase of IGR began in 1994 and ended in 2005 prior to the promulgation of IGFRA. The second phase is from 2005 onwards. IGR challenges in South Africa are discussed below based on these two time periods.

Prior to passing the IGR act as called for by the Constitution, a ten-year review (Layman 2003: 21) was done and it pointed to challenges affecting IGR at “forums, systems and process, and joint work” levels. In relation to IGR forums, confusion prevailed. The decisions of IGR structures such as MinMECs often did not reach provincial executive councils. They were resultantly of no effect. There was also poor information flow between MinMECs and the apex IGR structure, the Presidential Coordination Council (PCC). There was therefore, as per the review, a need for “clear channels of dialogue” (Layman 2003: 22). Local government also did not sit in some

IGR forums and where they sat in any, participated in an inconsistent manner. As a result, the preferences of communities via the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) process were compromised and did not feature in IGR activities.

Provincial-local forums were also patchy and strategies between the two spheres could therefore not be lined up. There was thus no cooperation for joint work. Coordinating via systems and process also posed a challenge with no clear understanding of what the central concepts such as coordination and integration meant. Aligning of strategic plans was weak making the flow of national and provincial priorities to local government difficult. As a result, localised development prospects could not be matched with resources from the provincial and national governments. Mismatched budget cycles with local government's financial year beginning in July and province in March of each year implied "grant allocation being squeezed into a 6-month financial year" (Layman 2003: 23). This led to funds not being spent.

The supervisory functions of provinces over local government as per the Constitution where the latter fails to provide services also left much to be desired. There was no consistency in approach by provinces over local government. Fragmentation characterised monitoring and oversight of local governments by provinces. Departments had no "integrated information systems" nor did they "consistently work off common data sets" (Layman 2003: 25). Joint work could also not be undertaken since funds could not be moved from one vote to another at will. The performance contracts of senior managers also did not cater for joint wok across spheres. Moreover, officials could not commit to joint task since this was not included in their budgets.

While the above where challenges prior to the passing of the IGFR act, Malan (2012) notes that the system moved from being informal to being statutory. This was done via the passing of legislation aimed at putting in place mechanisms and forums for IGR. IGRFA called for tiers of government to take into account each other's interests, fiscal and other substantive interests, when carrying out their responsibilities. Under the act,

spheres are expected to consult formally and informally as legally prescribed. They are not to act as if only they alone exist but forever remain conscious of the impact their actions may have on other spheres. In particular, they must eschew wastefulness, duplication of efforts and conflict over areas of responsibility (Kanyane 2016, Malan 2005). Cooperation is thus underlined in the act.

However, IGR challenges continued post the year of 2005. Phago (2014) paradoxically notes that though in South Africa the implementation of an IGR framework is in existence and structures for it were created, yet there is uncertainty regarding roles and confusion of responsibilities in the process of interaction. To explain this Malan notes that IGR challenges are attributed to the relatively embryonic nature of "whole-of-government planning framework" in South Africa which resulted in "the challenge to create synergy in the planning processes operating in various spheres of government" (2012:118). Thus, it is only with the passing of time and maturity of the system that some of the challenges will be addressed and hopefully disappear.

Malan (2012) goes further to mention the disputed nature of provinces and their role in South Africa as among factors when it comes to IGR challenges experienced. Being a result of compromise from the democracy negotiation process, the role of provinces in a context of concurrent functions brought their capacity issues to the fore. An added challenge to this is the two-tier system of local government that established district municipalities with ordinary local municipalities under them. Although IGFRA allows for the setting up of district IGR forums for coherent planning purposes, districts have been discovered "to be costly, largely ineffective and structurally redundant" (Malan 2012:119). Functions shared between them and ordinary municipalities resulted in obscurity and poor utility. The existence of district municipalities has therefore acted to further complicate the attainment of effective IGR in South Africa.

A further challenge to IGR is the involvement of humans themselves. The involvement of different personalities and individuals with varied temperaments can on its own lead to difficulties (Malan 2012). Working together may not come easy and taking charge

to lead so that goals are achieved is desperately required. This is especially the case where public officials interact with politicians and where opposing views between the two prevail. de Villiers (2012) notes how in IGR meeting senior government bureaucrats are sometimes silenced by juniors due to the latter being senior political party members. Other persisting challenges post-promulgating IGFR include ambiguity concerning decisions taken in IGR forums (PCC/MinMECs/Ministerial Clusters/Technical Forums/Premier's Forums/Interprovincial Forums), inconsistent attendance of IGR meetings, non-existent continuity and poor policy expertise that is unable to give direction.

While IGR in South Africa continue to evolve, all has not been lost. Clusters have assisted in building horizontal and vertical integration especially between national and provincial spheres (de Villiers 2012). The adoption of an outcome-based approach by government has also assisted in inculcating a culture where government plans as one through the setting of priorities. The establishment of the National Planning Commission is another development that stabilises whole of government planning via setting long term goals and objectives (Malan 2012). Through the Commission, the opportunity to assess whether government's strategic planning happens in a rational and organised manner exists.

The above developments notwithstanding it is of research interest studying the state of IGR between the provincial and local spheres. de Villiers (2012: 688) concludes his analysis of IGR in South Africa by regarding them as "work-in-progress" with effective IGR dependent on "human interaction". It is once again clear here that a qualitative approach that explores the subjective views of individuals involved in IGR is apposite. Impediments that hinder the effectiveness of IGR in South Africa also affect the building of sustainable human settlements.

2.8.1. IGR Challenges in the Housing Sector

Phago (2014) quotes Malan (2005: 241) that usually, policy priorities do not observe boundaries making IGR extremely valuable in a multi-sphere government. To deal with this, Malan argues that in the housing sector policy implementation by any government actor (national, provincial or local) needs to anticipate likely impediments and be willing to engage with other critical role-players. Thus, IGR practises should be inclusive of all the relevant participants in the provision of housing. For instance, Phago (2014) concludes that the Department of Land Affairs deeply matters in the provision of housing and that engaging all relevant parties should be prioritised in the human settlements space.

Phago (2014) further assets that the delivery of housing does not only affect those immediately affected by its implementation, such as the Water and Sanitation Departments. It also involves other departments that may appear to be distant, such as the Department of Health (clinics) and the Department of Education (schools). She (2014: 55) then concludes that “it is necessary to establish and implement the principles of IGR and support a clear notion of building sustainable human settlements”. This means recognizing IGR as an imperative and adopting its ethos as a norm among organs of state and other relevant parties in the housing delivery value chain. This is required for promoting an unambiguous understanding of what sustainable human settlements entail. Sustainable human settlements as a concept is discussed later in this chapter.

Charlton (2003) argues along the same vein that even though ideally the strengthening of IGR is fundamental to achieving sustainable human settlements and addressing ineffectiveness, it is still not being strategically achieved. Healthy and effective IGR is therefore more than necessary in the housing sector and of critical importance to the attainment of sustainable human settlements. Where it is ignored or not given the attention it deserves as a useful instrument in the implementation of housing projects, the policy underpinning the creation of sustainable human settlements will continue to stutter.

The way powers and functions are distributed between sphere is a challenge that expresses itself negatively in the housing sector. Among the IGR challenges related to powers and functions that affects housing delivery is the inadequate definition of land use planning (Malan 2012). It suffers imprecise meaning and its associated duties are unclear. If this goes on unaltered confusion will be the result and the delivery of housing continue to suffer. Another housing-related IGR challenge is the condition placed upon municipalities for the inclusion of “integrated transport, housing, spatial plans” in their principal strategic planning document, the IDP, “but authority and financial incentives [for this] reside with provinces” (Malan 2012: 121). This results in municipalities working hard to develop plans only to realize thereafter that they cannot implement them due to there being no funds.

The way functions in the delivery of housing are implemented affects projects negatively. For instance, responsibility for bulk infrastructure development is located at local government level and is critical in housing development, yet the prime delivery (implementation) of housing is assigned and performed at the provincial level. Even where some housing functions can be assigned to local government through accreditation they often are not because of already-existing turf interests. Yet the Comprehensive Plan on sustainable human settlements calls for the increased role of local government in housing delivery via accreditation (Koopa, 2016 :13). As a result, local government finds itself facing the pressure to deliver bulk infrastructure and meet targets driven by provinces, including in some instances depending on the provincial government for funding (unfunded mandate).

Housing is again affected by the IGR challenge arising from the less than clear and contested role of provinces in the South Africa state edifice. “The role of provinces is uncertain with respect to the practice of concurrency” (Malan 2012: 121). Whether the way the nine provinces as presently constituted is best remains unsettled. Views on their configuration and role tend to vacillate between calls for their complete abolition to those arguing that they be reduced in number with the responsibility for particular functions (education, health and social development). The duplication of

responsibilities is one of the unintended consequences related to the controversy surrounding the role of provinces.

For instance, the provincial government plays the dual role of building houses and providing funding to the local sphere of government in cases where local government does deliver houses. This scenario creates problems when the planning of related activities between these spheres of government is undertaken with neither of them sometimes hardly knowing each other's plans. In essence, the delivery of housing is adversely affected by complex processes of how roles and responsibilities are shared. Properly distributing roles would ensure complete and comprehensive delivery by responsible spheres. According to the principle of subsidiarity functions must be located at a level of government where they can be immediately best implemented.

IGR challenges in housing delivery relate not only to a problem among spheres of governments but also between relevant sectoral departments. In delivering housing, projects often occur without or with little interaction and consultation among key departments. For instance, the provincial Department of Education often has no clue on the number of houses to be built in the short to the medium horizon to inform its pipeline of schools to be built. In a nutshell, inter-departmental coordination is a key strategy in resolving the complexities of cross-sectoral policy issues (Kraak, 2011). Kraak maintains that the integration of horizontal coordination can improve governmental performance and national planning. This means mainstreaming working relations across key departments as a mode of operation for effective results.

Analysis of debates on human settlement in South Africa has shown that the delivery of subsidized housing has been a major challenge as it is affected by various factors. The challenge of fragmentation to integrated service delivery is also not a new phenomenon that is limited only to South Africa. Gray (2002: 04) reports that in New Zealand a Ministerial Team had to derive key objectives and implement services through determining and clarifying ideas linked to delivering services in a cohesive and unified manner. This importance of a shared understanding to effective IGR

should be underscored since a splintered vision often leads to a stillborn IGR culture. To accomplish this shared understanding, attention in New Zealand was placed on “regional coordination”, “collaboration”, “inter-agency”, “co-operation” and “partnership”. In essence connectedness was espoused and regarded as key while operating in silos was deplored.

More critically was the reason all this was necessary through the adoption of a citizen-centric approach to delivering services and “*identification of key successful factors or general principles for the operation”* (Gray 2002: 4). The acute importance of the latter cannot be overstated since it not only assumes IGR processes are functioning but deliberately monitors and assesses whether they do. The notion of integration in New Zealand proposed a call for the effective working-together of government departments rather than in fragmentation so as to achieve a common goal to improve public value (Gray, 2002). Furthermore, Gray (2002) emphasises a need for government to facilitate an enabling environment by giving the opportunity to work together to improve integrated service delivery.

In the end coordination and IGR were improved in New Zealand and impacted service delivery positively and resulted in improved public value. Thus, the outcome increased employment, stimulated good governance and ended up saving cost of service delivery (Gray, 2002). In a nutshell, effective coordination and improved IGR has the potential to improve the quality of lives of the poor in new settlements. Where it is absent the outcomes often become the opposite. The desire expressed in the Comprehensive Plan, the Breaking New Ground (BNG) Policy is to pursue holistic development that integrates previously excluded groups into already-existing cities and ensure functionality and environmental sustainability (Umhlaba, 2004). Sustainability and sustainable human settlements receive attention below.

2.9. Sustainability: Unpacking the Concept in the Human Settlement Space

Sustainability is seen as a broad term which is understood differently by different authors. Choguill (2007) regards sustainability as a term that is normally thrown in

discussions without understanding its meaning. He states that sustainability is used in varied contexts, like saying sustainable transportation, sustainable environment, sustainable housing without considering numerous factors relating to that notion. Hence, Choguill (2007) describes sustainability as a concept that is central to different disciplines and not only housing, but it contributes and influences different disciplines, such as infrastructure, transportation and urban services. The emphasis is that sustainability is a notion which is often misunderstood and misinterpreted.

Joseph & Karuri-Sebina (2014); Glavic & Lukman (2007); Choguill (2007) and Goebel (2007) all define sustainability as recognising the need to maintain or restore a balanced relationship, between economic growth and social development, having the capability to take care of natural resources but also possessing the results of wealth creation, poverty alleviation and economic equity. In addition, Goebel (2007) agrees that sustainable development embraces the well-being of humans without compromising the integrity of the ecology and also includes empowering economic growth for the poor.

Sustainability as a term that embraces various concepts is not there in form or frame within human settlements. There is an intense mismatch between the environment and human dignity. Sustainability in this space has not yet ensured genuine harmony of inclusiveness; equity; fairness; good governance; environmental and economic opportunities (see Burinskiene & Rudzkiene, 2004; Keivani (2010); Du Plessis (2007) & Huchzermeyer (2001). Various authors argue that systemic challenges in South Africa exist because of a rapid rate of urbanization, deep poverty, social inequity, low skills levels, weak governance and uncertain economic environment (Miraftab, 2003)

Sustainability looks into the continuity of existence of not only modern society but the future of human species, in order to avoid environmental and social meltdown. Du Plessis (2007) further assets that sustainable development encompasses three pillars, viz., and social, economic and environmental. In this regard there should be a relationship between sustainable development strategies which can create jobs and the environment in which they happen. In principle, the purpose of sustainability is not

to disregard the environment and its social impact by avoiding a scenario of displaced people and reduced biodiversity (Du Plessis, 2007).

A greater challenge with sustainability in the human development space is placing people in the urban periphery when building new settlements. Urban sprawl together with low-density housing and lack of affordable housing opportunities relegates the poor to the urban periphery, excluding them from economic opportunities (Burinskiene & Rudzkiene, 2004; Keivani, 2010; Du Plessis, 2007 and Huchzermeyer, 2001). In essence, sustainability encompasses the important aspect of the quality of life; its central point is their well-being (MØLLER, 2007).

Huchzermeyer (2001) and Wilkinson (1998) emphasizes that there should be a shift from the idea of pursuing an increased number of houses (quantities of houses) towards building quality housing by endorsing housing as an asset, also adhering to housing norms and standards specifications which were introduced to improve the housing product. There has been a greater interest and understanding in the notion of sustainability over the past decade including in the human settlement space (Joseph and Karuri-Sebina (2014). Sustainability as a concept embraces clean production, pollution prevention, pollution regulations and minimization of resources, eco-design, etc.

Joseph and Karuri-Sebina (2014) further state that sustainable human settlement should be regarded as moving or changing from the mere delivery of houses into building neighbourhoods and communities. Secondly, sustainable human settlement is ideal for moving from shelter to assets of investment. At its core, sustainability recognises the contribution of different sectors and disciplines in its overall achievement. It therefore calls for the different actors and stakeholders to each play their role. Fostering healthy IGR is among one of the many ways to do this.

2.10. Conceptual Framework

To establish an appropriate framework for this research study, the researcher drew on the overall research question, sub-questions and the central phenomenon deliberated

on in the review of the literature. Mainly, the overall question and sub-questions served to inform the literature review and they played a significant role in shaping the overall structure of the data collection and its analysis. The table in the next page summarises the core concepts and reflects how IGR is conceived and operationalised in this study. It must be read and understood from the right to left with each column viewed in relationship to and as resulting from the column prior to it.

IGR in this study is conceived as a mechanism or means through which the philosophical values and vision contained in the Constitution is advanced. Koopa (2016) considers IGR in similar fashion as an operational platform for achieving the developmental goals and objectives of any state. Thus, as per the conceptual framework below, IGR is necessitated by values in the Constitution especially the way the state is configured into a unitary state with decentralised features. The existence of three interdependent and interrelated spheres thrusts them into ongoing relations that comes with reciprocal obligations that make IGR imperative. All these are encapsulated in the first column of the conceptual framework.


Compelled by principles in the Constitution, spheres of government cannot act alone but are required to coordinate, collaborate and cooperate with each other. What these concepts mean and imply is captured in the second column, the existence of which emanates from the first one. On the right of the second column in the conceptual framework are areas over which spheres of government are expected to coordinate, collaborate and cooperate. These areas of commonality are legislation, policy, budgets and projects. Programmes can also be included before projects as these are overarching and constituted by projects themselves.

In the third column are practises reflecting what obtains in a healthy and effective IGR environment. These must be viewed as an extension of the second column. They reflect coordination, collaboration and cooperation when expressed maximally and to their best extent. An effective IGR culture is thus seen where information is widely shared and where communication lines are always open. It is seen in the constant

interaction of spheres and via frequent meetings, working sessions and workshops. In such a context, spheres of government, their constituent parts and other critical stakeholders are included in interactions meant for policy implementation. Regular reporting is the norm, documents are shared, there is mutuality of trust together with negotiation and bargaining. Decisions taken are followed up and not left to fall by the wayside.

In the end what result is positive impact on policy implementation as seen under column three of the conceptual framework. This is seen through improved administration which Wright (1967) mentioned as among key factors in the evolution

PHILOSOPHICAL VALUES		MECHANISM/ MEANS			HEALTHY IGR CULTURE	IMPACT	POLICY ASPIRATION
RECIPROCAL OBLIGATIONS	Unitary state Decentralised features Multi-spheres Interdependence Interrelatedness Cooperative governance	**INTERGOVERMENTAL RELATIONS**	**COORDINATION** Sequencing Harmonizing Organizing/Arranging Overseeing Synergizing **COLLABORATION** Alliance Openness Problem-solving Helpfulness Solution-oriented **COOPERATION** Joint working Partnering Friendliness Teamwork Supportive Assistance	**LEGISLATION/POLICY/PLANNING/BUDGETS/ PROJECTS**	**EXTANT PRACTICES** Constant interaction Frequent meetings Working sessions Workshops Open communication lines MoUs/MoAs/Communiques Decision follow-ups Regular reporting Information sharing Multi-stakeholder platforms Inclusiveness Mutual trust Negotiating Bargaining	Improved administration Improved processes & systems Holistic decision-making Stable relations Integrated cross-sectoral knowledge Improved public value Agreed value proposition Effective agenda setting Integrated planning Improved policy implementation Conflict management	**SUSTAINABILITY** Environmental development Viable communities Social facilities Quality structures Physical well-being Safe and secure environment Satisfied communities



of IGR. Healthy and effective IGR also results in improved processes and systems, improved agenda setting and integrated sectoral knowledge. Everyone begins relying on the same information and a shared understanding together with an agreed value proposition prevails. Relations among spheres, their organs and other critical stakeholders become stabilized due to constant interaction. Linked to improved process and systems is integrated planned where ways of doing become mainstreamed.

In the final analysis, the policy aspiration of sustainable human settlements as articulated in the BNG policy gets realised. New housing developments bring about viable communities. The houses built are of the required quality, there is proper development of the environment with needed social facilities, safety and security.

2.11. Conclusion

This chapter began with a discussion of IGR theories in the attempt to show their relevance to a healthy and effective IGR culture that facilitates policy implementation. The law of appropriateness theory was found to run short of creating a healthy IGR environment as it relies on the individual discretion of public officials to interact with their counterparts. The dual policy model on the other hand was shown to be ignorant of central government's behavior towards the local sphere by overstating its independence. The organizational/dependence model pointed to useful factors such as efficient processes, communication and management style relevant to healthy and effective IGR. It however drew attention away from analyzing individual conduct in IGR.

Rational choice models were discussed next and found limited in not giving attention to taxpayers' concerns as a critical component that should inform any IGR activity. Neo-Marxist theories on the other hand appeared to place healthy and effective IGR characterized by harmonious relations beyond reach. Network and multi-level governance theories were jointly found to best approximate how a healthy and effective IGR culture could be attained via constant interaction underpinned by continuous communication, collaboration, negotiation, and bargaining. The two

theories considered multiple overlaps and interaction with internal and external actors as making IGR nuanced and context-bound rather than generic and homogenous.

The empirical section devoted attention to the evolution of IGR and its development as an area of study. It shows that IGR has grown to become more fluid and open in multi-level governments, not observing hierarchies but being innovative instead. IGR in South Africa was discussed next. The development of IGR both before and after promulgation of IGFRA was adopted as a useful way to analyze it. Lack of clear roles, poor monitoring and supervision together with inconsistent participation by local government in IGR forums were some of the earlier challenges. Imprecise function definition, the yet-to-be settled role of provinces and the complex two-tier district planning system which led inefficiency were also highlighted as some of the factors later affecting IGR negatively.

IGR in the housing sector was the next to receive attention. Poor inclusiveness by all role players, concurrency challenges and the need for a widely understood notion of human settlements were touched upon. The requirement for local government to develop integrated housing, transport and spatial plans were other IGR difficulties finding expression within the housing sector. The need for horizontal and vertical coordination together with integration supported by a commonly shared vision as encapsulated in the BNG policy was proposed. Sustainable human settlements which entail multi-disciplinary participation and contribution also received attention.

The last section mapped the conceptual framework, related concepts and relationships this study utilizes and sees among them. The Constitutional values of a unitary but decentralized state, cooperative governance and interdependence were seen as achievable via IGR as a means and operational platform. Among others IGR entailed coordination, collaboration and cooperation as some its components. This meant teamwork, harmonious execution, supportiveness and joint work among others. A healthy IGR environment leading to sustainable human settlements was considered to entail frequent interaction, continuous communication, inclusiveness, etc.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH APPROACH, DESIGN, DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYIS METHODS

This chapter discusses the strategic orientation adopted in this study together with other relevant aspects necessitated by the approach taken. In this chapter, the methodological approach of this study which was qualitative gets discussed. The chapter also discusses data collection methods. A combination of interviewing, attending IGR meetings and the reviewing of government documents was employed in this study. The issue of bias is also discussed as a challenge that had to be approached cautiously.

3.1. Approach

This research adopted a qualitative approach in examining how IGR affect the delivery of sustainable human settlements. As an approach, the qualitative method is interpretive and depends on the knowledge held by individuals when studying any subject. The qualitative approach is utilized because of its relevance to the study since IGR as a phenomenon entails the participation of individuals. As already mentioned, it is the attitude and disposition of public officials that determines the effectiveness of IGR systems. Resultantly individuals involved in the delivery of housing were interacted with to unearth how they interact and the values underlying this interaction. A descriptive approach detailing IGR interactions between the City and Province in delivering housing was followed (Wagner, Kawulich & Garner, 2012).

Since the qualitative approach aims to gather subjective information, project managers from CoJ and the Gauteng Department of Human Settlement were targeted as group. The information they provided was interpreted to provide a holistic picture on IGR practices and their effect on the delivery of housing. In essence the data gathering process was approached inductively.

3.2. Research Design

Drawing from the literature review, the researcher used primary and secondary data collection methods. This involved a combination of interviews, attending IGR meetings

as an observer and reviewing policy documents. Bryman (2014) notes that such a design, collecting evidence through the exploration of diverse areas, has the ability to reveal more compared to a single approach. In a nutshell, a qualitative approach was more appropriate for this study since it is flexible and allowed the researcher the chance to incorporate themes that emerged from an ongoing process of data collection (Wagner, et al., 2012).

3.3. Data Collection Techniques

To collect data, interviews were undertaken by the researcher. A semi-structured interview schedule (see attached as Appendix A) containing appropriate questions on the subject-matter was developed for this purpose. This allowed for a conversation that flowed easily and for spontaneity with no interruptions. It was critical to have this rightly configured since interviewing plays a valuable role in the collection of information (Wagner et al., 2012). Giving careful attention to this was key as it ensured that the interview schedule provided valid data including adhering to ethical considerations that guided the researcher on proper conduct during the whole process (Kumar, 2019). Interviews also provided the opportunity to observe the display of feelings, emotions and experiences by respondents (Wisker, 2001) and in maintaining confidentiality.

Participant's expressions and emotions were observed so as to gather a thick layer of information. Since interviews offer a way of understanding participant's perspectives, respondents in this study were generally eager to air their views on IGR and housing yet frustrated by issues that seemed to present perennial problems. They gave meaning to their views and were provided the opportunity to make the social phenomenon (IGR activities) under study explicit (Wagner, et al., 2012). An audio/voice recorder was used during the interviews with the permission of respondents to record proceedings. A consent forms was served and signed by all respondents.

3.4. Participant observation

In order to have first-hand experience of IGR structures in action and to collect more data, the researcher attended two IGR meetings as an observer.[3] The first meeting occurred in June 2021 and the second one in July of the same year. Observational techniques are methods in which the researcher gathers first-hand information on processes and the behaviours studied (Bloomberg and Volpe 2008). Furthermore, they provide the researcher with an opportunity to collect rich insightful data, to capture a great variety of interactions and to openly explore the area under study. The researcher's experience during these meetings are integrated in the data collected and form part of discussions in the next chapter where research findings are presented.

Participant observation also gave the researcher the chance to be immersed in an IGR setting, thus developing a deeper understanding of it (Bloomberg and Volpe 2008). The researcher was able to attend IGR meetings between the Provincial Department of Human Settlements and CoJ's Department of Housing with the view to assess the prevailing culture, note challenges and determine their effectiveness such as attendance, matters considered and decisions taken. In the meeting both teams emphasised coordination of processes to create synergy and integrated human settlements plans. The researcher spent time in project meetings observing how IGR unfolded through the strengthening of working relations where emphasis was placed on improved communication and the need to avoid working in silos to build sustainable human settlements.

The researcher also relied on and reviewed relevant secondary sources, i.e. policy documentation, documents from the National Department of Human Settlements, the Gauteng Provincial Department of Human Settlements and local government documents. Among reviewed documents were annual reports from the City and Province, the National Housing Act, the National Housing Code, media reports and parliamentary documents. These were pored through and discussions on interactions

[3] The researcher is currently an employee with the Gauteng Provincial Department of Human Settlements and getting access to IGR meetings posed no challenge.

between the City and Province were extracted to get a sense of what the state of IGR between them was. Projects documents on Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development were also identified and City-Province interactions regarding its planning and delivery analysed.

3.5. Target Population and Sample Size

Sampling refers to the number of participants selected from a population (Wagner *et al*., 2012). The sampling approach undertaken in this study was a non-probability one. Non-probability sampling is not fixed and the chance of being in the study is unknown, meaning anyone could be selected depending on availability and willingness to participate in the study (Bhattacherjee, 2012). According to Bryman (2012) a non-probability approach is a non-random technique. Hence, Etikan, Musa and Alkassim (2016:1) refers to non-probability as "sampling techniques where samples are gathered in a process that does not give all the participants in the population equal chances of being included" in the study.

Project managers involved with housing delivery were targeted for this project. The sample size was divided into two strata (i) Officials from the Provincial Department of Human Settlements and, (ii) Officials from the CoJ's Housing Department. Miles, Huberman and Saldana (2020) note that any sampling method is drawn from a conceptual framework and research questions. The sampling approach for this study was purposive. The reason for selecting purposive sampling is because it is a useful type of non-probability sampling (Wagner et. al., 2012). Purposive sampling relies on experience, ingenuity, or rather previous research findings (Kumar, 2019). Thus, since the researcher had considerable experience in housing matters, relevant individuals were selected for interviews.

In addition, with purposive sampling the criteria to identify participant's findings can be considered to be representative of the population (Wagner et. al., 2012). Finally, purposive sampling was employed in this study because it is a cost- effective approach and does not consume a lot of time. Hence, Wotela (2016: 11) puts it, that "determining

a sample is a compromise between precision on one hand as well as time and cost on the other". This sampling was also relevant due to the fact that the researcher could not include everyone to form part of the study (Miles et.al. 2020).

Appropriate individuals to interview were identified through snowball sampling. The researcher approached individuals, in particular project managers, in City and Province's the human settlement space who in turn were asked to identify other individuals to interview (Patton, 2005). Marshall (1996) and Patton (2005) sees snowball sampling as a recruitment method of getting participants to contribute to any study. In this regard, the researcher identified Construction Project Managers from the Gauteng Department of Human Settlements and officials from CoJ's Department of Housing as the target group for interviews for this study. Face to face interviews were conducted with both groups.

3.6. Data analysis

Miles et.al. (2020) interpret data analysis as a source of well-grounded and rich descriptions of social processes. They (2020:3) point out that a good data analysis leads to "serendipitous findings and interrelationships". Thus, the process of data analysis is the interpretation of the way the researcher makes sense of data collected. Bloomberg and Volpe (2008) define data analysis as a process on how data is managed, organized and analysed in order to prepare and generate findings of your report. Wagner et.al. (2012: 229) describe data analysis as the process of "reduction focusing, simplifying and transforming data".

Miles et.al. (2020) similarly describe this process as data condensation - which is about summarizing of data for it to be stronger; as well as data displaying, meaning organising data into tables, graphs or summary statements (Wagner et.al. (2012: 229). This study followed organizing data into summary statement. Miles et.al. (2020) further explain data displaying as organising the compressed information to allow for analytical reflection and action. In this study, the researcher commenced with planning for how to manage the seemingly unwieldy data collected and making meaningful

notes from it (Bloomberg and Volpe, 2008). According to Miles et.al, (2020: 03) generating well-analysed data will produce the quality of “undeniability”.

The researcher obtained data from interviews, observation of IGR meetings and from the review of documents. The process of data analysis entailed the identification of significant patterns and “construct[ing] a framework for communicating the essence of what the data revealed given the purpose of the study” (Bloomberg and Volpe, 2008: 75). Data was iteratively studied to ensure the richness of information emerges to produce purposeful data for reliability and validity instead of a non-iterative process which would have resulted in general information (Bloomberg and Volpe, 2008). In addition, the researcher applied an inductive approach to come to conclusions on the effectiveness of IGR in delivering sustainable human settlements.

As indicated, primary data collected through a combination of in-depth interviews, participant observation and reviewing of documents, the researcher employed thematic content analysis first to break complexities inherent in the data into smaller themes and develop a detailed description, thereafter, used content analysis to understand the identified meanings as it is applicable to a qualitative study (Bhattacherjee, 2012). The researcher continued to identify categories and patterns by labelling them accordingly (Wagner et al., 2012 and Bloomberg and Volpe, 2008). Alongside this, the researcher made sense by comparing ongoing data with the emerging categories, objectively for the re-configuration of the existing data. Similar responses from interviews were grouped together and recurrent patterns among them noted.

3.7. Reliability and Validity Measures

Brink (1993) mentions reliability and validity as key aspects of all research. This author advises that differentiating between good and poor research is based on the meticulousness of credibility and trustworthiness of the research findings. Moreover, reliability and validity is fundamental when conducting a qualitative research study. Bryman (2014) & Bhattacherjee (2012) state that research reliability measures consistency. In undertaking this research study, stability, integrity and credibility had

to be maintained. In this study, credibility was established by analysing the interview transcripts for the verification of captured views and perceptions of the participants correctly. Furthermore, the researcher used more than one data collection technique to enhance the validity of the findings.

Trustworthiness is achieved by ensuring consistency of the findings should the research be conducted again. It requires that research have dependability. Therefore, in conducting any study the process should be meticulous and stringent to avoid inconsistencies caused by data inaccuracies. Brink (1993, citing Selltiz et.al. 1976) considers reliability of any study in its ability to be repeated. It depends on the ability of the researcher to collect and record information accurately. In a nutshell, reliability measures the consistency of the results. In undertaking this study, the researcher approached interviews with each participant the same way without fails.

Validity, on the other hand focuses on the accuracy and truthfulness of scientific findings (Brink, 1993, citing Le Comple and Goetz, 1982). Therefore, the validity of the study should demonstrate the existence of the phenomenon and a valid instrument should measure what it is supposed to be measured. Hence, in order to ensure the external validity of this research the sampling method was carefully explained to ensure that the approach and constraints were fully appreciated (Ibrahim, 2016: 39).

Brinks (1993) points out the threat or risk that can impede the reliability and validity of the study. For instance, as a researcher, the question of biasness stared the researcher in the face as she works in the Department of Human Settlements. In conducting this study, the researcher utilised all the information afforded by her employment objectively towards achieving the aims and goals of this study. Research ethics were unwaveringly adhered to as those not willing to participate were allowed to be. Hence, Brink (1993) embraces that the reliability and validity of the study must be objective.

The results of this study should be transferable and replicable to another study of almost the same population. Thus, in carrying out this study, care was taken by the

researcher to ensure that the results and findings are of a reliable, valid, and replicable nature.

3.8. Ethical Considerations

Ethical consideration is very important when conducting research of any nature, as the rights and well-being of participants have to be of uttermost priority (Bryman, 2014, Kumar, 2019 & Wisker, 2001). For this reason, to ensure adherence to ethical considerations, the researcher received permission from Wits University Ethics Committee before undertaking the research. Secondly, the researcher committed and adhered to all the ethics regulations, taking into consideration that participants are human beings that had not be harmed nor their lives put in danger (Bryman, 2014). During the research and data collection process, there was no deception of any kind used by the researcher in collecting data (Kumar 2019 & Wagner et al., 2012).

The researcher informed and disclosed the purpose of the research to participants and there was mutual agreement as a result, consent letters were issued to participants. Both the participants and the researcher signed consent letters; thus the researcher followed the ethical guidelines by getting permission from the participants and accepted that they could withdraw at any time from the study (Wagner et al., 2012). The researcher assured all the participants of confidentiality and anonymity to ensure privacy. All participants were assured their names would not be used or any of their personal information made public.

At CoJ, before the researcher was given permission, a contract agreement had to be signed (this really showed that CoJ considered research as important/ vital to drive to effectiveness and efficiency). Approval was therefore, granted to conduct interviews for a certain period of time and the contract agreement endorsed adherence to ethical guidelines. Finally, the researcher kept consent letters including respondent's details for personal records for the purposes of securing the validity of the study. Miles et.al. (2020: 49) concludes that ethical consideration has the ability to produce truthfulness and has the potential to produce wrongness.

3.9. Limitations of the research

During data collection challenges were experienced. The target respondents were busy implementing projects and other work-related activities. Although working in the Provincial Department of Human Settlements and getting participants for the study was supposed to be easy, some of the invited participants declined because of ongoing proceedings of the Commission of Inquiry into Allegations of State Capture, alleged corruption and fraud in the public sector including organs of state. Housing is generally also a field prone to allegations of corruption and housing issues often make news headlines.

Consequently, the study was limited by the reluctance from officials to take part in it. This happened although the researcher had, for ethical reasons, tried to overcome this by requesting permission to undertake interviews with officials from the Head of Department (from the Department of Human Settlements), which was granted. In the end and after much effort, ten project managers in all were interviewed as part of the study.

The Covid-19 pandemic also created challenges that prevented the conducting of some face-to-face interviews. As a result, some interviews occurred virtually with difficulties encountered due to some participants not being conversant with the functioning of Microsoft Teams. Then with load-shedding, some of the interviews also had to be cancelled. These had to be re-scheduled due to interruption from load-shedding. Unfortunately, some participants lost interest in participating in the study. To overcome this, some participants were interviewed at not-so-ideal venues such as eateries where noise levels created hindrances. All the same, interviews took place and were completed.

Another limitation was the arranged site-visit to Lufhereng Township which could not take place at the earlier period affected by community protest. The Project Manager from CoJ had to be reminded to arrange another site visit at the later time after the protest. This never happened. The research could have been far-reaching however, the researcher was not able to cover some of the relevant aspect. Future research is

advised in this regard. In conclusion, another limitation of this research study is that it lacks gender representation because it was not easy to find female respondents, as some of the invited female participants withdrew from the study. In adherence to ethical principles, they could not be forced to form part of the study.

3.10. Feasibility

To make any study feasible, it is always advisable that data collection tools be piloted first (Kumar, 2019). Consequently, the researcher piloted the interview schedule by initially undertaking preliminary interviews to ascertain the trustworthiness and credibility of the data collection instrument. In this process test subjects are utilized for initial assessment and those used during piloting do not form part of the sample (Kumar, 2019). Hence, to validate the effectiveness of the schedule, a piloting exercise was done through a face-to-face interview between the researcher and a CoJ official – from the Research Team. Certain questions were re-structured, as a result.

3.11. Positionality

Researching the effect of IGR in delivering housing and building of sustainable human settlement is on its own a broad subject. The researcher's positionality as an employee of the Gauteng Provincial Department of Human Settlements however enabled her to identify relevant respondents with interest and knowledge pertaining IGR and they were able to respond to questions. It is for this reason the researcher acknowledges that prior knowledge, background and working experience served as an advantage in undertaking this study.

According to Chavez (2008), positionality might conveniently advantage or give the researcher an insider's perspective because of proximity, providing the ability to detect participants' concealed perception. Thus, proximity positions the researcher advantageously and he or she is able to enjoy closeness and recognize the respondent's values and viewpoints. Moreover, approaching any member does not become difficult to do. On the other hand, the researcher's positionality, can negatively impact a study if left unrestrained, "leading to difficulty with recognizing patterns due to familiarity with community" (Chavez, 2008: 479). This can contribute to biasness in

the process of selecting participants. Therefore, in carrying out this research, one had to safeguard against the effects of positionality and control for biasness (Chavez, 2008).

Miles et.al. (2020) assert that the positionality and standpoint of the researcher is shaped by the social world. Thus, social phenomenon exists in the world and not in the mind. Bloomberg and Volpe (2008) believe that it is paradigm that positions the researcher's ideas. This study endeavoured to understand the social phenomenon of effective IGR from a context-specific perspective. Therefore, the constructivist paradigm allowed the researcher to construct and understand IGR reality in its social, cultural and power relations. According to Bloomberg and Volpe (2008: 9) constructivists recognize that "backgrounds shapes interpretation", thus they "position themselves in the research to acknowledge their own cultural, social and historical experiences" as well as add the effects of critical theory. According to the latter, undertaking research has within it the integral action of transforming the ideas.

3.12. Conclusion

This chapter began with a discussion on the approach taken in this study, which is qualitative and sought to explore the subjective views of individuals involved in the interaction between City and Province to deliver houses. This approach was considered relevant since the attitude and disposition of humans engaged in IGR is critical to its understanding as a phenomenon. The study's research design of interviewing, observation and documentary analysis was also deliberated on. The data collection techniques of interviews with housing delivery project managers, observation to assess the prevailing culture and effectiveness of IGR meetings between City and Province and a review of secondary sources received attention next.

Among documents reviewed were policy documents, annual reports, project reports and housing related legislation. The target population and sampling which was random and involved housing delivery project managers in the City and Province were also discussed. The data analysis process of thematic content analysis where similar responses from interviews were grouped together and patterns noted was adopted and discussed. Ethics and limitations of the study such as Covid19 were also noted.

CHAPTER 4: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTEPRETATION

This chapter comprises of two sections, the first section is a presentation of the data collected through interviews and the second an analysis of issues distilled from the interpretation of the data itself that the study considers central to improving IGR between the City and the Province.

SECTION A: PRESENTATION OF RESEARCH RESULTS

In this section findings from the interviews conducted are presented, including their interpretation to draw out meaning of what was said. Data in this section is the result of responses received from interview discussions using the interview schedule (attached as Appendix A). Content analysis where recurrent patterns in responses were noted and where similar ideas were grouped together was used to develop themes. The main themes are: practises related to IGR, policy and planning concerns, function assignment and related IGR fiscal flows. Each section notes both the issues vexing housing-related IGR issues between the Province and the City and possible solutions proposed by respondents.

The findings are also analyzed by drawing parallels with and casting them back against what the literature on IGR revealed. The objective for this being to establish if what pertains between the Province and the City corroborates or deviates from what is already known on IGR in general and on IGR in South Africa.

4.1. IGR practices

4.1.1 Involvement in Structures

As the first port of call respondents were asked on their involvement in IGR structures. Most respondents indicated that they are indeed involved in IGR forums – meaning some particular value was placed in IGR's ability to contribute in advancing the delivery of sustainable human settlements. Further to this, respondents revealed keen awareness of the existence of these structures. They not only assented to participating in the structures, but respondents also made reference to the names of some of the

available IGR structures, i.e., MinMEC. In particular, this level of awareness found expression among respondents from CoJ.

They specifically made mention of their awareness of the Mayor's participation in MinMEC. Some provincial respondents similarly mentioned that their MEC does participate in the MinMEC IGR structure. Not only were respondents acutely aware of the existing IGR structures but also of the applicable constitutional prescripts. Reference to the Constitution of 1996 and its call for the three spheres to work together was made. According to respondents, the Constitution promulgated the mandate for the three spheres to be autonomous and interdependent in their functioning. Thus, participants were aware of cooperative governance and its importance to the IGR framework. All these dovetails to what was observed in the literature discussed earlier that IGR is eventually about humans and that it is their attitude and involvement that makes or breaks the effectiveness of IGR as a tool. There was therefore a positive disposition and embracing of IGR among respondents.

4.1.2 Value and Worth

Respondents also expressed views on what they considered to be the value of having IGR structures in place. One respondent mentioned that IGR structures and forums are necessary *"to ensure the building of stakeholder relations"* while another opined that they are needed *"to ensure working together"*. Respondents stated that IGR structures are important for ensuring the smooth running of housing developments from the planning of activities to the implementation of different stages. IGR was seen as useful along the whole housing delivery value chain and not in just one particular stage of it.

All these pointed to the need for inclusivity in the delivery of housing and the building of sustainable human settlements. In particular respondents used various telling phrases to capture the value to be derived from IGR structures such as *"streamline"*, *"synchronization of efforts*", *"synergy"* and *"harmonised"* relations. Underlined in the use of these phrases is the imperative of all to pull together in one direction as a whole

instead of operating in a fragmented manner without any sense of direction. Some broad understanding of IGR existed. This is different from the situation prior to the passing of the act, IGFRA, where there was no clear understanding of critical concepts such as integration. This clearly reflected some level of progress where IGR culture is concerned.

4.1.3 Inter-dependence

Among others, respondents from the City voiced the fact that engagement in IGR is important since the municipality had custodianship of land. In a sense the City emphasised the importance of its participation since local government's involvement was initially treated as an after-thought in many IGR forums (Layman 2003). More critically, respondents expressed how there is a need to involve all key stakeholders since in their view there is no new human settlement that can be developed without involvement of all the three spheres of government. The respondents from province also viewed the City as important when it comes to land. In a sense the need to create synergies in planning as observed by Malan (2012) was being noted.

In relation to land, the City deals with the township establishment/proclamation process. One responded stated it plainly that, *"land is quite an important aspect for housing development"*. Due to the extended length of time involved in sourcing land for development, the National Department of Human Settlements ultimately established the Housing Development Agency (HDA) to facilitate the identification of well-located land for housing developments and to package it appropriately. An agency of this nature did not exist before. All this in the effort to curtail the length of time related to the sourcing of land. It is apparent here that there was keen awareness among respondent of critical milestones and prerequisites along the housing delivery value chain. The need for coordination was thus underlined as without these other housing delivery processes could not take place.

4.1.4 Information flows

Respondents from CoJ again expressed the point that IGR is important and valuable for the sharing of knowledge. In the words of one respondent, participation in IGR forums would *"ensure sharing of project management information"*. It seemed from the perspective of officials from CoJ they felt disadvantaged when it came to project information by virtue of the City's somewhat subordinate point of involvement in the housing development process. It seemed that they never happened to have full project information at any one time. It is for this reason that to them participation in IGR activities became pivotal - for the flow of critical project-related information. Thus, poor information flows which was an IGR challenge before the passing of IGFRA needed to be improved upon. This scenario reflects a deviation from what network theory proposes as effective IGR culture where widespread communication to share ideas is key.

4.1.5 Effectiveness of meetings/forums

Although the existence of IGR structures was acknowledged, respondents from CoJ mentioned how meetings happened in silos. Again, this attested to their disadvantaged position in the whole housing development process. Not only did meetings happen in a disconnected manner but it was also *"difficult to have meetings that drives (sic) implementation of decision making",* as put by one respondent. The challenge of the ambiguity surrounding the decisions of IGR structures continued to attend efforts to create a healthy IGR culture.

Respondents expressed the desire to hold meetings concerned with the *"implementation of objectives"* and in order to *"follow up on decisions made".* The challenge observed during the pre-2005 review of IGR where forum decisions did not reach higher structures is here in view. There was a disdain for meetings that descended into "*political discussions"* and a yearning for IGR meetings aimed at *"the promotion of service delivery".* Again, here the importance of effective leadership characterised by a collaborative managerial style and the ability to deal with individuals

from diverse backgrounds as noted by network theory and de Villiers (2012), seems absent.

As part of the methodological approach, the researcher attended a few meetings between CoJ and the Gauteng Provincial Department of Human Settlements to observe what transpired in them, to note IGR practises in action and to assess the prevailing culture in meetings. In corroboration of the difficulty of holding IGR meetings with regularity, speakers at the meeting attended by the researcher emphasised the need and encouraged attendees to readily avail themselves for meetings. The team was encouraged to change behaviour so that meetings would happen regularly and there would be promotion of working together through collaboration in adherence to the principles of cooperative governance.

The team acknowledged that attendance needed to be obligatory. The implementation of decisions was emphasized. In encouraging unity of purpose and working together an attendant at the meeting expressly stated it that *"it does not mean that [because] I (sic) am City and you (sic) are from Province"* there cannot be one report. Collaboration and a single government approach was underscored. The noble nature of these notwithstanding, the prevailing IGR culture deviated from what would be found in a healthy and effective IGR environment as proposed by network and organization theories such as regular interaction and high levels of communication.

Notwithstanding the length of time, it took time to develop the above IGR structure, respondents mentioned IGR meetings that took place on a monthly basis. In their view, work on the well-functioning of these meeting was not yet complete. *"There was a need to [further] develop that structure"*, said a one respondent. It was complained that in some meetings decisions were not implemented. *"It is a struggle to implement key decisions"* decried a respondent. The statement, *"meetings should transform and implement IGR decisions for the people of Gauteng"* aptly captured what respondents longed for. One respondent mentioned the experience from where he used to work,

> *you see, during the 20PTP [Twenty Prioritized Townships] programme, there was a forum meeting held on monthly basis. Discussions used to solve*

challenges in the developments, decisions were made and it was easier to discuss and manage projects. This used to improve projects as a result, planning and implementation of projects used to be effective.

In the prevailing scenario not only were decisions difficult to implement, but senior managers were also always sending junior staff to crucial meetings, needing decision makers. This post-2005 IGR challenge of poor meetings attendance persisted. Another respondent mentioned that in meetings – *"you see new faces"*. These IGR meetings were therefore still plagued by uncertainty when it came to their status or how seriously they were taken. It is apparent judging by how they were treated that they did not hold the weight they were supposedly expected to have. They were undermined due to lack of a strong decision-making feedback loop to higher structures. The attitude was however different in those IGR structures were politicians participated.

In particular, respondents expressed satisfaction on the intact nature of MinMEC. In addition, they referred to the effective way in which the MEC performed at driving the attendance of meetings by stakeholders. It is therefore clear that while the value of IGR initiatives was recognized as a norm high up, it was not lower down the rung. There was therefore limited diffusion of understanding in terms of the benefits to be derived from IGR efforts. This clearly ran against the development of an open and non-hierarchical culture that is found in effective IGR systems. Maturation of the system is still required and yet to happen.

Respondents from province offered the advice that structures are not supposed to be created at a political level only, but there had to be structures at operational level as these will lead to more effective implementation. *"I think our projects are hindered and turns to be slow due to lack of IGR within operational level,"* said a respondent.

You see meetings and decisions are taken in senior management meeting, but they don't get filtered to the operational level, accordingly.

This spoke to the need for multiple and regular meetings, consultations and interactions beyond formal institutional confines as proposed by network theory. There was thus no transcending of bilateral intergovernmental concerns to create inclusiveness and operation within multi-organizational arrangements with relations built for bargaining and negotiation purposes.

4.1.6 Support for IGR

Respondents generally answered the question whether IGR structures were being supported or not in the affirmative. It was their view that supporting these structures would make the implementation of sustainable human settlements policy realised. One of the respondents said yes there was support for IGR but in a contested terrain. The respondent put forward an example of hostels that were supposed to be maintained by the City but was dependent on the Province to implement and renovate. Again, inappropriate roles are in view here where a function that could be performed by one party is split into two. The respondent further said when the City was supposed to take over hostels, there would be resistance from communities due to stakeholder mobilization, portraying a picture of IGR structures that did not enjoy support at all.

A respondent that was formerly with the city but had then moved to a national entity felt that there was still a lot that needed to be done as support for IGR efforts was still weak for a number of reasons:

> *the inter-governmental meetings often meet on an ad hoc basis as and when there are crises*, *there is very little implementation of meeting resolutions by the different spheres of government* and *very often the constant changing of politicians and officials often affect the effectiveness of the forums*.

All these are signs of an IGR system that is still undergoing maturity. As already seen, in a matured, effective and fully functioning IGR system, there is a strong feedback loop with decisions taken lower down the run feeding up the structures and followed up regularly. Non-hierarchy, openness and innovating around how parties interact are key and still need to be developed.

4.1.7 Deepening IGR practices

Other respondents placed faith in the very culture and practice of IGR. One expressed the view that "*the City and province must improve working together"*. Another that *"harmonious relations must be maintained"*. And still another said *"collaboration between local and provincial spheres is important to improve service delivery to build sustainable communities"*. The need for the City and Province to develop a single government approach and draw benefits inherent in IGR is here underscored. Not only was this but that the effectiveness of these structures be seen as expressed by the following words, "*decision-making and implementation of decisions must be adhered to".* Again, what can be noted here is network theory thinking and especially how it was conceived with the intention to bridge the gap between policy determination and the task administration needed to play. Respondents understood IGR as an instrument for effective governance and policy implementation. Yet their answers indicated a lack of this.

4.2. On Planning

4.2.1 Misalignment of plans

Respondents representing the provincial sphere mentioned that since officials from province did not participate in local government's IDP process, they exhibited little understanding of it and by implication of local government plans. The IDP is the main strategic planning document of municipalities in which all infrastructure projects are contained. IDPs are developed in conjunction with communities for a period of five years but are reviewed on an annual basis. As a consequence of a poor understanding of IDPs by provincial officials, one respondent remarked that *"there is a disjuncture between IDP's and APP".* The latter refers to the annual performance plan of the Gauteng Department of Human Settlements.

The above scenario points back to both pre and post-IGFRA challenges that continue to plague IGR culture between the provincial and local spheres. Among them being patchy strategies, the weak alignment of strategic plans and the resultant weak flow of priorities.

4.2.2 Impediments to joint planning

Among hindrances to joint planning, respondents from Province pointed out the sharing of functions. This is an enduring IGR challenge that receives further attention in the next section of this chapter. One respondent put it this way, there is a *"challenge of overlapping of functions, i.e. City has planning unit and province has planning unit but you don't hear that they had had joint planning meetings"*. If not planning independently, where the City and Province planned together it was still haphazard. There was no coordination. Other impediments to joint planning mentioned included *"budget constraints" "communication [lack of]"* and simple *"respecting of [IGR] meetings"*. The pre-IGFRA or pre-2005 challenge of mismatched budget cycles still prevailed. Literature showed in the earlier chapter that opportunities for joint working among senior official are undercut by it not being budgeted or catered for it in their performance contracts. As a result, even where it was useful to engage in it, senior officials saw no need for this.

One respondent called for the maintaining of momentum where regular meetings were concerned instead of having once-off concerted efforts by saying

> *effective and on-going joint working between strategic policy-making authorities and relevant bodies is integral to the production of a positively prepared and justified strategy.*

The fact that this was not happening is clearly out of kilter with a proper and effective IGR culture as discussed in the previous chapter where inter-agency efforts and opportunities for joint-working were mentioned in efforts to mainstream integration.

4.2.3 Joint planning

Respondent regarded joint planning as key, particularly where projects were concerned. One respondent mentioned that the *"two spheres are supposed to engage before the projects start in order to plan together, you see a challenge in actual fact is not planning together"*. Another specifically stated that the "*planning of townships must be done together"*. This points to the prerequisite nature of the township establishment process in the housing delivery value chain as per the discussion on coordination in

the earlier chapter. It would appear here that were one party to the relationship was not involved in township planning, challenges were experienced and this led to the stalling of processes. In view here is coordination as an adversarial issue that is detectable only during the process to implement policy (Koopa, 2016).

One respondent said that *"all government officials and policy bearers should be trained constantly on what and how to interact in accordance with existing legislation and policies"*. Again, here ongoing training and capacity building that was underscored in literature on IGR in the previous chapter as part of developing an effective system is in view (de Villiers, 2012). Also, for this respondent it seemed like customs and traditions associated with a cooperative relations culture had not taken root. Thus, maturation of the IGR system as an ongoing process of fine tuning, monitoring, assessing and improving is still needed.

According to this respondent, legislation could be utilized *"to resolve challenges through ensuring that resolutions taken at forums are implemented"* and "*through holding responsible institutions and officials accountable for the decisions taken at these forums"*. In this respondent's view simple consequence management was necessary to instil a right IGR culture. As literature indicated, involvement in IGR efforts and shared responsibility does not take away accountability for specifically assigned functions and roles. This must still be maintained and expected amidst the mishmash of relations and shared responsibilities.

4.2.4 Consultation

Consultation was also put forward as a critical aspect. Respondents from the City mentioned they consult with all key stakeholders in order to avoid projects from becoming white elephants. They decried the prevailing scenario where renovated hostels lied idle, unoccupied and some vandalized due to the province's failure to consult widely. In this instance consulting with concerned communities. One respondent, emphasizing how consultation cannot be shied away from said the *"Housing Act advocates consultation as a meaningful exercise"*. Another said, *"intense consultation with the community must happen before the project commences".*

Inclusiveness, going beyond institutional confines to interact formally and informally together with forging relations vertically and horizontally were underscored in the earlier chapter where network theory was discussed as an analytical tool for assessing healthy IGR.

This failure to consult with affected communities had subsequent repercussions for other role-players such as the City, making it difficult for it to carry out its own assigned responsibilities of maintaining hostels. Again, what is in display here is coordination as an adversarial issue (Koopa 2016). Meaning it is as spheres implement policy that they begin to detect blockages and their interdependence on each other especially where specific actions from other spheres become prerequisite for other spheres completing their own assigned functions and roles. Mention of the creation of the *"Project Steering Committee"* by the Department of Human Settlements were consultation happened *"through interacting with different stakeholders and technical steering committee"* was made by another respondent.

4.2.5 Integration

All respondents agreed to the importance of integration and that *"integration is a very broad concept and a big subject".* One respondent said, *"when you integrate, you infuse all aspects together. Coordination is key".* Another said *"when you integrate you fusing all together, you still understand that there is autonomy and yet working together".* All respondents underscored the need to plan together because *"to plan is beyond the operations of individual departments".* A respondent formerly with the City said *"integrated planning involves ensuring that government plans are coordinated across all relevant departments"* and *"resources are directed towards the same programmes and projects".* This important IGR concept is well understood unlike prior to 2005 where it was among concepts that lacked a clear and widespread understanding. It is here seen as consolidating everyone's efforts with the view to achieve one similar objective. This however does not imply that it is being achieved.

In relation to directing resources, the *"re-structuring of budgets"* and different *"financial arrangements"* were mentioned as necessary. This corroborates Deli Wright's (1967) view of fiscal flows as an important feature of IGR. On how settlements integration could be concretely achieved mention was made that *"better implementation of business planning regulations will ensure integration of human settlement plans".* It was even stated that were such integrated planning occurred, *"accessibility to economic opportunities through public transport linkages, zoning and the iterative development of business spaces"* in new settlements would be achieved. In display here is the critical sustainability aspect of being multi-discipline that was expatiated on under the conceptual framework with different sectors involved in the process.

"Better cooperation of the relevant spheres of government" was also seen as necessary for integration, meaning the prevailing form of cooperation among spheres could be improved. Other views were that integration is not happening because *"political interests are hampering this process"* and there was *"resistance to integration and protecting territories".* The respondent that was formerly with the City concluded by saying that

> *where cooperation is crucial, government should ensure that it is mandatory for different spheres to do so through passing legislation and regulations to foster cooperation*

And *"if the responsible officials fail to implement, there should be consequences".* In this respondent's view, cooperation and working together needed to be treated with the seriousness it deserved. It is after all a precept enshrined in the Constitution. Again, in view here is the-yet-to-mature nature of South Africa's IGR system with cooperation still not being maximally expressed. This was underscored by empirical literature as among challenges emanating from the nascent state of the system and still needed to be overcome.

4.3. Policy

4.3.1 Policy gaps

In relation to the building of sustainable human settlements, respondents expressed concern over policy gaps. *"Policies are not aligned to the needs of the society"* one

said, as government was only happy to deliver houses but did not address the issues directly affecting the poor, i.e., economy to improve the lives of the poor allocated in houses, unemployment, crime, poverty, etc. *"You see the government is just happy with counting number of houses delivered but it is high time the important issue of spatial planning, creation of jobs"* was given attention. This underscored the critical aspect of sustainability.

Another bluntly put it that *"there are policy gaps that still needs to be addressed"*. Policy is obviously an iterative process and can therefore be improved upon. However, with policy gaps already noted, network theory has already offered a way in which the gap between policy determination and administration's task can be closed via communication, the increased sharing of ideas and through collaborations. Kraak (2012: 360) believes policy gaps can be closed through the state become a "learning state" where IGR participants possesses "expert situated knowledge" regarding what happens out there. It is in this direction that IGR practises between the City and Province need to move.

4.3.2 Getting policy right

Respondents saw policy misalignment as requiring fine tuning and recalibration.

> *alignment of policy development by national department…you know what when national draft policies…I am not sure how far they consult. Situational analysis is key to address the needs of the poor. Policy development is still a challenge as there is no alignment of policies.*

In support of this another respondent said, *"there must be alignment of programs and align[ing] the policies to the needs of the poor"*. It was felt that "*policy creation is stagnant"* since it failed to address pressing concerns of those poverty-stricken. Again, here the critical aspect of building sustainable human settlements that are not only about constructing top structures but also facilitating livelihoods was emphasized. Interestingly, it is the alignment of policy and programs, as per what was observed regarding the evolution and maturation of IGR in other countries where

competitiveness and professionalism became key in its deepening. that was viewed as needed.

4.4. Fiscal Flows

4.4.1 Funding instruments

According to respondents not only were the plans of Province and municipalities misaligned, so were the related funding instruments associated with the implementation of housing development projects. As a result of the disjuncture between the province's own financial instrument, the Human Settlements Development Grant (HSDG) and that of the City, the Urban Settlement Development Grant (USDG), a challenge that often occurred was the building of houses without the installation of necessary bulk infrastructure such as water and sewer or roads and stormwater. One respondent stated it at length that,

> *we [province] have to go to City and you find that City did not place bulk infrastructure in their planning for that financial year - so for instance, the Malibongwe Ridge Project - allocation had to be procrastinated as there was no bulk infrastructure, as City had not placed that activity in their plans in that financial year.*

Where this happens and houses are built without bulk infrastructure, the City found it's back pitted against the wall. The inability to place bulk infrastructure in the City's plans, reflects the dual role of local government where it has to respond to both central (provincial) and its own local needs resulting in central-local tensions as per observations of the IGR literature discussed earlier.

Unable to provide bulk infrastructure, the City was forced to raise more funding from its coffers and to also *"embark on the proliferation of Division of Revenue Act (DoRA) for the effectiveness of service delivery".* This meant since the USDG is a conditional grant from national government intended to enhance local government's own spending on bulk infrastructure, the City had to rely on national government's budgeting process to ask for more funding. The situation was also exacerbated because *"bulk infrastructure is quite difficult more especially [since] the department [City's] is relying*

on entities [City Power/Joburg Water/JRA] to install them" further complicating the required IGR interactions by adding another layer.

To counteract this outcome, respondents from the City made an appeal for the provincial government to properly consult with it as it was responsible for the installation of bulk infrastructure albeit through its entities. Respondents felt that by working together instead of in silos this would save time when executing projects, money and that the delivery of outputs would be quicker. Another challenge pointed out by respondents was that there was a *"disjuncture between the financial years, as City concludes it in June and Province in Feb/March".* On its own, this made it very difficult for the Province to plan its activities alongside those of the City so as to achieve alignment through parallel planning. As a solution respondents proposed *that "there must be alignment of the Urban Settlement Development Grant [USDG] and Housing Settlement Development Grant [HSDG]".* A proposal that actually makes sense.

4.4.2 Funding increment

Another respondent saw available resources as inadequate, especially when viewed against the magnitude of the need for housing. To arrest this problem, the respondent stated that the *"subsidy quantum must be aligned to the inflations (sic) as it takes very long to increase"*. One respondent suggested that *"there must be correlation between HSDG and USDG"*. Since one funded the building of housing provision and the other was meant for bulk infrastructure, the latter could not trail the infrastructure required for the number of houses to be built. The two needed to be in sync. All these proposals are sensible except they are made in context of competing priorities in the whole system of government with limited resources resulting in some being sacrificed for others.

4.5. Spheres and functions

4.5.1 Autonomy

The need to recognise the autonomy of spheres was also underscored by respondents. "Wo*rking together does not mean there should be domineering powers"* said one respondent. Another put it thus, *"like the Constitution says as it has given*

spheres equal powers". One respondent conveyed at length the interaction he witnessed where the violation of autonomy was explicitly seen,

> *the example that I saw in Orange Farm site visit was that X (provincial official) acted as if Y (city official) reports to him, i.e. some community members went to Y to complain about service delivery whilst Y was still trying to listen to the community members - X said let us go - and I could see that Y did not know how to respond, I wish X could have given Y a chance to respond as I believe that the challenge was going to be addressed. (you see that this Big Brother approach must stop and understand that X has its power as per the legislative endorsed).*

The perspective of respondents from the City was that Province did not engage them as equals. There was *"big brother behaviour"* according to one respondent. Another said *"Province always acts as if City reports to it"*, furthermore *"Province does not engage with City but there is subordinate and super-ordinate kind of relations"*. It was felt that the autonomy of spheres must be respected, as stated in the Constitution. One respondent with considerable experience from the City made reference to the misuse of IGR structures that "o*ther spheres of government use the platform to dominate other spheres of government"* resulting in practices that undermine proper cooperative governance*.* These experiences tally with observations of the dual polity theory which recognises and gives prominence to the authority of the centre (province in this case) in its analysis on IGR. They clearly go against open, non-hierarchical and multi-lateral relations proposed by network and multi-level governance theories.

Attention was again drawn to the politicized nature of interactions with a respondent mentioning that *"politics cloud the issue and it is a challenge"*. The ever present problem of human involvement in IGR which calls for effective leadership and the ability to deal with the diversity of individuals participating in it is here in view once more. It is clear that this capacity requires development. There is *"power and functions contestation"* and this, according to another respondent *"causes adversarial relations".* An example was put forward that both the City and the Province have project managers facilitating the implementation of building houses with this eventually leading to contestation for relevance and space. To defuse the situation one respondent called for tolerance. Inappropriate or unclear function assignment challenges here loom large.

Respondents generally felt that having IGR structures would ameliorate problems and improve service delivery. IGR structures and forums were thus seen as necessary for improved governance. However, it was the nature of IGR structures that emerged which would determine whether an effective and healthy culture is built or not.

4.5.2 Dependency eradication

Other respondents surprisingly viewed the interdependence of government entities as a problem. To deal with this they proposed radical and far-reaching solutions that resonate with observations of power dependence theory which views all manoeuvrings by organs of state as intended for advantage and aimed at avoiding dependence. Especially manoeuvers resulting from constraints on the centre (province) with its limited coordinating capacity. Among others one respondent said, *"deal away with overlapping of functions"*. In another place another said *"empower municipalities and deal away with province as a spheres"*. In these respondent's view it is the very sharing of functions that created problems and to correct the situation, their intersecting nature must be removed. In display here is the yet-to-be-settled role of provinces alluded to in the earlier sections. The view still prevails in some quarters that provinces are unnecessary. This leads us to a discussion on accreditation as a possible solution.

4.5.3 Accreditation and function shift

Respondents also mentioned accreditation and shifting the full housing function to the City as preferable. One respondent indicated that *"accreditation (sic) function should be realised as it was going to reduce the turn-around of projects".* Another said, *"Accreditation [as initially introduced] was a good idea".* Still another said*, "I was going to be happy if functions are transferred to local government".* One respondent pulled no punches that *"radically there be a shift from the way the government functions local government is at the fore-front of service delivery".* Function assignment and its challenges are, as shall become evident later, a perennial problem in the human settlement space hence the call for full rather than partial accreditation as suggested.

A respondent from province asserted that within such a housing value chain *"ideally, provincial government be afforded more on (sic) monitoring and evaluation function".* In essence here the call being made is for the provincial sphere to play a supervisory role only with the local sphere becoming the implementing agent for housing projects. Under this scenario*, "local government becomes well-funded and capacitated with skills, then service delivery was going to be effective".* In the past, prior to passing IGFRA, there was no consistency in the performance of supervisory functions by both national and provincial government on local government. Monitoring was also fragmented. These seem to persist even currently.

A dissenting voice also found expression when it came to how functions are assigned. A respondent formerly with the City indicated that *"the policy framework is clear regarding the allocation"* of functions*.* For this respondent *"the challenge is in the implementation of the policy".* In particular, *"lack of capacity especially within local government affects housing delivery",* said this respondent*.* Again, this brings the monitoring role of provinces over local government and the need for ongoing training into view. It is clear that helping capacitate local government is aspired for but is not happening as it should.

4.5.4 Municipal capacity

In calling for accreditation and function shift, respondent harped at the need for capacity improvements. *"Municipalities should be capacitated with appropriate skills"* said one and *"functions of accreditation be completely transferred to city".* A respondent from Province expressed the view that the *"municipality have a responsibility, they must be capacitated and thereafter accreditation take place".* This augurs well with observations of the dual polity theory which regards devolution and increased local government autonomy as indicative of the changing nature of IGR. The respondent formerly with the City similarly said*, "local government's capacity should be augmented to enable them to fulfil their function as legislated and as provided for in the policies".* Capacity improvement as a critical component in any IGR system is a recurring topic in literature. The above findings corroborate this observation.

4.6. Ethos

4.6.1 Instilling professionalism

One of the respondents from City said, "*it is about time that professionals be appointed to improve service delivery".* Reference to the then Minister of Public Service and Administration, Senzo Mchunu's seriousness in advancing professionalism and dealing with laziness; incompetency and corruption was made. *"Nepotism should be dealt away with,"* said another respondent. Addressing cadre deployment was also mentioned as necessary. It was stated by respondents that professionalism would improve service delivery. In particular, *"placing professionals to do work for the realisation of the delivery of projects"* was suggested.

The call for professional ethos together with the need for local government capacity building is in line with the evolution of IGR as noted by Wright (1967) where the role of public administration became an important feature of policy implementation. It is similarly being noted as critical in city-province IGR activities.

4.7. Conclusion

This section discussed the different themes emergent from responses given by those interviewed as part of the study. It was shown in this section that officials from the two spheres of government, the City and the Province held a positive attitude on the importance of IGR within the housing sector. Some wide understanding of IGR existed, and respondents noted the crucial need for coordination especially the critical milestones or prerequisites existent in the housing delivery value chain such as land acquisition and the township establishment process. Limited information sharing and ineffective meetings that had no influence on decisions were also flagged by respondents. So was the absence of effective leadership to deal with what respondents considered the negative effects of politics on IGR structures.

There were also poor levels of interaction and communication among individuals involved including non-satisfactory workings of IGR structures especially meetings

with no strong decision-making feedback loop to higher structures. Only meetings or IGR structures attended by political executives enjoyed proper respect. There was therefore no open or non-hierarchical IGR culture present as is the case in IGR systems considered matured. Decision-making powers lacked and there was still a need for the development of a united front to deliver houses in order to derive benefits associated with IGR. In particular, non-aligned plans affected housing delivery strategy implementation. The gap between policy and implementation was also noted by respondents. This confirmed the need for effective IGR as noted under network theory.

The need for maturation of the IGR system was also notable, especially what appeared to be the main problem of engagement in IGR activities with no intention to influence decision-making, something which loomed large. IGR system maturation via the deepening of professionalism where programs are aligned to ensure the achievement of policy deliverables was also underlined by respondents. Inadequate funding of bulk infrastructure also confirmed the development of appropriate fiscal flows as a critical IGR issue. Concurrency or functions sharing was noted as another problem affecting City-Province IGR activities with respondents advocating for full accreditation of the City as a solution. The next section discusses select issues critical to turning the situation around in detail.

SECTION B: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This section corroborates the first section by discussing particular issues that the study considers central to building an effective IGR culture between the City and Province. A culture that is close to what network and multi-level governance theories advance as necessary for healthy IGR. These central issues are functions sharing and the challenges of concurrency, planning and integration, the critical importance of developing appropriate fiscal flows and accreditation as a practise in IGR.

4.8. Housing policy framework

Chapter 2, Section 26 of the 1996 Constitution entitles all citizens to satisfactory levels of housing. It states that, "*everyone has the right to have access to adequate housing"*. It also places on shoulders of the state the duty to make all efforts at progressively realizing this right. Housing is thus elevated to a socio-economic right that enjoys protection with no arbitrary evictions allowed. Emanating from these constitutional prescripts, applicable general principles intended to simplify sustainable development and the achievement of acceptable levels of housing were formulated to guide spheres of government (National Department of Housing, 1997). It is not just the mere provision of housing that is being called for but housing of a particular standard.

To give effect to housing obligations in the Constitution, the National Housing Act was passed in 1997. The Act is central to housing legislation in South Africa (Clark et al., 2016). It is a fundamental instrument to housing development in the country. In terms of general guidelines for housing development as stated in the Housing Act national, provincial and local spheres must give priority to the needs of the poor in respect of housing development. Helping the most fortunate is thus given primacy and the shared nature of housing as encapsulated in the Constitution is also continued with. The Act also calls for honest, true and sincere consultation with beneficiaries of housing. This is so that individuals will enjoy a broad option of choices where housing types and tenure are concerned. Responsiveness and relevance to needs of the poor as features of sustainability are thus underscored.

According to the Act, this will safeguard housing developments that are not only economic but also affordable and sustainable. The Act further calls for integrated development planning among the national, provincial and local spheres. Healthy and effective IGR where government operates as one to deliver housing connected to already existing settlements rather than isolated developments is here made significant. In addition, the achievement of *"effectiveness and efficiency of transparent, accountable and equitable"* administrative processes across the spheres for purposes of good governance is advocated for in the Act (National Department of Housing, 1997:

09). Thus each sphere's managerial and administrative process are expected to enhance rather than diminish efforts to deliver quality and viable housing. Wright's (1967) observation of how public administration became a central feature in the evolution of IGR here comes to mind. Lastly, the Act calls on spheres of government to be responsive in attending to housing needs.

From the foregoing, the multi-sphere nature of delivering housing is already apparent. A well-functioning IGR system is necessary for underpinning this. Subsequent to development of the National Housing Act was the National Housing Code. According to the Housing Act (1997: 13), the National Minister for Human Settlements had to establish a National Housing Code incorporating national housing development policies or programmes to govern the functioning of national, provincial and local spheres. Again, the multi-sphere nature of housing as a function is clear, making increased interaction via IGR very crucial. According to the National Department (1996: 11) the National Housing Code was developed as a set

> *[t]o underlying policy principles, guidelines and norms and standards which apply to government's various housing programmes introduced since 1994, and the purpose is to provide an easy understanding of various housing subsidy instruments available to assist in low-income households to access adequate housing.*

According to the National Department of Human Settlements, the National Housing Code was meant to create effective implementation and application of national housing policy. In addition, its specifications are binding on local and provincial spheres regarding the building of sustainable human settlements. As such housing developments cannot be implemented in ignorance of the National Housing Code. It is an instrument for simplifying the implementation of housing projects and providing clear guidelines (National Department Human Settlement, 1997). It has been revised and has contributed in the improvement of housing programmes in South Africa.

4.8.1 Breaking New Ground, National Outcomes and National Development Plan

In relation to policy governing housing delivery, however, there is also the Breaking New Ground (BNG) policy. It is also known as the “Comprehensive Plan” aimed at alleviating poverty and ensuring that property is accessed as an asset for wealth creation and empowerment (Umhlaba, 2004). BNG’s policy objective is to effectively advance the Comprehensive Plan to build integrated and sustainable development for the advancement of communities. The South African government had also adopted a result-based approach with twelve outcomes. Outcome 8 is another housing policy intervention with measurable human settlements outputs and targets.

It embraces human dignity and social stability where communities enjoy access to good health, access to municipal services (such as water, sanitation, waste or refuse removal and electricity); quality education and the achievement of social cohesion (National Department of Human Settlements, 2014). In addition, access to municipal social services and economic opportunities within reasonable proximity is an integral notion in Outcome 8 (NDoHS, 2015). Already vertical and horizontal dependencies are obvious in its aims since the array of services to be accessed by households reside with different spheres and departments.

There is a call to deliver human settlements in an inter-disciplinarily manner. Thus, National Outcome 8 promotes good planning with the expectation that it will ultimately become a facilitator of economic development and job creation (Joseph & Karuri-Sebina, 2014). Sustainable human settlements with spheres working in harmony to deliver housing to the most desperate of society is again in view here.

The National Development Plan (NDP) is another policy instrument introduced in 2012 and designed to chart a new development path for South Africa. The NDP aims to achieve its goals by the year 2030 and desires to eliminate poverty and to reduce inequality by the set time horizon. It is seen as a vehicle to produce a more equitable, just and vibrant set of human settlements (Joseph and Karuri-Sebina 2014). According

to Joseph and Karuri-Sebina (2014: 15) the NDP aims to learn from the past two decades by finding the necessary keys to unravel and fast track improvements typical to changing inner-city terrains. Once again it is lasting and sustainable development that is the desired policy goal.

Joseph and Karuri-Sebina (2014: 15) states that NDP further aims

> *[t]o understand the notion of access and how citizens experience and navigate the city on a daily basis, so that interventions in human settlements…can contribute towards spatial transformation that enables poor communities to develop "positive" economic and social investment.*

It is therefore among the aims of NDP to come to terms with the challenges and everyday lived experiences of those residing in cities so as to holistically address these (including housing) in a manner that alters where the disadvantaged live. The ultimate outcome being to assist the poor so that they on their own can contribute to create their very own improved living conditions. It is in this way it is hoped by policy makers those sustainable human settlements would obtain.

Additionally, NDP's objective is to afford municipalities the ability to resource growth in their regions, in particular by including and expanding disadvantaged areas as part of the city's general tax base and lastly, to make *"spatial planning and budgeting"* a reality through better governance and efficient institutions where *"distributional equity"* is addressed and a sensible approach to investments followed *(*Joseph and Karuri-Sebina, 2014: 15). The building of viable and sustainable human settlements is once again clearly the overarching and desired policy goal but tied to it is the need to revise interactions between organs of the state in their exercise of legally assigned powers. Sustainability and effective IGR are here viewed together.

The human settlements policy framework clearly considers improved and effective IGR where each of the three spheres play both their specifically assigned and joint functions in the overall process to deliver housing, imperative and integral.

Even with a promising governing framework and good policies in place, the implementation of housing projects has not been without problems. Gaps between policy intentions, policy articulation and practice have been experienced (Charlton and Kihato, 2006). Charlton (2009) argues that there is a need for a fundamental rethink of elements in the housing policy and practices. Respondents interviewed as part of this study voiced similar concerns around policy, especially the mismatch they saw between policy implementation and the needs of the poor. In essence, the critically important nature of sustainability was underscored, and effective IGR considered necessary to turning the tide.

4.9. Function Distribution and Housing Delivery Implementation

The Constitution recognizes housing as a concurrent function and so do housing policies, as already noted above. It similarly identifies the interdependent nature of the different spheres of government in the delivery any housing development. The National Housing Act spells out the distribution of functions between national and provincial government as already seen but it also places local government squarely within the whole scheme to deliver housing. This distribution of the function among the spheres of government is discussed below to further illustrate its interdependent nature, challenges surrounding this and the acute importance of IGR in negotiating them.

4.9.1 National Functions

Through the Minister, the National Department of Human Settlement has roles and responsibilities to perform. These include the setting up of a sustainable national housing development process; national policy determination together with national norms and standards for housing developments; overarching goals for national housing delivery and simplifying determination of the same for provincial and local government where applicable. Moreover, the national sphere has the responsibility to ensure performance monitoring including those of provincial and local governments. This must be done against the set housing delivery and budgetary goals. (Housing Act 1997).

In addition, the national sphere is expected to help provinces better their administrative capacity which is necessary for the real use of their power and for performing their housing development duties. The national sphere also has the responsibility to assist improve the capacity of municipalities in managing their affairs, using their assigned housing development powers and duties and lastly to encourage consultation on housing development matters between the national government and other representatives. Administration as a key IGR feature is in view here.

Table 4: Function Distribution Across Spheres

SPHERES / FUNCTIONS	NATIONAL	PROVINCE	LOCAL
Sustainable housing development process	✓		
Policy development	✓	✓	
Norms & standards	✓		
Capacity development	✓	✓	
Housing development	✓	✓	✓ (accreditation)
Performance monitoring	✓		
Multi-year housing plans		✓	
Land assembly	✓ (HDA)		✓
Bulk infrastructure (installation)			✓
Bulk installation (funding)		✓	
Coordination & intervention		✓	
Progressive access to housing			✓
Housing delivery goals	✓		✓
Conducive public environment for housing			✓
Housing development enablement			✓

Source: Developed by author from the Housing Act

4.9.2 Provincial Functions

The provincial government, guided by the Member of the Executive Council (MEC), is responsible for promoting the smooth provision of adequate housing within the

province in accordance with the national housing policy framework. It must safeguard and decide on housing development policy that is province-specific including the promotion of legislation necessary for housing delivery that works. The provincial sphere is also expected to do all it rationally can to offer support and improve the capability of municipalities to execute their housing development powers and responsibilities smoothly. More importantly, the provincial sphere must also *"coordinate housing development in the province"* (National Housing Act 1997).


The provincial sphere is further expected to assist municipalities when they cannot carry out duties placed on them by the Act, to intervene as per Section 139 of the Constitution. In the context of municipal coalition governments, this requirement has heightened IGR as a governance issue than can be exploited by politicians. The intervention of Gauteng Province (run by the ANC), to purportedly restore order in the City of Tshwane (run by the Democratic Alliance (DA)) due to a non-functioning Council witnessed the courts of law reversing this decision. Provinces are also to develop and have multi-year plans for implementing their own housing programme and that of national. Lastly, the executive authority or MEC must, in implementing all programmes whether provincial or national, adhere to the National Housing Code. All housing projects are thus subject to the Code (National Housing Act 1997).

The local sphere is responsible, through the IDP, for ensuring it citizens access adequate housing on an increasing basis. Municipalities are also responsible for determining housing goals in their areas, identifying and putting land aside for this purpose and to generally produce a conducive public housing environment (National Housing Act 1997). Further to these local governments must deal with conflict issues arising from the process to develop housing and initiate, coordinate and facilitate plans for housing development in their areas. They are responsible for bulk infrastructure as already alluded to and land use management.

From the foregoing distribution of functions, the interdependent nature of spheres and the need for effective IGR among them in is already in view. Drawing from what one

of the respondents said in the previous section, *"planning [of housing developments] goes beyond operations of the individual departments"*. Kraak says this is so because of the "irreducibility of many social phenomena to the mono-departmental activities of single government departments" (20011: 344). Table 2 illustrates areas of commonality among spheres of government in relation to housing functions and roles. The implementation of housing development is clearly a function that runs across the three spheres, especially where accreditation was granted. Effective IGR is necessary for spheres to carry out the housing function successfully. Housing policy development and capacity development responsibilities, as can be seen in the table, also lends themselves to the adoption of a common approach among spheres via IGR. National and local government can also coordinate activities among themselves in relation to the packaging of land for housing developments since they are both involved in it. IGR is a tool that can be utilised for all these purposes.

Figure 4: Flowchart of Housing Development Process




Source: Tissington 2021

While other responsibilities and functions are assigned exclusively to specific spheres, they are also transversal in nature and run across all spheres. Among them is performance monitoring and the setting of norms and standards, a national function but which the provincial and local spheres must adhere to. All these make effective IGR and the coordination of efforts among spheres crucial. Having outlined the functions and roles of the different spheres and where they intersect and overlap in

the housing delivery process, it is still necessary to show their interplay in an actual housing delivery project, especially the interplay between the provincial and local spheres which is the focus of this study. Before discussing this using Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development as a case in point, elements of a typical housing development projects are briefly listed.

Figure 5: Township Establishment Process



Source: Tissington 2021

A typical housing development projects is made up of the following: an approved budget; a set number of houses to be built; the sourcing or acquisition of land; an approved beneficiary list; the appointment of a professional resource team (PRTs) to construct houses and lastly the allocation of houses to beneficiaries. As part of acquiring and preparing land there is the township establishment/proclamation process and the installation of bulk infrastructure. The process flow including the

estimated time it takes for the construction of houses to be completed is as reflected above in Figure 4.

In this process both the provincial and local spheres of government rely on each other for certain process to be completed – making healthy and effective IGR imperative. The level of complexity in planning housing developments is compounded by the fact that the township establishment process is a prerequisite for the other activities further down the housing delivery value chain but on its own it can be onerous and lengthy. Since this is a municipal responsibility, this makes the coordination of activities and alignment of roles and responsibilities between the provincial and local spheres crucial as part of a healthy IGR culture. Adding to this complexity is planning for bulk services in any housing development project. This is also a municipal responsibility and a prerequisite for other housing delivery processes down the value chain.

Again, the coordination of activities and knowledge of what is in the pipeline becomes fundamental for the City in order to always prepare plans and matching resources where necessary. Getting past the township establishment process on its own can presents major problems let alone other processes following it. A typical township establishment process is as reflected in figure 5 above. As can be observed, the process is elaborate and requires completion before significant progress in any housing project can be made on other activities further down the delivery value chain. Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development is discussed next to illustrate how some of the issues just discussed play themselves out and how effective IGR can make a difference in speeding up the delivery of housing.

4.10 Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development

Located in an area formerly known as Doornkop, Lufhereng is a Venda word meaning a place of new beginnings. The project was first started in 2008 by the Gauteng Provincial Government and CoJ. Its aim was to address housing backlogs in the area and to build up to 18 extensions in the area by the time it reaches completion

(Infrastructure News 2015). Those targeted to benefit from it were applicants from the 1996/7 housing waiting list or demand database, especially individuals from the greater Soweto and the nearby Protea informal settlement (South African Government Website, 2010). Formally launched as a mega development in August 2010, it had 907 houses already built at the time.

It has been visited by different human settlements ministers and mayors over time, often issuing out title deeds to beneficiaries. Interestingly, six houses were given to women in honour of women's month during its launch in August 2010. Situated on the west of Soweto, it is viewed as its natural extension and an integrated development. Sustainability as per BNG prescripts is considered a big part of Lufhereng and is always harped on whenever progress on it is publicly reported. By virtue of its location the belief by planners was that it would provide easy access to economic opportunities for those living in it. Planned to boast more than 15 schools and 60 community facilities in the end, Lufhereng was viewed as going to provide access to crèches, parks, churches, etc., for the poor.

Sustainability was also targeted via agriculture since the area was formerly occupied by small hold farmers. In particular, small scale farmer development via hydroponics, fish breeding and black economic empowerment that will integrate the poor in the agri-business value chain were targeted in its development (Nkomfe, 2010). In the end a viable community with access to housing, infrastructure and economic opportunities would eventually exist.

The creation of jobs during its development is also an achievement touted by government as a feather in the cap of Lufhereng as a project. In terms of output, 24 000 housing opportunities of mixed income and mixed typologies were targeted as deliverables of the project. Low income and middle to high income households thus stood to benefit from it. The housing opportunities to be delivered are made up of 12 000 fully subsidized free-standing houses (colloquially known as RDPs'), 6 000 rental units and 600 bonded units. The Gauteng Human Settlement Department reported in

its 2012/13 annual report that 1 832 houses were already built. In 2015 beyond 1 800 families were already living in Lufhureng (Infrastructure News 2015).

In early 2022, the reported figure for completed houses was 3 412 (Public Works and Infrastructure Budget Vote 22). Among performance expected from the project was that it would deliver 1 000 houses per annum but the numbers to date clearly show below par performance. The project has not been without problems and challenges. Among those plaguing it in its earlier stages being the violence that erupted over who was supposed to benefit from it by a group purportedly residing nearby. Contractors at some point initially had water and electricity access challenges and the project suffered unnecessary delays.

Providing resources to install bulk services represents a persisting IGR challenge for Lufhereng. In his 2011 budget vote speech, the then Minister of Human Settlements, Tokyo Sexwale listed Lufhereng as among projects whose implementation could be negatively affected due to constrained funding. He, in the same breath welcomed the introduction of the Urban Settlement Development Grant (USDG) as timely considering this challenge. Even though this was the case, CoJ still had to later on match this with its own funding as part of its responsibilities in Lufhereng project. The then project manager of Lufhereng for CoJ, mentioned in 2015 that the City had set aside R690 million as part of its capital expenditure leading up to 2017 (Infrastructure News 2015).


Yet in 2022, even after the project was subsumed under national Strategic Infrastructure Projects (SIPs) and targeted to be fast tracked, the requirement for bulk infrastructure funding solution persisted (Public Works and Infrastructure Budget Vote 22). Funding as alluded to earlier is an important aspect of IGR. In its 2018/19 annual report, CoJ reported it could not achieve the number of houses it had intended to build for that year in Lufhereng due to a reduction by province of the HSD grant. Clearly at issue here was the problem of concurrency and function assignment with the separation made between funding and the responsibility to construct houses. In its

plans to counter this from occurring in future, CoJ stated that it would “strengthen relations with National and Province to ensure transparency facilitation and allocation of the grants” (CoJ, 2019: 285). Again, this points to ineffective IGR and non-supportive fiscal flows.

Another IGR challenge facing Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development was the manner it was conceived. Seen from the vantage point of the City rather than Gauteng as a province, Charlton (2017) maintains Lufhereng is located at the periphery and on the municipal border of CoJ and West Rand municipalities. Although CoJ is now implementing the project after being accredited to implement housing projects in 2009 and doing this project via a private company, the Lufhereng Development Company, the City initially considered the project out of kilter with its main transport nodes where it hoped to implement new developments. Charlton (2017) concludes that the project was therefore more in line with the ambitions of provincial planners rather than those of the City. Where effective and healthy IGR was the norm joint priority setting would have been achieved instead of divergent planning views.

A further study, *Living the Urban Periphery* project, corroborates Charlton’s analysis by noting that according to residents in Lufhereng and surrounding areas “employment opportunities are perceived to be far away and the cost of transport prohibitive” (Living the Urban Periphery, 2022). It is clear from the foregoing that ineffective IGR is at issue in the form already discussed earlier, especially lack of a shared vision and the contested role of the provincial sphere. Again, at issue is the absence of ‘locally articulated preferences’ as captured in the IDP of municipalities which provincial planners did not consider.

Figure 6: The Intervening Nature of IGR



In the previous section where the presentation of research results was made, hints on the issues presented above were mentioned by respondents. There was mentioning of the need for provincial and municipal departments to keep each other in the loop and plan together especially in relation to the township establishment process which is a critical prerequisite for other processes further down the housing delivery value chain. The critical role of the City when it came to the issue of land was underscored by respondents lending credence to its impact on the pace of housing delivery. The above diagram, Figure 6, captures provincial-local housing functions and attempts to illustrate how IGR interventions can be a variable to enhance housing delivery planning.

4.11 Resuscitating Cooperation

In the previous chapter, respondents harped again and again in frustration, on what the Constitution prescribed regarding cooperative governance and its non-realization. In their view this important aspect of IGR enshrined in the Constitution had not become a norm or an integral part of housing-related IGR practices. Chapter 3 of the Constitution enjoins all spheres of government and organs of state within them to adhere to cooperative governance and its principles. The principles include the preservation of peace and keeping the country united

Spheres of government are further called upon to ensure the country's citizen are safe and to govern well in an "effective, transparent, accountable and coherent" manner (Constitution 1991). Moreover, spheres are expected to show fidelity to the Constitution including the country and its citizens. Beyond this, spheres are enjoined to treat "institutions, powers and functions of government in the other sphere" with respect. These must never be violated in any manner and their dignity must always be protected and never undermined. There must always be co-operation borne out of trust and goodwill when spheres of government interact with one another. There must be "assisting", "supporting", "informing" and "consulting" of one sphere with another.

Although endorsed in the Constitution, cooperative governance and its associated norms and values still eludes actors in the human settlement space as shown by responses from those interviewed. According to Agranoff and Maguire (2003: 4 cited in Voets 2005) there is a difference between collaboration and cooperation. The former is “more open” than the latter because with collaboration “those working jointly seek to be more helpful than hostile”. When the two are viewed on a scale, collaboration is therefore a more advanced way of interacting than cooperation. Agranoff and Maguire (2003: 4) define collaboration “as a purposive relationship designed to solve a problem by creating or discovering a solution within a given set of constraints”. Collaboration takes an attitude of preparedness to assist further by jointly undertaking action with others to solve a problem.

This ethic of helpfulness and being solution-oriented is yet to be an entrenched part of IGR culture in South Africa judging by responses given by those interviewed. Foundational as it is to the democratic dispensation, it requires reviving and reigniting. It is yet to become common practice as shown by what respondents have said in the previous chapter where adequately consulting with each other and the basic sharing of relevant information among officials are still challenges that continue to affect the interaction between the Province and the City in their delivery of housing developments. The prevailing IGR culture between the two spheres is therefore nowhere near that proposed by network and multi-level governance theory such as the multiplicity of non-hierarchical relations and the need by officials to venture beyond their institutional confines.

The difficulty of aligning housing delivery plans including the perennial challenge of integration together with funding and accreditation as aspects of provincial-local IGR practices are discussed next.

4.12 Improved Planning Through IGR

Respondents in the previous chapter mentioned how there was little appreciation for the IDP in the planning of housing projects. However, the National Housing Code regards the IDP as an important part contributing to the Comprehensive Plan (BNG) to achieve sustainable human settlements. According to the Code, municipalities are best placed to play a leading role in achieving inclusive strategic planning, such as "negotiating the location of housing provision to facilitate spatial restructuring and building linkages between housing delivery; spatial planning and transportation systems" (National Housing Code, 2009: 8).

Essentially, through the IDP it should be possible to coordinate, promote and enable appropriate housing development since the guidelines regarding the planning of housing are part of its objectives. The approach set out in the National Housing Code (2009) on the IDP is to give backing to the planning of housing as part of the IDP*;* to determine the extent of how far the planning of housing in the IDP is when viewed against the Housing Act and Housing policies and to set out and clarify roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, especially those important in the achievement of integration*.*

More importantly, the National Housing Code aims *"to guide vertical and horizontal sector alignment"* and to configure institutions for the realization of *"demand-defined and supply negotiated approach to housing provision"* and lastly *"to ensure that the housing planning activities which occur as part of the IDP are able to draw on existing housing related documentation and data resources"* (National Housing 2009: 64)*.* Thus, the critical nature of the IDP in the delivery of housing cannot be overstated.

Writing on it Rogerson (2006: 5) describes the IDP as a

> *participatory approach to integrate economic; sectoral; spatial; social; institutional; environmental and fiscal strategies in order to support the optimal allocation of scares resources between sectors and geographical areas and*

across the population in a manner that provides sustainable growth, equity and the empowerment of the poor and the marginalized.

Layman (2003:22) underlines the "the vital contribution of locally articulated preferences" through the IDP and maintains that "the participation of local government in national and provincial IGR forums and processes should therefore, where appropriate, be institutionalized". The participation of local government in IGR forums can therefore not be treated as an afterthought but as a priority.

To improve planning between the Province and CoJ for better housing delivery, it is necessary that their plans speak to each other. As already indicated by respondents in the previous section, the non-alignment of the Province's annual performance plan must be a thing of the past. Planning by province must always resonate with the City's IDP especially its section on housing and related activities. For this to happen, what is required is to follow an approach that supports "the successful undertaking of joint work" (Malan 2012: 118). According to Malan under such an approach to planning, IGR task teams need to operate with clear mandates, IGR programmes and projects have to be mapped against budgets and the fixation with working or reporting along individual departmental lines discouraged so that a culture of joint work is fostered.

4.13 Mainstreaming Integration

While the IDP underlines integration in local government processes and the National Housing Codes recognizes its contribution and relevance to housing developments, the integration of efforts by the different spheres has yet to become common practice. Respondents in the previous chapter mentioned integration in the form of fused processes as critical to the delivery of housing. Malan (2009: 1138) defines integration as a "process of bringing together different policies and ideas to ensure the achievement of shared objective". It is about everyone contributing their part to a bigger picture. Therefore, integrated service delivery is stimulated by the mechanism and modalities for delivering services, in this instance housing.

Gray (2002) explains that there is vertical and horizontal integration. Vertical integration refers to relations between central and local government, including NGOs and communities. Horizontal integration on the other hand refers to integration across government departments with no “hierarchical control over each other” (Kraak 2011: 344). Gray (2002) further maintains that integration is all about better policy formulation, meeting the needs of the poor and improved coordination of government performance. Charlton (2003) emphasizes integration as a concept that provides an enduring and effective basis for action rather than abstract reasoning which is unachievable. Thus with the mainstreaming of integration and its full crystallization into a daily IGR practice in housing processes delivery could be enhanced.

For integration to be mainstreamed requires a different type of public official, what Kraak (2012: 360) calls “boundary spanners” who are able to “work across silos and bring diverse teams together to solve cross-sectional problems”. The basis for all actions taken would be collective decision-making where boundary spanners deal with “informational asymmetries” and “facilitate goal adjustment” (Kraak 2012: 362). Further to this, these new type of officials will possess a keen sense of appreciation for interdependencies and a simplifying management style that builds trust. It under these circumstances that comprehensive whole-of-government plans will emerge.

4.13.1 District Development Model and One Plans

Noting the challenging and perennial nature of the difficulty posed by integration, government has since made an effort to innovate around it. President Cyril Ramaphosa, in his 2019 State of the Nation Address (SONA), introduced the District Development Model (DDM). DDM is designed for cooperative governance. This model was introduced to address the challenge of working in silos. As a result, the model aims to instil a new integrated district-based approach. As an approach, DDM advocates one district, one plan and one budget. It intends to “accelerate, align and integrate service delivery under a single development plan per district or metro that is developed jointly by national, provincial and local government, as well as business, labour and community in each district” (Presidency Research Unit, 2020: 2).

According to the Presidency Research Unit (2020: 2) DDM aims to, among others, deliver the following objectives to "s*olve the Silos at the horizontal and vertical level"; "maximize impact and align plans and available resources" and "to narrow the distance between people and government by strengthening the coordination role and capacities at the District and City levels".*

In explaining DDM, the Presidency (2020: 3) further states that,

> *the DDM will be implemented through a collaborative process to develop One Plan for all the 44 districts and 8 Metropolitan Municipalities which will be further synchronized with IDPs of these municipalities*

In addition, DDM is also seen as an integrated intervention to align spending across the three spheres of government. In a nutshell, DDM is an instrument that drives cooperative governance. It is in this regard DDM is a vehicle to accelerate integrated human settlements through promotion of IGR that reinforces interdependence and interrelations among spheres for the harmonious planning and implementation of policies to strengthen service delivery. A One Plan for CoJ already exists. It contains short and long term IGR programmes and projects that the national and provincial spheres intend carrying out in CoJ together with their budgets.

While the development of CoJ's One Plan signals positive developments in terms of whole-of-government planning, it also notes areas of concern requiring immediate attention. The relationship between the City and the Province is mentioned as a challenge requiring "policy and regulatory alignment" in order to lay down "a clear policy environment" (CoJ Metro One Plan 2020: 68). It is further noted in the One Plan that in terms of concurrent areas of responsibility, "role clarity", incomplete norms and standards meant to support local government and untimely budget allocations are issues of concern. As can be observed, challenges with functions distribution are still a sore point.

Of more critical concern for the City is “the unilateral changing of plans by provincial government” which work against the City’s plan and “which sometimes come in the middle of a planning cycle” (CoJ Metro One Plan 2020: 68). Clearly even as the IGR system attempts to develop and grow, centralizing challenges still persist. To address these, the One Plan calls for “a clear, consulted coordinated planning process” and “working together to…proactively define, learn and plan”. It also underlines “joint ownership” and straight and simple communication. The One Plan is the first of its kind to be developed as part of IGR practises. Its impact is yet to be felt or seen but there is at least deliberate and conscious effort to mainstream integration. The funding of housing is discussed next.

4.14 Funding of housing developments

Funding of housing was emphasized by respondents interviewed and was seen as critical to the improved delivery of housing. Improving IGR processes must go along with improvements in the distribution and allocation of the associated fiscal flows. According to Tshangana (2014) in the 2011/12 financial year, the budget introduced the new Urban Settlement Development Grant (USDG). However, the HSDG was negatively impacted by this for a number of reasons, i.e. by a number of diverse sectoral infrastructure grants intended to contribute to the delivery of sustainable and liveable human settlement, such as the Integrated National Electrification Programme, the Neighbourhoods Development Partnership Grant and the Regional Bulk Infrastructure Grant. The segmented nature of these infrastructure grants affect housing delivery. There is thus a need for aligning the implementation of infrastructure grants (Tshangana, 2014).

The USDG is the funding allocated to metropolitan municipalities to service land for the poor (Tshangana, 2014). USDG is created for the enhancement and support of the revenues of metropolitan municipalities for housing development programme meant for poor households (Emendo Project Managers and Planners, 2010). It is viewed as an “integrated source of funding for infrastructure for municipal services and upgrades to urban informal settlements” (Emendo Project Managers and Planners, 2010: 38). This means that, this funding is seen as a supplementary grant to cities to

be utilized in combination with own-revenues for the development of urban infrastructure and integrated human settlements. Moreover, USGD permitted for financing of components of human settlements projects which were not able to be funded, via the HSDG grant (Tshangana, 2014).

Table 5: Historical Delivery of Housing Opportunities funded from the Human Settlement Development Grant (HSDG)

YEAR	SERVICED SITES COMPLETED	HOUSES/UNITS BUILT	TOTAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES
1994/95	-	60 820	60 820
1995/96	-	74 409	74 409
1996/97	-	129 193	129 193
1997/98	-	209 000	209 000
1998/99	12 756	235 635	248 391
1999/2000	-	161 572	161 572
2000/01	19 711	170 932	190 643
2001/02	-	143 281	143 281
2002/03	82 286	131 784	214 070
2003/04	42 842	150 773	193 615
2004/05	87 284	148 253	235 537
2005/06	109 666	134 023	243 689
2006/07	117 845	153 374	271 219
2007/08	82 298	146 465	228 763
2008/09	68 469	160 403	228 872
2009/10	64 362	161 854	226 216
2010/11	63 546	121 879	185 425
2011/12	58 587	120 610	179 197
2012/13	45 698	115 079	160 777
2013/14	48 193	105 936	154 129
2014/15	49 345	94 566	143 911
2015/16	52 349	99 904	152 253
2016/17	56 886	89 186	146 072
2017/18	50 309	86 006	136 315
2018/19 (Apr to Dec 2018)	28 827	58 394	87 221
TOTAL Sites & Houses	**1 141 259**	**3 263 331**	**4 404 590**
1994 to 2018	EEDBS*		369 330
Total Housing Opportunities (Serviced Sites, Houses/ Units & EEDBS)			**4 773 920**

Source: https://africacheck.org/sites/default/files/Housing-delivery-1994-to-2018.pdf

According to Sokopo (2015) research on housing acknowledges that USDG funding should focus more on bulk infrastructure, rather than other milestones such as roads, street lighting and social facilities, as it causes constraints. USGD funding should, consequently, be linked more with its intended objective, which is about the implementation of bulk infrastructure, to provide "engineering infrastructure to support housing delivery and provision of basic services in unserved areas" (Sokopo 2015: 67). Thus, the study conducted by Sokopo (2015: 67) called *Design and Implementation Evaluation of the USDG* concludes that the "USDG grant was availed for infrastructure so that houses could be built and…would rather see the money spent on infrastructure".

4.15 Accreditation: what accreditation?

In the previous chapter, respondents also called for the City to be capacitated and for the function of housing delivery to be shifted from province once this was achieved. In a study she conducted with housing and planning officials from Gauteng province and the CoJ in 2011, Charlton (2014: 181) argues that

> *for a number of years Gauteng's provincial government took the lead in implementing housing projects within Joburg's municipal area, while City has since grown in capacity and has had a dedicated housing department for some years, the province's grip on the purse strings of housing subsidy money - the key funding mechanism - has tended to shape developments.*

As a result, "they who own the money…can…sway development in line with their priorities". While accreditation is an option availed by legislation as part of South Africa's IGR toolkit, there is still reluctance to fully utilise it.

Although it was much talked about, accreditation is yet to become a common IGR practise. The National Housing Code (2009) explains accreditation of municipalities as intended to stimulate cooperative governance to address constraints in the housing delivery process. Accreditation developed as a logical outcome from the call inherent in legislation to capacitate local government for addressing current constraints in the housing delivery processes. As a result, accreditation of municipalities seeks to achieve two interlinked objectives, firstly the move towards coordinated development

for horizontal integration which places municipalities as ideally situated for the effective alignment of interdepartmental and IGR funding streams. Secondly, accreditation for vertical integration.

Vertical integration is for efficiencies related to creating certainty regarding funding allocation to accelerate delivery and ameliorate expenditure patterns (National Code, 2009). Moreover, improved expenditure patterns will result in the reduced requirement to rollover unspent funding as well as a more coordinated approach to planning approval and implementation. Accreditation of municipalities is driven by the principle that funding follows functions. According to the National Housing Code (2009:15) "systems efficiency is an important principle that must be pursued so that municipalities receive funding consistent with their delivery performance and success".

More importantly, accreditation will enhance cooperative government through encouraging cooperation among spheres. Accreditation does not happen in one fell swoop but has levels (1, 2 & 3) and happens on an increasing basis. Level one (L1) occurs in a municipality with budget and planning capability together with being able to undertake priority programme management (Koopa, 2016). The latter may entail the gamut of competencies such as being able to approve and monitor programmes and projects, to administer contracts, do registrations for subsidy and manage cash flows as part of programme management. In addition, it may entail being able to undertake technical quality assurance of construction. Level two (L2) accreditation happens when all these exist on a definite basis in a municipality.

Level three (L3) happens when the full function is moved to a municipality. To date no full accreditation of any municipality has happened, only partial accreditation. As a form of devolving power from provinces to address possible constraints (Koopa, 2016), it is not being fully taken advantage of. Again, this reflects the reluctance to embrace effective and healthy aspects of IGR. Thus, as part of South Africa's IGR culture, accreditation is yet to be fully experienced or to take place.

4.16 Conclusion

This section began with a discussion of the housing policy framework which included the Constitution, the Housing Act, the Housing Code, BNG, National Housing Outcomes and the NDP. The overarching policy goal and desire inherent in the housing framework to build sustainable human settlements that are integrated to existing ones and the critical role of IGR underpinning this were noted. The distribution of housing as a function shared among the three spheres was discussed and their interdependent nature shown. The pivotal role of IGR in creating conditions where each sphere was able to carry out its responsibilities was underlined. Navigating the intricate township establishment process was noted as a critical step in any housing delivery project.

A typical housing development in the form of Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development was discussed to illustrate challenge surrounding function assignment occurs and the mediating nature of IGR in this. Inadequate funding of bulk infrastructure was shown to be a persisting IGR challenge arising from inappropriate functions assignment. The initial conception of Lufhereng project by the provincial sphere which City found to be at odds with its future plans to build along major transport nodes was mentioned as a typical issue reflecting ineffective IGR practises. Cooperative together together with better planning and integration were discussed next as critical issues requiring attention if a healthy IGR culture is to be created.

Cooperative governance and its associated values and norms still require improvement as it is not yet a common IGR practise. More scope to also improve planning and integration through joint work and collective decision making was also discussed and called for. The existence of a One Plan for the CoJ, the first of its kind, was discussed as a positive IGR development especially the alignment of plans it attempts to achieve between the City and Province. This notwithstanding, the persisting challenges of unclear roles and unilateral decisions by Province were noted to show that the IGR system is still a work in progress.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study set out to determine ways in which the interaction and collaboration between the local and provincial spheres could be leveraged on to maximise their specific contributions and lead to improved housing delivery. It further sought to identify blockages affecting effective IGR, be they legal, political, technical or operational in nature including specific aspects in the interaction between spheres that are difficult to resolve. Mechanism that could be introduced to do away with fragmentation also formed part of the study. The knowledge gaps the research aimed to address was responding to the lack of more in-depth analysis on actual IGR process and to suggest additional ways of improving IGR practises between the City and Province for the improved delivery of sustainable settlements.

The first chapter noted the commitment by the new democratic government to provide housing to all those in need. It noted the economically unique position of Gauteng province, the increasing demand for housing it contends with and the slow pace of housing delivery experienced. Challenges affecting housing delivery mechanisms including IGR were mentioned. The building of new human settlements such as Lufhereng township, away from centres of economic opportunity with compromised sustainability was discussed as among problems that still affect housing delivery. Effective IGR was identified as a possible solution for improving the delivery of housing even in reprioritizing Lufhereng as a SIP project for improved delivery. Thus, the acute importance of effective IGR was of central focus.

Theories of IGR and their explanatory powers were deliberated next as part of the study. Network and multi-level governance theories were jointly found to best approximate how a healthy and effective IGR culture could be attained via constant interaction among spheres of government underpinned by continuous communication, collaboration, negotiation and bargaining. IGR was shown to not just be a bilateral affair but to include a multiplicity of actors. The empirical section showed that IGR has grown to become more fluid and open in matured multi-level governments, not observing hierarchies but being innovative instead. Discussions on the South African context indicated that earlier on in the system, there were lack of clear roles,

inconsistent participation by local government in IGR forums and imprecise definition of functions.

In the housing sector, IGR was shown to suffer from poor inclusiveness of relevant role players, concurrency challenges and the need to have a widely understood notion of sustainable human settlements. Sustainable human settlements were understood as entailing multi-disciplinary participation and to benefit from the contribution of all relevant stakeholders. As part of the conceptual framework the study employs, IGR was viewed as an operational platform and together with its related concepts of coordination, cooperation and collaboration was considered necessary for achieving sustainable human settlements within a multi-layered government. Part of such a healthy IGR culture involves frequent interaction, continuous communication and inclusiveness where teamwork, harmonious execution, supportiveness and joint work are some of the normal practises.

A qualitative approach to understand the subjective views of individuals involved in IGR activities between City and Province to deliver housing was adopted in the study. A research design and data collection methods entailing interviews with housing project managers, observation to assess the culture and effectiveness of City-Province IGR meetings and reviewing of documents were utilized. The collected data was eventually analysed employing thematic content analysis with similar responses grouped together and recurring patterns noted.

Interviews findings and themes emerging from them receive attention after this. Themes included the value placed on IGR, the effectiveness of IGR meetings, concerns around planning, policy gaps and function shift together with the associated fiscal flows. A general understanding and appreciation of IGR existed among respondents and the crucial need for coordination was noted. Land acquisition and the township establishment processes were mentioned as important prerequisites in the housing delivery value chain. The negative influence of politics, poor project

information flows and meetings with no decision-making impact were mentioned. Policy gaps and non-aligned plans also formed part of discussions.

The need for maturity of the system through the deepening of professionalism where programs are aligned to ensure the achievement of housing policy deliverables was also underlined by respondents. Inadequate funding of bulk infrastructure also confirmed the development of appropriate fiscal flows as a critical IGR issue. Concurrency or functions sharing was noted as another problem affecting City-Province IGR efforts with respondents advocating for full accreditation of the City as a solution. The next section was a further development of the themes and what the study considered central issues requiring focused attention.

The section discussed the policy framework governing housing delivery and functions assignment. The overarching policy goal and desire inherent in the housing framework to build sustainable human settlements was noted. The interdependent nature of spheres in housing delivery and the critical role of IGR in ensuring their success at carrying out their responsibilities were illustrated. Lufhereng Mixed Housing Development was discussed as a typical case reflecting challenges surrounding improper function assignment as a persisting IGR challenge. Improving planning and integration through joint work and collective decision making also formed part of the discussions.

The findings of this study as per the main and secondary research questions indicates a developing but yet-to-mature IGR culture between City and Province. While efforts to deliver housing in unison through aligned plans, particular challenges that work against the development of an effective IGR culture persists. These are political, legal, technical and operational in nature such as unclear roles result from shared functions, unilateral decisions and a poor perception held on IGR meetings. Accreditation as a useful IGR option is not being fully exploited and the effectiveness of fiscal flows is undercut by split functions. Thus, features such as negotiation, bargaining,

communicative, collaborative and cooperative skills generally found in developed IGR systems have not yet fully formed.

Further research to assess the capacity of municipalities for accreditation and the full devolvement of the housing function, especially to cities can contribute more to understanding IGR. In the final analysis South Africa's democratic institutions are fairly new and have been in existence for under thirty years. Accordingly, so is the evolution of its IGR culture. Norms and values applicable in a multi-level government are exercised and adhered to on an inconsistently and on an irregular basis. How everything evolves in the near future, remains to be seen. IGR will thus continue to remain a relevant area of study.

5.1. Recommendations

To push IGR efforts between City and Province in the direction that will see an effective IGR culture being nurtured, the following are recommended:

- Support opportunities for joint planning among housing delivery stakeholders and where feasible avail funding for this purpose to incentivize and encourage participation by senior executives involved in the housing delivery process;

- Foster a culture of respect for meetings by having a clear line of sight that always showing how any IGR meeting feeds into other housing delivery processes. Avoid holding directionless or purposeful meetings that lack a strong decision-making feed-back loop to other structures;

- Align plans between the City and the Province, map their housing delivery programmes and projects against each other together with their associated budgets via appropriate funding streams be it from general appropriations or special grants;

- Promote effective leadership among City-Province IGR structures that is able to efficiently tackle the thorny challenge of political/administrative interface and handle the varied stakeholders of different hues involved in the housing delivery process by building trust and inclusiveness;

- Promote cooperation through open and non-hierarchical relations between the City and Province by shunning and disparaging domineering tendencies but instead embrace continuous and ongoing communication that values the contribution of local government in the housing delivery process;

- Develop a strategy to continuously assess IGR practices between the City and the Province when it comes to housing delivery in order to establish whether gains are being made in the building of sustainable human settlements and intervene appropriately where there is regress through ongoing capacity development and training.

- Fully embrace accreditation as an available option in IGR practices between the City and the Province and where feasible devolve functions to the former and deal with constraints affecting the provincial sphere as a result of inappropriate function assignment.

REFERENCE LIST

Agranoff, R. (2004). JPART symposium introduction: Researching intergovernmental relations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 14(4),* 443 – 446.

Agranoff, R. (2006). Inside collaborative network: Ten lessons for public manager, *Journal of Public Administration Review, Special Issue Collaborative Public Management, 66,* 56 – 65.

Agranoff, R. and Radin, B.A. (2014). Deil Wrights' overlapping model of intergovernmental relations: The basis for contemporary intergovernmental relations, *Paper Prepared for the Deil Wright Symposium*, ACADEMIA.

Bhattacherjee, A. (2012). *Social Science Research: Principles, Methods, and Practices*. University of South Florida: Global Text Project Press

Bloomberg, L.D & Volpe, M. (2008). *Completing Your Qualitative Dissertation: A Roadmap from Beginning to End*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Bryman, A. (2014). *Researching Social Life* (4th ed). Cape Town, South Africa: Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Researching Social Life,* 5th edition, Published in the United States, Oxford University Press, Cape Town, South Africa.

Brink, HIL. (1993). Validity and reliability in qualitative research, *Paper delivered at SA Society of Nurse Researchers Workshop, Curationis, 16(*2).

Burinskiene, M. & Rudzkiene, V. (2004). Comparison of spatial-temporal regional development and sustainable development strategy in Lithuania. *International Journal of Strategy Property Management, 8(3),* 163 - 176.

Castells, M. (2011). A network theory of power, *International Journal of Communication*. *5,* 773 - 787.

Charlton, S. (2003). The integrated delivery of housing: A local government perspective from Durban. In Harrison P., Huchzermeyer M., & Mayekiso M. (Eds.). *Confronting Fragmentation: Housing and Urban Development in a Democratizing Society* (pp 263-277). Cape Town: UCT Press.

Charlton, S. and Kihato, C. (2006). Reaching the poor? An analysis of the influences on the evolution of South Africa's housing programme. *Democracy and Delivery: Urban Policy in South Africa*. (pp. 252-282).

Charlton, S. (2009). Housing for the nation, the city and the household: Competing rationalities as a constraint to reform? *Development Sothern Africa,* 26(2), 301 -315.

Charlton, S. (2014). Public housing in Johannesburg. In, P. Harrison, G. Gotz, A. Todes, and C. Wray, (eds.). (pp 176-193). *Changing Spaces, Changing Cities - Johannesburg after Apartheid*, South Africa: Wits University.

Charlton, S. and Meth, P. (2017). Lived experiences of state housing in Johannesburg and Durban. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa, 93,* 91 -115.

Chavez, C. (2008). Conceptualizing from the Inside: Advantages, Complications and Demands on Insider Positionality. *The Qualitative Report, 13(3),* 474 - 494.

Cheruiyot, K. (2018). (ed.). City-regions and their changing space economies. *The Changing Space Economy of City-Regions: The Gauteng City-Region.* South Africa: Springer International Publishing.

Clark, M.; Dugard, J; Tissington, K. & Wilson,S. (2016). Socio-economic rights-progressive realization: The right to housing in South Africa. *Paper Commissioned by the Foundation for Human Rights.*

City of Johannesburg District Development Model One Plan Report (2022) file:///C:/Users/21610959/Downloads/City%20Of%20Johannesburg%20District%20Development%20Model%20One%20Plan.pdf

Choguill, C. L. (2007). The search for policies to support sustainable housing. *Habitat International, 31*, 143 -149.

Culwick, C. and Patel Z.(2020). Building just and sustainable cities, through government housing developments, *Environment and Urbanization*. (pp. 1-20). International Institute for Environment and Development,.

De Villiers, B. (2012). Codification of "intergovernmental relations" by way of legislation: the experience of South Africa and potential lessons for young multitiered system, *Heidelberg Journal of International Law, 72 (1),* 671 - 694.

Du Plessis, D. (2007). A strategic framework for sustainable construction in developing countries. *Journal of Construction Management and Economics, 25 (1)*, 67 - 76.

Du Toit, J. (2007). Is spatial integration socially sustainable?. *Journal of Town and Regional Planning, 51,* 37 - 45.

Emendo Project Manangers & Planners (2020), Section A *Gauteng Human Settlement Spatial Planning Report: Gauteng Department of Human Settlements spatial master plan 2030*. (pp. 1- 150). Gauteng Provincial Government.

Etikan, I., Musa, S.A. and Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purpose sampling, *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1- 4.

Glavic, P. and Lukman, R. (2007). Review of sustainability terms and their definitions. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 15*, 1875 - 1885.

Goebel, A. (2007). Sustainable urban development? Low-cost housing challenges in South Africa. *Journal of Habitat International, 31(3-4),* 291-302.

Gray, A. (2002). Integrated service delivery and regional coordination: A literature review. *Research Report Prepared as Part of the Review of the Centre-Regional Co-ordination Work-Stream.* (pp.1-57). Ltd New Zealand: Gray Matter Research,

Harrison, P. (2003). Fragmentation and globalization as the new meta-narrative. In, P. Harrison, G. Gotz, A. Todes, and C. Wray, (eds.). (pp 13 - 25). *Changing Spaces, Changing Cities - Johannesburg after Apartheid*. South Africa: Wits University Press.

Harrison, P., Gotz, G., Todes, A., and Wray, C. (2014). *Changing Spaces, Changing Cities - Johannesburg after Apartheid*. South Africa: Wits University Press.

Hart, C. (2018). *Doing a Literature Review: Realising the Social Science Research Imagination*. London: Sage Publications.

Huchzermeyer, M. (2001). Housing for the poor? Negotiated housing policy in south africa. *Journal of Habitat International, 25*, *303 - 331*.

Huchzermeyer, M. and Karam, A. (2013). South African housing policy over two decades: 1994- 2014. In Kepe, T., Levin, M. and von Liers, B. (eds), *Twenty years of Freedom*, Cape Town: UCT Press.

Ibrahim, B. (2016). Entrepreneurship amongst Somali migrants in South Africa*, Masters in Management Research Report*.(pp. 1- 99). University of the Witwatersrand

Joseph, S. & Karuri-Sebina, G. (2014). From housing to human settlements: Evolving perspectives in South African cities network, *From Housing to Human Settlements: A City Perspective*. (pp. *1-13).* Braamfontein: South African Cities Network

Kanyane, M. (2016). Interplay of intergovernmental relations conundrum. In D. Plaatjies; M Chitiga-Mabungu; C. Hongoro; T. Meyiwa; M. Nkondo and F. Nyamnjoh (eds.) *State of the Nation South Africa 2016: Who is in Charge: Mandates, Accountability and Contestations in the South African State*, pp. 92- 106, Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Keivani, R. (2010). A review of the main challenges to urban sustainability. *International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development, 1(1-2)*, 4 -15.

Kennedy, DM. (1972). The law of appropriateness an approach to a general theory of intergovernmental relations*, Journal of American Society for Public Administration Review, 32(2),* 135 -143*.*

Kraak, A. (2011). Horizontal coordination, government performance and national planning: the possibilities and limits of the south african state, *Journal of Politikon, 38 (3),* 343 -365*.*

Koopa, H.P. (2016). Implications of Intergovernmental Relations for the Department of Human Settlements: An evaluation of the institutional arrangements and forums, *School of Public Management and Administration: Economic and Management Science*, University of Pretoria, 1- 136.

Kumar, R. (2019). *Research Methodology: A Step-by-step Guide for Begginers.* Los Angels: SAGE Publisher.

Layman, T. (2003). Intergovernmental relations and service delivery in South Africa: A ten year review. *Final Report Commissioned by the Presidency.* South Africa

Malan, L. (2005). Intergovernmental relations and co-operative government in South Africa: The ten-year review. *Journal of Politeria, 24(2)*, 226- 243.

Malan, L. (2009). Co-operative environmental management: The applicability of a multi-dimensional model. *Journal of Public Administration, 44(4)*, 1138- 1148.

Malan, L. (2012). Intergovernmental relations in South Africa: A revised policy approach to co-operative government. *African Journal of Public Affairs, 05(3),* 115-123.

Malone, TW. and Crowston, K. (1990). What is coordination theory and how can it help design cooperative work systems?, *Center for Coordination Science* (E53 - 333). Massachusetts Institute of Technology - Cambridge University, 357 - 370.

Marshall, M. N. (1996). *Sampling for Qualitative Research - Family Practice*. Oxford University Press, 13(6), 522-526.

MILES, M.B., Huberman A.M. and Saldana, J. (2020). *Qualitative Data Analysis*, 4th Edition. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Miraftab, F. (2003). The perils of participatory discourse: Housing policy in postapartheid South Africa. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 22*, 226 - 239.

Moller, V. (2007). Quality of life in South Africa - The first ten years of democracy. *Journal of Social Indicators Research, 81(2)*, 181- 201.

National Department of Human Settlements. (2014). *Annexure A: Outcome 8 Delivery Agreements of Sustainable Human Settlements and Improved Quality of Household Life*, *1-37.*

Opeskin, B.R. (2001). *Mechanisms for Intergovernmental Relations in Federations*. USA: Blackwell Publishers.

Patton, M. Q. (2005). Purposeful sampling in qualitative research synthesis. *Journal of Qualitative Research*, *11(2),* 63-75.

Pieterse, E. & van Donk, M. (2013). Local government and poverty reduction. In U. Pillay, G. Hagg, F. Nyamnjoh and J.D. Jansen (eds.), *State of the Nation: South Africa 2012-2013 - Addressing Inequality and Poverty* (pp. 98-123). South Africa: HSRC Press.

Phago, K. (2014). Intergovernmental relations and housing policy implementation in South Africa, *Politeia, 33(02),* 48-62.

Presidency Research Unit (2020). Overview of the district development model - a framework for co-operative service delivery. *Parliament of the Republic of South Africa*

Redaelli, E. (2016). Creative place making and the NEA: unpacking a multi-level governance- cultural policy, intergovernmental relations, national endowment for the arts. *Journal of Taylor & Francis Group, 37(4),* 387 - 402.

Rogerson, C.M. (2006). Pro-poor local economic development in South Africa: The role of pro-poor tourism, *Journal of Local Environment*, *11(1),* 37 -60.

Stoker, G. (1995). Intergovernmental Relations, *Journal of Public Administration,* 73, 101 - 122.

Stoker, G. (1995). Urban Governance in Britain, *Journal of Sociologie du Travail*, 37(2), 301 - 315.

Sokopo, Z. (2015). *Design and Implementation Evaluation of the Urban Settlements Development Grant Study Report*, National Department of Human Settlement South Africa: Government Printer.

South Africa. (2004). *Breaking New Ground Comprehensive Plan for the Development of Sustainable Human Settlements.* National Department of Human Settlements. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Housing Act, Pub. L. No. 107 (1997). Cape Town: Government Printer.

Interim Constitution Act, Pub. L. No 200 (1996). Cape Town: Government Printer.

The Constitution, Pub. L. No 108 (1996). Cape Town: Government Printer.
Constitution. Pub. L. No. 108 (1996). Cape Town: Government Printer

The National Housing Act, Pub. L. No. 107 (1997). Cape Town: Government Printer.

Tapscott, C. (2000). Intergovernmental relations in South Africa: The challenges of co-operative government, *Public Administration and Development*, *20,* 119-128

Tomlinson, M. and Jeffery, A. (2015). *South Africa's Housing Conundrum: Breaking New Ground, Understanding FLISP and fundamental Rethink*. South African Institute of Race Relations (IRR), *4(20),* 1- 19*.*

Tshangana, A. (2014). Intergovernmental funding framework. *From Housing to Human Settlements: A City Perspective in South Africa*. (pp.13 - 29). Braamfontein: South African Cities Network*.*

Turok, I. (2015). What will housing megaprojects do our cities? (pp. 1-7) *Retrieved September 25, 2020 fom https://www.econ3x3.org*/article/what-will-housing-megaprojects-do-our-cities

Umhlaba Consulting Group. (2013) Afesis-Corplan-promoting active citizenship and good governance: land and settlement development, *Research Report on Housing Project Life Cycle,* 1-44.

Voets, J. (2005). Intergovernmental relations in multi-level arrangements: Collaborative public management in Flanders, *Proposal for Phd Thesis*. University of Holland.

Wagner, C. K., Kawulich, B. and Garner, M. (2012). *Doing Social Research : A Global Context,* Berkshire, Britain: The McGraw-Hill Higher Companies.

Wilkinson, P. (1998). Housing Policy in South Africa. *Journal of Habitat Int. 22(3)*, *215 -229.*

Wisker, G. (2001). *The Postgraduate Research Handbook: Succeed with your MA, MPhil, EdE and PHD*. Palgrave Study Guides.

Wright, D.S. (1967). Intergovernmental relations: An analytical overview, *Journal of American Academy of Political and Social Science.1-16.*

Wotela, K. (2016). Towards a Systematic Approach to Reviewing Literature for Interpreting Public and Business Management Research Results, *Electronic Journal on Business Research Methods*., *14(2),* 83-97

Internet Sources

Gauteng Province – Housing Demand document retrieved on September 15, 2021 from https://gpgonline.sharepoint.com/sites/gdhs/Sustainable%20Human%20Settlement/

Historical delivery of housing opportunities funded from the Human Settlement Development Grant (HSDG), retrieved on August 01, 2021 from https://africacheck.org/sites/default/files/Housing-delivery-1994-to-2018.pdf

Lufhereng - a beacon of hope for Soweto residents, retrieved from https://www.gov.za/lufhereng-beacon-hope-soweto-residents ,17 August 2010.

Lufhereng Human Settlements Development Project is a prime example of how we can integrate our cities with all three spheres of government working together, 12 Aug 2021, retrieved from

https://www.gov.za/speeches/minister-patricia-de-lille-concludes-oversight-visit-lufhereng-human-settlements.

MINMEC REPORT, retrieved from http://www.treasury.gov.za/documents/national%20budget/2002/review/Annexure%20E.pdf

South Africa elections: Has the ANC built enough homes? By reality check team

BBC News, published on the 3 May 2019, retrieved from

https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-48093711

Address by Acting Premier Mandla Nkomfe to a special sitting of the Gauteng Provincial Legislature, retrieved from https://www.gov.za/address-acting-premier-mandla-nkomfe-special-sitting-gauteng-provincial-legislature, 09 Dec 2010).

Appendix A – Interview Schedule

Interview Schedule A – Experts (Department of Human Settlements Officials)

The Role of Inter-Governmental Relations in Building Sustainable Human Settlements, Gauteng Province

Biographical data (FILL IN AT END)

Interviewee name/pseudo:
Interviewer:
Location:
Date:
Interview length: 60 min

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

I am a Masters Student at the Wits School of Governance (WSG) conducting a study on the role of inter-governmental relations in building sustainable human settlements in Gauteng Province. As part of my studies I am conducting interviews with key informants to understand their views and opinion on how stakeholders and key role-players' participation in inter-governmental relations affect the building of sustainable human settlements in Gauteng. I am kindly inviting your participation in an interview.

Please take note that this process is voluntary and that you are free to withdraw at any time if you do not feel comfortable. The interview remains confidential and a pseudo-name of your choice can be used. The information will be used for purposes of this study only and later destroyed. I also need to record this conversation in order to be able to transcribe it and do a general analysis along with other interviews at a later stage. Do I have your informed consent for us to proceed?

OPENING

A. (Establish Rapport) My name is _____ and as explained, I am interviewing various stakeholders and key role-players involved in the building of human settlements in Gauteng Province.

Tell me the position you hold and what it entails?

B. (Purpose) I would like to ask you several questions to obtain your views and opinion regarding inter-governmental relations and coordinated efforts by all and how thees affect the building of sustainable human settlement.

C. (Motivation) I hope to use this information to better understand your perspectives on the topic.

D. (Timeline) The interview should take about 60 minutes.

MAIN QUESTIONS

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS: *interaction among government entities – both vertical and horizontal*

1. Are you involved in any inter-governmental relations structures/forums?
2. If yes, can you share your experience on participating in these structures/forums?
    i. **Probe:** Has it been positive or negative?
3. What is your view on their role in advancing the building of sustainable human settlements?
    i. **Probe:** what informs this view?
4. As far as you know, would you say there is adequate inter-governmental support for housing issues in the province?
    i. **Probe:** If not or yes, please elaborate?
5. Based on your experience, what do you think key decision-makers in the housing sector need to do to further improve the functioning of intergovernmental relations among stakeholders and key role-players?
    i. **Probe:** Can anything be done to further equip political heads, senior managers and government officials?
6. In your view, are housing issues properly prioritised and do they frequently find their way to the top of the agenda of the highest existing intergovernmental relations structures/forums?
    i. **Probe:** If yes/no, please elaborate

7. In your view, how can intergovernmental relations be effectively utilized to resolve some of the challenges confronting the implementation of new housing developments?

8. Do you think the principles of cooperative government are adhered to and regularly practiced in the building of sustainable human settlements?

9. Is there any other comment which you would like to make in respect of maximizing utilization of coordination and IGR to achieve goals of cooperative government for building sustainable human settlements?

****

COORDINATION: *sequencing of activities and events in the effort to achieve a particular goal*

10. In your opinion, how critical is coordination in the implementation of new housing developments and why?

11. Would you say there is proper coordination among critical stakeholders and key role-players when housing developments are implemented?
    a) **Probe:** "If not or yes, please elaborate?

12. When it comes to coordinating the efforts of different stakeholders and key role-players, where would you say areas of strength are in the housing sector?

13. In your assessment, is there unity of purpose among stakeholders and key role-players and is everyone pulling as a whole when implementing new housing developments?
    a) Probe: "If not or yes, please elaborate?

14. In your view, how has coordination or the lack thereof contributed in any way to the sustainability or non-sustainability of new housing settlements?

****

INTEGRATION: *all actions and efforts undertaken to act as one or in unison*

15. What do you understand by the integrated planning of human settlements?
    i. **Probe:** How is this integration actualized in practice?

16. How can the delivery of integrated human settlements be achieved?

    i. **Probe:** What are some of the glaring gaps you find missing in the housing sector in terms of efforts to promote integrated planning?

****

CONSULTATION: *interacting with other relevant stakeholders and key role-players when carrying out projects/activities*

17. In your view, how widely does your department consult when planning housing development projects?

18. Please explain the consultation process your department undertakes when planning new housing developments?

19. In your opinion, what would you say are some of the major impediments or challenges to joint planning when it comes to the implementation of housing development projects?

****

FUNCTIONS: *assignment and distribution of roles and responsibilities*

20. Are you happy with the allocation of functions between provinces and local government when it comes to the delivery of housing? Probing
    a) **Probe:** "If not or yes, please elaborate?

21. In your view, which functions in the housing sector are most prone to difficulty and could be improved on through re-allocation?

CLOSING

Do you have any questions on anything we discussed or anything that took place during the interview?

Are there any responses you would like to further elaborate upon?

Thank you for taking time to have this interview