



Imraan Buccus

David Hemson

Janine Hicks

Laurence Piper

Public Participation and Local Governance

Acknowledgements

The Centre for Public Participation (CPP) acknowledges the funding contribution and support of CAGE to carry out this research. We are also grateful to our research collaborators, Dr David Hemson of the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) and Prof Laurence Piper of the School of Politics at the University of KwaZulu Natal (UKZN).

Finally we express our gratitude to our research assistants on this project, including: Mbongeni Manqele, Nompumelelo Bhengu, Thamsanqa Mbele, Senzo Myeni and Esther Jantjies. The successful completion of the project would not have been possible without their contribution.

Sincere thanks also to Janine Hicks, CPP's former director, for her advice and active participation on this project.

Imraan Buccus
Project Manager



Public Participation and Local Governance

Research Report prepared by
The Centre for Public Participation (CPP)
in association with
Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) and the
University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN).

May 2007



Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
1 Introduction	4
2 The Broader Significance of Public Participation	6
3 Public Participation in Post-Apartheid South Africa	9
4 Methodology.....	13
5 Findings	15
6 Discussion	23
7 Recommendations and comparisons	25
Endnotes	27
Notes	28

Executive Summary

Public participation is receiving increasing attention in South Africa, especially at local government level. Notably, public participation is on the agenda globally and in Africa, as well as in South Africa. This is because public participation can help to (i) enhance development and service delivery, (ii) make governance more effective, and (iii) deepen democracy. In South Africa, the basis for public participation in local government is outlined in key legislation like the *Municipal Systems Act* of 2000, and key policies like the *Draft National Framework for Public Participation* of 2005 and *Draft KZN Community Participation Framework* of 2007. These frame public participation mostly as consultation rather than formal empowerment. Further, there is a significant policy development lag, with no final national or provincial policy some seven years after the enabling legislation.

We investigated the implementation of public policy in this context, exploring both views ‘from above’ of officials and councillors, and ‘from below’ of members of civil society and the community. Respondents were drawn from the district municipalities of eThekweni, Ilembe, Mgungundlovu and Sisonke, and also some of the local municipalities within them. Our main finding was that while all parties seem committed to the idea of public participation, they lack the necessary resources to make it work. Hence, the impact of public participation on local governance ‘ends at the imbizo’.

Key here are:

- Developing policy on institutionalising public participation, including:
 - the establishment and location of a public participation unit
 - the annual development of a public participation plan
 - clarifying the relationship between district and local municipalities
 - clarifying the relationship between CDWs and local municipalities
- Resources to:
 - employ dedicated administrative staff
 - a budget for public participation, especially to
 - train councillors, ward committee members and the community
- Best practice guidelines for existing mechanisms like:
 - *Izimbizo* (especially participation and follow-up)
 - Ward committees (meaningful role in processes e.g. budget)
- Explore new mechanisms for instance:
 - Budget/IDP (integrating planning processes)
 - Budget/IDP forums (best practice guidelines to include civil society)
 - Advisory committees (stakeholder forums, Citizen’s Juries)
 - A municipal Citizen’s Charter
- Develop state-civil society partnerships. Including:
 - A civil society register and contact list
 - Using new mechanisms that draw on civil society organisations
 - Governance partnerships e.g. public participation training.

In summary the challenge is practical, not political. With better organisation and resources we can develop public participation which does impact by improving delivery, building local governance and deepening democracy.

1 Introduction

The issue of public participation is receiving increasing attention in South Africa, from both government and civil society sectors – notably despite the fact that the relevant legislation was passed some seven years ago. We are witnessing acknowledgement from a wide range of government institutions that insufficient consideration has been paid to public participation, and that existing policy frameworks, institutional mechanisms and programme interventions are failing to comply with government’s constitutional and statutory obligations. Recent Constitutional Court rulings have reinforced this, with proposal health legislation being returned to parliament to provide for sufficient engagement with civil society and other affected stakeholders². Another example is the court ruling that the re-demarcation of Matatiele from KZN to the Eastern Cape was improperly conducted due to a lack of public consultation³. Politically, the renewed emphasis on public participation is evident in the large number of *izimbizo* (public gatherings) conducted by the President and provincial government over the last few years to consult around various government initiatives. Following their adoption by Cabinet in 2000, *izimbizo* have proved to be very popular forums for interaction between government officials and members of the community.

Nowhere has the emphasis on public participation been more keenly felt than in local municipalities. Mostly this is because it is the sphere of government where the greatest constitutional and statutory obligations to public participation exist. Perhaps it is also because it is the sphere of government perceived as ‘closest to the people’. In addition though, the emphasis on public participation reflects a concern at the lack of performance of many local municipalities, with roughly 50% of all local government falling under Project Consolidate, a government capacity-building programme. This poor performance is reflected in the widespread public dissatisfaction with many local municipalities. Hence, in the year preceding the March 2006 local government elections, the Minister of Safety and Security, Charles Nqakula, reported to parliament that there had been 5085 protests against local government country-wide against issues like poor service delivery (*Daily News* 14/10/05). In this context, public participation has come to be seen as one way of making municipalities more accountable and responsive, and so more effective.

Over the last couple of years, the national Department of Provincial and Local Government (DPLG), the KZN Department of Local Government and Traditional Affairs (LGTA) and local municipalities have implemented a process to develop guidelines and programmes to ensure that public participation obligations are adequately met. Hence in 2005 the *Draft National Policy Document on Public Participation* was developed, and currently the KZN government is piloting its *Community Participation Framework* Document. Already a few municipalities like eThekweni have developed their own community participation policies. Notably it has taken close to seven years for the development and implementation of public participation policy to follow the adoption of the legislation which requires it.

It is in this context that the Centre for Public Participation (CPP) drew together the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) and the School of Politics at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN), to participate in a joint research initiative to address public participation in local government in KwaZulu-Natal. This project builds on existing work by the three partners. Very simply, our objective was to assess the extent to which public participation has been implemented at the municipal level in KZN, identify best practices and challenges where they exist, and make some recommendations about how practically to improve implementation.

In brief we found that, despite evidence of support from councillors and officials for the idea of public participation, very little has been done in practice. Indeed, most municipalities surveyed are currently not meeting their statutory requirements in this regard. This may well have something to do with the delayed development of relevant policy, but other problems around resources and capacity also presented themselves. Further, the popular experience of public participation was mostly supportive of the idea, but also reflected a degree of fatigue at going to meeting after meeting (many of which were national or provincial) which seemed not to make much difference. Hence the view that the effect of public participation ‘just ends with the *imbizo*’.

Nevertheless, building on the good will that clearly exists, and which is crucial for the success of public participation, we argue that certain, properly implemented mechanisms, will make a positive difference. In part these are informed by experiences with public participation world-wide, but also by traditions and practices which have strong local roots. It is our hope that these recommendations will assist in realising the common goal of participatory local governance.

2 The Broader Significance of Public Participation

Public participation is an idea whose time has come. Throughout the world, and especially in Africa, public participation is seen as a means to (i) enhance development and service delivery, (ii) improve governance and (iii) deepen democracy. Before exploring these in more detail we begin with a more basic question: what is participation?

While there are many definitions, a useful starting point is the World Bank which states: 'Participation is a process in which stakeholders influence and share control over development initiatives and the decisions and the resources which affect them'⁴. Notably this definition directly links public participation to development; probably the most common context in which public participation is invoked. For the last ten years the World Bank and related international development organisations have moved away from the more elitist 'external expert stance' in development planning, and towards a 'participatory stance'. This means that instead of just having the project sponsors and designers imposing development projects on the local contexts, the Bank engages with various stakeholders, especially local groups, in developing and implementing projects.⁵

The reason for this shift is fundamentally quite simple: experience shows that the 'external expert stance' does not generate social change, whereas the participatory stance does. According to the Bank this is because of the 'social learning' that stakeholders generate and internalise during the participatory planning and implementation process. In addition, local stakeholders generally have greater commitment to development than external experts, and tend to develop new and appropriate local institutions through the participatory process. Importantly, the Bank distinguishes between 'popular' participation by the poor and marginalised who, after all, are the intended beneficiaries of development, and 'stakeholder' participation which includes others who could affect the outcome of a development project, such as government officials and NGOs with an interest in the outcome. In order to ensure the success of projects, public participation is taken to mean stakeholder participation – which includes the poor and marginalised – but others who can affect the project outcome too.⁶

Worth noting here also would be the critique of the World Bank model of public participation, where many have argued that it offers no threat to 'technocratic authoritarianism'. Pithouse argues that 'this model has certainly not worked well for many of the organisations and people who took it up in good faith. Defenders of the status quo will point to small shifts consequent to lobbying or advocacy in various forms but there have been no fundamental shifts in policy due to engagement in official public participation processes.'⁷

Notably, the significance of public participation in the dominant development model has become consolidated over the last ten years, as experience has proven it works better than the 'external expert stance' approach. Hence, whether one is talking about budgeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil or the Kerala state of India, or health delivery in rural Bangladesh or urban Britain, public participation is seen as a central component necessary to meet the end of human development. Notably though, public participation is also justified in respect of two other purposes, both political. These other purposes are (i) strengthening states and (ii) deepening democracy.

Development is the connection between public participation and strengthening states in that it has become generally received, that success in development, more especially success in achieving the Millennium Goals, is linked to effective governance.⁸ This is clearly the case for development aid that takes the form of budget support to a government to finance, for example, a poverty reduction strategy. However, budget support has proved less successful in countries with weak institutions or whose government shows little inclination to use funds accountably. While debates around this are ongoing, many donors see public participation and participatory methodologies as improving governance by making it better informed and more responsive to local needs.⁹ Hence, the World Bank sees public participation as integral to the successful decentralisation of political power to local government level, especially in the developing world.

In the context of Africa, public participation is seen in a similar 'capacity building' role in the developmental model captured in the *New Partnership for Africa's Development* (NEPAD). Now the flagship policy of the African Union, NEPAD affirms 'broad-based participation in development by all stakeholders'. In addition though, in the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), one of the key questions to assess whether 'Constitutional Democracy' is being realised is: 'what is being done to create an enabling environment for meaningful popular participation in all forms and levels of government?'¹⁰ Further, the self-assessment process of every member country through the APRM is required to have 'the active participation of all stakeholders' so as to 'facilitate the evaluation of countries on the basis of the realities expressed by all stakeholders'.¹¹ Hence, in NEPAD's normative model, public participation is specifically seen as a part of good governance, and also part of the way to assess the state of governance in a country.

Last but not least, we come to arguments that link public participation to deepening democracy in both new and established democracies. An example: on 18 June 2004 the European Council agreed on the first ever Constitutional Treaty, which would have given the European Union a constitution if all 25 member states ratified it. Member states could do this either through a parliamentary process or through direct democracy in the form of a referendum. While most countries chose the parliamentary route, several went with referenda. Notably, on 29 May 2005 French voters rejected the terms of the treaty with a 'no' vote of 55.6%. Dutch voters followed in June, with 61.8% voting against the treaty. Two weeks after the failed referenda, the EU summit decided that the referenda would be put on hold in countries that had chosen to put the ratification of the treaty to a public vote. Superficially this decision might look like a victory for popular democracy, but what is really interesting about the referenda is the division they exposed between political elites and ordinary citizens. Hence, French citizens voted 'no' despite not one significant political party or media group opposing the constitution. While this contrast was not as stark in Holland, a similar kind of division was evident.

This example illustrates what several scholars have called the 'democratic deficit' in contemporary liberal-democratic states. As Carothers puts it, many democracies are characterised by a sense of disappointment as to how little elections have improved government accountability and performance.¹² As poverty and inequality

3 Public Participation in Post-Apartheid South Africa

have grown, as governments have pursued unpopular wars, and as political life has become dominated by parties and powerful lobby groups, public skepticism and distrust have grown, and participation in political life has declined.¹³ Similar problems are, arguably, evident in South Africa with both declining participation rates in national elections and clear dissatisfaction by many important groups with key aspects of national policy, as well as the spate of protests against poor local government performance noted above. Some authors argue that the solution to this ‘democratic deficit’ lies in increasing public participation in government both by communities directly and through civil society.

In conclusion, public participation is a national, continental and international practice linked to development, but also state-building and deepening democracy. Notably, in South Africa, government justifies public participation in local government in all three ways. Hence the 2005 *Draft National Policy Framework for Public Participation* states that public participation ‘could be promoted in order to make development plans and services more relevant to local needs and conditions’ (development), ‘in order to hand over responsibility for services and promote community action’, (state-building) and ‘to empower local communities to have control over their own lives and livelihoods’ (democracy).¹⁴ These points are mirrored in the White Paper on Local Government’s affirmation that citizens must participate in local government as ‘consumers and service-users’ (development), ‘partners in resource mobilisation’ (state-building), and ‘voters’ and ‘participants in policy processes (democracy)’¹⁵. We now explore the legal and policy framework for public participation in South Africa in more detail.

South Africa is a multi-party, representative democracy, under a constitution which is sovereign and which entrenches human rights. In addition, state power is mostly centralised in the national sphere, with only limited power devolved to provinces and local municipalities. Despite being a representative democratic system, the South African constitution and some legislation complements the power of elected politicians with forms of public participation. In the national and provincial spheres, this takes the form of public consultation by legislatures. In the municipal sphere there are even more requirements for public participation. In addition, the public service has committed itself to being more responsive, accountable and transparent in implementing government policy.

While all this may seem reason for optimism about the seriousness with which the South African state regards public participation, there are two reasons for caution. First, a close reading of law and policy reflects that public participation is limited to forms of consultation, rather than formal empowerment of citizens in political decision-making or implementation. Second, as already indicated, there is a significant delay between the promulgation of legislation and the development, never mind implementation, of public participation policy. We now explore in more detail the key legislation and policy in chronological sequence.

Figure 1: Timeline of Public Participation Relevant Legislation and Policy

Legislation in black Policy in grey											
Constitution	Batho Pele	Municipal Structures Act The White Paper on Local Government		Municipal Systems Act					Guidelines for the Operation of Ward Committees Draft National Framework for Public Participation		KZN Community Participation Framework Document
1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007

a. Constitutional and Legislative Requirements for Public Participation

The requirement that national and provincial legislatures consult is reflected in Section 59(1) of the 2006 Constitution which states ‘The National Assembly must (a) facilitate public involvement in the legislative and other processes of the Assembly and its committees.’ Section 118 makes similar requirements for the provinces. Notably, the constitution makes it clear that decision-making power resides with parliament alone, reflecting the reality that public participation is limited to informing the deliberations of parliament.

Notably, the obligations on the local sphere to consult are more developed. Hence Section 152(1) of the constitution states that ‘local government must encourage the involvement of communities and community organisations in the matters of local government’. This implies going beyond just consulting communities as an aid to deliberation. In this regard the Municipal Systems Act 2000, section 16, obliges municipalities to ‘develop a culture of municipal governance that complements formal representative government with a system of participatory governance, and must for this purpose (a) encourage, and create conditions for, the local community to participate in the affairs of the municipality, including in (i) Integrated Development Plan; (ii) the performance management system; (iii) performance, (iv) the budget (v) and strategic decisions relating to services’. In addition to requiring local councils to consult communities on key municipal processes, the Municipal Structures Act of 1998 establishes ward committees. Consisting of ten people and chaired by the ward councillor, ward committees are intended to act as the main means of communication between the council and local communities.

Notably, while the requirements of the Municipal Structures Act and the Municipal Systems Act are the most important concerning public participation in municipalities, there are many other acts that apply to many other municipal functions, albeit in more modest ways. For example, the Municipal Finance Management Act (46 of 2003) requires the Annual Report of a municipality be made public. Another example is Chapter 4 of the Promotion of Access to Information Act (2 of 2000), which governs community access to municipal information. For a comprehensive list of these requirements see Chapter 8.3 ‘Legal Public Participation Obligations of Municipalities’ in the KZN LGTA (2007) *Community Participation Framework* document.

Importantly, a close reading of the legislation reveals that the opportunities created for public participation whether through ward committees or public meetings, are overwhelmingly forms of public consultation rather than the actual participation of civil society or local communities in decision-making or implementation¹⁶. As with national and provincial legislatures, the law makes it very explicit that decision-making power resides with municipal councillors, and responsibility for implementation remains with officials. Of course, deliberation is very important to the democratic process, but it is not equivalent to either voting or implementing the decision taken by the vote.

b. Public Participation Policy Development and Implementation

The insight that, by design, public participation in South Africa is mostly limited to public consultation is confirmed by a review of key public participation policy. Further, it is notable that policy development has lagged behind legislation by some five to seven years, and indeed there still remains no final national policy on public participation. The first policy to be adopted relevant to public participation was the *Batho Pele* (‘People First’) policy of 1997 which aims to ‘get public servants to be service orientated, to strive for excellence in service delivery and to commit to continuous service delivery improvement’. In the words of the policy, ‘it is a simple and

transparent mechanism, which allows citizens to hold public servants accountable for the level of services they deliver’. This provides a relatively general but nevertheless important normative resource for civil society and local communities to press for more responsive implementation, for example, around services. Again however, the democratic dividend promised by *Batho Pele* is getting officials to deliver as promised, not so much to share in deciding what gets delivered to whom.

More detailed policy relevant to public participation in local government is found in the 2005 *Draft National Policy Framework for Public Participation* of the DPLG. This document mostly sketches the background to policy, such as identifying the assumptions underlying participation and the different levels of participation, outlining the legislative framework, identifying various initiatives which involve public participation, as well as listing the key principles of public participation. The document then moves to focus mostly on ward committees, their role in developing a ward-base plan through community-based planning, and their relationship to community development workers (CDWs). Indeed, other than the section dealing with ward committees, the policy is pitched at a very general level.

Notably subsequent DPLG documents deal in more detail with setting up and running ward committees¹⁷. Indeed, later in 2005 the Minister of Provincial and Local Government published a Notice 965 setting out new guidelines for the establishment and operation of ward committees. Clearly then, ward committees were at the centre of national government’s thinking on public participation in local government at this time. Importantly, as outlined by the 2005 Notice, ward committees are intended as advisory bodies to ward councillors to assist in communication and mobilisation functions, and cannot be delegated significant powers.

While several provincial governments have adopted public participation policies, including the Western Cape, most relevant to our study is the *Community Participation Framework Document* of 2007 currently being piloted by the KZN Department of LGTA. In addition to echoing the general policy frame of the national DPLG document, the *Community Participation Framework* also aims to make more practical recommendations about the mechanisms and processes required in terms of public participation law – as well as ward committees – and makes specific recommendations about institutionalising public participation in a unit which is responsible for drawing up an annual public participation plan, developing a citizen’s charter and the like. Notably, the public participation plan must accommodate all the statutory requirements on municipalities according to suggested time-frames, mechanisms and dummy budgets.

While the provincial framework is much more practical than the national one, it must be noted that at the time of the research it had not been distributed to our target municipalities, and thus cannot be used as a template against which to assess municipal public participation programmes. Notably, of the municipalities under investigation, only one, eThekweni, had a public participation policy. Termed the *Citizen Participation Policy*, the document begins with the obligatory background conceptual discussion and legislative review, before proposing a model for ‘active participation’, as well as various institutions including ‘mechanisms to ensure efficiency’, ‘systems of redress’, a ‘citizen’s charter’ and an ‘intervention strategy model’. With the possible exception of the Citizen’s Charter, the eThekweni document is pitched at a more general and less practical level than the provincial framework document.

The last key policy innovation relevant to public participation is that of CDWs. In his 2003 State of the Nation address President Thabo Mbeki spoke of the need for a ‘new public service echelon of multi-skilled community

4 Methodology

development workers', whose role is 'to maintain direct contact with the people where they live and to ensure that government sharply improves the qualities of the outcomes of public expenditure'. To this end CDWs are expected to help local communities practically access government services¹⁸. The programme was approved by Cabinet on 27 October 2004 and implemented the following year. An initiative of the national executive, CDWs are paid by province and deployed locally, although outside of the direct control of local government. While, strictly speaking, CDWs are not a public participation institution they are important in how they relate to existing public participation structures and mechanisms, especially ward committees, and potentially could assist in the further development of public participation.

Notably, all the policy documents surveyed place significant weight on the value of active citizenship and the importance of meaningful inclusion in municipal decision-making to help realise this active citizenship. However, there are few practical mechanisms identified through which meaningful public participation is to be achieved, other than ward committees. Both the national and eThekweni policy documents are pitched at a rather abstract level with very few practical suggestions at all. While the provincial policy is much better in this regard, listing many possible mechanisms, much is left up to municipal public participation units and their public participation plans. Notably, these generally do not exist yet as the policy is still to be distributed to municipalities.

a. Research Questions

The research was designed around two basic research questions, each in turn, sub-divided in two:

Research Question 1: How is public participation designed (a) in South Africa, and (b) how does it compare to elsewhere in the world?

Research Question 2: What have (a) KZN municipalities done to implement public participation, and (b) what is the experience of this 'from below'?

b. Research Methods

To answer these two sets of research questions required using divergent sets of research methods. Research question 1 required mostly a thorough review and analysis of primary documents in the form of policy and legislation relevant to public participation in South Africa. In addition, an extensive consultation of secondary sources, more specifically a thorough review of literature on the subject of public participation and local governance, was also done. This required surveying books, journal articles, newspapers, popular articles, research reports as well as extensive use of the internet. We also looked to compare and contrast the South African case with similar public participation policies, institutions and mechanisms from elsewhere in the world. Lastly, a few interviews were conducted with key informants on government policy to supplement our findings from the literature. This research was conducted by Professor Piper of the School of Politics, at UKZN.

Research question 2 required original empirical research with primary sources, mostly through interviews with sources but also through the review of some documents. Notably, the research required to answer question 2a mostly meant collecting data from a range of stakeholders that included, among others, the Speaker/manager in the speakers office, municipal managers, public participation practitioners, staff dealing with integrated development planning (IDP) processes (and related planning processes), and in some cases ward councillors. Worth mentioning is the fact that in-depth interviews have proven to be one of the most reliable, innovative and internationally recognised data selection instruments as they provide researchers with the opportunity to delve deeply into knowledge, ideas, attitudes and opinions of the respondent.¹⁹ This research was conducted by CPP fieldworkers led by Imraan Buccus.

In contrast the research needed to answer question 2b required collecting data from civil society organisations and ordinary members of the community. Focus groups and in-depth interviews were conducted with community representatives as to their experiences of public participation. Community representatives included, among others, CDWs, representatives of traditional authorities, and civil society representatives. This research was conducted by HSRC fieldworkers led by Dr David Hemson.

5 Findings

c. Sampling

In terms of sampling for research questions 2a and 2b, the municipalities from which respondents were drawn were the district municipalities of Mgungundlovu, Ilembe and Sisonke, some local municipalities within these districts, for instance KwaDukuza, Ubuhlebezwe and Msunduzi, and the metropolitan municipality of eThekweni. Notably, while most of our findings apply to districts, it seems the trend is similar at local level too, as confirmed by respondents and by other studies. These municipalities were selected using 'purposive sampling'. This is a non-probability sample that has been used internationally with great success. The researcher identifies the sampled population based on several characteristics that he/she judges to be relevant to the selection, social parameters and the study.

In this particular study the selection of the sample was based on the make up of municipalities; including issues of how resourced they are, urban and rural location, and their known history in the area of participation. Hence eThekweni is well resourced and overwhelmingly urban, and has a tradition of radical politics and some social movements; while others like Sisonke and Mgungundlovu are mostly rural with many traditional leaders, and much less by way of radical politics. It would be pertinent to mention at this point that while Mgungundlovu agreed to be part of the study, repeated attempts to get hold of municipal officials proved unsuccessful and thus very limited data was available for analysis from this municipality.

d. Time frame

Research Task	Date
Planning and conceptualisation:	October – November 2006
Fieldwork:	December 2006 – February 2007
Report writing & DTP:	March – April 2007
Public presentation:	May 2007

a. The view from above: public participation as seen by councillors and officials

1. the positive

Perhaps the key positive finding on interviewing municipal councillors and officials is that they all affirmed the importance of public participation for accountability and transparency in local governance. A reason often given was the experience of the exclusionary planning process at the local level under apartheid, and wanting to avoid this practice. Whether this political will extends much beyond meeting the requirements of their job to a 'genuine passion' for public participation is still to be seen. While councillors and officials did not share just one understanding of participation, they did generally see it as about some kind of involvement of communities, political parties and other stakeholders like civil society. Further, they also knew that there existed significant constitutional and legislative requirements for public participation at local government level. Most were able to identify these as including the budget process, IDPs, performance management, ward committees, ward councillors, community-based planning, CDWs, and *izimbizo* or public meetings.

2. the negative

However, on the negative side, it seems that public participation mechanisms are generally poorly or at least unevenly developed. The mechanisms that were covered in the interviews included public consultation processes (the budget, IDP, performance management system, in addition to ad hoc *izimbizo*), structures like ward committees and organisational issues like the establishment of public participation units, and the role of CDWs. While respondents generally recognised room for improvement, they tended to attribute shortcomings to a lack of support from national and provincial government in terms of policy guidelines, money to pay for public participation, and training and support to implement new policy. They also raised issues about the inefficient design of local government system. Let us unpack this in more detail.

Budget and IDP

These can be dealt with together as all municipalities tended to deal with the IDP and Budget at the same *izimbizo*. Further, all municipalities claimed to have had at least some *izimbizo* on the IDP and budget at both district and local level. In Sisonke the IDP process involves an IDP forum which is constituted by both municipal managers and ward committees. In eThekweni these *izimbizo* went under the name of 'Big Mama workshops' which included many sectorally-based stakeholders as well as geographically-based representatives. These workshops were consultative forums on the city's development plan, and the budget process too. These inform the performance targets which are assessed and reviewed through a sophisticated performance management system. Notably, the Big Mama workshops are not regular events, and something of a gap has arisen in the last three years since their demise. In addition it was claimed that IDP consultation will happen through ward committees now that they are finally established in eThekweni.

Notably, the eThekweni Municipality has a more sophisticated integration of the budget and IDP than others in that the budget is structured according to the priority area for development identified in the IDP. Hence strategic planning leads to strategic budgeting, which in turn informs operational planning and budgeting and then implementation²⁰. Although this is more an issue of effective organisation than public participation *per se*, it does seem plausible to believe that public participation in both the IDP and budget processes will be more effective if the two are closely and clearly related.

Performance management

Generally there was little or no public participation in the performance management systems of municipalities. In Ilembe, concern was expressed that the system is not working very well, and in Sisonke it was reported that while communities are invited to engage around performance management, they have no clear role. In eThekweni there is no public participation in the performance management process, other than indirectly through the periodic Big Mama events. Performance management is treated as a technical and legal issue, ultimately overseen by the auditor general. It has been drawn to our attention that a number of municipalities now have customer satisfaction surveys, but no reference to these was made by our respondents.

Izimbizo or Public Meetings

Only Sisonke and eThekweni reported calling *izimbizo* around issues that arose from time to time. Sisonke said that public meetings are called to allow for community input into by-laws. EThekweni reported that public meetings are sometimes called around the budget but are not very effective. Notably, the top-down organisation of *izimbizo* came in for some criticism from Ward Councillor Dlamini of Sisonke:

Izimbizo are a very good idea indeed, but the problem we have been experiencing with the process is that there is no proper consultation. What usually happens, as in the case of the Presidential Imbizo, is that officials from both the national government only liaise with top officials from the municipality such as the mayors, who just unilaterally decide which area the president would visit – which always happens that the area they take the president to is usually the relatively developed part. If we as Councillors suggest that the President should be taken to visit a particular area, which we know is highly underdeveloped, the officials assume that our aim is to embarrass the municipality²¹.

Ward Committees and Community-Based Planning

Despite the fact that ward committees have been established in some municipalities as early as 2001 (eg Msunduzi), only Ilembe reported having ward committees in all its local municipalities. While Ilembe respondents thought that ward committees were a good thing, they complained of a lack of clarity about whether, and how, the District might make use of ward committees. Indeed, they complained of ‘power plays’ around ward committees, arguing that clearer guidelines on the role of ward committees between local and district needed development. Both Sisonke and eThekweni reported that ward committees were in the process of being elected for the first time. Respondents from both expressed concerns at the need to properly train ward committees and especially clarify the role that they will play in local council processes.

Although one of the roles for ward committees envisaged in policy is Community-Based Planning (CBP) as part of the IDP process, this has not happened in any municipality. Despite having ward committees Ilembe reported that community-based planning existed on paper only. Sisonke saw CBP as a function that would have to be taught to new ward committees, and eThekweni reported that it had done its own CBP as part of the re-organisation of development on the new strategic direction of the city, but had not used ward committees in this process. Instead, they had identified representatives from various communities to work with in identifying local needs.

Community Development Workers (CDWs)

All municipalities reported having CDWs working in them, but that confusion existed as to their precise role and relationship to local role-players. Moreover, there are always fewer CDWs than wards. Further, it is not clear to whom they account, and how they should relate to the local council, officials or ward committees. In the words of Councillor Nzuzi, Speaker of the Ilembe DM:

“About Community Development Workers (CDWs), I don’t know these people, or who is in charge over them. ... I have heard that there is a person who supervises, and I have been told that person is at district level but we haven’t met. Only then will we know better what they do where, with whom, for whom.”²²

Most saw it as important that CDWs have some relation with ward committees, perhaps even acting as their secretariat.

Institutionalising Public Participation

Concern was expressed by both Ilembe and Sisonke that the responsibility for public participation had not been clearly institutionalised in public participation units. Indeed, both reported having no staff responsible to oversee public participation. Both complained of a lack of policy guidelines on this, and a lack of resources to employ staff to oversee this new set of responsibilities. Hence the budgets for public participation in Ilembe and Sisonke were just R50 000. eThekweni reported having a public participation unit, and a budget of R500 000, including R250 000 for the IDP process. Further, repeated reference was made by all municipalities for the need for training around public participation for officials, councillors and the community, and the lack of support from national or provincial government, or entities like SALGA in this regard. Lastly, Ilembe noted tensions between officials in the district and locals, undermining communication and information sharing between the municipalities. As reported by Mr Pahla, Traditional Councillor, KwaDukuza:

“An initiative was undertaken by the District mayor to set up proper community structures that would liaise directly with the District in matters relating to water, simply because it is the DM which is in charge of water. But the mayor for the LM came and poured cold water on all of that initiative.”²³

b. The view from below: public participation as seen by communities

Notably the data collected in this section of the research was from just three district municipalities: Ilembe, Sisonke and Mgungundlovu, and not eThekweni. Hence the gap in respect of Mgungundlovu 'from above' is mirrored by a gap around eThekweni 'from below'. While this is a problem, the constant nature of the trends across municipalities from both view-points suggests that there is good reason to assume very similar kinds of findings in the missing cases.

1. the positive

In general, perceptions 'from below' of public participation in the three municipalities were quite negative. However, there are two significant findings which suggest some reason for hope. First, most respondents were well aware of public participation – at least in the sense of having experienced *izimbizo* – and without exception thought that effective participation would be a good thing. Second, there was some evidence that respondents' perceptions of public participation was positively affected by well-run events, in which there was good follow-up by officials on key issues. This suggests that with the requisite levels of organisation and political skill, public participation can be made more meaningful.

2. the negative

As noted, on the whole, perceptions of public participation were quite negative, with respondents feeling that, even when it did occur, public participation tended to make little or no difference to local governance. Indeed, it was often commented that public participation was used mostly to legitimise decision already taken at a higher level. Significantly, the experience of public participation was almost entirely limited to *izimbizo*, with only a few experiencing ward committees, or any other mechanism of participation. This reflects the under-developed nature of public participation programmes at municipal level. Lastly, research suggested that civil society was very weak in most municipalities, leaving communities without alternative sources of organisation to take the initiative in respect of local governance.

Budget and IDP

Notably, respondents felt that consultation around the IDP did occur, but was often poor. Hence, the IDP forums operate partially, and the ward level reflection on the IDP – where it does happen – is not clearly integrated into the IDP at municipal or district level. Hence in Ilembe and Mgungundlovu it was felt that the IDP did not reflect the priorities of the community. In Sisonke it was felt that there was no link between the general and local priorities in the IDP. Notably, in Sisonke one set of respondents were members of a ward committee in an IFP area, who felt that the priorities they identified were passed over by ANC aligned district and local municipalities. Hence, party politics was perceived as undermining public participation.

Performance management

Respondents reported no evidence of public participation or consultation around the performance management system in any of the municipalities.

Izimbizo or Public Meetings

Izimbizo are the most common mechanism through which ordinary citizens experienced public participation. In this respect it is notable that all respondents had experienced *izimbizo* hosted by national and provincial government as well as by local government. As illustrated by Table 2 below, crucial to the success of an *imbizo* is the political will to make it happen, and this applies in three respects: attendance or access (the Ndwedwe example), participation or voice, and impact or follow-up from the meeting.

Table 2: The Ndwedwe *Imbizo* by Invitation

According to provincial government spokesperson Thabang Chiloane, the hosting of the Presidential *Imbizo* on 10 December 2005 at Ndwedwe reflected the fact that 'Ilembe is one of those municipalities in the province that have been identified as needing intervention by the provincial and national governments'.²⁴

However, unlike most *izimbizo* which look to facilitate unmediated communication between government and the people, the Ndwedwe *Imbizo* excluded ordinary members of the community. Attendance was strictly by accreditation and was 'restricted to mayors, councillors and invited guests'.

Notably, the Ndwedwe *imbizo* followed shortly after public meetings in KwaZulu-Natal where Deputy President Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka (Zuma's replacement), and provincial premier Sbu Ndebele had been heckled and booed by Zuma's supporters. According to media reports, the high security and admission by invitation of the Ndwedwe *imbizo* were designed to prevent any similar disruption.

Controversy surrounding the Ilembe *Imbizo* was not only restricted to the issue of attendance. The President 'urged councillors to give feedback to ward committees and encourage community participation'. Notably, one of the important messages conveyed in response was that local government 'services were mostly intended to certain political affiliates'.²⁵

Notably, respondents' evaluations towards *izimbizo* varied according to how well-organised the *imbizo* was, and the follow-up on issues raised. Hence in Ilembe Municipality, respondents felt that *izimbizo* were important forums for interaction with government, whereas in Sisonke and Mgungundlovu they were seen as ineffective road shows. As *Induna* Hadebe of KwaMpande, Mgungundlovu, observed:

“Consultation is a foreign concept here. People just do their own things. It is not just the members of the traditional council who are not consulted. Area committees do not hold meetings either. When the Councillor does happen to call the community, meetings are announced at very short notice. For an example, if say, people move around the area on a Saturday using loud hailers announcing a meeting to be held on Monday I don’t think you can call that a proper way of doing things. That is not proper consultation.”²⁶

Importantly, in all three municipalities respondents reported the provision of T-shirts, meals, music and entertainment as the main drawcards to ensure greater attendance. Further, in both Ilembe and Sisonke the *izimbizo* were well publicised with clear agendas. However, only in Ilembe were minutes or official notes taken, and there was evidence of follow-up by officials on the issues, which included liaising with the relevant government departments. Thus whereas Ilembe respondents felt that participation brought some change, Sisonke respondents felt that participation brought the promise of change, and Mgungundlovu respondents felt that participation brought nothing.

Further, respondents from Ilembe pointed to a Stakeholder Summit (consisting of business, civil society and CDWs) and a Water Summit (consisting of two members from each ward committee), that both resulted from undertakings given by the President at an *imbizo* in the area less than a year prior to these events. What this suggests is that while food, T-shirts and entertainment might attract larger numbers of people to *izimbizo* (hence increasing popular access to local government) they do not translate into meaningful input or outcomes. Rather, what seems to matter is that the *imbizo* is well run, so that people can express themselves, and perhaps most importantly, that the views are taken seriously and something tangible is done about the issues raised. Hence good organisation, but especially political will are required to turn an *imbizo* from a social event (and actually not that effective a public relations exercise given the resentment at the lack of outcomes) into a real participatory event.

Ward Committees and Community-Based Planning

Respondents from Ilembe and Sisonke noted that ward committees met regularly, but not in Mgungundlovu. Nevertheless, in both Ilembe and Sisonke it was reported that ward committee members lack the capacity to be effective. Partly this was due to a lack of training and resources, but partly also to the lack of a clear role. In Sisonke and Mgungundlovu development committees were seen as preferable, for this reason.

Notably respondents felt that ward committees did try to represent the interests of their communities, although contrary to the requirements of legislation, ward committee members tended to be drawn from the same party as the ward councillor in Ilembe and Sisonke. Perhaps this explains why ward committees worked well with the ward councillors, in those two municipalities, if not in Mgungundlovu.

Further, only in Sisonke was it reported that ward committees worked well with traditional leaders. Generally little or no interaction with civil society was reported as civil society organisations are very weak in all areas surveyed. In short then, the common perception is that, despite some good intentions, ward committees are largely ineffective structures. This is notable given the equally common and high dissatisfaction with the delivery of services across all municipalities.

Community Development Workers (CDWs)

Respondents’ views on CDWs varied tremendously, but tended to be positive when the role of CDWs, and their relationship to the municipality, was clearly established. This was the case in Sisonke mostly, to some extent in Mgungundlovu, but not in Ilembe. Hence in Sisonke and Mgungundlovu CDWs are allocated to all wards, and have some relationship with ward committees where they exist, but not in Ilembe. Further, In Sisonke and Mgungundlovu CDWs do seem to relate reasonably well to the office of the speakers and other role-players but again, not so in Ilembe. This suggests that the question of effective organisation between CDWs and key municipal officials is central to their effectiveness and thus their popularity. Notably, all ward committee members expressed unhappiness that CDWs are paid good salaries while they get nothing for a similar job. As observed by Councillor Mhlaba, ANC, KwaDukuza Local Municipality:

“Although Ward Committee members exist at ward level, we should remember that there are no incentives for these people – they do not get paid... Since they are spread across the ward, they usually have to use taxis in order to attend meetings. They have to use their own money to pay for transport.”²⁷

Notably Sisonke respondents reported that ward committee members do get a R300 monthly stipend to cover costs.

Institutionalising Public Participation

In Ilembe a public participation unit is not in place, and the district manager uses members of staff drawn from the speaker’s office. Moreover there is no discrete or ‘ring-fenced’ public participation budget. In Sisonke a unit was in the process of being set up, and plans to advertise the position of training officer and support staff were underway. A total of R500 000 was mentioned as the proposed budget for the unit in the coming financial year. Mgungundlovu was the only district municipality with a public participation unit in place.

The issue of training emerged repeatedly from respondents as a major need. Training was understood as education in everything from local government, to community development, to the rights of communities. While there were reports of some training for councillors in Sisonke, it was reported as inadequate. Further, respondents reported little or no training of ward committee members or communities across all three municipalities.

Other: citizen’s charters, councillors, service delivery & traditional leaders

Other issues that emerged from the research included ignorance of various modalities and instruments of public participation. For example, no respondents were familiar with the notion of a citizen’s charter, and no municipality had implemented a local citizen’s charter, despite the development of a provincial charter in November 2005. Further, in all three municipalities, respondents felt that meetings with ward councillors were a waste of time – if indeed they ever happened, as was the experience of Mgungundlovu. In general respondents felt powerless in respect of their councillors, even when, as in the cases of Ilembe and Sisonke, respondents reported that their councillors were enthusiastic about public participation.

These feelings were most sharply expressed in respect of service delivery. Not only did respondents feel that current forms of public participation made no difference to service delivery, but confusion about whether the district or local municipality were responsible for service delivery was also expressed. Hence, as Councillor, Mr Amani Pillay, IFP, of the Ilembe District put it:

“Although not intended, we are having this problem of duplication. Money is wasted at the LM level; money is wasted at the district level - to do the same thing. This is what makes things so costly. This is also the problem with the IDP.”²⁸

Further, in all three municipalities, party conflict came up as one of the major impediments to service delivery. In Sisonke, lack of delivery to an IFP ward by an ANC council was seen as an attempt to undermine the IFP. Similar sentiments were expressed by an IFP ward in Mgungundlovu. Despite dissatisfaction with the politicised and slow pace of delivery, most respondents indicated an ignorance of their rights and especially how to access them.

Another major issue was the relationship of traditional leaders to local councillors, and to public participation structures and processes. Respondents from Sisonke noted that conflict between traditional leadership and elected officials is a major obstacle, in Mgungundlovu the relationship is ambivalent, and in Ilembe it was reported as good. In all three municipalities respondents noted the misgivings of traditional leadership as to the political orientation of elected representatives which they saw as prejudicial against them and their constituencies.

6 Discussion

Overall the findings of the empirical research on the state of public participation in KZN municipalities are not that positive. The DPLG *Ward Committee Resource Book* notes that institutions of public participation ‘will not work’ when:

- they try to co-opt independent and legitimate voices within civil society
- there is no definite political commitment to the model
- the system exists in principle (that is, it sounds good on paper) but when it comes to carrying it out, the necessary resources are not available.²⁹

In brief, our finding was that while there was no real evidence of co-option, and some evidence of political commitment, the necessary resources to make participation work are not yet available. (For more details see Table 3). Where officials conceded that public participation mechanisms are generally poorly developed, communities confirmed this, adding they felt they made little or no difference to local governance. Notably, both officials and communities agree on some of the causes of this malaise: a lack of resources invested in public participation, especially money for staff and training, and the failure to institutionalise public participation effectively in the municipality and between district and local levels. Lastly, the weakness of civil society means that communities are even more reliant on state goodwill and effectiveness to realise effective participation.

Table 3: Limitations of Public Participation

- 1. Budget & IDP:**
 - 1.1. Irregular and largely meaningless nature of most budget/IDP *izimbizo*
 - 1.2. The partial operation of IDP forums
 - 1.3. No role for ward committees in Local and District budget and IDP processes
- 2. Performance management systems:**
 - 2.1. No evidence of public participation in the performance management systems in any of the municipalities
- 3. Izimbizo**
 - 3.1. Irregular
 - 3.2. Little opportunity for meaningful input
 - 3.3. Lack of continuity or follow-up of issues
- 4. Ward Committees & Community-Based Planning**
 - 4.1. Limited role of ward committees in Local and District municipal processes
 - 4.2. Lack of clarity on relationship of ward committees to the District
 - 4.3. Lack of training for ward committees
 - 4.4. Partisan politics undermining ward committees
 - 4.5. Lack of remuneration for ward committee members

7 Recommendations and comparisons

In light of the above findings and discussion, we would like to make the following five sets of recommendations.

5. **Community Development Workers**
 - 5.1. Confusion over role and accountability of CDWs
6. **Institutionalising Public Participation**
 - 6.1. Confusion over where to house public participation.
 - 6.2. Confusion over the relationship between District and Local
 - 6.3. A lack of resources, especially money, for public participation
 - 6.4. A lack of training for officials, councillors and the community
7. **Others**
 - 7.1. Weak civil society
 - 7.2. Negative perceptions of participation as regards service delivery

On the positive side though, there was evidence that respondents' perceptions of public participation was positively affected by well-run events, in which there was good follow-up. A more detailed list of positive findings is below in Table 4. This suggests that with the requisite levels of organisation and political will, public participation can be made more meaningful. To make the point another way, the solutions to poor public participation appear to be better organisation (institutionalisation, well-run events), the resources to do this (money, staff, training), and most of all, the political will to make it happen. In this regard both officials and communities affirmed the value of the idea of public participation – providing something of basis in political will for improving on the status quo.

Table 4: Strengths of Public Participation Practice

1. **Budget & IDP:**
 - 1.1. The integration of IDP and budget planning processes as in eThekweni, creates a more effective process, opening the possibility for more influential public participation.
2. **Izimbizo:**
 - 2.1. Food, entertainment and gifts boost attendance, but minute-taking and follow-up by officials is required for positive perceptions of real change. Hence while access is well done, more attention needs to be paid to issues of meaningful participation (voice) and follow-up (impact).
3. **Ward councillors:**
 - 3.1. Many ward committees try to represent the whole community and work well with ward councillors.

1. **Institutionalisation.** There exists something of a policy vacuum, hopefully to be filled before too long, as regards institutionalisation of public participation. More specifically the issues that this policy needs to address include:
 - 1.1. The establishment and location of a public participation unit
 - 1.2. The annual development of a public participation plan that assigns responsibility and sets time-frames for all the activities requiring public participation
 - 1.3. Clarifying the relationship between district and local municipalities as regards public participation, especially *izimbizo*, ward committees, and public participation plans
 - 1.4. The relationship of CDWs to local municipalities, especially in respect of public participation, for instance, ward committees
2. **Resources.** Local government requires resources to make public participation effective, including :
 - 2.1. Dedicated administrative staff for public participation units
 - 2.2. Funding for these staff
 - 2.3. Funding for the training of councillors, ward committee members and the community to engage meaningfully in public participation
3. **Existing mechanisms.** Guidelines to improve existing public participation mechanisms are required. More specifically, municipalities would benefit from:
 - 3.1. *Izimbizo*: Best practice guidelines need to be developed. At the moment there is some real world success in securing attendance (access) at *izimbizo*, but more needs to be done to secure meaningful participation (voice) and follow-up (impact).
 - 3.2. Ward committees: resources are needed to (i) support effective ward committee operation and (ii) train ward committee members. Perhaps more important though is (iii) the need to empower ward committees in various council process. E.g. participatory budgeting using ward committees after the examples of Porto Alegre in Brazil³⁰ and the Kerala state in India³¹. One model is to top-slice 5% off the budget, and delegate it to ward committees according to a needs-driven distribution formula, who then decide what projects to implement using a community-based planning process.
4. **New Mechanisms.** Guidelines to introduce new public participation mechanisms are required. Some possibilities include:
 - 4.1. Budget/IDP: Planning processes need to be integrated in a similar way to the eThekweni model to allow for more effective and rationalised participation.
 - 4.2. Budget/IDP forums: Best practice guidelines need to be developed to ensure the effective inclusion of civil society in the annual review process.
 - 4.3. Advisory committees: If used, they tend to be 'expert stakeholder' forums. One option is to institutionalise 'expert stakeholder' advisory committees into annual processes like the

performance management system review, or service delivery contracting. Another, is to constitute them as 'citizen's juries' on key public policy issues (e.g. renaming of streets).

4.4. Citizen's Charter: municipalities need to develop a citizen's charter which explains how to make use of public participation, including contact information.

5. **Civil society partnerships.** Public participation is currently practiced mostly as community participation. More effort needs to be placed on public participation as involving civil society organisations as these can play a leadership role in the community. Given the weak state of much civil society, municipalities can assist civil society by creating constructive partnerships. This should allow for more effective local governance. Some suggestions include:

- 5.1. A civil society register and contact list for use by municipal communications
- 5.2. Using new mechanisms that draw on civil society like those listed under point 4 above
- 5.3. Partnerships with civil society in aspects of local governance, for example, public participation training.

Some of these recommendations are very likely to be met in the LGTA's forthcoming *Community Participation Framework* Document, specifically points 1.1, 1.2 and 4.4 above. Also some points will be partly covered such as 1.3 and 2.1. However many of the remaining points go beyond the recommendations of the document. This makes it reasonable to assume that much of the challenge to realise effective public participation remains.

Notably, this is not a challenge of political will but rather one of practical implementation. It is a challenge of those who want to participate, but cannot yet. With better organisation and resources we can meet this challenge, and develop real public participation which improves delivery, builds local governance and deepens democracy.

Endnotes

- 1,2 See <http://www.constitutionalcourt.org.za/Archimages/7606.PDF>.
- 3 *The Witness* 04/04/07.
- 4 *The World Bank Participation Sourcebook*. Washington: World Bank, 1996. P. xi.
- 5 Ibid P.5.
- 6 Ibid Pp.5-6.
- 7 Pithouse R (2006) Rethinking public participation from below. In I Buccus, J Hicks, T Ngwenya (eds) *Critical Dialogue*, Vol 2 No 2
- 8 Development Research Centre. 2006. *Building Effective States: Taking a Citizen's Perspective*. Brighton: University of Sussex. P. 3
- 9 Ibid P.6.
- 10 *Objectives, Standards, Criteria and Indicators for the African Peer Review Mechanism*. P. 8. [<http://www.nepad.org/aprm/>]
- 11 *Country Self-Assessment for the African Peer Review Mechanism*. P. 5. [<http://www.nepad.org/aprm/>]
- 12 Carothers, T. 2005. 'What really lies behind challenges of deepening democracy and establishing the rule of law?', paper at *New Challenges in State Building*, Centre for the Future State Conference, London, 21 June.
- 13 See Putnam, R. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- 14 *Draft National Policy Framework for Public Participation*. 2005. Public Participation and Empowerment Chief Directorate. Department of Provincial and Local Government. P. 2. [http://www.thedplg.gov.za/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=27&dir=DESC&order=name&limit=5&limitstart=15]
- 15 See DPLG. 1997. *The White Paper on Local Government*. [<http://www.treasury.gov.za/mfma/guidelines/policy/whitepaper.pdf>] Pp. 13-14.
- 16 See Section 4(1)(b) of the *Municipal Systems Act* (32 of 2000)
- 17 See the DPLG Ward Committee Handbook and DPLG Ward Committee Resource Book, both available at http://www.thedplg.gov.za/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=27&Itemid=27
- 18 see Ntuli, Z. 'Mbeki calls for integration in all spheres of government'. *GCIS*, 11 December.
- 19 Nachmias H and Nachmias J 1998 *Research Methods in Social Relations* (Third Edition), St Alban's Press. Selltiz C and Jehoda H 2000 *Research Surveys in Human Relationships* (8th edition) Mc Graw Hills
- 20 See Corporate Policy Unit. 2004. *Making City Strategy Come Alive: Experiences from eThekweni Municipality*, Durban, South Africa. Durban: eThekweni Municipality. Pp. 68-77.
- 21 Interviewed on 07 October 2006.
- 22 Interviewed on 21 September 2006.
- 23 Interviewed on 07 October 2006.
- 24 Mtshali, T. 2005. 'Mbeki to avoid Zuma supporters in KZN', *Cape Times*, 09 December 2005.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 Interviewed on 16 February 2007
- 27 Interviewed on 21 September 2006.
- 28 Interviewed on 21 September 2006.
- 29 See DPLG. 2005. *Ward Committee Resource Book*. [http://www.thedplg.gov.za/index.php?option=com_docman&task=cat_view&gid=27&Itemid=27] P. 10.
- 30 See Navarro, Z. 2002. 'Decentralization, Participation and Social Control of Resources: Participatory Budgeting' in Porto Alegre (Brazil), paper presented at *Citizen Participation in the Context of Fiscal Decentralisation: Best Practices in Municipal Administration Workshop*, Tokyo and Kobe, Japan, 02-06 September.
- 31 See Thomas Isaac, T.M & Richard Franke. 2002. *Local Democracy and Development: The Kerala People's Campaign for Decentralised Planning*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Centre for Public Participation

Office Suite 801
Intuthuko Junction
750 Francois Road
Durban 4001

P.O. Box 30191
Mayville 4058

Tel: 031 261 9001
Fax: 031 261 9059

E-mail: info@cpp.org.za
Website: www.cpp.org.za

