

TOGETHER WE MOVE SOUTH AFRICA FORWARD





UPDATE

- 25 April 2018
- Cabinet approved release of Bill for public comment
- 04 May 2018
- Bill Gazetted and released for public comment, with initial closing date of 8 May 2018 but after requests for an extension of deadline new date 4 June 2018
- As at closure date:
 - 19 DPME consultations and engagements were convened with relevant and critical stakeholders
 - 67 public comment submissions were received on the Bill

CONSULTATIONS

1.	NPC	11.	Cities Support Network
2.	DPSA	12.	Gauteng Provincial
3.	Auditor General		Planning Unit
4.	The Study Group	13.	Department Justice & Correctional Services
5.	National Treasury	1 1	
6.	COGTA	14.	Presidency
		15.	Department Human
 7.	Health		Settlements
8.	Health Strat Planning Workshop	16.	Department Basic
9.	SALGA Management Com	. 0.	Education
10.	FFC	17.	Limpopo Province
		18.	North West Province
		19.	Statistics South Africa

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Ministers

Minister Nene; Minister Mkhize

DGs

 Statistician General; Auditor General; Public Service Commission; DPSA; Office of the Premier: Free State; Office of the Premier: Western Cape; Health; National Treasury; Office of the Head of Department – Ekurhuleni City Planning; Science & Technology; COGTA; Economic Development and Transport; Justice & Correctional Supervision; Presidency

Officials

Ms Colette Clark-DPSA

NPC

Prof MW Makgoba on behalf of the National Planning Commission

NPC Secretariat

Dr Kefiloe Masiteng

NGOs

Institute for Security Studies; South African Cities Network; Isandla

Academia

 North West University: Prof Anel Du Plessis; UJ: Prof George Onatu; UCT: Dr Nombeka Mbevu; University of Stellenbosch: Dr Babette Rabie; WITS School of Architecture and Planning; University of Venda-Committee of Heads of Planning

PUBLIC COMMENTS (2)

Sector Specific

SA Property Association; SA National Biodiversity Institute; Law Society of SA

National Departments

 Women; National Treasury-Cities Support Programme; Human Settlements; Basic Education; DRDLR

Provinces

 Office of the Premier: Limpopo; City of Tshwane: Group Legal & Secretariat Services & Economic Development & Spatial Planning; Free State Department of Education; Limpopo, Vhembe; Western Cape Department of Health; Office of the Premier North West Province

Other

 Mr David Bills; Mr Nelson Ditshela; Ms Sam Braid; Ms Zandi Kabini; Mr Sifiso Hlatshwayo; Mr Mbulelo Dala; Mr Louise de Villiers; Ms Mmalethabo Julian; Mr Kheta Zulu; Mr Hendrik du Toit; Mr Sam Dagane

International Institutions - UNDP

Chapter 9 Institutions

 South African Human Rights Commission; South African Planning Institutions; South African Council for Planners;

Expert Commissions - FFC

Local Government - South African Local Government Association State Owned Enterprises - Transnet; IDC; SANRAL; ESKOM; Randwater Mayoral Offices - Cape Town

IMPORTANT CRITIQUES

- 13 fairly important public submissions stood out and exceedingly critical of Bill
 - DPSA
 - o DoT
 - COGTA
 - Finance-NT; FFC & Cities Support Programme
 - Western Cape Premiers Office
 - o SALGA
 - o DBE
 - o DOJCD
 - Human Settlements
 - Health; and
 - The City of Tshwane (Legal)
- Constitutional Court judgement, on 7 June 2018, in City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality v Chairman of the National Building Review Board, [2018] ZACC 15, relating to the constitutional principles of distinctive, interrelated and interdependent powers also has implications for the Bill

PROBLEM STATEMENT

- 1. (Limited) Planning powers and functions in Govt are provided for in Constitution and straddle 3 spheres
- 2. Current system is characterised by dispersed, disparate and diffused planning responsibilities with a plethora of structures and legislation, leading to parallel plans, processes and initiatives that affect policy coherence, co-ordination and effective implementation
- 3. Separation between planning and budgeting creates risks of misdirection of resources and under-resourcing of critical policy priorities
- 4. Lack of a NSDF limits govt's ability to lead the spatial location of development and related investments

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

- 1. Developmental Principles & Norms and Standards
- 2. Provides for functions of DPME
- 3. Establishes an institutional framework for a new predictable planning paradigm and discipline
- 4. Co-ordination and Institutionalisation of the Planning System including Status of National Development Plan
- 5. Supports effective M&E of government programmes
- 6. Establishment of Central Information Repository
- 7. Provide for function and continued existence of NPC
- 8. Better co-ordination, integration, collaboration and alignment of PME between and across 3 spheres incl. SOCs, DFIs, Public Entities and the social partners
- 9. Accountability Management and intervention support, and
- 10.Matters for Regulation



OBJECTS OF BILL, TO...

- Establish NDP as primary long-term plan & vision to guide all govt planning
- Reaffirm DPME as lead co-ordinator of integrated planning system for govt
- Provide for continued existence, powers and functions of NPC
- Ensure coordination, alignment of planning across 3 spheres; incl SOEs, DFIs and public entities
- Ensure that planning and budgetary decisions contribute to govt developmental objectives
- Provide for systemic M&E and implementation of govt developmental objectives
- Ensure that govt performance, as informed by various plans and planning frameworks, is properly monitored and evaluated, and lessons from M&E are utilised
- Provide for accountability measures and related interventions; and
- Give effect to obligations emanating from global, continental, and regional development goals and frameworks to which we are party, such as by the UN, AU and SADC

OVERALL REMARKS

- Bill had a fairly good response to the request for public comments and this should be appreciated and noted
- Effort by DPME, through the public release of the Bill, to ensure better integration, coherence and alignment of a functional national planning system was expressly welcomed and considered timely
- Recognised that functioning of planning system can be improved
- While there is broad consensus about NDP, likely to be more contestation about whether doing it through a Bill was the best approach.

OVERALL REMARKS (2)

- National Developmental Planning, as lever for developmental planning, broadly accepted
- Distinction "National Planning for SA" and "National Planning in govt" useful insofar as it outlines breath of planning landscape
- In line with experience of successful developmental states, accepted national planning required an authority - logical role of Minister in the Presidency
- Bill must reflect 3 critical cogs that should be further sharpened:
 - Establishment, 2010, of SA's first ever NPC
 - Release & approval, August 2012, of SA's first ever NDP, and
 - Establishment, 2014, Department of Performance Monitoring & Evaluation to form DPME through an executive authority, being a Cabinet Minister

AREAS OF CONCERN

Number of issues considered areas of major concern and contradiction

THE NPC vis-a-vis DPME

- Roles and responsibilities of DPME and that of NPC needs a better articulation (and further clarification)
- Bill does not come out stronger as to why it intends to use legislation to regulate functionary departmental matters relating to planning, monitoring and evaluation and then use the same legislation to deal with the mandate, existence and the powers conferred to the NPC
- The need was for Bill to address national development planning
- NPC submitted inputs which included that role of the NPC, as apex planning commission for the country, should be more clearly articulated

AREAS OF CONCERN (2)

- The deadline for public comments
- Ignoring of fullness of principles of inter-governmental cooperation
- Powers, roles and responsibilities of DPME vis-à-vis everyone else
- Lack of proper definitions of planning terms and terminology
- Perceived subsuming and/or straddling Spatial Planning
- Need for "Norms and Standards"
- The necessity of a Central Information Repository
- The need for "Accountability Management"
- Continued lack of clarity of "Institutionalisation of Planning"
- Explaining and clarifying "Improving co-ordination"
- The need for "Planning Cycles"
- The question of updating and or amending the NDP
- The utility and relevance of existing planning and policy instruments

Questions to reflect on at 2nd Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation Forum

MAKING THE CASE

In making the case for new policy and/or legislation:

- What are the salient areas where we require a new policy and/or an Act for?
- What is the rationale that will advance this case?

Stated differently:

 What precisely is the mischief that we wish to address through an Act?

Assume:

- A law is passed on 1 October 2018, what will change on the vast terrain of our disparate, diffused and fragmented planning landscape?
 - •Will efforts at planning across 3 spheres improve?
 - **OWILL NDP implementation improve?**
 - •Will our impact improve?

CONTEXT: THE PROCESS TO LEGISLATE

- Important that reflections consider process for making law, as per Constitution
- Starts with a Discussion Document (Green Paper) typically drafted in Ministry/Dept dealing with a particular issue/set of issues
- This provides the general thinking that informs a particular policy, and is published for comment, suggestions or ideas
- Leads to a more refined document, a White Paper, which is a broad statement of govt policy
- Serves as backdrop and guide to drafting of a Bill
- Followed by further consultations before and after introduction to Parliament

REFLECTION

On Content

- Is there a sufficiently strong case to be made for a new policy; and should we follow with Discussion Document, White Paper and Bill?
 - What are some of the policy areas/issues to note?
 - Can we discuss this at PME Forum and list and propose same?
- There needs to be wider consultations, beyond govt only-include rest of social partners

On Process

- We have IPF Bill-some tough lessons learnt, principally, in 3 areas
 - 1. Need for an unequivocal and crystal-clear policy intent
 - 2. Is legislation the best means to the end the test of rationality: 'Affordable Medicines Trust' Concourt case, 2006 Court noted:
 - "The exercise of all legislative power is subject to ... constitutional constraints...that there must be a rational connection between the legislation and the achievement of a legitimate government purpose."
 - 3. Transparent, open and inclusive consultation process to get stakeholders on board within reasonable time frames

CONCLUSION

•	Recasting Bill must:
	Ensure an agreed process to align and integrate NDP
	across 3 spheres
	Bill will co-ordinate and operate at macro, overarching
	level
•	Explain better:
	□ National Development Planning-what is it? Why? Who
	does it, and for whom is it done?
	Long term developmental view - 20/30 years
	Role of NPC (what will its roles/responsibilities be?)
	Respond to what is ideal institutional arrangement
	necessary
	Establish an overall planning framework
	Draw in key departments, after initial framing
	☐ Develop 10-20 page Policy Document
	Develop implementation plan - frame of reference

CONCLUSION (2)

- Recrafting Bill must:
 - □ Ensure implementation of planning and more effective M&E
 - ☐ Define "co-ordination", "integration" and "alignment" and provide coherence
- Centred on NDP
 - ☐ 5year Implementation Plan (for N, P and L)
 - ☐ Sector plans (plus any other plans)
 - ☐ Social partners-what will be its role
 - Academia –define roles
 - □ Planning bodies define roles
 - Research define roles

S DANKIE KE A LEBOGA MGIYABONGA NDIYABULELA
NDI NDI KHOU
NDI KHOU
LIVHUHA Thank you