

MSUNDUZI ASSOCIATION OF RESIDENTS, RATEPAYERS AND CIVICS (MARRC)

Tel: 072 536 2978 E-mail: msunduziarrc@gmail.com
PO BOX 100969, SCOTTSVILLE PIETERMARITZBURG 3201

The Msunduzi Association of Residents, Ratepayers, and Civic Organisations (MARRC)

Community Comments on the Msunduzi 2019/2020 IDP

**In accordance with the requirements of the Municipal System Act
No 32 of 2000 (MSA) & Amendments thereto including the**

LOCAL GOVERNMENT: MUNICIPAL PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS

The intent of the MSA inter alia, and particularly relating to the IDP and its functions as a strategic management tool for developmental local governance is:

- A. To define the legal nature of a municipality as including the local community within the municipal area, working in partnership with the municipality's political and administrative structures;
- B. To provide for the manner in which municipal powers and functions are exercised and performed;
- C. To provide for genuine community participation;
- D. To establish a simple and enabling framework for the core processes of planning and performance management.

The members of MARRC have carefully studied the IDP and its associated SDF (understood, as the integration arm of the IDP) and have come to the following conclusions:

1. Procedurally and substantively, the 2019/2020 IDP which is also now reflected as the 2017-2022 IDP does not comply with the requirements of the MSA or the Municipal planning and performance management regulations.

1. Procedurally, the public were invited to comment on the 2019-2020 IDP during the week prior to the budget adoption process. The initial power "presentation of the IDP" to the public during the process was substantially truncated and reflected a few Status Quo "facts" and an illegible map showing some dots and square as to where some illegible projects were located.

This was certainly not a strategic planning overview or a municipal strategy depicting the direction of senior management and governance for the next five years. Consequently, the public presentations by the Municipal staff and the mayor were procedurally fatally flawed.

2. Procedurally, the process was subsequently flawed as the new IDP now is dated 2017 -2022 and is a different document that the public were invited to comment on three weeks ago. Consequently, the documents debated in council and by various other stakeholders are now different in form and in content and again a fatal flaw in community participation is at hand.

3. Substantively, much of the current 2017-2022 document contains outdated 2011 statistics which the strategy is attempting to address required projections to 2023 in the short term according to the requirements of the MSA. Many of the projections in the plan stop at 2017 or 2015 which are rather useless and erroneous a strategy point of view unless, of course, one is attempting “backward planning” which is substantively flawed as the implementation horizon has already passed. Therefore none of the strategies can be supported as they can only be backwardly substantiated if at all.

4. There is no substantiated analysis or strategies that address the municipality’s internal transformation needs, in the wake of the gross public administrative governance situation that **MUST be informed by the strategies and programmes set out in the integrated development plan as called for in the MSA performance management regulations Section 2(11)**. Therefore the IDP is fatally flawed from a legal PMS perspective.

5. The MSA performance management regulations also call for careful documentation and strategic management of any investment initiatives in the municipality initiated by the private sector in accordance with Section 2(11). Again a huge oversight that means there is no private sector engagement or even vague knowledge of what private investments are possibly occurring or more accurately fleeing the Municipal area of jurisdiction. The strategic intent should be to ascertain the **extent of capital flight** and the **extent of public sector confidence** in the municipal area of jurisdiction in order to invest in the area. Once again a regulatory requirement that has been ignored.

6. Following from point 5 is the direct consequence that genuine **public engagement and participation has not occurred at in the analysis sections or in the strategies sections of the IDP as is required as stated as point C of the intent of the IDP as is required in the MSA**.

7. There are none of the “outcomes” or outcome indicators in the IDP and the SDF, and the IDP and SDF are aligned.

8. Integration is not evident and merely calling roads “corridors” does not make them corridors or “integrators” in a planning process. The substance needed in these cases is lacking.

Conclusion: The IDP and SDF are fatally flawed and cannot be supported.

Anthony Waldhausen
Chairperson
MARRC
Email: arwaldhausen@gmail.com
Tel: 072 536 2978

2 July 2020