

# INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND HOUSING POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

**Kedibone Phago**

Turfloop Graduate School of Leadership

University of Limpopo

kedibone.phago@ul.ac.za

---

## Abstract

Housing policy in South Africa requires that government departments at different spheres coordinate their activities to facilitate the provision of housing. This coordination is imperative because without such, effective housing provision remains compromised. The question that this paper raises is: whether intergovernmental relations (IGR) for housing policy implementation in South Africa? From this question it is clear that the nature of this discussion is conceptual as it seeks to engage on the institutional IGR model of public housing delivery. This question is raised in this paper because a system that ties activities of different spheres of government is necessary to realise housing policy implementation outcomes. However, in responding to this question several issues receive attention: Firstly, a broader view on a social contract as well as establishing public institutions to facilitate public service delivery. Secondly, intergovernmental relations and housing which consider the nature of IGR system in place, while arguing that this system is not viable for housing delivery. Thirdly, while the municipal accreditation system has been introduced, it remains complex and costly in addressing housing delivery challenges. In the final analysis, this paper argues for a constitutional amendment which would allow housing to become a functional competency of municipalities similar to other human settlements components such as roads constructions, electricity, sanitation and clean drinking water.

**Keywords:** intergovernmental relations, housing policy, policy implementation, service delivery, human settlements

## INTRODUCTION

A discussion of intergovernmental relations in South Africa is topical and relevant; especially in the domain of housing policy and human settlements. In this domain,

different actors are considered to ensure that liveable conditions, for the low income communities are made for the improvement of their wellbeing. This article undertakes to consider how intergovernmental relations (IGR) is understood in South Africa within the context of housing. This consideration seeks to highlight key challenges inherent in the current IGR system within housing. Further, a discussion on the accreditation system and its impediments to the improvement of housing conditions are observed. In this regard, a final analysis is made on the relevant issues to ensure that a viable IGR model which considers issues of policy and strategy, and not just of policy implementation is sought. A discussion of a social contract is discussed below to provide the context of housing and human settlements within the broader perspective of government functions and responsibilities.

## **THE SOCIAL CONTRACT AND PUBLIC SERVICE DELIVERY**

In constitutional democratic countries such as South Africa, where societies regularly elect their representatives as well as government, the question of the manner in which societal needs are addressed becomes crucial. In fact, the question of societal needs is the main reason why government is elected to act on behalf of the (community) members. It is perceived that community members are preoccupied with the running of their daily lives; hence the need for government to act as an agent. Therefore, one of the fundamental roles of government remains the provision of quality public services (either directly or through other innovative means and approaches). The establishment of public institutions where specialist appointments are done serves this justification. The performance of these specialists appointments are usually overseen by political executives regarding the achievements of political mandates and goals that should translate into the provision of quality public services (Phago 2012: 61– 65). In a context where the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa 1996 makes a provision to operate the government within the three spheres, it becomes imperative for this article to analyse intergovernmental relations arrangements in this context. This is because the question of IGR is embedded in the sphere of government model that the 1996 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa prescribes. Therefore, this Constitution further requires attention on how IGR could be structured and then operationalised in accordance with Chapter 3 of the 1996 Constitution. This intergovernmental relations seeks to indicate the need for cooperative governance and minimise tension among the different spheres of government. A promulgation of the Intergovernmental Relations Frameworks Act 13 of 2005 has sought to provide for a framework, systems and approaches supporting IGR among the three spheres of government in the provision of public services.

However, for issues of human settlements and housing, the question of IGR remains a going concern where both formal and informal (intergovernmental relations) structures have not been fully implemented to resolve this conceptual puzzle (Department of Provincial and Local Government 2007). Schedule 4 of the 1996 Constitution details housing as one of the concurrent competence of national and provincial spheres of government. A consideration of this provision provides contradiction since, on the one hand viable municipalities in cities and metropolitan municipalities have been engaged with housing development projects, delivery and managing municipal rental stock of some kind, despite this constitutional provision in Schedule 4. On the other hand, this provision inhibits initiatives from smaller, poorer and rural municipalities that have not been involved in the provision of housing as part of the apartheid prescripts; because currently housing is not regarded as a municipal competency. In this case, what emerges from this observation is that the levelling of a playing field for all municipalities to ensure that the question of accreditation does not favour some and not others as such conditions are not their (municipalities) own creations; but were inherited from a system of separate development (during apartheid South Africa).

In order to realise an implementation of a social contract where sustainable and quality public services are rendered in relation to housing within a local government sphere, the national Department of Human Settlements has introduced the municipal accreditation process. This matter of the accreditation of municipalities remains controversial and vague to fathom in the context of existing policy provisions, which are mainly documented in the Housing Act 107 of 1997, the Breaking New Ground Policy of 2004 and the Housing Code of 2009. There is a further contradiction which is visible in the provisions of the Breaking New Ground Policy of 2004 that indicates that the accreditation is expected to bring about shifts in the delivery of housing, with the Housing Code of 2009 affirming a constitutional provision of the concurrency of responsibilities; despite municipalities being accredited. Table 1 below is a summary of the inherent contradictions of these three policies which form the basis for this municipal accreditation dispensation:

**Table 1:** Inherent contradictions of the municipal housing accreditation process

Policy	Base/position	Contradiction
Housing Act 107 of 1997	Housing forms part of municipal IDP process	Is IDP process a bottom up or top-down approach? Does the IDP inform Provincial Processes or vice versa?
	Municipalities to apply to MECs for accreditation	In the case where MECs are accrediting municipalities, what role does the minister play?
Breaking New Ground Policy of 2004	Phased-in accreditation system	The choice is determined by the Minister. This has failed and currently fewer municipalities have been accredited. BNG requires a comprehensive review to ascertain its impact on human settlements.
Housing Code of 2009	Three levels of accreditation	Which municipalities will achieve which levels? How is this approach related to Housing Act of 1997 and the Breaking New Ground policy above?

**Source:** Own observation

From this observation, it is clear that the question of municipal accreditation requires a substantial reconsideration on whether it indeed addresses the interests of the different spheres of government in an effective and efficient manner. The rationale for this assertion is that housing delivery remains a key government obligation to society and forms an important component of the government's social contract. Table 1 above indicates the need to harmonise the three overarching policies on human settlements, including housing. Such a consideration should look at the intended goal which is to afford municipalities some space and role in the provision of housing. What this table also highlights is that the manner in which the role of municipalities is viewed is complex and therefore requires to be simplified. A simplified model in this regard should consider human settlements and housing as a primary responsibility of municipalities without the attached conditions as currently required by municipal accreditation process. This observation is primarily supported by the fact that municipal involvement on similar infrastructure and other related technical projects have been operated by municipalities since their reconstitution and establishment in 2000. The rationale for such an approach remains inexplicit and ambiguous, and further complicates the manner in which municipalities are required to respond to human settlements and housing needs of their communities. In order

to further the discussion regarding how government is undertaking to address the housing needs, the issue of how intergovernmental relations systems are geared towards responding to housing delivery is discussed below.

## **INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS AND HOUSING**

The question of intergovernmental relations features in varying forms within the entire system of government. For example, it may appear in the manner in which municipalities relate to provinces or the manner in which the national government departments address provincial concerns. Going back to Table 1 above, it is difficult to comprehend how an intergovernmental relations model could be able to harmonise these three conflicting policy positions in order to realise a successful municipal participation in housing delivery. The National Council of Provinces<sup>1</sup> (NCOP), has also compiled a list of questions that resonate with IGR issues and institutional administrative framework. These questions were compiled for the different ministers of the Social Services and Governance Cluster which include the then National Department of Housing. Questions on housing also relate directly to the capacity of the National Department of Human settlements in carrying out their administrative mandate. The questions as asked by members of the NCOP include the following (National Council of Provinces 2008, 2–6):

- Six hundred houses of the 15 000 Zanemvula Human Settlement Project units in the Eastern Cape Province have been certified as faulty and need to be demolished. What are the administrative and financial ramifications of the process? Are there administrative measures in place to recoup the funds lost from demolishing these 600 units?
- Is there coordination between various government departments of housing and entities with regard to the allocation of housing units to relevant beneficiaries?
- Is the Minister aware of the different lists between certain provinces and their municipalities regarding housing waiting lists? This question is of concern as other beneficiaries receive stand numbers of the houses they should occupy while after completion houses are occupied by different beneficiaries.
- Does the Department have any plans in place to correct the recurrence of the Free State Province's under-spending of R82, 2 million of the 2007/08 financial year?
- Does the Department keep a record of the total number of the reported housing units that are demolished or rebuilt as a result of poor building materials and shoddy contractors?

- Is the Department putting preventative measures administratively to avoid poor building materials and shoddy work by contractors?
- What is the current situation regarding the performance audit by the Office of the Auditor-General on RDP housing projects?
- Has the Department ensured that contractors have been prosecuted for the shoddy work and for non-completion of contracts?

These questions have direct relevance on how IGR activities manifest in complex varying degrees and require sophisticated administrative skills to facilitate in addressing challenges in the delivery of housing. In the main, the questions highlight practical and operational challenges which need coordination from all the three spheres of government. The importance of these questions also lies in the fact that they were raised with the Minister of Human Settlements by Members of Parliament who represent their constituencies (ordinary citizens) and the interest of the provinces at the national sphere of government. The nature of these questions also seeks to determine checks and balances of housing IGR system in South Africa.

In this regard, the promulgation and operationalisation of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act 13 of 2005 has been a positive advancement of an administrative arrangement in coordinating the activities of the three spheres of government. There are numerous focal points in which this Act is attempting to address in strengthening aspects relating to intergovernmental relations which have some relevance to housing and human settlements namely:

- Intergovernmental structures, which include President's coordinating council, national intergovernmental forums, MinMec, as well as municipal intergovernmental forums.
- Conduct of intergovernmental relations.
- Settlement of intergovernmental disputes.
- Other important matters relating to intergovernmental relations such as reporting to parliament.

The Department of Provincial and Local Government (2007) has further identified these practical aspects, where IGR has been functional as well as in areas it had been battling in implementation. However, Malan's (2005, 241) two important deficiencies of intergovernmental relations; despite the implementation of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act 13 of 2005, remain observable despite government interventions. The first one is that there is always a variety of processes and structures existing, whose roles and relationships are mostly uncertain. In housing, the legislation makes provision for the national and provincial departments to undertake the concurrent (or shared) responsibilities of managing public housing provisions, while the responsibility of municipalities is to provide

information and manage the public housing waiting list. The second deficiency is that while IGR policies attempt to provide a clear and manageable structures and programmes, policy priorities often cut across ministerial mandates and traditional policy fields. The argument by Malan (2005, 241) is substantive in the context of this article in that the National Department of Human Settlements should take into consideration possible challenges and/or obstacles whenever addressing IGR issues. This is necessarily so, especially when interactions with other departments such as Land Affairs become unavoidable. For example, the provision of public housing, especially within cities, requires well-located land for the low-income earners. This could ensure that low income earners have access to other public services, while at the same time being able to access job opportunities and transport to and from work within cities at cheaper prices.

Breaking New Ground (2004) (BNG) intended to serve as a comprehensive administrative strategy of the government to ensure the acceleration of public housing provision. The message of this strategy also suggests that the success of public housing should depend on a collaborative approach where all the stakeholders work together as a collective. This approach is important since the delivery of public housing takes place in a multi-faceted environment, where some aspects would impact both directly and indirectly on the administration and provision of public housing. For example, the development of the National Spatial Development Perspective (NSDP) at the national government sphere informs the Provincial Growth and Development Strategy (PGDS) of different provinces, while these provincial strategies should inform the municipal Integrated Development Plans (IDPs)<sup>2</sup>. According to Nkoana-Mashabane (2008, 30–31) the provincial administrative activities are also informed by the NSDP and the BNG policy. It is important to take this assertion into consideration, since the planning approach of government is hierarchical and therefore top-down in nature. This means that the planning systems and budget distribution of the provinces should be aligned with the national government, while the municipal plans (IDPs) should be aligned to the provincial planning system (PGDS). The coordination of activities of the three spheres of government calls for this alignment, improvement in planning and investment prioritisation as referenced in the NSDP (Public Service Commission 2007: 46; Menguele, Khan and Vawda 2008: 185).

The adoption of the BNG in 2004 also ushered in new administrative reforms that broadened the focus of the national and provincial departments of human settlements. This approach has been called ‘sustainable human settlement’, and intends to ensure that houses and other relevant public services (such as land, roads, schools, *inter alia*) are provided to make life more convenient for citizens. Thus, the provision of public housing cannot be undertaken separately from other necessary

public services. It further means that since the provision and administration of public services such as housing overlap to some functions of national state departments; for example, clinics are administered by the Department of Health, schools by the Department of Education, roads by the Department of Transport and police stations by the Department of Safety and Security, it goes without saying that it is necessary to establish and implement the principles of IGR and support a notion of human settlement. Therefore, this argument suggests that an intergovernmental housing forum or framework should be introduced to address matters affecting housing from other state departments (cf. Department of Housing: Sustainable Human Settlements 2005, 7). In theory, a realisation is that the success of the national and provincial departments of housing is also dependant on other specialised government departments at various spheres and levels. These specialised services (land, roads, schools, *inters alia*) need to be noticed to be able to learn the impact they make over public housing delivery or *vice versa*.

In the views of the former Minister of Finance, Trevor Manuel, during his 2007 address to the National Council of Provinces, there are numerous administrative challenges which largely relate to resource allocation in the context of intergovernmental relations. Firstly, the main challenge facing housing intergovernmental cooperation relates to the ability to establish strong linkages between policy making and resource allocation. The linkage in this regard relates to the national government's provision of policy and financial allocations to provinces and municipalities, while they (provinces and municipalities) are expected to ensure that resources are used for the budgeted activities. It is imperative that the systems theory thinking is maintained in ensuring that the process unfolds from policy to resources allocation, to processing and towards results as well as policy development and implementation effects. Secondly, the challenges related to the cooperation between Cabinet, Parliament, National Treasury, National Department of Human Settlements, Provincial Executive Councils and provincial departments of human settlements are also raised. Provincial Executive Councils make provincial resource allocations after the national government structures (outlined above) have undertaken the resource distribution process to the provinces in line with national priorities. The challenge in this regard lies with the need to ensure that intra- and inter-provincial equity is achieved in the delivery of public housing. Thirdly, the need to align national government policy on housing *versus* the provincial budgets constitutes an important challenge to be considered. In an attempt to address these intergovernmental challenges, the role of Parliament, in particular, the National Council of Provinces is central in overseeing this and ensuring that the interest of the provinces are taken seriously by government departments dealing with different components addressing human settlements issues (Manuel 2007, 8–10).

Furthermore, the importance of the availability of land where houses and the afore-mentioned amenities need to be constructed cannot be overlooked. The National Department of Housing should work with the Department of Land Affairs in a coordinated way to ensure speedy delivery of public housing. Without properly allocating land for such purposes, meeting the needs for public housing remains an illusion. This observation is advanced even in the context where the Housing Development Agency (HDA) has been established, as also indicated in section 7(1)(f) of the Housing Development Agency Act 23 of 2008 to ‘ensure that there is collaboration and intergovernmental and integrated alignment for housing development services’. The Housing Development Agency (2013a) has reported its success in meeting its targets regarding the amount of hectares of land to be acquired in relation to its Strategic Plan of 2012/13–2016/17. However, the challenge facing the HDA is to ensure that the acquired land benefit low income earners in accordance with its legislative mandate (Housing Development Agency 2013b).

It is clear that the new legislative, institutional and administrative reforms for the development of housing in South Africa are not clear-cut aspects. The success and/or failure of other department(s) working together regarding the provision of public housing and human settlements is critical for the overall success of service delivery. Therefore, it is important to align the institutional administrative reforms of various government departments and to apply uniform standards and approaches where overlaps occur within the three spheres of government. Although it is important for each department to conduct research and plan according to their needs and objectives, integrated governmental planning through the intergovernmental housing forum is salient for developing a holistic approach on how government should render services and how intergovernmental relationships should be handled.

The substantiveness of intergovernmental cooperation in the implementation of the housing policy highlights structures in place which are entrusted to facilitate public housing provision. In this regard, some approaches such as the national housing strategy, statutory bodies, and housing subsidy allocations and funding could be regarded as the input and processing stages of converting policy into tangible results (namely, housing or human settlements). Other structures for intergovernmental cooperation could be viewed as being entrusted with the facilitation of the implementation of policy for results purposes. At this stage, the cooperation of various government departments and Parliament should be results-driven, serving as an indicator of whether these administrative IGR arrangements for the implementation of the national housing policy are effective and efficient. What still needs to be considered is the notion of accrediting municipalities as one of the key issues emerging from the IGR system.

## **MUNICIPAL HOUSING ACCREDITATION PROCESS**

One critical question of note on the relevance of an IGR model is whether within this context, the notion of municipal housing accreditation process is a viable intervention to facilitate IGR and housing policy implementation challenges? This is a necessary question because the revised Housing Code of 2009 considers the role of municipalities central in aligning with interdepartmental and intergovernmental funding streams better. The Breaking New Ground (2004:24) holds that the reduction of administrative costs could be done by channelling funds from the national government department directly to qualifying municipalities. This administrative arrangement is intended to be undertaken without the direct involvement of provincial departments. This is another important administrative efficiency measure which could be regarded as an effort to promote intergovernmental relations between national government departments and municipalities. In reinforcing an administrative measure (efficiency) in the use of these funds, funded municipalities are required to submit a full financial report to both the national and provincial departments. Sisulu (2005) indicates that selected municipalities would be accredited and more funds could be allocated to such municipalities to carry out service delivery mandates on housing developments. Accreditation means that if municipalities have the 'capacity and competent financial systems' in place to provide for their public housing, they (municipalities) should receive an exemption from the provincial and national administration. However, the national and provincial spheres should put systems in place to support municipalities receive their accreditation to undertake and implement their housing plans (Jolobe Interview 22 June 2005).

The initial targets of BNG municipal housing accreditation were that all metropolitan municipalities would receive accreditation during 2004 and then 20 more municipalities per annum for a 10-year period to accredit all the municipalities in South Africa (Breaking New Ground 2004). The most obvious contrary view is that this plan was not commensurate with the municipal capacities to deliver housing as earlier alluded to. With the new arrangements of an accreditation system regarding the different levels of accreditation (levels 1–3) and the approach that initiatives are within respective municipalities has 'shifted the goal post' in a manner in which municipalities are to be involved in the provision of housing (Housing Code 2009). This is a costly decision because the understanding that housing and its associated services such as water, electricity, sanitations, among others (human settlements) as basic service remains a pipedream. In fact, it is clearer now that municipal accreditation process is becoming complex, and therefore no longer relevant to address housing delivery blockages the country is experiencing.

Although the legislation requires municipalities to play an integral role in the provision of public services including housing, the majority of municipalities in South Africa have not been practically and largely involved in public housing provision since this is largely the competence of provinces (although it is regarded as a shared service responsibility by national and provincial government departments). The accreditation of municipalities has been documented since 1997 in section 10(1) of the Housing Act 107 of 1997 to provide a framework on the applicable process to be followed. This accreditation concept was further expanded in the initial Housing Code of 2000 & 2009; as well as the Breaking New Ground (BNG) policy of 2004. However, despite documenting the accrediting of municipalities, little has been done to capacitate municipalities in the provision of public housing.

According to Masondo (2005: 3), who has served as the executive mayor of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality and Chairperson of the South African Local Government Association (SALGA), there is a need to build appropriate capacity in municipalities. He further highlighted that a component of the municipal housing accreditation process is focused on the sustainable institutional capacity at the municipal level. The following quotation captures Masondo's (2005: 3) concerns regarding the accreditation and administrative capacities of municipalities in South Africa:

The critical area that we need to focus on is to ensure that sustainable institutional capacity is developed at municipal level to manage the housing processes and projects. We understand that a component of the 'Municipal Housing Accreditation Process' is intended to address that particular challenge. We believe that Housing Accreditation Process also needs to have focused capacity building initiatives towards urban planning and management. The phased approach to accreditation needs to ensure that municipalities are fully capacitated and resourced to expedite housing delivery.

It appears from the foregoing discussion regarding the accreditation process of the municipalities that, on the one hand selected qualifying municipalities are accredited to provide public housing delivery. On the other hand, however, those municipalities which are not accredited would still depend on the national and provincial government to provide services on their behalf. The accreditation process of municipalities may be a cause for concern, since other municipalities may not qualify for accreditations for years after the introduction of the system. This reason is observable, in part, due to a lack of functional and substantive support measures from the national and/or provincial governments to capacitate municipalities in preparation of their applications for accreditation. This raises questions such as the attempts by other spheres of government to level the playing field of municipalities before they start

with the accreditation process. Accrediting selected municipalities based on their administrative abilities, without considering the capacity-building programmes for 'levelling the playing field' for all municipalities for the accreditation could be seen as dubious. This is so especially for municipalities who desire to provide services themselves without much interference from provincial or national spheres. It could be integral that a holistic approach be taken by all municipalities to provide training for the scarce and necessary skills as a capacity building initiative.

One gets the impression that the accreditation process is discriminatory in nature; and this end up promoting the apartheid patterns of governance; where only viable municipalities could be able to develop their communities. This approach may further compound the problems of overcrowding and squatter settlements in accredited and viable municipalities. Thus, the most viable municipalities remain to urban (especially those who were previously referred to as White Local Authorities (WLAs) rather than rural municipalities (based in the former Bantustands).

The notion of having urban municipalities qualifying for the accreditation process, while rural municipalities are unable to qualify, has also been conceived by Bell, Dearborn and Hunter (1993, 583–587) as an administrative defects. This article attempts to address concerns or challenges on financing post-apartheid municipalities of South Africa. This work points out to the fact that the former WLA were financially viable since industries and business activities were only erected in cities, and not in poor areas (Bell, Dearborn and Hunter 1993, 588). The existing municipal accreditation process may signal the fact that perhaps the plight of the rural poor has not yet reached attention of both the political and administrative leadership of the South African government.

In order to conclude the scholarly discussion regarding an intergovernmental relations and housing policy implementation several issues need to be taken into account. These issues are necessary for informing a relevant housing IGR model.

## **INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS MODEL: ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

Clearly, the question of IGR and policy implementation is complex to unpack because it mainly requires participation and facilitation of multi-sectoral skills and approaches. It is necessary to bear in mind that in order to address issues of policy implementation, a model should be able to consider the following three issues to succeed:

- Firstly, IGR issues should be considered at a strategic and policy level and not as a prescription for policy implementation. Since the development of an IGR policy framework, there have only been IGR problems and minimal solutions

on issues of service delivery within municipalities. Thus, municipal relations with the other spheres of government have not been effective and efficient in the provision of housing. Therefore, the question of IGR should be used as a framework, norms and standards rather than a prescriptive or compulsory approach whereby municipalities are forced to comply, especially in the accreditation process for housing delivery. The other spheres of government (such as the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, National/Provincial Treasury and the Department of Human Settlements, Department of Land Affairs as well as the Housing Development Agency) should be concerned with the manner in which capacity is built within municipalities to enhance municipal performance on the provision of housing.

- Secondly, it is necessary to consider a BNG as an expired approach, although it has evolved to introduce the National Department of Human Settlements. While this Department has taken a turn to make attempts to consider issues of human settlements, it essentially remains a custodian of the Housing policies such as the Housing Act 107 of 1997, as well as others. In essence, projects and activities that accompany human settlements would not be well coordinated at national level, but at municipal level. This approach is in relation to the nature of service that is associated with the notion of human settlements.
- Thirdly, addressing the problem of housing is a constitutional mandate for municipalities. If the role of municipalities is to provide basic services such as electricity, clean water and sanitation among others, it makes sense that the same municipalities should also be responsible for the provision of housing if the human settlement agenda is to be realised. This should not be done through the accreditation process like it is currently the case, but through a constitutional amendment to repudiate this costly experiment. Such an approach would minimise bureaucracy and many futile IGR efforts currently in place to address human settlements developments in South Africa (see Schedule 4 and 5 of the 1996 Constitution).
- The accreditation of municipalities should be clearly defined either as an IGR model or IGR tool, developed to assist municipalities implement housing and human settlements policy. The accreditation process has become too expensive for poor municipalities to implement. This assertion casts doubt on how municipalities would be capacitated to budget properly in the developing of capacity for accreditation purposes.
- Accreditation needs to be reviewed and reversed. This view has been prompted by the conceptual perspective which indicates a lack of clarity on

the rationale, the place and manner in which the accreditation process fits into the housing and human settlements policy dispensation in South Africa. IGR and policy implementation for housing could be properly ameliorated by a complete turnaround on the accreditation.

These arguments above represent some of the main issues of this article as an attempt to consider whether an IGR model for housing policy in South Africa is able to facilitate proper policy implementation. This is partly because the municipal accreditation process does not offer a functional and relevant alternative to municipal involvement and performance on housing and human settlements; except that the system could become more unresponsive.

## CONCLUSION

The relevance of IGR and housing policy implementation in South Africa cannot be overemphasised. This is because the human settlements agenda is inherently multi-dimensional and therefore requires the involvement of different government departments for it to be realised. This article has set out to describe IGR and housing in the South African context, as well as the manner in which municipal accreditation is being considered in the provision of human settlements. In the end this article argues that the housing IGR model used is not befitting the current situation, and therefore radical constitutional reforms should be introduced to allow municipalities' sufficient space to deal with housing issues on their own.

## NOTES

- 1 The Parliament of South Africa is made up two houses, namely, the National Assembly and National Council of Provinces as the second house. The NCOP represents provinces to ensure that provincial interests are taken into account in the national sphere of government.
- 2 NSDP, PGDS, and IDP are all inclusive government planning systems which are coordinated to ensure that priorities and activities are focused upon. This further means that all the spheres of government are to ensure that their individual planning inform one another and are being informed by the other.

## REFERENCES

- Bell, E.B., Dearborn, P.M. and Hunter, R. 1993. Financing the post-apartheid city in South Africa. *Urban Studies* 30(3), 581–593.
- Breaking New Ground. 2004. *A comprehensive Plan for the development of sustainable human settlements*. Pretoria. Department of Human Settlements.

- Department of Housing 2005. *Sustainable Human Settlements*. Pretoria: DoH.
- Department of Housing 2000. *National Housing Code*. Pretoria: DoH.
- Department of Provincial and Local Government 2007. A guideline document on provincial-local intergovernmental relations. Pretoria: DPLG.
- Housing Code 2009. *National Housing Code*. Pretoria: DoH.
- Housing Development Agency 2013a. *Newsletter 9<sup>th</sup> edition, Johannesburg, The HAD*.
- Housing Development Agency 2013b. *The Housing Development Agency: revised Five Year Strategic Plan 2012/13 to 2016/17*. Johannesburg: The HDA.
- Jolobe, L. *Interview 22 June 2005, Chief Director in the Director General's office*, Pretoria.
- Malan, L.P. 2005. Intergovernmental relations and co-operative government in South Africa: The ten-year review. *Politeia* 24(2), 226 – 243.
- Manuel, T.A. 2007. Provincial budgets and expenditure review 2003/04 to 2009/10: Address to the National Council of Provinces, 5 September 2007. Pretoria: Ministry of Finance.
- Masondo, A. 2005. Key success factors for sustainable human settlements. Speech delivered by the executive mayor and chairperson of SALGA at the National Housing Indaba, 31 October, Pretoria: DoH.
- Menguele, F., Khan, F. and Vawda, A. 2008. The emergence of and endurance of an evolving human settlements imaginary. In *Consolidating developmental local government: lessons from the South Africa experience* ed. van Donk, M., Swilling, M., Pieterse, E. & Parnell, S, Cape Town: UCT Press.
- National Council of Provinces 2008. *No 1-Fifth session, third parliament: Question paper*, 4 March, Cape Town, Parliament.
- Nkoana-Mashabane, M. 2008. Address to the Limpopo Legislature by MEC of Local Government and Housing on occasion of budget vote 11, Polokwane. Department of Local Government and Housing.
- Phago, K. 2012. Local government in South Africa: twinning election campaigns and service delivery. *Politeia* 31(1), 60 – 73.
- Public Service Commission 2007. *Report on the evaluation of the Batho Pele principle of 'value for money' in the public service*. Pretoria: PSC.
- Republic of South Africa 1996. *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa 1997. *Housing Act 107 of 1997*, Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa 2005. *Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act 13 of 2005*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa 2008. *Housing Development Agency Act 23 of 2008*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Sisulu, L.N. 2005. Speech by the Minister of Housing at the opening of the Municipal Housing Indaba, Kempton Park, Emperor's Palace, 31 October, Johannesburg.