

Urban Environmental Management Programme

UEMP

South Africa – Denmark

Report to Programme Steering Committee

“Year One: A Slow Start with Promise”

Status Update

Final Document

July 2007

“Economic marginalisation and environmental degradation can be products of the world we live in, as can environmentally sustainable development, economic inclusion and an end to poverty...

Few challenges have emerged in recent years as daunting as the environmental ones that we are increasingly turning our attention to, largely because they threaten so much of what we hold dear in terms of economic development as well as those we already know are so vulnerable, our poor and marginalised. As an international community we need to ensure that we do indeed address those challenges.”

President Thabo Mbeki in a speech to the International Monetary Conference, Cape Town – 3rd June 2007

Table of Contents

Purpose of this document.....	4
Executive Summary.....	5
Introduction.....	10
1. Programme Integration.....	10
1.1 Alignment and Integration.....	11
1.2 Inter-governmental integration.....	11
1.3 Intra-governmental integration.....	13
2. Financial Integration and Expenditure.....	14
3. Programme Management.....	15
Roles and Responsibilities.....	15
Communication.....	15
Administration procedures.....	15
Programme Planning.....	16
Human Resources.....	17
4. Programme benefits and opportunities.....	18
Appendix One: UEMP expenditure in year one.....	20
<i>Table One: Overall Summary.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Table Two: Summary of National and Provincial Expenditure.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Table Three: Summary of municipal expenditure.....</i>	<i>20</i>
Appendix Two: Monitoring of Assumptions and Risks.....	21
<i>Table Four: Programme Assumptions - Findings.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Table Five: Programme Risks – Findings.....</i>	<i>22</i>
Appendix Three: List of persons interviewed.....	23
Appendix Four: Key statements by interviewed partners.....	26
Municipalities.....	26
Provinces.....	27
National.....	28
Appendix Five: Potential case studies.....	30
Appendix Six: Introductory Letter to UEM Partners.....	31

Purpose of this document

This report aims to assist programme partners reflect upon the first year of implementation of the Urban Environmental Management Programme (UEMP).

Fifty-one managers¹ from all government and programme partners responsible for implementation of the UEMP were interviewed in the course of this study. The monitoring of results, outcomes and programme-related expenditure is an integrated part of standard government processes, and is therefore not a primary focus of this status update. Rather, after one year of operation the emphasis has been upon gathering partners' experiences, identifying opportunities and needs, and drawing lessons learned in order to further strengthen programme implementation.

The UEMP agreement between South Africa and Denmark provides three key platforms for monitoring and making strategic adjustments over its five-year life-span.

1. The **Joint Annual Programme Review (JAPR)** provides the forum for a joint (South Africa and Denmark) review of progress and will make recommendations to the Programme Steering Committee (PSC), informed by observed performance, for allocations of budgets across components, and across partner organisations within components. The JAPR may also make recommendations to the PSC on possible adjustments to specific outputs. The JAPR can also recommend to the PSC on the inclusion of additional partners into the programme. The PSC has agreed that the first JAPR will take place towards the end of 2007. Programme Reviews are scheduled to be undertaken on an annual basis.
2. **An annual status assessment** (this document is the first) is a learning exercise to inform the PSC with an overview of progress, opportunities and challenges in implementation of the programme. These reports will also serve as a resource document for the JAPR. The nature and focus of the annual status assessment will be informed by identified needs and timing within the programme life-cycle.
3. **The PSC** is the most regular monitoring and review forum at which programme-related management decisions are made.

I thank all UEMP partners interviewed for making the time to share your thoughts and insights.

This report was commissioned by the Royal Danish Embassy, with endorsement from the Programme Steering Committee (PSC). This status update does not include consideration of component two of the programme (Knowledge Management and Civil Society).

Chris Albertyn

July 2007

¹ See appendix three for full list of persons interviewed

Executive Summary

The Urban Environmental Management Programme (UEMP) is a new breed of development assistance which pursues effectiveness through fully integrating its management within normal governance systems of the recipient country. This means that the UEMP can only work at the pace that partner capacity, systems and procedures are able to work. It also means that UEMP resources can be used to assist in developing and strengthening those capacities, systems and procedures essential for sustained and accelerated delivery.

This report is compiled following interviews with 51 managers from all UEMP partners with responsibility for implementing the programme across all spheres of government. Despite the expected slow start in integrating the planning and management of outside funds into existing formal systems, the programme and its key activities within government are reported as now well under way. However, the bulk of actual payments associated with already started year-one ongoing activities will be disbursed in the first half of year two. Overall spending of government partners at the end of year one in the UEMP amounts to approximately R4,581,905.19 – or 20% of the allocated year-one budget of R23 085,000.00. (See [appendix one](#) for details).

Programme-supported activities amongst the ten government partners were generally slow in reaching the implementation phase during this first year. Most of the key start-up bottlenecks faced by all partners do appear to have been resolved, and it is reported that programme activities are now picking up at a significant rate. An ongoing bottleneck challenging the programme is the delay in appointing programme advisors.

The UEMP has already demonstrated its added value and future potential in providing special opportunities and examples that support the evolution of effective inter-governmental cooperation for enhanced service delivery in urban environmental management.

Through a leadership representing all government partners the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) has provided an important foundation from which to take the UEMP past its establishment phase into a second phase supporting increasingly integrated and coordinated programme activities which provide valuable test cases and solutions to be shared beyond existing programme partners.

This report outlines the various challenges faced by government UEMP partners in the establishment process and provides some pointers as to where systems could be further strengthened. These challenges can be grouped in three categories:

1. Challenges widely recognised by the Public Service Commission as **generic challenges** faced by South Africa's relatively new administrative

"The State is heavily reliant on the strength and capability of the system of government to successfully implement the range of programmes designed to respond to the developmental challenges we are facing. Excellence in performance across and within the three spheres (of government), underpinned by the availability of capacity (skills, human capital resources and systems), attracting and retaining the right capacity, its location and optimal use as well as maintaining an ethos of service become of central concern and importance."
Public Service and Administration Minister Fraser-Moleketi in 5th June 2007 Budget Speech

systems still undergoing substantial organisational change, clarification of mandates, and development of systems – *including staffing shortages, skills, procurement procedures and inter and intra-governmental coordination;*

2. Challenges specific to integrating a development assistance programme into the mainstream of government procedures, and challenges specific to **programme coordination** across three independent spheres of government – *including fund flows, aligning and managing budgetary allocations, alignment of project planning systems; hiring of technical advisors; and communication by PSC members of essential UEMP information to line function managers;*
3. Challenges specific to **individual partners** – *including the freezing of hiring new staff; changes in organisational structure and individual responsibilities.*

While a number of government partners did raise matters pertaining to the UEMP research and knowledge management process, this status update was not tasked with looking at component two of the UEMP.

Summary Overview

- Local **ownership** of the programme by all partners is strong;
- It took some initial effort on the part of partners, but the UEMP is mostly **integrated** into and managed through normal administrative systems, and wholly **aligned** with South African policies and priorities, as well as with the policies and priorities of Denmark;
- Due to its integration and strong partner ownership, the programme is seen as **flexible** and responding to the needs and priorities of partners;
- The UEMP is experienced as **adding value** through providing opportunities for enhanced inter-governmental relations and sharing of experiences. Many partners believe there is significant potential to strengthen this cooperation even further, thereby “assisting in accelerating delivery”;
- Examples where all three governmental spheres have coordinated activities within the programme include developing a campaign on indoor air quality and developing Environmental Management Frameworks (EMF). The **coordination challenges** within the EMF process are instructive and point to ways and means in which strategically placed programme resources could add further integrative value;
- In addition to enhancing vertical inter-governmental relationships, municipalities report added **horizontal coordination** value through the programme bringing different line function departments with overlapping mandates closer together. Four of the five partner municipalities are in the closing phases of significant organisational restructuring;
- Successful implementation of the UEMP will require a dedicated and strategic management **balancing act** which keeps busy senior management believing that **programme benefits surpass programme management demands**. While programme-specific administration, reporting and management demands (for example PSC meetings) are minimal compared to normal donor project approaches, steps have been taken to further simplify these;
- While additional funds for operational budgets are valuable, most partners place higher value in the potential of the UEMP to assist in exploring and promoting enhanced opportunities for coordinated inter-governmental action

and the production and sharing of good practice and knowledge – with **goal-directed face-to-face meetings and experience sharing** seen as especially valuable;

- There is potential for national and provincial partners to **share procedures, systems and experiences developed** within the UEMP with other provincial and municipal governments throughout South Africa;
- As a result of the UEMP there has already been an increased sharing across municipalities of examples of management system documents, studies and experiences. If it can remain focussed the envisaged website is seen as valuable database for partners to share knowledge;
- Further clarity could be developed and communicated to partners on the kinds of activities which are in alignment with the programme's overall **poverty reduction and institutional capacity development** objective – for example how a programme approach can go beyond providing short-term employment to poor people and become coordinated with efforts to develop systems and procedures in sectors whose improved services reduce environmental threats to the poor.

“Cabinet noted the need for African countries to develop and adopt a common position on environmental matters, and to highlight the linkages between poverty eradication, sustainable development and maintaining the integrity of the of the natural resource base in the long term.”
Statement from South African Government Cabinet Meeting of 18th April 2007

Programme Management

Roles and Responsibilities

- A number of partners report experiencing initial confusion over who they should speak to with respect to questions over different aspects of programme management and implementation.
- While programme and financial management procedures were described in the programme inception note, and in subsequent documents developed by the ILTA, financial officers and line-function managers in a number of departments report that they were not aware of these documents.

The envisaged programme website will enable line-function managers and financial officers to access programme-related procedures documents.

- The above situation has been exacerbated with the ongoing delay in the appointment of a National Long-term Advisor within DEAT, requiring the PSC Secretariat and the ILTA having to pick up and apportion additional responsibilities;

Communication

- While most PSC members have a thorough grasp of the UEMP's overall objectives and strategic thrust, for some partners a number of implementing line-function managers reporting to PSC members have limited knowledge of the programme's objectives and procedures;
- It will take time for PSC members to get their departments to conceptualise programme-supported activities as integral to normal departmental activities, and for the UEMP elements and management to become an agenda item of normal management meetings;

- A number of partners report a perception that programme management communications could be further rationalised with a view to receiving fewer and clearer communications. The experience of some partners feeling flooded by e-mails is also a function of their own departments needing to develop their own filter and targeting systems, and not forward all programme communications to all involved managers – two partners suggested consideration of thematically oriented mailing lists;

Administration procedures

- A number of programme delays were due to partners with limited donor experience having internal challenges in understanding and implementing described “on-budget” procedures to draw down monies from the RDP fund – and then setting up internal systems for line function managers to access and disburse those funds once they had been received.;

Planning

- Given the staggered timeframes of planning cycles across the different spheres of government, the UEMP faces challenges of aligning approval of programme plans with normal cycles – especially if key partners experience delays in their own planning processes. Partners suggest that the PSC Secretariat should be more flexible in not requesting UEMP plans in advance of their own departmental plans being finalised;
- The inception workshop in **Magaliesberg** was mentioned by many partners as being very valuable to them in a) understanding the programme; but perhaps more importantly b) in making contact with and understanding the challenges faced by colleagues in different municipalities and government spheres;

“Activities supported by this programme – at whatever sphere– should be relevant to resolving national priorities and bring the spheres closer to working out how best to tackle our common problems together. In future the PSC must try and find ways of enabling and challenging UEM partners to choose activities that will get us working on the same priority together”.
(PSC member Mr Thabo Ndlovu - Gauteng).

Many partners have requested an annual planning and capacity development meeting for key managers, with a view to strengthening the possibilities for developing their own year-plans that are coordinated and reinforce each other.

- **Official procurement** systems of partners mean that it can take up to six months from development of terms of reference to appointment of the service provider. Tenders cannot be advertised unless funds are secured. While first-year set-up bottlenecks added to these delays, some partners systems enabled a three-month turn-around time and, with advance planning; this problem should be less in year two.

The envisaged UEMP planning and coordination workshop in September 2007 will assist partners in advance preparations for agreeing on year-three priority programme activities. Advance official letters of financial guarantee from the UEMP Secretariat to provincial and municipal treasuries for agreed priority programme activities in year-three will enable line-function managers to have plans and tenders ready for processing at the beginning of the next financial year.

- Partners who needed to change some of their initial approved activities had this matter resolved within the PSC who have developed an approval system that adds further flexibility for partners to re-organise plans and allocated budgets during the year;
- Given the first year start-up challenges partners' first year's **activity plans** were not that well coordinated and integrated across different partners (cities, provinces, national). The potential for a new level of added value through inter-governmental UEM planning coordination is recognised and appreciated by most partners;
- The **scheduling** and re-scheduling of **PSC meetings** is viewed by those PSC members who have to travel to Pretoria as a significant demand made by the programme;

Human Resources

- South Africa faces a serious shortage of skilled staff, with the public service experiencing high vacancy levels at middle and senior management levels. The Public Service experiences high rates of staff turn-over with 10% of senior managers and 11.2% of middle managers leaving each year. During the year under review the municipality of Ekurhuleni lost three of its six managers in the environment department.
- The committed but overstretched government managers participating in the UEMP PSC have not had the time they would have liked to communicate the programme's vision and processes to line function managers
- Delays in hiring **technical advisors** to assist in programme coordination have added additional stress and bottlenecks to programme implementation.
- The more **successful UEMP partners** had two critical elements in place – a) their **chief financial officers** were involved and informed of the process from the outset; b) they had the capacity to mandate a dedicated manager to play a central programme coordination role across all their sub-departments. **Ethekwini**, for example, chose not to have a technical advisor but appointed one of their own managers to take coordination responsibility – and spent 86% of their allocated budget.
- Delays in the assumption of both technical advisor posts in DEAT required temporary solutions and additional in-house responsibilities for coordinating and communicating with all partners on programme inception. The post of national advisor had to be re-advertised and is as yet not filled.

Public servants are in certain instances influenced to leave a department because of working conditions. Where there are staff shortages, workloads are often heavy.

*Minister Fraser Moleketi –
Governance and
Administration Cluster
Media Briefing – January
2007*

While it appears beyond the scope of the UEMP to address recruitment and retention measures, some consideration could be given to UEMP making available short-term programme-specific management support to assist those partners experiencing temporary or acute administrative and coordination gaps at key planning and reporting times.

Introduction

The current volume of all development assistance to the South African government is less than one percent of government revenue and less than the current budget surplus. A key challenge for all partners benefiting from donor-supported interventions in South Africa is how to add value beyond just additional cash - so that this short-term investment has a longer-term positive impact.

The UEMP is a five-year support programme which seeks to add value through strengthening the institutions with responsibility for urban environmental management. The UEMP is already addressing a number of key areas that will add value:

- supporting the development of processes which lead to improved inter-governmental coordination – facilitating meetings and sharing of experiences, sharing of documentation, management systems, models and examples;
- supporting the development of frameworks, guidelines and regulations;
- supporting the implementation of pilot interventions at municipal level which can be shared with other municipalities as good practice that addresses the programme's poverty focus.

Many partners interviewed recognise the potential for this programme to move into an “even higher gear” in supporting the achievement of the above objectives. This report outlines the key challenges and opportunities that partners recognise can be addressed in further strengthening programme implementation.

1. Programme Integration

In its first year of operation a big challenge for most UEMP partners has been creating the administrative and management systems to enable the integration of a relatively small assistance programme into existing departmental and sub-departmental processes. This is a relatively new process for government departments. For those partners with previous experience of receiving and managing donor support, these were mostly separately managed, audited, and reported upon according to project requirements.

It took most partners some time to work out how they could go about enabling this integration. Once systems were internally decided, most partners began implementing the agreed activities – developing terms of reference, tender processes, contracting and so on. The programme-funded activities began later than non-programme-funded activities and most were not completed in the first year. Tender processes, for example can take between three and six months to complete. Due to the relatively late UEMP start in these instances departmental spending percentages of their own mainstream budgets has been higher than their spending of programme funds.

Due to human resources incapacities and various internal challenges some partners took longer to resolve their internal administrative bottlenecks. These same partners experienced general challenges in implementing all activities – programme and non-programme.

The challenges of UEMP have for the most part been the same challenges faced by the young governance system in South Africa: human resources gaps; developing skills, pioneering administrative systems and procedures, and cementing relationships through clarifying inter-governmental roles and responsibilities.

1.1 Alignment and Integration

All programme-supported activities are fully aligned with South African and Danish priorities and policies. Guided by frameworks described in the agreed programme documentation, partners identify their own priorities for annual support. The PSC reviews the submitted plans for their alignment with programme objectives, and then approves them.

In a small number of cases some discussions were required to consider the contributions of the proposed activities to poverty reduction or sustainability. The programme sought to support activities which contributed to institutional strength, and did not support activities in which there were recurrent costs which would extend beyond the duration of the programme – for example, annual short-term employment of communities to dig drainage ditches or catch rats. Some initial proposals were not accepted as sufficiently aligned to the agreed programme objectives.

The programme will make a useful contribution through supporting the development of a number of "good practice" case studies that help highlight and communicate the way in which effective environmental management and delivery of environmental services is contributing towards improving the lives of the poorest in South Africa. See appendix four for a starting list of potential studies.

1.2 Inter-governmental integration

The UEMP is experienced as **adding value** through providing opportunities for enhanced inter-governmental relations and sharing of experiences. Many partners believe there is significant potential to strengthen this cooperation even further, thereby “assisting in accelerating delivery”.

In the first year each partner submitted proposed plans which responded to their own priorities - within the five thematic areas and responding to UEMP poverty reduction and institutional capacity development objectives. The programme was not in a position to facilitate greater overlaps of initiatives across the spheres.

Examples where all three governmental spheres have worked on coordinating activities within the programme include DEAT beginning to coordinate around a campaign on indoor air quality, and developing Environmental Management Frameworks (EMF). The **coordination challenges** within the EMF process are instructive and point to ways and means in which strategically placed programme resources could add integrative value.

Reports by the UEMP Secretariat to the PSC indicate ongoing discussions around the possibility of partners collaborating on:

- Joint environmental health education programmes

- Joint undertakings to streamline procedures and legislation in spatial planning
- Joint undertakings to address in-door air pollution in townships
- Joint exploration and mutual learning on local energy strategies

In the planning theme it became apparent to DEAT that there were overlaps in the UEMP with intentions to produce environmental management frameworks (EMF) for the Sedibeng District Municipality. DEAT called a meeting with Gauteng Province and Sedibeng to address these matters and it was agreed by all that Sedibeng would become a national pilot study for the development of an EMF in a district municipality. As such, the initiative would be coordinated from DEAT in close cooperation with Gauteng Province and Sedibeng. The programme monies initially allocated to Sedibeng for their EMF planning was re-allocated to DEAT. Terms of reference for the exercise were developed and circulated, and adjusted according to subsequent partner inputs. It has since emerged that a separate process to produce an EMF had been initiated between Gauteng Province and one of the three municipalities within Sedibeng, creating some coordination challenges in aligning the processes of producing a district-wide EMF, and an EMF for one of three municipalities within the district.

It is clear that we do not as yet have a settled model, in the necessary detail, to efficiently handle the inevitable contestation over powers and functions within and between spheres of government. We must establish a policy framework, which is clear enough to enable us to navigate the necessary tension between processes of recentralising some aspects of power and those of decentralising others. *Provincial and Local Government Minister Sydney Mufamadi in Policy Speech to National Council of Provinces; 20th June 2007.*

While DEAT as the national department does and should take the lead in these coordination processes, it has become apparent to all partners that these processes are more demanding than initially anticipated – and that DEAT’s own human resources are stretched. It is also recognised that these processes would be strengthened through one person having an ongoing or dedicated coordination role. **The appointment of a national advisor** will be of valuable assistance in strengthening the communications and inter-governmental coordination role in a) planning and b) facilitating and c) documenting experiences in the implementation of these important pilot interventions.

The PSC could consider the allocation of additional UEMP resources towards assisting partners coordinate pilot inter-governmental cooperation priorities supported by UEMP. The documentation of these processes and lessons learned will also be of value to others who subsequently initiate similar interventions.

The programme provides a valuable opportunity for partners from all three spheres to practically address various UEM challenges together and thereby deepen their understanding of the different roles and responsibilities that each sphere is best placed to undertake in each circumstance.

A number of partners interviewed indicated that it would be helpful for the programme to convene an **annual programme planning exercise** – (October seemed to be the most convenient month mentioned) – where line-function managers across the spheres and themes could meet to discuss and agree on a broad framework for setting priorities that the programme should support in the following year. An ideal would be for these managers to leave the workshop with a short list of priority areas

where there were productive opportunities for inter-governmental cooperation. This list would then inform their own planning and budgeting for UEM support in the following year.

1.3 Intra-governmental integration

In addition to enhancing vertical inter-governmental relationships, municipalities report added **horizontal coordination** value through the programme bringing different line function departments with overlapping mandates closer together. Four of the five partner municipalities are in the closing phases of significant organisational restructuring. The UEMP provides additional scope for supporting interventions that assist municipalities in further clarifying intra-organisational roles and responsibilities in terms of national legislation, and the delegation of powers and functions from other spheres.

The pending UEMP-supported study implemented by the National Department of Health should contribute in the process of assisting to clarify possibilities and models for municipalities to enable environmental health officers and environmental management inspectors to harmonise implementation of functions.

2. Financial Integration and Expenditure

The main challenges for financial integration arise around communication between the implementing managers and their own financial sections that are tasked with accessing monies from the RDP Fund in National Treasury, and then following Treasury guidelines and regulations for the management and reporting of these funds.

During inception the programme arranged for National Treasury to provide a training session for partner department's financial officers on accessing and reporting on funds received via the RDP Fund. The UEMP inception manual contains a full annex explaining these draw-down procedures and requirements. Those partners who sent their financial officers to Pretoria for the training experienced fewer difficulties in accessing the funds, and in setting up their systems. A second similar training workshop was offered through the programme in May 2007.

Programme finances have become integrated into the operations of partner departments, with line function managers signing off expenditures in the same way as with government-allocated budgets. Programme requirements for financial reporting are less frequent (every six months) than inter-governmental financial reporting takes place. For some line-function managers in a number of departments it has taken time and effort to obtain programme-related financial reports from their financial sections. It appears that for some partners that the financial departmental budget allocation and tracking categories differ from the programme budget lines originally submitted by that department to the PSC. While this is not an unusual situation, and all expenditure can be eventually reconciled, it becomes a lot of work for line-function managers and their finance departments to access information on UEMP-related expenditure and report to the PSC on their programme-related expenditure.

There may be some benefits in the UEMP supporting some line-function managers and their finance departments to explore any possibilities for harmonizing their budget-line allocation categories – either the finance departments create systems which can allocate expenditures according to the budget lines submitted to the PSC; or; line-function managers submit budget-line categories to the PSC which their finance departments already use and can easily track.

A final indicator of UEMP integration within financial management systems will be the **departmental audit reports**. All programme expenditure through government is audited by the Auditor-General as part of the process of annual departmental audits. In keeping with the programme agreement, and National Treasury guidelines, the UEMP funds will be identified as a donor income from Denmark, and the annual expenditure recorded. Departmental audits are required to take place within three months of the financial year-end.

The figures presented in [Appendix One](#) are preliminary figures provided by the partners themselves. There may be small variances in final expenditure as some invoices and payments were in process at financial year-end, and may fall either side of the cut-off date. Overall spending of government partners at the end of year one in the UEMP amounts to R4,581,905.00 – or 19,85% of the allocated year-one budget of R23 085,000.00.

3. Programme Management

Between August 2006 and May 2007 the PSC met five times and also participated in a two-day programme inception workshop. Attendance by all partners at PSC meetings has been remarkable for its almost 100 percent record. Partners have provided the PSC with the agreed reports. PSC minutes and related appendices have been compiled and distributed effectively to PSC members.

Some partners indicated that it would add further value if PSC meetings had a slot for discussing and/or updating on key UEM topics beyond just focussing on programme management.

Roles and Responsibilities

A number of partners report experiencing initial confusion over who they should speak to with respect to questions over different aspects of programme management and implementation. While programme and financial management procedures were described in the programme inception note, and in subsequent documents developed by the ILTA, financial officers and line-function managers in a number of departments report that they were not aware of these documents. This situation has been exacerbated with the ongoing delay in the appointment of a National Long-term Advisor within DEAT, requiring the PSC Secretariat and the ILTA having to pick up and apportion additional responsibilities;

The envisaged programme website will enable line-function managers and financial officers to access programme-related procedures documents.

Communication

While most PSC members have a thorough grasp of the UEMP's overall objectives and strategic thrust, for some partners a number of implementing line-function managers reporting to PSC members have limited knowledge of the programme's objectives and procedures. It will take time for PSC members to get their departments to conceptualise programme-supported activities as integral to normal departmental activities, and for the UEMP elements and management to become an agenda item of normal management meetings.

A number of partners report a perception that programme management communications could be further rationalised with a view to receiving fewer and clearer communications. The experience of some partners feeling flooded by e-mails is also a function of their own departments needing to develop their own filter and targeting systems, and not forward all programme communications to all involved managers – two partners suggested consideration of thematically oriented mailing lists;

Administration procedures

A number of programme delays were due to partners with limited donor experience having internal challenges in understanding and implementing described “on-budget”

procedures to draw down monies from the RDP fund – and then setting up internal systems for line function managers to access and disburse those funds once they had been received.

Programme Planning

Given the staggered timeframes of planning cycles across the different spheres of government, the UEMP faces challenges of aligning approval of programme plans with normal cycles – especially if key partners experience delays in their own planning processes. Partners suggest that the PSC Secretariat should be more flexible in not requesting UEMP plans in advance of their own departmental plans being finalised;

The inception workshop in **Magaliesberg** was mentioned by many partners as being very valuable to them in a) understanding the programme; but perhaps more importantly b) in making contact with and understanding the challenges faced by other colleagues in different municipalities and spheres of government.

Many partners have requested an annual planning and capacity development meeting for key managers, with a view to strengthening the possibilities for developing their own year-plans that are coordinated and reinforce each other.

Official procurement systems of partners mean that it can take up to six months from development of terms of reference to appointment of the service provider. Tenders cannot be advertised unless funds are secured. While first-year set-up bottlenecks added to these delays, some partners systems enabled a three-month turn-around time and, with advance planning; this problem should be less in year two.

The envisaged UEMP planning and coordination workshop in September 2007 will assist partners in advance preparations for agreeing on year-three priority programme activities. Advance official letters of financial guarantee from the UEMP Secretariat to provincial and municipal treasuries for agreed priority programme activities in year-three will enable line-function managers to have plans and tenders ready for processing at the beginning of the next financial year.

Partners who needed to change some of their initial approved activities had this matter resolved within the PSC who have developed an approval system that adds further flexibility for partners to re-organise plans and allocated budgets during the year;

Given the first year start-up challenges partners' first year's **activity plans** were not optimally coordinated and integrated across different partners (cities, provinces, national). The potential for a new level of added value through inter-governmental UEM planning coordination is recognised and appreciated by most partners.

The **scheduling** and re-scheduling of **PSC meetings** is viewed by those PSC members who have to travel to Pretoria as a significant demand made by the programme.

Human Resources

South Africa faces a shortage of skilled staff, with the public service experiencing high vacancy levels at middle and senior management levels. The public service experiences high rates of staff turn-over with 10% of senior managers and 11.2% of middle managers leaving each year.² During the year under review the municipality of Ekurhuleni lost three of its six managers in the environment department.

The committed but overstretched government managers participating in the UEMP PSC have not had the time they would have liked to communicate the programme's vision and processes to line function managers.

Delays in hiring **technical advisors** to assist in programme coordination have added additional stress and bottlenecks to programme implementation.

The more **successful UEMP partners** had two critical elements in place – a) their **chief financial officers** were involved and informed of the process from the outset; b) they had the capacity to mandate a dedicated manager to play a central programme coordination role across all their sub-departments. **Ethekwini**, for example, chose not to have a technical advisor but appointed one of their own managers to take coordination responsibility – and spent 86% of their allocated budget.

Delays in the assumption of both technical advisor posts in DEAT required temporary solutions and additional in-house responsibilities for coordinating and communicating with all partners on programme inception. The post of national advisor had to be re-advertised and is as yet not filled.

While it appears beyond the scope of the UEMP to address recruitment and retention measures, some consideration could be given to UEMP making available short-term programme-specific management support to assist those partners experiencing temporary or acute administrative gaps at key planning and reporting times.

² Public administration in South Africa requires an additional 108,400 highly skilled personnel and 302,000 skilled personnel *Source: Republic of South Africa. Department of Public Service and Administration: Personnel Expenditure Review 2006. p.16*

4. Programme benefits and opportunities

While funds additional to operational budgets do add some value to able, most partners place higher value in the potential of the UEMP to assist in exploring and promoting enhanced opportunities for coordinated inter-governmental action and the production and sharing of good practice and knowledge – with **goal-directed face-to-face meetings and experience sharing** seen as especially valuable.

Appendix three provides a bullet-point summary of the key benefits and challenges as identified by programme partners.

Website

Many line-function managers involved in UEMP said they would like to have examples of what other partners were doing and thinking in their municipalities and provinces. Workshops and meetings through UEM have already resulted in increased exchanges of information across municipalities, with the smaller Sedibeng District Municipality particularly benefiting from receiving examples of management plans developed by the metropolitan municipalities. The envisaged programme website could play a valuable role in giving partners access to key programme documentation and examples. Partners said they would be interested to see each others' UEMP plans and reports so that they could get "some tips and good ideas" of how they could improve their own plans and ideas.

There is potential for national and provincial partners to **share procedures, systems and experiences developed** within the UEMP with other provincial and municipal governments throughout South Africa;

Another important benefit of the website would be in helping busy PSC members communicate key messages and decisions from the PSC. The site could not only become a central archive on programme decisions and procedures, but could also keep all partners informed of agreed dates and programmes timeframes.

The programme will make a useful contribution through supporting the development of a number of "good practice" case studies that help highlight and communicate the way in which effective environmental management and delivery of environmental services is contributing towards improving the lives of the poorest in South Africa. See appendix four for a starting list of potential studies.

The PSC could consider the allocation of additional UEMP resources towards assisting partners coordinate pilot inter-governmental cooperation priorities supported by UEMP. The documentation of these processes and lessons learned will also be of value to others who subsequently initiate similar interventions.

There may be some benefits in the UEMP supporting some line-function managers and their finance departments to explore any possibilities for harmonizing their budget-line allocation categories – either the finance departments create systems which can allocate expenditures according to the budget lines submitted to the PSC; or; line-function managers submit budget-line categories to the PSC which their finance departments already use and can easily track.

The envisaged programme website will enable line-function managers and financial officers to access programme-related procedures documents.

Many partners have requested an annual planning and capacity development meeting for key managers, with a view to strengthening the possibilities for developing their own year-plans that are coordinated and reinforce each other.

The envisaged UEMP planning and coordination workshop in September 2007 will assist partners in advance preparations for agreeing on year-three priority programme activities. Advance official letters of financial guarantee from the UEMP Secretariat to provincial and municipal treasuries for agreed priority programme activities in year-three will enable line-function managers to have plans and tenders ready for processing at the beginning of the next financial year.

While it appears beyond the scope of the UEMP to address recruitment and retention measures, some consideration could be given to UEMP making available short-term programme-specific management support to assist those partners experiencing temporary or acute administrative gaps at key planning and reporting times.

The UEMP could support the convening of thematic-specific workshops or seminars where interested line-function managers within and beyond the programme could discuss and share experiences on specific challenges faced.

Appendix One: UEMP expenditure in year one

Note: These figures represent actual disbursements by financial year-end and are not an accurate indicator of the larger number of actual UEMP activities being undertaken – for which the costs will be reflected in the first part of year two.

Table One: Overall Summary

	Budget 06/07	Expenditure 06/07	% spent
National / Provincial	R 9,910,000.00	R 622,000.00	6,28%
Municipal	R13,175,000.00	R 3,959,905.19	30,06%
TOTAL	R23,085,000.00	R 4,581,905.19	19,85%

Table Two: Summary of National and Provincial Expenditure

		Budget	Expenditure	% spent
DEAT	Air Quality	R500,000.00	R 0.00	0.00%
	Sedibeng EMF	R1,500,000.00	R 0.00	0.00%
	Waste Management	R 800,000.00	R 0.00	0.00%
	National Advisor	R 600,000.00	R 0.00	0.00%
		R 3,400,000.00	R 0.00	0.00%
Health	Env Health Study	R500,000.00	R 0.00	0.00%
Gauteng	Waste min plan	R300,000.00	R 0.00	
	Haz waste study	R 500,000.00	R 0.00	
	EMF for 2 cities	R1,200,000.00	R 0.00	
		R 2,000,000.00	R 0.00	0.00%
KZN	Waste Mgmt Plan	R500,000.00	R 0.00	
	EMF for one city	R265,000.00	R 0.00	
	Air quality database	R245,000.00	R 0.00	
		R 1,010,000.00	R 0.00	0.00%
W Cape	Waste Management Plan	R500,000	R408,000.00	
	Spatial Devlpmnt Manuals	R500,000	R214,000.00	
		R1,000,000.00	R622,000.00	62,2%
STTA	National / Provincial	R2,000.00	R00.0	0.00%
TOTAL		R9,910,000.00	R622,000.00	6,28%

Table Three: Summary of municipal expenditure

	Budget 06/07	Expenditure 06/07	% spent
Cape Town	R2,735,000.00	R 710,937.00	25,99%
Ekurhuleni	R2,700,000.00	R 668,790.42	24,77%
Ethekwini	R2,225,000.00	1,912,405.00	85,95%
Johannesburg	R1,400,000.00	R 305,379.00	21,81%
Sedibeng	R2,115,000.00	R 362,393.77	17,13%
STTA	R2,000,000.00	R0.00	23.5%
TOTAL	R13,175,000.00	R 3,959,905.19	30,06%

Appendix Two: Monitoring of Assumptions and Risks

The UEMP Programme document outlines a number of risks and assumptions which the programme needs to monitor and respond to when the need arises – see page 54 of the programme document. The tables below outline the programme assumptions and risks as identified in the programme document, and then summarise the status quo.

Table Four: Programme Assumptions - Findings

Programme Assumptions	Findings
Alignment with business plans – reducing management burden and responding to priorities	Programme activities are aligned with business plans at all three spheres of government – any delays in implementation reflect overall departmental delays and not programme delays. Business plans at local and provincial level do not usually plan to the output level to which programme activities are planned. While these partners have had some additional work in elaborating their UEM-related plans, feedback suggests this has had a positive overall effect.
Counterpart contributions	There is a sustained growth in counterpart resources being allocated generally and to UEM-related activities. Programme resources are adding value to existing allocations – and in some cases are being used to leverage additional support for new or expanded activities. In some instances a number of municipalities used programme funds to kick-start priority activities for which budget allocations were still pending, and were then able to motivate additional funds from the fiscus for year two.
Alignment with development policies - focusing on interventions that support South African policy to alleviate poverty	Challenges for some partners in identifying the direct and indirect impacts of proposed programme-supported activities on poverty alleviation. No conflicts with overall policy. National focus is more on developing frameworks and guidelines. Some provinces seeking to implement activities in municipalities, while others are focussing on developing and sharing knowledge. Implementation at local level more often has a direct and visible poverty-related focus. The mainstreamed poverty focus of all government departments focuses more on job creation – UEM is more about reducing threats to the poor.
Government absorptive capacity – assumed that partners have staff and capacity to cope with the additional programme resources and management demands	Being the first year of a complex programme, the low absorptive capacity appears to be more as a result of start-up and administrative challenges of developing “on-plan” and “on-budget” systems in different departments for donor funds. For almost all partners this has required some administrative ‘pioneering’ efforts, and resulted in delays. Most partners estimate that their outstanding year-one activities will be complete half-way through year two. With the administrative bottlenecks removed, it is expected that absorptive capacity in year-two will be significantly higher.

Programme Risks

The integration of the programme into existing government priorities and business plans mitigates the risks of programme implementation. Some of the risks in urban environmental management relate to the aim of the programme - to develop urban environmental management as a proactive tool towards sustainable development and to avoid increased poverty. The aim of the programme is to add value and improve the use of already available resources, and part of this is risk management.

Table Five: Programme Risks – Findings

Programme Risks	Findings
<p>Institutional capacity. <i>There is a <u>medium</u> risk that capacity is stretched due to the assumption, delegation and assignment of sometimes unfunded overlapping mandates. Delays in clarifying mandates, functions, responsibilities and budgetary responsibilities can lead to challenges in coordination –result in implementation delays.</i></p>	<p>Programme coordination efforts are leading to improved management of this risk. For example, DEAT has invested effort in coordinating with provincial and national partners in the development of priority Environmental Management Frameworks (Sedibeng and Gauteng); and in developing a coordinated national response to indoor air-pollution in poor households. The programme also provides increasing possibilities for partners across the spheres to meet and develop plans for mutually reinforcing activities on common areas of concern.</p>
<p>Financial flow delays. A <u>small</u> risk of delays in financial flows was identified in programme formulation. This risk was addressed in design by ensuring that there was flexibility to the timing of output delivery in the programme. The preferred action is to work with the existing financial system despite its real or perceived weaknesses and seek ways to improve the rate of disbursement.</p>	<p>This risk was found to have had an impact in delaying the arrival of funds into specific internal accounts accessible to relevant managers at provincial and local level. Previous donor experience by national government meant that there were no delays in accessing funds at this level. Most of the delays were not due to disbursement from the national treasury to provincial or local level to. Delays were more due to internal communications from line function managers to their own financial management departments who did not have previous experience of these kinds of fund flows. All systems are now established and this risk is now considered as minimal.</p>
<p>Strong focus on implementation through projects. There is <u>medium</u> risk that the implementation is project driven due to limited staff capacity and a demand at local government level for visible results. The drawback is that insufficient attention is possible for addressing institutional capacity development or the overall quality of municipal services for poor communities. The UEM Programme will respond to this by aiming at results but also secure means for institutional capacity development and replication of lessons learned.</p>	<p>Many of the activities at local, and even provincial level, are focussed on implementation of priority projects. A number of the provincially and nationally coordinated activities are designed as pilots and learning initiatives with a view to sharing these experiences with other municipalities. There are fewer programme-supported activities which focus upon developing institutional capacity through (for example) organisation development support. There are a number of initiatives aimed at development of manuals, procedures and guidelines. Partners have already identified a number of project-driven initiatives in which they would like to share their lessons learned on common challenges with other partners. The programme has stimulated an increase in communication and sharing of existing documentation and guidelines etc among municipalities.</p>
<p>Staff capacity and availability. There is a <u>medium</u> risk of limited staff capacity. Limited capacity and vacancies in key positions in government departments may result in insufficient staff allocations for the management and implementation of the UEM Programme.</p>	<p>This risk is an ongoing reality that has had an impact upon programme implementation – but (being integrated) not necessarily more so than overall implementation of government work. High annual staff turnover (11% of senior management as average of government) demands significant time from managers in processes of advertising and hiring. There have also been delays in appointing all technical advisors, which has had a knock-on effect in weakening programme coordination and communication.</p>
<p>Local Government elections. There are <u>high</u> risks for delays in local development programmes in due to possible delays associated with the local government elections.</p>	<p>The local government elections did not have any negative impact upon inception and implementation of the programme at local level.</p>

Appendix Three: List of persons interviewed

National

Department: Environmental Affairs and Tourism

Ms Joanne Yawitch:	Chair of UEM PSC; Deputy Director General Environmental Quality and Protection;
Dr Ranjini Pillay:	UEM PSC Secretariat; Director Administration Environmental Quality and Protection;
Mr Peter Lukey:	PSC Member: Chief Director: Air Quality Management and Climate Change;
Ms Lize McCourt:	PSC Member: Chief Director: Environmental Impact Monitoring;
Ms Zanele Mvusi: Waste	PSC Member: Chief Director: Pollution and Management;
Mr Bo Leth-Espensen:	International Long-Term Advisor, UEMP;

Department: Health

Ms Qaphile Gcwensa:	Director Environmental Health
---------------------	-------------------------------

Provincial

Gauteng Province

Mr Thabo Ndlovu:	PSC member: Chief Director Sustainable Use of Environment
Dr Dhiraj Rama:	Alternate PSC member: Director Waste Management
Mr Pirate Ncube	Director Environmental Impact Monitoring
Ms Zingisa Smale	Environmental Officer
Ms Disebo Mashitisho:	Environmental Officer

KwaZulu-Natal Province

Dr Timothy Fasheun	PSC member: Manager Environment and Technology Development Services
Ms Sphumi Nomele	Environmental Planning
Mr Jay Puckree	Manager: Air Quality
Dr Shauna Costley	Assistant Director Waste Disposal

Western Cape Province

Ms Dipolelo Elford	PSC Member: Chief Director Environmental and Land Planning
Mr Gotlieb Arendse	Director Waste Management
Mr August Hoon	Principle Environment Officer
Ms Raudhiyah Sahabodien	Town and Regional Planner

Municipal

Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality

Mr Keith Smith and Mr Solomon Bhunu Mr Abdul Waheed Patel	Director: Strategic Development Information GIS Manager: Corporate GIS Manager: Office of the Executive Director Strategy and Planning Directorate (UEM TA Designate)
Ms Osman Asmal Mr Keith Wiseman Management Ms Kobie Brand	Director: Environmental Resource Management Manager: Integrated Environmental Manager: Environmental Education and Communications
Ms Shirene Rosenberg Mr Godfrey Mvuma Ms Barbara Southworth Ms Cathy Glover Dr Ivan Bromfield Mr Jacobus Schippers	Manager: Environmental Resource Management Manager: Environmental Strategy Director: Spatial Planning and Urban Design Manager: Spatial Planning and Urban Design Director: Environmental Health. Manager Special Projects: Environmental Health

Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality

Mr Lebogang Raliaple	Director: Environment
----------------------	-----------------------

eThekweni Municipality

Ms Soobs Moonsammy:	PSC member; Deputy City Manager Sustainable Development and City Enterprises Senior Planner, Development Planning
Ms Vicky Sim Department Ms Jessica Rich Implementation: Management Mr Gavin Benjamin Mr Siva Chetty Risk Mr Karamchund Jaggeth: Mr Prem Maharaj	Manager: Policy Coordination and Environmental Deputy Head: Development Planning Deputy Head: Pollution Control Support and Management, Health Unit Manager: Pollution Control Support Manager: Vector Control Service

Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality

Ms Lunelle Serobatse Mr Peter Mosang Mr Enoch Lipoto Cleaner Mr Peter Manganye Mr Percy Matlepeng	Director: Environmental Policy Integration and Management Support Senior Specialist: Central Strategic Unit Programme Manager: Climate Change and Production Deputy Director: Environmental Health Programme Manager: Compliance Monitoring
--	---

Sedibeng District Municipality

Mr Sorrious Manele	
--------------------	--

Mr Zies Van Zyl
Ms Lizette Venter
Mr Rob Short

Assistant Manager Environmental Services
UEM Technical Advisor

Royal Danish Embassy

Mr Troels Bruun Jørgensen
Ms Portia Poulsen

Environment Counsellor
UEM Programme Officer

Appendix Four: Key statements by interviewed partners

Municipalities

POSITIVES

- UEM planning process assisted in own local identification of priorities and sector planning. Cross-cutting nature of UEM promoted communication and improved alignment across city departments with overlapping functions;
- Prompted environment management departments to consider means of deeper integration with other line-function departments in municipality with overlapping mandates;
- Programme has helped elevate visibility of UEM issues in municipality;
- Relationship and networking with other municipalities has provided significant added value to Sedibeng;
- Provides much-needed space to develop horizontal (city-to-city) and vertical partnerships for mutual benefit and learning;
- Has brought environmental health and environmental management closer together, for example, to coordinate on the training of Environmental Management Inspectors (EMIs);
- Increased contact with province and national has led directly to improved coordination and cooperation on development of Environmental Management Frameworks (though there is still room for improvement);
- **Headstart funding:** Enabled earlier start-up of a project on sustainability indicators, and also provided leverage to motivate for bigger budget from city in year-two of project; Similar benefits for setting up training of EMIs;
- Programme flexibility has been an important plus – allowing shifting of budgets within city partners as long as it remains within agreed programme objectives and priorities;
- The programme focus on poverty reduction has elevated the internal discussions on relating environmental management and poverty reduction;

TEETHING

- Start-up process internally took long – municipal partners not familiar with the planning format and budgeting process;
- Unfamiliarity with the administrative process and slow municipal internal communications meant it a) it took a long time for municipal finance department to get the funds from national treasury; and b) once it was in the municipality, to set up internal vote numbers and for relevant managers to work out and set up the sign-off processes;
- Getting to feel an understanding and familiarity with the design, structure and objectives of the programme meant that the opportunities that were available were not initially exploited;
- **Staff turn-over and vacant posts** meant shortage of managers to drive the activities (Ekurhuleni lost half of its key managers in year-one) (As a district level

municipality there were very few staff who were overwhelmed by their responsibilities)

- Clarifying and then acting upon the division of environmental powers and functions at municipal/district level remains a big challenge – district has to consult with three municipalities who each have their own agendas;
- **Restructuring** of departments made inter-departmental coordination difficult and led to slow start-up and limited activity within municipality – restructuring now complete with a good outlook for programme-related coordination (Ekurhuleni and Johannesburg);
- Recruiting and then managing the municipal advisor and developing clarity on their roles and responsibilities took more effort than anticipated – project management and facilitation role identified as key – not technical expertise;
- Sharing one advisor between Johannesburg and Ekurhuleni has not been an ideal situation;

OUTPUTS AND EXPENDITURE

- Slow start-up internally means that most year-one activities will be complete six months into year two (applies to most municipal partners);
- Terms of reference written and tender processes nearly complete for year one – year two will be much quicker as municipality is already developing ToRs for activities planned for year two – also, signing off on project activities will be located within implementing departments;

INTEGRATION

- Plans relate to cities own plans and priorities – and to sector-plan goals;

OPPORTUNITIES

- Would like to enhance contact and network with other partners on issues of substance;
- Would like to see the development and sharing of documentation on lessons learned and specific successes;

Provinces

POSITIVES

- Provided opportunities for new inter-governmental relationships, and for deepening some existing ones;
- Having supplementary resources for a bigger project has given flexibility and added value – eg Western Cape Provincial Spatial Development Framework manuals that were developed;

TEETHING

- Staffing capacity led to additional challenge to integrate the UEM business plan process with province's own planning processes – two provinces planned to do work beyond their own capacity, and thus none was done;
- Information flow and sharing from PSC members through to line managers was a problem – leading to administrators having no idea of how to access

funds, set up accounts, integrate plans, work with donor funds using own procurement processes etc – PSC structure did not meet the needs of line-function managers who felt they needed more support in setting up the process;

OPPORTUNITIES

- “The activities supported by this programme – at whatever sphere of government – should be relevant to resolving national priorities and bring us closer to working out how best to tackle our common problems together. In future the PSC must enable and challenge UEM partners to choose that will get us working on the same thing at the same time together”.
- getherbenefits to The process of selecting projects for support by this programme should be informed by having national relevance and standing

CHALLENGES

- Communications and understanding the programme opportunities, operations and procedures – a website would be most helpful;
- Staff turn-over – filling vacancies takes significant management time and delays planned work;
- Subsidiarity - How to align priorities as seen by district municipalities with the bigger picture as seen by the province;
- How to maximize benefits from the knowledge management component;
- How to enable knowledge transfer from hired consultants to staff;
- How to address poverty and develop capacity;

KZN

- How to relate project activities to poverty focus
- Staff would like training opportunities in project management

National

POSITIVES

- Inception workshop in Magaliesburg was important, and more of this is needed to capitalize on synergies and potential;
- Joint conceptualization and planning on EMFs and Air quality has been of important added value – have realized how much work it takes and has identified the need for joint protocol on identifying and assuming responsibilities;
- Important opportunity to build practical bridges between national and local, as there are no other such forums enabling this;
- Helping in the process of identifying IGR “grey areas” of overlap – some way to go still;

TEETHING

- Staffing shortages and winding up national waste project led to delays in implementation;
- Insufficient clarity on roles and responsibilities in programme management;
- Those partners that successfully and quickly negotiated the funds draw-down and programme establishment process had **a dedicated coordinating person** responsible;
- Took time to get to grips with programme administration and procedures;

- “Wood for the trees”: Frustrations with communications not being clear and strategic - too much on detail and not enough targeted – which results in key managers ignoring the perceived deluge and thus missing important communications
- Some confusion over lines of responsibility and reporting;
- UEM business plans for year two had to be submitted before DEAT’s own delayed business plans were formulated and approved – need to align these to minimize extra work; - how to align timing with provincial partners?

OUTPUTS AND EXPENDITURE

- Staff shortages were the key bottleneck to implementing plans – DEAT’s own budgets more than covered what could be spent, which provided an additional challenge of were to strategically deploy programme funds. Assuming retention of additional staffing complement that has been recruited it is expected that spending will pick up in year two. One Chief Directorate was R13 million underspent – where these trends are anticipated, available programmes should be re-directed – **issue of monitoring and balancing requests for funds with capacity to spend – advisors can play an important role in bringing this information to the surface**
- The post of national advisor had to be re-advertised due to “weak and unsuitable” candidates. Of the 33 applicants on the first round, most were not qualified.
- Important for the vision of the programme to be communicated to line-function managers who do not attend PSC meetings – still a challenge to see this programme as integrated within normal functions – it or its activities are seldom spoken of in normal departmental management meetings

OPPORTUNITIES

- Important opportunity to develop learning pilots that entail working relationships across all three spheres of government;
- International technical assistance on waste matters will be helpful;
- How to ensure strategic use of the proposed website – not just an archive of information – this requires active management and targeted updates to participants – fine balance between too much and too little information must be strategically managed;

Appendix Five: Potential case studies

During interviews partners were asked if there were any ‘good-practice’ examples that could be documented for sharing within and beyond the programme. Many partners said that while they had some good ideas, it was perhaps still too early in the process and that year-two may be a better time. The following were examples that could be addressed.

- **Western Cape Provincial Government**

The development and production of “practical, how to go about it” manuals and guidelines for municipalities on a) urban restructuring and b) inclusionary housing; have been fruitful processes supported by the programme – a first in the country. This process required significant attention to developing inter-governmental relationships and has “paid off”.

- **Challenges of a district municipality in coordinating**

There are some important IGR lessons to be learned from the process of trying to set up coordinated processes for Environmental Management Frameworks in Sedibeng – three municipalities, district, plus province, plus national ... fragmentation and joint responsibility has created some significant challenges.

- **As the first national priority area for Air Quality**, there would be some value in documenting the process and challenges experienced in Sedibeng.
- Ethekwini has a number of UEMP projects which they would like to document as case studies. These include:
 - An overview of their UEMP-supported projects;
 - A case study on capacity development support to communities in informal settlements aimed at informing them on how and where to exercise their rights to improved delivery of UEMP services;
 - Case study on integrating local planning with coastal management planning;
 - Review of renewable energy technologies and actions to address climate change.

Appendix Six: Introductory Letter to UEM Partners

Summary Note for UEM Partners

The pending end of the first year of the UEM programme for National and Provincial partners is a good time to look back and identify what has worked and what has not – and to consider how year two could be made even easier and more successful. In keeping with the agreed Programme Document a “Programme Status Update” will provide the Programme Steering Committee with your lessons learned and experiences so as to assist them in considering enhancements to the programme. Information on programme status will also be provided to National Treasury and the Danish Government.

As first years in programmes like this one go, it is quite usual to find that our original ambitions have exceeded our achievements. Part of this status update is to understand what the ‘teething problems’ have been, and then to see if there is anything that can be done to assist in making year two even better than year one.

Mr Chris Albertyn has been contracted by the Danish Embassy as an independent consultant to have discussions with each partner during the second half of March this year. He will be contacting you to make appointments at a time convenient to you.

Much of the information needed will most likely be contained in your annual UEM progress reporting processes. Discussions with partners will cover the following:

1. What are the key positives that have emerged from your first year of participating in the UEM Programme?
2. ‘Teething problems’ – what planning, administrative or other bottlenecks have impacted upon your implementation of UEM plans? Is there any support or change that the programme could provide make in making year two easier?
3. How have your planned outputs compared to your achievements for the year?
4. How have you managed to integrate the UEM planning process into official departmental approval and management processes – ‘on plan’³?
5. How has your planned UEM expenditure compared to actual expenditure of funds?
6. How have you managed to integrate UEM funds into normal departmental financial management reporting and disbursement procedures – ‘on budget’⁴?
7. Is there anything from your year-two UEM-related plans that you would like to highlight as addressing South Africa’s national urban environment management priorities and the objectives of this programme?
8. Are there any opportunities for the programme documenting these proposed activities as “good practice” examples for partners and other stakeholders to learn from?

³ According to National Treasury Documentation: ‘On plan’ = “All ODA interventions shall be described and integrated into a specific government planning framework”.

⁴ According to National Treasury Documentation: ‘On budget’ = “Inclusion in official budgets and financial management and accounting processes”.