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Introduction to survey

The current government and governance systems in South Africa operate in a highly hierarchical manner. As a result, integrative management practices, decentralisation, public participation and the inclusive approach to public-private initiatives have not seen fair promotion in municipalities. This questionnaire sets out to collect data related to the feasibility of implementing an integrated public service system (IPSS) for municipalities which will drive public value (PV) generation.

What the survey will measure:

- General information regarding the unit of analysis, i.e. the respondents who are senior managers in the Housing and Social Development departments at municipalities in the Western Cape Province.
- The preparedness (readiness / willingness) of senior managers within the municipality to address open deliberative relations (collaboration, integration, feedback, monitoring and evaluation) with integrated stakeholder teams (internally and externally) to achieve a wide range of benefits in respect of integrated municipal service delivery to communities.
- To determine the level of integration of services with regard to municipal service delivery.
- To determine how municipalities may manage PV generation given an IPSS.

The questionnaire should be completed at one sitting which will last approximately 45 minutes.
Abbreviations:

IPSS: A flexible, nonlinear, non-hierarchical, open system of governance which is comprised of stakeholder teams operating in a defined network.

PV: The permanent and sustainable value which accrues to communities through the delivery of quality services by a municipality and stakeholders operating collectively.

M-Participation: Mobile participation using dedicated internet applications (Apps).

ISO 9001:2015: Quality standards for municipal projects and programmes presented by the International Standards Office (ISO), with community involvement / focus.

Stakeholders: Community, NGO’s, Community Based Organisations (CBO’s), Institutions of State, private sector organisations, consultants, semi-private institutions and foreign based organisations if any.
1. **Respondent work related data**

1.1 Please tick (✓) ONE of the following alternatives relating to your position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am a senior manager in the Housing Directorate.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a senior manager in the Social Development Directorate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a senior manager in the Housing and Social Development Directorate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Please tick (✓) ONE of the following alternatives relating to your years of experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 to 2 years.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Please tick (✓) ONLY current tasks you are engaged with:

- Policy formulation.
- Policy implementation.
- Call meetings with other government bodies, e.g. Provincial Government.
- Teamwork (collaboration) with other departments.
- Teamwork (collaboration) with external stakeholders.
- Strategic planning with external stakeholders.
- Arrange problem solving meetings with external stakeholders.
- Programme and projects monitoring.
- Programme and projects evaluation.

1.3 Any others?

…………………………………………………
…………………………………………………

1.4 Please tick (✓) ONLY the items directly related to your current work on integration:

- Integration initiatives between departments are supported by your department.
- You have participated in integration initiatives with other departments.
- Your staff understands the benefits of relationship building between departments.
- You invite the Finance and Human Resources departments to your meetings.
- You invite external stakeholders to attend your departmental meetings.
- Your department hold public meetings to record community concerns.
- Your department conduct community satisfaction surveys.
- Your department has a satisfactory communication system with the community.
- You have participated in stakeholder networks.
- The Human Resources department is proactive in public participation training.

1.4 Any others?

………………………………………………………………............
………………………………………………………………............

1.5 Collaboration generates integration between departments.

Tick (✓) ONLY the statements which describes your experience:

- Collaboration is limited by departmental regulation.
- The advantages of collaboration is understood by senior managers.
- Collaboration has been neglected as a way of bringing ideas and views together.
- Collaboration is limited by the independent decisions of various departments.
Collaboration is limited by regulation imposed by other state structures.
Collaboration is discouraged as a municipal practice.

1.6 Rank the service delivery **capacity-building initiatives** for implementation in your Department; 1 being the **MOST** Needed, 2 the **NEXT** Needed and 3 the **LEAST** Needed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiation skills training.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consensus building between your department and the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public participation (working with communities).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-management: managing with other departments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring programmes and projects for quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships building with stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative governance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating programmes and projects for sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 Any others?

| …………………………………………………………………………………………………… |  |
| …………………………………………………………………………………………………… |  |

1.7 Rank the following political factors which impact **negatively** on service delivery in your department,

1 for **HIGHLY** Negative Impact, 2 **SOME** Negative Impact and 3 **NO** Impact:

| Political requests to remove or replace an organisational objective. |  |
| Politicians increase uncertainty in communities by making empty promises. |  |
| Political action that prevents a programme / project or budget in initiative. |  |
| Politician’s non-attendance at community meetings / workshops. |  |
| Political pressure on a municipal staff member to perform a duty. |  |
| Politician meddling in strategic decisions to accommodate a personal agenda. |  |
| Political refusal to collaborate with stakeholders and or community. |  |
| Political decision which are in conflict with community decision. |  |

1.7 Any others?

| …………………………………………………………………………………………………… |  |
| …………………………………………………………………………………………………… |  |

1.8 Rank the following local government legislation with which you are familiar;

1 MOST Familiar, 2 **Familiar** and 3 LEAST **Familiar**:

| The Public Finance Management Act, No.1 of 1999. |  |
| The Public Administration Management Act, No.11 of 2014. |  |
2. **Managements’ approach toward the application of collaboration and integration in the generation of public value for communities.** Rate the following instances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Dialogue with external stakeholders require renewed focus in my department.

2.1 Why?

........................................................................................................................................

2.2 Dialogue with external stakeholders will clash with the municipal objectives.

2.2 Why?

........................................................................................................................................

2.3 Dialogue with external stakeholders has been strengthened by integration practices.

2.4 Dialogue between organs of state, the municipality and external stakeholders is weakened by suspicion.

2.5 Communication infrastructure is not made available to external stakeholders.

2.5 How can this be improved?

........................................................................................................................................

2.6 Feedback to external stakeholders require no additional resources.

2.6 Why?

........................................................................................................................................

2.7 The value of feedback to external stakeholders has not been worked out by the municipal departments.

2.8 Managers prefer not to operate in networks with external stakeholders.

2.9. The effective evaluation of programmes and projects by municipal departments is of concern to external stakeholders.

2.10 The evaluation of programmes and projects take external stakeholders’ views into account.

2.11 Communities favour integrated programmes and projects as it combines their interests.

2.12 The lack of common objectives with external stakeholders is problematic for my department.

2.12 Why?

........................................................................................................................................

2.13 Collaborative governance is purely theoretical at this point in time.

2.14 Collaborative governance is not valid without public participation.

2.15 Stakeholders have the right to access to your data and information.

2.16 Integration with community and public groups on programmes / projects is weak.

2.16 Why?
2.17 The municipality provides resources for public value generation.

### How?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate the following managerial tasks related to integration, collaboration and the generation of public value:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.18 Relax controls in order to encourage self-management among staff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.19 Improve communication and consultation with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20 Emphasise monitoring of quality service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21 Involve beneficiaries in budget planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22 Send staff for training to obtain sustainable development certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23 Discuss the introduction of civic education with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24 Conduct public workshops on housing shortages / social issues arising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25 Adopt common goals between your department and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26 Introduce service delivery performance charts to staff and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27 Formulate sustainability criteria for community adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.28 Formulate measures for relationship building between departments and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.29 Adopt methods for feedback to community and public groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30 Encourage departments to achieve integration targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.31 Send staff for training to obtain collaborative governance certification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.32 Invite all stakeholders to strategic planning meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.33 Initiate capacity-building for staff on municipal legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.34 Promote enabling environment in community through information sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.35 Motivate staff to engage with community representatives on matters of concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.36 Implementing ISO 9001:2015 quality standard measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.37 Support e-government access to information and municipal data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The following items examine your actual involvement with collaboration, collaborative governance, integration and public value generation.

### Please rank the related criteria, where 1 indicates HIGHLY important and 5 the LEAST important:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build networks with stakeholders.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopt integrated strategies with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create value in communities through service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with stakeholders within the legal framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with stakeholders within collaborative governance framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 Motivate your choice for HIGHLY important:

3.2 Please rank the related criteria, where 1 indicates HIGHLY important and 5 the LEAST important:

| Utilise digital technology for internal and external communication. |
| Empower stakeholders to engage with the municipality. |
| Think holistically about projects and programme design. |
| Manage complexity through simplifying tasks. |
| Manage networks composed of internal state bodies and stakeholders. |

3.2 Motivate your choice for HIGHLY important:

3.3 Please rank the related criteria, where 1 indicates HIGHLY important and 5 the LEAST important:

| Practice collaborative governance in stakeholder networks. |
| Effective and efficient use of resources by measuring performance. |
| Reach consensus though negotiation with stakeholders. |
| Maintain community focus on common set of objectives. |
| Listen to community voice through participatory methods. |

3.3 Motivate your choice for HIGHLY important:

3.4 Should integration (working with government bodies and stakeholders on equal level) become a core function in your department?

4. Generating public value through service delivery. Rate the following items on the scale indicated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly agree</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Disagree</th>
<th>4 Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 My department has adopted a shared vision with the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Community objectives are merged with my departmental objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Departmental managers do not have a clear understanding of collaboration as a means to generate value for the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 The municipality, community and stakeholders collaborate to generate community stability, safety and security.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Trust between various stakeholders is a basic public value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Common goals (vision) guide public participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 My department launched a framework for open dialogue with stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 Local government legislation links service delivery to social wellbeing.

4.9 My departmental management plan is specific on the issue of accountability and transparency with stakeholders.

4.10 The municipality, community and stakeholders are challenged by limited financial resources.

4.10 Why?

4.11 My department lacks capacity to implement, monitor and evaluate sustainability measures.

4.11 Why?

4.12 Community satisfaction survey results are open for public scrutiny.

4.13 My department has implemented ISO 9001:2015 quality measures.

4.14 My staff are innovative with regard to value creation for the community.

4.14 How?

4.15 My departmental business plan has integrated stakeholders’ objectives.

4.15 Why?

4.16 Rank the following public value generating activities appropriate to community building:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MOST appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>APPROPRIATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LEAST appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ensure efficient and effective service delivery to the community.

Community safety and security surveys.

Negotiate with stakeholders.

Public participation workshops.

Discussion with individuals and focus groups from the community to gauge their expectations.

4.17 Rank the following Public Value generating activities appropriate to community building:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MOST appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>APPROPRIATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LEAST appropriate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E-governance instruments for feedback and easy communication.

Departmental coaching and mentoring on public engagement.

Reaching consensus with stakeholders on sustainability criteria.

Open access to municipal information for stakeholders.

Share values and vision with stakeholders.

5 Exploring your readiness to engage with stakeholders. Rate your level of readiness regarding the implementation of the following tasks:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 To build trust with stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Share other information and data with stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 To implement participatory methods for budgeting with stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 To implement feedback methods to stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 To adapt from internal focus to dynamic (participatory) focus when working with stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Invite stakeholders to discuss concerns and issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 To build an enabling environment for stakeholders to be heard, i.e. to voice their opinions and concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 To co-manage projects and programmes with stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8 How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9 To implement common objectives (joint strategy) with stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9 How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10 To measure value invested in the community through service delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10 How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11 To implement e-government platforms for public M-participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11 How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12 To measure community satisfaction with contributions from stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12 How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13 To operationalise community building programmes for stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.13 Why?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

5.14 Build staff capability to deal with participatory methods / tools.

5.15 Build staff technical capability to manage in stakeholder networks.

5.16 Implement continuous dialogue with community.

5.16 How?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………

5.17 Anticipate service delivery failure.

5.17 How?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

6. Generating public value: Assessment measures / criteria (elements) for outputs, outcomes and adaptation with regard to transformation:

6.1 Regarding public participation, rank the following criteria, where 1 is the MOST important, 2 is IMPORTANT and 3 the LEAST important:

| Share knowledge and information. |
| Co-manage sustainable performance. |
| Sustain trust in relationships. |
| Sustain dialogue on programmes and projects. |
| Involve and include political groups. |

6.2 Regarding public participation, rank the following criteria, where 1 is the MOST important, 2 is IMPORTANT and 3 the LEAST important:

| Participatory planning and budgeting. |
| Effect common objectives through consensus. |
| Align outcomes to expectations. |
| Align outcomes to common objectives. |
| Build internal and external capacity. |

6.3 Regarding public participation, rank the following criteria, where 1 is the MOST important, 2 is IMPORTANT and 3 the LEAST important:

| Benefits / quality management. |
| Manage efficiency (programmes and projects). |
| Effective resources allocation. |
| Manage sustainability of outputs and outcomes. |
| Promote innovation. |

6.4 Regarding public participation, rank the following criteria, where 1 is the MOST important, 2 is IMPORTANT and 3 the LEAST important:

| Implement community satisfaction surveys. |
| Evaluate equity. |
| E-government / M-participation feedback. |
| Evaluate effectiveness. |
| Monitor the adopted sustainability measures. |
6.5 Regarding public participation, rank the following criteria, where 1 is the MOST important, 2 is IMPORTANT and 3 the LEAST important:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report on small transformative changes observed in the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on adaptability (over time) to small changes implemented in the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on effectiveness of value created.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on equity (fairness) in value created.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on stability achieved in the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Performance management functions related to the efficient and effective delivery of services, i.e. public value to communities. Rate the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Management Function</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 My department share understanding with stakeholders on the evaluation of social wellbeing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Community satisfaction surveys are aligned to quality of life objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Visual performance tools are used at meetings with the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 My department has a performance evaluation team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 My department evaluate current programmes / projects outputs periodically.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 My department receives feedback from stakeholders on current programmes and projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Evaluation of projects / programmes identifies public value generated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Evaluation of projects / programmes involves the review of strategy with stakeholder participation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 Evaluation helps projects / programmes teams to learn from each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.10 Efficiency levels regarding the use of resources has a direct impact on achieving higher standards of living in communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.10 Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.11 Evaluation and measurement of public value generated is dependent on how thoroughly the community participated in the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.12 My department has adopted criteria for measuring public wellbeing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.13 Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.14 Sustainability measures are in place to preserve community assets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.14 How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.15 Evaluation and measurement of outputs are linked to a common set of objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.15 Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.16 Successful performance regarding services delivered is linked to high morale displayed in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.16 Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In considering a future integrated public service system for municipal service delivery i.e. for effective public value generation, rate the following propositions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly agree</th>
<th>2 Agree</th>
<th>3 Disagree</th>
<th>4 Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8.1 An integrated system is not better than a hierarchical system of operability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.1 Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 Our current departmental operational functioning does not require change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.2 Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 Dynamical (flexible) work modes are superior to static work modes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.3 Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4 My department is reluctant to sign agreements with stakeholder teams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.4 Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.5 Public value generation is about delivering incremental improvements in service delivery over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.5 Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>…………………………………………………………………………………………</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.6 Public value generation is about making community wellbeing a priority.

8.6 Why?

8.7 Fragmentation (working in silos) is suited to the current need for order.

8.7 Why?

8.8 My department actively eliminates waste, duplication and fruitless spending through integration with other departments.

8.8 How?

8.9 My department actively support sustainable development measures as they are value generating measures.

8.10 My department actively support being a network partner for the effective delivery of value to communities.

8.10 How?

8.11 An integrated system’s network model for generating public value requires training for senior managers.

8.11 Why?

8.12 My department allocate time for discussions with stakeholders on integration approaches to operations.

8.12 How?

8.13 My department allocate time for discussions with other departments on value generation within the service delivery function.

8.14 The municipality is a stakeholder with other stakeholders engaged in developmental agenda.

---

**Please attempt to answer this question:**

8.15 An integrated public service system calls for a non-hierarchical system for the delivery of public value. Would your department operate in a non-hierarchical system of governance?

---

**The following characteristics describe future dynamic and interconnected municipalities:**

8.16 Rank the characteristics listed; 1 is HIGHLY Desirable, 2 is DESIRABLE and 3 is LEAST desirable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformation characteristics concerning the public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A participatory system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and information sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A responsive municipality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A municipality that empowers community.
The public enjoy interactive e-government platforms.

8.17. Rank the characteristics listed; 1 is **HIGHLY** desirable, 2 is **DESIRABLE** and 3 is **LEAST** desirable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformation characteristics concerning an integrated system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative governance with stakeholders (partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint stakeholder – citizen - municipal control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergence of new knowledge from stakeholder teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating stakeholder teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming approach to innovation and creativity arising from the community and public groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Making a shift from hierarchical governance to flexible collaborative governance; rate the elements presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Disregard is shown for co-management, i.e. working together with stakeholders to achieve common goal targets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 In collaborative governance one cannot locate an accountable person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 Integrated municipal functions requires open support from senior managers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 Dialogue between municipality, community and stakeholders is problematic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5 Collective approaches to programme and project implementation remains the decision of senior management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6 Building good relationships with politicians demands appealing to their particular interest in community issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7 Network teams can achieve efficiencies (in service delivery) sooner and cheaper than departmental managers can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7 Why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8 Network (stakeholder) teams can potentially replace departmental management teams.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.8 How?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9.9 Collaborative governance has not been instituted as a municipal function.

9.9 Why?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9.10 Teamwork leads to the attainment of total (unqualified) transparency.

9.10 Why?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9.11 Teamwork hampers the attainment of total (unqualified) accountability.

9.11 Why?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9.12 The current governance system is internally focused.

9.12 How?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9.13 The current governance system does not lead to public value generation, i.e. service delivery.

9.14 Working within a network of organisations implies that the municipality’s work is complicated.

9.14 Why?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9.15 Public value generation by network teams is more effective than when generated by individual departments.

9.15 Why?
……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9.16 Please express your opinion on the implementation of a non-hierarchical, self-managing, integrated, stakeholder-driven municipal environment?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Training needs for networked governance:

9.17 Please rank, giving 1 for HIGHLY needed, 2 for NEEDED and 3 of LEAST needed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal capabilities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehending local government knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to be responsive and responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation skills training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-managing networks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension of networked governance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.18 Please rank, giving 1 for HIGHLY needed, 2 for NEEDED and 3 of LEAST needed:
### Internal capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to attain consensus in networks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to manage feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to build trust between stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing data, information and knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to share and cost resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension of social wellbeing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension of quality standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public engagement skills (relationship building).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to use feedback effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining public value outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External capabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to sustain community development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to build strong networks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning interpersonal skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop on responsibility and responsiveness of municipal departments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to deal with network problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.19 Please rank, giving 1 for HIGHLY needed, 2 for NEEDED and 3 of LEAST needed:

9.20 Please rank, giving 1 for HIGHLY needed, 2 for NEEDED and 3 of LEAST needed:

PLEASE USE THIS SPACE FOR ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU MAY WISH TO MAKE.

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Source: The author
ANNEXURE B
Statistical information
Department of Statistics and Accounting, Stellenbosch University.

1. Respondent work related data

1.1 Position of respondent.

1.2 Years of experience in the position.

1.3 The current tasks of managers in community development and housing.

1.4 Tasks directly related to integration.
1.5 Collaboration generates internal integration (between departments).

1.6 Capacity-Building Initiatives required in community development and housing departments

1.6.1 Negotiation skills training

1.6.2 Consensus building between department and community

1.6.3 Capacity-building required for public participation
1.6.4 Capacity-building required for co-management with other departments

1.6.5 Capacity-building required for monitoring programmes and projects for quality.

1.6.6 Capacity-building required for relationship building with stakeholders.

1.6.7 Capacity-building required in collaborative governance.
1.6.8 Capacity-building required in the evaluation of programmes and projects for sustainability.

1.7.1 Political factors which impact negatively on service delivery in respect of political request to remove or replace an organisational objective.

1.7.2 Political factors which impact negatively on service delivery in respect of an increase in uncertainty owing to empty promises made by politicians.

1.7.3 Political factors which impact negatively on service delivery in respect of political action which prevents a programme, project or budget initiative.
1.7.4 Political factors which impact negatively on service delivery in respect of politicians’ non-attendance at community meetings / workshops.

1.7.5 Political factors which impact negatively on service delivery in respect of placing political pressure on staff to perform a certain.

1.7.6 Political factors which impact negatively on service delivery in respect of political meddling in strategic decisions to accommodate a personal agenda.

1.7.7 Political factors which impact negatively on service delivery in respect of political refusal to collaborate with stakeholders and or community.
8 Political factors which impact negatively on service delivery in respect of political decisions which are in conflict with community decisions / agenda.

1.8 Ranking familiarity with local government legislation.

1.8.1 The Municipal Systems Act, No. 32 of 2000

1.8.2 The Public Finance Management Act, No. 1 of 1999

1.8.4 The Public Administration Management Act. No.11 of 2014.

1.8.5 The Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 13 of 2005.

1.8.6 The municipal finance management act, no.56 of 2003

1.8.7 The municipal structures act, no.117 of 1998

2. Examining management’s approach towards collaboration and integration wrt public value generation in communities.

2.1 Dialogue with external stakeholders require renewed focus

2.2 Dialogue with external stakeholders clash with municipal objectives.

2.3 Dialogue with external stakeholders has become stronger with integration practices.
2.4 Dialogue between Institutions of State, the municipality and external stakeholders is weakened by suspicion.

2.5 Communication infrastructure is not made available to external stakeholders.

2.6 Feedback to external stakeholders require no additional resources.

2.7 The value of feedback to external stakeholders has not been appreciated by municipal departments.
2.8 Managers prefer not to operate in networks with external stakeholders.

![Bar chart showing preferences of managers regarding operating in networks with external stakeholders.](image)

2.9 The effective evaluation of programmes and projects is of concern to external stakeholders.

![Bar chart showing preferences of external stakeholders regarding the evaluation of programmes and projects.](image)

2.10 The evaluation of programmes and projects take external stakeholders' views into account.

![Bar chart showing preferences of external stakeholders regarding the evaluation of programmes and projects.](image)

2.11 Communities favour integrated programmes and projects as it combines their interests with that of the municipality.

![Bar chart showing preferences of communities regarding integrated programmes and projects.](image)
2.12 The lack of common objectives with external stakeholders is problematic for municipal departments.

2.13 Collaborative governance is purely theoretical at this point in time.

2.14 Collaborative governance is not valid without public participation / engagement.

2.15 Stakeholders have the right to access to municipal data and information.
2.16 Integration with community groups and stakeholders on programmes and projects is weak.

2.17 The municipality provides resources for public value generation.

2.18 Relaxing controls to encourage self-management among staff.

2.19 Improve communication and consultation with stakeholders.
2.20 Emphasise monitoring of quality service delivery provided by the municipality.

2.21 Involve beneficiaries in budget planning.

2.22 Send staff for training to obtain certification in sustainable development.

2.23 Discuss the introduction of civic education with stakeholders.
2.24 Conduct public workshops on housing shortages / social issues arising.

![Bar chart for 2.24 Pub w/shops re shortages]

2.25 Adoption of common goals between municipality and stakeholders.

![Bar chart for 2.25 common goals for mun & Sths]

2.26 Introduce performance charts to staff and stakeholders

![Bar chart for 2.26 Serv del perf charts]

2.27 Formulate sustainability criteria for community adoption.

![Bar chart for 2.27 Formulate S criteria]
2.28 Formulate measures for relationship building between departments and stakeholders.

![Bar chart for 2.28](image)

2.29 Adopt methods for feedback to stakeholders, including the community

![Bar chart for 2.29](image)

2.30 Encourage departments to achieve integration targets.

![Bar chart for 2.30](image)

2.31 Send staff for training for collaborative governance certification.

![Bar chart for 2.31](image)
2.32 Invite all stakeholders to strategic planning meetings

2.33 Invite capacity-building for staff on municipal legislation

2.34 Promote enabling environment in community through information sharing.

2.35 Motivate staff to engage with community on matters of concern.
2.36 Implement ISO 9001:2015 quality standards (measures)

2.37 Support e-government access to information and municipal data.

3.1.1 Build networks with stakeholders.

3.1.2 Adopt integrated strategies with stakeholders.
3.1.3 Create value in communities through service delivery.

3.1.4 Work with stakeholders within the legal framework

3.1.5 Work with stakeholders within collaborative governance framework

3.2.1 Use digital technology for internal and external communication.
3.2.2 Empower stakeholders to engage with the municipality.

3.2.3 Think holistically about programmes and projects design.

3.2.4 Manage complexity through simplifying tasks.

3.2.5 Manage networks composed of internal state bodies and stakeholders.
3.3.1 Practice collaborative governance in stakeholder networks.

3.3.2 Effective and efficient use of resources by measuring performance.

3.3.3 Reach consensus through negotiation with stakeholders.

3.3.4 Maintain community focus on common set of objectives.
3.3.5 Listen to community voice through participatory methods.

4.1 Municipality adoption of shared vision with communities.

4.2 Merge community objectives with departmental objectives.

4.3 Managers do not have clarity on collaboration iro public value generation.
4.4 Municipality, community and stakeholders should collaborate regarding community safety and security.

4.5 Trust between stakeholders is a basic public value.

4.6 Common goals (vision) should guide public participation.

4.7 Department should launch framework for open dialogue with stakeholders.
4.8 Local government legislation links service delivery to social wellbeing.

![Bar Chart](image1)

4.9 Departments’ support for accountability and transparency with stakeholders through management planning / business planning.

![Bar Chart](image2)

4.10 Municipality, stakeholders and community programmes and projects are challenged by limited financial resources.

![Bar Chart](image3)

4.11 Department lack capacity implementing, monitoring and evaluating sustainability measures.

![Bar Chart](image4)
4.12 Community satisfaction survey results are open for public scrutiny.


4.14 Staff can be innovation in the generation of public value.

4.15 The departmental business plan has integrated stakeholder objectives.
4.16.1 Ensure efficient and effective service delivery to communities.

4.16.2 Appropriateness of community safety and security surveys.

4.16.3 Appropriateness of negotiation with stakeholders.

4.16.4 Appropriateness of public participation workshops.
4.16.5 Department staff to discuss and hold focus group sessions with communities and individual actors to gauge their expectations.

4.17.1 Appropriateness of e-governance instruments for feedback and easy communication.

4.17.2 Appropriateness for coaching and mentoring on public engagement.

4.17.3 Reaching consensus with stakeholders on sustainability criteria.
4.17.4 Open access to municipal information for stakeholders.

4.17.5 Appropriateness of shared values and vision with stakeholders.

5. Exploring readiness to engage stakeholders.

5.1 Build trust with stakeholders.

5.2 Share data and information with stakeholders.
5.3 Implement participatory methods for budgeting with stakeholders.

5.4 Implement feedback methods to stakeholders.

5.5 Adaptation from internal focus to dynamic – participatory (external focus) iro working with stakeholders.

5.6 Invite stakeholders to discuss concerns and issues.
5.7 Build enabling environment for stakeholders.

5.8 Co-management of programmes and projects with stakeholders.

5.9 Implement common objectives with stakeholders.

5.10 Measure value invested in the community through service delivery.
5.11 Implement e-government platforms for m-participation.

5.12 Measure community satisfaction with contributions from stakeholders.

5.13 Operationalise community building programmes for stakeholders.

5.14 Build staff capability to deal with participatory methods / tools.
5.15 Build staff technical capability to manage in stakeholder networks.

5.16 Implement ongoing / continuous dialogue with communities.

5.17 Anticipate service delivery failure.


6.1.1 Share knowledge and information
6.1.2 Co-manage sustainability performance.

6.1.3 Sustain trust in relationships.

6.1.4 Sustain dialogue with all actors on programmes and projects.

6.1.5 Involve and include political groups in discursive democratic space.
6.2.1 Participatory planning and budgeting is a participatory criterion.

6.2.2 Effect common objectives by consensus is a participatory criterion.

6.2.3 Align outcomes to expectations for effective participation.

6.2.4 Alignment of outcomes to objectives is a participatory criterion.
6.2.5 Build internal and external capacity is a participatory criterion.

6.3.1 Benefits and quality management is a participatory criterion.

6.3.2 Managing efficiency on programmes and projects is a participatory criterion.

6.3.3 Effective resources allocation is a participatory criterion.
6.3.4 Managing sustainability outputs and outcomes is a participatory criterion.

6.3.5 Promoting innovation is a participatory criterion.

6.4.1 Implementing community satisfaction surveys is a participatory criterion.

6.4.2 Evaluating equity is a participatory criterion.
6.4.3 E-government and m-participation feedback is a participatory criterion.

6.4.4 Evaluating effectiveness is a participatory criterion.

6.4.5 Monitoring the adopted sustainability measures is a participatory criterion.

6.5.1 Reporting small changes observed in process, is a participatory criterion.
6.5.2 Report on adaptation in the community is a participatory criterion.

6.5.3 Reporting on the effectiveness of the value creation process is a participatory criterion.

6.5.4 Reporting on the equity (fairness) in value created is a participatory criterion.

6.5.5 Reporting on stability achieved in the community is a participatory criterion.
Performance management functions related to efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery, i.e. the delivery of public value to communities.

7.1 Shared understanding with stakeholders on the evaluation of social wellbeing.

7.2 Community satisfaction surveys are aligned to quality of life objectives.

7.3 Visual performance tools are used at community meetings.

7.4 Departmental performance evaluation teams are operating.
7.5 Evaluation of current programmes and projects are done periodically.

7.6 Municipal departments receive feedback from stakeholders on current programmes or projects.

7.7 Evaluation of programmes and projects identifies the public value created.

7.8 Evaluation of projects and programmes involves the review of strategy iro stakeholder participation.
7.9 Evaluation stimulates learning within programme and project teams.

7.10 Efficiency levels regarding the use of resources has a direct impact on the achievement of higher standards of living in communities.

7.11 Evaluation and measurement of public value generated is dependent on how thoroughly the community participated in the evaluation.

7.12 Public value measures for community wellbeing, was adopted by municipal department.
7.13 Department utilises the iso 9001:2015 for measuring quality in services delivered.

7.14 Sustainability measures are in place to preserve community assets.

7.15 Evaluation and measurement of outputs are linked to a common set of objectives.

7.16 Successful performance regarding services delivered are linked to high morale revealed in the community, implying public value was generated.
8. In consideration of implementing an ipss in the future, the following criteria were rated:

8.1 an integrated system is not better than a hierarchical system.

8.2 Current departmental operability (operations) does not require change.

8.3 Flexible (dynamic) work modes are superior to static work modes.

8.4 Reluctance (by the municipality) to sign agreements with stakeholders.
8.5 Public value generation is about delivering incremental improvements in service delivery over time.

8.6 Public value generation is about generating community wellbeing

8.7 A fragmented municipal system is good for the need for order.

8.8 Departmental elimination of waste, duplication and fruitless spending through integration with other departments is actually done.
8.9 Departmental support for sustainable development measures as public value generating measures.

8.10 Departmental support for working within a network of stakeholders as an active partner for the generation of public value to communities.

8.11 The concept that an ipss can generate public value must be put to senior managers in a training course.

8.12 Department allocates time for discussion with stakeholders on approaches to integrated operations.
8.13 Department allocates time for stimulating internal integration on public value generation through service delivery.

8.14 The municipality is a stakeholder, in a network with other stakeholders, engaged in a developmental agenda.

A description of future, dynamic, interconnected municipalities.

8.16.1 Participatory systems.

8.16.2 Knowledge and information sharing.
8.16.3 A responsive municipality.

8.16.4 Municipality empowers community.

8.16.5 Public enjoy interactive e-government platforms.

8.17.1 The collaborative governance of stakeholders (within stakeholder network teams).
8.17.2 Joint stakeholder, citizen, municipal control.

8.17.3 Emergence of new knowledge from stakeholder teams operating in networks.

8.17.4 Operating stakeholder teams.

8.17.5 A welcoming approach to innovation and creativity arising from the community and public groups.
Making a shift from hierarchical governance to collaborative governance:

9.1 disregard is shown for co-management with (within) stakeholder teams.

9.2 In collaborative governance, one cannot identify an accountable person.

9.3 Integrated municipal functions require open support from senior managers.

9.4 Dialogue between parties is problematic
9.5 Collective approaches to programme and project implementation remains in the decision making realm of senior managers.

9.6 Building good relationships with politicians demands appealing to their particular community interests.

9.7 Network teams can achieve efficiencies in service delivery sooner and cheaper than departmental managers can.

9.8 Network / stakeholder teams can potentially replace departmental management teams.
9.9 Collaborative governance has not been instituted as a municipal function.

9.10 Teamwork leads to the attainment of total (unqualified) transparency.

9.11 Teamwork hampers the attainment of total (unqualified) accountability.

9.12 The current governance system is internally focused.
9.13 The current governance system does not lead to public value generation.

9.14 working inside network teams / organisations implies that the municipalities work is complicated.

9.15 Public value generation in networks is more effective than when produced by individual departments.

Training needs for networked governance:
9.17.1 Comprehending local government knowledge.
9.17.2 Being responsive and responsible.

9.17.3 Acquiring negotiating skills.

9.17.4 Co-managing networks.

9.17.5 Comprehending networked governance.
9.18.1 Attain consensus in networks.

9.18.2 Managing feedback.

9.18.3 Build trust between stakeholders.

9.18.4 Sharing data, information and or knowledge.
9.18.5 Sharing and costing resources.

9.19.1 Comprehending social wellbeing.

9.19.2 Comprehending quality standards.

9.19.3 Public engagement skills (relationship building).
### 9.19.4 Using feedback effectively.

![Bar chart showing feedback effectiveness](chart1.png)

### 9.19.5 Sustaining public value outcomes.

![Bar chart showing public value outcomes](chart2.png)

### 9.20.1 Sustaining community development.

![Bar chart showing community development](chart3.png)

### 9.20.2 How to build strong networks.

![Bar chart showing network building](chart4.png)
9.20.3 Learning interpersonal skills.

9.20.4 Need for workshops on responsibility and responsiveness of municipal departments.

9.20.5 Dealing with network problems.

Source: Professor M Kidd. Department of Actuarial and Statistical Services. Stellenbosch University
ANNEXURE C
Information obtained from open-ended questions

Introduction
The opinions and views of senior managers in the community development and housing departments in Western Cape Province municipalities, as recorded from the open ended questions in the questionnaire. ‘How’ and ‘Why’ questions were placed at items throughout the questionnaire. The purpose was to extract more detail from the respondents. Not all respondents dealt with the open ended questions, while many respondents took the time to be thorough and their responses were very valuable. This is a summarised version of the respondents’ answers and some ‘data cleansing’ was done to facilitate the reading thereof. The researcher regarded the views expressed by the respondents as honest, credible and genuine. The item numbers have been retained for the purpose of reference to the item in the questionnaire.

The open ended responses

1.3 Additional service delivery tasks managers are engaged with:
Senior managers in the housing and community development departments are also engaged in the following tasks / functions:
- Sustainable development.
- Sourcing funding.
- Research on best practises and inclusion of same in above list.
- Capacity-building in collaboration with community networks to assist local organisations.
- Implementation of programmes and projects in partnership with other spheres of government.
- Manage municipal grant funding process to community organisations.
- Social relief for distress during disaster incidents.
- Operational tasks related to water, sewage, streets, sports fields and Thusong Centres.
- Procurement and contract management, budget implementation, staff performance evaluation.
- Performance reporting and monitoring.
- IDP policy compliance.
- Public participation.

1.4 Additional tasks directly related to the current work of senior managers i.e. integration:
- Attendance at IDP public participation meetings, i.e. being responsive.
- Active in the formalisation, strengthening and participation of community networks and structures representing vulnerable groups.
- Integration regarding social, economic, physical and psychological health, cultural areas of development.
- Consulting NGOs to train managers in public participation.

1.5 Collaboration generates internal integration:
The advantages of collaboration is understood by senior managers only in as far as it fits into the work ambit of managerial duty; however the advantages of collaboration are recognised internally, thus preserving internal departmental norms, policies or key performance areas.

1.7 Political factors, not stated, that impact negatively on service delivery:
- Politicians are new and take a while to understand municipal processes,
- They change focus/strategy – leaving all previous work undone, then start with new projects.
- Uncertainty / instability relating to strategic direction.
- Political interference is most prevalent in the housing space.
- Politicians influence the appointment of junior staff.
- Lack of decision making
- Shortcomings in exercise of their oversight role.
2.1 Dialogue with external stakeholders require a renewed focus:
- Dialogue with external stakeholders is non-existent.
- Dialogue takes place when budget Imbizo need approval.
- Purpose (objectives) and funding is required for good communication and regular interventions.
- To build leadership, accountability and support in communities.
- Should be guided by common objectives.
- A dedicated staff should manage stakeholders’ communication on e-platforms.
- Engaging stakeholders is a new approach in many departments.
- Social Development need to establish synergy and regular engagement with the community to establish and satisfy their needs.
- Rental stock requires meeting with external stakeholders regularly.
- Public dialogue is always manipulated by elites.
- Focus should shift away from compliance to effective and efficient service delivery.
- Quality dialogue is needed with communities to determine that service delivery is aligned with community demands.
- Silo approach still exist yet some claim an ‘open door’ policy.
- Customer centricity is a new term; suggest a team of stakeholders and sharing of information and knowledge with community organisations.
- Municipalities do not have enough engagement with communities to understand their thinking in terms of service delivery demands and needs.
- Many issues relating to strategic planning drawback is that municipal departments do not attend meetings, hence integration suffers.

2.2 When disputes arise with external stakeholders over common objectives:
- When there is little openness and transparency.
- When objectives are not on par with community objectives.
- Officials are encouraged to engage and consult with the local community.
- When common objectives are not aligned (to programmes and projects).
- Community objectives are entrusted solely to ward councillors, when the municipality do not assume direct responsibility for common objectives.
- When collaboration with external stakeholders helps to obtain resources for implementing projects - dialogue will strengthen working relations (assume the opposite to be true).
- When there are interruptions during housing delivery.
- When external stakeholders are not key to the formation and prioritisation of municipality strategic objectives: Public participation is imperative to set strategic objectives.
- When officials do not feel comfortable to express an opinion regarding the directorate / department – difficult to find common ground.
- When objectives are community oriented but not necessarily a product of community input seemingly not an issue of disagreement, it is however the means to achieve ends that are at variation.
- The municipality has a mandate to focus on certain issues only which leave other issues outside its scope of work i.e. no mandate can handle all issues.
- Municipal strategies are informed by the needs of the communities but strategic plans will prevail specifically when it comes to prioritization of basic services to the citizens.

2.5 Communication infrastructure is not made available to external stakeholders. How can this be improved? i.e. How can electronic communication be improved?
- Through communication (direct) or communication by ‘apps’ and social networks. Improve communication with M-participation and regular dialogue proposed to sort out differences.
- Communication infrastructure to communities and partners is required to improve intergovernmental relations on a regular basis.
- Improved communication processes are needed as well as interactive sessions.
• Through forging a genuine participative partnership with community structures and schedule regular engagement opportunities to improve communication.
• The municipality can source funding for the implementation of projects, wi-fi, access and a call centre in order to engage more with stakeholders. Free access to internet and toll free numbers should work.
• Broad band and other methods. Collective goals are superior to silo goals. More effective stakeholder tools and more regular interaction with stakeholders. All parties including stakeholders and IOS must start applying integration in planning and evaluation.

2.6 Feedback to external stakeholders require no additional resources. WHY?
• Communication resources are required. IDP and the ward councillors are resources. These methods of feedback is not enough.
• Poor feedback leads to misinformation and communities believing that municipalities are doing nothing.
• Budgetary limitations exist.
• Can utilise already available platforms, i.e. e mails makes it easier and effective feedback adapted to requirements.
• Communication via technology has obstacles. There are also travel and overtime costs of staff.
• A need exist for more resources to improve communication. Need for updating communication system with external stakeholders. There must be budgets for it.
• Expand feedback platforms to radio interviews, optimum use of the municipality website and Facebook page. Sometimes there are additional requirements.
• Municipality practice open door policy (helps with easing communication).
• Continuous change implies changes in resources requirement. A budget is needed for stakeholder engagement // structure and procedures are in place to facilitate feedback with parties i.e. all possible stakeholders even the media. Have municipal portals ‘apps’.

2.12 Lack of common objectives with stakeholders is a problem. WHY?
• There is no stakeholder management programme.
• Communities require immediate response to problems / concerns raised. Municipalities are required to plan ahead …only sometimes plan it into future budgets.
• Integrated service delivery is not sufficiently dealt with.
• Staff understood the objectives.
• Integration of objectives are needed (alignment) / The public participation model needs to be improved.
• Objectives formulated and communicated with committees (IDP).
• Common objectives are critical in determination of success of programmes and projects. IDP informs better alignment of objectives.
• Stakeholder and municipalities should align objectives via PP and IDP and service delivery SDBIP as prescribed by the Municipal Systems Act.
• Policies are strictly applied //no lack of common objectives
• Not always clear of 5W’s. This is not the problem… the implementation is the problem. Needs of all stakeholders need to be addressed? Reporting on performance becomes irrelevant since it is not taken seriously.
• All the communities are unique. Common objectives are not all aligned with the common objectives of the municipality. Community consultation is ongoing.
• Public participation requires strengthening and actively implemented.

2.16 Integration with community and public groups on programmes and projects is weak. WHY?
• Skills and lack of willingness to walk / go the extra mile.
• Community or publics may drive own agendas creating uncertainty regarding who they actually represent.
• Secrecy in allocating rental stock is a sign of fragmentation.
• IDP and other programmes shows that great strides have been made over the years.
• Working with and engaging communities is seen as a burden by municipal officials. There is no integrated year planner.
- Yes at all times public participation and integration is necessary. Public participation and consultation is practiced as a mere compliance exercise and not a principled position.
- IDP and strategic objectives help in this regard. Objectives should be 'common'.
- Consultation must include all stakeholders, including informal settlements business groups etc. Communities must be kept informed.
- Community education is needed to facilitate sustainable programmes and projects with improved public participation and involvement of the youth / Police / and other organisations.
- A Small municipality can achieve consensus easily and also maintain it.
- Integration is not that weak, but gaps exist. Capacity is needed as well as resources and time to meet with stakeholders (Here the problem is understanding network approaches as institutionalised (institutional framework). Factions within communities mean that some sections of the community remain excluded for reasons to be discovered.
- Much room for improvement since committees do not attend public meetings that engage community projects.
- IDP is aligned to community needs and demands. [This implies a good starting point].

2.17 The municipality provides resources for public value generation. HOW?
- There are processes in place / PP budget at Community Development department.
- Public meetings initiate inputs on service delivery and implemented Charter (??).
- Municipality does not deal or promote PV.
- The municipality holds annual customer satisfaction surveys. Cannot be equated with real outcomes only for compliance purposes.
- Municipality provide basic service delivery / sport and rec and other facilities to the community. No firm programme.
- More resources are required for convenient systems to enable the public to register complaints rates services and receive feedback.
- Time and space needed for consumer education (actually civic education) prior to the handover of houses.
- Thusong centres is an info point; E–centres, library assistance, ward committees.
- IDP is focused on value for the communities. Projects of value to communities can be metricised in order to calculate resources needed.
- Resources become available with collaboration. That does community projects with communities. Ward committees, NGO’s, public meetings.

3.1 In respect of actual involvement with aspects of integration, motivate your choice for HIGHLY important:
- We cannot activate projects and programmes on the ground without the support and buy in of the stakeholders and communities. Their buy-in is reflected in the IDP
- Municipality cannot accommodate individual agendas – need to ensure that it engage on a platform that represents the broader community. Thus works with a disability network rather than with individual organisations.
- Mostly done by legislation, internally.
- Networks within communities increase my directorate understanding of community objectives. Need to align services, to avoid duplication and to improve services.
- Working collaboratively amplifies budgets, builds capacity adds to the value chain and improves service delivery
- Collaborative governance is a constitutional mandate and as well as keeping the community educated, informed. Service delivery must be effected efficient and effectively.
- Approval of networks to widen sources of funding via integration strategies, alignment and avoidance of duplication in one environment where funding is a challenge.
- Build networks with stakeholders will facilitate tasks.
- To get information and to earn trust
• Integrated strategies with stakeholders will work. The core function as a municipality is effective and efficient service delivery. It is essential that municipalities get maximum input from all stakeholders. Community development require multiple areas of development; integrated strategies may ensure that all role players know exactly how they contribute and what they need to as part of specific development areas. Regard community involvement highly as well as quality service delivery. Creating value through a sustainable service is key to driving development in a community as LG cannot do all on its own.
• Public participation relating to community development ensure that all stakeholders are present. Seems like this is a wishful thought in order to see success, must co-operate with other stakeholders since relationship building is important for community-municipality relations.

3.2 (See 3.1)
• The ideal is to manage within these criteria
• Encouraged by ITC department to go digital to give effect to developmental Local Government.
• E-government and M-participation is viable and Links with stakeholder engagement.
• Networks are critical for improving communication in order to facilitate genuine participation and engagement and to facilitate genuine PP and engagement.
• Civic education in all communities are important re complex processes of planning to improve transparency and effective communication.
• Trust building between stakeholders and participation are linked
• Empower stakeholders to engage with the community; buy-in and work with stakeholders is essential for success. This will ensure that the needs of the stakeholders are understood and that development is geared to the correct needs as stated by them.
• It seems like community can communicate with the municipality via a facebook page and what's-up group.

3.3. (See 3.1)
• The ideal to manage within these criteria, collaborative governance, networks, consensus and common goals, community focus and through listening to community demands and needs. There is a legal stipulation for this.
• Community meetings and IDP budget process assumes importance.
• Resources can be effectively managed.
• Community focus is the backbone of service delivery outputs and a critical factor in determining common objectives.
• KPI’s are smart- formulated to facilitate effective and efficient use of resources…
• Participatory governance is very good in housing as this assists to smooth blockages in projects and communities.
• Ensure that SDBIP is drafted and implemented effectively with assigned budget; communication is key.
• PP need strengthening and common objective and to align projects and programmes.
• M-service delivery would be better if complexity is understood hence community involvement is critical.
• PPP’s will be perfect for this; community first need to be educated i.e. need for civic education to ensure resources are correctly placed, allocated, measure performance impact studies.
• There is value for money cycle and ROI cycle?

3.4 Should integration (working with government bodies and stakeholders on equal level) become a core function in your department?
• All the municipalities responding to this question answered YES.
• It is a fundamental component of efficient service delivery.
• It is the core function of my department.
• Already have community and organisation contact e.g. sport bodies / social development / Thusong and Sport.
• Housing is about improving the lives of people and they need to be part of decisions taken.
• For sake of consistent developmental agenda and processes to ensure success.
• Yes to make communities aware of service delivery challenges to resolve issues.
• Synchronisation prevents duplication regarding service delivery etc., especially where it concerns the wellbeing of communities.
4.1 My department has adopted a shared vision with the community. WHY?
- To improve capacity and motivation.
- To have multi-stakeholder engagement.
- Develop strategy with communities.
- LG must take responsibility for the needs of the community.
- Municipality has a shared vision; some said a municipal vision, not a shared vision.
- PP is weak and are manipulated by politicians.
- Consultation with real community structures take place to facilitate transparency and building shared programmes with shared objectives.
- To empower communities through education.
- An approved integrated development plan with shared vision and to keep community informed.
- Create sound relationships and openness departments.
- Political objectives probably not aligned to community needs.
- Leading to ownership by community and lead to sustainability, networks and resources sharing.
- Communities are generally well informed.
- Community should be involved in decision making.

4.5 Trust between various stakeholders is a basic public value. WHY?
- It’s vital that there is mutual ‘fait accompli’ to ensure progress.
- Trust is a precursor to working with someone
- Trust is earned.
- The municipality is doing well in that regard.
- Stakeholders do not trust each other related to resources and access to opportunity.
- Trust that stakeholder teams has the interests of the community at heart [note elements of mistrust].
- Trust is key to collaboration.
- Stakeholders need to trust municipality to deliver on objectives and to reduce problems.
- Trust is everything for constructive engagement.
- No trust? No participation. There is a general perception that government do not work for the people.

4.10 The municipality, community and stakeholders are challenged by limited financial resources. WHY?
- Migration phenomenon / aging infrastructure – no investment.
- Budget process allows you to plan for immediate and future need / core focus is always on basic services i.e. economic status and unemployment is high and returns are low.
- Service delivery needs exceed financial resources.
- The budget of the municipality cannot meet the needs of the people.
- Low capacity municipalities are dependent on national (government) grants.
- No having adequate funding is a constraint.

4.11 My department lacks capacity to implement, monitor and evaluate sustainability measures. WHY?
- There is enough capacity for doing own initiatives.
- Lack of understanding the value of community engagement.
- Stable project management system and clean audits.
- Lack of resources.
- Do not understand sustainability. No common view about it and staff shortage and lack of equipment.
- Sustainability approaches are at the centre of municipal strategies.
- Sustainability is a fairly new topic and still needs to be workshoped.
- Challenges due to filling of vacancies for critical.
- Department has a capacity (lack of) problem. Budget limitations to appoint new staff.
Insufficient resources and lack of will by management [note in a hierarchy there is only performance of outputs but little measurement of outcomes / attitude, drive and flexibility for innovation] // resources and capability constraints.

Do not have the time nor the expertise to analyse information and community matters.

4.14 My staff are innovative with regard to value creation for the community. HOW?
- Lacking in skills, capacity and motivation.
- Could improve and enhance the limited capacity.
- Networking with private and academic institutions and brainstorming / problem and solution finding
- Value creation must be on a social agenda within a broader set of discussions. We need to move from awareness to implementation.
- By holding regular public meetings; to involve the community in programmes and projects such as housing education.
- Fund raising for the municipality…..as well as coordination of efforts through departments, as well as housing consumer training.
- Staff need to grow and mature doing after hour workshops for no pay???
- By embarking on practical ways to improve the community [however these are not regeneration programmes that is being referred to but rather small scale improvements to improve the happiness of children]. Play parks also have to be maintained and socialisation of parents need to be stimulated in depressed communities.

4.15 My departmental business plan has integrated stakeholders’ objectives. WHY?
- Lack in skills, capacity and motivation does not allow for this.
- IDP implementation guides our KPI’s.
- Planning with stakeholders have been initiated.
- Service delivery no Business Plan and an integrated approach is needed
- Need to follow legislative guidelines.
- We consult broadly and with most stakeholders. Department Business Plans concerns the delivery of KPIs.
- When developing the human settlement plan there are vigorous campaigns to involve various stakeholders. They involve the community to ensure that resources are shared and a bigger impact can be obtained.
- Public participation is upheld.
- BP contains stakeholder inputs.
- “Needs are based on IDP objectives”.

5.1 To build trust with stakeholders. WHY?
- For restructuring: from service delivery to developmental municipality.
- Policies workshoped with stakeholder and clear on roles and responsibilities to ensure sustainability.
- Initiated objects and programmes to involve external stakeholders and community are clients the reason for the existence of the municipality and to improve operations.
- Trust has been corroded re political instability and promises that have preceded the actual matter at hand; have managed to grow a culture of service among staff; assists with development of trust with communities and stakeholders and municipality.
- To ensure that implementation of projects and improvement of lives happen with no disruption; trust ensures ownership of community programmes and projects.
- Trust to keep information flowing.
- Without stakeholders the department cannot deliver on the program.
- Politicians and permanent staff to deal with this challenge // trust is important.
- Municipal structure not suited for this yet; engage on a regular level with communities.

5.2 Share other information and data with stakeholders. WHY?
- Lack in skills, capacity and motivation to acquire new website and social media tools
- planning together to address challenges
- Data available on GIS.
To build trust and open / accountable / transparent governance.
Information is of most importance to stakeholders, municipalities have the interest and means to do it.
For transparency and fairness as there are always complaints of corruption in housing allocations. Transparency is important for communities to be happy, as it eliminates suspicion and builds trust.
Communication systems require improvement. Communicate via social media.
Community and stakeholder engagement is important for effectiveness / no waste / and for being on target.
The open approach is the best. Structure not suited for this yet … still embedding new structures and frameworks within department first. Yes C3 notifications, the internet and call centres are used.
Provide feedback re programmes and projects progress … transparency required.

5.3 To implement participatory methods for budgeting with stakeholders. WHY?
- Municipalities lacking in skills, capacity and motivation.
- Public participation not controlled by staff, therefore no flexibility and spontaneity for staff to engage community.
- To improve knowledge to compile credible budgets
- No listening to the community voice.
- Interdepartmental planning does not encourage such interaction. Relevant and appropriate processes and systems need to be created.
- So that communities can understand the prioritisation of projects and budget limitations when projects are not implemented.
- The budget must speak to the needs of the community.
- In alignment with the Municipal Systems Act, IDP and SDBIP.
- To coordinate, cooperate and collaborate.
- This is the only way to improve the IDP. People matter and their decisions are important. Has been done in line with legislation.

5.8 To co-manage projects and programmes with stakeholders. HOW?
- To build skills, capacity and motivation.
- Municipality currently works with stakeholders via our development task team.
- Have clearly developed project plans.
- Look into governance and relevant legislation see what it says.
- Develop and implement projects and programmes together, as well as to plan together, example, urban gardens and stakeholder consultations.
- Increase understanding of co-management / partnership and stakeholder engagement models.
- To allow stakeholders to participate in all aspects of planning and decision making processes. It is already happening in sport, law enforcement, parks, recreation, and traffic services.
- Training of community and to organise them need to through collaboration with NGO’s et al. To ensure that projects are implemented in a collaborative way. Municipality does hold project ready meetings and progress information meetings.
- Public participation is effective and ward committees are active.
- Stakeholders need to understand their roles and responsibilities and be involved in information sharing in order to make resources available.
- Support teamwork, capacity-building and transfer of responsibility, This is work-in- progress at the moment. Joint planning and community participation in safety plans, needs assessments etc. takes place … ward committees do this already by having meetings with stakeholders every three months.

5.9 To implement common objectives (joint strategy) with stakeholders. HOW?
- Lack in skills, capacity and motivation in implementing common objectives.
- Sharing information and finding finance for joint solutions.
- Have clearly developed project plans.
- By identifying community projects with community members.
Discuss and align plans to strategies with stakeholders and continuous work with ward councillors and ward committees and common vision leads to agreement.

To discuss budgets, regulations risks and expected outcomes. Already being implemented through various community development departments.

Developing housing master plans so to understand the needs of the community are taken into account. Attain consensus at joint meetings?

Signed service level agreements.

Municipality need to listen to stakeholders then deliberate and plan strategy for the future.

Make budget available to venues and infrastructure.

Engage with them in a proper manner [which is discursive democratic manner].

5.10 To measure value invested in the community through service delivery. HOW?

- Build skills, capacity and motivation.
- No systematic measurement tools or system in place.
- Use people and research teams.
- Use Feedback sessions and surveys.
- Communities have no understanding regarding this matter.
- M and E must measure value created … use surveys, focus groups and consultations.
- Very important an assessment need to understand the needs of the communities and how the housing types and styles impact on the community.
- Definite targets, realistic KPI’s and project M and E as a common practice.
- Trust building, getting views out on the table, this must happen prior to measurement and deciding on measures.
- Include community in strategy formulation.
- Measure outcomes; surveys are used currently and SAP (software).
- Hold feedback sessions. Already done?

5.11 To implement e-government platforms for public M-participation. HOW?

- Build skills, capacity and motivation.
- No being done accept website and facebook
- Function is not in my control.
- SMS / website / e-mail / electronic survey and implementation with Provincial Government of integrated systems.
- Use new apps to engage communities and use e-mails.
- Very little access to e – communication.
- Use all ITC available for communication. Through internet and social media platforms.
- Make M-participation a reality.
- Given the availability of the technology and possibility of implementation, feedback should be reliable and comprehensive and descent.
- Yes via the IDP
- Already rolling it out - social media platforms.

5.12 To measure community satisfaction with contributions from stakeholders. HOW?

- Accredited training for staff and community members.
- State when meeting and PP / feedback / surveys are conducted and research teams.
- Stimulate and build interest in community satisfaction surveys.
- Community surveys done annually and IDP allows for surveys and focus group discussions.
- Conduct social happiness survey with quality of service received.
- Feedback and follow up on work that is to be done for communities.
- Yes on a yearly basis. Municipality is doing it, but integrated reports are hard to find on the internet … kept tight within the administration … fear of scrutiny while reports do exist.
5.13 To operationalise community building programmes for stakeholders. WHY?
- Accredited training [civic education] for community as way of motivation to participate.
- To increase and capacitate stakeholders.
- Have youth centres and or café’s as examples.
- Community is divided in Drakenstein and participation is dependent on matters affecting affected communities.
- Regular engagements and allow for stakeholders to give recommendation.
- Municipality not ready.

5.16 Implement continuous dialogue with community. HOW?
- Through accredited training for skills development and understanding.
- Committee meetings are held in the larger towns irregularly.
- Use existing networks.
- YES: Have periodic engagement with stakeholders and use Facebook, newsletters, ward committees, workshops. Social support networks and service delivery issues also ward committee should be involved.
- Use digital and face to face platforms and opportunities.
- Regular meetings with pamphlets distributed by the stakeholders.
- Conduct housing education programme.
- Would like to do this with the backing of stakeholders, M and E and being objectives driven and critical path driven [note here that the non-tangible PV’s are not a priority].
- Monthly meetings and media … for feedback.

5.17 Anticipate service delivery failure. HOW?
- By engaging accredited training for staff.
- Budget contingency required and infrastructure contingency required.
- By forward planning, and community trust is built to inform the municipality of issues early.
- Have contingency plans.
- High arrogance to accept failure does not help.
- System allows for expression by community but service delivery failure is often manipulated by politics or personal interest groupings.
- Feedback through community based orgs, NGOs, ward councillors and ward committees is needed.
- Continuous monitoring and evaluation of progress on projects needed.
- Institute M and E. Monitor closely.
- Use the critical path risk management.

7.1 My department share understanding with stakeholders on the evaluation of social wellbeing. HOW?
- Through public engagement.
- Through meetings and continuous engagement on projects and programmes contributing to the social wellbeing in the community and identifying community needs. Use surveys.
- No understanding of social wellbeing.
- Identify groups in the community who can exercise influence and community meetings as well KPA’s are drafted with set targets.
- Beneficiary circumstances are known to municipality, regarding the waiting lists. To be resolved.
- The development of evaluation standards is still outstanding.
- By knowing the needs of those the municipality must respond to.
- Hold regular community meetings.
- Reporting performance through public participation, community awareness and frequently discussed in meetings.

7.3 Visual performance tools are used at meetings with the community. WHY?
- To project visual successes of the programmes and better understanding.
Service delivery objectives must be communicated and to make sure that matters are understood.

- To improve communication.
- No tools are used.
- Good for feedback. Lack of presentation skills and inability to tailor “old’ methods.
- Yes at community meetings basic civic education is desperately needed, as people do not have the skill to understand (measures).
- Yes it is more effective as the community is left confused at times.

7.5 My department evaluate current programmes / projects outputs periodically. WHY?

To provide monthly reports and to be accountable regarding expenditure.

- Through feedback meetings to monitor performance against set objectives.
- M and E reporting not that regular.
- Evaluation not formalised but forms part of quarterly performance meetings.
- Council standing committee meetings and technical progress meetings are held monthly to measure effectiveness and SDBIP.
- Adhere to KPI on the SDBIP.
- Done in the IDP and SDBIP reporting, feedback and annual reports.

7.6 My department receives feedback from stakeholders on current programmes and projects. HOW?

- Ward committees, public meetings, portfolio committees, ward committees and community forums / reports , sms’s and e-mails.
- Linked to ECD, forum street people food and nutrition; hold public engagement meetings and scheduled IDP meetings.
- Complaints lodging at community meetings, debriefing meetings and close up reports.
- Through IDP or NCOP meetings; ward meetings and beneficiary meetings (Happy letters)
- As part of the M and E function which is done quarterly.
- There are project reports, meetings, forum meetings and walk in(s).

7.7 Evaluation of projects / programmes identifies public value generated. HOW?

- PV has not been introduced at municipalities.
- Use project feedback meetings and objectives as identified on the IDP.
- Yes through performance and project appraisal.
- Emphasise quality of the product and report to council monthly.
- Honesty and trust is contentious, therefore feedback from communities is needed.
- One need to look at the outcomes at community meetings.

7.9 Evaluation helps projects / programmes teams to learn from each other. HOW?

- Through diagnostic analysis and knowledge sharing.
- Projects and programmes provide information for strengths and weaknesses and gaps in the implementation process.
- Community must be part of critical meetings such as technical, regulatory meetings.
- Stakeholder inputs will contribute to lessons learnt on project close up report.
- Pilot projects (green agenda for example) / waste recycling / on site sanitation etc measures are in line with sustainability by holding common views.
- To know what is working or not working. Learn from the successes and implement as best practice.
  Information sharing lessons learnt helps to improve communication and better relationships.

7.10 Efficiency levels regarding the use of resources has a direct impact on achieving higher standards of living in communities. WHY?

- Through empowering communities to achieve more with less resources and improve on the efficiency levels and competencies, leads to enhanced services.
• Allows community to develop social cohesion and social capital because of improved service delivery standards.
• Promote oversight to sustain projects and programmes.
• More efficiency brings better results.
• This allows for value for money and the optimal use of resources.
• Proper planning, with legitimate teams, produce quality outcomes, stretch budgets and address issues sooner than later.
• Involve all stakeholders and keep openness regarding information.
• Inefficiencies create waste and limit service delivery quality to communities.

7.13 My department utilise the ISO 9001:2015 for measuring service delivery quality standards. WHY?
• It is in line with good engineering practice and ensures less maintenance in the future.
• Service delivery standard measured not clear need for internal development.
• It is a legislative requirement.
• The building control unit assist in the quality assurance of houses and community happiness is registered as a concern.
• Ward committees must be educated regarding effective feedback regarding quality outcomes.
• Currently we use National Treasury frameworks and guidelines.

7.15 How is evaluation of outputs dealt with for a common set of objectives?
• M and E of pre-determined objectives via the SDBIP and using the IDP, department vision, mission and strategic objectives.
• By determination of evaluation criteria.
• Report in monthly reports. Are the needs of people always met?
• Linked to the IDP but not implemented and measured like this.
• All performance indicators are linked to a strategic focus and IDP objectives.

7.16 Successful performance regarding services delivered is linked to high morale displayed in the community. Why?
• Vandalism leads to poor performance.
• Communities are not effectively informed about the success achievement of the municipality.
• Too simplistic a statement…lots of variables at play.
• Community happiness is registered as a concern.
• Municipality is finding its feet; while success is being achieved in small ways, the municipality is beginning to utilise local media, facebook and other media.
• Community are highly influenced by political structures; therefore establish working relationship with communities.
• Then the community can be in partnership with service delivery; this link is difficult to prove. City does have community satisfaction surveys and morale re service delivery
• Co-operation of communities is key factor.

8.1 An integrated system is not better than a hierarchical system of operability.
• Democracy at work! [Uphold democratic practices].
• Integration allows for community expression and inclusivity at all times and also for evaluation involving community between all components and levels which will lead to better outcomes. Municipal system requires synergy.
• Integration works better in housing when more than one department are required to assist. An integrated system ensure service delivery are implemented effectively according to community needs; integration is key.
• A non-hierarchical system will avoid wasteful expenditure.
• NGOs bring fresh (outside) opinions which is good for projects and programmes.
• An integrated system is needed because old systems work away from …?
• An IPSS is better. As is collaboration … better than silos or individual powers … An integrated system involves all.
• IPSS is the future… Silos are dysfunctional. Service provision must be holistic to create value therefore integration is good.

8.3 Dynamical (flexible) work modes are superior to static work modes. WHY?
• It would be beneficial for stability. Strategic change of direction often so fast that that progress to small to measure or report on.
• Functional operations require ongoing education to determine change and improvements.
• Flexibility for improving service delivery hampered by regulation and bureaucracy.
• It allows management to redefine and reprioritise programmes and projects and needs as the dynamics change.
• The Department must be flexible to community changes and need to adapt plans accordingly.
• Flexibility is key. Would bring about more responsiveness.
• Change and variability can be welcome, accommodating different views and approaches to arriving at solutions.
• Flexibility encourage innovation which is much needed for the future.

8.4 My department is reluctant to sign agreements with stakeholder teams. WHY?
• Do not have the mandate.
• Clear understanding of role and responsibilities must be established.
• No need to be reluctant when we believe in integrated government and cooperation.
• Agreements are on the cards but not fully effective.
• Agreements are on the cards but not fully effective // community dynamics change all the time with huge turnover in leadership position
• Agreements must be approved by council and in line with legislation.
• The value of collaboration is to serve the community better, with openness.
• Will sign agreements on given provisions.
• Municipality cannot be sure of political influences that the community did not aspire to sign agreement with communities.
• Department needs to streamline processes first. When service menu is clear then agreements become easy. Sometimes governed by legislation or internal policies which limit how stakeholders are engaged.

8.6 Public value generation is about making community wellbeing a priority.
• The lives of the communities are improved through improved service delivery.
• To improve future for youth.
• Community wellbeing is highly related to sustainable livelihoods.
• LG is about quality service delivery, quality service to communities. To improve wellbeing.
• Safety and basic needs must be addressed with consultation and community buy-in.
• Strategic objectives must focus on wellbeing of community, but not so in reality.
• Aim is to sustain good levels and improve sustainable environment.
• Prevent community unrest. People need to see a positive response from the community.

8.7 Fragmentation (working in silos) is suited to the current need for order. WHY?
• This is the reality.
• Fragmentation devalue the service delivery and integration. Cooperation and sharing of resources is conducive to better service delivery, integration and efficiency.
• Integration cannot be escaped; more emphasis placed on compliance.
• Collaboration is good for service delivery as it helps community development.
• Silos create extensive drawbacks e.g. sharing information and other achievable efficiencies.
• Need to work as a collective to achieve common goals and curb fragmentation.
• Lack of capacity, skills, lack of vision and strategic orientation.
• Order requires a non-fragmented environment … Transversal approach is more effective.
8.8 My department actively eliminates waste, duplication and fruitless spending through integration with other departments. HOW?

- Working in cooperation with stakeholders to improve collaboration with the internal departments, stakeholders and the community on integrated management platforms.
- Sharing knowledge is important.
- No integrated budgeting takes place.
- Housing work closely with town planners and engineering and share info to avoid duplication.
- Planning must involve the stakeholders to draft the project plan prior to implementation through engagements and dialogue.
- Be aware of fruitless expenditure e.g. types of infrastructure in informal settlements.
- Processes are in place to avoid waste, duplication and inefficiencies but no processes are in place to identify ways in which this process can be implemented.
- Currently there are duplications and inefficiencies. Sound institutional framework with support from all levels within the organisation is key to eliminate silos – Performance Management moved and shared with executive and senior management.
- To ensure cooperation, collaboration, and effective communication.

8.10 My department actively support being a network partner for the effective delivery of value to communities. HOW?

- Participate in collaborative efforts with partners to initiate projects and programmes to support communities. By using innovative social and development programmes, knowledge, business partners and integration with other departments.
- Various stakeholder forums exist.
- Continuous engagement with communities and establishing forums in informal settlements to encourage integrated planning.
- By initiating inter-departmental meetings e.g. on informal settlements, gaining support at multi-disciplinary meetings.

8.11 An integrated system’s network model for public value generation, requires training for senior managers. WHY?

- Senior managers must understand the value of working with a collaboration model.
- The more senior managers are equipped the better to change mind sets.
- Not all senior managers understand integrated systems.
- They need it as archaic methods have become redundant.
- Capacity suffers because of bureaucratic constraints. Capacity alone does not create capability. Focus is on compliance and departmental KPIs and targets, but not PV outcomes.
- Managers need to understand PV, hence capacity-building serves to improve skills in order to be effective.
- No realisation of benefits as there will always be resistance to change.
- Governance processes and policies require managers to understand systemic change.

8.12 My department allocate time for discussions with stakeholders on integration approaches to operations. HOW?

- Periodic engagements with stakeholders to plan and evaluate and implement programmes and to hold consultative meetings requires regular engagement.
- Managers do not understand integration.
- We have regular meetings with stakeholders. Simply have no time to formalise this.
- We do inform the stakeholder on 5yr. strategic plan and KPA for the financial year.
- Just no time. Responsiveness for meetings means extend invitations to other departments.
- Workshops, training and capacity-building not being done at this point.

8.15 An IPSS calls for a non-hierarchical system for the delivery of public value. Would your department operate in a non-hierarchical system of governance?
No. If that is how the municipality is structured. The department can be willing, but to achieve this, the entire structure should be aligned to a new modus operandi.

No. Position and post grading is much more important. Yes this would be the ultimate goal the municipality does not but it could. Politics and bureaucracy undermine integration efforts. A non-hierarchical system cannot be imposed on a society that is largely hierarchical.

No. Government structures determined by legislation: therefore not possible to work in a non-hierarchical system and to be open to change. To identify risks. Mature in decision making required.

No. No time for implementation of proper integration.

No. Local government is too bureaucratic.

Yes. Where information is shared on an equal basis.

Yes. Resources are under pressure therefore a collective approach is better.

Yes. The housing department operate at various levels with ease.

Yes. However, change management is needed. Strategy – outcomes based approach is needed. Yes. There is too much emphasis on hierarchy but I do not believe it should vanish completely.

Yes. Requires responsibility and accountability to considered from another source or level at a Project Management level perhaps.

Yes. Without compromising delegations.

Yes, if it speeds up service delivery. Eliminate red tape in government processes.

9.1 Disregard is shown for co-management, i.e. working together with stakeholders to achieve common goal targets. WHY?

Programmes and projects that involve other stakeholders and joint solutions work better.

Managers don’t understand integration.

The system is not ready to adapt radical change. My department tries to co-manage with community structures.

Still fear and low levels of trust. Need to eliminate misunderstanding and conflict.

Yes, responsibilities are shared and joint decisions are better that silo decisions.

Weak attendance at meetings will be the result.

Need to ensure sustainability internally.

Important to join with stakeholders as there is a need for collaboration on an integrated basis.

Multiple players to collaborate effectively.

9.3 Integrated municipal functions requires open support from senior managers. WHY?

Senior managers are placed in positions that most often allow them to effect change.

They can send a strong message about integration and cooperation, to guide and support collaboration; integration does not allow top-down processes.

A clear directive and even guidelines should be designed. There must be a champion appointed to promote account and responsibility.

Support for such venture will have to be implemented. Buy-in and accountability from senior management is critical. Senior managers must support an external focus as well.

9.4 Dialogue between municipality, community and stakeholders is problematic. WHY?

Always in place.

Municipalities are not aware of collaborative governance.

Too diverse and self-interest and position dominated.

Platforms for dialogue does not always turn out to be in the interests of the community.

Interest groups and politicians interfere.

Empowering and educating communities re civic education becomes stated as a need to promote co-operation. It is never easy, needs to be managed responsibly.

Trust is built over time when a municipality shows responsiveness, positive attitude consistency and respect for communities. Dialogue builds trust in communities.

Not exactly open, discursive or democratic as stakeholders never really meet communities.
9.5 Collective approaches to programme and project implementation remains the decision of senior management. WHY?
- It should be a bottom-up approach that includes middle management
- Specialist at lower level can contribute.
- Senior management can effect strategic planning managers and sometimes junior staff gets involved for joint responsibility iro sensitivities in community dynamics.
- Objectives must be aligned to planning operations.
- Still the culture at present. Flexibility must apply regarding delegated authority.

9.7 Network teams can achieve efficiencies (in service delivery) sooner and cheaper than departmental managers can.
- Effective use of resources, skills knowledge and information needed to achieve efficiencies.
- Network teams that are too large will be problematic.
- Department managers have authority [to work in network teams to achieve efficiencies].
- Efficient service delivery with M and E is a need, also reduced red tape for expediency.
- Network teams have ready available local knowledge and can therefor give “real” solutions better than when working from a desk.
- Power of teamwork has proven to be more effective.

9.8 Network (stakeholder) teams can potentially replace departmental management teams. HOW?
- A need for balance between department managers and stakeholders.
- Accountability and responsibility is paramount for a common approach.
- Integrated government is the future but the admin functions will be problematic.
- This can create instability as no clear accountability may occur.
- Departmental managers will always be needed in their capacity.
- Somebody need to be accountable.
- Change management: collaborate with service providers and personnel to address service requirements needed for development.

9.9 Collaborative governance has not been instituted as a municipal function. WHY?
- It has a strong patriarchal approach.
- Less focus on collaborative approach and more on municipal functioning
- Does not fit into the present municipal arrangements and org structures / functions.
- Senior managers not understand integration.
- No sufficient buy-in. Municipalities need to review who their “customers” are.
- Portfolio committees, transversal management systems and working groups are in place.

9.10 Teamwork leads to the attainment of total (unqualified) transparency. WHY?
- It has been legislated but not practiced.
- Total “unqualified” transparency is impossible. Accountability is necessary.
- Use the open approach; “transparency is driven by the values of the organisation, not teamwork”.

9.11 Teamwork hampers the attainment of total (unqualified) accountability. WHY?
- Accountability remains but teamwork strengthens the accountability.
- Such as the SCOA implementation [Standard Chart of Accounts] can be structured to measure accountability, hence the team is accountable.
- Total accountability and trust will be required as the team or individual must be accountable.
- Teamwork ensures no hidden agendas as openness can only be beneficial to building sustainable projects and programmes.
- Easy to shift blame.
- A team can be accountable as well; team leader is accountable.
- Always have political interference as politicians assume to be the voice of the community.
9.12 The current governance system is internally focused. HOW?
- Municipalities affirm an internal focus. Restructuring is currently taking place.
- Skills and capabilities to achieve internal system advantages are considered in the current system of governance.
- Communities are often consulted after decisions have already been made as the current system does not favour integration, because the focus is on compliance primarily.
- This is not true as it is implied that governance does not extend to the community level.

9.14 Working within a network of organisations implies that the municipality’s work is complicated. WHY?
- Too many involved hence outcomes take long to see.
- No, networks supplement and enrich collaborative efforts.
- Local Government lack of genuine partners.
- People do not like to deal with complexity / complicated matters.
- Local government is overregulated … does not favour innovation.
- Municipalities has to manage diverse communities, hence the complexities.
- Municipalities must learn different ways of doing business as it merely implies greater collaboration with other role-players and stakeholders.
- It is not easy to communicate government views to the public….again the need for civic education arise.
- Collaboration can achieve more than working alone.
- Need to build trust, efficiency and openness. It’s a new and innovative way of thinking.

9.15 Public value generation by network teams is more effective than when generated by individual departments. WHY?
- Working in silos has never been successful in generating value re strategies.
- It is dependent on capacity and how the teams are structured to generate PV.
- Network teams represent various departments and community organisations.
- Individual departments can work well but must collaborate with others.
- Need to cooperation, coordination and collaboration.
- Not all communities trust the municipalities.
- Creates better buy-in. Take more ownership.
- Provides a more holistic development; individual departments are normally limited in what they can do, or services they can provide.

9.16 Please express your opinion on the implementation of a non-hierarchical, self-managing, integrated, stakeholder-driven municipal environment?
- Not possible within legislative and political environment where everyone must watch their backs.
- Challenging.
- Integrated, stakeholder-driven municipal environment is a Pipe dream as legislation and political nature of institution does not allow for it.
- It tends to be complicated if not governed by certain laws. Responsibility and responsiveness may be implemented by the individuals.
- Challenges require more innovative ways to improve service delivery.
- Can work if done by a highly competent team, specifically in LED projects. Depend on which values are being discussed and promoted.
- Very idealistic not suited to present LG system.
- This will be the opportunity for the public to be heard.
- Sharing ideas mean that all stakeholders must be committed.
- In this approach you need someone to be accountable.
- It involves a non-selfish approach that allow for innovation.
Hierarchy is always required to an extent, but greater involvement of stakeholders will improve efficiency regarding resources utilisation and effectiveness in problem solving and community development. Emphatic answer “the idea will not work”.

There is a risk that stakeholders would waste ones time. However integration is key for community growth.

This is the way for the future. An excellent opportunity for the enhancement of service delivery

Not yet ready for self-managing teams as municipalities don’t have the levels of trust required at the moment.

It will be ideal but municipalities will struggle with capacity issues and with people who do not have the necessary skills.

Municipalities are governance driven: too regulated for co-management and self-management thus it will not work.

Additional Comments

I. Collaborative governance:

- Biggest constraint to collaborative governance are attitudes and personalities.
- Agree that new ways of doing things in the workplace must be implemented and work away with the old system.

II. Integration:

- Integrated systems has been practiced on numerous programmes and projects including Public Safety and Security.
- To take municipalities to the next level we need integrated planning, reporting and BSC proposed.
- Very little analysis of power, i.e. where it is located and the impact / influence thereof.
- Buy-in and motivation is required to adopt innovative systems, but there will be a conflict of interest between IOS and the municipality re nonlinear systems adoption.
- Integrated stakeholder engagement need to be improved between all parties and IOS as well as within the municipality.
- Public participation should be a serious business, i.e. community voice on planning, M and E, re service delivery and other programmes.
- “This research project will provide new, innovative ways and social re-engineering through partnership with stakeholders”.

III. Public value:

- Sport-coordination and social development to name few and has proven to increase the PV and thereby increase service delivery levels with more effective and efficient and economical resource allocations. The public should be involved at most incidences, e-governance to be integrated with public participation and civics interests should be higher than what it is at present.
- The PV concept is interesting and allows for mental inspection of what can be achieved.
- Housing issues are discussed at IDP meetings. Community problems are structurally hard to solve as the DHS do not attend IDP meetings.

Source: The author
ANNEXURE D

Semi-structure interview questions and responses
Western Cape Provincial Government, Windhoek (Namibia), London (UK) and City of Cape Town ODTP officials.

Doctoral title: Public Value (PV): Managing the Integrated Public Service Systems (IPSS) with regard to municipalities in the Western Cape Province

Supervisor: Professor F M Uys, School of Public Leadership (SPL), SUN. Telephone: 021 8082316

Question 1
The question pertains to implementing and measuring integration which the researcher did not treat separately from collaboration and use of network technology if any.

Sub-questions
Who are the stakeholders in the community development and housing delivery process?
How does stakeholder collaboration proceed?
Is co-management with stakeholders an option?
Do you utilise network / integration theory in any way?

Question 2
Ask how stakeholder engagement is conducted.

Sub-questions
Can one obtain an integrated outline or schema for service delivery?
How is the balance obtained?
Are a common set of objectives generated with communities?
What is your ultimate future goal regarding building stable communities?

Question 3
Ask how communities are engaged and mention qualitative differences between public participation and community engagement.

Sub-questions
What is the institutional position regarding community voice?
How do you satisfy community voice?
How are communities educated, empowered and engaged in housing processes?

Question 4
Question how performance is measured, monitored and evaluated.

Sub-questions
What methods are being employed by the IOS to (i) to assess quality in service delivery and (ii) to measure integration? Are you using PPPs, public participation, M and E. surveys, special instruments, models?
ANNEXURE D: SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS (MOST RELEVANT POINTS MADE)

   - Discussing integration of housing entities summarised in schema
   - Catering for the economically active and the indigent
   - Horizontal and vertical convergence.
   - Imizamo Yethu Houtbay then all three spheres of government come together.
   - Places of worship in high demand as churches have become businesses.

   - PGWC Strategic Goal 4 … integrates the above “Enable a resilient, sustainable, quality and inclusive living environment. We’re committed to improving urban and rural areas through enhanced management of land, an enhanced climate change plan, and better living conditions for all”.
   - The relationship between BNG (40 m sq.) and the eventual elimination of townships is strong.
   - The ultimate aim (income earners between R3000 and R15000 per month).
   - National funding (R2–2.2 b (2017-2018) out of a budget of about R41b) controlled by PGWC. An amount of R80b is required by the WCP alone.
   - Each housing provider, a municipality or an agency (Communicare, Madulammoho) submits a business plan for receipt of funding. Upon the merits of the business plan, funding is released.
   - NGOs and liaison officers are assigned to do the public participation hence it is not a thorough process (in terms of IPSS and PV criteria stated elsewhere). Communities need to understand and scrutinise BPs. Applies to all municipalities as well as the towns falling in their jurisdiction.
   - City of CT gets 70% of the budget allocated by National. The BNG is for people earning between R0 and R3500 per month. But programmes exist for those earning between R3500 and R15000. And those include social housing and community residential units and rental stock, owned by the City, i.e. finance linked Individual Subsidy programme (FLISP), rental stock, province also own property; also municipalities have stock. Which provides an income to municipalities.
   - Aim is to see fewer BNG and more rental stock being used.
   - Strategic objectives of the WCPG are (i) Upgrade informal settlement, (ii) 570 000 (not a shrinking number) on a waiting list, 18000 per annum at best and continuously growing. (iii) Demand exceeds supply, (iv) BNG, affordable (rental or purchase) and social housing (rental to low income earners, (v) elderly should be housed as well. Culture of payment is not what it should be.
   - Land and financial resources are scarce. The Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act, No. 16 of 2013, EIAs and NEMA legislation applies.
   - Project Steering Committees are set up in the community and need training regarding the democratic elements. Government spheres + councillors + small bus + big bus + labour + lead to project steering committees.

   From a planner’s point of view, the best is done given the prevailing constraints, land, finance and affordability. The WCPG planning departments adhere to a normal prescription and IPSS and PV conceptualisation has not yet reached this institution of state.
   - The approach to planning is generic, meaning that it is governed by the same policies and regulations for the 9 provinces … guided by Treasury cycle [annual and three year cycles] for planning and budgeting.
   - PGWC is dependent on the municipalities’ IDP and annual ‘Imbizos’. The WCPG utilise the public participation outcomes to inform their work.
   - The WCPG are not involved with municipal tasks such as building sustainable communities, integration, visioning new housing models, cheaper energy sources, economic hubs and so forth. They are guided by a 3 year budget for programmes or projects, while the IDP stretches over 5 years.
   - The outlook of the PGWC is one which perpetuates the norm, which places the majority of the population in a socio-economic position excluded from the mainstream economy.
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The interviewee made the point that there is lack of insight, imagination, astuteness, vision, education that operates in a community among citizens that results. While Chapters 8 and 9 of the NDP applies to their work, they have not yet begun to factor these policy principles into their planning as imperatives.

4. Mr Ferreira CTCHC. At his office. Century City. 6 November 2017.
- Convergence equates with province +CCT + and housing agencies such as CTCHC (Pty.Ltd).
- Social housing and related institutions governed by Social Housing Act, 2008, (No. 16 of 2008), creates social, i.e. rental housing schemes. See schema for PV definition: The PV elements are contained in the ‘General Principles’ in the Act, sections 2.1(i) (ii) to (viii).
- Also build BNG (40m.sq). Lacking of many building regulations for quality standards, e.g. electrification, cavity wall, finishings, size, aesthetics, floors, ceilings, insulation and more.
- Need to establish rental opportunities promote higher density rental units.
- Scarcity of resources.
- As housing ownership is too expensive the rental option is offered by the CTCHC.
- For the persons earning between R3000 and R15000 per month as banks do not give loans if you earn below R15000 per month.
- Affordable housing: R3500- R25 000. 32% of the home loan market up to R600 000
- Gap housing, in partnership with the private sector, (combined earnings R3501-R18 000) who earn too much to get a free house from the government and earn too little to get a bank bond.
- Public Participation done by consultants and liaison officers.
- In principle, the interviewee agreed to IPSS and PV theory. However they are constrained by factors outside the scope of their immediate work interests and higher order interests.
- Community participation constraints arise from:
  (i) Community members want to be paid for work they do.
  (ii) Divided on simple issues.
  (iii) Firmness is required from the organisers.
  (iv) The need for experts is an important factor.
  (v) Decisions take very long. Grievances take long.
  (vi) Politics are very divisive.
  (vii) Council should play a role in facilitating matters, utilising sub councils, ward committees, ward councillors and key community leaders.
  (viii) Too many players / entities can derail a project.

5. Mr Dyiki Homeownership Transfer, Tenancy Management and Staff Housing Assets and Facilities Management [HOTTS]. At the CCT. 01 December 2017.
- Core responsibility: Management of rental stock 45000 units.
- Aim is to make sure that tenancy is integrated, irrespective of race and class etc,
- E communication and mobile communication need to be instituted as well.
- In terms of education-empowerment-engagement: “have to find ways to redress the education divide” to address these problems; with proud home ownership as a starting point these issues can be addressed. Social Services need to be addressed. Technically speaking, SASSA should also be involved in this matter.
- From discussion it seems as if M and E can be replaced by an CGR, for PV generation in an IPSS.
- Refer to Metro’s new structures in schema of OTDP and transversal management. To improve service delivery, bring about systematic change, and customer centricity, a transversal management approach to break silos; gives realisation to the elements contained in the Systems and Structures Acts to give life to strategic planning, i.e. sustainability, responsiveness and effectiveness].
- Some of the staff has been in council for ages and it’s not easy to change mind-sets as they don’t really want to transform. Change the business of “us and them” …Some of the PV and IPSS qualities are acknowledged.
- Some of the stakeholders are: (i) safety and security, (ii) social services, (iii) Tennant forums (iv) residents KTS, (v) EPWP, to bring coloured and black areas “share experiences”, (vi) VPUU.
- EPWP has a role in absorbing some of the your into temporary work (programmes) with the aim of issuing training and permanent work in the City of Cape Town. EPWP can grow into a catalyst to raise people out of poverty.
- Thusong centres can be more dynamic; currently their core business is defined by:
The Six-Block Service Model
1. Government social and administrative services (Grants, personal documents, Housing applications)
2. Office services (minimal).
3. Education and skills development services (ABET, FET, Specialised training).
4. Local Economic Development (LED); Small business advice and development
5. Business services and community opportunities (SMMEs).
6. Community information, government communication activities and awareness.

Strategic Objectives
The objectives of the Thusong Service Centre Programme are directly linked to the strategy of the programme:
- To bring government information and services closer to the people to promote access to opportunities as a basis for improved livelihoods
- To promote cost-effective, integrated, efficient and sustainable service provision to better serve the needs of citizens
- To build sustainable partnerships with government, business and civil society
- To create a platform for greater dialogue between citizens and government.

6. Mr Crous M and Goodwin M, (TDA, CCT) on 12 December 2017 at Goodwood offices.
Questions in respect of (i) integration with community services, Department of Social Development (CCT) and housing delivery, (ii) inter departmental (TOD and TDA) ‘integration’ or transversal management as it is known to CCT officials, (iii) integration with community based stakeholders were raised. No affirmative answers in respect of integration was forthcoming. The question of community engagement elicited remote answers. The Figure below was discussed and the researcher pointed out that the diagram is ‘linear’ (hierarchical in every respect.

The organisational development and transformation plan (ODTP), City of Cape Town (2016:21)

Figure: TDA Housing Process Diagram revised to ‘fit’ the ODTP organisational arrangement.
We will dedicate resources and effort to the spatial transformation of the City. This includes escalating affordable housing provisions and promoting inclusionary land use. …We will make every effort to deepen the conversation around race and inclusion in Cape Town by investing in research that will help to understand the real-life experiences of residents”.

In the words of Mr Goodwin (and agreement from Mr Crous), the ODTP is in its early stages and interviewees stated with certainty, integration has not reached the level which is implied by the researchers’ questions; lines of communication between the organisational entities (departments) remained opaque as there are no clear ‘open’ means for effective communication with top level managers in the hierarchy by lower rung managers, in terms of the ‘transformation’ process or model.

7.  Ms Zukiswa Mandlana (TOD, CCT)
Interview with Ms Zukiswa Mandlana and her deputy: WED 31 JAN 10.00 – 10.30

The following points are significant, as derived from this interview:

- Public participation, which is qualitatively different from public engagement, does not fall within the scope of work of Ms Z Mandlana; she could not offer substantial information on the methodology of public participation followed at the City of Cape Town, nor could she relate to the concept of ‘open’ public engagement. Community engagement is not included in the TDA’s strategic focus areas nor in the 11 strategic priorities of the CCT. The community is not engaged in the performance of the municipality as required by legislation. Assumption, based on the interview information objectives for effective public engagement has not been formulated.

- The researcher could not locate reports (or accountable officials) who could account on how these directorates collaborate or integrate (or measure performance) as actual programme details were not located with Ms Mandlana. To this end, the City of Cape Town’s Transport and Urban Development Authority (TDA) claim that a holistic approach, densification and a renewed focus on maximising space can mitigate social and economic problems in poor communities, while retaining a fragmented system; this measure can be effected but has not yet been accomplished.

- On the provision of pertinent documents relative to the ODTP (meeting minutes) or strategic documents regarding transformation as carried out by the CCT: no she cannot … the interviewee provided hierarchical diagrams (organograms) of the ODTP transformation but could not answer to questions on how municipalities, the housing delivery and community services departments’ senior managers, who are at the coal-face of communities, are not familiar with (or have not been exposed to) effective feedback, deliberation, effective community engagement and reflection procedures, as ‘systemic’ IPSS and network catalysts in respect of IPSS and PV approaches i.e. Presently, municipalities have not, as part of their ‘transformation process evidenced discursive and deliberative dialogue with communities and stakeholders in formulating commonalities, nor does policies in this regard exist.

- Transformation and integration was effected. An integrated strategic framework has not been made clear or how integrated communities and integrated transport systems are linked to the Metropolitan Spatial Development Framework (MSDF). As the process is in its early stages (Council minutes 31 March 2016), many questions remain unanswered.
• Measuring needs satisfaction: How are citizens’ needs satisfied regarding housing delivery and community? The interviewee could not answer this question.

Other Points:

15 the floor Civic Centre. Innovation and TOD specialist
IDP + TOD + MSDF >> TDA
• Special transformation + densification maximising of space and central is transport nodes to reduce cost per individual it really a partnership between the business sector and the city. Focus is on the growth rate of the city per capita / population and social progress.
• Transit oriented development is an holistic approach
• Land available, spatial development, planning and housing is part of TDA
• IDP still intact but will eventually have to adjusted to absorb TOD alignment
• Transversalism (cross-cutting? ): What does it actually mean? What is transversal management?
• The ODTP commenced in January 2017. Explained transversalism in terms of matrix application that embrace all departments to get collaboration, buy-in and shared resources and expertise; also institutionally and organisationally.

PROBLEM: Silos still exist and community engagement still not on the cards. However public participation is relied upon but needs to be examined as civic education is not in place.

While integration is an approach the TOD (strategic doc) from the perspective of transit

Transversal management definition
Growth, the specialisation of functions, development of matrix organizations, managing a process/ the contribution of actors often spread over actors // have no hierarchical power. A triangular relationship between the contributor, his line manager and the cross-functional manager. The transversal manager makes sure not to bypass the line manager, even if he has direct contact with the actors.

The transversal manager’s challenge is to coordinate locally dispersed contributors to achieve their own overall goals. What are the levers of influence to fulfil its role? To coordinate the actors without having the hierarchical power of reward / sanction, the transversal manager develops its influence. It is not manipulative because the transversal manager clearly explains his objectives and has a positive attitude towards the actors. With legitimacy. Personal capacity to convince, train, and make join the actors to the objectives related to his activity to put them in action. The third lever of influence relates to the strategic nature of the activity for the company. The transversal manager coordinates actors of the activity: It determines the objectives of each actor in relation to their hierarchical manager; It contributes to their evaluation by the line manager by providing his or her own assessment, participating or not in the evaluation interviews; It is concerned with raising their level of competence by organizing training sessions or taking informal contact with them.

A transport development index consist of the indices for effective transport development to develop inner city and build bridges re peri-urban and urban what at maximising utility an reducing the cost factor per activity and per user.
Questions:
On the urban development index, what will the indices be?
Does an integration index exist? Would be dependent on successful integration? Can a mathematician formulate this?

Note this for spatial development from: The Metro-Corridor development-Nodal development, local and smaller than this Precinct (a district) of a city or town) development.
The IDP is the public participation programme and nothing else. How often the public is consulted by the new ‘Areas Based arrangements Big thing is ultra-modern 3D visual tools, exhibition, digital communication yet civic education is so badly needed.
• Not currently programme or project specific
• Not dealing with housing
• Not dealing with social services
8. Mr K Mahomed (Senior Manager / Director; Western Cape Education Department, Cape Town. 5 November 2017.

Confirmation was obtained from Mr K Mahomed that civic education does not exist and has never been authorised by the Department of Education (WCP). It was confirmed by the interviewee that civic education is not part of the Adult Basic Education Curriculum in the WCP schools. He stated that if one were to examine the course outline for Life Orientation (FET) grades 10-12, as contained in the core syllabus issued by the Department of Basic Education (2011:8-9), one observes from the extract that it could fit well for the preamble to civic education; the extract states the specific aims as:

- Guide and prepare learners to respond appropriately to life’s responsibilities and opportunities;
- Equip learners to interact optimally on a personal, psychological, cognitive, motor, physical, moral, spiritual, cultural and socio-economic level;
- Guide learners to make informed and responsible decisions about their own health and well-being and the health and well-being of others;
- Equip learners with their constitutional rights and responsibilities, to the rights of others and to issues of diversity;
- Equip learners with knowledge, skills and values to make informed decisions about subject choices, careers, additional and higher education opportunities and the world of work;
- Equip learners to various study methods and skills pertaining to assessment processes and
- Equip learners to an understanding of the value of regular participation in physical activity.

The above does have relevance for civic education but cannot be a substitute for civic education which deals in the primary with the enablement of communities to effectively engage IOS. Civic education should also deal with the following core issues: (i) self-development, (ii) democracy and human rights, (iii) politics and (iv) career choices.

The above is not dealt with at university teacher training level nor at the adult basic education ABE level. Mr K Mohamed did not indicate the need for civic education from the perspective of the WCP Department of Education.

Key findings from interviews conducted in IOS, based on four primary questions

| Q1. Implementing and measuring integration, collaboration and use of ‘networks’ technology. | The implementation and measurement of integration is not being done; in the space allowed by current work mode, i.e. some vertical and horizontal integration. No systemic change to working with communities. No full integration. Network technology is not employed, but confused with ‘networking’ which is minimal, only when required.

Collaboration among stakeholders is not being done. Networks are not being used. Corporate collaboration is on the agenda. Difficulties exist; no effective and efficient system is being utilised; fragmentation is problematic between and in departments; continuous feedback to stakeholders does not exist; transversal management has not been evaluated. TDA system is not fully integrated and not measured or assessed periodically.

In the City of Cape Town, the Areas Based Service Delivery Directorate hold the functions of the ODTP, TDA, and HOTTS, responsible for social housing delivery and management, while the Social Services Directorate is responsible for community services. The functions are ‘integrated’ in the Social Services Directorate. The researcher could not locate reports, relating to operations and governance, in this regard.

The City of Cape Town is internally focused within a hierarchical system of reform. Integration is envisaged between the various programmes in the IDP (Five-Year IDP 2017-2022:31) through transversal management. The researcher could not locate documents regarding evaluation of ‘transversal management’.

An intensive study is required of ODTP document and schema in order to find (i) integration linkages, public engagement data and (iii) what is measured when and why. |
An example of this ‘gap’ could be that EIAs (and project and programme development) are deliberated upon ineffectually since there is no guarantee that all stakeholders have given their inputs, which will ultimately impact upon commonalities and collaborative decision making. Intensive research is required to evaluate the ODTP, as being different from the previous system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2. How is integration performance measured, monitored and evaluated?</td>
<td>The researcher could not locate performance and evaluation results for integration activities. At provincial government level there is open support for hierarchy as people aspire to position themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. How is stakeholder engagement achieved?</td>
<td>Stakeholder engagement is not given adequate or quality attention. No decisive answer is given to this question by senior managers. Effective public engagement is understood in term of present public participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. How is community engagement achieved?</td>
<td>Not given adequate or qualitative attention; community organisations, rate-payer and tenant organisations are various levels in respect of education and financial position. Community satisfaction surveys are not project, programme, community specific and does not grow out of community specific problems, integration or lack of integration challenges or achievements related to wellbeing. There is no relationship between community satisfaction surveys and the need for effective community engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The author
### ANNEXURE E

**Key elements for public value management (PVM), public value (PV) generation and evaluation, in an integrated public service system (IPSS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrative managerial imperatives and skills required for PVM</th>
<th>‘Integration’ tasking in respect of policy, projects and programmes</th>
<th>IPSS and PV Evaluation tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership training:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deliberative, open engagement focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developmental focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coordination: effective scheduling, planning and evaluation of outcomes, outputs and impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cooperation: readiness, responsiveness and assuming responsibility for activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collaboration: channeling ideas, innovation and creativity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communication skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trust building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Team management skills required for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Examining internal and external factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consensus building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sharing resources, capacity and information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluation of network ties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluation of stakeholder relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Directing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contracts negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incentives negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negotiation involving persuasion, mediation and arbitration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Commitment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conscious paradigm shift.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Motivating actors and stakeholder teams.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating skills required:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Activation skills: the avoidance of bureaucratic sluggishness in respect of action, stimulation and implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Orchestration skills: effective coordination, cooperation and collaboration, holistic integration and commensalism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Modulation skills: exercising ability and skill in flexibility, expertness in judgement, inducing changes, gatekeeping, refinement and expediency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Experiential learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Efficient use of resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capacity to plan for and address complex problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Risk management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sustainability measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organisational enhancement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stage analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implement strategic goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Acquire resources, set up teams, calculate costs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Formulate performance indicators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluation re ISO 9000 and TQM according to an integrated framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resolve problems, make improvements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sustain and maintain outputs and outcomes according to integrated framework criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Design business case for projects and programmes with common stakeholder objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Arrange professional teams; utilise resources, capacity and information / knowledge interface.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Policy for implementation framework(s); sustainability imperatives; integrated resources management and planning; Human Resources matters regarding sense of ownership, trust and community pride and stability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Challenges regarding standards, operational planning, monitoring and evaluation, achieving efficiencies and economies of scale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Constant evaluation and feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organisational dynamics and influence from political sectors; need to inculcate new modus operandi and modus vivendi (find ways to work together in a nonlinear organisational arrangement).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quality, moving away from “passive documentation” with regard to implementation of ISO 9000 Quality Management System (Fogel 2011:7).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appropriate staff training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Successful network growth, stabilisation, productivity, openness to innovation and public engagement, modularity, densification, and strength (cohesiveness).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Customer Lifetime Value Management (CLV-M).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conflict assessment, negotiations, mediation, persuasion, and arbitration (binding and nonbinding arbitration).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cost and benefits accruing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consensus building, roundtables and focus groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collaboration and enablement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Partnership arrangements (contract management).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Activation, orchestration, and modulation tools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Levels or degree of coerciveness (ability to build ties).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Directness (leading).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Automaticity, i.e. utilising and maximising the employ of existing resources and structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visibility, i.e. transparency and accountability displayed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overcoming entrenched ideas and values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strength of ties / relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evaluating the management links between actors may be performed with the same criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Integration tools for management in IPSSs:**

- Middleware / Webopedia / Cloud based integrated platforms.
- Resources (material, human, financial).
- Employ of consultants.
- Judgement by experts on indicators achieved.
- Information (technical and legislative).
- Project management Information systems.
- Configuration management tools.
- Monitoring and control tools.
- Detailed Work Breakdown Structure (WBS).
- Quality service Surveys such as (SERVQUAL).
- Customer Lifetime Value Management (CLV-M).
- Conflict assessment, negotiations, mediation, persuasion, and arbitration (binding and nonbinding arbitration).
- Cost and benefits accruing.
- Consensus building, roundtables and focus groups.
- Collaboration and enablement.
- Partnership arrangements (contract management).
- Activation, orchestration, and modulation tools.
- Levels or degree of coerciveness (ability to build ties).
- Directness (leading).
- Automaticity, i.e. utilising and maximising the employ of existing resources and structures.
- Visibility, i.e. transparency and accountability displayed.
- Overcoming entrenched ideas and values.
- Strength of ties / relationships.
- Evaluating the management links between actors may be performed with the same criteria.
| 1. Competitiveness between actors. |
| Quality services driven. |
| Understand why networks produce certain outcomes, “irrespective of whether networks result from bottom-up processes or are the product of strategic decisions made by network participants or government officials”. |
| Efficiency versus Inclusiveness. |
| Internal versus External Legitimacy. |
| Flexibility versus Stability. |
| Utilising network-level competencies. |
| Flexibility is demanded since the unit of analysis shifts from government to stakeholders, including third-party government actors in a network arrangement. |
| Changes in organisational and institutional structure, planning and contract demands a shift in focus and understanding of network dynamics, attributes and possibilities. |
| Relationship strengthening with the private sector requires emphasis on relationship building and commonality of purpose, lending advantages and opportunity to Public-Private partnerships. |
| Management according to planning, organising, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting (POSDCORB) should be incorporated with greater enabling and empowerment skills stated above. |
| Relationships / reciprocity / readiness for negotiability re capacity, resources and information. |
| Seek opportunities for connectivity. |
| Strengthen work ties. |
| Build equilibrium and stability. |
| Network leaders to train managers to understand the paradigm of new management by probabilities. |
| Eff / effect / economy / quality / sustainable dev and knowledge Audits (KA) re employ of resources, information and capacity. |
| Silo / fragmentation / Weberian eradication and or mitigation. |
| Constant innovation and creativity. |
| Channel capacity. |

**PV of a task, equal to the task’s budget allocation at completion (BAC).**

Source: The author
### Key elements for public value (PV) generation and evaluation in an integrated public service system (IPSS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key components and elements for PV generation in an IPSS</th>
<th>PV Inputs</th>
<th>PV Outputs</th>
<th>PV Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions and imperatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inputs regarding PV generation, task (project) definition, planning implementation and delivery</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foundational elements of an IPSS as bases for building a management science for IPSS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assumptions and imperatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intangible PVs (Meynhardt 2009):</strong> Moral-ethical:</td>
<td><strong>Evaluation of outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An IPSS is a nested system, part of a larger integrated system, composed of networks.</td>
<td>- PV can be more qualitatively produced in a nonlinear open system.</td>
<td>- Building communities</td>
<td>- The holistic evaluation of tangible and intangible PVs, i.e. economic values generated to society are expected to produce results related to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Open system.</td>
<td>- In an age of highly advanced technology, nonlinear open systems are more effective than linear systems as it possesses catalytic dynamical qualities.</td>
<td>- Infrastructural products produced.</td>
<td>- The quality or level of sustainability, with respect to infrastructure (public goods).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possess between and inside flexibility.</td>
<td>- An IPSS draws sustenance from the macro, meso and micro spheres of systemic operability where network actors are positioned.</td>
<td>- Services</td>
<td>- The wellbeing of the citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resilient / robust.</td>
<td>- IPSS growth is irreversible, hence change and development are expectations.</td>
<td>- Maintenance</td>
<td>- Social progress (economic, social, political, educational and cultural).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unpredictable / entropic.</td>
<td>- IPSS managers require training in the field of nonlinear systems operability (networks) the qualities of which are listed in the first column.</td>
<td>- Social wellbeing and safety</td>
<td>- Quality of life in communities in respect of ISO 9000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Commensalist.</td>
<td>- Stakeholder teams are comprised of the public, organised social groups, business and state institutions.</td>
<td>- Public engagement</td>
<td>- Client / community satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Networks have density, diameter, duration, direction, modularity, centrality and strength of relationship ties.</td>
<td>- Integrated Management (Refer to management logic model).</td>
<td>- Civic education</td>
<td>- Financial monitoring and control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Autopoietic /chaotic.</td>
<td>- Public interest, needs, demands and desires.</td>
<td>- Social benefits</td>
<td>- Cost efficiency and cost benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Complex and nonlinear.</td>
<td>- Public participation / engagement.</td>
<td>- Deliberative democracy (voice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- **Public engagement** is a formal, statutory mechanisms with formal consultation processes, public hearings governance arrangements and involves information and communication (leaflets, newsletters, advertising websites, engagement with the media), effective customer service, face to face interaction, market research (e.g. surveys, focus groups), deliberative methods (e.g. citizens’ panels, juries or inquiries), devolved responsibility (e.g. participatory budgeting and funding for community partnerships).

- The concept of discontinuity implies nonlinear behaviour, managing interconnected probabilities and relationships which allows actors to ‘leap’ to higher or lower modes of operability, in order to achieve an objective in another manner. Skipping stages in this manner may or may not affect outcomes.

- **PV is measurable.**
- A municipality is a stakeholder in an IPSS.
- A community is a stakeholder in an IPSS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legitimacy and support Authority</th>
<th>PPPs formations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networked / collaborative Governance.</td>
<td>NGOs formations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBOs formations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **PVs identified by Nabatchi (2012)**
  - Political interest and participation
  - Legal - developmental
  - Organisational
  - Market involvement

- **Additional PVs**
  - Leveraging public (social) capital.
  - Social capital.
  - Information and knowledge.
  - Resources and resourcefulness.
  - Citizen innovations.

- The intangible derivatives of the above are considered as outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders’ relationships success or failures.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractual successes or failures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy implementation successes or failures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation of information (ICT and E-governance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Capacity appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management successes or failures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public engagement effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting on innovation successes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamical changes in municipal organisation arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamical changes in municipal institutional arrangements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The author
ANNEXURE F
Evaluation framework for IPSS performance model

Derived from Tables 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and Figure 8.1 (Chapter 8:354)

The following table represents a framework for the evaluation of integrated public service system (IPSS), i.e. inputs, outputs, outcomes, adaptation and sustainability, which constitutes the PV generated by stakeholder bodies (such as a PPP, NGO-CBO alliances with communities), or any other form of working relationship with an institution of state (IOS) acting as a stakeholder in a network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of work done: PV Productivity States 1 to 4</th>
<th>Indicators (KPIs)</th>
<th>Adaptation and sustainability: Productivity State 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PV Productivity States 1 to 2</td>
<td>Collaborative governance and networked governance indicators:</td>
<td>Feedback: stabilise (+‘ve) and enhance (-‘ve) aspects relative to issues arising from work done and analysis of outcomes with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Paradigmatic change: Establishing the Paradigm for IPSS operability.</td>
<td>(Salmon, Stoker, Bingham, Nabatchi, O’Leary).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identifying the relevant stakeholders.</td>
<td>• Trust.</td>
<td>• Discussion with individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Principles and guidelines for community engagement.</td>
<td>• Legitimacy.</td>
<td>• Discussion with groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Schooling and learning: civic education.</td>
<td>• Accountability.</td>
<td>• Focus groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Schooling and learning: stakeholder workshops.</td>
<td>• Equity.</td>
<td>• Urgent discussion meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establishing and adoption of IPSS principles for integration.</td>
<td>• Efficiency.</td>
<td>• Steering or changing direction meetings pertaining to coordination / cooperation, collaboration and negotiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Project, policy and programme identification.</td>
<td>• Evaluating effectiveness and sharing learning.</td>
<td>• Positive engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Adopt methodology for identifying, stabilising and sustaining PV.</td>
<td>• Openness.</td>
<td>• Invite change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Goal setting (emergence of common ‘operational’ platforms) among stakeholders.</td>
<td>• Transparency.</td>
<td>• Invite innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Adopt e-governance / ‘PSN’ instrumentation.</td>
<td>• Deliberation and engagement.</td>
<td>• Listening to perceptions / perspectives / opinions / alternative views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV Productivity State 3</td>
<td>• Participatory dialogue.</td>
<td>• Addressing objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparation for the management of networks.</td>
<td>• Collaborative policy making.</td>
<td>• Review of available funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Networked governance guidelines.</td>
<td>• Participatory budgeting, citizen juries, study circles.</td>
<td>• Coaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coordination and Cooperation methodology in preparation for effective Collaboration.</td>
<td>• E-governance effectiveness and efficiency.</td>
<td>• Skills enhancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clarity on actor participation guidelines regarding self-organisation and self-management.</td>
<td>• Contract construction.</td>
<td>• Using empathy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clarity on actor participation guidelines for PPP, alliance and other forms of network organisation.</td>
<td>• Stakeholder reciprocation.</td>
<td>• Mentoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Methodology for discursive interaction:</td>
<td>• Stakeholder responsiveness.</td>
<td>• Explaining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishing rules for control (hierarchical and nonlinear).</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Locating the missing links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Listing common project, policy and programme objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Celebrating achievements such as project completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV Productivity states 3 to 4 overlap</td>
<td>Employable methodology:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning.</td>
<td>• Surveys.</td>
<td>• Team building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Design: Inputs from Stakeholders.</td>
<td>• In-depth Interviews,</td>
<td>• Positive reinforcement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Activities / Tasks implementation.</td>
<td>• Reporting: employ e-governance. The UK ‘PSN’ model is an example.</td>
<td>• Motivating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Control risk and mitigate risk (endogenous and exogenous).</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offering added training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Exercise Public Value Management style (PVM).</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offering greater support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Feedback and monitoring loops.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dismbanding what does not work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The author