FRAMEWORK FOR MANAGING JOINT PROGRAMMES

December 2005

Governance and Administration Cluster

The Governance and Administration Task Team on the
Framework for Managing Joint Programmes

FRAMEWORK FOR MANAGING JOINT PROGRAMMES

Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS

JP	Joint Programmes
EPWP	Expanded Public Works Programme
ISRDP	Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Programme
URP	Urban Renewal Programme
LRAD	Land Redistribution and Development Programme
IJS	Integrated Justice System
IGRA	Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 2005
G&A	Governance and Administration Cluster
DPSA	Department of Public Service and Administration
NDPW	National Department of Public Works
NT	National Treasury
DPLG	Department of Provincial and Local government
OP	Office of the Presidency
MTEC	Medium Term Expenditure Committee
PFMA	Public Finance and Management Act, 1999 (as amended)

1.   INTRODUCTION

In its January 2003 report to the Cabinet Lekgotla, the Governance and Administration (G & A) Cluster identified the need to develop a framework with clear and practical principles and mechanisms for managing joint / crosscutting programmes. The cluster noted that joint programmes are a crucial and challenging test of integrated and co-operative governance. It further noted that whilst some platforms such as clusters, and other intergovernmental structures already exist to address joint / crosscutting policy and programme matters and to agree on priorities, the main challenge remains at the level of implementation of programmes requiring and involving multiple departments. Research undertaken in support of this Framework suggests that government departments continue to deliver services in a fragmented manner, which makes it difficult to achieve whole of government outcomes.

This Framework is aimed at addressing the weaknesses in the current procedures and processes of planning, budgeting and implementation that are hampered by weak capability to deliver. It seeks to:

- Identify challenges and solutions to some of the barriers that prevent successful delivery of joint / crosscutting programmes; and,
- Encourage new ways of working to address the capability and integration challenge.

It is understood, though, that promoting better management of joint programmes is clearly part of a larger process of ensuring coherent macro-organisation of government, as well as improved intra-governmental and intergovernmental relations. It should be noted, however, that the Framework is not aimed at addressing all the complex challenges related to intergovernmental or interdepartmental issues, but rather seeks to support the objects of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act[1]. To ensure the strengthening of this Framework document, it has been agreed that the Department of Provincial and Local Government will use this Framework as a basis to develop the guideline in terms of Chapter 5, section 47, (1) (b) of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, with clear and practical mechanisms that can be used in implementing joint programmes.

In the process of developing the Framework, it became clear that for joint programmes to be successful, it will be necessary to review, and if required, reengineer those systems that hinder the implementation of joint / crosscutting policies and programmes. In doing so the following areas will have to be addressed:

- Systems
- Infrastructure
- Skills
- Culture
- Leadership
- Budget
- Planning

---

[1] Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 13 of 2005

2.   BACKGROUND

Various joint programmes have been initiated and implemented. Most of these programmes are aimed at addressing the developmental goals identified by government. These include, amongst others, the Rural Development Programme (RDP), the Urban Renewal Programme (URP), the Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) and Poverty Alleviation Programme. These programmes experienced challenges in achieving their targets and goals. It is this experience that prompted a need for a deeper understanding of the challenges of implementing joint programmes.

The programmes that were reviewed point to one fundamental issue that should be used as the starting point: '*joint / crosscutting programmes are not homogeneous'*. They differ in, among other things, *scale, content, and the spheres of government they involve*. Accordingly, and based on the experiences reviewed, what is proposed is *a generic Framework with key elements* around which to plan in order to improve the chances of success of such programmes. Where appropriate, examples of specific tools and mechanisms are provided to illustrate practical implementation.

It should be noted, however, that some of the mechanisms recommended in the Framework are already being implemented in some of the programmes. For instance, the Expanded Public Works Programme has established a programme office with the Programme Manager appointed at a level appropriate to the level of effort and responsibility. Another more recent example is Project Consolidate where an inter-ministerial committee has been established for purposes of joint advocacy and accountability.

3.   RESEARCH PROCESS FOLLOWED

In identifying the underlying causes to the challenges of implementing crosscutting programmes and developing mechanisms to address these challenges, an interdepartmental Task Team was constituted in August 2003. The task team comprised representatives from:
- The Department of Public Service and Administration
- The Department of Provincial and Local Government
- Office of Presidency
- The Department of Public Works
- National Treasury.

The team reviewed some of the locally implemented joint programmes, which were used as case studies, and these include:
- The Expanded Public Works Programme
- Sustainable Human Settlements
- The Land and Agricultural Development Programme
- Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Programme
- The Urban Renewal Programme

In each instance, the approach was to review relevant available reports on the programmes coupled with interviews of the relevant programme managers. In so doing the team reflected on the nature and extent of joint / crosscutting work involved, the programme management model used, the accountability and reporting processes used, and how staffing and resourcing (including budgeting) was done. Throughout this reflective process, the idea was to learn from these experiences and to identify certain key elements that would need to be considered in the development of a framework for managing joint programmes.

Secondly, the team reviewed experiences from crosscutting programmes internationally. The approach used on the local programmes was repeated here.

Lastly, the experiences and the elements generated from the local and international implementations were put in conversation with each other and a Framework for managing joint programmes proposed.

4.   DEFINITION OF "JOINT PROGRAMMES"

Programmes labelled as joint programmes usually have the following characteristics:

- They require a cross-departmental involvement in the planning, budgeting and delivery of services.
- A number of departments are often responsible for a specific aspect of the programme, but none is responsible for it in its entirety.

This clearly indicates joint programmes require integration rather than merely coordination. For purposes of this Framework joint programmes refer to:

"Those programmes that transcend the conventional organisational boundaries in planning, budgeting and implementation resulting in a number of departments/agencies/ministries responsible for one aspect of the programme, although none is responsible for it in its entirety".

Examples of joint programmes include, inter alia, the:

- Expanded Public Works Programme
- Sustainable Human Settlement
- Integrated Justice System
- Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Programme
- Urban Renewal Programme
- Integrated Development Plans
- Poverty Alleviation Programme

5.   PROBLEM STATEMENT

Increasingly public institutions are being called to work together in the delivery of public services. This stems partly from the mounting recognition for public institutions to deliver better results and achieve maximum impact. This new approach will require willingness to change systems, procedures and processes.

A number of barriers have been identified that hinder improved collaboration and successful implementation of joint programmes. Firstly, the poor management of crosscutting work is partly attributable to prevalent culture in the public service that is characterised by silo- and hierarchy-based work conventions, which makes it difficult for project and programme managers in any one department to collaborate across institutions. Organisational culture is very fundamental in bringing about change to the modus operandi within government departments. It is this culture that can determine the extent to which change and innovation can flourish. The issue of organisational culture also touches on the values system in the public service, work ethics, the level of discipline and professionalism in doing work. In the absence of such a value system, corruption thrives and ultimately compromises service delivery.

Secondly, due to lack of **capacity** and **capability** deficiencies in government departments, joint programmes are usually compromised. Currently, some of the programmes have created the requisite capacity (by appointing personnel and establishing a programme office) to deliver and manage joint programmes; however there are greater signals of a huge gap on the issue of capabilities. As a result, it is important that both capacity and capability issues be addressed in the implementation of joint programmes.

There is therefore a clear distinction between what can be referred to as capacity and what is referred to as capability. Capacity is more related to issues of human resources (personnel, budget, and infrastructure) whilst capability relates to competency, that is, the ability to apply knowledge and skills to achieve goals. This issue became clear during the rapid assessment of joint programmes, wherein the Department of Housing had officials within the establishment. However, the challenge noted was that the officials would need to be capacitated with the right skills and competencies (in spite of qualifications currently possessed by these officials) to assume responsibility for performance of duties at hand. Whilst it is acknowledged that qualifications are important, the challenge here is competency levels. Similarly, *critical mass (numbers, quantity) is essential, but what is even more important is the quality* of the personnel appointed.

Programme and project management are critical capabilities for the implementation of joint programmes.   It is vital that this function be strengthened to improve the overall performance of government. The implementation of the framework for joint programmes provides an opportunity to consider the role of project managers in the public service and to recommend measures for strengthening their status, training and performance, including the development of competencies and a curriculum for project managers.

Equally important is the issue of appointment and placement of leadership to strike a balance between *operational and strategic leadership*. The key challenge experienced here is clearly evident in departments such as Housing, Justice, Health where professionals or specialists are given managerial responsibilities leaving the field of professionals/ specialists under-resourced. In this way technical specialists often find themselves in more strategic leadership roles, for which they have not been trained, and in some instances, and in which they do not necessarily excel. It is within this context that developmental programmes are implemented including the joint programmes.

Thirdly, poor planning has been identified as one of the key challenges to successful implementation of joint programmes. Planning in joint programmes requires involvement

and participation by all stakeholders from the conceptual phase of the programme to the implementation phase. Currently, programmes are conceived with not much planning undertaken resulting in stakeholders being informed of their role, participation and contribution at a late stage and, in so doing, most stakeholders are usually not properly geared to fulfil their role.

Lastly, the current approach to funding mechanisms does not promote integration in implementation of joint programmes. For most of the local programmes and international case studies funding has always constituted the major barrier. Although the PFMA is perceived as the barrier, it does not necessarily contradict or prevent integrated planning and budgeting. What the legal Framework prescribes is the appropriation of resources to departmental programmes.

Against this background, the G&A Cluster proposed that a facilitative mechanism be developed to ensure the effective management of joint programmes.

6.   THE PRINCIPLES OF THE PROPOSED FRAMEWORK

It has become evident that most of the joint / crosscutting developmental programmes do not only require coordination but also integration if goals and targets set are to be achieved. The following are the key elements of the Framework that clearly indicate the need to deal with challenges holistically for maximum impact:

❑   Identify the primary and secondary objectives
❑   Determine the nature and extent of the joint / crosscutting work required
❑   Establish a mechanism to ensure joint accountability
❑   Put in place a partnering protocol
❑   Appoint appropriate programme management and programme support staff
❑   Make provision for the key role of a Coordinating Department
❑   Make appropriate financing arrangements

6.1 Identify the primary and secondary objectives to focus on

In formulating joint / crosscutting programmes, there are a number of areas that require careful consideration. Most importantly, there should be clarity around the question: what is the focus of the programme? Lessons from the Urban Renewal Programme (URP) and Integrated Sustainable Development Programme (ISRDP) indicate that **it is necessary to have a sharp and contained focus with a limited set of objectives**.

Joint / crosscutting work is very challenging and complex as it is – but having too wide a focus often compounds these challenges. Looking at the URP and ISRDP reports the question asked is as follows: what is the primary focus of the programmes? Is it to deliver infrastructure and services or, to build a process of integrating development by aligning decision-making and resourcing so as to create a best practice model for sustainable rural/urban development? Perhaps some may immediately argue that these two objectives are not mutually exclusive which is correct as well. However, the point being made is to identify which of the two becomes the primary objective. If this is not considered it can ultimately lead to different actors giving priority and emphasis to different deliverables.

With the primary and secondary objectives identified, it then becomes easier to mobilise stakeholders around *what needs to be achieved*, to optimise the impact of the resources available, to work towards specific targets, and to take appropriate steering decisions where required. Other objectives become secondary objectives and may still be realised as a crucial part of the programme.

It is therefore important that a distinction be made between *primary objectives and secondary objectives*. Taking an example made on URP and ISRDP, the primary focus of these programmes is to promote integration across all three spheres of government, and, as a result of that, the secondary objective, which is delivering infrastructure and services, will then be achieved. Primary objectives relate to the core business/ focus of the programme.

To enable proper classification of the objectives, the starting point is to identify the focus of the programme.   For instance, the Expanded Public Works Programme was conceived for purposes of alleviating poverty and unemployment by promoting 'a nation at work' through infrastructure development. It can be argued that the primary objective for the programme is the creation of job opportunities, whilst the provision of essential infrastructure becomes the secondary objective.

Example of a mechanism:
One way to promote clarity of focus is to ensure that there is in writing, specific primary deliverables and indicators to which there is an in principle commitment by all the players in the programme. This could be in the form of an implementation Framework/strategic plan for the programme as a whole, which could then be translated into individual plans by the respective departments. This should be done on time before the programme moves too far into implementation.

6.2 Determine the nature and extent of joint / crosscutting work required

Joint programmes are not homogenous and the management mechanisms put in place need to take cognisance of this aspect. To this end, it is necessary to ensure that early in the process, **a preliminary scoping of the programme** is done to get a sense of issues such as: who are the partners that need to be involved? What does 'involve' mean for each of these partners?

For instance, for some partners involvement may mean information sharing or consultation without necessarily being involved in implementation. In such instances, it may suffice to put in place protocols for such interaction without establishing formal structures. Formal structures would be more appropriate in instances where 'involve' means joint planning, joint implementation, joint resourcing. It is crucial that these areas are clarified very early on so as to delineate roles and set up appropriate programme structures.

If this matter is not clarified early on, institutions run the risk of trying to manage a programme whose parameters they do not understand that well. **Not all programmes that involve joint / crosscutting objectives need joint implementation,** and the preliminary scoping would help in clarifying this.

Co-ordination in planning, budgeting and setting performance targets is important, but **the implementation of deliverables assigned to specific departments often does not require joint work**. This is an important principle to ensure that there are clear points of accountability for implementation, once performance targets have been agreed during the joint planning stage.

> *Different tools can be used to conduct the preliminary scoping of the programme. In undertaking such a preliminary scoping exercise two key questions need to be clarified, namely,* **who are the partners that should be involved; and, what should the nature and extent of their involvement be?**

6.3 Establish a mechanism to ensure joint accountability for the programme

Joint programmes are often compromised because they are seen as the responsibility of the coordinating department. Other institutions do not feel directly accountable for the programme because although they have been identified as partners, they continue to see this as an 'add-on' to what is seen as core responsibilities.

For this reason it is important to **formalise the acceptance, "buy-in" and joint accountability right from the Executing Authorities to the officials**. Unless Executing Authorities and Accounting Officers value and are seen to promote joint work, the rest of the officials may not have the requisite motivation to take crosscutting work seriously.

To achieve joint accountability, it is proposed that the existing system of Cabinet Committees be utilised to provide strategic leadership, guidance and direction to joint programmes. In specific cases, it may be necessary to establish an inter-Ministerial Task Team, but this should not be the norm. Regular reports, channelled through the Directors-General Clusters, should be submitted to the relevant Cabinet Committee. It is essential that Programme Steering Committees, with departments represented by Directors-General or their alternates (who must have the Director-General's mandate), be established for each joint programme.

Ownership of joint programmes by Executing Authorities and Accounting Officers does not mean **joint accountability even for the performance targets that clearly fall within the responsibility of specific departments**. At the level of implementation, certain elements of a joint programme would often be assigned to specific departments and they should accordingly be held accountable for delivering on these aspects.

> *Example of Mechanism: Utilise an existing Cabinet Committee or in relation to specific projects establish an inter-Ministerial Task Team. Establish a Programme Steering Committee comprising Directors-General (or their mandated alternates) whose departments participate in the programme. The joint programmes should be included as part of the key performance areas for the Department as well as for the Directors-General.*

6.4 Put in place a partnering protocol for the programme

Partnering protocols are important because they are designed to clarify objectives, roles, channels of accountability, communication, etc. Protocols can also clarify the roles of structures such as the Cabinet Committee or inter-Ministerial Task Team, Directors-General Cluster and the Programme Steering Committee. Such a protocol would promote a shared understanding of the 'rules of engagement'. Again, **joint programmes often fail because these areas are often neglected as it is taken for granted that everyone knows why they are there and what their specific role is**. The protocol should be facilitative for stronger intergovernmental relations.

The partnering protocols are not in any way intended to replace the current sound intergovernmental working relationships, but seek to clarify roles and expectations related to very specific joint programmes and initiatives. In the case of the Alexandra Renewal Programme, some of the Memoranda of Understanding were developed but never signed. However, partners have nonetheless largely continued to observe these agreements. Also, the institutional arrangements were made clear such that issues of reporting and accountability would not be confused. The structures at local government level continue to report to the City Manager whilst those at provincial level report to the Head of Department, but the two coordinate and interface closely to ensure that they, for example, submit the same reports to their respective principals.

Example of a Mechanism: A partnering protocol/Memorandum of Understanding clarifying roles, channels of accountability/communication, etc.

6.5 Appoint a Programme Manager and other Staff at appropriate levels

Be clear about the responsibilities of the Programme Manager and ensure that an appropriate job description is developed. **The job should be evaluated to determine an appropriate job grade that is commensurate with the demands of the post**. Unless this is done there is a danger that the programme would be 'under-managed' in case a post that is lower than the requirements of the job is created.

In this process, also determine the **level of effort** required from the Programme Manager. It is important to keep in mind that the right post level may be created and an appropriate candidate recruited; however, if the incumbent is loaded with other departmental responsibilities while the programme requires full time attention, realising the potential success of the initiative will be compromised. Once the post has been created in this way, appropriate incumbents may be recruited from within and outside the public service. Secondments should be encouraged as this approach assists with increasing the ownership of the programmes by other participants as well as assisting with mainstreaming the programme into the work of the departments.

Repeat this process with other members of the Programme Team. Determine what their functions would be, whether these functions require them to be full time in the programme, and what level of seniority they should be.

Although the overall Programme Manager will effectively be in the employ of one department, this should not detract from the fact that s/he is accountable to an inter-departmental/municipality Programme Steering Committee which reports to a Cabinet Committee (or in special instances, an inter-Ministerial Task Team) through the Directors-General Cluster.

Almost all analyses indicate that key to the success of the Alexandra Renewal Programme is the fact that there is a dedicated capacity (about 20 full-time professionals) responsible for driving the programme. Of course some questions have been asked about the replicability of this model in other settings – but the point remains that **it is key to 'match people and resources to the task'**. If the task requires a certain number and calibre of people on a fulltime basis, arrangements should be made to have these in place. Learning from the experiences of the Alexandra Renewal Programme, there are indications that this initial investment in staff is paying off in that they now have what can be regarded as 'an experienced urban upgrading expert team' that is beginning to benefit other programmes in the province.

The Inter-Departmental Task Teams established for the ISRDP have the potential to be effective vehicles for coordinating joint programmes. Their effectiveness is however compromised when officials who represent departments are not empowered to make appropriate decisions that commit their respective departments to certain deliverables.

In the Expanded Public Works Programme a programme management office headed by the programme manager at the level of Deputy Director-General has been established to provide support to all spheres of government in addressing issues such as capacity that might impede the implementation of the programme.

Example of a Mechanism: Create dedicated Project Team commensurate with the requirements of the Programme. The Team is to serve as the coordination nerve- centre of the Programme which follows up to ensure that the programme is on track and that credible monitoring information is availed to the principals to inform steering committee decisions. Sectoral/departmental project teams, with clear roles and responsibilities, should support the Project Team. The programme should be reflected in the performance agreements of all team members.

6.6 The key role of Coordinating Departments

It is important to be clear about which Ministry and department should be made responsible for overall coordination of the programme. It is about identifying a department that would be better placed to **facilitate the articulation of crosscutting goals and objectives**. The idea here is not to undermine the roles of the other departments and spheres. The reality of the matter is that joint programmes are often about achieving 'government-wide' goals, goals that transcend departmental boundaries. Without the coordinating department playing its role effectively, there is always the risk that joint programmes would lose sight of the government responsibility 'to serve the public interest', with the departmental interests and accountability receiving more attention instead. A central coordinating department must be identified to facilitate

appropriate interventions when the broader crosscutting goals of the programme face the risk of being compromised by sector interests of departments.

> *Example of Mechanism: Identify department best placed to facilitate the coordination and articulation of the crosscutting objectives of the particular programme. E.g. DPLG coordinates the URP/ISRDP – the department's mandate includes aspects of strengthening intergovernmental relations as well as significant resource transfers to other spheres through, for example, the Municipal Infrastructure Grant. The Coordinating Department should lead by example through e.g. assigning human and financial resources and taking leadership in areas that constitute its share of the programme*

6.7 Financing of Joint / Crosscutting programmes

The financing proposals are premised on an approach that seeks to integrate and mainstream the funding of joint / crosscutting programmes into the planning, budgeting and reporting process of government. The proposals do not transfer accountability outside of the existing legislation. This means that Accounting officers would still be responsible for their outputs, targets and the resources allocated to their departments.

Many reasons have been given to try to explain why some departments often not include joint programmes in their strategic plans and budgets. For example, the issue of communication has been raised, where departments do not budget for the projects because they somehow expect that there would be a special fund (perhaps managed by the Coordinating Department) from which they can access resources to finance the projects. For example, some departments may have expected that the national Department of Public Works would have a special fund to finance projects undertaken as part of the Expanded Public Works Programme.

Another possible reason cited for the non-inclusion of joint programmes in departmental strategic plans is the issue of timing, where overall planning for the programme is not aligned to the planning cycle of the departments. Indeed, there may be many other reasons cited but this Framework argues that it is important to ensure that funding for these programmes is as far as possible integrated and mainstreamed into the plans of participating departments.

Enhancing the system: A Proposed Way Forward

When preparing their budget proposals, national departments base their medium-term spending proposals on their draft strategic plans that cover a three to five-year period. **The extent to which crosscutting programmes are accommodated in spending proposals is largely determined by their inclusion in the departments draft plans**. While the format that is prescribed for the preparation of spending proposals is capable of interrogating the human and financial resources that a department contributes towards crosscutting programmes, **if the strategic plan focuses on narrow departmental objectives and targets and does not reflect joint programmes, then the extent to which the budget can accommodate these type of programmes is limited**.

Joint programmes have a greater chance of success if there is better alignment between planning, budgeting and reporting. Identifying the human and fiscal implications of joint programmes early in the planning and budget preparation stage will deepen the basis for informed budget allocation decisions. This can be done through joint planning sessions leading to formal agreements between the relevant departments. These agreements could then form part of a department's budget submission.

Short to medium term arrangements are proposed:

Firstly, it is important that such programmes go through proper processes of feasibility analysis, consultation and planning to facilitate budgeting and implementation. Resources should be made available to support these processes because they are important to ensure that a sound base is created for the programme. The resources required may be minimal relative to those required for actual implementation, but the impact they have would be felt even in the later stages of the programme. The outcome of this work would be sound programme management and reporting arrangements as well as detailed proposals for implementation.

Secondly, it is important to ensure that once the initial conceptual and preparatory work has been done, **the actual implementation plans of the programme are in place and mainstreamed into the MTEF plans of the partner departments**. **This therefore means that the planning process should be timed in such a manner that there would be alignment with the budgeting cycle of government**. By the time departments prepare their plans and budgets, they should already be aware of the particular crosscutting programmes they would be part of and the nature and extent of their envisaged role. In this approach, it is important that departmental budgets cover not only specific projects to be implemented but **programme management** as well. This is critical to programme success but is often not provided for when budgets are prepared. The need for specific budget for programme management became evident in the Expanded Public Works Programme where R100 million has been committed for programme management support.

This is now incorporated into the MTEC process where Departments reflect, discuss and assess the extent to which they have budgeted and catered for joint and crosscutting issues. It is through these cluster sessions that funding challenges for joint programmes will be addressed.

In the **long term**, a more enabling mechanism to finance joint programmes would involve an outcomes-based planning, budgeting and reporting cycle. Some of the characteristics of such a cycle would be:

- Medium-term strategic and performance plans include policy priorities whose success is dependent on the outputs of two or more departments. While the outputs would be identified alongside the responsible departments, specific targets would be contained in the respective strategic plans.

- Binding agreements will need to be established between the respective departments at the conclusion of joint planning meetings. These agreements will need to form part of a department's medium-term spending proposals.

- Budget evaluations, negotiations between departments and National Treasury, and trade-offs made by MinComBud and Cabinet will consider policy priorities and

outputs of individual departments, as well as those that cut across departments and spheres of government.

Although it is not likely that resources will be specifically appropriated for an outcome (that cuts across more than one department), current budget formats and legislation will allow for specific amounts in the Estimates of National Expenditure and Appropriation Bill for joint/cross-crosscutting programmes. Legislation allows for a more forward-looking three-year approach.

7. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FRAMEWORK

7.1 Monitoring the implementation of the Framework

It is critical that the implementation of the Framework be monitored to ensure relevance and appropriateness to the challenges currently experienced in joint programmes. Key elements of the Framework will be refined over time as they get applied to more of these type of joint / crosscutting programmes.

7.2 Marketing the Framework

To ensure that all government departments are aware of the Framework, it is important that the Framework be presented to all provincial governments including local government. Since this Framework will be adopted in terms of Chapter 5 of Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, 23 of 2005, DPLG with the support of the G&A task team, will market the tool to all relevant stakeholders. It will also be published as a best practice guideline.

8. WAY FORWARD

While the above represent the main elements identified to address the challenges in managing joint programmes, its usefulness must be monitored at the level of the actual programmes. Indications are that the departments and provinces consulted are supportive and agreeable to the Framework.

The Department of Provincial and Local Government will build the elements of this Framework into the guidelines as per Chapter 5 section 47 (4) of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act once Cabinet has approved the Framework.