



*For an Equitable Sharing of National Revenue*

# Submission for the Division of Revenue 2017/2018

**30 SEPTEMBER 2016**

**ISBN: 978-0-621-44488-9**

**RRP112/2016**

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Montrose Place, Bekker Street,  
Waterfall Park, Vorna Valley, Midrand, South Africa  
Private Bag X69, Halfway House 1685  
Tel: 086 1315 710, Fax: +27 (0) 11 207 2344

**[www.ffc.co.za](http://www.ffc.co.za)**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Contents</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Figures</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Tables</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Foreword and Editorial</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>About the Authors</b>	<b>19</b>

## PART 1

### Macro-Micro and Fiscal Context of Rural Development

**21**

<b>Chapter 1</b>	<b>Introduction to Rural Development and Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>The Role of Targeted Intergovernmental Transfers in Rural Poverty Reduction</b>	<b>59</b>

## PART 2

### National Government and Rural Development

**75**

<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>The National Land Reform Programme and Rural Development</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>State Owned Companies and Rural Development</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>The Role of National and Provincial DFIs in Rural Development</b>	<b>117</b>

## PART 3

### Provincial Government and Rural Development

**127**

<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>Assessing Government's Fiscal Instruments to Fund Job Creation Strategies in Rural Areas: The Case of PEPS</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>Enhancing Domestic Resource Mobilisation for Effective Rural Development and Growth The Role of Provinces Taxation</b>	<b>156</b>
<b>Chapter 8</b>	<b>The Role of PES and Conditional Grants in Funding Provincial Rural Development Mandates</b>	<b>178</b>

**PART 4****Rural Municipalities and Rural Development****195**

<b>Chapter 9</b>	<b>Developing Rural Municipalities' Own-Revenue Sources</b>	<b>196</b>
<b>Chapter 10</b>	<b>The Funding Model for Local Rural Municipalities</b>	<b>207</b>
<b>Chapter 11</b>	<b>The Adequacy of Local Equitable Share and Conditional Grants and Rural Development</b>	<b>223</b>
<b>Chapter 12</b>	<b>The Effectiveness of Transfers to Local Municipalities for Rural Development</b>	<b>239</b>
<b>Chapter 13</b>	<b>District Municipalities and Rural Development Local Government</b>	<b>258</b>
<b>Chapter 14</b>	<b>Farm Evictions and Increasing Rural Local Municipal Responsibilities</b>	<b>271</b>
<b>Chapter 15</b>	<b>Reviewing Effectiveness of Sanitation Fiscal Instruments and Governance in Enhancing Rural Development</b>	<b>284</b>

# FIGURES

Figure 1. Evolution of rural development policies	25
Figure 2. Growth and poverty-reduction pathways of rural policies	30
Figure 3. Economy-wide linkages of rural policy in a general equilibrium model	33
Figure 4. Characteristics of municipalities	37
Figure 5. Access to services in urban municipalities (1996–2014)	39
Figure 6. Access to services in rural municipalities (1996–2014)	39
Figure 7. Audit outcomes for urban municipalities (2007/08–2012/13)	40
Figure 8. Audit outcomes for rural municipalities (2007/08–2012/13)	40
Figure 9. Value of transfers to local government (2000/01–2015/16)	41
Figure 10. Average revenue split per source by municipal category (2003/04–3012/13)	41
Figure 11. Shifts in distribution of population among provinces	42
Figure 12. Provincial revenue by source	43
Figure 13. GDP growth (annual %)	44
Figure 14. South African developmental indicators (1996–2014)	45
Figure 15. Main economic sectors and contribution to GDP	45
Figure 16. South Africa gross value of main agricultural commodities (1994–2014)	46
Figure 17. Location of the 27 priority districts	47
Figure 18. South African agricultural production	49
Figure 19. Agriculture, forestry and fisheries (AFF) trade (1996–2014)	50
Figure 20. Trends in farm minimum wages (2003–2015)	51
Figure 21. South African agricultural labour trends (2006–2014)	51
Figure 22. The relative role of agriculture and non-agriculture growth in reducing poverty	62
Figure 23. Responses to innovations in apw and pci – full sample	67
Figures 24 and 25. Responses to innovations in apw and pci	67
Figure 26. Land reform and rural development linkages	83
Figure 27. SOE categorisation framework	98
Figure 28. Current ratio (2010–2014)	105
Figure 29. Debt to equity ratio (2010–2014)	105
Figure 30. Households connected to mains electricity (2008–2014)	106
Figure 31. Percentage of indigent households that receive free basic electricity (2013–2014)	107
Figure 32. Rural households where Eskom distributes electricity (2010–2014)	107
Figure 33. Households with access to postal services (2010–2014)	108
Figure 34. Rural households with access to postal services (2014)	109
Figure 35. Rural households with access to functional landline telephones (2010–2014)	110
Figure 36. Rural households with access to functional cell phones (2010–2014)	110
Figure 37. Rural households with access to the internet at home (2010–2014)	111
Figure 38. Services used to access internet at home (2013–2014)	112
Figure 39. Households that access the internet via cell phone or other mobile services (2012–2014)	112
Figure 40. Freight commodities Gauteng–Natal Corridor (2015/16)	113
Figure 41. Freight commodities Cape–Gauteng corridor (2015/16)	113
Figure 42. Freight commodities Natal–Gauteng corridor (2015/16)	114
Figure 43. DBSA disbursements to municipalities (2013–2015)	120
Figure 44. IDC total value and agro-industries financing approved (2010–2014)	122
Figure 45. IDC approvals to companies and jobs facilitated in rural areas (2010–2014)	123

Figure 46. Approvals for the RDCF and total approved transactions (2012–2015)	124
Figure 47. Unemployment trends in South Africa	130
Figure 48. Youth unemployment trends in South Africa, sub-Saharan Africa and BRICS*	131
Figure 49. Job creation strategy of government	134
Figure 50. Spending on EPWP by sector	137
Figure 51. Breakdown of provincial spending on EPWP and CWP	137
Figure 52. Work opportunities created through EPWP (2008/09–2014/15)	139
Figure 53. Work opportunities created through CWP (2012/13–2014/15)	139
Figure 54. EPWP work opportunities created across the nine provinces (2008/09–2014/15)	140
Figure 55. EPWP work opportunities created across three provinces with the highest number of rural (B4 and B3) municipalities (2008/09–2014/15)	141
Figure 56. EPWP work opportunities created across three provinces with the second highest number of rural (B4 and B3) municipalities (2008/09–2014/15)	142
Figure 57. EPWP work opportunities created across three provinces with the least number of rural (B4 and B3) municipalities (2008/09–2014/15)	143
Figure 58. CWP job opportunities created across the nine provinces (2012/13–2014/15)	144
Figure 59. CWP work opportunities created across the three provinces with the highest number of rural (B4 and B3) municipalities (2012/13–2014/15)	144
Figure 60. CWP work opportunities created across the three provinces with the second highest number of rural (B4 and B3) municipalities (2012/13–2014/15)	145
Figure 61. CWP work opportunities created across the three provinces with the least number of rural (B4 and B3) municipalities (2012/13–2014/15)	146
Figure 62. EPWP and CWP daily rates compared to domestic and farm workers (2013/14)	148
Figure 63. Provincial own-revenue (2010/11–2016/17)	160
Figure 64. Growth in own-revenue (2005/06–2016/17)	161
Figure 65. Provincial own-revenue by category (2001/02–2016/17)	162
Figure 66. Own-revenue composition by province (2005/06–2014/15)	163
Figure 67. GDP share by province (2004)	164
Figure 68. GDP share by province (2014)	164
Figure 69. Sector share of GDP by province (2014)	165
Figure 70. Overall index for fiscal effort (2005)	167
Figure 71. Overall index for fiscal effort (2010)	167
Figure 72. Overall index for fiscal effort (2014)	168
Figure 73. Provincial agriculture and rural development expenditure (2010–2017)	188
Figure 74. Agriculture expenditure growth rates by programme (2012/13–2017/18)	188
Figure 75. Rural development expenditure trend by province (2012/13–2017/18)	189
Figure 76. CASP allocations and agriculture GVA (2005/6–2013/14)	190
Figure 77. Average revenue split per source by municipal category (2003/4–2012/13)	199
Figure 78. Economic activities in B3 and B4 municipalities (2014)	199
Figure 79. Number of municipalities and average municipal population sizes	212
Figure 80. LGES as a percentage of operating revenue	216
Figure 81. Total transfer capital funding as a percentage of total capital funding	216
Figure 82. Own-revenue index	217
Figure 83. GVA Index	217
Figure 84. Per capita income index	218
Figure 85. Unemployment index	218
Figure 86. Poverty index	219
Figure 87. Municipal functionality	220
Figure 88. Characteristics of municipalities	225
Figure 89. Division of Revenue among the three spheres of government	226

Figure 90. Value of transfers to local government (2000/01–2015/16)	226
Figure 91. LGES vs actual operational costs	228
Figure 92. Impact of LGES	229
Figure 93. Redistributive impact of LGES	229
Figure 94. Estimated capital requirements	231
Figure 95. Capital investments required for electricity (2015)	231
Figure 96. Capital investments required for solid waste vs MIG allocations (2015)	232
Figure 97. Capital investments required for roads and storm water vs MIG allocations (2015)	233
Figure 98. Estimated capital requirements for roads and storm water	234
Figure 99. Capital investments required for water vs MIG allocations (2015)	235
Figure 100. Capital investments required for sanitation vs MIG allocations (2015)	236
Figure 101. Estimated capital requirements for sanitation	236
Figure 102. Implications of the new LGES formula on rural municipalities	243
Figure 103. Actual vs. budgeted expenditure in rural local municipalities (2005/06–2012/13)	245
Figure 104. Under-spending on conditional grants in rural municipalities (2008/9–2012/13)	245
Figure 105. Capital spending in rural municipalities by service (2005/6–2012/13)	246
Figure 106. Operational spending in rural municipalities by expenditure item (2005/6–2011/12)	246
Figure 107. Audit findings for rural municipalities (2009/10–2013/14)	247
Figure 108. DEA frontier	249
Figure 109. Provincial distribution of DMs	261
Figure 110. DMs and under-spending	262
Figure 111. Annual average efficiency scores by municipality	264
Figure 112. Composition of total revenue for DMs	266
Figure 113. Number of municipalities in each district	267
Figure 114. Average efficiency levels: rural vs DMs (2008–2014)	268
Figure 115. Formally employed farm workers and labourers in the agriculture sector (2008–2014)	272
Figure 116. Formally employed farm workers and labourers in the agriculture sector in Western Cape, Eastern Cape and Northern Cape (2008–2014)	273
Figure 117. Formally employed farm workers and labourers in the agriculture sector in Free State, KwaZulu-Natal and North West (2008–2014)	273
Figure 118. Formally employed farm workers and labourers in the agriculture sector in Limpopo, Mpumalanga and Gauteng (2008–2014)	274
Figure 119. Employment in the agriculture sector for the 13 municipalities (2005–2014)	274
Figure 120. Municipal hotspots in South Africa (2014)	278
Figure 121. Municipal hotspots in South Africa (2015)	279
Figure 122. Tenure security cases in South Africa (2014 and 2015)	279
Figure 123. Land tenure disputes in municipal hotspots (2014 and 2015)	280
Figure 124. Expenditure related to farm eviction incidents in Dihlabeng and Emadlangeni	280
Figure 125. Expenditure related to farm eviction incidences in Emakhazeni and Breede Valley	281
Figure 126. Global causes of child death under the age of five years	286
Figure 127. Causes of child deaths (aged 1–5 years) in South Africa (2007)	287
Figure 128. Global use of improved sanitation between 1990 and 2015 (%)	288
Figure 129. Urban and rural trends in sanitation coverage (%)	289
Figure 130. Urban and rural access to adequate sanitation in South Africa (1996–2013)	289
Figure 131. Sanitation backlog by municipal category between 1996 and 2014	291
Figure 132. Municipal sanitation backlog as a percentage (2009–2014)	293
Figure 133. Year-on-year percentage change in sanitation backlogs	293

# TABLES

Table 1. Mandate and funding of three government spheres	31
Table 2. Selected rural development outputs and departmental responsibilities	31
Table 3. Classification of municipalities in 2015	35
Table 4: Provincial ranking according to composite rural index (2015)	36
Table 5. Categories of municipalities per province	36
Table 6. Comparison of urban and rural municipalities	37
Table 7. Share of GVA by sector in rural and urban areas	38
Table 8. Provincial development disparities	42
Table 9. South Africa's agricultural export destinations	50
Table 10. Panel – VAR Granger causality wald test	65
Table 11. Forecast-error variance decomposition	66
Table 12. Sectoral growth linkages. Forecast-error variance decomposition	68
Table 13. Impact of sectoral growth on food poverty	70
Table 14. Impact of sectoral growth on lower-bound poverty (LBP)	71
Table 15. Impact of sectoral growth on upper-bound poverty (UBP)	71
Table 16. Funding and grant framework of land reform	85
Table 17. Public spending on land reform by DRDLR	86
Table 18. Proportion of sample by land reform treatment and employment type	86
Table 19. Regression analysis of factors affecting household income excluding social security	87
Table 20. Impact of land reform on household dietary diversity and food insecurity	88
Table 21. Impact of land reform on HFAIS index for farm labour beneficiaries	88
Table 22. Land area sampled including comparisons of the area transferred to the beneficiaries	89
Table 23. Land area sampled excluding two large joint venture restitution projects (outliers)	89
Table 24. Estimated job losses on land reform farms within the sample	89
Table 25. Intergovernmental implementation of land reform	91
Table 26. Government's 18 Strategic Infrastructure Projects	102
Table 27. Parent departments of Selected SOCs	103
Table 28. Guarantees to selected SOCs (2006/07–2014/15)	104
Table 29. Debt ratio formulas, benchmarks and interpretations	126
Table 30. DBSA debt ratios	126
Table 31. IDC debt ratios	126
Table 32. Land Bank debt ratios	126
Table 33. NEF debt ratios	126
Table 34. Poverty measures by settlement type	131
Table 35. Typology of PEPs	132
Table 36. Multiple dimensions within which PEPs operate	132
Table 37. Selected job creation programmes	135
Table 38. Number of participants per sector	136
Table 39. Spending on PEPs	136
Table 40. Annual growth in PEPs over the MTEF (2015/16–2018/19)	138
Table 41. Design and intergovernmental implementation of PEPs	147
Table 42. Effectiveness of EPWP and CWP (2011/12–2013/14)	150

Table 43. Tax revenue receipts by province	172
Table 44. Selected provincial tax bases	173
Table 45. National average tax rates	174
Table 46. Potential tax revenues (R-billions)	175
Table 47. Index for fiscal effort	176
Table 48. Overall fiscal effort by province	177
Table 49. Classification of provinces by rural attributes	182
Table 50. Provincial development disparities	182
Table 51. Variation in per capita provincial allocations	186
Table 52. Average provincial share of the infrastructure allocations (2000–2015)	187
Table 53. Comparison of provincial agriculture conditional grant allocation and agriculture output	190
Table 54. Special rural development conditional grants ( R-million)	191
Table 55. Classification of municipalities in 2015	198
Table 56. The geographical distribution of the South African population (2011)	200
Table 57. Sources of local government funding	201
Table 58. Municipalities affected by boundary re-determinations in 2016	211
Table 59. Number of citizens per councillor	213
Table 60. Summary of literature on the impact of municipal boundary changes	214
Table 61. Funding profiles of municipalities	225
Table 62. Summary of literature on the adequacy of local government funding	227
Table 63. Estimated capital investments required for electricity per province (2015)	230
Table 64. Estimated capital investments required for solid waste (2015)	232
Table 65. Estimated capital investments required for roads and storm water	233
Table 66. Estimated capital investments required for water per province (2015)	234
Table 67. Estimated capital investments required for sanitation per province (2015)	235
Table 68. Municipal categories in South Africa	241
Table 69. Conditional and unconditional allocations to municipalities (2006/07–2018/19)	242
Table 70. Conditional allocations to municipalities (2008/09–2015/16)	244
Table 71. Summary of empirical studies on spending efficiency in local government	248
Table 72. Output-oriented DEA (VRS) efficiency results	251
Table 73. 100% efficient municipalities	252
Table 74. Ten most efficient municipalities	252
Table 75. Ten least efficient municipalities	253
Table 76. Results from the truncated regression analysis	253
Table 77. Revenue sources for DMs	261
Table 78. Average efficiency scores for district municipalities	263
Table 79. Urban LMs by indicators showing relations to DMs	265
Table 80. Causes of child deaths (aged 1–4 years) in South Africa (1997, 2001, 2005 and 2007)	287
Table 81. Causes of death for children aged 1–4 years (2012)	288
Table 82. Municipal ranking based on improvement in sanitation backlog (2012)	290
Table 83. Randomly selected municipalities based on improvement ranking	290
Table 84. Municipal Infrastructure Grant components	291
Table 85. RHIG budget and expenditure	292
Table 86. RHIG recipients (2012/13–2014/15)	294

# ACRONYMS

ADS	Agency Development and Support (IDC)	DLA	Department of Land Affairs
AGOA	African Growth and Opportunity Act	DM	District Municipality
AGSA	Auditor-General of South Africa	DMA	District Management Areas
ALHA	Agricultural Land Holding Account	DME	Department of Minerals and Energy
ANC	African National Congress	DOE	Department of Energy
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance	DOH	Department of Health
APAP	Agricultural Policy Action Plan	DORA	Division of Revenue Act
apw	Agricultural Value Added per Worker	DPE	Department of Public Enterprises
AsgISA	Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa	DPME	Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
ASIDI	Accelerated Schools Infrastructure Delivery Initiative	DPW	Department of Public Works
B&CB	Business and Corporate Banking (Land Bank)	DRDA	District Rural Development Authorities
BFAP	Bureau for Food and Agricultural Policy	DRDLR	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform
BLA	Black Local Authority	DSBD	Department of Small Business Development
BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa	DSD	Department of Social Development
BVT	Business Value Tax	dti	Department of Trade and Industry
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme	DWS	Department of Water and Sanitation
CASP	Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme	ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
CGE	Computable General Equilibrium	ECD	Early Childhood Development
CLC	Community Law Centre	EcoSan	Ecological Sanitation
COGTA	Cooperative Government and Traditional Affairs	EDD	Economic Development Department
CPI	Consumer Price Index	EPWP	Expanded Public Works Programme
CRDP	Comprehensive Rural Development Programme	ESTA	Extension of Security of Tenure Act
CRS	Constant Returns to Scale	EU	European Union
CWP	Community Works Programme	FBS	Free Basic Services
DAFF	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	FDH	Free Disposal Hull
DARD	Department of Agriculture and Rural Development	FEVD	Forecast Error Variance Decompositions
DBE	Department of Basic Education	FFC	Financial and Fiscal Commission
DBSA	Development Bank of Southern Africa	FICA	Financial Intelligence Centre Act
DEA	Data Envelope Analysis	FTE	Full-Time Equivalent
DFI	Development Finance Institutions	GDP	Gross Domestic Product
DHS	Department of Human Settlements	GEAR	Growth Employment and Redistribution
		GHS	General Household Survey
		GMM	Generalised Method of Moments
		GPP	Gross Provincial Product

GRP	Gross Regional Product	MSA	Municipal Structures Act
GSM	Government Shareholder Management	MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
GVA	Gross Value Added	MTSF	Medium Term Strategic Framework
HDA	Housing Development Agency	MWIG	Municipal Water Infrastructure Grant
HDDS	Household Dietary Diversity Score	NAMC	National Agricultural Marketing Council
HFSIAS	Household food insecurity access score	NDP	National Development Plan
HST	Health Systems Trust	NEF	National Empowerment Fund
ICASA	Independent Communications Authority of South Africa	NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
ICT	Information and Communication Technology	NGP	New Growth Path
ID	Identity Document	NPC	National Planning Commission
IDC	Industrial Development Corporation	NPO	Non-Profit Organisation
IDP	Integrated Development Plan	OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
IDT	Independent Development Trust	OLS	Ordinary List Squares
IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture Development	P&F	Powers and Functions
IGFR	Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations	PCC	Presidential Coordinating Commission
IGR	Intergovernmental Relations	pci	Per Capita Income
ILO	International Labour Organisation	PDARD	Provincial Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
IMF	International Monetary Fund	PEP	Public Employment Programme
INEP	Integrated National Electrification Program	PES	Provincial Equitable Share
IRF	Impulse-Response Function	PFMA	Public Finance Management Act
ISRDP	Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Programme	PICC	Presidential Infrastructure Coordinating Commission
ISRDS	Integrated Sustainable Rural Development Strategy	PIE	Prevention of Illegal Eviction
KwH	Kilowatt Hours	PIT	Personal Income Tax
KZN	KwaZulu-Natal	PLAAS	Institute for Land and Agrarian Studies
LASS	Land Acquisition for Sustainable Development	PLAS	Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy
LBIS	Land Bank Insurance Services (Land Bank)	PRC	Presidential Review Commission
LED	Local Economic Development	PSC	Public Service Commission
LGES	Local Government Equitable Share	PSM	Propensity Score Matching
LGFF	Local Government Fiscal Framework	RADP	Recapitalisation and Development Programme
LGNF	Local Government Negotiating Forum	RBIG	Regional Bulk Infrastructure Grant
LGTA	Local Government Transition Act	RCB	Retail Commercial Banking (Land Bank)
LM	Local Municipality	RCDF	Rural and Community Development Fund
LRAD	Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development	RDP	Reconstruction and Development Programme
MDB	Municipal Demarcation Board	REM	Retail Emerging Markets (Land Bank)
MFMA	Municipal Finance Management Act	RHIG	Rural Household Infrastructure Grant
MIG	Municipal Infrastructure Grant	RHIP	Rural Household Infrastructure Programme
MISA	Municipal Infrastructure Support Agency	RICA	Regulation of Interception of Communications and Provision of Communication-Related Information Act
MPF	Municipal Participation Fund	ROA	Return on Average Assets

ROE	Return on Assets
SAHRC	South African Human Rights Commission
SALGA	South African Local Government Association
SAM	Social Accounting Matrix
SAPO	South African Post Office
SARB	South African Reserve Bank
SARS	South African Revenue Services
SIBG	School Infrastructure Backlogs Grant
SIP	Strategic Integrated Project
SLA	Service Level Agreement
SLAG	Settlement Land Acquisition Grant
SOC	State-Owned Company
SOE	State-Owned Enterprise
Stats SA	Statistics South Africa
TDCA	Trade, Development and Cooperation Agreement
TMC	Transitional Rural Council
UCLG	United Cities and Local Governments
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USA	United States of America
USDG	Urban Settlement Development Grant
VAT	Value Added Tax
VECM	Vector Error Correction Model
VIP	Ventilated Improved Pits
VRS	Variable Returns to Scale
WHO	World Health Organization
WLA	White Local Authority
WSA	Water Service Authority
WSP	Water Service Providers
WTA	World Trade Atlas

# FOREWORD AND EDITORIAL

**T**he Financial and Fiscal Commission (the Commission) tables at Parliament its Annual Submission for the Division of Revenue every year. The Submission is made in terms of Section 214(1) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (1996), Section 9 of the Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations Act (No. 97 of 1997) and Section 4(4c) of the Money Bills Amendment Procedure and Related Matters Act (No. 9 of 2009).

This Submission is part of the Commission's constitutionally defined processes, to advise Parliament and state organs on how the money collected by national government should be allocated fairly and equitably among the three spheres of government, to enable them to carry out their constitutional and other legal mandates. Intergovernmental fiscal transfers are a dominant feature in South Africa, as the bulk of government revenue is raised at national level and then allocated to subnational government (municipalities and provinces) through the equitable share and other grants. On 27 May 2016, the Commission tabled at Parliament its Annual Submission for the 2017/18 Division of Revenue. This volume of technical chapters is published as a companion document to the Annual Submission.

The theme of this year's Submission is the Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations System and Rural Development in South Africa. Rural areas cover 80% of South Africa's land and are home to almost 40% of the population. Although poverty and economic deprivation have declined significantly since 1994, rural areas lag behind the country as a whole. Despite increased funding, rural regions are not performing as well as urban areas, and the unemployment rate, particularly among the youth, in rural areas is much higher than the national unemployment rate. Poverty is a manifestation of under-development emanating from a range of factors, including historical legacies, under-investment and structural issues. As a result of historical social engineering policies and weak regional economies, rural areas carry the highest burden of poverty. This burden imposes additional demands for services and funding on rural provinces and municipalities.

Government has recognised the need for integrated rural development – one of the key objectives of the National Development Plan (NDP) is an "Integrated and Inclusive Rural Economy" by 2030, while rural development is one of the priority areas identified in the Medium Term Strategic Frameworks (MTSF) of 2009–2014 and 2014–2019. However, this new approach has not yet been accompanied by a substantial reallocation of resources. Part of the problem is that, like many other countries, South Africa does not have a government-wide, officially agreed and accepted definition of "rural". This lack of a common definition has led to a plethora of rural development programmes across government departments.

To date, the fiscal framework has not had a significant impact on rural development for various reasons, including (a) the transfer system from national government; (b) uncollected property rates and/or service charges that are not cost-reflective; (c) leakages, including bad management, inefficient procurement, under-spending and institutional challenges. The Submission provides evidence on how improving the efficiency of intergovernmental fiscal relations can assist national government, public entities, provinces and municipalities to stimulate rural development through prioritising public investments and interventions.

Rural development is a complex process and is not just about agricultural development, as agriculture contributes less than 3% to South Africa's economy. Indeed farm families increasingly rely on off-farm employment and social grants. Therefore, land reform needs to go beyond agriculture and farm-based activities. Rural areas require new economic engines and initiatives that seek to expand industrial activities, enhance agricultural productivity, and foster greater production linkages within agro-processing industries.

Given this complexity, rural development requires proper coordination among the institutions and departments involved. Coordination is needed at both local level and between national and subnational governments, in order to integrate sectoral approaches, to involve private partners and to achieve the appropriate geographic scale. Public

entities, such as state-owned companies (e.g. Eskom, Telkom) and development finance institutions (e.g. Land Bank, Industrial Development Corporation) also have a responsibility to support rural development. However, they invest modestly in rural areas and do little to crowd in the private sector.

Perhaps the most challenging aspect of rural development is ensuring that provinces and municipalities are well funded, through own-revenues and transfers from nationally collected revenue. Rural provinces have limited economic activity and a narrow tax base, which means that they rely heavily on central government for funding. As a result, they have little spending discretion (i.e. ability to direct resources towards province-specific needs). While the principle of supporting the poorer regions or provinces through grants or special projects is generally well-supported, there is no agreed method for determining poverty levels and related needs among regions. In addition, government's current rural strategies are often sector-based and do not allow for the different developmental needs of rural regions, many of which depend on exploiting special local resources. For example, policies to encourage rain-fed activities, such as livestock and cropping, are clearly not suitable for all areas. This sector-based approach, coupled with the lack of intergovernmental coordination, has led to the two main rural grants servicing the same target audience and funding the same activities. Greater alignment is needed between the land reform programme and other rural development policies.

Like rural provinces, the majority of municipalities in rural areas depend heavily on transfers to fulfil their mandate. This is in part because they have limited scope for economic diversification, exhibit deficient services and infrastructure and revenue bases are declining because of high unemployment and population losses through migration. In addition, rural municipalities face the dilemma of expanding expenditure requirements, including caring for the farm workers and dwellers who are evicted from farms – these evictions are the unintended consequences of laws introduced since 1994 to regulate the rights of farm workers. Municipalities have to use their own funds because currently the intergovernmental fiscal instruments do not cater for evictions.

The main purpose of this Technical Report is to explore how improving the efficiency of intergovernmental fiscal relations (IGFR) can assist national government, provinces and municipalities to stimulate rural development through prioritising public investments and interventions. If managed properly, fiscal reforms for rural development can bring about greater inter-regional equity and potential economic growth. While the focus is on rural areas, the debate should not be an "either-or" choice between urban and rural development, as both exist in parallel throughout South Africa. The Commission is also inter-

>>

<sup>1</sup> Place-based policies refer to government efforts to enhance the economic performance of an area within its jurisdiction (in this case a rural area), typically in the form of transfers to facilitate more job opportunities, higher wages or basic consumption. Perhaps the best known place-based policies are those that target underperforming areas, such as deteriorating rural areas or relatively disadvantaged areas eligible for regional development aid such as former Bantustans.

ested in urban development, as both rural and urban regions can contribute to national growth and poverty alleviation.

A vexing methodological question confronting practitioners is whether these IGFR instruments for rural policies work. Despite growing interest among policy-makers, very little research has documented the results of place-based rural development policies<sup>1</sup>, and what determines success or failure. This is because isolating the impact of cross-sectoral policies is difficult, especially in quantitative terms.

Two pillars dominate the conceptual framework underpinning the work in this volume:

1. Weak and ineffective IGFR instruments, which are a major constraint for planning, implementing, operating and maintaining rural development interventions.
2. Institutional failures and deficiencies, which account for a large part of this state of affairs, in particular weak governance and technical and administrative capabilities.

At the broadest level, this Technical Report will enhance our understanding of emerging trends in rural-urban development and their theoretical and practical implications for South Africa. Reflecting the diversity of systems and practices, the Report adopts a multi-layered and multi-levelled approach, covering local, regional and provincial aspects, and encompassing many actors, institutions, enterprises, state enterprises and social movements. While these multiple dimensions are modelled here as distinguishable from one another, in reality they cannot be separated, as they are intertwined in various ways. For example, public investment in urban areas can affect poverty directly or indirectly, and at different levels (i.e. household, municipal, provincial or national), while the magnitude and direction of impacts will depend on the type of investment. Therefore, the impacts of investments must be assessed holistically. In essence, this is the concept of a general equilibrium, in that the inter-relations, interactions, exchanges and positive externalities are expressed simultaneously across all dimensions. Similarly, the general equilibrium concept is not limited to urban areas but captures all possible elements that share the same geographical space on both the consumption and production side. The notion of general equilibrium only becomes meaningful when this wider set of interdependencies, interactions, and the implied synergies and externalities are taken into account. In assessing the impact of public investments in urban areas, the importance of institutional arrangements needs to be highlighted. Institutional arrangements are structures and mechanisms of social configuration and cooperation and can be formal and/or informal.

Reflecting the ambitions of this volume, each of the chapters takes the form of a structured narrative, which (unlike descriptive accounts) maps the interaction between multiple variables that the literature suggests may contribute to institutional change. In line with this approach, a mix of econometric and simulation/modelling methods and tools are used to assess the impacts of IGFR instruments in rural areas. To attach numbers to relationships requires quantification and modelling. However, identifying the types of socio-economic models that can be used to analyse rural policy issues is fraught with difficulty. The model types used take into account the different policy measures corresponding to each generic policy issue and thus the “compatibility” of each measure with types of socio-economic models that are able to carry out the analysis.

Defining the policy effects that models can capture is complicated. A policy-impact analysis can be directed towards more than one type of effect, and different “perspectives” can drive the definition of the effects to be measured (as relevant). These include policy-eligibility criteria (e.g. low agricultural incomes, high share of agricultural employment, etc.), micro-level direct variables (e.g. new economic activities generated, or new quality products produced), economy-wide impacts of policy measures (e.g. on employment, income, structures) and “meta” issues such as regional economic growth and convergence or residual choice (to which rural development policies seem to contribute). The approach adopted here draws on the literature, as well as the researchers’ relevant experience in research and policy analysis, and concentrates on modelling approaches judged to be suitable on the evaluation of “most important” effects.

Another important issue, which influences not the choice of model but the choice of scale, is related to the issue of spill-overs. Ideally (i.e. to serve a comprehensive policy-evaluation exercise), every model type could be used at the lowest possible sectoral level. However, spill-over effects and the rather wide scale of the socio-economic process do not allow such an approach.

Finally, another issue taken into account is the difficulty that several model types have in distinguishing the effects induced by the (specific) policy alone. This is a major/traditional methodological problem, and its solution is included here. However, where appropriate, there is a hint that a model might be more useful for assessing the likely impacts in the absence of policy intervention.

It is difficult to isolate the impact of a particular external (exogenous) shock from underlying trends and from other internal and external factors that influence economic performance. These factors include price movements of major imports and exports, changes in government economic policy, booms and slumps in the world economy, or the effects of civil or international conflict. Therefore, an eclectic approach

is adopted, using a mixture of quantitative and qualitative analysis. The quantitative analysis combines regression analysis and an examination of movements around trends, “before-and-after” impacts of instrument changes, and forecasts versus actual performance of key economic indicators. Other relevant approaches are drawn upon, including those used in constructing computable general equilibrium (CGE) models, input-output tables and social accounting matrices (SAMs). Furthermore, a number of the drought impacts are qualitative and not easily captured within the framework of a formal model. Therefore, qualitative approaches included stakeholder interviews and perception surveys. In addition, desk-based statistical studies of the relationships between economic performance and IGFR instruments were undertaken. Finally, case studies examine the interlinking issues of farm evictions and municipal finances in selected municipalities that have experienced actual farm expulsions.

The Technical Report consists of 15 chapters that are organised into four parts:

1. Macro-Micro and Fiscal Context of Rural Development
2. National Government and Rural Development
3. Provincial Government and Rural Development
4. Rural Municipalities and Rural Development

**Part I** presents the methods and tools applied in the analysis of the many different topics, as well as an overview of the definitions of rural development. Rural areas account for four-fifths of the land and are home to about two-fifths of the population in South Africa. Although poverty and economic deprivation have reduced substantially since the advent of democracy, greater poverty is found in provinces that contain former homelands (only the Western Cape and Gauteng did not “inherit” former homeland territory). Like many other countries, South Africa does not have a government-wide, officially agreed and accepted definition of “rural”. Understanding what “rural” means is particularly important when assessing programmes aimed at stimulating rural development. This lack of a common definition may explain the plethora of rural development programmes that are found in virtually every corner of the government. Furthermore, measurement issues remain unresolved, and so the relationship between rural development, intergovernmental fiscal relations instruments and related aspects (such as land reform, food security or infrastructure) is not always clearly defined and understood. Thus, the effectiveness of spending on rural development is unclear. This section sets the context for the rest of the Technical Report, by looking at these issues and offering the lens through which the Commission will approach the contestable areas. It examines the socio-economic profile and characteristics of rural areas, as well as how to define rural areas, and assesses how rural regions are coping with

economic change, and the weight of agriculture and agricultural spending in rural economies. It also explores the evolution of rural policy, including who is implementing policy for rural areas and whether integrated rural policies work, and presents the rural development model underlying the Commission's recommendations.

**Part II** presents chapters focusing on national government and rural development. Over the past decade, South Africa has implemented many rural development strategies focused on mostly land reform and restructuring the country's agrarian economy, as a catalyst for poverty reduction and wider societal transformation. In recent years, conditional grants have been used to fund the flagship policy programmes. However, agriculture's declining share (in terms of employment and gross value added) has raised concerns about the efficacy of directed public investments in agriculture for achieving growth, reducing rural poverty and creating a vibrant and inclusive rural economy. Three aspects are examined in this section. The first seeks to show that agriculture and non-agricultural linkages can play an important economic development role and, if well managed, the interactions between the two can be the basis for economically, socially and environmentally balanced regional development. The second argues that land reform is essential because for many poor rural households, land is the main source of livelihood and means for investing, accumulating and transferring wealth. Providing secure rights in land they already possess can significantly increase the net wealth of rural households. Finally the third deals with state entities and their critical developmental role in the economy, looking at what state-owned companies (SOCs) and development finance institutions (DFIs) do in rural spaces and what they need to do in order to be drivers of rural growth.

In **Part III**, the primary focus is on provincial government and rural development. Like many other developing countries, South Africa is characterised by disparities across provincial jurisdictions. The distribution of poverty is highly skewed, with the rural provinces carrying the highest burden due to historical social engineering policies and weak regional economies. The higher poverty burden imposes additional demands for services and funding on rural provinces, but the funding framework for provinces is not adequately sensitive to the different developmental needs. Poverty is a manifestation of under-development emanating from a range of factors including historical legacies, under-investment and structural issues. Limited economic activity and a narrow tax base impede the ability of rural areas to mobilise sufficient resources to finance their own development programmes, leaving them dependent on the centre for both transfers and interventions. As a result, their spending discretion (i.e. directing resources towards province-specific needs) is limited – the provincial equitable share, which accounts for 80% of revenue, is normally tied to national priorities and statutory responsibilities. Similarly, spending on the remainder of the funding from conditional transfers is restricted to

specific sector and expenditure activities. The inability of the rural provinces to intervene in their spaces through the powers and functions assigned to them by the Constitution is evident from their consistent maladministration practices and fiscal management failures. Whereas such failures reflect poor fiscal choices, the lack of appropriate skills in the rural areas may also exacerbate management inadequacies and thus reinforce rural under-development.

**Part IV** addresses rural municipalities and rural development. Poor access to adequate levels and standards of basic services compound the challenges of poverty and unemployment in rural areas. Dealing with these challenges requires not only a strong national government but also a capable and capacitated local government – the sphere of government closest to the people. However, despite increased funding and interventions over the years, this has not translated into commensurate service delivery improvements in the majority of rural municipalities. Initiatives underway include the recent review of the local government equitable share formula introduced in 2013, the ongoing "Back to Basics" initiative, as well as the infrastructure grant reviews. In addition, amalgamations of municipalities are being experimented with in order to turn around the fortunes of this sphere of government. Yet many municipalities continue to under-spend their budgets, and suffer from inefficient procurement and irregular and wasteful spending, bad management and outright corruption. For many rural municipalities, their dilemma is one of expanding expenditure requirements and shrinking fiscal space. This part of the Technical Report looks first and foremost at whether the resources transferred to the sector are adequate and used efficiently and effectively. It then considers the extent and costs of farm displacements, and how rural local municipalities can deal with this problem and the associated costs. Furthermore, the section evaluates the role of district municipalities in rural development. Lastly, the focus turns to finding innovative ways of tapping into economic activity in rural areas, and developing new sources of municipal income while arresting the decline in existing sources.

The chapters that make up the four parts of this Technical Report are briefly described below.

In **Chapter 1**, Ramos Mabugu outlines and addresses IGFR problems associated with rural development. After describing the main rural development issues (i.e. rural development, classification and spatial characteristics, economic activities and the impact on growth and jobs, the role of migration and declining agricultural jobs in rural areas), the macroeconomic issues influencing rural development are summarised. Next, the conceptual framework underlying the Technical Report is developed, taking into account the strong interdependence of national, provincial and local government and differences across municipalities. The rest of the chapter looks at the evolution of rural policy, the main rural development actors, and the flagship rural policies and interventions. The final

section gives recommendations that set the context underlying the more detailed recommendations in the rest of the report.

The aim of **Chapter 2**, by Hammed Amusa, is to examine the role of targeted intergovernmental transfers in reducing rural poverty. This chapter looks at the contribution of the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors to poverty reduction and local/regional economic growth. The study found that agricultural activities represent an important driver of incomes and local economic growth in rural municipalities because of their positive effect on non-agricultural sectors. However, growth within the non-agricultural sector can lead to resources leaving the agriculture sector, causing a slow-down in productivity growth or a decline in overall value-added output. Growth within the agriculture sector exerts significant poverty-reducing effects and can be a powerful tool for lifting people out of poverty. However, this comparative edge over growth in the non-agricultural sector declines in the presence of a large public sector and deep poverty. In such instances, growth in non-agriculture per-capita value added is a more powerful tool for reducing poverty. The chapter recommends reviewing the agricultural grants targeted at small-scale farmers and creating linkages between the agriculture and non-agricultural sectors.

Ghalieb Dawood evaluates the national land reform programme's impacts on rural development in **Chapter 3**. A field-based approach across three selected provinces is used to investigate the impact of land reform on food and nutrition security, job creation and agricultural output. Then ways of improving the intergovernmental implementation of land reform are explored. The study found that land reform beneficiaries are worse off than those who did not benefit, and that land reform has had a negative effect on job creation and farm productivity. Clear duplication and overlaps exist between the Recapitalisation and Development Programme (RADP) and the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) grants, while major gaps include the lack of affordable loans for land reform beneficiaries and planning for land reform. The findings reveal that weak administration and implementation have compounded poor outcomes of land reform. The chapter recommends consolidating the RADP and CASP grants into one funding programme and clarifying the role of municipalities in providing support to land reform. It also notes the need for a wider perspective to land reform that goes beyond agriculture and farm-based activities.

**Chapter 4** by Sasha Peters, Poppie Ntaka and Thembe Ntshakala analyses ways of enhancing the role of state-owned companies (SOCs) in rural development. SOCs have a responsibility to align to the country's national goals and support government's initiatives aimed at addressing the socio-economic legacy of the past. This chapter's overarching objective is to assess the role of SOCs in rural development. The study found that the studied SOCs (Eskom, Telkom, Transnet and the

South African Post Office or SAPO) do not have a specific rural focus. The chapter recommends reconfiguring and modernising the South African Post Office (SAPO) to broaden its focus, improving Transnet's contribution to regional economic growth and expanding Telkom's network infrastructure in rural areas.

**Chapter 5** by Thando Ngozo analyses ways of enhancing the role of development finance institutions (DFIs) in rural development. DFIs are expected to play an instrumental role in the implementation of developmental policies and act as catalysts for accelerated industrialisation, economic growth and human resource development. The chapter examines the role of four DFIs – the Land Bank, Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), Industrial Development Corporation (IDC) and the National Empowerment Fund (NEF) – in enhancing rural economic development, and how they can support rural development. The study found that investments by DFIs in rural areas are minimal and declining. The chapter recommends designating a single champion and coordinating entity for rural finance and development to guide investment by DFIs in rural areas.

In **Chapter 6**, Thando Ngozo evaluates the extent to which provincial own-revenues respond to rural development needs. The fiscal decentralisation and IGFR systems entrenched by the Constitution assign to provinces narrow-based taxes, which means that they have lower fiscal autonomy and tax-raising powers than other government spheres. This constitutional constraint means that all provinces – and especially rural provinces – have a limited ability to generate own-revenues. This chapter explores the scope for increasing provincial own-revenues and examines the shared tax base model as a viable alternative. The study found that, with the exception of KwaZulu-Natal, rural provinces have low own revenues (because of narrow tax bases) and high levels of poverty – poverty constrains the ability of provinces to generate own revenues. The chapter recommends investing in infrastructure and quality education and training in order to enhance economic growth and employment, and thereby grow the tax base.

**Chapter 7** by Eddie Rakabe evaluates the extent to which provincial fiscal transfers (provincial equitable share and conditional grants) respond to rural development needs. Rural provinces in South Africa have the heaviest burden of under-development, and are characterised by weak economic activity, poor socio-economic conditions and high infrastructure backlogs. The chapter assesses the responsiveness of the fiscal transfers to the needs of rural provinces and the extent to which rural provinces prioritise development. The study found that provincial fiscal transfers show mixed results. The equitable share makes no visible distinction in the allocations to various provinces (to address disparities), while infrastructure conditional grants allocations seem to favour the rural provinces. The grants supporting agrarian development and the eradication of other rural-specific in-

infrastructure backlogs have design, targeting and spending deficiencies. The chapter recommends that the allocation framework for rural development grants be aligned to the national rural development policy imperatives.

In **Chapter 8**, Poppie Ntaka, Ghalieb Dawood and Sasha Peters assess government's fiscal instruments to fund job creation in rural areas, and in particular public employment programmes (PEPs). This chapter assesses the targeting and benefits of PEPs to households in rural areas. The outcomes of the Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) and the Community Works Programme (CWP) in rural areas are compared using a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods. Specific focus areas include job opportunities created, the intergovernmental implementation model and cost effectiveness. The CWP was found to be more effective than the EPWP at creating employment opportunities in rural areas. In addition, the CWP's design and implementation is better able to meet the needs of rural communities and to foster social cohesion. In order to achieve the NDP target of two million full-time recipients by 2020, the chapter recommends that the training component of PEPs be strengthened and that PEP spending be restructured, so that more resources can be directed at the CWP and the non-profit and social sectors of the EPWP, which are labour-intensive and more cost-effective, and have activities that are easily implementable in rural areas.

**Chapter 9**, by Zanele Tullock, is about developing rural local municipalities' own-revenue sources. Municipalities require diverse and "non-traditional" revenue sources to address their growing responsibilities and pay for their operations, infrastructure and maintenance. This chapter examines the potential for additional own-revenue taxes that could benefit rural municipalities and explores constraints to the property revenue base. The study found that, despite property taxes being generally deemed to be a reliable source for local governments, this is not the case in rural municipalities because of deficient property tax administration. Other possible additional revenue sources (outside of property taxes and electricity service charges) include "user fees" for social amenities and "restaurant/hotel fees" in areas with a vibrant tourism industry. The chapter recommends that rural municipalities ensure their property registers and valuation rolls are up to date and be capacitated to collect such taxes.

**Chapter 10**, by Mkhululi Ncube and Jabulile Monnakgotla, is about financing rural local municipalities for rural development needs. Government is seeking to make rural municipalities self-sufficient and less dependent on transfers, through amalgamating municipalities. This chapter examines whether the model (whereby all municipalities are financially viable) is appropriate for rural municipalities, considering their weak and fragile revenue bases. The study found that amalgamations are a weak instrument for pursuing financial viability of rural municipalities and the wrong one for improving the functionality of municipalities. The chapter recommends that the

transfer system be sensitive to financially unviable municipalities, and that financial viability be achieved through economic development and functionality through legislative, policy and capacity-building measures.

**Chapter 11**, by Mkhululi Ncube and Jabulile Monnakgotla, is about the adequacy of the local government equitable share (LGES) and conditional grants for rural development needs. This chapter investigates whether the LGES and conditional grants compensate municipalities sufficiently for their lack of own revenues, and whether the new LGES has had the desired outcomes. The study found that transfers adequately compensate rural local municipalities for the lack of own revenues in some services and not in others. Viewing a grant in isolation, rather than taking a holistic view of all grants, may give the impression that a service is underfunded, when this is not the case. The chapter recommends that grants continue to be consolidated and reviewed regularly to ensure needs and resources are aligned, and (along with the LGES) that they are informed by objective cost estimates.

**Chapter 12** by Nomfundo Vacu is about the effectiveness of transfers to local municipalities for rural development needs. The main objective of this chapter is to assess the effectiveness and efficient use of intergovernmental transfers in South African rural municipalities. The study found that conditional grants are under-spent, and yet these municipalities have significant backlogs in almost all services. Rural municipalities are not prioritising their spending, as shown by the resources spent on employee costs compared to vital expenditure needs such as repairs and maintenance of existing infrastructure. It also found that the performance of rural municipalities can be improved without necessarily increasing the amount of resources. The provision of FBS and the lack of institutional capacity are the major causes of technical inefficiencies in rural municipalities, whereas economic performance, municipal size and grant reliance have positive effects on municipal efficiency. The chapter recommends more stringent expenditure supervision of rural local municipalities by national and provincial governments.

**Chapter 13**, by Mkhululi Ncube and Nomfundo Vacu, evaluates the effectiveness of district municipalities (DMs) for rural development. DMs have an important role to play in rural development and in assisting local municipalities to fulfil their mandate. This chapter assesses the effectiveness and efficient use of intergovernmental transfers in the South African rural local government space and evaluates the role of DMs in rural development. The study found that DMs under-spend on conditional grants and on infrastructure repairs and maintenance, and that many DMs are not performing their core legislative functions, which is compromising local economic development. The chapter recommends that DMs should be retained in rural (not urban) areas and be tasked with more complex tasks, in particular water and electricity infrastructure, in addition to strategic regional planning and coordination. The

chapter recommends strengthening the capacity of DMs so that they can support weaker municipalities, and making DMs more accountable to citizens.

**Chapter 14**, by Thembe Ntshakala, analyses the extent of farm evictions and the increasing responsibilities of rural local municipalities. Since 1994, government has introduced numerous laws, policies and initiatives to regulate and improve the situation and rights of farm dwellers and farm workers. However, unintended consequences have been a climate of uncertainty in the agriculture sector and the eviction of farm workers and dwellers from farms. The chapter examines the extent of the burden caused by farm evictions and explores how fiscal instruments can respond to this widespread situation. According to legislation and court rulings, the responsibility of caring for the vulnerable evictees increasingly falls on municipalities, thereby creating an unfunded mandate. The study found that municipalities have to use their own funds because currently the intergovernmental fiscal instruments do not cater for evictions. The chapter recommends that the current disaster grant should be allowed to include (or cater for) eviction-related emergencies. Furthermore, government should strengthen the coordination and implementation of the existing programmes targeting the increasing number of displaced farm workers and dwellers.

In **Chapter 15**, Sabelo Mtantato reviews the effectiveness of fiscal instruments and governance in enhancing sanitation in rural areas. Improving sanitation infrastructure reduces the risk of infection from excreta-related diseases, particularly for children under the age of five years. Since 1994, the government has introduced programmes to reduce sanitation backlogs. The chapter reviews funding and institutional constraints that are undermining government's efforts to address sanitation backlogs in rural areas, where backlogs remain high. The study found that the high backlogs are because of limited revenue sources, the poor performance of the Rural Household Infrastructure Grant (in part as a result of municipalities failing to submit business plans on time), the lack of prioritising sanitation infrastructure (not included in IDPs) and a failure to plan, budget and undertake maintenance. The chapter recommends that rural municipalities should include sanitation in their IDPs and develop a complete sanitation infrastructure plan that includes relevant technologies, and scheduled and costed periodical maintenance.

*Ramos Mabugu, Research and Recommendations  
Programme Director*

# ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Ramos Mabugu** is Head of the Research and Recommendations Division at the Commission and a Fellow at the University of Stellenbosch, South Africa. He has published on topics related to applied economics, public finance, tax policy, and intergovernmental fiscal relations. Most of his economic modelling work is on the application of computable general equilibrium (CGE) models, social accounting matrix (SAM) methods, input-output methods, and macroeconomic models. In collaboration with colleagues, Ramos has pioneered the first applications of CGE microsimulation (static and dynamic) in two Southern African countries. He has taught and supervised at postgraduate level at the University of Zimbabwe and the University of Pretoria, South Africa. While at the University of Pretoria, Ramos was instrumental in setting up a collaborative environmental economics MSc and PhD training programme. He has served as a consultant for many organisations and was an external examiner for several universities. Ramos has also taught economic modelling courses at the Ecological and Environmental Economics Programme at the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP) in Italy. In 2003/04, Ramos gave technical advice at the Centre for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Indonesia, and Sida, Sweden. In 2006 he was awarded the visiting fellowship award from Curtin University in Australia, in recognition of his contributions to intergovernmental fiscal relations modelling. He earned his PhD in economics from the University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

**Hammed Amusa** is Programme Manager of the Commission's Macroeconomics and Public Finance Unit. He holds a PhD in Economics from Northern Illinois University in the USA. His work at the Commission focuses mainly on using quantitative tools to understand the impacts of public finance policies, especially those related to intergovernmental fiscal relations. Hammed's research interests are in understanding the political economy of resource redistribution and the impact of public policies.

**Ghalieb Dawood** is Programme Manager of the Commission's Provincial Budget Analysis Unit. He holds an MSc in Economics from the University of Cape Town and is a qualified adult education specialist. His work focuses mainly on budget analysis, division of revenue and fiscal frameworks, provincial sector priorities and costing. Ghalieb's current research interests are in the areas of food security, public transport systems, the public sector wage bill and productivity analysis. Prior to joining the Commission, he was a Programme Manager at the Applied Fiscal Research Centre and has worked as an independent consultant, focusing mainly on public finance, institutional development, monitoring and evaluation, costing, intergovernmental fiscal relations, budget analysis, governance and oversight.

**Sasha Peters** is Programme Manager of the Commission's National Budget Analysis Unit. She has an MPhil in Public Policy from the University of Cape Town. Her focus areas are budget analysis, electricity, municipal debt, service delivery arrangements and local government capacity in South Africa. Previously, Sasha was employed at the Presidency and within IDASA's Budget Information Services, where her focus was mainly on the social sector and the departments of education, health and social development.

**Poppie Ntaka** is a Researcher within the Commission's National Budget Analysis Unit. She holds a MCom in Economics from the University of Stellenbosch and an MA in Development Economics from the University of Göttingen, Germany. Her work at the Commission focuses mainly on national budget analysis and issues relating to economic development. Her research interests are in the areas of social policy and the economics of education.

**Thembie Ntshakala** is Programme Manager of the Commission's Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations Unit. She holds a PhD in Public Administration from the University of KwaZulu Natal and is a professional planner. Her work at the Commission focuses mainly on intergovernmental fiscal and financial relations issues. Prior to joining the Commission, she worked in local government (in a number of municipalities), where she was involved in integrated planning, spatial planning, land-use management frameworks and performance management.

**Thando Ngozo** is a Senior Researcher in the Commission's Macroeconomics and Public Finance Unit. He holds a Master's degree in International Economics and Public Policy from Cardiff University in the United Kingdom and an MBA from Milpark Business School. His work at the Commission focuses mainly on macroeconomic and public finance analysis, taxation issues and fiscal decentralisation. Thando's research interests are in the areas of development finance, taxation policy, domestic resource mobilisation and economic development.

**Eddie Rakabe** is Programme Manager of the Commission's Fiscal Policy Unit. He holds a Master's in Economics Policy and Development from the University of Johannesburg. His focus areas are the design of intergovernmental grants, public expenditure efficiency and various provincial and local government fiscal framework issues. Eddie is also part of the Research Project on Employment, Income Distribution and Inclusive Growth (REDI3x3) (managed by SALDRU), where he publishes occasionally on aspects related to low-income markets, second economy activities and inclusive growth.

Before joining the Commission in 2007, Eddie worked at the National Treasury as a policy analyst in the Local Government Finance Policy Unit and as senior economist in the Provincial Policy Unit. In 2004, Eddie received an award in the postgraduate category of the Nedbank/Budget speech competition for a paper on black economic empowerment.

**Zanele Tullock** is a Senior Researcher within the Commission's Local Government Unit. She holds a Master's degree in Public and Development Management (cum laude) from the University of Witwatersrand and an MBA (Finance and Entrepreneurship) from the University of Pretoria's Gordon Institute of Business Science (GIBS). Her work at the Commission focuses mainly on local government accountability, fiscal decentralisation, local government budget analysis and governance, and economic development. Zanele's research interests are in the areas of development finance, micro-finance, local economic development and infrastructural development.

**Mkhululi Ncube** is Programme Manager of the Commission's Local Government Unit. He holds a PhD in Economics from the University of Gothenburg, Sweden. Mkhululi has also lectured at various universities in and outside South Africa. His present research interests are climate change and fiscal policies, local government budget analysis and gender budgeting. He is passionate about local economic development issues and sustainable resource utilisation in urban spaces.

**Jabulile Monnagotla** holds a Master's degree in Economic Science from the University of the Witwatersrand. At the time of writing this Technical Report, she worked within the Commission's Local Government Unit and is currently working in the Development Policy Research Unit at the University of Cape Town. Jabulile's research interests are in the areas of macroeconomics, finance, international trade, development and growth.

**Nomfundo Vacu** is a Researcher within the Commission's Local Government Unit. She holds a Master's degree in Economics from the University of Fort Hare. Her work at the Commission focuses on financial and non-financial performance of municipalities, local economic development and understanding the dynamics of the South African local government sector. Nomfundo's research interests are in the areas of public finance, macroeconomics, financial markets and international economics. Before joining the Commission in 2015, she worked at the University of South Africa as a research assistant in the Macroeconomic Policy Analysis Programme.

**Sabelo Mtantato** is a Senior Researcher within the Commission's Fiscal Policy Unit. He holds a Master's in Economics from the University of KwaZulu-Natal. He focuses mainly on intergovernmental fiscal relations issues in a number of areas, including human settlements and land-use planning and management. He has also worked on various research projects related to public transport and roads infrastructure. Before joining the Commission, Sabelo worked in the Public Finance Division of National Treasury and the Mergers and Acquisitions Division at the Competition Commission.