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A B S T R A C T

The aim of this paper is to assess intergovernmental relations in the implementation of social housing policy in Gauteng Province, South Africa. Despite all mechanisms, efforts and resources, the pace of social housing delivery is not at a point where it is measurably satisfactory across all spheres of government. The performance of government shows a lack of institutionalised arrangements, coordination, and alignment in implementing social housing policy. A mixed-methods research approach was implemented. Interviews were conducted with senior managers and research questionnaires were administered with operational staff within the national, provincial government and the three metropolitan municipalities in Gauteng Province which included City of Tshwane, City of Johannesburg and Ekurhuleni, state agencies involved in the delivery of social housing units and municipal social housing institutions. The data were complemented by documentary content analysis pertaining to the provision of human settlements and social housing. The paper acknowledges the role played by government in implementing social housing policy, however, it proposes a model to fast track social housing delivery in Gauteng Province.
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Introduction

Like many other developing countries in the world, South Africa is in the throes of an unprecedented housing crisis. It faces a growing challenge in providing all citizens with access to adequate suitable or adequate housing despite the Constitution stating that ‘everyone has a right to have access to adequate housing’ and that the ‘state must take reasonable legislative and other measure, with its available resources, to achieve the progressive realisation of this right’ (Marutlulle, 2021:2) For many years South Africans, have faced challenges in accessing adequate houses. The government is unable to address and eradicate the housing backlogs both qualitatively and quantitatively and has resorted to strategies, housing plans and guidelines and new ways of policy implementation.

There are gaps in the current social housing policy, and these include lack of enabling principles in the current social housing policy in relation to the speedy release of land for social housing development, efficient social housing funding model which facilitate accelerated disbursement of funds to implement social housing projects and programmes. The policy is silent on key project coordination and project management activities such as planning, financing, and deliverables to implement social housing project at all government levels, the social housing intergovernmental relations system is not streamlined at policy level to ensure there is common understanding between the three spheres of government in terms of operationalisation of priorities and targets. The current social housing intergovernmental relations system is not clearly articulated at policy level to ensure there is alignment and integration between the three spheres of government, state agencies and social housing institutions. Prevailing material conditions and the actions taken by social housing actors are not synchronized to ensure social housing project data is updated automatically between actors to maintain consistency within the social housing delivery system. The policy is not addressing capacity issues at local government level and delivery agents. The problem manifest itself in the slow delivery of social housing wherein the government is failing to reach its target of delivering 20 000 units in five years and has failed to provide bulk infrastructure for human settlements development.
and social housing opportunities meaning that the implementation of social housing policy requires planning, funding, and cooperation between the different spheres of government (Chattopadhyay and Wittington, 2019:16).

The focus is on South Africa as a developing country given a huge demand for affordable rental housing in Gauteng Province as an economic hub, where people from other provinces migrate to in search for economic opportunities. Furthermore, people from other countries especially from neighbouring countries such as Zimbabwe, Eswatini, Mozambique, Lesotho and Botswana settle first in Gauteng Province before they relocate to other provinces. In this context there will always be a backlog for affordable rental housing wherein the government, and municipalities must ensure the environment is conducive for social housing delivery agents to deliver social housing units within the policy prescripts and within a well-defined intergovernmental relations system. The study answered the following research questions: how do the three spheres of government interact in the implementation of social housing?, what are key challenges impacting role players in the delivery of social housing units?, what are the institutional, legal and policy framework governing the three spheres of government in the implementation of social housing?, what are the roles played by regulatory institutions in the delivery of social housing?, and what social housing delivery model can be utilised in Gauteng Province to fast track the delivery of social housing units?

In responding to these questions, the study presents the reviewed literature, the methodological steps followed, the conceptualisation of social housing followed by the data collected and analysis. Subsequently the limitations of the study are spelled out including how their effect was mitigated. The article proceeds to articulate the discussion of findings and propose a model for tackling intergovernmental relations. Drawing from the discussion of results the article presents recommendations that can contribute to the enhancement of social housing delivery.

**Literature Review**

The relationship between the three spheres of government is explained through the term intergovernmental relations. Mathebula (2011:1416) defines intergovernmental relations (IGR) as the various combinations and interactions conducted by government officials, elected and/or appointed, between and among spheres of government and organs of the state. The term “intergovernmental relations” refers to the symbiotic, interdependent, interrelated, cooperative liaisons and functions that exist amongst the three spheres of government in South Africa, namely the national, provincial, and local governments (South Africa, 1996). Onwughalu, Obiorah and Ishaka (2018:2) noted that how these spheres of government relate and interact in the performance of government functions is known as intergovernmental relations. According to Matusitz (2013:66) the modern intergovernmental relations system integrates information, communication, development of new organisational designs and management to explain how intergovernmental relations processes evolve in complex political environments. IGR are an integral and pervasive part of modern political systems of growing importance as complexities of modern governance increase (Phillimore, 2013:228).

An effective and efficient intergovernmental relations system promotes functional partnerships, collaborations, and co-operation between or amongst states and between or amongst spheres of governments to deliver infrastructural development, capacity building and resource sharing (Onwughalu, et al, 2018:1). Matusitz (2013:67) further mentions that organisations collaborate and participate in joint ventures, and this is applicable to South Africa, where the provision of social housing involves collaboration and joint efforts between the three spheres of government, government entities, non-government entities, financiers, and to a greater extent, the beneficiaries of a social housing project. The missing link in the housing system is a theoretical underpinning that is holistic and sensitive enough to address the gaps that describe how key players, in this case, national, provincial, and local governments, social housing institutions, financiers, regulators and other interest groups interact in such a way that there is coordination and alignment of activities.

In many developing countries, the state is involved in urban affairs and there are clear definitions of roles and responsibilities between spheres of government. According to Mukhadakhomu and Khumalo (2019:335) government has been involved in housing provision before the World War II and the development of urban settlements during that war provided a further impetus for direct state involvement in a post war period. There are formal structures of housing provision which are perceived to configure institutional relations between housing agents and determine the political terrain and terms of contestation for housing policy (Dodson, 2007:9). Akinrinde and Ololade (2021:04) attest that these structures are assigned with functions and provided with enabling empowerment, including resources, appropriate authority to enable them to discharge their responsibilities optimally. The formalisation of IGR structures helps to ensure that spheres of government interact with one another on a continuous basis. The South African IGR system combines both formal and informal interaction elements to achieve better, more productive policy outcomes and national social housing coherence (Chattopadhyay and Wittington, 2019:2). The social housing actors in the South African context include the national, provincial, and local governments and state-owned entities such as the Social Housing Regulatory Authority, the Housing Development Agency, and the Gauteng Partnership Fund. What is clear about these actors is that each has its own political mandates, priorities, targets, and perceived internal institutional arrangements in relation to how to achieve its own policy objectives. In South Africa, each sphere of government has its own constitutionally mandated tasks regarding the provision of social housing and this compels different spheres including government entities to work collaboratively to obtain policy outcomes that no single spheres of government could on its own. Consequently, an element of alignment and a coordinated approach by the government is needed to ensure that the production of housing is managed to deliver quality housing units.
Conceptualising social housing

The paper adopted the systems theory to unpack the provision of social housing. Adedire (2014:63) defines systems theory as a conceptual framework and methodology for understanding the operation of a system, where there are two or more factors that are essentially components of the whole. Systems theory is therefore defined as a series of statements about the relations among independent variables in which changes in one variable are accompanied or followed by changes in other variables. In a functional social housing delivery system, the application of systems theory cannot be overemphasised. The theory demonstrate the issues of interdependence, dependence, and interactions of variables. Systems theory is relevant to the study of social housing since there are various components interacting with one another for policy making, financing, planning, policy development and implementation, and other matters affecting state delivery of social housing opportunities. The component units are independent, interrelated, and complementary, rather than competitive. According to Lai and Lin (2017:3) components of systems theory as they relate to social housing system are structured in a hierarchical ordering and components are interdependent with one another in the system to the extent that one component cannot function without the support of other components.

The multi-faceted nature of social housing and the dynamics thereof necessitate a more integrated approach and systems thinking on the matter allows a comprehensive outlook which some of the theories do not fully articulate. Furthermore, the lack of a model for the implementation of social housing policy necessitated a more holistic approach which the systems theory was viewed as better placed to address this gap given the multiplicity of players and areas of weakness in the current policy implementation set up. The role of the private sector in partnering with government cannot be ignored and the state is incorporating societal actors; and increasingly relying on participatory models, with an emphasis on cooperation and partnership with other policy actors operating outside government. According to Mok and Shen (2016:292) there are stakeholder relationships and interests that need to be managed to ensure a successful delivery of a major project. The implementation of a social housing project involves numerous stakeholder groups who have discrepant concerns and expectations and are interrelated by multiple kinds of social interactions in the project (Mok and Shen, 2016:292). Manomano, Tanga and Tanyi (2016:113) presented that new housing programmes including social housing require government to involve other stakeholders to make them more able to reach their goals and encourage participation by the people in a way of empowering beneficiaries. In light of these Systems Theory was considered by the researcher as the most suitable theory in defining social housing as it provides a holistic perspective on complex programmes and interventions, allowing housing and human settlements policy researcher to fully understand the housing and human settlements system as a whole and the interrelationships between its components. This relates to the relationship between the three spheres of government, government entities, social housing institutions and other delivery agents, financiers and beneficiaries. The systems theory is relevant for the practical definition of social housing and the provision of social housing involves more actors who are interconnected, both within an organization and across different organizations and industries. This interconnectedness has led to an increased focus on understanding how systems interact and how they can be optimized to achieve desired outcomes and in this case the provision of social housing. The systems theory is suitable as it focuses on the interactions and on the relationships between parts in order to understand an entity's organization, functioning and outcomes. System theory is particularly relevant in housing and human settlements where the efficient and effective coordination of multiple components is critical to the success delivery of social housing.

Figure 1: Systems theory and provision of social housing; Source: Bertalanffy L. von General System Theory. Foundations, Development, Applications. New York: George Braziller, 1968. Google Scholar (modified by the researcher)
units. Overall, system theory provides a framework for understanding and designing complex systems that is essential for addressing many of the challenges facing contemporary industry and organizations than any other theory in the definition of social housing.

Social housing has been conceptualised as having social goals, aims, objectives and providing low-income communities with affordable housing, improving their overall well-being, and aimed to improve liveability in neighbourhoods (Eikelenboom, Long and Jong, 2021:2). According to a study conducted by Flanagan, Tually, Varadharajan, Verdouw, Faulkner, Meltzer and Veugdenhil (2020:4) social housing tenants felt at home in social housing units as they felt connected to and embedded within their dwellings and their communities. The government provides social housing to the economically weaker section of the society and at-risk population such as children, senior citizens, vulnerable populations and the disabled (Venkataraman and Golapan, 2015:133). To understand the role of social housing within the spectrum of housing system in South Africa, it is important to understand what is meant by the term. According to mainstream approaches, social housing is generally defined as housing provided on a not-for-profit basis, managed either by the state, or by various permutations of not-for-profit or community agencies that range from housing associations to cooperatives (Hegedus, Lux & Teller, 2013:4). Tercu (2017:57) defines social housing as homes that are rented from and/or subsidised by the state to be allocated to individuals or families whose economic circumstances do not allow them access to their own homes. The generally accepted definition of social housing in the South African context is “a rental or co-operative housing option for low-income persons at a level of scale and built form which requires institutionalised management, and which is provided by accredited social housing institutions or in accredited social housing projects in designated restructuring zones” (Department of Human Settlements, 2009:17). The entities have social goals in common, that is, social housing associations interact with a variety of stakeholders including the municipalities, other interest groups to share knowledge, thinking along strategies and social elements in the sector, collaborate and influence decision making processes in the social housing space (Eikelenboom et al, 2021:4). Colasanti, Frondizi, and Meneguzzo (2018:162) explain social housing as housing for households whose needs are not met by the open market and where there are rules for allocating housing to benefit households. Colasanti, Frondizi, and Meneguzzo (2018:163) identified three main general features that are common in defining social housing, namely: its mission, which is to serve a general interest; its objective, which is to increase the supply of housing either by building new houses or by purchasing existing ones; and its target, which is defined based on its socio-economic status (mostly low income). Social housing is provided by a variety of stakeholders, including public companies, local administrations, non-profit or low profit organisations, cooperatives and, in some cases, even for-profit private companies and investors. The provision of social housing involves an intricate and complex network of relationships between various agents and the government, noting that there are high levels of interdependence between stakeholders and powerful interests controlling social housing production factors.

There have been several studies looking at housing in South Africa and many focused on one aspect or the other relating to failure and challenges for example the failure of the project management approach by Amoah, Kajimo-Shakantu and van Schalkwyk (2020), however, very few have looked at the subject from governance aspects within specific geographic areas such as Gauteng. This systems approach on social housing in the Gauteng province seeks to bring about a new look at the working of different spheres in the implementation of the social housing policy. Housing is a co-competence of the three spheres of government and as such the intricacies on the collective efforts of different spheres, their agencies and non-governmental players has not been fully interrogated.

Research and Methodology

The article was conducted using mixed research methods to collect the empirical data from social housing actors which included : (1) national, provincial and three Metropolitan Municipalities namely, Tshwane, Johannesburg, and Ekurhuleni, (2) social housing institutions which included : Yeast City Housing, Housing Company Tshwane, Ekurhuleni Social Housing Company, Johannesburg Social Housing Company, Mannadello Social Housing and Madulamaho Social Housing Organisation, (3) state agencies- Social Housing Regulatory Authority, Gauteng Partnership Fund, (4) South African Local Government Association and (5) National Social Housing Organisation. The mixed method was used to comparatively analyse the three spheres of government and to identify the challenges associated with the implementation of a concept. Bentahar and Cameron (2015:05) support the use of the mixed method to reduce the weaknesses and the problems linked to mono methods, ameliorate the validity and reliability of the results, and enrich the comprehension of the studied phenomenon and the emergence of new dimensions. Mixed method was used to investigate the application of intergovernmental relation system in modern public administration to better understand the values of different stakeholders in the implementation of social housing. As such the study hypothesised that: Intergovernmental relations are a key success factor in the implementation of social housing policy in Gauteng Province.

Data was collected using three techniques namely, interviews, content analysis and questionnaires. The researcher used a semi-structured interview method for qualitative data collection and used both closed and open-ended questions. To ensure consistency, the researcher prepared a set of pre-planned core questions as a guide. These research questions covered the most important areas of the study. Exploratory questions, focusing on a situation or change were asked to solicit information about an understanding of intergovernmental relations and social housing policy implementation which entails in-depth analysis. Questions focusing on relations between phenomenon were asked and what can be done to improve the delivery of social housing units and the development of a social housing delivery model to be employed to fast track service delivery. Descriptive questions aimed at describing the present situation about how the social housing system is functioning were asked. The focus of descriptive questions was to solicit information about current processes and systems to measure cooperation, alignment, planning, financial planning, and integration of funding.
sources for social housing projects. The researcher analysed the following documentary sources as part of the qualitative research aspect of this study: administrative documents, including proposals, progress reports, annual performance reports and other internal records, business plans, formal studies, survey data, research materials and academic research documents including completed dissertations and thesis, articles appearing in the mass media, books, accredited journals and written reports, published and unpublished statistics and institutional publications, data provided by private sector organisations and institutions of higher learning such as universities and research organisations; historical records; acts of parliament, policies, strategies and guidelines. The questionnaire that the researcher used included the exploratory questions that focused on the current situation, the descriptive questions for investigating the current situation, and the exploratory questions that focused on the relations between the three spheres of government. The researcher used the above types of research questions to explore, describe, and explain intergovernmental relations and implementation of social housing as the units of analysis in the study. Bless et al. (2006:120) define a questionnaire as an instrument of data collection consisting of a standardised series of questions relating to a research topic that are to be answered in writing by participants. The researcher administered the questionnaires with operational staff within the three clusters (government, state agencies and social housing institutions) national, provincial, and local spheres of government which included City of Tshwane, City of Johannesburg, and Ekurhuleni Metropolitan municipalities in Human Settlements Departments. The state agencies involved in the delivery of social housing units such as the Social Housing Regulatory Authority and municipal entities such as the Housing Company Tshwane, Johannesburg Social Housing Company, and the Ekurhuleni Social Housing Company. Private and non-governmental social housing institutions, such as the Yeast City Housing and Mannapendlo Social Housing and Madulammoho Social Housing Organisation were also included. The questionnaires were sent to all three clusters mentioned above, noting that each cluster plays a different role in the social housing value chain. In cluster sampling, the units of interest are aggregated into clusters representing some type of proximity that affects survey economics (Stopher, 2016:296).

Table 1: Study Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Organisations</th>
<th>Number of officials at top managing delivery of social housing units</th>
<th>Number of officials at operational level dealing with delivery of social housing units</th>
<th>Number of Interviews conducted with top Management staff</th>
<th>Number of questionnaires distributed to operational staff</th>
<th>Number of questionnaires completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Department of Human Settlements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gauteng Provincial Department of Human Settlements</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Three Metropolitan Municipalities (Tshwane, Johannesburg, and Ekurhuleni)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Six Social Housing Institutions (Housing Company Tshwane, Johannesburg Social Housing Company, Ekurhuleni Social Housing Company, Yeast City Housing, Mannapendlo Social Housing and Madulammoho Housing Institution)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Social Housing Regulatory Authority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gauteng Partnership Fund</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>National Social Housing Organisation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>South African Local Government Association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: The sets of questions are added as appendices to this article. The size of the population of the study which entails the number of organisations, number of officials at management and operational level that were interviewed and who completed the questionnaires.
Table 2: Demographic data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of service related to the delivery of sustainable human settlements</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50 years</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or more</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below Matric</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Certificate/Diploma</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Grad</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for gender suggest that females dominate in the housing and human settlements sector across the three spheres of government, social housing delivery agents, and government entities, as 51.3% of the respondents were females in comparison with 48.7% males. Of the human settlements sector staff surveyed, 23% had between 11 and 15 years of experience, and only 18% had worked in the sector for five years or less. This statistic indicates that the housing and human settlements sector is dominated by people with experience. This observation is supported by the age group results which reflect that most of the respondents were between 36 and 50 years of age. Most of the staff had post graduate qualifications and only 1.3% had just a matric certificate. Although majority of respondents had tertiary education, they do not have the expertise and skills to develop social housing policy implementation guidelines at local government level. This is because the provision of social housing is relatively new in South Africa, and it requires grounded understanding of the implementation protocol in an intergovernmental system. Of those interviewed 26.9% agreed that the current staff is capacitated to fast-track the delivery of sustainable social housing units and were trained in housing policy development and practice. Of those interviewed, majority had grounded understanding of the implementation of social housing programs. These are operational staff executing day to day policy implementation tasks. Twenty-one officials which fall under top management were trained in housing policy development and practice.

**Findings and Discussion**

The research questions (as presented below) are answered in this section, the results and findings of this study are discussed in relation to the literature reviewed in the section above. The following is a list of questions that the study answered, using scientific method: How do the three spheres of government interact in the implementation of social housing policy? What are key challenges impacting role players in the delivery of social housing units? What are the institutional, legal and policy framework governing the three spheres of government in the implementation of social housing policy? What are the roles played by regulatory institutions in the delivery of social housing units? What social housing delivery model can be utilised in Gauteng Province to fast track the delivery of social housing units?

**Presentation of results and analysis.**

**Analysis**

For analysis of the qualitative data, the researcher used software called Atlas.ti version 8 to identify themes in the data collected from the diversity of respondents. Atlas.ti Version 8 was used to find the real meanings of, and the relationships between the key concepts in this study, namely intergovernmental relations, social housing challenges, risks, funding, alignment, and integration. Patterns of themes related to the research questions of the study were determined from the empirical data collected. Units of meaning were identified, and they constituted theme accounts, which were grouped according to larger units and stages of experience and understanding in line with the theoretical and empirical overview of the study. Main themes were determined through analysis of the data and some interpretations were presented regarding the experiences and knowledge of social housing practitioners, including those involved in the practical implementation of social housing projects. The main themes were contextualised in line with applicable housing and human settlements policies, legislation, strategies, and guidelines in South Africa.
Considering the choice of a mixed methodology, for quantitative research, the data collected was captured in Microsoft Excel spreadsheets, and exported to Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, means and standard deviations were used to describe the data by visualising it in graphs. The graphical presentations were created to assist the researcher in presenting the data through visualisation tools such as histograms, for frequency distributions, and scatter plots. Below is a descriptive statistics table presented for the key questions (variables) used in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The comprehensive plan on sustainable integrated human settlements supports the delivery of social housing</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need to align the Housing Code of 2009 with the development of sustainable integrated human settlements as per the new mandate of Human Settlements Department</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental cooperation and co-ordination requests alignment of duties and functions between different state agencies in law and policies</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The South African intergovernmental system of spatial planning is slow and coordination of planning activities between the three spheres of government is very slow</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a direct relationship between cooperative governance and good governance</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current housing subsidy quantum for social housing is not sufficient for the development of sustainable integrated human settlements</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2:** Intergovernmental relations, planning, alignment and funding; (Note that, in the written description and interpretation of the findings presented in Figure 2 the values for the responses “Agree” and “Strongly agree” are combined and presented as one value. The same applies to the values for the responses “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree”)

The findings presented in Figure 2 suggest that the government’s shift from the provision of housing to the creation of sustainable human settlements, in a manner that is responsive to the demands of segments of society and local situations, was well understood and supported by the respondents. Figure 2 shows that about eight out of every 10 respondents agreed that the comprehensive plan on sustainable integrated human settlements supports the delivery of social housing (84.7 %), where a few felt otherwise (5.1 %). Almost similar proportion (82 %) felt that there is a need to align the Housing Code of 2009 with the development of sustainable integrated human settlements as per the new mandate of the Human Settlements Department, and 82.1% agreed that intergovernmental relations and coordination requests alignment of duties and functions between different state agencies in laws and policies.

The implication is that the Housing Code is outdated, and it must be reviewed to be brought in line with the Breaking New Ground (BNG) principle. Another 80.8% of the respondents felt that the South African intergovernmental system of spatial planning is slow and coordination of planning activities between the three spheres of government is very slow, while 70.6% felt that there is a direct relationship between cooperative governance and good governance.

The findings presented in Figure 2 are confirmed by information in the National Development Plan (2012) that identifies weak spatial planning and governance capabilities as one of the challenges in the implementation of BNG. According to Paynter (2011:70), spatial planning contributes towards achieving the objectives of the Gauteng City Regions and the setting of more realistic planning regimes that link infrastructure provision within cities in Gauteng, infrastructure privatisation, and equity of access to services and the benefits of compact cities. Between five and six out of 10 respondents (57.7%) felt that the current housing subsidy quantum for social housing is not sufficient for the development of sustainable integrated human settlements. A quarter of the respondents (24.4%) were uncertain about this, and less than 20% disagreed.
Assessment of the intergovernmental relations structures involved in the implementation of social housing

**Figure 3:** Intergovernmental relations structures active in the implementation of social housing related functions and activities. *(Note that, in the written description and interpretation of the findings presented in Figure 3 the values for the responses “Agree” and “Strongly agree” are combined and presented as one value. The same applies to the values for the responses “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree”)*

According to the results presented in figure 3, about eight out of every 10 (82%) of respondents agreed that, from their experience, there are institutional weaknesses that hinder the performance of the department, fewer disagreed (7.7%). Less than half (43.6%) of the respondents agreed that there is streamlining of activities between the three spheres of government to improve the effectiveness/efficiency in the implementation of social housing policy projects. More than half took a neutral stance (34.6%) or disagreed (21.8%) with this statement. Less than half (43.6%) of the respondents agreed that social housing related functions are integrated and coordinated in the three spheres of government, a quarter (26.9%) were neutral, while 29.5% disagreed. About four out of 10 (41.0%) of the respondents agreed that no cooperation between the spheres of government takes place. More than half took a neutral stance (28.2%) or disagreed (29.5%). Relatively few respondents (37.2%) agreed that the best practices have been disseminated, exchanged, and shared with other local, provincial, national, and international organisations. Together, there was a higher number of those who were neutral (34.6%) or disagreed (28.2%).
The interview responses also show that there are procedures that impact the work and performance of both the officials and state departments in the delivery of services including social housing. Participant D3: 2285-2681 was aware of the existence of forums for social housing and rental housing that are coordinated by the National Department of Human Settlements. “I know that at the national and provincial level the department organises the provincial steering committee wherein social housing institutions, metros and the regulator meet to discuss various issues relating to social housing.” A relatively low number of respondents felt that the decisions of the inter-governmental relations (IGR) structures are not binding to the three spheres of government (39.7%), and that the spheres of government adhere to the decisions of the intergovernmental relations structures (30.8%). Less than 40% of the respondents agreed that representation of the spheres of government in IGR structures is always at the required level by officials with decision-making powers, 44% disagreed and 20% were neutral.

The qualitative results from the interviews confirmed that there are intergovernmental relations administrative structures in place at national, provincial, and local government levels that have been established in terms of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act (No. 13 of 2005). The qualitative findings identified some of these organisational weaknesses in those structures as lack of streamlining of coordination activities between spheres of government. Other weaknesses identified were related to government officials not working together to achieve a common goal, and the spheres of government not supporting one another to ensure maximum participation, transparency, and involvement to ensure accountability. Participation was defined in the context of attendance of IGR structures and participants taking accountability and ownership of decisions taken in IGR structures. Given the number of actors in the social housing delivery value chain active, participation of these actors as equal partners, who respond quickly to the ever-changing demands of the electorate is key. There are visible evidence of silo mentality, projects, programmes and social housing implementation, land identification and release activities not aligned between different spheres of government. The case in point was the ten-year period it took for the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality to transfer land to Housing Company Tshwane, which is a municipal entity. The domains of social housing policy implementation focus on participation from different stakeholders, with the underlying assumption that their involvement provides a positive contribution to the policy implementation process.

Participant D3:3 5635-6568 also confirmed the existence of intergovernmental relations structures, forums, and committees, as follows: “Various departments within a metro must ensure they participate in intergovernmental relation forums. There are committees and forum that the city officials from various departments must attend and ensure that the city is well represented to ensure that projects are aligned to the implementation plans and budgetary requirements. The main aim of participating in social housing task teams, committees and forums is, according to Gil-Garcia (2018:26), to enforce a coordinated behaviour within and between actors that consist of different sets of people who share a particular belief system. The interaction among actors and stakeholders is aimed at influencing the outcomes of social housing policy implementation processes. Participant D13: 2552:2817 confirmed the importance of effective intergovernmental relations by noting that “The city attends all IGR forums at both the national and provincial level, this serves as an opportunity to share experiences and learn from other metropolitan municipalities in the province. Although most, if not all the decisions are not binding the forums are used to gain experiences.” Of those interviewed 82.1% of respondents agreed that, from their experience, there are institutional weaknesses that hinder the performance of the social housing sector. The qualitative findings identified what some of these institutional weaknesses are, including lack of streamlining of operational activities, lack of relevant skills such as poor project management in the implementation phase, lack of a monitoring and control system for emerging social housing institutions.

From the findings of this study, it can be deduced that, within the current intergovernmental relations administrative structures, there is poor coordination within and between different structures of government to deliver social housing programmes. The low level of attendance and inconsistencies makes it practically impossible for attendees to take binding decisions regarding mobilisation of physical resources like land, buildings, and financial resources, as the provision of these is not coordinated and synergised within these structures. This study showed that there is a lack of effective intergovernmental administrative structures to ensure both vertical and horizontal interaction among and between the three spheres of government. One example is projects taking time to be completed due to lack of efficient financial planning between the three spheres of government. It took considerable amount of time for the Provincial government to release institutional subsidies for social housing development in the Thembelihle Social Housing project implemented by Yeast City Housing.

The research participants mainly operational staff who constituted 82.1% felt that there is a need to align the Housing Code of 2009 with the development of sustainable integrated human settlements as per the new mandate of the Human Settlements Department, and 70.12 % agreed that intergovernmental relations and coordination requests alignment of duties and functions between different state agencies in laws and policies. The implication is that the Housing Code is outdated, and it must be reviewed to be in line with the BNG. Another 80% of the respondents felt that the South African intergovernmental system of spatial planning is slow and coordination of planning activities between the three spheres of government is very slow, while 70% felt that there is a direct relationship between cooperative governance and good governance. The findings presented confirmed the National Development Plan (2012) that identifies weak spatial planning and governance capabilities as one of the challenges in the implementation of . According to Paynter (2011:70), spatial planning contributes towards achieving the objectives and setting of more realistic planning.

1 Detailed presentation of both quantitative and qualitative data sets is presented in the appendices.
regimes that link infrastructure provision within cities, infrastructure privatisation, equity of access to services and the benefits of compact cities.

Between five and six out of 10 respondents (57.7%) felt that the current housing subsidy quantum for social housing is not sufficient for the development of social housing units in Gauteng Province. According to the results presented eight out of every 10 (82.1%) of respondents agreed that, from their experience, there are institutional weaknesses that hinder the performance of the department in the delivery of social housing units, fewer disagreed (7.7%). The qualitative findings identified what some of these institutional weaknesses are, including lack of streamlining of operational activities, lack of relevant skills such as poor project management in the implementation phase, lack of a monitoring and control system for emerging social housing institutions.

The results of the quantitative analysis reflect that two-thirds (66%) of the respondents agreed that the current organisational structure of their departments is not sufficient to support the delivery of sustainable, integrated human settlements and social housing. This is because of a slow pace of transition from housing to human settlements as the metropolitan municipalities in Gauteng Province have not taken control of human settlements planning, project management, financial planning, and capital and operational budgets to have organisational structures that represent the new mandate. The quantitative analysis of the study found that there are challenges and risks that inhibit effective social housing policy implementation and impact negatively on the delivery of social housing units in Gauteng Province. Three quarters of the respondents felt that there are limitations and risks in the current social housing policy implementation system, acts, and challenges emanating from those shortcomings, while a quarter felt otherwise.

The most common challenge cited was lack of cooperation and alignment of social housing activities between the three spheres of government. The study revealed that there is no sharing of information on best practices, risks and challenges, and mitigation measures. The study findings highlighted that municipal linked Social Housing Institutions (SHIs) are grappling with leadership challenges, as municipalities do have political and administrative influence in the affairs of the SHIs noting that municipalities are the major shareholders as, in most cases, donate land, funding, transfer units, and second human resources to the SHIs. The study found that key risks and challenges that impact negatively on the delivery of social housing emanate from both the social housing institutions and the local government spheres, in this case the metropolitan municipalities.

**Institutional, legal and policy framework governing the three spheres of government in the implementation of social housing policy**

There is a legislative and policy framework that governs the operations in the provision of social housing. The research participants were asked questions in relation to the impact of legal and policy framework governing the three spheres in implementing social housing policy. A third (34%) of respondents agreed that local government is operating within a strict legislative control from other spheres of government which makes it practically impossible to meet the objectives of social housing policy, 41% disagreed, while a quarter (25%) were neutral. The vast majority (90%) of respondents felt that there was a need to align the Housing Code of 2009 and to pass a new Development of Housing and Human Settlements Act as per the new mandate of the Department of Human Settlements, while 10% of the respondents did not agree with this need. At least 70% of respondents agreed that the intergovernmental cooperation and coordination requires alignment of duties and functions between state agencies and government departments. Fewer than half of the respondents (40%) agreed that the IGR Framework Act of 2005 is sufficient to ensure accountability and improve the relations between the spheres of government with respect to the delivery of sustainable integrated human settlements including social housing, and the same number agreed that the Municipal Finance Management Act and Public Finance Management Act are two acts opposing each other (40%). The number of respondents who were uncertain about these aspects was 40-50%, while 10-20% disagreed.

The qualitative analysis found that the provision of social rental housing is highly regulated and there are quite several legislations that clearly define the roles and responsibilities of the national, provincial, and local governments. There are different legislations governing social housing provision resources such as budgets, land, and buildings differs from one sphere of government to another. This makes it difficult, if not impossible, to ensure there is financial planning, alignment, and integration to ensure streamlining of housing provision operations. The study revealed some elements of conflict in the administration of both the Municipal Finance Management Act and the Public Finance Management Act, which govern the financial operations of the national, provincial, and local governments.

In terms of executing both pieces of legislation for land release, the study found that the Municipal Finance Management Act is complex, as it relates to the processes of release of land and was found to be cumbersome and lengthy which affects the delivery of social housing units. The study found that there are several stakeholders involved in the social housing value chain, each with competing expectations and agendas. There are no specific land release policies for one sphere, and this affects the smooth supply and release of land for social housing development. The study found that there is strong need for alignment between the legislative framework and key policy documents, in terms of the aims, objectives, and key principles of the social housing policy to fast track the delivery of social housing units. The study also revealed that the missing link in all legislation is the alignment, integration, and synchronisation of all social housing related activities, because the provision and delivery of social housing units is a concurrent function of the three spheres of government.
Determination of the roles played by regulatory institutions in the delivery of social housing units

**Figure 4:** Social Housing Regulatory Authority as financier and regulator of social housing; (Note that, in the written description and interpretation of the findings presented in Figure 4 the values for the responses “Agree” and “Strongly agree” are combined and presented as one value. The same applies to the values for the responses “Disagree” and “Strongly disagree”)

The findings presented in figure 4 show that 70% of the respondents agreed that the financial resources granted to the SHRA are sufficient for the delivery of social housing, and that the SHRA complies with the Division of Revenue Act (70%). Only 30% of them either disagreed or were uncertain about these two issues. At least 60% of respondents agreed that the financial resources granted to the SHRA are utilised effectively and that the SHRA always spent the allocated budget (60%). Only 30% of them either disagreed or were uncertain about these two aspects. At least 80% of respondents agreed that there is accountability by the SHRA on the spending of the allocated budget. The same proportion agreed that the SHRA is improving to ensure that a sustainable social housing sector is developed with sound financial and governance principles in place (80%), and that the SHRA plays an important role to ensure that the sector is effectively managed and held accountable for its delivery and the utilisation of public funds (80%). Only 20% of the respondents were either uncertain or negative about these three aspects (Figure 4).

All respondents (100%) indicated that there is a need to protect and manage the state’s considerable investment in social housing to date, as well as planned investment over the next five years. There was also complete agreement that the SHRA was established to ensure that the public interest is preserved, and that social housing projects are implemented to provide services to the intended target groups (100%). Half of the respondents agreed that the SHRA is doing a good job in ensuring that both social housing projects as well as social housing institutions are financially viable, while the other half of the respondents disagreed or were uncertain (figure 4).

The study found that there is no regulatory system linked to the social housing sectoral leadership, and that there are no strategic partnerships with stakeholders such as the National Department of Human Settlements, Water and Sanitation, Housing Development Agency, Gauteng Department of Human Settlements and Metropolitan Municipalities to ensure timely regulation of the sector. The study found that there is a pipeline of prioritised social housing projects, and that, in each phase or stage of social housing production, the government has developed frameworks to regulate, conduct beneficiary administration activities, ensure compliance with housing
norms and standards, and identify the applicable and appropriate subsidies. The study found that the application of regulations in respect of the accreditation of SHIs and the disbursement of government funds to SHIs is complex, cumbersome, and lengthy.

The study found that the SHRA is not capacitated to monitor the implementation of social housing regulations, giving the impression that social housing institutions are not well skilled, resourced, and led. Contrary to the existence of an effective supportive legislation framework, the study found that there is no effective customised and well-structured capacity programme tailored for SHIs to implement business processes and systems that enable the support and implementation of a social housing regulatory plan. The study found that the SHRA is controlling the social housing sector instead of regulating it, and this is evident as there is no social housing regulatory plan, which is inclusive of the roles and responsibilities of the SHIs to ensure the state is not monopolising the delivery of social housing. The evidence on the ground suggests that metropolitan municipalities, are experiencing low capacity and are under-resourced in terms of staffing and finances, to develop and implement a social housing programme. Municipalities are not capacitated to develop sustainable affordable rental housing strategy and implementation plan wherein social housing delivery is structured and fully funded. Participant D13: 13 2884:3470 confirmed the capacity challenges in the provision of affordable rental housing by noting that: The other challenge is lack of capacity by both local and the provincial governments in terms to the right personnel to plan and monitor the delivery of social housing projects. The other challenge is funding for social housing and lack of expertise in terms of project implementation wherein projects take time to be completed and the project costing is also a major challenge as it affects budgeting.

Development of social housing delivery model for Gauteng Provincial Department of Human Settlements to fast track the delivery of social housing units.

The study found that there are many variables militating against the delivery of effective and efficient social housing programmes by the government, social housing institutions, and government agencies. Some of the variables militating against the delivery of social housing units are nepotism, favouritism, personal interest, policy changes, insufficient funding, leadership qualities, lack of accountability, corruption, and political instability at the local government level. These variables need to be thoroughly studied if an efficient and effective social housing delivery model is to be developed that will improve the modus operandi of fast tracking the delivery of social housing units in Gauteng Province. Currently, the evidence collected shows only the roles and responsibilities of the different stakeholders and nothing about a tried and tested social housing delivery model.

The study revealed that there is funding, financial, and planning models and systems in place, but no social housing delivery model and/or attempt to integrate all models that will ensure there is managerial accountability, address quality and quantity of social housing units, and integrate social housing funding sources and technical leadership. The study found that, in the absence of an institutional social housing delivery model, the production of social housing units is not in line with the New Public Management principles wherein innovative administrative, managerial and governance techniques are embraced. The study revealed that the provision of social housing is still new and public sector managers do not have the requisite skills and knowledge to plan and manage social housing production factors such as land and buildings identification, acquisition, project packaging, and funding to deliver social housing units effectively and efficiently.

The social housing delivery model for Gauteng Province

One of the main objectives of the study was to develop a social housing delivery model for Gauteng Province. Therefore, based on the key delivery challenges identified and the findings of the study, a model was developed which is anticipated to lead forwards an improved and sustainable delivery of social housing units in Gauteng Province. The model consists of actors at national, provincial, local levels and delivery agents as well as state and non-governmental entities. This model was triggered largely by the participation of many stakeholders in the implementation of social housing policy which goes beyond the public sector. The implementation protocols to a larger extend incorporates both the private and non-governmental actors. The other relevant factor is that the provision of social housing is a highly regulated sector, which involves quiet several participants.
The model recognizes and incorporates societal actors, such as resident committees, private social housing institutions and social housing project committees and rely heavily on participatory model which emphasize cooperation and partnerships with other policy actors such as the national, provincial, and local government. Within the proposed model, there are new actors proposed which are integral part of social housing delivery model for Gauteng Province and are treated as equal partners for the achievement of social housing delivery goals and objectives. The model proposes an institutionalized, legal, and regulatory framework wherein municipalities must develop social housing development plans that are aligned vertically and horizontally with the national and provincial plans to advance sustainable urbanization, especially in fast-growing Gauteng cities. The model presents a relationship that is complex in nature, as it involves flow and exchange of information between nodes on the left side, centre and right and there is a reciprocal multiple relation between government departments, government entities and non-governmental organizations. In practice, there is interactions between and within a larger number of actors and most of these actors are interdependent on other actors, hence cooperation as equal partners are crucial. The coordination and alignment of social housing related activities at all levels is necessary, as it contributes towards the speedy release of land, financial planning, and synchronization of project plans before implementation of social housing projects. Participant D11: 4571:5184 noted the importance of alignment in planning related matters as: “Alignment is necessary and must occur because when you have a project, different stakeholders must contribute different resources so that people do not start running around looking for funding and how the funding should be.”

Conclusions

Based on literature reviewed and the data collected, the study concluded that the provision of social housing remains a concurrent function and shared mandate across the spheres of government. Furthermore, the study confirmed the existence of an intergovernmental relationship between the three spheres of government, namely national, provincial, and local. The provision of social housing and the right to have access to adequate, affordable rental housing is a basic human right, and the government has a responsibility to ensure the environment is conducive for all role players to develop and manage affordable social rental housing. The study concludes that there are key challenges inherent in the implementation of social housing and intergovernmental relations which includes coordination, alignment, financial planning, human settlements planning, funding, and regulation of the sector. The study also confirmed the existence of intergovernmental relations structures and that these structures are not fully operational and effective, that their decisions are not binding, and the implementation of their resolutions is not monitored. Intergovernmental relations structures are not consistently meeting with high level of activeness as mandated by relevant legislation. In most cases their decisions are not implemented to the later. The following structures meet as and when: Gauteng Province Social Housing Steering Committee and National Rental Housing Task Team which do not meet regularly to guide the social housing sector. The lack of interaction wherein the province brings both the national and local government in one room to discuss and relate challenges and risks facing the social housing sector is an intergovernmental relation gap.
An important recommendation is that, for the Gauteng Provincial Government to improve the delivery of social housing units, there is a need to strengthen intergovernmental relations structures and stakeholder management, participation, and involvement in those structures. This strengthening could be achieved by: (1) confirming the legitimacy of such structures that cut across all spheres; (2) developing their terms of reference and providing them with a full mandate to take decisions that are binding; (3) giving them powers to monitor the implementation of resolutions; and (4) ensuring that attendance is compulsory and that delegates account for, and take ownership of all social housing development and implementation processes and decisions. This is adequately narrated in the proposed social housing delivery model for Gauteng Province, which reflect several structures playing different roles in the social housing delivery value chain.

The study found non completion of social housing projects within specified time due to lack of planning, financial planning, no alignment, and integration is a major risk. It is therefore recommended that the Gauteng Provincial Department of Human Settlement (GPDHS) develops and approves a Medium-Term Social Housing Development Plan (MTSHDP), which is linked to a Medium-Term Expenditure Budget Framework (MTEBF), to plan for the purchase of all social housing production resources and provision of bulk infrastructure over a three-year cycle that includes land use planning and development control. The MTSHDP should outline the several social housing functions as part of activities to be budgeted for in the MTEBF. This will in practice assist in the allocation of budget for the social housing programme, and it is for this reason that it is recommended that plans and budgets around social housing needs are prioritised over a three-year period.

Limitations are those factors that limit the execution of the research project and impact the internal and or external validity of the study, including challenges experienced in executing research activities. Structured interviews with top management at both national and provincial level, social housing regulatory authority and social housing institutions were planned to be conducted during office hours. Few of the potential interviewees were not available making the availability of study participants one of the limitations. The lack of availability of literature on intergovernmental relations and social housing policy implementation in Gauteng Province was another challenge, most likely because social housing is still a relatively new concept in South Africa. Another challenge in conducting this research study was access to classified information such as minutes of meetings of the Minister and Member Executive Committee (MinMec), which is the highest political structure in the housing and human settlements sector noting that MinMec influence policy development and implementation in the social housing sector. The researcher was able to circumvent this limitation by researching online using search engines such Google Scholar. Non availability of top managers was addressed through attending IGR structures’ meetings and requesting for a few minutes’ interviews during breaks and after the meetings.
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