



# BRIEFING ON THE SUBMISSION FOR THE 2017/18 DIVISION OF REVENUE

---

SEPTEMBER 2016

*For an Equitable Sharing of National Revenue*

# BACKGROUND TO THE SUBMISSION

---

- Submission made in terms of:
  - Section 214(1) of the Constitution (1996)
  - Section 9 of the Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations Act (1998)
  - Section 4(4c) of the Money Bills Amendment Procedure and Related Matters Act (Act 9 of 2009)
- Theme of 2017/18 Submission is: Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations System and Rural Development in South Africa
  - Aim of submission: to provide a comprehensive review of the intergovernmental fiscal relations (IGFR) instruments and their reform for more effective rural development
  - Context: low economic growth a threat to future prioritisation of rural development so overarching questions concerns the coordination and adequacy of resources

# OUTLINE OF SUBMISSION CHAPTERS

## Macro-Micro and Fiscal Context of Rural Development

- 1. Introduction to Rural Development and Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations
- 2. Model of Rural Development Underpinning FFC's Recommendations

## National Government and Rural Development

- 3. Role of Targeted Intergovernmental Transfers in Rural Poverty Reduction
- 4. National Land Reform Programme and Rural Development
- 5. Enhancing the Role of Public Entities in Rural Development

## Provincial Government and Rural Development

- 6. Fiscal Transfers and Own Revenue in Funding Provincial Rural Development Mandates
- 7. Assessing Government's Fiscal Instruments to Fund Public Employment Programmes in Rural Areas

## Rural Municipalities and Rural Development

- 8. Financing Rural Local Municipalities for Rural Development
- 9. Effectiveness of Transfers to Local and District Municipalities for Rural Development
- 10. Farm Evictions and Increasing Rural Local Municipalities' Responsibilities
- 11. Reviewing Effectiveness of Sanitation Fiscal Instruments and Governance in Enhancing Rural Development

# 1 AND 2. RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL FISCAL RELATIONS

---

- Rural areas account for about 80% of the land and are important demographically, economically and politically in South Africa
    - Rural areas are home to 38% of the population compared to 43.4% in 2001
  - South Africa does not have an officially agreed and accepted definition of ‘rural’
    - It is recognised that rural development is a necessary condition for reducing poverty but meaning of the concept is sometimes not clearly understood
  - Urban and rural development are concurrent areas of responsibility
    - No explicit delineation of how subsumed activities should be shared
      - » Creates an implementation vacuum on how the different spheres perceive their respective roles in and contribution to rural development
  - A key challenge for rural policy: achieving strong growth and improving the wellbeing of rural residents
    - Majority of the poor live in rural areas – in 2011, more than 2/3 of rural dwellers lived in poverty compared to less than a 1/3 in urban areas
-  Rural areas lag behind the country as a whole on economic performance indicators such as economic growth, labour force participation rates, unemployment, education attainment and life expectancy at birth

# DEFINING RURAL

---

- Rural economic development is about improving the general wellbeing of rural people and spaces
- Strategies to promote rural economic development include:
  - Provision/facilitation of income earning opportunities
  - Provision of quality education and health care
  - Investment in social and economic infrastructure
  - Provision of basic services and protection of the rural environment
- Use term rural to refer to entire municipal areas, specifically:
  - Small towns (B3): Municipalities without a large town as a core urban settlement, have relatively small populations of which significant proportion is urban and based in small towns. Rural areas in this category characterised by presence of commercial farms because the local economies are largely agriculture-based. There are 113 municipalities in this category
  - Mostly rural (B4): Municipalities that contain no more than one or two small towns, characterised by communal land tenure and villages or scattered groups of swellings, typically based in former homelands. There are 68 municipalities in this category
  - Districts (rural): District municipalities that are rural. There are 35 municipalities in this category

# ESTABLISHING A WORKING DEFINITION: PROVINCIAL LEVEL

Province	% Share of B3 and B4 municipalities in each province (A)	% Share of B4 municipalities in each province (B)	Composite Average	Rural Ranking
Eastern Cape	87%	38%	63%	3
Free State	75%	0%	38%	7
Gauteng	8%	0%	4%	9
KwaZulu-Natal	79%	54%	66%	2
Limpopo	92%	64%	78%	1
Mpumalanga	67%	28%	47%	6
Northern Cape	92%	4%	48%	5
North West	74%	26%	50%	4
Western Cape	60%	0%	30%	8

# RURAL DEVELOPMENT IS MORE THAN AGRICULTURE

---

- The rural economy is no longer just a farm economy
  - The role of agriculture as engine of growth within rural provinces is declining
- Rural development has evolved over time to focus on space based interventions and diversified economic activities
  - While growth in agriculture output has poverty reducing effects, non-farm sectors are more powerful tool for reducing poverty headcount
- A multi sectoral policy approach is needed to attain rural development objectives

# RECOMMENDATIONS

---

- Government should develop a comprehensive definition of rural areas and rural development to be applied across the three spheres of government. The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) and the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) must convene a task team with other relevant government departments to develop a definition of rural, remote and rural development that is clear and simple to categorise and measure
- Government must deal with disparities within and between regions by harnessing the growth potential of rural areas
- Government must strengthen intergovernmental relations
- The DRDLR together with the DPME convene a task team with other relevant government departments to develop a new rural development research agenda

### 3. ROLE OF TARGETED INTERGOVERNMENTAL TRANSFERS IN RURAL POVERTY REDUCTION

---

- Focus on land reform and radical restructuring of agrarian economy as focal points for rural development is implicitly silent on some key points
  - Mechanisms through which agricultural growth can create mutually beneficial effects with other economic activities : production linkages; consumption linkages; wage-good effects
- One size fits all approach to using agricultural sector to foster growth/development and poverty reduction ignores that different contribution other sectors can make
  - Location dynamics
  - Labour intensity
  - Asset inequality

# MAIN FINDINGS

---

- **For rural municipalities**

- Agriculture is a vital component for per capita incomes
- Given that 20% of raw materials used in non-agricultural sector is derived from agricultural output, forward linkages vital for expanding growth in agricultural sector of rural economies

- **Poverty reducing initiatives**

- In rural areas, more effective if derived from growth created in agricultural sector (positive participation effects)
- However, when depth of poverty (Gini/Inequality) and existence of a large non-agricultural sector (community services – Government) then growth in non-agricultural sector becomes a more effective poverty reducing tool within rural municipalities

# RECOMMENDATIONS

---

- Government enhances agricultural productivity by establishing a framework for the implementation, evaluation and monitoring of key agricultural grants targeted at subsistence and small scale farmers
- The bulk of municipalities where agriculture accounts for a fifth (or more) of total GVA are category B3 and B4. Rather than the relatively blanket approach to allocation, agriculture based grant allocations would need to be weighted to ensure that reflect need and intensity associated with location of agricultural activities
- Beyond existing grant framework:
  - Government needs to address co-ordination and communication between departments and local government institutions tasked with rural development
  - Plans to enhance the economic developmental role of rural municipalities is effected through integrated development plans (IDPs) and planning for infrastructure spend geared towards enhancing potential multiplier effect through effective investment in creating linkages with other sectors such as manufacturing, trade and retail

## 4. NATIONAL LAND REFORM PROGRAMME AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

---

- It is widely felt that much of the potential of land reform as a mechanism for rural development have gone unrealised
- The study investigates how the intergovernmental implementation of land reform can be strengthened in order to play catalytic role envisioned in policy
- The chapter examines examine the impact of the land reform programme on key rural outcomes and assesses fiscal gaps that should be addressed to enhance the outcomes of land reform in rural areas
  - To assess the impact of land reform in rural areas, a survey in three ‘rural’ provinces were conducted (i.e. Eastern Cape, Kwazulu-Natal and Mpumalanga)
- *Focus of the study:* Land redistribution as well as post-settlement funding targeting redistribution and restitution beneficiaries. Land tenure reform and basic infrastructure is outside scope of investigation

# KEY FINDINGS

- The Research identified the following outcomes related to land reform
  - For the sampled sites, food security decreased due to failed projects, while only in a small proportion of operational projects, food security improved
  - Large production losses in redistributed farms across all three sample sites
  - Job losses as a result of decreased cultivated land also significant, with Kwazulu-Natal the hardest hit with a 94% decline as a result of labour-intensive crops that went out of production

Province	Jobs on farm		
	At transfer	Current	Percentage change
<b>KwaZulu-Natal</b>	490	30	-94%
<b>Mpumalanga</b>	878.6	99.3	-89%
<b>Eastern Cape</b>	93.35	27.8	-70%
<b>Total</b>	1461.95	157.1	-84%

Province	Total area represented	Crop production area (ha)		Irrigation production area (ha)	
		At Transfer	Current	At Transfer	Current
<b>KwaZulu-Natal</b>	2718	509	27	313	19
<b>Mpumalanga</b>	9926	1892.4	2474.8	1892.4	1170.8
<b>Eastern Cape</b>	4731	540	226	275	20
<b>Total</b>	17375	2941.4	2727.8	2480.4	1209.8

# RECOMMENDATIONS

---

- CASP and Recap should be consolidated under one funding programme for post-settlement support to emerging and land reform farmers under DAFF as it has more expertise in the area of agriculture. Currently both funding instruments are servicing the same target audience and funding the same activities. The consolidated fund should provide timeous support to land reform beneficiaries as delays was one of the main reasons for the creation of Recap. The consolidated fund should also be complemented by investigating models of affordable loan funding by DFIs so that the funding framework for land reform farmers achieves a greater outreach
- To improve land reform outcomes, coordination between DRDLR and DAFF should be strengthened at both a policy and implementation level
- Implementation gaps in the land reform programme should be addressed through reprioritised funding from existing baselines
- The role of municipalities in supporting land reform beneficiaries should be clarified. This is necessary as the centralising of decision making and responsibility at a national level results in many loop-holes and omissions at lower levels

## 5. ENHANCING THE ROLE OF PUBLIC ENTITIES IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT

---

- The chapter examines how public entities (State Owned Companies(SOCs) and Development Finance Institutions (DFIs)) can align with the new ethos of rural development and, if financially sound and self-sustaining, be used as alternative IGFR instruments for national development
    - Public entities 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
  - SOC and DFIs have a distinct lack of rural focus and presence:
    - The four SOC (Eskom, Telkom, Transnet and Post Office) do not have a specific rural focus when it comes to delivering on their core mandate, unless such a focus is being driven by the parent/sector department responsible for the SOC (e.g Eskom)
    - It is also not clear whether SOC are actually required to have an explicit rural focus/dimension to their activities
  - SOC would benefit from clear guidelines on what their roles in terms of furthering South Africa’s rural developmental agenda is
- Investments by DFIs in rural areas are very small and declining

# RECOMMENDATIONS

---

- The Economic Development Department, in collaboration with departments of agriculture, forestry and fisheries, rural development and land reform and public enterprises, designates a single champion for rural finance and development. This champion should guide and coordinate investment by DFIs in rural areas, and encourage crowding-in by the private sector
- The Department of Telecommunications and Postal Services (DTPS) must ensure that SAPO modernises and broadens focus towards becoming a one-stop shop in rural areas
- The Department of Public Enterprises ensures that Transnet contributes to regional economic growth and development by connecting business to customers and goods to markets. Transnet should also transport agricultural goods, so as to include rural communities from rural areas where they produced to urban areas where they are consumed, processed, or sent out of the country
- DTPS should put measures in place to improve Telkom's network infrastructure in rural areas, so as to improve cellular network coverage. Telkom and SAPO, under the guidance of the DTPS, should forge a partnership to develop the mobile market

## 6. FISCAL TRANSFERS AND OWN REVENUE IN FUNDING PROVINCIAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT MANDATES

---

- Rural development mandates straddle a number of functions, including education, health, housing
- Provinces are allocated similar mandates irrespective of their regional disparities
  - Rural mandates imposes unique services and funding needs on the rural provinces
- The study evaluates the responsiveness of fiscal transfers and own revenue in funding rural development mandates

# KEY FINDINGS

- **Own Revenue**

- Rural provinces optimise revenue collection on existing sources, but further growth is constrained by weak economic bases
- Notwithstanding, higher revenue optimisation rural provinces cannot implement their rural mandates without fiscal transfers

- **PES**

- The PES makes no discernible variation in provincial allocations to respond to the rural needs
- Provinces allocate a small share of own revenue for rural development –Agriculture

- **Conditional Grants**

- Rural provinces are the main beneficiaries of conditional grants
  - Over 50% of key infrastructure conditional grants are allocated to the three rural provinces

The allocation framework for agriculture grants are misaligned to the policy objectives

Indirect conditional grants targeted at rural provinces are under performing

# RECOMMENDATIONS

---

- Provincial Offices of the Premier in consultation with the provincial departments of education, health, agriculture and roads must identify the rural development needs and set annual delivery targets against which PES allocations will be assessed
- National Treasury in collaboration with the departments of education, health and roads must ensure that criteria for allocating infrastructure conditional grants takes into account spending efficiency, delivery targets and performance as well as the applicable national norms and standards on access to infrastructure
- The department of agriculture and national treasury must review the framework for allocating agriculture conditional grants to reduce the use of non-agriculture land size as an indicator of need and incorporate factors that are closely aligned to the objectives of the grant, in particular promotion of agriculture activity
- The department of Planning Monitoring and Evaluation must conduct a comprehensive review of expenditure outcomes associated with infrastructure conditional grants targeted at the rural provinces, to ascertain the extent to which infrastructure backlogs have been reduced and the efficacy of spend

## 7. ASSESSING GOVERNMENT'S FISCAL INSTRUMENTS TO FUND PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMMES IN RURAL AREAS

- As a response to the unemployment challenge, government introduced large-scale public employment programmes (PEPs) in the form of Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP) and Community Works Programme (CWP)
- The overarching objective of the study is to examine the fiscal instruments that are used to fund PEPs in rural areas and to assess whether the design and spatial allocation of these funds produce the same outcomes in rural areas
- Key findings from analysis include:
  - Most job creation schemes implemented (E.g. Jobs Fund, DTI incentive schemes, etc.) by government do not have a specific rural bias
  - When comparing PEPs over the period reviewed, most of the jobs created in EPWP were located in metropolitan municipalities (52%). Small towns and rural municipalities only account for 16% each of total job opportunities created
  - With CWP most of the jobs created are concentrated in small towns (32%) and rural municipalities (41%)
  - Even though 61% of beneficiaries from EPWP gained new skills, only 17% were able to transition into sustainable jobs
  - Focus should shift to CWP, social and non-profit (NPO) sectors of EPWP as these are more labor-intensive and work activities easily implementable in rural areas

# RECOMMENDATIONS

---

- Government through the DTI, National Treasury and Departments of Social Development and Public Works should consider narrowing the focus of PEPs and utilising the CWP, Social and NPO sectors of the EPWP as an explicit strategy for addressing rural poverty
- Given that funding for PEPs is insufficient to cover all unemployed, focus should be based on giving unemployed individuals without access to a grant priority. At present, a significant share of participants are either on a social grant or employed elsewhere. Government should also carefully balance the need to improve the conditions of employment and expanding PEPs
- Department of Public Works and National Treasury should ensure that grant frameworks for EPWP in the Division of Revenue Act include an explicit condition that appropriate training of recipients, especially in skills that promote self-employment opportunities, should be made mandatory
- Funding of job creation initiatives should be viewed in an integrated way, with programmes that absorb unemployed poor individuals given funding priority, especially if these programmes are targeting high unemployment nodes in B3 and B4 municipalities

## 8. FINANCING RURAL LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

---

- Rural municipalities depend significantly on grants to fulfil their mandate.
- This is something that the government is focussed on minimising as evidenced by the recent Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (CoGTA) Ministry proposal on amalgamating many municipalities to make them self-reliant.
  - Is the current funding model that seeks to eliminate grant dependency appropriate for rural municipalities, considering that many face weak and fragile revenue bases? Will amalgamated municipalities be financial viable and functional?
  - If the current financing model is not appropriate, it means many rural municipalities have to permanently rely on transfers. Considering that own revenues constitute a small proportion of budgets of rural municipalities a related pertinent question can be asked: Are transfers to the rural local government adequate?
  - If not: Are there any own-revenue alternatives for rural municipalities that they can exploit and lessen dependency on transfers?

# KEY FINDINGS

- The analysis in this chapter suggests that amalgamations will not necessarily result in financially viable municipalities and may worsen the situation of some demarcated municipalities
- The results also indicate that many rural municipalities will continue to be transfer dependent as their revenues bases are fragile and weak. Thus the funding model of rural local municipalities should not be oblivious of the fact that transfers will remain the main stay of rural local government
- Findings also suggest that transfers adequately compensate municipalities for lack of own revenues in some services and not in others. Thus, it is crucial to regularly review every transfer stream so that needs and resources are always aligned
- Furthermore, the research found that viewing a grant in isolation may give the impression that a service is underfunded and yet when all grants are included, the service may be fully funded
- Finally, the chapter evaluated possible new revenue sources and obstacles to exploiting them. Municipalities require diverse and ‘non-traditional’ revenue sources outside of property taxes and electricity service charges. These include ‘user fees’ for social amenities such as parks and community halls, and ‘restaurant/hotel fees’ in areas with viable and vibrant tourism industries

# RECOMMENDATIONS

---

- With assistance from the National and Provincial Departments of CoGTA, rural municipalities should ensure that property registers and valuation-rolls in rural areas are in place and up-to-date and that rural municipalities are adequately capacitated to collect and administer such a tax
- The National Treasury and CoGTA should note that, by their nature, some municipalities will never be self-funding, and so demarcation processes must go beyond financial viability, to consider issues of democratic representation and community participation, which are equally important and should be funded by the transfer system even in “financially unviable” municipalities. They should also seek to achieve “financial viability” in municipalities by increasing or developing tax bases through economic development rather than amalgamating municipalities

# RECOMMENDATIONS [CONT.]

---

- The Department of Cooperative Governance:
  - Amends the Municipal Demarcation Act to ensure that the full financial impact of demarcations on a new municipality are assessed before any amalgamations are done
  - Seeks to correct for dysfunctionality through relevant legislative, policy and capacity-building measures rather than through amalgamations
  - Monitors whether mergers have been successful, and the actual costs of the mergers
- The National Treasury continues to consolidate grants (as previously recommended by the Commission) as reviewing grants in isolation gives the impression that some services are underfunded, whereas services may be fully or overfunded when viewing the grants holistically
- The National Treasury ensures that the LGES and conditional grants are informed by objectively derived cost estimates, without which the viability of rural municipalities will always be under threat

## 9. EFFECTIVENESS OF TRANSFERS TO LOCAL AND DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

---

- Rural municipalities are less efficient than district municipalities at providing basic services
- Performance of local municipalities can increase by 60% without additional resources
- Districts are not performing their legislative functions to the full due to asymmetry in powers and functions
- Districts are more relevant and useful in rural areas than urban areas
- Rural municipalities are less efficient than district municipalities at providing basic services

# RECOMMENDATIONS

- National Treasury includes, as part of the principles underlying grants to rural municipalities, more stringent expenditure supervision, in order to minimise wastage and improve efficiency
  - The national and provincial governments should evaluate the effectiveness of existing supervision methods with a view to strengthening them
- The Department of CoGTA:
  - Pronounces on the role that urban district municipalities should play, with a view to introduce a single tier-local government system in urban areas and to strengthen a two-tier local government system in rural areas
  - Reviews the accountability mechanisms of district municipalities in order to make them more accountable to citizens
  - Provides clarity, as a matter of urgency, on the functions and powers of district municipalities  
In line with the White Paper on Local Government, their powers and functions should encompass district-wide planning, coordination of strategic development and intergovernmental relations policy issues, provision of technical assistance to local municipalities, provision of district-wide services, and provision of bulk water, sanitation, refuse removal, and services to District Management Areas
  - Ensures that the MISA prioritises the capacity building of rural district municipalities in the areas of coordination and planning, so that they can in turn provide quality technical support to local municipalities

# 10. FARM EVICTIONS AND INCREASING RURAL LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES' RESPONSIBILITIES

---

- The study looks at the extent of the burden caused by farm evictions and explores how fiscal instruments can respond to this widespread situation
  - Local municipalities increasingly have to deal with the ramification of this influx into rural towns in terms of shelter, services and consequences of unemployment
  - In a recent ruling, the Constitutional Court placed the challenge of these migrations firmly at the door of local municipalities. When workers are evicted from farms, rural municipalities are responsible for providing services and caring for the destitute, despite being ill-equipped and having no budget, resulting in an unfunded mandate
- In 2015, over half (52%) of all tenure security cases in South Africa concerned evictions, and of these, 48% were evictions and 4% illegal evictions. A third (32%) of all cases were threatened evictions, which might lead to either legal or illegal evictions
- The cost implications of farm evictions range from 0.1% (Dihlabeng) to 1% (Breede Valley and Emakhazeni) of a municipality's local government equitable share allocation

# RECOMMENDATIONS

- The current Municipal Disaster Grant is allowed to cater for eviction-related emergencies. The same approach of accessing the portion of the Disaster Grant should be applicable to farm eviction incidences. This approach is aligned with the findings from previous research by the Commission that provinces and municipalities, rather than national government, appear better at ensuring grant funding is spent
- Government strengthens the coordination and implementation of existing programmes targeted at displaced farm workers and dwellers, through
  - - Including farm evictees among the beneficiaries for housing in rural towns, access to land for own production and agri-villages programme
  - - Centralising the reporting of evictions and improve data collection
- The following government departments should be involved in coordinating and implementing programmes: DRDLR, the departments of agriculture, fisheries and forestry, home affairs, human settlements, cooperative governance and traditional affairs, social development, SAPS and municipalities

# 11. REVIEWING EFFECTIVENESS OF SANITATION FISCAL INSTRUMENTS AND GOVERNANCE IN ENHANCING RURAL AREAS

---

- Sanitation backlog remains high particularly in rural areas despite various programs implemented by government since 1994, the main aim of this chapter therefore is to understand constraints undermining government's efforts of addressing sanitation backlog
- Findings show that sanitation is funded on an ad-hoc basis with RHIG remaining the key funding source due to limited own revenue, funding from LGES utilised for operational expenditure and MIG prioritising other infrastructure
- With respect to the implementation of RHIP on selected municipalities: there was a marginal reduction of 1% on backlog in some municipalities, while the level of backlog has remained the same and even increased in some municipalities between 2012/13 and 2013/14
- Findings revealed that some municipalities received funding only for one year, while some continue to be funded for more than a year
- In SA, sanitation improvement is implemented through the provision of VIPs while other countries have moved towards Ecological Sanitation Waterless toilets technologies

# RECOMMENDATIONS

---

- Rural municipalities that are Water Services Authorities (WSA) should prioritize delivery of sanitation infrastructure and must be reflected in municipal's Integrated Development Plans (IDPs)
  - SALGA should play an oversight role in ensuring compliance with this recommendation
- With respect to planning and implementing sanitation projects, rural municipalities that are WSAs should explore and prioritise Ecological Sanitation waterless technologies where possible and develop a complete municipal sanitation infrastructure project delivery plan which includes the following (among other things):
  - Technologies to be used for emptying toilet latrine pits, in case of VIPs taking into account community dynamics

# RECOMMENDATIONS [CONT.]

---

- Scheduled periodical maintenance of sanitation infrastructure
- Full costs of maintenance and sources of funding
- SALGA and DWS at national and provincial levels should play a monitoring role in the implementation of this recommendation
- The National Treasury and DWS should undertake a comprehensive evaluation on the impact of the sanitation grants on rural municipalities before the grant is discontinued to a municipality
- District and rural municipalities that are WSAs must submit compliant business plans timeously to DWA
  - If they fail, executives should be hold accountable. In cases where WSAs lack capacity, DWS both at the national and provincial levels should intervene and provide capacity

WWW.FFC.CO.ZA



# FINANCIAL AND FISCAL COMMISSION

An Independent Constitutional Advisory Institution



- [Home](#)
- [About](#)
- [Discussions](#)
- [Media & Events](#)
- [Research](#)
- [FAQs](#)
- [P.A.I.A](#)
- [Jobs & Tenders](#)
- [Links](#)
- [Contact](#)

You are here: [Home](#)



## Submissions

- [Commission Submissions](#)
- [List of Recommendations](#)

Financial and Fiscal Commission  
Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations Conference  
10 - 13 August 2014

International Convention Centre,  
Cape Town, South Africa  
*Briefing on the Annual Submission 2017/18*

## More Publications

[FFC Submission on stoppage of local government Equitable Share Allocations](#)