# NATIONAL SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE

2006



THE PRESIDENCY REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

# NATIONAL SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE

2006



THE PRESIDENCY REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Published by: The Presidency, RSA First Print March 2007

© The Presidency, RSA

**Contact Details:** 

Chief Policy Analyst: Planning Policy Coordination and Advice Services The Presidency, RSA www.thepresidency.gov.za

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE		
EXECUTIV	VE SUMMARY	
Endnotes		xii
GLOSSAF	RY OF TERMS	xiii
Endnotes		XVİ
INTRODU	JCTION	1
1.	Setting the scene	1
2.	Methodology: Preparing the NSDP 2006	2
Endnotes		3
1.	Part one – Framing: Purpose, Principles and Application of the NSDP	4
1.1	The goals and objectives of the developmental state	4
1.2	Spatial challenges	4
1.3	Meeting the challenges through spatial-development perspectives	4
1.4	NSDP principles	5
1.5	Policy interventions impinging on spatial disparities	8
1.6	NSDP application	11
1.6.1	Analysis, recording and sharing	11
1.6.2	Context-specific spatial and economic-development planning	12
1.6.3	Resource-use and efficiency	12
1.6.4	Applying and contextualising the NSDP approach	12
1.7	Monitoring, review and update	15
Endnotes		15
2.	PART TWO - READING: DESCRIBING AND MAKING SENSE OF THE NATIONAL SPACE ECONOMY	<u>16</u>
21	Introduction	16

Introduction	10
People and space	18
Introduction	18
Population location and spread	18
Growth and movement/migration patterns	22
	People and space Introduction Population location and spread Growth and movement/migration patterns



2.2.4	Employment	27
2.2.5	Education	33
2.2.6	Poverty	33
2.3	Economy and space	40
2.3.1	Spatial location of economic activity	40
2.3.2	Spatial location of categories of economic activity	46
2.3.2.1	Production: Labour-intensive mass-produced goods	47
2.3.2.2	Production: High-value differentiated goods	48
2.3.2.3	Public services and administration	51
2.3.2.4	Services and retail	51
2.3.2.5	Innovation and experimentation	52
2.3.2.6	Tourism	53
2.4	Infrastructure and space	55
2.4.1	Road and rail	55
2.4.2	Electricity, water and sewerage	58
2.4.3	Government capital investment	60
2.5	Environment and space	62
2.5.1	Significance	62
2.5.2	Agriculture and forestry	62
2.5.3	Biodiversity	63
2.5.4	Protected areas	67
2.5.5	Water availability	67
2.5.6	Climate change and its implications	68
2.5.7	Air quality	68
Endnotes		69

3.	PART THREE: INTERPRETING THE SPACE ECONOMY	70
3.1	Introduction	70
3.2	Centres/core areas of high economic potential and value, as well as high need	71
3.3	Areas with low economic activity, high population densities and high concentrations of persons living below MLL	79
3.4	Trends in migration, resource-use and ecological sustainability	84
3.4.1	Migration trends and pressures on the areas with high concentrations of demonstrated economic potential	84
3.4.2	Growing pressures for resource efficiency and protection of natural resources	85



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.5	An overview of the space economy in relation to provinces, districts and metropolitan areas	86
3.6	Conclusion	89
Endnote		90
LIST OF I	MAPS	
Map i:	Macro distribution of economic growth	V
Map ii:	Macro distribution of population	vi
Map iii:	Macro distribution of poverty	vii
Map iv:	Distribution of economic growth and poverty in the Gauteng province	viii
Map v:	Macro distribution of poverty	Х
Map vi:	Macro distribution of areas of economic significance	xi
Map 1:	Functional urban areas and administrative context	8
Map 2:	Population distribution	19
Map 3:	Population density trend	20
Map 4:	Impact of HIV and Aids on the population	21
Map 5:	Population loss or gain (including external in- and out-migration), 2001-2004	26
Map 6:	Unemployment (total number of people), 2004	29
Map 7:	Unemployment (percentage of people in area), 2004	30
Map 8:	Unemployment trends, 1996-2004	32
Map 9:	Concentration of people living below MLL	35
Map 10:	Poverty gap	37
Map 11:	Poverty gap trend analysis	38
Map 12:	Human Development Index, 2004	39
Map 13:	Distribution of economic activity, total GVA, 2004	40
Map 14:	Concentrations of economic activity and accessibility	41
Map 15:	GVA trends, 1996-2004	44
Map 16:	GVA projection, 2010	45
Map 17:	GVA distribution per NSDP sectors: Labour-intensive mass-produced goods and high-value differentiated goods and services, GVA, 2004	50
Map 18:	GVA distribution per NSDP sectors: Public administration, social and community services, services and retail, tourism and innovation and	
	experimentation, GVA, 2004	55
Map 19:	Road network density	56
Map 20:	Access to services	59
Map 21:	Combined investment for national and provincial government and the private sector	61
Map 22:	Agriculture potential	63



Map 23:	Terrestrial ecosystems	64
Map 24:	Priority areas for biodiversity conservation	65
Map 25:	Protected areas	66
Map 26:	Water balance	67
Map 27:	Core economic areas	71
Map 28:	Core economic areas and areas of economic accessibility	72
Map 29:	Economic categories' contribution to the core area GVA, 2004	74
Map 30:	Core economic area typology of economic activity	76
Map 31:	High concentrations of people living below MLL	79
Map 32:	High concentrations of people living below MLL in relation to economic accessibility	81
Map 33:	Core economic areas and high concentrations of people living below MLL in relation to terrestrial ecosystem status	85
Map 34:	Medium-to-high base areas: Composition and growth of economic activity	87
Map 35:	Low-base areas: Composition and growth of economic activity	88

# LIST OF TABLES

Table i:	Categories of economic development potential	ix
Table ii:	Conceptual framework for describing and measuring poverty/need	ix
Table 1:	A summary of the concentrated nature of economic accessibility and people living below the MLL, 2004	10
Table 2:	Categories of economic potential	17
Table 3:	Categories of need	17
Table 4:	Minimum Living Level (Rand-value)	18
Table 5:	Population figures for the 20 most populous district and metropolitan municipalities in the country, 2004	22
Table 6:	Population growth figures for the 20 district and metropolitan municipalities with the biggest growth in population in the period 1996 to 2004	22
Table 7:	Migration figures for the 19 municipalities experiencing an in-migration of population between 2001 and 2006	23
Table 8:	Migration figures for municipalities experiencing the greatest out-migration of population between 2001 and 2006	24
Table 9:	Reasons for migration by percentage of respondents	25
Table 10:	Population per age group per province, 1996 and 2001	27
Table 11:	Employment figures for provinces and RSA, 2004	28
Table 12:	Formal employment per NSDP category of economic development potential as a percentage of formal employment	31
Table 13:	Poverty figures per province, 2004 data	36
Table 14:	The 20 district and metropolitan municipalities with the highest percentages of those living below MLL in the country	36
Table 15:	Top 20 contributors to total national GVA, 2004 data	42
Table 16:	GVA share of the six economic categories at national level and in each province, 2004 data	46



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table 17:	Relative provincial contribution to the GVA of each category of economic activity, 2004 GVA data	47
Table 18:	Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of mass-produced labour-intensive goods, 2004 data	47
Table 19:	Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of high-value differentiated goods, 2004 data	49
Table 20:	Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of public services and administration, 2004 data	51
Table 21:	Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of services and retail, 2004 data	52
Table 22:	Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of innovation and experimentation, 2004 data	53
Table 23:	Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of tourism, 2004 data	54
Table 24:	Extent of provincial road networks in km, 2000 data	57
Table 25:	Summary of GVA generated and poverty concentrations in the areas of economic significance and specified proximity ranges, 2004 figures (see also Map 28)	70
Table 26:	Socio-economic statistics per area of national economic significance: Population, people living below MLL, GVA	73
Table 27:	Typology of economic activity: Areas of national economic significance (see also Map 30)	77
Table 28:	Summary of population, MLL and GVA generated in concentrations of people below MLL, 2004 figures (see also Map 32)	80
Table 29:	Summary of population concentrations of MLL and GVA in relation to economic accessibility, 2004 figures (see also Map 32)	80
Table 30:	Areas with high concentrations of people living below the MLL	82
LIST OF B	OXES	
Box 1: Box 2:	The failure of the 'watering-can'-approach/principle in the former East Germany Social and institutional grant allocation	7 34
LIST OF D	IAGRAMS	
Diagram 1:	The NSDP principles and perspective informing the basis for robust analysis for the three spheres of government	12
Diagram 2:	NSDP principles guiding prioritisation, resource allocation and implementation in the intergovernmental development-planning landscape	14
LIST OF FI	GURES	
Figure i:	Grant allocation per province	34
Figure ii:	Type of grant per province	34
Figure 1:	Percentage distribution of the population in the nine provinces, 2001-2006	18
Figure 2:	Change in population per age group per province, 1996-2001	27
Figure 3:	Gender composition per province	27
Figure 4:	Employment figures for provinces as a percentage of economically active population (EAP) for RSA, 2004	28



Figure 5:	Employment figures per province as a percentage of economically active population in each province, 2004	28
Figure 6:	Changes in formal employment figures per NSDP category, 1996-2004	31
Figure 7:	Levels of education per province as a percentage of population per province, 2001	33
Figure 8:	GVA figures for the nine provinces, 2004	42
Figure 9:	Difference between percentage of national GVA generated and percentage of national population	43
Figure 10:	Freight flow volume concentrations for selected sectors: Mining, automotive industry, petro-chemical and containers, 2003	58
Figure 11:	Access to municipal services per province	58
Figure 12:	Contribution of the core economic areas to the national economy	75

#### LIST OF ANNEXURES (AVAILABLE ON CD)

Annexure A: The data analysis and mapping methodologies that were used in the spatial analysis.

- Annexure B: A brief overview of international spatial-development planning instruments and debates.
- Annexure C: A reflection on spatial engineering by the Apartheid Government in the National Physical Development Plan (1975).
- Annexure D: The Executive Summary of the January 2005 Harmonisation and Alignment Report, which outlines the interventions to improve alignment of the NSDP, PGDS and IDP, and clarifies the role of the provincial growth and development strategies (PGDSs) and district and metropolitan municipalities' Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) in an all-of-government development planning regime.
- Annexure E: District and metropolitan municipality specific statistics.

Annexure F: Statistics for economic core areas and areas with highest concentration of people living below MLL in SA.

#### **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

- CSIR Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
- DBSA Development Bank of Southern Africa
- DEAT Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism
- DIB Demographic Information Bureau
- DPLG Department of Provincial and Local Government
- DTI Department of Trade and Industry
- GGP Gross Geographic Product
- GTZ German Technical Cooperation
- GVA Gross value added (GVA)

- IDP Integrated development plan
- MLL Minimum Living Level
- MTEF Medium-Term Economic Framework
- MTSF Medium-Term Strategic Framework
- NSDP National Spatial Development Perspective
- PGDS Provincial Growth and Development Strategy
- TYR Ten Year Review
- SANBI South African National Biodiversity Institute



### PREFACE

The National Spatial Development Perspective (NSDP) is a major achievement in the continued drive by the State to eradicate the damage wrought by decades of colonial and apartheid manipulation of settlement patterns and economic activity in South Africa. Following on from the 2003 NSDP, the NSDP 2006 is not only an update of the original perspective, it also provides a framework for a far more focused intervention by the State in equitable and sustainable development. It represents a key instrument in the State's drive towards ensuring greater economic growth, buoyant and sustained job creation and the eradication of poverty.

The NSDP 2006 demonstrates the urgency as to the kind of space economy we require if we are to achieve our objective of a better life for all. The perspective identifies key localities throughout the Republic whose growth and development performance are crucial to the attainment of our national objectives.

The NSDP 2006 also represents a major achievement in intergovernmental collaboration, being the outcome of intense engagements between national government and provincial and municipal structures. With the technical support provided by a range of specialists from research institutes and academia; this document reflects advanced mapping and spatial-analysis techniques.

The original NSDP, which was approved by Cabinet in January 2003, is an overarching framework to encourage interaction and coordination between departments and spheres of government. It provides the methodological tools and principles to make government decisions on infrastructure-investment and development spending more focused.

As its predecessor, the NSDP 2006 provides a framework for deliberating the future development of the national space economy and recommends mechanisms to bring about optimum alignment between infrastructure investment and development programmes within localities. It is not a national development plan; nor does it predetermine what should happen where, when and how. Instead, it utilises principles and the notions of need and potential as a common backdrop against which investment and spending decisions should be considered and made. In addition,

while the NSDP provides an initial interpretation of the potential of different localities and sectors, this is not a definitive measure. Provincial Growth and Development strategies (PGDSs) and Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) will need to provide more rigorous assessments of potential by combining the NSDP's initial interpretation with local knowledge and research. Through a process of interaction and dialogue, these provincial and municipal planning instruments will then define each locality's development potential in terms of the six stated categories of development potential.



### INTRODUCTION

Government's key priority in the Second Decade of Freedom is to increase economic growth and to promote social inclusion.

A clearly articulated set of spatial priorities and criteria is one of the mechanisms through which government provides a strategic basis for focusing government action, weighing up trade-offs, and linking the strategies and plans of the three spheres and agencies of government. In this sense, the National Spatial Development Perspective (NSDP) is a critical instrument for policy coordination, with regard to the spatial implications of infrastructure programmes in national, provincial and local spheres of government.

It is in this context that the January 2003 Cabinet *lekgotla* approved the NSDP as an indicative tool for development planning in government. Since its adoption, three factors have necessitated a review and update of the NSDP:

- New data on socio-economic trends;
- The development of IDPs and PGDSs and the continuing engagement in aligning them with the NSDP; and
- A renewed focus on decisive interventions to ensure accelerated and shared economic growth.

#### The NSDP provides:

- A set of principles and mechanisms for guiding infrastructure investment and development decisions;
- A description of the spatial manifestations of the main social, economic and environmental trends that should form the basis for a shared understanding of the national space economy; and
- An interpretation of the spatial realities and the implications for government intervention.

The NSDP 2006 contains an update of the original data and clarifies critical issues that emerged during the iterative process within the three spheres of government. It consists of the following three components:

- i. **Part One:** "Framing". This section discusses the principles and mechanisms of the NSDP. Included is a brief introduction to spatial development perspectives and a section that describes the purpose, use and components of the NSDP.
- ii. **Part Two:** "Description and analysis". This section summarises the current spatial reality by providing a snapshot of recent demographic, settlement, environmental, economic and government investment trends.
- iii. Part Three: "Interpreting the space economy". This section provides an interpretation of the space economy using the reading of the spatial realities and the key dynamics and trends in Part Two, as well as signals for meeting government's social and economic objectives.

In addition, annexures of various data analyses and mapping tools, background documents and key statistical information are available electronically on CD.

#### 1. PURPOSE, PRINCIPLES AND MECHANISMS OF THE NSDP

National spatial guidelines or perspectives are increasingly being recognised as critical tools for bringing about coordinated government action and alignment to meet social, economic and environmental objectives. They provide a comprehensive and incisive analysis of current and future trends, of the factors/forces driving these trends and of the strategic implications thereof in spatial terms. They thus provide the basis for maximising the overall social and economic impact of government development spending by interpreting the strategic direction, promoting policy coordination and fitting government actions into a coherent spatial terms of reference.

The ultimate purpose of the NSDP in the South African setting is to fundamentally reconfigure apartheid spatial relations and to implement spatial priorities that meet the constitutional imperative of providing basic services to all and alleviating poverty and inequality. To this end, the document examines the spatial dimensions of social exclusion and inequality, recognising the burden that unequal and inefficient spatial arrangements place on communities. For example, the poor have to incur huge transaction costs by commuting large distances to and from work.



Given government's objectives of growing the economy, creating jobs, addressing poverty and promoting social cohesion; the NSDP assists government in confronting three fundamental planning questions:

- i. Where should government direct its investment and development initiatives to ensure sustainable and maximum impact?
- ii. What kinds of spatial forms and arrangements are most conducive to the achievement of the objectives of democratic nation-building and social and economic inclusion?
- iii. How can government as a whole capitalise on complementarities and facilitate consistent decision making and move beyond focusing on integration and coordination procedures to establishing processes and mechanisms that will bring about strategic coordination, interaction and alignment?

#### 1.1. NSDP principles

In order to contribute to the broader growth and development policy objectives of government, the NSDP puts forward a set of five normative principles:

**Principle 1:** Rapid economic growth that is sustained and inclusive is a pre-requisite for the achievement of other policy objectives, among which poverty alleviation is key.

**Principle 2:** Government has a constitutional obligation to provide basic services to all citizens (e.g. water, energy, health and educational facilities) wherever they reside.

**Principle 3:** Beyond the constitutional obligation identified in Principle 2 above, government spending on fixed investment should be focused on localities of economic growth and/or economic potential in order to gear up private-sector investment, to stimulate sustainable economic activities and to create long-term employment opportunities.

**Principle 4:** Efforts to address past and current social inequalities should focus on people, not places. In localities where there are both high levels of poverty and

demonstrated economic potential, this could include fixed capital investment beyond basic services to exploit the potential of those localities. In localities with low demonstrated economic potential, government should, beyond the provision of basic services, concentrate primarily on human capital development by providing education and training, social transfers such as grants and poverty-relief programmes. It should also reduce migration costs by providing labour-market intelligence to give people better information, opportunities and capabilities, to enable them to gravitate - if they choose to - to localities that are more likely to provide sustainable employment and economic opportunities.

**Principle 5:** In order to overcome the spatial distortions of apartheid, future settlement and economic development opportunities should be channelled into activity corridors and nodes that are adjacent to or that link the main growth centres. Infrastructure investment should primarily support localities that will become major growth nodes in South Africa and the SADC region to create regional gateways to the global economy.

The NSDP principles are aimed specifically at focusing government action and investment, avoiding the so-called "watering-can"<sup>1</sup>-approach and enabling the Developmental State to achieve maximum social and economic impact within the context of limited resources. While the idea of focusing government spending on economic infrastructure in areas with some potential for economic development may seem to exclude many other areas from development, this is in fact not the case.

Different regions have different economic potential and the spatial variations in the incidence of poverty are also vastly different. The NSDP argues that these diverse and disparate spatial contexts suggest a policy approach that itself should be differentiated and conducive to the requirements of the different contexts. Hence, in areas of low or no economic potential, the path of development and poverty reduction should be through a focus on investment in human capital development (education, training, social welfare, sound rural development planning, aggressive land and agrarian reform, expansion of agricultural extension services, etc). The Indian state of Kerala provides a striking examples of the effect of this approach on poverty reduction and overall human development<sup>2</sup>.



#### 1.2. Policy interventions impinging on spatial disparities

In generating the principles, the NSDP has drawn on and engaged with national and international theory and empirical cases. International theory shows that spatial inequality is a product of growth and that the dynamic qualities of an area are developed historically and culturally over a long period. In no country in the world is social and economic development evenly distributed in geographic space. Spatial disparities are a universal problem affecting all countries. In the United States, 50% of its GDP is produced in 2% of its land area. From a transnational perspective, similar extreme inequalities exist in the European Union, with 82% of its GDP produced in just 36% of the EU space.

South Africa is not unique. However, its spatial configuration is not only a product of historical growth patterns, but also of apartheid spatial planning; particularly in respect to human settlement formation. Apartheid spatial planning ensured that many people were located far from social and economic opportunities, denying them access to opportunities for employment, wealth creation and social progress. Spatial marginalisation from economic opportunities and social amenities continues to be a significant feature of the space economy and must be addressed in order to reduce poverty and inequality and to ensure shared growth.

Spatially uneven social and economic development has generated tremendous debate about how policy interventions should impinge on spatial disparities. The approach in the NSDP is informed, in part, by international case studies which show that:

- unfocused infrastructure spending does not necessarily result in improved GDP growth;
- unfocused human resource development does not improve GDP growth;
- regions which already have some economic success are more likely to grow than other regions, because successful regions have individuals, firms and industries with the ability to learn from concrete experience;
- successful learning occurs when institutions and incentives work and when institutions are locally specific;
- success is often achieved through focused and polarised investment; and

• redirecting public investment from economically dominant regions to lagging regions has not automatically spurred economic activity in lagging regions.

Ellis and Harris argue that "the poor benefit when they have more options to which to turn, and more options are created in the vortex of dynamic growth processes, not in the declining sectors that are left behind"<sup>3</sup>. From a spatial point of view, studies have shown<sup>4</sup> that the impact on poverty depends crucially on the proximity of poor households to centres of economic activity and on the extent to which these households are connected to such economic activities.

#### The NSDP is underpinned by the following assumptions:

- Location is critical for the poor to exploit growth opportunities;
- The poor that are concentrated around economic centres have greater opportunity of gaining from economic growth;
- Areas with demonstrated economic potential provide greater livelihood and income protection because of a greater diversity of income sources;
- Areas with demonstrated economic potential are most favourable for overcoming poverty;
- The poor make rational choices about relocating to areas with greater economic opportunities; and
- Government must ensure that policies and programmes are in place to ensure the poor are able to benefit fully from growth and development opportunities in such areas.

#### 1.3. Applying and contextualising the NSDP approach

Each sphere of government has its own distinct development tasks and related planning frameworks corresponding to the scale of operations and the area of jurisdiction. For these frameworks to be coordinated and strategically aligned, each sphere will have to adopt the NSDP methodology and approach. The adoption of the NSDP approach implies the following:

 Undertaking rigorous analysis of the space economy to identify areas of economic significance with a view to focusing government investment and development interventions to ensure maximum and sustainable impact;



- Capitalising on complementarities and facilitating consistent and focused decision making by providing a common platform for structured dialogue; and
- Moving beyond focusing on mere integration and coordination procedures, to establishing processes and mechanisms to bring about strategic coordination, interaction and alignment within government.

It is expected that some areas or regions will not feature as prominent economic centres when considered on a national (macro) scale. This, however, does not mean that the NSDP is irrelevant to these areas. On the contrary, any area, regardless of its position in the national space economy, can utilise the twin components of potential and need to analyse the local space economy and define its unique economic capabilities.

By providing a general methodology and approach for robust planning and coordination across government, the content of the NSDP is a critical indicative tool for government as a whole. At the same time, application of the NSDP methodology – i.e. utilisation of the NSDP as an instrument for planning – is a matter for policy.



#### Map i: Macro distribution of economic growth



#### 2. Reading the space economy

The South African space economy, as read both on a macro- and a microscale, demonstrates a number of stark disparities and dualisms. This polarised nature of the space economy finds expression on the macroscale in two clearly distinguishable sets of spatial arrangements and settlement patterns: (1) concentrated areas of high economic growth, high population densities and high levels of poverty; and (2) areas with low economic growth, high population densities and high levels of poverty (particularly in the former Bantustans). These phenomena are captured in Maps i-iii.

The macro description of the space economy as displayed in map i provides a set of broad brushstrokes only, hiding enormous variations within each of the categories. Moreover, it hides the fact that areas of high and low economic growth are in many ways tightly interlinked, often in very symbiotic, mutually beneficial ways through the flows of remittances and food products; but also in highly exploitative and parasitic relationships. In some cases, of course, the two live in denial of each other, as if 'the other' simply does not exist.

#### Map ii: Macro distribution of population



#### Map iii: Macro distribution of poverty



The starkness and idiosyncrasies of the duality in the national space economy is equally, if not even more glaringly, apparent in the micro manifestation of the dual space economy – the legacy of 'local apartheid'. This is evident in the social and economic exclusion and deprivation in the former townships and informal settlements on the fringes of generally prosperous cities and towns. Map iv, demonstrating the distribution of economic activity and poverty in the Gauteng province, provides a vivid example of this situation. These microdualisms, with their high levels of spatial fragmentation, economic exclusion and deprivation, pose a serious challenge to meeting government's economic development and social inclusion objectives.



In order to better describe, make sense of and respond to the 'broad brushstroke-picture' of the space economy as demonstrated, created and sustained through the distribution of economic activity, population and poverty; two structuring concepts were developed and deployed in the NSDP 2003, namely: (1) economic development potential; and (2) poverty/need. The economic development potential of a place was further defined as consisting of one or more 'categories of economic potential', as set out in Table i. This economic categorisation enabled a more nuanced, richer and more meaningful identification and description of areas of economic significance than typical spatial categorisations such as 'urban' and 'rural' would have had. It also enabled quantitative comparisons between areas/places and provided more specific signals on ensuring the maintenance and sustainable growth of areas of demonstrated economic potential.



#### Map iv: Distribution of economic growth and poverty in the Gauteng province



#### Table i: Categories of economic development potential

Category	Description
Innovation and experimentation	Research and development and the application of novel technologies to production processes.
Production of high value, differen- tiated goods (not strongly dependent on labour costs)	All forms of production that focus on local and/or global niche markets such as manufacturing and some specialised agricultural or natural resource-based products.
Production of labour-intensive, mass- produced goods (more dependent on labour costs and/or on natural- resource exploitation)	These are industries, primarily made up of iron and steel producers and large-scale commercial agricultural and mining activities that are highly dependent on proximity or good, cheap transport linkages to the huge volumes of natural resources that they use in their production processes. They also depend on the availability of large pools of unskilled and semi-skilled labour.
Public services and administration	Activities in this group tend to take place in larger towns and cities with significant public-sector employment and consumption supporting private-sector activities, such as retail and private-sector services.
Retail and private-sector services	These consist of retail, catering and personal services, both formal and informal. These are major components of any economy and are large employers of skilled and semi-skilled workers in most advanced economies. Such activities flourish in diverse settlements with large populations.
Tourism	These diverse sets of activities, while generally less spatially focused than, for instance, the manufacturing and services sector, are nonetheless all dependent on tourist-attractions (e.g. eco-scenery, culture, heritage), good transport routes, safety, and, in certain cases, high-quality medical services, restaurants, retail outlets and hotels.

#### Table ii: Conceptual framework for describing and measuring poverty/need

Category	Description		
Minimum Living Level (MLL)	Defined as "the minimum monthly income needed to sustain a household", this numerical indicator varies according to household size, i.e. the larger the household the larger the income required to keep its members out of poverty. It includes the following items: food, clothing, compulsory payments to local authorities in respect of rent, miscellaneous services, water and electricity, fuel and energy for lighting and heating, washing and cleaning materials, education, transport, contributions to medical funds and medical and dental expenses, replacement of household equipment, taxes, and support of relatives.		
	The poverty indicator is based on the Bureau of Market Research's Minimum Living Level and seeks to identify the absolute number of people living below the minimum living level. Other than a mere indication of the percentage of people living below this line, which can hide the extent of the developmental challenge in especially high-population areas, MLL provides the absolute number of people living below this line, which is very useful for planning pur- poses.		
Weighted poverty gap	This is an indicator of the depth of the poverty of those living below the Minimum Living Level. It also provides a quantitative indication of size/extent of the improvement that is required to elevate those living in poverty to above the poverty line.		
Human Development Index (HDI)	This composite index attempts to quantify the extent of human development of a community. It is based on measures of life expectancy, literacy levels and income. The HDI has a maximum level of $1 -$ indicating a high level of human development – and a minimum value of $0 -$ indicating the opposite.		

In terms of the second structuring concept, three methods for measuring poverty/ need were deployed, making it possible to (1) identify absolute numbers and spatial distribution of people in poverty/need; (2) enable comparisons among areas; and (3) identify requirements to address poverty. These concepts are described in Table ii. In the analysis of the space economy in the NSDP 2006, the two major structuring concepts of economic development potential and poverty/need were again used, but in this case they were supplemented with more detailed description, mapping and analysis of key national demographic, human settlement, economic and environmental trends. With the use of far more sophisticated mapping techniques and more comprehensive and recent data sets than were available in 2003, a far finer-grained picture of the macro- and microdevelopment potential, needs and challenges of the national space economy is provided.



#### 3. Interpreting the space economy

Overall, the South African space economy (see Map v) represents a dualism with two overarching spatial categories:

- Areas of national economic significance with high population densities and high numbers of people living below the minimum living level; and
- Areas with low economic activity and low levels of demonstrated economic potential with high numbers of people living below the MLL.

The areas with low economic potential and high densities of poor people (defined as areas with less than R1bn GV on Map v) have an average per-capita incomes of about 9% of the national average, with a huge reliance on welfare transfers, grants and remittances. These areas are generally experiencing a net out-migration towards towns and cities. The areas represent 1.3% of total land area and account for 4.1% (1.9 million) of the national population, 6.5% (1.5 million) of people below MLL, and 0.4% (R4.6 billion) of national GVA.

In accordance with NSDP principles, government should provide basic services in localities with low economic potential, as in all other areas.







#### Map vi: Macro distribution of areas of economic significance



Moreover, with regard to macroplanning, government's focus should be on providing social transfers, human resource development and labourmarket intelligence which would enable people, if they chose to, to become more mobile and to migrate to localities that are more likely to provide sustainable employment or other economic opportunities.

In addition to this, important interventions that support and enhance livelihood have to be identified and implemented. These may include (1) sound rural development planning policies and programmes; (2) far more aggressive land and agrarian reform initiatives; and (3) significant expansion of agricultural extension services.

Where viable and practicable, functional linkages could be developed between various small nodes to create a critical mass and thereby create opportunities for the achievement of scale economies with respect to key services as well as access to markets, skills and financial capital. This could lead to the development of a functionally linked polycentric network/grid of service nodes where communities can access key health, education, welfare, financial and other social services.



The analysis of the national space economy also reveals that only 26 locations represent the engine of the South African economy (see Map vi).

These areas and their immediate hinterlands (within a 60 km radius) are home to 77.3% of all people living below the minimum level in the country, 84.5% of the total population and generate 95.6% of the national Gross Value Added. Hence government's policy objectives of promoting sustainable economic growth and alleviating poverty operate largely in the same space. However, while these areas share similar characteristics, they are not homogenous entities.

In order to generate and sustain economic growth rates of 6% and more, and to address poverty, it is important to focus on the role of these areas. Greater resources and collaborative government action is required to make these areas more productive and socially inclusive.

As indicated in Principle 5, a key aspect to overcoming the spatial distortions of apartheid is through focusing on corridors and densification. To overcome metropolitan, town and city spatial distortions between where people live and where they work, greater emphasis should be on medium-density settlements closer to the workplace and on improved transportation networks. Facilitating greater access by the poor and intensifying growth in the core areas by enhancing the place-based qualities of these areas is crucial.

#### 4. Conclusion

The NSDP 2003 provided a spatial vision and framework to steer detailed policies and investment decisions towards the achievement of common national objectives. In accordance with this vision the NSDP envisaged a situation where South Africa will become a nation in which investment in infrastructure and development programmes support government's growth and development objectives by:

- focusing economic growth and employment creation in areas where this is most effective and sustainable;
- supporting restructuring where feasible to ensure greater competitiveness;
- fostering development on the basis of local potential; and

• ensuring that development institutions are able to provide basic needs throughout the country.

The NSDP 2006 supports and advances the realisation of this vision by providing a systematic overview and framework for understanding and interpreting the national space economy. It furthermore provides a far finer-grained analysis to enhance its role as providing a basis for strategic dialogue within government about where to focus infrastructure investment and development spending and optimise intergovernmental impact within specific localities. This it can of course only do if it is used as such by all in government in all forms of planning, budgeting and implementation.

The NSDP should be understood both as a policy directive in terms of its methodology and an indicative tool in terms of its content. That is:

- The principles and methodology of the NSDP should inform the development plans, policies and programmes of all spheres and agencies of government as a matter of policy;
- The details of economic potential and demographic patterns in localities to be the subject of ongoing dialogue among state and non-state actors; and
- Districts and metropolitan areas should be positioned as the geographical units for building an understanding of the nature and distribution of potential and demographic patterns across the country.

#### ENDNOTES

- 1. The "watering-can"-approach refers to an approach to investment in infrastructure that is indiscriminate, uncoordinated and inefficient.
- 2. Isaac, T. and Frank, R. (2000), Local Democracy and development: People Campaign for Decentralised Planning in Kerala.
- 3. Ellis, F. and Harris, N. (2004).
- 4. Kanbur R. and Venables A.J. (2003).



## **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

**Comparative advantage** – Comparative advantage refers to what a firm or geographic entity, such as a region (district or metropolitan area) or country is most efficient at producing or providing/delivering. In contrast with competitive advantage, in which firms and regions compare themselves with other firms and regions, comparative advantage entails an inward focus, i.e. self-assessment. The focus thus falls on the individual firm or region, with the key question being: Given all the options that it could possibly pursue in terms of production or the provision of services, what could the firm or region do most efficiently given available resources? The firm or region will then focus its resources and human capabilities in those sectors/areas.

Every region has a comparative advantage in the production of a good or the provision of a service. Even if it is the least-efficient region in every sector in a country, a region will still have one sector in which it is less inefficient than others and which it could focus on in that region. This sector would then be the one it concentrates on, relying on trade with others to obtain the goods and services it does not produce or supply internally (being able to afford to do so through the sale or supply of the good or service it is least inefficient at producing or providing).

It is important to observe that a region's comparative advantage need not be static. If a region does what it is good at, then it will in all likelihood see its income rise, which may result in better education and infrastructure provision and greater institutional density, which could give rise to a different comparative advantage-profile. Targeted government investment in infrastructure investment or development spending could also change the internal comparative advantage-profile, but would not necessarily make a region more competitive in relation to other regions. Government expenditure to enhance potential should thus be made with clear objectives in mind: Is it to enhance the relative competitiveness of a region; is it to change its comparative advantage-profile; or both?

**Competitive advantage** – A firm that is able to sustain profits that exceed the average for its industry/sector in the production of goods and the supply of services is said to have an advantage over its competitors. It can achieve and sustain this

position only if it is able to deliver the same benefits to consumers at lower costs (cost advantages) or deliver benefits (differentiation advantage) that exceed those offered by its competitors, or both. In this process, such a firm creates superior value over its competitors to its customers and secures superior profits for itself.

In the context of the NSDP, a region (district or metropolitan area) has a competitive advantage over other regions if it is able to sustain the production of certain goods, or the delivery/provision of services at lower costs or at greater benefit to consumers than other regions. Regions that are able to do so in a sustainable way are able to more efficiently combine resources obtained from inside and/or outside the region, with human capabilities sourced either from inside or outside the region and to deliver the outcomes to consumers/clients at lower distribution/service costs. This means that regions that (1) have effective, creative and adaptive institutions related to the production of the good or delivery of the service; (2) are populated/staffed and run/managed by people with the required competencies for the task/s at hand; and (3) have easy and low-cost access to suppliers of resources/inputs and markets, will be at an advantage to those that are less so. More urbanised regions that are well-served with transport and other infrastructure, with huge and constantly expanding skills bases and that are well-located and connected to similar areas with such qualities, will generally have an advantage over more remote ones with weak connecting links to resources and markets and in which the institutional density and complexity, skills levels and learning capabilities are low.

Government intervention in less competitive regions has tended to be in the form of infrastructure investment and human skills development. Increasingly, developing countries are finding that investment in human capacities provides greater and more sustainable returns on investment, as people are far more adaptive and have a far quicker response rate than infrastructure and resource-extraction patterns. Changes in the economic fortunes of places, such as the opening up of new opportunities and a decline in an old industrial region, can thus be contended with far more easily by individuals through relocation on a temporary or permanent base, than the relocation of often hugely expensive fixed infrastructure on and in the ground. Speculative investment, where government hopes to 'open up a new region', or to



harness an apparent potential, should thus be done with the utmost care. Human resource development would, in most cases, be a safer and more rewarding option.

**Development spending** – Development spending refers largely to investment in the improvement of human capacity and potential, both to overcome past inequities, and to enable people to adjust to new circumstances and environments.

**Economic potential** – This concept refers to the actual and relative geographical spread/location of demonstrated economic potential in a particular area. International theory and case studies show that spatial inequality is a product of growth and that the dynamic qualities of areas are developed historically and culturally over a long period. The assumption underlying this concept in the NSDP is that localities that have exhibited past activity in a particular category are more likely to have the potential to continue doing so in the future. Economic potential is thus demonstrated through existing economic activities and especially through the generation of Gross Value Added (GVA) for the specific geographic area. Research conducted for NSDP 2003 indicated that, despite some three decades of spatial engineering by the apartheid regime (from the 1960s to the late 1980s), the location of high levels of contribution to national GVA has been subject to little change over the last hundred years of settlement in the country<sup>5</sup>. Research into international examples of similar attempts at redirecting the location of economic activity in countries reveals that this has largely been unsuccessful.

**Gross Domestic Product (GDP)** – This is the total value of final goods and services produced within a country's borders over a specified period (normally measured annually). GDP is measured according to where income is earned rather than who owns the factors of production. Production in firms owned by foreign investors would thus be counted as part of the GDP of the country in which the firm is located, rather than the country in which the firm is registered. To convert from Gross National Product (GNP) to GDP, the factor income receipts from foreigners that correspond to goods and services produced abroad must be subtracted from the GNPfigure, using factor inputs supplied by domestic sources. **Gross Geographic Product (GGP)** – Gross Geographic Product is the same as GDP when referring to a specific country, such as South Africa. It can also refer to any other geographic area in which economic activity can be clearly delineated and defined. GDP is made up of GVA (at current basic prices) plus taxes on products, minus the subsidies on products, or: GDP = GVA + (taxes on products + subsidies on products).

**Gross National Product (GNP)** – This is the total value<sup>6</sup> of all final goods and services produced by a nation in a specified period (generally expressed quarterly or annually), plus the income earned by local residents in other countries through foreign investments, minus the value of income earned by overseas residents with-in the domestic economy.

**Gross Value Added by Region (GVA or GVA-R)** – Gross Value Added (GVA)<sup>7</sup> measures the value added/contribution made by each individual producer, industry or sector to the economy. It thus measures the difference between output and intermediate consumption for any given sector/industry. That is the difference between the value of goods and services produced and the cost of raw materials and other inputs that are used up in production. Gross Value Added by Region (GVA-R) measures the GVA for a specific geographic area, be it a municipality, province or the city as a whole.

The link between GVA and GDP is as follows: GVA (at current basic prices, available from industry only) plus taxes on products (available at whole-economy level only) less subsidies on products (available at whole-economy level only) equals GDP (at current market prices; available at whole-economy level only), or: GVA = GDP - (taxes on products + subsidies on products).

**Integrated Development Plan (IDP)** – The IDP is a holistic development plan that, in terms of the Municipal Systems Act, 2000, must be prepared by every municipality in the country on a five-year basis and is reviewed annually. Spanning and integrating all sectors through a focus on cross-cutting issues, IDPs are meant to ensure

# **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**

the sustainable development of the municipality, the targeted development of especially deprived communities and the reintegration of the fragmented settlements created by apartheid. IDPs can do this only if they reflect the development objectives/intentions, strategies and budgets of government as a whole, which requires joint intergovernmental prioritisation, coordinated resource allocation and synchronised implementation.

**Intergovernmental alignment**<sup>®</sup> – A process entailing structured and systematic dialogue within government, with a view to bringing about coordinated and integrated action within the spheres of government and between the spheres and other organs of state, to achieve common objectives and to maximise developmental impact.

**Intergovernmental implementation protocol** – An agreement between organs of state in terms of the Intergovernmental Relations Framework Act, Act No 13 of 2005, where the implementation of a policy, the exercise of a power or function, or the provision of a service depends on the participation of organs of state in different governments. The protocol is used by organs of state to coordinate their actions as may be appropriate or necessary under the circumstances.

**Infrastructure investment/Fixed investment** – Fixed investment refers to both economic (roads, railways, ports) and social (household, schools and clinics) investment to support, sustain and stimulate sustainable economic and social development.

**Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF)** – The MTSF is a reflection of government's assessment of, and perspective on, key development challenges at a particular point in time, as well as a statement of intent (with strategic objectives and targets) of the way it envisages addressing the challenges over the medium (five-year) term. It serves as a backdrop to guide planning and budgeting across the three spheres of government.

**Minimum Living Level (MLL)** – MML is defined as "the minimum monthly income needed to sustain a household". This numerical indicator varies according to household size; i.e. the larger the household, the larger the income required to keep its members out of poverty. MML includes the following items: food, clothing, compulsory payments to local authorities in respect of rent, miscellaneous services, water and electricity, fuel and energy for lighting and heating, washing and cleaning materials, education, transport, contributions to medical funds and medical and dental expenses, replacement of household equipment, taxes, and support of relatives.

The poverty-indicator is based on the Bureau of Market Research's Minimum Living Level<sup>9</sup>. It seeks to identify the absolute number of people living below the minimum living level. Other than a mere indication of the percentage of people living below this line, which can hide the extent of the developmental challenge in especially high-population areas, MLL provides the absolute number of people living below this level, which is useful for planning purposes.

**Provincial Growth and Development Strategy (PGDS)** – A PGDS is a strategic and integrated provincial development plan that provides direction and scope for province-wide development programmes and projects, within the context of a long-term perspective and taking into consideration resources available and constraints. A PGDS provides a spatially referenced framework for both public and private sector investment, indicating areas of opportunity and development priorities and enabling intergovernmental alignment. A PGDS guides the activities of all agencies and role-players by linking to and deepening the application of the NSDP and MTSF in areas of shared impact.

**Spatial Development Perspective** – A Spatial Development Perspective is a planning document that typically provides a rigorous multidimensional analysis of the space economy of a specific administrative area with a view to understanding poverty, economy, environment and migration trends and issues in spatial terms.



This is followed by the governing body's normative reading of the analysis in terms of the challenges and potentials the space economy presents in meeting its set of development objectives for that area. In most cases, this is followed by the governing body's principle-led response to this situation, including its view of how the territory could be developed and used in a more rational, planned and focused way.

A Spatial Development Perspective typically contains a few carefully phrased, powerful position statements and/or normative principles that specify the approach that should be adhered to in planning exercises with spatial implications, in the area in which the statements/principles apply (see Annexure B for a more detailed description).

#### **ENDNOTES**

- 5. McCarthy (1999).
- 6. "Value" is defined both in terms of factor consumption (goods and services purchased by private citizens and government, gross private investment, and the net foreign trade-investment balance) and in terms of factor earnings (wages, taxes, rents, interest and profits, and depreciation).
- 7. GVA figures are reflected in constant prices.
- 8. This is the definition as used in the project on Harmonising and Aligning: The National Spatial Development Perspective, Provincial Growth and Development Strategies and Municipal Integrated Development Plans (2004).
- 9. See Bureau for Market Research Report no. 235 and later editions, Minimum and Supplemented Living Levels in the Main and Other Selected Urban Areas of the RSA, August 1996.



# INTRODUCTION

In this section, the background to the NSDP and an overview of the structure of the document is provided.

#### 1. Setting the scene

Government recognises the important role fixed investment, in general, and public investment, in particular, plays in achieving high rates of GDP growth. Public sector capital formation is an important contributor towards aggregate fixed investment. In this context, the need to make choices about where to invest scarce resources in order to maximise the social and economic returns on investment cannot be avoided. Public investments potentially have huge social and economic spin-offs for a country. In the absence of an explicit mechanism to guide investment decisions, effective planning in government can be hindered and investment choices could become arbitrary, ad hoc and even wasteful.

A clearly articulated set of spatial priorities and criteria is one of the mechanisms by which to guide government choices about investment and development spending. Such a set of spatial priorities introduces consistency and rationality in planning and provides a focal point and a strategic basis for focusing government action, weighing up trade-offs, and linking the strategies and plans of the three spheres and agencies of government. In this sense, the NSDP is a critical instrument for policy coordination with regard to the spatial implications of infrastructure programmes in national, provincial and local government.

It is in this context that the January 2003 Cabinet *lekgotla* approved the NSDP as an indicative tool for development planning. Since its adoption, three key factors have necessitated a review and update of the NSDP:

- The publication of new information and statistical data on demographic, settlement, environmental and economic trends;
- The development of IDPs and PGDSs and the efforts to link them with the NSDP; and
- The renewed focus on decisive interventions to ensure accelerated and shared economic growth.

Spatial-development perspectives are increasingly being used to support the development of regions through the coordination of policies and programmes according to set principles and guidelines. Essentially, these overarching instruments utilise space as a common backdrop against which investment and spending decisions can be made. The key purpose of these perspectives is to bring about synergy and complementarities in terms of the spatial effects of government action, with a view to maximising the overall social and economic returns on government development spending. In order to do this, these perspectives require a shared frame of reference – a shared understanding of the state of the space economy – and an agreement on a set of guidelines or principles in terms of which infrastructure investment and development spending will be undertaken by the different spheres of government<sup>10</sup>. Through a consistent and meticulous application of these shared principles, it is possible to reconfigure spatial relations by ensuring synergy and alignment in government priority setting, resource allocation and implementation.

The NSDP is thus South Africa's attempt to construct a national spatial-development perspective with a three-fold purpose in mind:

- To provide common principles and mechanisms to guide infrastructure investment and development spending across government;
- To provide a description of the spatial manifestations of the main social, economic and environmental trends which should form the basis for a shared understanding of the national space economy; and
- To provide an interpretation of the spatial realities and the implications for government interventions.

The NSDP 2006 contains an update of the original data and clarifies critical issues that emerged during the iterative process within the three spheres of government. It consists of the following three components:

**1. Part one:** "Framing". This section discusses the purpose, principles and mechanisms of the NSDP. Included is a brief introduction to national spatial development perspectives, with a specific focus on the role of national spatial perspectives such as the NSDP within the broader developmental environment.



**2. Part Two:** "Description and analysis". This section summarises the current spatial reality. This is done through the provision of a snapshot of some recent demographic, settlement, environmental, economic and government investment trends, which includes an overview of the following:

- · Human settlement trends/dynamics and resulting settlement patterns;
- The national space economy and key trends and challenges in this regard;
- · The state of the natural resource base in relation to current spatial trends; and
- Patterns of infrastructure and development spending.

**3.** Part Three: "Interpreting the space economy". This section provides an interpretation of the space economy using the reading of the spatial realities and the key dynamics and trends in Part Two, as well as signals for meeting government's social and economic objectives.

In addition, the following annexures of various data and mapping tools, background documents and key statistical information are available electronically on CD:

- Annexure A: The data analysis and mapping methodologies that were used in the spatial analysis;
- Annexure B: A brief overview of international spatial development planning instruments and debate;
- Annexure C: A reflection on spatial engineering by the apartheid government in the National Physical Development Plan, 1975;
- Annexure D: The executive summary of the January 2005 Harmonisation and Alignment Report that outlines the interventions to improve alignment of the NSDP, PGDS and IDP and to clarify the role of the Provincial Growth and Development Strategies (PGDSs) and district and metropolitan municipalities' Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) in an all-of-government development planning regime;
- Annexure E: District and metropolitan municipality-specific statistics and trend and projection mapping on magisterial districts; and
- Annexure F: Statistics for areas of national economic significance.

#### 2. Methodology: Preparing the NSDP 2006

The initial NSDP was prepared through an interactive process using the outcomes of expert research (commissioned as part of the project), statistical maps representing settlement and economic patterns, and discussions with officials in various parts of South Africa. This information was combined in a spatial narrative<sup>11</sup> of the current reality and a set of normative principles.

From the outset it was stated that the information used and reflected in the NSDP would be subject to constant review and would be updated as (1) new data became available and (2) information from PGDSs and IDPs provided more nuanced and richer reflections on the subject material as covered in the perspective. The release of the Census 2001 data provided one such opportunity, as did the IDPs and more detailed economic data.

In preparing the NSDP 2006, it was not simply a case of updating maps and introducing new sets of tables and figures. Essentially, it was about providing an analytical and strategic framework to reconfigure spatial relations and structures and tackle head-on the dualistic and polarised nature of the South African space economy. This implied a sharper analysis of the spatial data to provide greater clarity to all three spheres of government regarding points/places of current and future strategic social and economic significance and environmental opportunities/ pressure. In doing so, a picture emerged that indicates high and low demonstrated economic potential, high and low population numbers, and high and low levels of persons living below Minimum Living Level (MLL) and demonstrates their interconnectedness.

This resulted in a process in which new data and information was accessed from a wide variety of sources, including StatsSA, government departments and private-sector data-brokers and was captured in GIS databases. Numerous brainstorming and work sessions were also held with representatives from national government departments, provinces, municipalities and parastatals such as the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA) and the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR).

# INTRODUCTION

The NSDP requires an ongoing process of elaboration and refinement that takes into account the dynamic nature of the space economy.

Although different spheres of government have a hierarchy of different strategic objectives and naturally differing scales of spatial perspectives, it is expected that the process of dialogue between spheres will assist in generating an informed consensus on the nation's spatial development priorities.

#### **ENDNOTES**

- 10. These principles are statements by government reflecting the issues to be considered when making decisions (and hence making trade-offs) regarding all forms of infrastructure investment and development spending in different spatial locations.
- 11. This simply means an account of the way in which settlement is, and has been, taking place in South Africa; the spatial location of economic activity in the country; government investment and spending in the country; where major infrastructure is located; and how the current spatial settlement and economic activity patterns are impacting on the natural resource base of the country.



#### 1. FRAMING: PURPOSE, PRINCIPLES AND APPLICATION OF THE NSDP

In this section, the value of national spatial development perspectives such as the NSDP is located within the broader developmental environment. The principles, approach and application of the NSDP are also discussed.

#### 1.1 The goals and objectives of the developmental state

In his inauguration speech at the "Tenth Anniversary of Freedom" celebrations, President Thabo Mbeki stressed that "... it will always be impossible for us to say that we have fully restored the dignity of all our people as long as the overwhelming majority of our people suffer under the burden of poverty and deprivation".

The persistence of poverty and unemployment represents the foremost challenges we face as a country. Hence, government's core priorities in the Second Decade of Freedom are to increase economic growth and to promote social inclusion. Achieving these twin outcomes will, however, require a greater developmental role for the State in guiding and directing social and economic development.

If the broad objective of the State is to place South Africa on a new growth and development path and to build a caring and inclusive society premised on human solidarity, what is required of the State according to the Ten Year Review is:

"... focus and decisiveness on the part of government, the will to weigh trade-offs and make choices as well as strategies to inspire all of society to proceed along a new trail. If decisive action is taken in a number of focused areas, the confluence of possibilities is such that the country would enter a road of faster economic growth and job-creation, faster and more efficient provision of quality services, increased social cohesion, and reduction of the paradigm of exclusion prevalent among sections of society"<sup>12</sup>.

#### 1.2 Spatial challenges

Ultimately, all government programmes and activities find expression in space. The spatial dispensation and the nature of the space economy of a country/region have important implications for meeting the social, economic and environmental objectives of a government. For instance, in cases where human settlements are scattered and fragmented over vast distances, servicing becomes expensive, both in terms of initial capital investment and subsequent maintenance. On the other hand, well-connected settlements, with sufficient densities to enable better public transport, are far more conducive to spatial targeting of investment in nodes along such routes to facilitate the creation of jobs that are accessible to all.

Dismantling the spatial distortions of apartheid and constructing new spatial forms and arrangements that are more conducive to the objectives of nation-building and social and economic inclusion, is a pressing preoccupation of policy.

Improving policy and programmatic coordination, weighing trade-offs and making strategic choices to overcome apartheid spatial distortions are the critical aspects influencing the spatial impact of government programmes.

#### 1.3 Meeting the challenges through spatial-development perspectives

According to Akin L Mabogunje "the spatial reorganisation of a country can induce the release of tremendous physical and mental energies, whose practical outcome is certain to give rise to the socio-economic transformation necessary to launch a country on to a path of self-centred, self-reliant and self-sustaining development"<sup>13</sup>.

However, in analysing social exclusion, poverty and inequality, the focus of most policy analysts has often been on individuals and social groups, while the spatial dimensions and manifestations are often neglected. This has implications for the design of policies to address poverty, inequality and social exclusion. Kanbur and Venables argue that the failure to understand inequality and development in spatial terms means "policy discussion tends to take place in something of an analytical and empirical vacuum"<sup>14</sup>.

### PART ONE

National spatial guidelines are increasingly being recognised as a critical tool for bringing about coordinated government action. An exploration of international examples suggests that alignment is increasingly pursued by making use of spatial development frameworks<sup>15</sup>.

The key purpose of such perspectives is to bring about synergy and complementarities in terms of the spatial effects of government action.

'National spatial perspectives' refer to overarching national strategic perspectives providing a comprehensive and incisive analysis of current and future trends, the factors/forces driving these trends and the strategic implications thereof in spatial terms. They are invoked as crucial instruments to support integrated development through the coordination of policies and programmes.

The NSDP is South Africa's first major attempt to understand the national space economy and to provide a principle-based approach to coordinate and guide policy implementation across government. Understanding the national space economy (the dynamics of growth and the determinants of spatial exclusion and inequality) is important, because it has a bearing on practical decisions related to the type and location of infrastructure investment and social spending.

#### **1.4 NSDP principles**

The ultimate purpose of the NSDP in the South African setting is to fundamentally reconfigure apartheid spatial relations and to implement spatial priorities in ways that meet the constitutional imperative to provide access to basic services and economic opportunities to all, to alleviate poverty and inequality. To this end, the document examines the spatial dimensions of economic potential, social exclusion and inequality, and their implications for the achievement of the broader growth and development policy objectives of government. It recognises the burden that unequal and inefficient spatial arrangements place on communities, especially on the poor who incur huge transaction costs by having to commute large distances to and from work.

Given the Government's objectives of growing the economy, creating jobs, addressing poverty and promoting social cohesion, the NSDP assists government in confronting three fundamental planning questions:

- If government were to prioritise investment and development spending in line with its goals and objectives, where would it invest/spend to achieve sustainable outcomes?
- Given the apartheid spatial configuration, what kinds of spatial arrangements are more conducive to the achievement of our goals of nation-building and of social and economic inclusion?
- How can government as a whole capitalise on complementarities and facilitate consistent decision making and move beyond focusing on integration and coordination procedures to establishing processes and mechanisms that will bring about strategic coordination, interaction and alignment?

In order to contribute to the broader growth and development policy objectives of government, to examine the spatial dimensions of social exclusion and inequality, and to lift the burden that unequal and inefficient spatial arrangements place on the State (e.g. high transport subsidies) and communities (e.g. high commuting costs), the NSDP puts forward a set of five normative principles:

**Principle 1:** Rapid economic growth that is sustained and inclusive is a prerequisite for the achievement of other policy objectives, among which poverty alleviation is key.

**Principle 2:** Government has a constitutional obligation to provide basic services to all citizens (e.g. water, energy, health and educational facilities) wherever they reside.

**Principle 3:** Beyond the constitutional obligation identified in Principle 2 above, government spending on fixed investment should be focused on localities of economic growth and/or economic potential, in order to gear up private-sector investment, stimulate sustainable economic activities and create long-term employment opportunities.



**Principle 4:** Efforts to address past and current social inequalities should focus on people, not places. In localities where there are both high levels of poverty and demonstrated economic potential, this could include fixed capital investment beyond basic services to exploit the potential of those localities. In localities with low demonstrated economic potential, government should, beyond the provision of basic services, concentrate primarily on human capital development by providing education and training, social transfers such as grants and poverty-relief programmes. It should also reduce migration costs by providing labour-market intelligence to give people better information, opportunities and capabilities, to enable them to gravitate - if they choose to - to localities that are more likely to provide sustainable employment and economic opportunities.

**Principle 5:** In order to overcome the spatial distortions of apartheid, future settlement and economic development opportunities should be channelled into activity corridors and nodes that are adjacent to or that link the main growth centres. Infrastructure investment should primarily support localities that will become major growth nodes in South Africa and the SADC region to create regional gateways to the global economy.

The NSDP principles are specifically aimed at focusing government action and investment, avoiding the so-called 'watering-can'-approach (see Box 1) and at enabling the developmental State to achieve maximum social and economic impact within the context of limited resources.

While focusing government economic infrastructure spending in areas with some potential for economic development may seem to exclude many other areas from development, this is in fact not the case. Different regions have different economic potential and the spatial variations in the incidence of poverty are also vastly different. The NSDP argues that these diverse and disparate spatial contexts suggests a policy approach which itself should be differentiated and conducive to the requirements of the different contexts. Hence, in areas of low or no economic potential, the path of development and poverty reduction should be through a focus on investment in human capital development (education, training, social welfare, sound rural-development planning, aggressive land and agrarian reform and the expansion of

agricultural extension services, etc.) as elaborated in Section 1.5. The Indian state of Kerala as well as Chile and Tunisia provide striking examples of the effect of this approach on poverty reduction and on overall human development in the so-called 'shadow' areas or areas with low potential.

The NSDP and its principles are also designed to act as a guide for policy coordination with emphasis on the spatial and economic implications of development policy and programmes of national, provincial and local government. South Africa has three spheres of government that are distinct and interrelated. Achieving policy coherence and coordination within such a context is complex. Map 1 illustrates the functional and administrive context of the country. It is intended that the implementation of the strategies of different agencies and spheres of government be monitored in accordance with NSDP principles. In this sense, the NSDP principles are also seen as contributing to:

- The principle of cooperative governance; and
- The achievement of sustainable human settlements and of robust local economies within the framework of sustainable development.



#### Box 1: The failure of the 'watering-can'-approach/principle in the former East Germany<sup>16</sup>

The 'watering-can'-approach/principle is a term that has been used to describe and critique the approach of indiscriminate, uncoordinated and inefficient investment in infrastructure under the ambit of 'spatial equity', by those favouring greater spatial and sectoral concentration in infrastructure investment to strengthen economic clusters<sup>17</sup> and to accelerate economic growth and job creation. As they have it, "[i]t makes no sense to distribute the money indiscriminately with a watering-can"<sup>18</sup>. Instead, they suggest, as argued by Dr Gerhard Heimpold of the Halle Institute for Economic Research, that it would be better "... to concentrate the resources granted on those locations with the best potential for growth"<sup>19</sup>.

The 'watering-can'-approach/principle has been critiqued in approaches at a variety of regional scales, with the spending by the European Union being one of these. In this case, it has been argued that the funds are scattered over too wide an area, resulting in a lack of critical mass and impact<sup>20</sup>. This critique goes back a long way. More than two decades ago, and prior to the subsequent change in policy and magnificent rise of Ireland, it was argued in that country, in relation to the spending of the then EEC Funds, that, "[t]here has been a watering-can policy in relation to the distribution of the regional fund in Ireland. The resources of the fund are spread over too large an area"<sup>21</sup>, resulting in a lack of impact.

The most-often quoted current critique of this approach is that of the former East Germany<sup>22</sup>, where, in an attempt at ensuring 'spatial balance/equality' between it and the former West, a staggering 90 billion Euros have been spent

per annum since reunification in 1989. Despite this enormous investment, economic growth has remained far below that in the West. Migration from the East to the West has also continued unabated, with some rural areas in the former East becoming completely depopulated. Instead of seeing economic development in the East rise to the level of the West, Germany as a whole has fallen into serious recession, with approximately 5 million people, or 11.6% of the workforce, unemployed. Of these, 1.8 million are termed as 'long-term unemployed'. In the East, the average unemployment figure is nearly 20%, with this figure rising to more than 22% in certain parts. In addition to this, those with money, skills and an entrepreneurial drive continue to make their way to the West, leaving the area increasingly depleted of skills and buying power. The picture for the whole of the country is not rosy, with serious questions being asked if it would not have been wiser to have spent funds in a targeted way in the East in those areas with potential, most of them around the major cities and/or to have invested in the areas in the West towards which most of those from the East are gravitating, which would have strengthened the economy and absorptive capacity of these areas. Such focused investment, it is argued, will also provide the critical mass for private-sector investment and consolidation. This is very aptly put by Franz et al who, after an in-depth study into the benefits of the current regional development policy in the former East, argue that "... one may conclude from our findings that the present use of the 'wateringcan'-principle had not been able to stimulate economic applomerations in economically weak peripheral regions. It could be a better strategy to support the existing 'clusters' and industrial agglomerations"<sup>23</sup>.



#### 1.5 Policy interventions impinging on spatial disparities

In generating the principles, the NSDP has drawn on and engaged with national and international theory and empirical cases. International theory shows that spatial inequality is a product of historical growth and the uneven distribution of social and economic development is often a feature of economic and industrial activity. Accordingly, nowhere in the world is social and economic development evenly distributed across geographic space. Moreover, the dynamic qualities of areas are developed historically and culturally over a long period. Hence, most countries and regions have extreme spatial differences. For example, 50% of US GDP is produced in 2% of its land space. On a trans-national scale, 82% of the EU 15's GDP is produced in just 36% of its area<sup>24</sup>.

South Africa is not unique. However, its spatial configuration is not only a product of growth, but also of apartheid spatial planning, particularly in respect of human settlement formation. Apartheid spatial planning ensured that the majority of the people were located far from social and economic opportunities. This has created a disjuncture

8





National Spatial Development Perspective, 2006 South Africa. Prepared for the Presidency by the CSIII Built Environment



### PART ONE

between where people live and where economic opportunities exist, denying the vast majority of the poor access to opportunities for employment, wealth creation and social progress. This spatial marginalisation from economic opportunities is still a significant feature of our space economy.

Spatially uneven social and economic development has generated tremendous debate about how policy interventions should impinge on spatial disparities. Questions such as the following arise:

- Are infrastructure investments in areas with low economic potential effective in reducing poverty?
- What types of investments are effective in areas with poor natural resources and economic potential?
- What kinds of areas afford the poor greater protection against the deleterious effects of economic shocks and the opportunity to diversify income sources?
- Is the aggregate impact on poverty reduction greater by focusing on areas with high poverty rates or with high poverty densities?
- Is it possible in all circumstances to locate jobs where people reside, or does it make more sense to link people to areas with job opportunities?

How these questions are answered may lead to different policy responses and approaches. Some have attempted to redirect public investment from the economically dominant regions to the lagging regions. The thinking within this approach is that by simply investing in infrastructure, the pattern of economic development can be shaped and economic activity spurred. This approach has not proved to be effective and is being largely abandoned, as it is becoming clear that unfocused infrastructure spending does not improve GDP growth. Germany is a telling example. Since unification in 1989, Germany has spent 90 billion euros per annum in the East without much impact<sup>25</sup>. Despite this massive injection of investment, economic activity remains low and migration from the former East to the former West continues.

A divergent view<sup>26</sup> that is gaining currency is that it is not always true that poverty is best addressed where it manifests itself. This view states that poverty is prevalent in some areas because "economic and social dynamism is at such low ebb in those

areas and is unlikely to improve under any feasible scenario of intervention by government or donors". It is more beneficial to engage in activities such as education and healthcare, etc. that provide "valuable momentum to increasing human capital, knowledge and the capability of individuals to make decisions from a broader set of alternatives"<sup>27</sup>. Ellis and Harris succinctly summarise this view when they state: "the poor benefit when they have more options to which to turn and more options are created in the vortex of dynamic growth processes, not in the declining sectors that are left behind"<sup>28</sup>.

From a spatial point of view, studies have shown<sup>29</sup> that the impact on poverty depends crucially on the proximity of poor households to centres of economic activity and the extent to which these households are connected to such economic activities. According to Kanbur and Venables,<sup>30</sup> between 1992 and 2000 when Uganda experienced strong economic growth, the incidence of poverty fell by half in areas around the growth centres, but only by 9% in the remote northern parts. Similarly, in Ghana between 1992 and 1998, poverty did not fall sharply in the less well-connected areas, and in fact increased in the remote northern Savannah zones.

This second view thus emphasises functional linkages and connections between lagging areas and core regions as a means to address spatial disparities. Empirical studies by Niebuhr and Stiller<sup>31</sup> on territorial disparities in Europe show that policy measures aimed at ensuring the even distribution of economic activities do not necessarily enhance efficiency, but may also have adverse effects on overall growth. The core regions form the backbone of the economy and neglecting the core regions can have a detrimental effect on the economy as a whole.

In South Africa the apartheid regime tried to bolster the Bantustans by encouraging, through heavy incentives, factories to locate to remote areas. The factories functioned and jobs were created as long as the incentives lasted. The moment these were removed, the factories shut down and economic activity dwindled.

The NSDP proceeds from the premise that the reconstruction and development of South African society should include the reconfiguration of apartheid spatial relations. This requires an acknowledgement in our development planning of the



existing and changing spatial patterns of population settlement, economic development and general potential. Further, whatever spatial priorities are implemented, they should be guided by these realities, as well as the constitutional imperative to provide basic services to all South Africans wherever they may be located. At the core of the NSDP is the view that the diverse and disparate spatial contexts suggests a policy approach that itself should be differentiated and conducive to the specific requirements of the different spatial contexts.

The approach adopted by the NSDP is, in part, informed by international case studies that show that:

- Unfocused infrastructure spending does not necessarily result in improved GDP growth;
- · Unfocused human resource development does not improve GDP growth;
- Regions that already have some economic success are more likely to grow than other regions, because successful regions have individuals, firms and industries with the ability to learn;
- Successful learning occurs when institutions and incentives work and when institutions are locally specific;
- Success is often achieved through focused and polarised investment; and
- Redirecting public investment from economically dominant regions to lagging regions has not automatically spurred economic activity in lagging regions.

This approach, which differs from the more empirical descriptions used in other spatial perspectives,<sup>32</sup> seeks to focus the bulk of fixed investment<sup>33</sup> of government on those areas with the potential for sustainable economic development. While the idea of focusing government spending on economic infrastructure in areas with some potential for economic development may seem to exclude many other areas, analysis reveals that economic potential and large concentrations of poverty are found in the same places. South Africa has 26 areas of economic concentration that accounted for approximately 77% of total GVA in 2004.

This concentration is illustrated in Table 1 (and in more detail in Part Two). When the 26 areas of economic concentration are extended to an accessibility radius of 60 km to where at least R1 billion of GVA is generated, they account for 95.59% of national GVA, 84.5% of all households and 77.31% of all people living below MLL in the country (see Table 1).

# Table 1: A summary of the concentrated nature of economic accessibility and peo-ple living below the MLL, 2004

Category	% of national population	% of people below MLL in SA	% of national GVA	% of SA land surface
26 areas of economic significance	62.62	53.21	77.04	27.15
Areas of economic significance extended into an accessibility radius of 60 km where R1 billion of GVA is generated/annum	84.46	77.31	95.59	31.24
Concentrations of people below MLL in areas with low economic accessibility (more than 60 km radius from spaces where R1 billion of GVA is generated per annum)	4.10	6.52	0.37	1.32
Remainder of South Africa	11.44	16.17	4.04	67.44

Source: NSDP Spatial Profiles: GVA, 2004 at current prices; and Minimum Living Level, 2004 from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

Hence, a key finding of the NSDP is that localities of higher growth also include a large number of the poor and therefore both policy objectives of promoting economic growth and of poverty alleviation operate largely in the same spaces. This trend will continue to be reinforced by the lure of work opportunities to areas with economic potential. This means that some of the biggest backlogs for services will remain in the most densely populated areas. It can therefore be argued that government spending is likely to be more effective, efficient and equitable if aligned with these trends. The NSDP is unequivocal about suggesting that economic growth and poverty alleviation should be focused on people (that is, follow the trends) and not on places that have become poverty traps for many of the poor (that is, we cannot expect to bring about social equality through spatial equality).

International comparative research has firmly established that no factor correlates dynamic growth with equity as strongly as human capital development. Remedying



### PART ONE

the plight of persons who are stuck in poverty traps in areas with low prospects for sustaining livelihoods in the foreseeable future, may well be better served by forceful efforts directed at human capital development and greater social support (education, skills acquisition, welfare, labour-market intelligence, land reform and agricultural extension services to sustain livelihoods).

While the focus on places – that is the geographical distribution of localities with demonstrated economic potential – seems quite narrow, the focus on people and on localities with demonstrated economic potential addresses the majority of the population. It can be shown<sup>34</sup> that it is in these areas that Government's objectives of both promoting economic growth and alleviating poverty will best be achieved. In areas of limited potential, it is recommended that, beyond a level of basic services to which all citizens are entitled, government should concentrate primarily on human capital development by providing social transfers, education and training and poverty-relief programmes; and by reducing migration costs by providing labour-market intelligence and/or helping with set-up costs to give people in these areas better information, opportunities and capabilities to gravitate towards areas with greater demonstrated potential for economic development, should they so choose.

In addition to this, important interventions that are livelihood-enhancing and supporting will have to be considered, including (1) sound rural-development planning policies and programmes; (2) far more aggressive land and agrarian reform initiatives; and (3) significant expansion of agricultural extension services.

It is assumed, in line with both local and international trends and research, that people tend to move to areas of greater employment or economic opportunities. In this regard, the Ten Year Review highlighted the impact of key social trends over the last decade, such as the 30% increase in the number of households and the net migration to urban areas with a fifth of the population in major cities being new-comers<sup>35</sup>.

In terms of poverty eradication the NSDP is underpinned by the following assumptions:

- Location is critical for the poor to exploit opportunities for growth;
- The poor, who are concentrated around vibrant and active junction points or activity corridors, have greater opportunity to gain from higher rates of economic growth and to improve their welfare;
- Areas of demonstrated economic potential give greater protection to the poor against adverse effects of economic shock because of greater opportunities to diversify income sources;
- Areas with demonstrated economic potential are the most favourable for overcoming poverty;
- Migration studies conclusively prove that the poor are making rational choices about locating to areas of employment and economic opportunities; however
- Government must ensure that policies and programmes are in place to ensure the poor are able to benefit fully from growth and development opportunities in such areas.

### **1.6 NSDP application**

The application of the NSDP will enable government to:

- Undertake rigorous analysis of the space economy to identify areas of economic significance, with a view to focusing government investment and development interventions to ensure maximum and sustainable impact;
- Capitalise on complementarities and facilitate consistent and focused decision
  making by providing a common platform for structured dialogue; and
- Move beyond mere focusing on integration and coordination procedures to establishing processes and mechanisms to bring about strategic coordination, interaction and alignment within government.

#### 1.6.1 Analysis, recording and sharing

The NSDP recognises that unfocused infrastructure spending and human resource development does not improve GDP growth. Moreover, all government actions involve choices, but in the absence of an explicit perspective, such choices become ad hoc and misdirected.


Within the context of the Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) the NSDP principles provide the mechanisms for rational and consistent decision making by expressing a clear preference for evidence-based considerations. The NSDP principles facilitate structured and rigorous analysis that enables comparison between places and between sectors, to assist all three spheres of government in weighing up trade-offs, making clear choices and maximising the impact of scarce state funds. It also necessitates the regular updating and sharing of information to prevent duplication and ensuring that decisions are based on the 'current reality' on the ground (see Diagram 1).

## Diagram 1: The NSDP principles and perspective informing the basis for robust analysis for the three spheres of government<sup>36</sup>



#### 1.6.2 Context-specific spatial and economic-development planning

No policies and activities, whether of national, provincial, local governments or state entities, find expression in mid-air, but rather in physical local spaces in municipalities. IDPs are plans for district/metro and local municipalities containing integrated economic and social programmes for given geographic spaces. They are thus ideal instruments for intergovernmental planning and coordination. It is therefore important to begin to position district/metro IDPs as the primary instruments of intergovernmental coordination. This will, however, necessitate that all spheres of government collaborate to transform the district and metropolitan IDPs into local expressions of the development plans of all three spheres of government. Moreover, it is important that urgent attention be given to building spatial-development planning capacity within government, in particular within districts and metros, to facilitate effective and coordinated decision making across government.

#### 1.6.3 Resource-use and efficiency

In specific local contexts strategic interventions, especially at district and metro levels, need to address the impact of existing natural resource use and the mediumto-long term consequences arising from current patterns of resource use. The outcome of such analysis may require new technologies, appropriate infrastructure provision and a re-assessment of the regulations currently in place.

In opting for sustainable development, spatial interventions and impacts have to be designed and monitored for the broader economy and human settlements, for specific sectors in the economy (e.g. water and energy consumption, air pollution and waste management, brick making, etc) and at household level (e.g. exploring renewable energy alternatives, reducing and re-using waste, and efficient public transport use).

#### 1.6.4 Applying and contextualising the NSDP approach

Each sphere of government has its own distinct development tasks and related planning frameworks corresponding to the scale of operations and the area of jurisdiction. For these frameworks to be coordinated and strategically aligned, each sphere will have to adopt the NSDP methodology and approach.

In the same way that the NSDP uses the structuring elements of potential and need to read the national space economy, all spheres of government should contextualise



### PART ONE

and apply this approach according to their particular context. It is expected that some areas or regions will not feature as prominent economic centres when considered on a national (macro) scale. This, however, does not mean that the NSDP is irrelevant to these areas. On the contrary, any area (whether a province, district, metropolitan or local) regardless of its position in the national space economy can utilise the twin components of potential and need to analyse the local space economy and to define its unique economic capabilities.

Impotantly, consistent and scrupulous application of the NSDP should enable government to identify and seek out new areas of advantage. This is encouraged through more decentralised assessment of potential and comparative advantage particularly through incorporating the NSDP approach and methodology in district and metropolitan development planning processes.

Contextualising and applying the NSDP has to be understood from the perspective that the overall performance of our economy hinges on the growth and development potential of regions. Developing a coherent understanding of regional economic development and territorial patterns of economic development, social exclusion and resource use is of paramount importance in achieving our objectives. The NSDP argues that undertaking infrastructure investment and development-spending decisions on the basis of an area's unique potential is likely to produce far more desirable and sustainable outcomes in terms of addressing poverty and improving growth. Sub-national structures such as districts/metro areas have a valuable role to play in capitalising on synergies and in harnessing the energies and contributions of a range of state and non-state actors and role players, with a view to enhancing an area's social and economic potential. Proceeding from the premise that district and metropolitan areas are to be the pivotal sites on which to build an understanding of the nature and distribution of regional potential across the country, it is envisaged that the NSDP will be used in three ways by national government departments, provinces, and district and metropolitan municipalities:

Firstly, all three spheres of government will use the notion of potential to inform rigorous analysis of the space economy and to identify the areas of economic significance and the relative and dynamic comparative advantage of localities. This process should be informed by the mapping of demonstrated economic potential, as set out in Part Three of the NSDP.

Secondly, having identified the areas of potential within districts and metropolitan municipalities, the NSDP principles should then be used to inform and structure the necessary dialogue between spheres, and between departments and institutions within spheres, on strategic decisions around infrastructure investment and development spending. Provinces and municipalities will also inform this debate by incorporating the NSDP approach into PGDS and IDP, and by ensuring a top-down and bottom-up process of planning for development.

Thirdly, the NSDP will guide the relations between the three spheres of government, and organs of state within each sphere, in as far as it concerns making resource allocation choices and trade-offs, and optimising the intergovernmental impact of public-sector investment within the 46 district and 6 metropolitan municipal areas of the country.

The relationship between national development strategies and plans such as sector strategies, departmental strategic plans, the medium term strategic framework and expenditure framework; provincial plans such as provincial growth and development strategies (PGDSs) and municipal IDPs should be determined in the context of the following set of intergovernmental planning principles:

- The NSDP guidelines and principles should inform planning for development in all spheres.
- District and metropolitan IDPs should reflect the convergence of government (national, provincial and local, as well as organs of state within each sphere) commitment and actions within these municipal areas and should represent the outcomes of intergovernmental coordination and alignment. Ultimately, these plans should become the local expressions of national development plans. Government's development plans and intentions should be based on a shared and common definition of the economic potential of each district and metropolitan area.
- Such a process would provide government with a rigorous appreciation of development potential of each district and metropolitan area and would feed into an

iterative process for the future review, refinement and further elaboration of the NSDP.

The necessary mutual alignment between national principles/guidelines, sectoral departmental planning requirements (standards, provincial strategies) and local needs, conditions and resources must be conducted in the spirit of cooperative governance, whereby the plans of one sphere should support those in another. This should not entail that all plans are in complete agreement but rather that, at the very least, contradictory policies are discouraged and that the spheres align themselves around the national policy priorities.

The NSDP acknowledges that the processes of developing IDPs by local government structures, which themselves cover the length and breadth of the country, is a critical element of spatial planning.

Applying and contextualising the NSDP methodology and approach as an integral part of municipal integrated development planning and the promotion of the convergence of government's commitments and actions within the 52 district/metro-politan municipal areas in accordance with national spatial planning guidelines will be crucial to the realisation of NSDP objectives (see Diagram 2).

#### Monitoring Prioritisation Resource Implementation Allocation DEPARTMENTAL National STRATEGIC District & MTEF & & SECTOR PLANS Metropolitan **Budget** MTSF Spaces Focussed government actio Provincial DEPARTMENTAL NSDP STRATEGIC MTEF & & SECTOR PLANS **Budget** PGDS -District/ DEPARTMENTAL Local 53 Impact STRATEGIC Financial & SECTOR PLANS Zones of Plans & IDP Government **Budget -** - -

As shown in Diagram 2, consistent application of the NSDP will enable government to focus investment and development interventions, capitalise on complementarities and enhance coordination. This will require that the role and status of the NSDP be clearly understood within government. Two aspects are important in this regard. On the one hand, by providing a general methodology and approach for robust planning and coordination across government, the content of the NSDP should be seen to serve as a critical indicative tool for strategic dialogue and decision making in government as a whole. The principles and methodology of the NSDP on the other hand should inform the development plans, policies and programmes of all spheres and agencies of government as a matter of policy.



Diagram 2: NSDP principles guiding prioritisation, resource allocation and implementation in the intergovernmental development-planning landscape

### PART ONE

#### 1.7 Monitoring, review and update

In time, it is envisaged that the various spheres of government will report annually on how their strategic choices with regard to infrastructure investment and development spending relate to the NSDP.

Over and above the monitoring function this would fulfil, the information provided – through these annual reports together with the comments from the three spheres of government on the spatial analysis in Part Three, plus any new data and/or research and the output of key strategies formulated by the different spheres – will be used to periodically update the NSDP for Cabinet (anticipated to be every three years). Cabinet, after any processes of review it may deem necessary, would approve such a revised NSDP, which could then be used to inform future dialogue about government's spatial priorities.

#### **ENDNOTES**

- 12. South African Government, Ten Year Review, 2004.
- 13. Akin L. Mabogunje (1984).
- 14. Kanbur R. and Venables A.J. (2003). Spatial Inequality and Development. Introduction to an edited volume of papers, from the Cornell-LSE-WIDER conference on Spatial Inequality and Development.
- 15. See in this regard the work of Faludi (2003a and 2003b) and Faludi and Waterhout (2002) on supranational planning with specific reference to Europe; the cited examples in Harrison and Oranje (2000) and Oranje (2002) spanning three continents; and a recent paper by Harrison (2004) on examples from all over the globe.
- 16. See *The Economist* of 20-26 August and 27 August to 2 September 2005; Eisenblatter (2004); Anonymous (2003); Glauser (undated); City of Leipzig (2002); Taxpayers Union of Europe (2002); Local Network Governance (2005); Heimpold (2001); Franz et al (2005a); The Fraunhofer Institute for Systems and Innovation Research ISI. (2003).
- 17. The City of Leipzig views clusters as synergistic arrangements combining people, capital and knowledge in which 2 + 2 = 5, and are maintained by networks of experts in businesses, administration, education and associations (City of Leipzig, 2002).
- 18. It has also been used in the donor-community to describe the principle of funding of as many projects as possible in the context of certain programmes offered. Anonymous (2003).
- 19. Heimpold (2001).
- 20. Taxpayers Union of Europe (2002).
- 21. Office of the House of the Oireachtas (1983).

- 22. See especially The Economist (2005) and Heimpold (2001) and Franz et al (2005).
- 23. Franz et al (2005b). Niebuhr A. and Stiller S. (2003).
- 24. The Economist (20-26 August 2005), (27 August to 2 September 2005).
- 25. See Box1.
- 26. Ellis, F. and Harris, N. (2004).
- 27. Ibid.
- 28. Ibid.
- 29. Kanbur, R. and Venables, A.J. (2003).
- 30. Ibid.
- 31. Niebuhr, A. and Stiller, S. (2003).
- 32. Such as the European Spatial Development Perspective and other examples referred to in Annexure B.
- 33. In the context of this proposal, fixed investment refers both to economic (roads, railways, ports) and social (household, schools and clinics) investment. Development funding refers largely to investment in the improvement of human potential, both in order to overcome past inequities and to enable people to adjust to new circumstances and environments.
- 34. This understanding is validated in the spatial narrative in Part Two. A key finding of the research and mapping exercise is that areas of high poverty are part of or adjacent to areas where there is high economic activity and/or economic potential.
- 35. Towards A Ten Year Review, PCAS, The Presidency, 2003.
- 36. Based on the Harmonisation and Alignment Report. 2004. The Presidency, Republic of South Africa.



# 2. READING: DESCRIBING AND MAKING SENSE OF THE NATIONAL SPACE ECONOMY

This section comprises an analysis that summarises the current spatial reality, through the provision of a snapshot of some recent demographic, settlement, environmental, economic and government investment trends.

#### 2.1 Introduction

In this section, the national space economy is described in terms of key demographic, human settlement, economic and environmental trends. The intention with this exercise is to identify (1) areas that score high in terms of displaying certain economic potential; (2) localities with high concentrations of people in need; and (3) clusters of strategic economic importance. The outcome of this exercise provides a coarse first-order analysis of the South African space economy, and identifies the areas of national strategic economic importance and extreme need. This analysis needs to be further refined in provincial and local planning and strategising exercises.

In more detail, this exercise serves the following functions:

- It provides a snapshot in time and space of the current, and in some cases, future
  patterns of demographic, settlement, economic, social and ecological trends.
- It puts in place a framework within which to discuss the future development of the national space economy by reflecting the spatial location of areas of highpopulation concentration; severe deprivation and need; significant demonstrated economic potential; high infrastructural endowment; and areas in which the ecological integrity is under threat or is subject to risks associated with high energy consumption.
- It acts as a common reference point for national, provincial and municipal governments to analyse, debate and reflect on the comparative economic potential of localities in the country.
- It identifies key areas of tension and/or priority in achieving positive spatial outcomes through well-targeted, programmed and coordinated government infra-

structure investment and development spending.

- It provides national government's response to investing and spending in areas of high development and need.
- It provides an opportunity for ensuring alignment in the spatial locations of infrastructure investment and development spending across all three spheres of government.

The NSDP describes the national space economy in terms of key demographic, human settlement, economic and environmental trends. It also identifies areas of national strategic economic importance and extreme need. Two broad elements are used in this regard, namely economic potential and need.

In relation to economic potential, six categories are used (see Table 2). These categories were developed to (1) enable an identification of areas of economic significance and enable comparison between areas; (2) highlight key characteristics and the diverse and unique attributes of localities; and (3) provide signals as to which sectors and institutions need to be supported to ensure the maintenance and growth of the areas of demonstrated economic significance.



### Table 2: Categories of economic potential

Category	Description
Innovation and experimentation	Research and development, and the application of novel technologies to production processes.
Production of high value, differen- tiated goods (not strongly dependent on labour costs)	All forms of production that focus on local and/or global niche markets such as manufacturing, and some specialised agricultural or natural resource-based products.
Production of labour-intensive, mass- produced goods (more dependent on labour costs and/or on natural- resource exploitation)	These are industries, primarily made up of iron and steel producers, and large-scale commercial agricultural and mining activities that are highly dependent on proximity or good, cheap transport linkages to the huge volumes of natural resources that they use in their production processes. They also depend on the availability of large pools of unskilled and semi-skilled labour.
Public services and administration	Activities in this group tend to take place in larger towns and cities with significant public-sector employment and consumption supporting private-sector activities, such as retail and private-sector services.
Retail and private-sector services	These consist of retail, catering and personal services, both formal and informal. These are major components of any economy and of large employers of skilled and semi-skilled workers in most advanced economies. Such activities flourish in diverse settlements with large populations.
Tourism	These diverse set of activities, while generally less spatially focused than, for instance, the manufacturing and services sector, are nonetheless all dependent on a tourist-attractions (e.g. eco-scenery, culture, heritage); good transport routes; safety; and, in certain cases, high-quality medical services, restaurants, retail outlets and hotels.

The categories of need, on the other hand, were developed to:

- · Identify absolute numbers and spatial distribution of people in poverty/need;
- · Enable comparisons among areas; and
- Identify requirements to address poverty.

In order to provide for a more nuanced description of need, three categories by which poverty can be described and mapped<sup>37</sup> are provided in Table 3.

#### Table 3: Categories of need

Category	Description
Number of people below Minimum Living Level (MLL)	This indicates the absolute number of people living below the MLL. Other than a mere indication of percentage of people living below this line, the number of people below MLL provides the indication of quantum, which is crucial for planning purposes.
Weighted poverty gap	This indicates the depth of the poverty of those living below the MLL, which provides an indication of the extent of the improvement that is required to elevate people to above the poverty line.
Human Development Index (HDI)	A composite index that attempts to quantify the extent of human development of a community. It is based on measures of life expectancy, literacy levels and income. The HDI can take on a maximum level of 1 – indicating a high level of human development – and a minimum value of 0 – indicating the opposite.

The Minimum Living Level, which reflects the minimum income required to sustain a household, will vary in accordance with household size – the larger the household, the larger the income required to keep its members out of poverty.

The MLL includes the following items:

- Food;
- Clothing;
- Compulsory payments to local authorities in respect of rent, miscellaneous services, water and electricity;
- Fuel and light;
- · Washing and cleaning materials;
- Education;
- Transport;
- · Contributions to medical funds and medical and dental expenses;
- · Replacement of household equipment;
- Taxes; and
- Support of relatives (applicable only to singles).



The monthly poverty incomes<sup>38</sup> that were used for different household sizes in such analyses are indicated in Table 4.

#### Table 4: Minimum Living Level (Rand-value)

Household size (number of people)	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
1	443	501	526	586	627	684	752	829	871
2	545	610	635	720	765	843	937	1 021	1 074
3	726	810	842	949	1 008	1 098	1 219	1 334	1 398
4	903	1 009	1 050	1 174	1 245	1 349	1 495	1 638	1 713
5	1 084	1 208	1 258	1 402	1 487	1 610	1 784	1 959	2 042
6	1 278	1 422	1 481	1 647	1 745	1 882	2 085	2 291	2 391
7	1 452	1 615	1 681	1 867	1 977	2 124	2 354	2 589	2 708
8+	1 770	1 967	2 047	2 268	2 402	2 563	2 839	3 126	3 241

Source: RICON REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPLORER - ENCYCLOPEDIA (VER 2.0A).

In the following paragraphs, the national space is examined using a number of selected characteristics.

#### 2.2 People and space

#### 2.2.1 Introduction

In this section, the location, growth, movement/migration patterns, age and gender distribution, employment figures, poverty data and education profile of the population are discussed.

#### 2.2.2 Population location and spread

Nationally, the population is largely concentrated in the eastern and northern parts of the country in and around settlements on the primary road network, while the western half of the country is sparsely populated (see Map 2). The four provinces with the highest population figures (KwaZulu-Natal, Gauteng, Eastern Cape and Limpopo) are located in this northern and eastern part of the country (Figure 1).

## Figure 1: Percentage distribution of the population in the nine provinces, 2001-2006

Drovinco	2001	2002	2002 2002		2005	2006	2006	Total 2006	
PLOVINCE	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	(new boundaries)		
Eastern Cape	15.5	15.4	15.2	15.1	15.0	14.9	14.6	6 894 300	
Free State	6.5	6.4	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.2	6.2	2 958 800	
Gauteng	18.5	18.7	18.9	19.0	19.2	19.4	20.1	9 526 200	
KwaZulu-Natal	20.7	20.7	20.7	20.6	20.6	20.5	20.9	9 924 000	
Limpopo	12.3	12.2	12.1	12.1	12.0	12.0	11.3	5 365 400	
Mpumalanga	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	7.4	3 508 000	
Northern Cape	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.3	1 094 500	
North West	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.1	7.1	3 374 200	
Western Cape	9.4	9.5	9.7	9.8	9.9	10.0	10.0	4 745 500	
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	47 390 900	

Source: StatsSA Population Estimates for 2006.



#### Map 2: Population distribution



The highest concentration of population is located in the six metropolitan areas (see Table 5). These are also the areas that have some of the densest settlements in the country,<sup>39</sup> including magisterial districts such as Umlazi, Soweto, Mitchell's Plain, Soshanguve, Goodwood, Chatsworth, Alberton, Wynberg and Inanda. These all have densities of more than 2 000 people per km<sup>2</sup>. In addition to this, these magisterial districts have also experienced the highest rise in density over the last decade, with a rise of more than 1 000 persons per km<sup>2</sup> between 1996 and 2004 taking place in Umlazi, Soweto, Mitchell's Plain and Soshanguve<sup>40</sup> (see Map 3).



In addition to the high concentrations in and around the metropolitan areas, significant concentrations of people are also located in secondary and port cities, large towns and the former Bantustan areas. This includes magisterial districts such as Botshabelo and Mdutjana (Middelburg), Witsieshoek (Phuthaditjhaba), Pietermaritzburg, Mdantsane (Buffalo City), Ritavi (Greater Tzaneen), Oberholzer, Welkom, Nsikazi and Umbumbulo (Bisho), Bushbuckridge and parts of Thoyandou<sup>41</sup>. These are all areas that experienced sizeable increases in population between 1996 and 2004, and that have population densities in excess of 250 people per km<sup>2</sup>. District municipalities such as OR Tambo, Amatole, Vhembe, Bojanala and Capricorn are amongst the most populous districts alongside the major metropolitan municipalities (see Table 5).

The 20 district and metropolitan municipalities account for almost 68% of the national population (see Table 5).

#### Map 3: Population density trend





#### Map 4: Impact of HIV and Aids on the population



Future population growth is likely to be affected critically by the Aids-pandemic, metropolitan growth and continuous foreign in-migration - particular from the rest of Africa (see Map 4 for an indication of the impact of HIV and Aids on the population). Estimates of the incidence of HIV and Aids, in the context of limited or no intervention, indicate that the South African population could peak at around 45 to 48 million within the next 20 years, which is between 15% and 20% lower than what it would have been in the absence of the disease<sup>42</sup>. While this has a myriad implications for the country as a whole, it is set to have further devastating impacts on households and individual enterprises, especially in the small, medium and micro enterprise (SMME) sector.





Table 5: Population figures for the 20 most populous district and metropolitanmunicipalities in the country, 2004

Ranking	District and metropolitan municipality	Province	Total population	% of national population	Cumulative % of national population			
1	City of Johannesburg MM	Gauteng	3 479 723	7.74	7.74			
2	eThekwini MM	KwaZulu-Natal	3 099 213	6.89	14.63			
3	City of Cape Town MM	Western Cape	2 898 908	6.45	21.07			
4	Ekurhuleni MM	Gauteng	2 123 276	4.72	25.79			
5	City of Tshwane MM	Gauteng	1 987 549	4.42	30.21			
6	OR Tambo DM	Eastern Cape	1 682 895	3.74	33.95			
7	Amatole DM	Eastern Cape	1 675 013	3.72	37.68			
8	Ehlanzeni DM	Mpumalanga	1 451 651	3.23	40.91			
9	Vhembe DM	Limpopo	1 203 969	2.68	43.58			
10	Bojanala DM	North West	1 193 645	2.65	46.24			
11	Capricorn DM	Limpopo	1 162 105	2.58	48.82			
12	Mopani DM	Limpopo	1 067 409	2.37	51.19			
13	Nkangala DM	Mpumalanga	1 023 162	2.27	53.47			
14	Nelson Mandela MM	Eastern Cape	1 014 220	2.25	55.72			
15	Greater Sekhukhune DM	Mpu/Limpopo	969 816	2.16	57.88			
16	Sedibeng DM	Gauteng	962 993	2.14	60.02			
17	Umgungundlovu DM	KwaZulu-Natal	933 023	2.07	62.09			
18	Gert Sibande DM	Mpumalanga	902 509	2.01	64.10			
19	Uthungulu DM	KwaZulu-Natal	888 645	1.98	66.08			
20	Chris Hani DM	Eastern Cape	811 961	1.81	67.88			
Te	Total percentage of the 20 district and metropolitan municipalities							

Source: NSDP Data Profiles, Disaggregated and re-aggregated to 2005 demarcated Provincial boundaries through Mesoframework Version 1.1, based on Population Estimates for 2004, Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (Version 190).

#### 2.2.3 Growth and movement/migration patterns

An analysis of Census 1996 and Census 2001 data with regard to population growth figures reveals that the district and metropolitan municipalities that have experienced the highest population growth for this period are the City of Cape Town, areas

in and around the Gauteng city region, eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality and the district municipalities of Amatole and Nkangala (see Table 6).

municipalities with the biggest growth in population in the period 1996 to 2004							
Ranking	District and metropolitan municipality	Province	Total growth population 1996-2004	% of the RSA population growth 1996-2004			
1	City of Cape Town MM	Western Cape	400 005	7.9			
2	Ekurhuleni MM	Gauteng	361 555	7.1			
3	City of Johannesburg MM	Gauteng	357 114	7.0			
4	eThekwini MM	KwaZulu-Natal	330 381	6.5			
5	City of Tshwane MM	Gauteng	286 455	5.6			
6	Sedibeng DM	Gauteng	179 325	3.5			
7	Amatole DM	Eastern Cape	172 429	3.4			
8	Nkangala DM	Mpumalanga	158 002	3.1			
9	Ehlanzeni DM	Mpumalanga	146 105	2.9			
10	Vhembe DM	Limpopo	137 637	2.7			
11	Capricorn DM	Limpopo	119 263	2.3			
12	OR Tambo DM	Eastern Cape	114 873	2.3			
13	Gert Sibande DM (Former Eastvaal District)	Mpumalanga	112 772	2.2			
14	Sekhukhune CBDM	Mpumalanga/Limpopo	112 411	2.2			
15	Nelson Mandela MM	Eastern Cape	111 196	2.2			
16	Umgungundlovu DM	KwaZulu-Natal	110 454	2.2			
17	uThungulu DM	KwaZulu-Natal	110 207	2.2			
18	Mopani DM	Limpopo	103 183	2.0			
19	West Rand CBDM	Gauteng	97 785	1.9			
20	Bojanala Platinum DM	North West	96 641	1.9			

## Table 6: Population growth figures for the 20 district and metropolitanmunicipalities with the biggest growth in population in the period 1996 to 2004

Source: StatsSA 2001.

Between 2001 and 2006, 3 039 159 South Africans migrated from one district or metropolitan municipality to another. (This figure excludes movement within the same district or metropolitan municipality.) This means that about 1 in 15 South Africans migrated from one district or metropolitan municipality to another between



2001 and 2006. Of the district and metropolitan municipalities, 19 experienced a net in-migration of people, while<sup>43</sup> 34 district municipalities experienced a net out-migration.

The following two tables (Tables 7 and 8) provide a list of the municipalities that experienced the greatest net in- and out-migration of South Africans between 2001 and 2006. The tables also indicate what percentage the net in- and out-migrants constituted of the total population for each of these listed municipalities in 2006.

## Table 7: Migration figures for the 19 municipalities experiencing an in-migration of population between 2001 and 2006<sup>44</sup>

Ranking	Name of municipality	Province	Net in- migration	Total population in 1996	In-migration as % of total population in 2001
1	Ekurhuleni MM	Gauteng	140 252	2 384 020	5.88
2	City of Tshwane MM	Gauteng	137 685	1 926 214	7.15
3	City of Cape Town MM	Western Cape	129 400	2 952 385	4.38
4	City of Johannesburg MM	Gauteng	120 330	2 993 716	4.02
5	West Rand DM	Gauteng	42 674	732 759	5.82
6	Ethekwini MM	KwaZulu-Natal	27 277	2 978 811	0.92
7	Eden DM	Western Cape	22 983	419 334	5.48
8	Bojanala Platinum DM	North West	20 168	1 182 913	1.70
9	Cape Winelands (former Boland) DM	Western Cape	18 770	595 564	3.15
10	Metsweding DM	Gauteng	18 560	183 304	10.13
11	West Coast DM	Western Cape	17 211	256 400	6.71
12	Overberg DM	Western Cape	14 965	182 864	8.18
13	Umgungundlovu DM	KwaZulu-Natal	13 149	931 729	1.41
14	Waterberg DM	Limpopo	11 694	613 539	1.91
15	Nelson Mandela MM	Eastern Cape	6 715	1 073 114	0.63
16	Southern DM	North West	4 914	584 956	0.84
17	Ehlanzeni DM	Mpumalanga	2 465	919 503	0.27
18	Siyanda DM	Northern Cape	1 504	212 011	0.71
19	Nkangala DM	Mpumalanga	1 452	1 034 098	0.14

All the Gauteng and Western Cape district and metropolitan municipalities experienced a net in-migration of people between 2001 and 2006, while none of the Free State district municipalities did. Only one district or metropolitan municipality in Limpopo, the Northern Cape and the Eastern Cape experienced net in-migration. In the case of KwaZulu-Natal, the North West and Mpumalanga, only two district or metropolitan municipalities experienced a net in-migration.

In most cases, the movement was to municipalities with either a strong metropolitan area or a secondary city. Primarily though, the pattern was that of a focused migration towards the two predominantly metropolitan provinces in the country (i.e. Gauteng and the Western Cape).

The percentage of in-migration as a percentage of the total population is much higher in the municipalities in these two more metropolitan provinces (between 3.15% and 10.13%) than that in the more rural provinces (between 0.14% and 1.91%), with the percentage in most of the district and metropolitan municipalities in the latter group being below 1% of the total population. The single highest percentage of in-migration as a percentage of total population (10.13%) occurred in the Metsweding DM in the Gauteng province.

Source: StatsSA, Migration Data Table, 2006.



Ranking	Name of municipality	Province	Net out- migration	Total population in 1996	Out-migration as % of total population in 2001
1	OR Tambo DM	Eastern Cape	95 737	1 677 914	5.71
2	Amatole DM	Eastern Cape	83 514	1 708 126	4.89
3	Chris Hani DM	Eastern Cape	65 846	773 505	8.51
4	Sekhukune DM	Mpumalanga	62 575	936 016	6.69
5	Capricorn DM	Limpopo	53 242	1 087 685	4.89
6	Vhembe DM	Limpopo	31 405	1 241 013	2.53
7	Mopani DM	Limpopo	29 075	937 041	3.10
8	Central DM	North West	27 664	713 675	3.88
9	Alfred Nzo DM	Eastern Cape	27 610	579 583	4.76
10	Lejweleputswa DM	Free State	26 023	694 609	3.75
11	Bohlabela DM	Limpopo and Mpumalanga	25 479	694 746	3.67
12	Umzinyathi DM	KwaZulu-Natal	24 448	425 625	5.74
13	Ukhahlamba DM	Eastern Cape	23 196	297 540	7.80
14	Thabo Mofutsanyane DM	Free State	21 985	717 822	3.06
15	Zululand DM	KwaZulu-Natal	21 333	769 971	2.77
16	Bophirima DM	North West	16 352	426 431	3.83
17	Umkhanyakude DM	KwaZulu-Natal	15 587	555 618	2.81
18	Gert Sibande DM	Mpumalanga	14 988	851 892	1.76
19	Uthukela DM	KwaZulu-Natal	13 865	585 690	2.37
20	uThungulu DM	KwaZulu-Natal	12 600	809 710	1.56
21	Amajuba DM	KwaZulu-Natal	11 806	541 486	2.18
22	Kgalagadi DM	Northern Cape and North West	8 470	173 010	4.90
23	Ugu DM	KwaZulu-Natal	8 226	650 724	1.26
24	King Shaka DM	KwaZulu-Natal	8 083	578 557	1.40
25	Sisonke DM	KwaZulu-Natal	5 460	277 489	1.97
26	Frances Baard DM	Northern Cape	5 264	337 029	1.56
27	Karoo DM	Western Cape	5 174	166 720	3.10

## Table 8: Migration figures for municipalities experiencing the greatest out-migration of population between 2001 and 2006

### Table 8: (continued)

Ranking	Name of municipality	Province	Net out- migration	Total population in 1996	Out-migration as % of total population in 2001
28	Namakwa DM	Northern Cape	1 855	103 367	1.80
29	Fezile Dabi DM	Free State	1 608	475 416	0.34
30	Motheo DM	Free State	1 565	734 801	0.21
31	Cacadu DM	Eastern Cape	1 131	375 619	0.30
32	Sedibeng DM	Gauteng	609	843 006	0.07
33	Xhariep DM	Free State	329	121 319	0.27
34	Sentrale Karoo DM	Western Cape	70	56 530	0.12

Source: StatsSA, Migration Data Table, 2006.

Of the 20 district or metropolitan municipalities that experienced the highest net out-migration of people between 2001 and 2006, six (out of a total of seven for the province) district and metropolitan municipalities are in the Eastern Cape, three (out of a total of four) district municipalities are in Limpopo and two (out of a total of four) district municipalities are in the North West province. The three district municipalities that experienced the largest net out-migration in absolute numbers in this period were all in the Eastern Cape, while the municipality that saw the largest out-movement of people as a percentage of its total population was Chris Hani DM with 8.51%.

Movement of people between major towns and metropolitan areas is also prominent. Between 2001 and 2006, major movements were evident within the metropolitan municipalities in the Gauteng province. For example, 50 260 people moved from the City of Johannesburg MM to the Ekurhuleni MM and 41 961 from the Ekurhuleni MM to the City of Johannesburg. Other movements of more than 20 000 persons took place from:

- the Amatole DM and the Chris Hani DM to the City of Cape Town MM (40 214 people and 30 626 people respectively);
- the Bojanala Platinum DM and the Capricorn DM to the City of Tshwane MM (34 283 and 25 563 people respectively);



- the City of Johannesburg MM to the City of Tshwane MM and the City of Cape Town (21 364 and 21 038 people respectively);
- the Sedibeng DM to the City of Johannesburg MM (20 986 people); and
- the Capricorn DM to the Ekhurhuleni MM (20 178 people).

The analysis in Tables 7 and 8 of population movement figures reveals that larger towns and cities are generally witnessing a net gain of people, while rural areas are experiencing a loss (see the disaggregated spatial distribution of population losses and gains on Map 5). This would suggest that, as is universally the case, people are moving to places where there are economic activities, or at least perceived to be, and where levels of income are higher and prospects for employment are better. Areas experiencing the highest influx rates are the metropolitan areas and secondary cities, despite already high levels of unemployment in these places (see Section 2.2.4). Estimates in the *Ten Year Review* done in 2003, have it that more than 20% of the population in the major metropolitan areas and some of the regional centres and small towns are new migrants.

Government's discussion document on macrosocial trends quotes an analysis of the *1997 October Household Survey*<sup>45</sup>, which offers the following main reasons for migration:

#### Table 9: Reasons for migration by percentage of respondents

Reason	Percentage
Marriage-related	12%
Work-related	50%
Moved to a new house	24%
Could no longer afford to pay rent	1%
Evicted	2%
Left to escape crime	2%
Lack of land	3%
Political reasons	3%
Other reasons	3%

Source: A Nation in the Making: A Discussion Document on Macrosocial Trends in SA, 2006.

Anecdotal evidence from the Western and Eastern Cape suggests a tendency for migration to take place from more-rural villages to major roads that cross these areas. In this way, households manage to maintain a link to a form of rural agriculture. At the same time, they seek to gain from being on a conduit (the road) of buying power in the form of passing traffic, and to facilitate movement to towns and cities with a view to finding employment.

Between 1996 and 2001, the largest increases in the economically active population took place in Gauteng, KwaZulu-Natal, the Western Cape and Limpopo (see Figure 2). A more detailed analysis reveals that predominantly rural districts have a much higher percentage of their population in the 0 to 19 yearold age group, while predominantly urban districts and metros have a much higher percentage of their population in the 15 to 65 year-old economically active age group (see Annexure E).







#### Table 10: Population per age group per province, 1996 and 2001

	2001					1996				
Province	Age	group a	s % of p	rovince t	total	Age	e group a	as % of p	province t	otal
	Age 0-14	Age 15-19	Age 20-39	Age 40-65	Age 66+	Age 0-14	Age 15-19	Age 20-39	Age 40-65	Age 66+
Eastern Cape	36.8	12.6	26.1	18.8	5.7	39.5	11.7	26.7	16.8	5.3
Free State	30.7	11.3	32.8	20.6	4.6	31.1	10.3	34.6	19.7	4.3
Gauteng	23.6	8.5	41.6	22.7	3.6	25.5	8.0	41.2	21.5	3.8
KwaZulu-Natal	34.7	12.0	30.9	18.2	4.2	36.2	11.1	31.6	17.0	4.1
Limpopo	39.4	13.2	26.9	15.4	5.2	43.1	12.4	26.1	13.5	4.9
Mpumalanga	35.0	11.9	31.7	17.5	3.9	36.1	10.8	33.1	16.2	3.8
North West	30.6	10.3	31.6	22.5	5.0	33.6	10.4	31.5	20.0	4.6
Northern Cape	31.3	10.6	33.0	20.5	4.6	33.7	10.4	33.6	18.0	4.3
Western Cape	27.3	9.9	35.6	22.5	4.7	29.2	9.0	36.2	20.9	4.7
South Africa	32.2	11.1	32.2	19.9	4.6	34.2	10.5	32.7	18.2	4.4

Source: StatsSA.

#### Figure 2: Change in population per age group per province, 1996-2001



Source: StatsSA, 2001.

Gender composition per province indicates a slightly higher number of females in the provinces of Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Limpopo (see Figure 3).

#### Figure 3: Gender composition per province



Source: StatsSA, 2001.

In summary two key trends can be identified in the country: (1) the 'hollowing out' of parts of the Northern Cape and Southern Free State; and (2) pressure on the northern part of the country and sections of the coastal area. Over and above a general townward shift, most localities outside of the major metropolitan areas also experienced a net decline in population due to out-migration, declining fertility, and possibly the impact of HIV and Aids (see Map 5).

#### 2.2.4 Employment

The size of the economically active population has grown immensely – from an estimated 9.6 million people in 1995 to 11.2 million in 2002, which represents a growth of just below 34%. As a result, even though the economy created some 1.6 million net new jobs between 1995 and 2002, the number of unemployed (using the strict StatsSA definition) grew by 2.4 million in this period<sup>46</sup>.

27

18 261 294

KwaZulu-Natal and Gauteng are the provinces with the largest number of unemployed (each have more than 20% of the total unemployment in RSA), followed by the Eastern Cape, Limpopo and North West (see Figure 4 and Table 11). In four provinces (Eastern Cape, Kwa-Zulu Natal, Limpopo and North West) more of the economically active population are unemployed than formally employed (see Figure 5).

## Figure 4: Employment figures for provinces as a percentage of economically active population (EAP) for RSA, 2004



Source: Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (version 190).

		Number of people								
Province	Unemployed	Formally employed	Informally employed	Economically active population (EAP)						
Eastern Cape	1 128 695	700 866	160 986	2 025 855						
Free State	507 099	586 070	102 566	1 296 276						
Gauteng	1 603 918	3 236 142	360 347	4 712 407						
KwaZulu-Natal	1 621 229	1 287 655	376 026	3 472 305						
Limpopo	715 147	498 718	194 985	1 484 590						
Mpumalanga	464 651	572 066	186 975	1 226 122						
Northern Cape	135 322	216 992	16 038	380 055						
North West	701 451	673 091	119 748	1 525 540						
Western Cape	504 643	1 422 575	167 291	2 138 145						

#### Table 11: Employment figures for provinces and RSA, 2004

Source: Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (version 190).

7 382 156

Total

## Figure 5: Employment figures per province as a percentage of economically active population in each province, 2004

9 194 175

1 684 963



Source: Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (version 190).



#### Map 6: Unemployment (total number of people), 2004



In relative terms, the rate of employment as a percentage of economically active population per province is the highest in Gauteng, Western Cape and Northern Cape (see Figure 5).

A spatial analysis of employment data (see Maps 6 and 7) reveals that unemployment is strongly concentrated in the metropolitan areas (see employment figures per district and metro area in Annexure E), the secondary and port cities and large towns, the former Bantustans, and rural areas of the Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, North West, Limpopo and Mpumalanga. With higher numbers of females relative to males in the Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Limpopo, the differential impact of unemployment on women is greater in these provinces.



An analysis of formal employment figures per NSDP category (see Table 12 for a provincial breakdown) from 1996 to 2004 shows a rise in formal employment in the (1) services and retail, (2) public services and administration and (3) tourism categories. The biggest decline in formal employment took place in the labour-intensive massproduced goods category (see Figure 6). Map 7: Unemployment (percentage of people in area), 2004





### Table 12: Formal employment per NSDP category of economic development potential as a percentage of formal employment

Province	Labour- intensive mass- produced goods	High-value differentiated goods	Services and retail	Tourism	Innovation and experimen- tation	Public services and administration	Total
			199	96			
National	44.0	9.9	22	3.9	0.16	19.6	7 191 477
Western Cape	45.2	7.9	24	4.9	0.16	17.9	1 269 755
Eastern Cape	35.9	12.3	18	3.3	0.07	30.1	548 027
Northern Cape	54.9	4.1	16	2.7	0.06	22.0	166 744
Free State	60.7	3.2	14	2.1	0.07	19.5	523 052
KwaZulu-Natal	46.1	9.7	21	3.6	0.14	19.8	1 009 185
North West	56.8	5.1	14	4.6	0.06	19.8	527 025
Gauteng	32.7	15.3	30	4.5	0.27	17.0	2 309 489
Mpumalanga	59.4	6.9	16	2.3	0.07	15.8	471 995
Limpopo	50.1	3.1	14	2.4	0.08	30.4	366 206
			200	04			
National	36.1	7.9	27.8	4.6	0.24	23.4	8 237 508
Western Cape	37.8	5.8	27.2	5.7	0.21	23.3	1 330 193
Eastern Cape	30.0	8.9	20.6	3.7	0.10	36.8	613 125
Northern Cape	49.8	3.2	17.9	2.9	0.08	26.2	191 647
Free State	49.5	2.7	16.6	2.5	0.09	28.5	487 916
KwaZulu-Natal	38.3	7.9	25.8	4.2	0.21	23.6	1 153 212
North West	48.7	3.9	18.0	5.9	0.09	23.4	607 823
Gauteng	25.1	12.1	38.8	5.2	0.41	18.3	2 904 843
Mpumalanga	52.5	5.5	19.3	2.8	0.10	19.8	513 869
Limpopo	48.7	1.9	12.1	2.2	0.09	35.1	434 879





#### Figure 6: Changes in formal employment figures per NSDP category, 1996-2004



As indicated on Map 8 the biggest relative increase in unemployment between 1996 and 2004 has been in Potchefstroom/Klerkdorp area, the southern and northern parts of Johannesburg, Port Elizabeth and Pietermaritzburg, with high relative increases in unemployment also evident in Durban, North of Pretoria, as well as in a number of secondary cities. Map 8: Unemployment trends, 1996-2004





#### 2.2.5 Education

An overview of levels of education indicates relatively high levels of education in the category of matric and higher in Gauteng and the Western Cape, compared with the other provinces (see Figure 7 and Annexure E). Excluding those in Gauteng and the Western Cape, more than 10% of the population has no formal schooling. In the light of the changes in the employment figures and trends in work opportunities, it is evident that formal employment opportunities are declining in the labour-intensive category and increasing in the service-related category. This trend and the demand for innovation and highly flexible and skilled labour markets highlight the challenge that the country and most provinces face with regard to lifting the levels of education.

## Figure 7: Levels of education per province as a percentage of population per province, 2001



#### 2.2.6 Poverty

Numerous studies over the past number of years have explored the extent and depth of poverty<sup>47</sup> in South Africa. One such recent study, *Trends in Poverty and Inequality* Since the Political Transformation <sup>48</sup> highlights the 1990s as a decade in which the new government had to operate in an economy marked by stagnant growth, high unemployment and widespread poverty; whilst since the turn of the century, "...[the] expanded social-grant system and improving labour-market prospects have had major impacts on poverty reduction" (see Box 2: Social and institutional grant allocation). Despite their usefulness in pointing out trends, such studies tend to neglect the spatial dimensions and manifestations of poverty. As discussed earlier, failure to understand poverty and inequality in spatial terms tend to lead to policy discussions taking place in an analytical and empirical vacuum. Often poverty indicators used in such studies unfortunately do not enable spatially disaggregated and comparative analysis. In contrast the NSDP uses the Minimum Living Level measure which allows for spatial representation and interpretation. On average, the MLL translates into a much higher 'poverty line' (see Table 4), hence the larger number of people who are considered in need compared to the stricter Poverty Datum Line Measures (see Table 13). This is supplemented with an analysis of the poverty gap and Human Development Index (HDI) at magisterial district level (the smallest unit of analysis for these indicators available at the time of publication) to provide a richer description of the socio-spatial dimension of poverty and human development.

Source: StatsSA, 2001.

#### Box 2: Social and institutional grant allocation<sup>49</sup>

A number of social grants have been put in place and are contributing, among other things, towards alleviating poverty and assisting households in creating livelihoods. Social grants such as the child-support grant, grant for the aged person, war-veterans grant, foster-child grant, government-institution grant, care-dependency grant and combination grant are all aimed at specific target groups.

#### Figure i: Grant allocation per province



#### Figure ii: Type of grant per province



Some of the key trends are (1) that females constitute 84% of beneficiaries of social grants; (2) that more than 20% of all grants are allocated to recipients in the Limpopo province; and (3) that more than 15% of all grants are allocated to recipients in the Free State (see Figure i). The relations between; for example, gender, age and poverty distributions in the respective provinces and the type of grants taken up in the provinces are clearly evident (see Figure ii). Flows of grants to Limpopo, KwaZulu-Natal and Free State are high, with almost 67% of all grants going to these provinces. In the case of the government institution grant, almost 65% goes to the Free State in support of the administrative and income-generating capacity of weak municipalities.



#### Map 9: Concentration of people living below MLL



An analysis of people below the Minimum Living Level indicates strong concentrations in (1) the six metropolitan areas; (2) the secondary and port cities; (3) large towns on the major national road grid; and (4) the more rural, former Bantustan areas - a stark reminder of former apartheid policies that forcefully located people in isolated and desolate places with little/low demonstrated economic potential (see Map 9). Table 13 illustrates that the largest numbers of people living below the MLL are located in KwaZulu-Natal (5.3 million) and Eastern Cape Province (4.8 million), followed by Mpumalanga (2.9 million) and Gauteng province (2.8 million) (see also Annexure E and Figure 2). The fact that Gauteng has more or less the same number of unemployed persons as Eastern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal, but a much lower number of people living below MLL, indicates that urban concentrations have more opportunities outside the formal economy than rural areas and that the absorption capacity of people not employed in the formal economy is higher in these areas than in rural areas.



It is especially in municipalities in the northern and eastern parts of the country that extremely high densities of the poor are concentrated. Once again, the pattern indicates high levels of those living below MLL in major towns and cities, as well as in remote areas far removed from the major cities and towns. These patterns are borne out by the information for the various district and metropolitan municipalities (Table 14 and Annexure A).

#### Table 13: Poverty figures per province, 2004 data

	Poverty	data	% of National	Difference between %	
Province	People below Minimum Living Level (2004)	% of Population below MLL in RSA (2004)	Population (2001)	of population below MLL in RSA and % of National Population	
KwaZulu-Natal	5 491 199	23.28	21.38	1.90	
Eastern Cape	4 744 003	20.12	14.03	6.09	
Limpopo	3 437 904	14.58	11.16	3.41	
Gauteng	2 662 439	11.29	20.47	-9.18	
Mpumalanga	2 088 163	8.85	7.51	1.35	
North West	1 861 970	7.89	7.13	0.77	
Free State	1 680 005	7.12	6.03	1.09	
Western Cape	1 051 516	4.46	10.08	-5.62	
Northern Cape	567 197	2.40	2.22	0.19	
Total	23 584 395				

Source: NSDP Data Profiles, Disaggregated and re-aggregated to 2005 demarcated Provincial boundaries through Mesoframework Version 1.1, based on Population Estimates for 2004, Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (Version 190).

		-	_	-	
Ranking	District and metropolitan municipality	Province	People below Minimum Living Level	% of national population living below MLL in municipality	Cumulative % of % of population below MLL in province
1	OR Tambo DM	Eastern Cape	1 463 491	6.21	6.21
2	Amatole DM	Eastern Cape	1 298 980	5.51	11.71
3	eThekwini MM	KwaZulu-Natal	1 046 053	4.44	16.15
4	Ehlanzeni DM	Mpumalanga	973 079	4.13	20.27
5	Capricorn DM	Limpopo	875 105	3.71	23.98
6	City of Johannesburg MM	Gauteng	865 573	3.67	27.66
7	Vhembe DM	Limpopo	864 691	3.67	31.32
8	City of Cape Town MM	Western Cape	718 254	3.05	34.37
9	Chris Hani DM	Eastern Cape	693 256	2.94	37.31
10	Greater Sekhukhune DM	Mpu/Limpopo	685 253	2.91	40.21
11	Mopani DM	Limpopo	670 500	2.84	43.05
12	Ekurhuleni MM	Gauteng	589 449	2.5	45.55
13	Nkangala DM	Mpumalanga	558 187	2.37	47.92
14	Gert Sibande DM	Mpumalanga	556 897	2.36	50.28
15	Uthungulu DM	KwaZulu-Natal	552 778	2.34	52.63
16	UMgungundlovu DM	KwaZulu-Natal	532 359	2.26	54.88
17	Bojanala DM	North West	531 067	2.25	57.14
18	City of Tshwane MM	Gauteng	515 537	2.19	59.32
19	Sedibeng DM	Gauteng	475 789	2.02	61.34
20	Nelson Mandela MM	Eastern Cape	448 437	1.9	63.24

## Table 14: The 20 district and metropolitan municipalities with the highest percentages of those living below MLL in the country $% \left( {{\left[ {{{\rm{T}}_{\rm{T}}} \right]}} \right)$

Source: NSDP Data Profiles, Disaggregated and re-aggregated to 2005 demarcated Provincial boundaries through Mesoframework Version 1.1, based on Population Estimates for 2004, Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (Version 190).



#### Map 10: Poverty gap



An analysis of the poverty gap (see Maps 10 and 11) and employment statistics (see Maps 6, 7 and 8) between 1996 and 2004 provides the same information as the MLL data, indicating that the depth of poverty of those living below the MLL is highest in (1) the metropolitan areas; (2) the secondary and port cities and large towns, such as Pietermaritzburg, East London and Bisho, Bloemfontein, Rustenburg, Mmabatho, Kimberley, Newcastle and Welkom; and (3) the former Bantustan and densely populated rural areas in Limpopo (in the district municipalities of Waterberg, Capricorn, Sekhukune and Vhembe), Mpumalanga (Bushbuckridge and Nkomazi), North West (in the Central and Bojanala district municipality areas), and the KwaZulu-Natal and Eastern Cape coastline and surrounding areas <sup>50</sup>.



### Map 11: Poverty gap trend analysis



**38** NATIONAL SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE



#### Map 12: Human Development Index, 2004



The Human Development Index (HDI) (see Map 12) indicates relatively high development levels in the urban areas of the country and relatively low development levels in the more rural areas of the country, especially in the Eastern Cape, the Free State, North West and KwaZulu-Natal. As indicated in Table 2 of this section, this index uses life expectancy, literacy levels and income as its key indicators.

As such, the HDI works on averages for people in places rather than the actual number of persons. This means that a particular locality in which there are high levels of absolute poverty but also significant levels of wealth will score far higher than areas in which the latter, wealthier group is absent. The presence of significant numbers of people with relatively high incomes and access to high quality health services in urban areas explains the difference between urban and rural areas. The higher HDI in urban areas thus often hides huge and deep pockets of urban poverty. Notwithstanding this, the HDI does point out the lack of human development in many rural areas - an area that the NSDP specifically seeks to address though focusing spending on the people living in such places.



#### 2.3 Economy and space

#### Map 13: Distribution of economic activity, total GVA, 2004

## 2.3.1 Spatial location of economic activity

Map 13 indicates that even though there is some level of economic activity in most parts of the country, an extremely high level of GVA is generated on a very small proportion of the land. As in most parts of the world (including the European Union<sup>51</sup> and North America), the location and spread of significant and dynamic economic activity in South Africa is heavily concentrated in a few regions/areas of the country. Map 14 provides an indication of concentrations of economic activity by identifying areas with medium-tohigh levels of demonstrated economic potential. In Europe, the major agglomerated and large city and urbanised regions comprise 36% of the territorial space, but generate 82% of GDP<sup>52</sup>. In the USA, 50% of GDP is generated on 2% of the territory.

As argued in Part One, spatial inequality is a product of growth and that the dynamic qualities of areas are developed historically, institutionally and culturally over a long period. In terms of the spatial concentration of growth, South Africa is thus not unique. However, it is unique in that apartheid spatial



National Spatial Development Perspective, 2006 South Africa. Prepared for the Presidency by the CSIR Built Environment.



40

Economy

#### Map 14: Concentrations of economic activity and accessibility



planning, particularly in terms of human settlement formation, created a disjuncture between where people live and where economic opportunities exist. The assumption is that localities that have exhibited past activity in a particular category are more likely to have the potential to continue doing so in the future. Economic potential is thus demonstrated through existing economic activities and especially through the generation of GVA for the specific geographic area.

Research conducted for the NSDP 2003 indicated that, despite almost three decades of spatial engineering by the apartheid regime (1960s to the late 1980s), the locations that contribute the most to national GVA have been subject to little change over the last 100 years of settlement in the country<sup>53</sup>. Research into international examples of similar attempts at redirecting the location of economic activity revealed that this has largely been unsuccessful. The trend increasingly seems to be for governments to support and, at most, guide the 'flows' of economic activity and people, and to ameliorate the difficulties faced by those in localities that have low or limited demonstrated economic potential, by focusing on improving and/ or maintaining the quality of life in these areas.



The key driver in this approach is ensuring the maintenance of those places that make the biggest contribution to tax income and job creation in a country.

The assumption underlying this approach is that localities that exhibit high levels of economic activity are more likely to have the potential to do so in the future. This, however, does not preclude the identification of new areas of potential.

A provincial breakdown indicates that by far the largest percentage of GVA is being generated by the Gauteng province, followed by KwaZulu-Natal, the Western Cape, Mpumalanga and North West (see Figure 8). In South Africa's case, the dominant economic centres are the six metropolitan areas, with a very strong node stretching from the Middelburg/Witbank conurbation in the east, through Gauteng, to the Rustenburg/Brits area in the west. Further areas of high GVA include major secondary cities and their surrounding areas, such as Bloemfontein, Nelspruit, Umtata, Welkom, Newcastle, Richards Bay, Potchefstroom, Klerksdorp, Kimberley, George/Mossel Bay, Pietermaritzburg and East London<sup>54</sup>, the coastal areas of KwaZulu-Natal, the mineral extraction zones in the Limpopo province and the Northern Cape.

#### Figure 8: GVA figures for the nine provinces, 2004



Table 15 provides an indication of the 20 district and metropolitan municipalities in South Africa making the largest contribution to the GVA of the country, with the relative contribution evident in Annexure E.

#### Table 15: Top 20 contributors to total national GVA, 2004 data

Ranking	District and metropolitan municipality	Province	TOTAL GVA (R1 000)	% of national GVA
1	City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	GT	221 376 293	18.13
2	City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality	WC	137 148 900	11.23
3	eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality	KZN	122 116 536	10.00
4	City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	GT	112 293 408	9.20
5	Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality	GT	86 392 597	7.08
6	Bojanala District Municipality	NW	44 672 135	3.66
7	Nkangala District Municipality	MP	38 730 795	3.17
8	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality	EC	35 920 783	2.94
9	Gert Sibande District Municipality	MP	27 414 783	2.25
10	Southern District Municipality	NW	25 090 484	2.06
11	Cape Winelands District Municipality	WC	23 088 753	1.89
12	Sedibeng District Municipality	GT	21 792 359	1.78
13	Amatole District Municipality	EC	20 117 165	1.65
14	Motheo District Municipality	FS	19 209 270	1.57
15	Uthungulu District Municipality	KZN	19 189 861	1.57
16	Fezile Dabi District Municipality	FS	19 008 093	1.56
17	Ehlanzeni District Municipality	MP	18 361 722	1.50
18	UMgungundlovu District Municipality	KZN	17 023 539	1.39
19	Waterberg District Municipality	NP	13 967 938	1.14
20	Eden District Municipality	WC	13 852 574	1.13
	Total for the 20 municipalities	-	1 036 767 997	84.92

Source: NSDP Data Profiles, Disaggregated and re-aggregated to 2005 demarcated Provincial boundaries through Mesoframework Version 1.1, based on Population Estimates for 2004, Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (Version 190).



The percentage of national GVA exceeds the percentage of the national population that live there in only two provinces (see Table 5 and Annexure E). Gauteng and Western Cape together have 30% of the population, but contribute 55% to national GVA. The flipside of this pattern is a high number of localities with low levels of GVA and high population concentrations. Consequently, the per-capita contribution to national GVA is the highest in Gauteng, followed by the Western Cape (see Figure 9).

## Figure 9: Difference between percentage of national GVA generated and percentage of national population



Source: Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (version 190).



Some of the areas with high demonstrated economic potential are experiencing difficulties. An analysis of the trends in GVA between 1996 and 2004 (see Map 15) suggests that, despite places such as the West Rand and the Free State Goldfields still showing relatively high GVAs per annum, they have been experiencing a steady decline in this regard over the past few years. Map 15: GVA trends, 1996-2004





#### Map 16: GVA projection 2010



Projected GVAs for 2010 show an entrenchment of current patterns (see Map 16).



#### 2.3.2 Spatial location of categories of economic activity

The broad analysis of GVA provides valuable insights into the national spread of economic activity, but does not reveal the categories of economic endeavour that constitute it. In order to provide a more nuanced reading of the space economy, as well as to facilitate the analysis of economic potential, the national space economy was further analysed in terms of the six categories described in Part Two. The categories are as follows (see Table 2 for description):

- Production: Labour-intensive mass-produced goods;
- Production: High-value differentiated goods;
- Public services and administration;
- Retail and private-sector services;
- Innovation and experimentation; and
- Tourism.

The relative share of these categories of the national GVA and the relative provincial contribution of each of these provinces is set out in Tables 16 and 17 respectively (also see Annexure E). As shown in Table 16, the services and retail category is the largest single contributor, accounting for 34% of national GVA, followed by labour-intensive mass-produced goods at 33.2%. Provinces in which the latter category is most prominent are the Free State, the Northern Cape, North West, Mpumalanga and Limpopo. Gauteng and Western Cape Provinces are dominant in services and detail.

	GVA share of categories at national level and relative to provincial GVA										
Locality	Labour-intensive mass-produced goods	High-value differentiated goods	Public services and administration	Services and retail	Innovation and experi- mentation	Tourism	Total				
South Africa	33.2	12.4	17.7	34.0	0.1	2.7	100				
Eastern Cape	25.6	12.5	29.9	29.5	0.1	2.4	100				
Gauteng	23.7	16.2	14.8	41.9	0.2	3.1	100				
KwaZulu-Natal	33.7	13.5	19.2	30.8	0.1	2.6	100				
Free State	44.4	6.3	23.4	23.6	0.1	2.3	100				
Northern Cape	46.1	6.2	22.0	23.7	0.0	2.0	100				
Western Cape	28.7	9.0	18.6	40.7	0.1	2.8	100				
North West	56.8	6.4	14.7	19.5	0.0	2.6	100				
Mpumalanga	59.9	11.5	11.3	16.0	0.0	1.3	100				
Limpopo	41.7	4.0	29.5	22.9	0.0	1.9	100				

## Table 16: GVA share of the six economic categories at national level and in each province, 2004 data

Source: Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (version 190).

However, as shown in Table 17, Gauteng is a big contributor to the GVA in all the categories; for example, accounting for about 64% of all innovation and 41% of all tourism GVA.



## Table 17: Relative provincial contribution to the GVA of each category of economic activity, 2004 GVA data

	Province									
Category	Eastern Cape	Gauteng	KwaZulu -Natal	Free State	Northern Cape	Western Cape	North West	Mpuma- langa	Limpopo	Tota
Innovation and experimentation	2.7	63.5	9.6	2.7	0.6	15.7	2.1	1.8	1.3	100
High-value differentiated goods	6.1	52.6	14.4	2.6	1.0	11.3	3.4	7.5	1.1	100
Labour-intensive mass-produced goods	4.7	28.7	13.3	6.8	2.7	13.3	11.3	14.6	4.5	100
Public services and administration	10.2	33.5	14.3	6.7	2.4	16.3	5.5	5.2	5.9	100
Tourism	5.5	47.1	12.7	4.4	1.5	16.2	6.4	3.9	2.5	100
Services and retail	5.2	49.4	11.9	3.5	1.4	18.5	3.8	3.8	2.4	100

Source: Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (Version 190).

#### 2.3.2.1 Production: Labour-intensive mass-produced goods

Industries in this category, which primarily is made up of iron and steel producers and large-scale commercial agricultural and mining activities, are highly dependent on proximity, or good, dependable, cheap transport linkages to the huge volumes of natural resources that they consume in their production processes.

The spatial location of the areas in which production takes place is indicated on Map 14. While industries in this category were traditionally also highly dependent on the availability of high numbers of unskilled and semi-skilled labour, increasing mechanisation has greatly reduced the labour requirement of the activities in this category.

Table 18: Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of mass-produced labour-intensive goods, 2004 data

Ranking	District/metropolitan municipality	Province	Total GVA (R1 000)	% of DM/MM contribution to total GVA of the sector
1	City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	GT	52 679 593	13.00
2	eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality	KZN	39 893 139	9.85
3	City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality	WC	30 446 475	7.52
4	Bojanala District Municipality	NW	29 215 991	7.21
5	Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality	GT	25 245 060	6.23
6	Nkangala District Municipality	MP	22 991 179	5.67
7	Gert Sibande District Municipality	MP	20 927 123	5.17
8	City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	GT	18 413 551	4.55
9	Southern District Municipality	NW	14 782 822	3.65
10	Fezile Dabi District Municipality	FS	12 659 959	3.12
11	Cape Winelands District Municipality	WC	9 092 354	2.24
12	Waterberg District Municipality	NP	8 839 136	2.18
13	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality	EC	8 764 519	2.16
14	Uthungulu District Municipality	KZN	8 383 758	2.07
15	Lejweleputswa District Municipality	FS	7 404 975	1.83
16	Ehlanzeni District Municipality	MP	7 064 801	1.74
17	Mopani District Municipality	NP	5 964 033	1.47
18	Umgungundlovu District Municipality	KZN	5 785 777	1.43
19	West Coast District Municipality	WC	5 548 465	1.37
20	West Rand District Municipality	GT	5 299 051	1.31
	Total % for the 20 district and metrop	83.78		

Source: NSDP Data Profiles, Disaggregated and re-aggregated to 2005 demarcated Provincial boundaries through Mesoframework Version 1.1, based on Population Estimates for 2004, Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (Version 190).


As illustrated in Map 17, these activities are much more spread out than that of high-value differentiated production, with large concentrations in the six metro-politan areas, the secondary and port cities, and mining and industrial areas in the magisterial districts of Welkom (Free State), Rustenburg and Klerksdorp (North West), Sishen (Northern Cape), Thabazimbi and Ellisras (Limpopo), Sekhukune (Mpumalanga) and Newcastle (KwaZulu-Natal), the KwaZulu-Natal coastal strip between Richards Bay and Port Alfred, and the George/Mossel Bay area<sup>55</sup>.

The 33.2% this category contributes to the national GVA also shows a slightly lessor concentration in the metropolitan areas (a few localities) than the activities in the high-value production and experimentation and innovation categories, as can be seen by the distribution of this activity per metro and district area in Table 18 (see also Annexure E). The trend analysis of GVA in this category between 1996 and 2004 reveals two sources of growth, namely growth in areas in which this activity is already strongly concentrated (with the possible exception of areas such as the West Rand and Free State Goldfields), and growth in 'new' centres such as Rustenburg, Richards Bay and Ermelo (Gert Sibande). The 2010 projection suggests that these trends will continue (see Annexure E).

#### 2.3.2.2 Production: High-value differentiated goods

This category includes all forms of production that focus on high-value goods for local and/or global niche markets in the manufacturing, specialised agricultural or natural resource-based sectors; for example, glass products; household appliances; radio, television and communication equipment; as well as medical and precision instruments (see Map 17). Internationally, it is viewed as an area of economic endeavour in which it is still possible to establish niche markets and to compete globally. To a large extent, the location requirements of this activity correspond with those of labour-intensive mass-production, such as the need for good transport routes, access to markets and skilled labour. However, this activity is far more dependent than labour-intensive mass-production on facilities such as air transport and high-end information and communications technology. While this activity can be found in pockets in otherwise primary resource-based economies, essentially it is

an indicator of a more mature economy that is more dependent on skilled labour than on the availability of natural resources.

Reliant as it is on specific location requirements, this economic activity demonstrates a highly concentrated spatial pattern, with the main areas of productivity occurring in and around the six metropolitan areas, major secondary cities (especially port cities focused on the export market) and large towns, such as Richards Bay, East London, Bloemfontein, Rustenburg, Welkom, Secunda, Nelspruit, Witbank/Middelburg, Pietermaritzburg, and Newcastle<sup>56</sup>. In line with its highly concentrated nature, the bulk (92.5%) of the 12.4% that this activity contributes to the national GVA is concentrated in 20 district and metropolitan municipalities (see Table 19 and Annexure E).

The recent trends and 2010 projection for this category show that even further concentration of these activities is very likely.



# Table 19: Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of high-value differentiatedgoods, 2004 data

Ranking	District/metropolitan municipality	Province	Total GVA (R1 000)	% of DM/MM contribution to total GVA of the sector
1	City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	GT	25 840 900	17.12
2	City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	GT	21 957 571	14.55
3	eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality	KZN	16 753 052	11.10
4	Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality	GT	16 256 986	10.77
5	City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality	WC	12 740 912	8.44
6	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality	EC	8 318 863	5.51
7	Nkangala District Municipality	MP	7 770 181	5.15
8	Sedibeng District Municipality	GT	7 131 425	4.72
9	Uthungulu District Municipality	KZN	5 511 376	3.65
10	Bojanala District Municipality	NW	2 531 425	1.68
11	Amatole District Municipality	EC	2 206 350	1.46
12	Amajuba District Municipality	KZN	1 645 710	1.09
13	Umgungundlovu District Municipality	KZN	1 529 996	1.01
14	Ehlanzeni District Municipality	MP	1 524 101	1.01
15	Motheo District Municipality	FS	1 482 566	0.98
16	West Rand District Municipality	GT	1 425 010	0.94
17	Central District Municipality	NW	1 349 247	0.89
18	Cape Winelands District Municipality	WC	1 321 354	0.88
19	West Coast District Municipality	WC	1 223 649	0.81
20	Fezile Dabi District Municipality	FS	1 153 804	0.76
	92.53			

Source: NSDP Data Profiles, Disaggregated and re-aggregated to 2005 demarcated Provincial boundaries through Mesoframework Version 1.1, based on Population Estimates for 2004, Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (Version 190).



Map 17: GVA distribution per NSDP sectors: Labour-intensive mass-produced goods and high-value differentiated goods and services, GVA 2004







#### 2.3.2.3 Public services and administration

The spatial location of public services and administration activities, which constitute 17.7% of the national GVA, shows the same concentration in the metropolitan areas, secondary and port cities and large towns as in most of the other categories. As with the mass-produced labour-intensive goods category, this category also displays a wider spread (see Map 18 and Table 20).

As can be expected, administrative capitals of the various provinces and the previous Bantustan administrations, as well as important district administrative centres, also display some level of concentration in this category.

Significant concentrations are also located in the densely populated areas of Limpopo, KwaZulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape. Trend analysis and projections suggest that these activities are set to remain concentrated in the areas in which they are currently located.

#### 2.3.2.4 Services and retail

Retail, catering and personal services, both formal and informal, are major components of any economy and large employers of skilled and semi-skilled workers in advanced economies. Such activities flourish in dense, diverse settlements with huge numbers of inhabitants. It is especially the ability of customers to pay that gives this category a strong city- and town-focus, as these are the areas with the largest proportion of higher-income members of the population. Services provided in the urban areas are also typically of a higher monetary value than those in rural areas and reflect a larger contribution to the GVA of that area.

Spatially, the spread of this activity bears out this city- and town-focus, with the six metropolitan areas, the secondary and port cities and large towns (East London, George/Mossel Bay, Richards Bay, Bloemfontein, Nelspruit, Pietermaritzburg, Newcastle, Kimberley, Welkom, Witbank/Middelburg, Rustenburg, Vanderbijlpark, Vereeniging, Polokwane, Mmabatho, Potchefstoom and Klerksdorp) standing out as areas of significant concentrations of these activities (see Map 18).

# Table 20: Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of public services andadministration, 2004 data

Ranking	District/metropolitan municipality	Province	Total GVA (R1 000)	% of DM/MM contribution to total GVA of the sector
1	City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	GT	27 858 263	12.86
2	City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality	WC	26 524 884	12.25
3	City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	GT	25 548 908	11.80
4	eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality	KZN	19 456 473	8.98
5	Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality	GT	9 819 035	4.53
6	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality	EC	7 272 101	3.36
7	Amatole District Municipality	EC	6 804 449	3.14
8	Motheo District Municipality	FS	6 620 890	3.06
9	Cape Winelands District Municipality	WC	4 988 936	2.30
10	UMgungundlovu District Municipality	KZN	4 287 763	1.98
11	Bojanala District Municipality	NW	4 037 095	1.86
12	Capricorn District Municipality	NP	3 912 800	1.81
13	Southern District Municipality	NW	3 832 267	1.77
14	Vhembe District Municipality	NP	3 814 123	1.76
15	Ehlanzeni District Municipality	MP	3 804 612	1.76
16	Central District Municipality	NW	3 403 863	1.57
17	Sedibeng District Municipality	GT	3 176 367	1.47
18	Mopani District Municipality	NP	3 165 389	1.46
19	OR Tambo District Municipality	EC	3 158 802	1.46
20	Nkangala District Municipality	MP	3 142 581	1.45
	80.64			

Source: NSDP Data Profiles, Disaggregated and re-aggregated to 2005 demarcated Provincial boundaries through Mesoframework Version 1.1, based on Population Estimates for 2004, Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (Version 190).



Table 21 lists the 20 district and metropolitan municipalities that contributed the largest segment to the GVA in services and retail in 2004.

Comparisons between 1996 and 2004 show that the magisterial districts of Johannesburg, Rustenburg, Durban, Port Elizabeth and Cape Town had the strongest increases in the GVA in this category. The 2010 projection suggests that there will be significant growth, especially in the secondary cities and large towns (see Annexure E)<sup>57</sup>.

#### 2.3.2.5 Innovation and experimentation

The distribution of innovation and experimentation activities, which are made up of research and development and the application of novel technologies to production processes, are largely concentrated in the metropolitan areas, most of the major secondary cities and a number of large towns. These are typically localities in which universities and research institutions are located, such as Potchefstroom, Pietermaritzburg, Stellenbosch, Bloemfontein, Umtata, Alice, Mmabatho and Polokwane, and where intensive major mining and manufacturing activities are conducted, such as Rustenburg, Sasolburg, Richards Bay, Klerksdorp, Witbank/Middelburg and Newcastle (see Map 18). The metropolitan and district municipalities that make the largest contribution to national GVA in this economic category are listed in Table 22. This spatial spread is largely a result of the highly specialised nature of the activities, for example agriculture and livestock research, chemical, electrical and engineering research laboratories and marine research, and the need for a very specific enabling environment to support these activities, e.g. highly skilled and adaptable labour, good communication networks and high guality living environments.

Ranking	District/metropolitan municipality	Province	Total GVA (R1 000)	% of DM/MM contribution to total GVA of the sector
1	City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	GT	106 413 977	25.70
2	City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality	WC	63 355 676	15.30
3	City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	GT	42 958 413	10.37
4	eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality	KZN	42 566 904	10.28
5	Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality	GT	32 781 387	7.92
6	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality	EC	10 680 997	2.58
7	Bojanala District Municipality	NW	7 564 627	1.83
8	Cape Winelands District Municipality	WC	6 947 330	1.68
9	Motheo District Municipality	FS	6 686 104	1.61
10	Amatole District Municipality	EC	6 198 469	1.50
11	Sedibeng District Municipality	GT	5 918 471	1.43
12	Ehlanzeni District Municipality	MP	5 545 338	1.34
13	Eden District Municipality	WC	5 071 025	1.22
14	Southern District Municipality	NW	5 001 832	1.21
15	Umgungundlovu District Municipality	KZN	4 888 142	1.18
16	Nkangala District Municipality	MP	4 554 838	1.10
17	West Rand District Municipality	GT	4 147 225	1.00
18	Gert Sibande District Municipality	MP	3 300 111	0.80
19	Uthungulu District Municipality	KZN	3 086 562	0.75
20	Capricorn District Municipality	NP	3 031 618	0.73
	89.52			

Table 21: Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of services and retail, 2004 data

Source: NSDP Data Profiles, Disaggregated and re-aggregated to 2005 demarcated Provincial boundaries through Mesoframework Version 1.1, based on Population Estimates for 2004, Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (Version 190).

	k
N.00°C	Ļ.
~	1
Y ST	

52 NATIONAL SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE

While innovation and experimentation are crucial for sustained participation in the global economy, this sector constitutes only 0.1% of the national GVA. Furthermore, close to 80% of the GVA generated in this category is produced in only five district and metropolitan municipalities, as can be seen in Table 22. Comparisons of 1996 and 2004 data show that this concentration will probably continue into the future, and even intensify (see 2010 projection in Annexure E).

#### Table 22: Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of innovation and experimentation, 2004 data

Ranking	District/metropolitan municipality	Province	Total GVA (R1 000)	% of DM/MM contribution to total GVA of the sector
1	City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	GT	470 173	32.33
2	City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	GT	201 557	13.82
3	City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality	WC	194 158	13.31
4	Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality	GT	164 803	11.30
5	eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality	KZN	136 210	9.34
6	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality	EC	23 716	1.63
7	Sedibeng District Municipality	GT	20 972	1.44
8	Cape Winelands District Municipality	WC	16 363	1.12
9	Motheo District Municipality	FS	16 096	1.10
10	Bojanala District Municipality	NW	16 039	1.10
11	West Rand District Municipality	GT	15 420	1.06
12	Umgungundlovu District Municipality	KZN	15 010	1.03
13	Fezile Dabi District Municipality	FS	13 204	0.91
14	Eden District Municipality	WC	12 390	0.85
15	Southern District Municipality	NW	11 505	0.79
16	Amatole District Municipality	EC	11 428	0.78
17	Uthungulu District Municipality	KZN	11 404	0.78
18	Ehlanzeni District Municipality	MP	8 722	0.60
19	Nkangala District Municipality	MP	7 588	0.52
20	6 629	0.45		
	Total % for the 20 district and metropolitan m	unicipaliti	es	94.16

Source: NSDP Data Profiles, Disaggregated and re-aggregated to 2005 demarcated Provincial boundaries through Mesoframework Version 1.1, based on Population Estimates for 2004, Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (Version 190).

#### 2.3.2.6 Tourism<sup>58</sup>

The specific locational requirements of this specialised type of activity, which has become a key economic driver in the 21st century and has shown strong growth in South Africa since 1994, are difficult to group together because of the diverse nature of tourism. Phase 1 of the Global Competitiveness Project, undertaken by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, clearly illustrates the growing GDP and employment contribution of tourism. It further identifies the types of products and experiences that tourists want, such as the need for tourist-attractions (e.g. eco-scenery, cultural, heritage), good transport routes, safety, high-quality medical services, restaurants, retail outlets and hotels.

The GVA reflecting tourism (see Map 18) paints a very diverse picture in space, with some areas, such as scenic areas in Mpumalanga, Limpopo, Free State and North West that do not feature on any of the other maps, coming to the fore. The main metropolitan areas, the port cities and a number of secondary cities once again make a strong showing (see Table 23). Table 23 shows the 20 district and metropolitan municipalities that contributed the most to the tourism GVA, which stood at 2.7% of total GVA in 2004.

Areas of tourism potential (PATII areas) have been identified by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT), as have priority focus areas for tourism, generated by Phase 2 of DEAT's Global Competitiveness Project<sup>59</sup>. This project, in line with the NSDP principles, identified the tourism priority-focus areas as those where the product and experience demands of tourists could best be met, and where the biggest impact on poverty could also be achieved.

In the trend analysis (1996-2004),<sup>60</sup> it emerged that areas in Gauteng, North West, Limpopo and Mpumalanga have grown most significantly with respect to their level of tourism GVA. Durban also showed a marked increase in these levels, along with the coastal areas in the Western and Eastern Cape.



Ranking	g District/metropolitan municipality		Tourism GVA (2004)	% of DM/MM contribution to total GVA of the sector
1	City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	GT	8 113 384	24.81
2	City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality	WC	3 886 792	11.88
3	eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality	KZN	3 310 755	10.12
4	City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	GT	3 213 406	9.83
5	Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality	GT	2 125 323	6.50
6	Bojanala District Municipality	NW	1 306 955	4.00
7	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Municipality	EC	860 583	2.63
8	Cape Winelands District Municipality	WC	722 413	2.21
9	Motheo District Municipality	FS	549 724	1.68
10	Amatole District Municipality	EC	526 825	1.61
11	Eden District Municipality	WC	522 370	1.60
12	Umgungundlovu District Municipality	KZN	516 849	1.58
13	Sedibeng District Municipality	GT	505 620	1.55
14	Ehlanzeni District Municipality	MP	414 145	1.27
15	Southern District Municipality	NW	409 155	1.25
16	Central District Municipality	NW	362 534	1.11
17	Fezile Dabi District Municipality	FS	286 434	0.88
18	OR Tambo District Municipality	EC	283 770	0.87
19	Gert Sibande District Municipality	MP	282 774	0.86
20	Capricorn District Municipality	NP	268 734	0.82
	87.05			

Table 23: Top 20 contributors to the national GVA of tourism, 2004 data

Source: NSDP Data Profiles, Disaggregated and re-aggregated to 2005 demarcated Provincial boundaries through Mesoframework Version 1.1, based on Population Estimates for 2004, Ricon (Pty) Ltd, Regional Economic Explorer (Version 190).



# Map 18: GVA distribution per NSDP sectors: Public administration, social and community services, services and retail, tourism and innovation and experimentation, GVA, 2004

2.4 Infrastructure and space



## 2.4.1 Road and rail

The road density index illustrates the relatively high density of road infrastructure concentrated in the northern and central parts of the country, especially around the Gauteng City Region, the Free State and areas surrounding the other metropolitan areas, coastal cities and secondary towns (see Map 19).



The section of the national road network that falls under the jurisdiction of the South African National Roads Agency Limited (SANRAL) is 6 713 km long. The surfaced provincial rural road network is approximately 8.5 times larger, at 56 464 km. The extent of the gravel road network is approximately 300 954 km, with an additional 221 092 km of unproclaimed gravel and earth road, including access roads. The extent of the total non-urban road network is thus approximately 580 000 km. The urban road network (i.e. streets, etc.) amounts to an additional 168 058 km, giving a total non-urban and urban road network extent of 748 058 km. The rural road networks and drainage structures (excluding national roads) represent an asset value (i.e. replacement value) of approximately R300 billion to R350 billion (i.e. 35% to 40% of annual GDP). Rural provincial roads without drainage structures represent approximately R205bn, or 23% of the national annual GDP<sup>61</sup>. (Table 24 provides an overview of the extent of the road network in the various provinces in the country.)

#### Map 19: Road network density





Province	Surfaced roads (km)	Gravel roads (km)	Access roads (km)
Eastern Cape	6 233	34 718	7 631
Free State	7 070	22 046	20 000
Gauteng	3 487	1 771	2 410
KwaZulu-Natal	7 489	19 347	10 571
Limpopo	6 403	11 866	10 578
Mpumalanga	7 062	10 517	7 479
Northern Cape	5 630	53 725	12 023
North West	6 723	19 161	10 017
Western Cape	7 172	24 991	7 822
Total	57 269	198 142	88 531

#### Table 24: Extent of provincial road networks in km, 2000 data<sup>62</sup>

Information on the use of the various roads and railway lines in the country in 2003 indicated that a few routes in the country (eight in total) carried a significant percentage of the total freight movement (almost 50%), while 40% of the routes carried less than 5% of the total<sup>63</sup>. Projections to 2020 by the national Department of Transport of freight movement show little change from the present pattern, with the main freight movement projected to take place between the Gauteng City Region, the coastal metropolitan areas and the other major port cities<sup>64</sup>.

The massive train and bus subsidies continue to impose a costly burden on state funds, highlighting the inefficiency of apartheid-style planning which created a mismatch between where people live and where they work. The Western Cape, for instance, spends more on transport subsidies than it spends on housing. The Department of Transport expects bus subsidies to rise from about R2bn in 2004/05 to R2.5bn in 2007/08, while rail subsidies are set to increase from R1.7bn to R2.3bn over this period<sup>65</sup>. The main subsidy areas are in and around the metropolitan areas; a number of secondary cities and large towns, such as Bloemfontein, Nelspruit, Pietermaritzburg, Newcastle and Polokwane; and the port cities of East London and Richards Bay.

Public transport is more efficient and transport costs are lower along transport corridors linking densely inhabited areas, which may be one way to respond to the

fragmented spatial form of South Africa's cities and towns. In order to address these patterns, it has been suggested that higher settlement densities should be located specifically along transport corridors, that more dispersed settlements could be discouraged through a reworking of the subsidy formulae, and by changing the incentive and control systems governing urban land-use<sup>66</sup>.

The number of vehicles (including cars, trucks, motorcycles, buses and taxis) is constantly increasing nationally, contributing to rising congestion on the country's roads. The National Transportation Information System (NaTIS) shows that vehicle registrations have increased on average by 2.8% per annum over the last five years (from 6.46 million in 1999 to 7.44 million in 2004). The high congestion levels are also reflected in the 2003 National Household Travel Survey (NTS) data, which showed that 48% of all commuter trips are longer than 30 minutes and that 18% are longer than 60 minutes. Private cars are the most favourable mode of transport for the 10 million people who regularly travel to work (33% of all working trips), while 25%, 9%, 6% and 23% of all work trips are carried out with taxis, buses, trains and by foot, respectively. This has been accompanied by a greater demand for energy.

The main factors affecting vehicle-transport energy-demand include economic trends, demographics, fuel accessibility and supply, spatial structure and transport infrastructure (urban sprawl), inter-modal competition, lifestyle norms and regulation.

Roads and rail lines are an essential component of the South African transport system and one of the biggest investments by the country in transport infrastructure. They also play a crucial part as enabling infrastructure, supporting the interaction (flow of materials and goods) between producers, manufacturers and consumers nationally. In a study commissioned by the Department of Trade and Industry and Spoornet (2003-2004) on existing freight flows in South Africa, it was evident that a national freight network is essential to sustain this interaction (see Figure 10 for an indication of key rail and road freight flows for selected sectors in the study).



Figure 10: Freight flow volume concentrations for selected sectors: Mining, automotive industry, petro-chemical and containers, 2003



# Infrastructure

Source: Department of Trade and Industry, Land Freight Market Analysis, 2004

#### 2.4.2 Electricity, water and sewerage

The whole of urban South Africa is well serviced by the existing electrification grid (see Map 20). Since the 1994 election, the number of households in previously disadvantaged areas with electricity has grown exponentially. Whereas only 12% of the rural population had access to electricity in 1994, that figure now stands at 42%. Urban electrification reached 80-90% in 2000 and the national average is about 65%. Further grid-based electrification in rural areas is, however, at least two to three times more expensive, due to the high costs associated with dispersed settlements and low levels of consumption, suggesting that off-grid-based provision may be the better option in these areas. In terms of the percentage of people in a particular municipality with access to municipal services and sanitation facilities, the metros, secondary and port cities, as well as large towns score the highest (see Map 20). On the other hand, access to these services is at its lowest in the rural parts of the Eastern Cape, the North West, KwaZulu-Natal and Limpopo provinces.

Access to municipal services (2004) is illustrated in Figure 11. This figure indicates relatively high levels of access to water and electricity in the Western Cape, the Northern Cape, the Free State and Gauteng, with relatively low levels of access to services in the Eastern Cape, Limpopo and KwaZulu-Natal.

#### Figure 11: Access to municipal services per province



Source: StatsSA, 2001



58

## Map 20: Access to services





#### 2.4.3 Government capital investment

The Department of National Treasury has recently begun to collect and collate data on capital investment by the national and provincial spheres of government in municipal jurisdictions. Due to the newness of this endeavour, data gaps still exist. As the database matures and improves over time, it should be possible to undertake a meaningful analysis of the trends in capital-investment patterns of government per sector in space and time, and to assess the extent to which actual investment gives effect to the NSDP principles and logic. A detailed analysis of this information could potentially be used to scrutinise the investment patterns of sector departments and to study changing patterns of investment in particular localities over time. For this purpose data provided by government and private sources was used.

If the assumption is made that the combined datasets from National Treasury and Industry Insight provide a reasonable representation of the proportion of spending in each municipal area, then it is possible to deduct (from spatial analysis as illustrated in Annexure E and Map 21) that:

- Government investment is, as can be expected, quite spread-out amongst municipalities; and
- Higher levels of investment are directed at the metropolitan municipalities and also at some district municipalities in the Eastern Cape and the Western Cape.

As time-series data on government investment improves, so will the ability to undertake statistical analysis of correlation between investment, development and areas of economic concentration.

Infrastructure



## Map 21: Combined investment for national and provincial government and the private sector



## 2.5 Environment and space

#### 2.5.1 Significance

South Africa is a signatory to a number of international agreements on the environment. This, together with the constitution and a range of policies and legislation, indicates a sound basis for sustainable development. The natural environment provides the foundation for the efficient and effective functioning of ecological and socio-economic systems upon which we all depend for our existence. The South African economy relies heavily on natural resources for activities such as agriculture, fishing, tourism, horticulture, forestry, etc<sup>67</sup>. Natural resources also underpin rural livelihoods, while most manufacturing processes rely on natural biological process to assimilate pollution and waste. Job creation and empowerment in the tourism, fishing and conservation sectors have also contributed to the struggle against poverty and inequality. Understanding the long-term social, economic and ecological trends and implications of existing resource use, as well as its contribution to GVA, should be a critical part of all planning frameworks. Operating within a sustainable development paradigm entails ensuring that economic growth and social development are in balance with environmental priorities. Practically, this means giving greater consideration to achieving greater resource efficiencies in production and urban spatial planning through, for example, investment in alternative energy infrastructure and in sustainable management of our key natural resources such as forests and soils, biodiversity, water and air quality, as well as waste management.

#### 2.5.2 Agriculture and forestry

South Africa has limited productive agricultural and forestry surface area (see Map 22). Excluding indigenous natural forests and woodland or savannas, forestry activities related to plantations cover approximately 1.25% of total land area. Over 80% of this occurs in the three provinces of Mpumalanga, KwaZulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape. Implementation of the forestry initiative, including further development of forests and forestry products, could have a positive impact on rural poverty and job creation, while also contributing to ecological services through carbon seques-tration, nutrient cycling and improved water quality by reducing surface run off and evaporation, and increasing the top-soil quality. In terms of agriculture, estimates by the Department of Agriculture suggest that less than 4% of the total agricultural land area of the country can be classified as of high potential, while only about 11% is arable. The few areas of high agricultural potential are primarily located in KwaZulu-Natal, with significant portions in Mpumalanga, Eastern Limpopo, Gauteng and strips extending along the coast southwards through the Eastern Cape into the Western Cape.

As far as the rest of the country is concerned, a very crude distinction can be made between land to the east and the west of an imaginary line stretching from East London to Kimberley. The land to the east of the line is generally of medium agricultural potential, while that to the west of it is generally of low potential. As in the case of land for agriculture, high-potential land for forestry purposes is largely located in the eastern parts of the country, in particular in the eastern parts of Mpumalanga, western parts of KwaZulu-Natal and the north-eastern parts of the Eastern Cape.

Care needs to be taken to ensure that soil degradation caused by erosion, nutrient loading, salination and over-use of chemical inputs is curbed and that agricultural production is not negatively affected. Encroachment of other developments on prime agricultural and forestry land should be strongly discouraged. Agriculture is the main driver of rural growth and poverty reduction<sup>68</sup>. Agricultural production and development performance in South Africa, however, remains lacklustre. Thus, while the potential of agriculture for land reform, employment and poverty reduction remains high this is nor being fully realised.

According to Van den Brink<sup>69</sup> how rural space is organized is absolutely crucial. In this regard three aspects are generally highlighted as relevant to improving the development performance of agriculture. The first is that countries with more equal land distribution grow faster. Second is the aspect of the location of agricultural production. As with the mismatch between where people live and where opportunities exist, a similar disjuncture exists in the way high potential arable land is used with potentially huge economic and social costs.

62



## Map 22: Agriculture potential



For example, often forests are found on arable, non-erosion prone land too far down the watershed to protect the upper reaches.

The third relates to the organisation of agricultural production. Here of significance is the type of production and the size of farms considered to be the most productive and durable agricultural production units.

## 2.5.3 Biodiversity

South Africa is considered one of the world's most biodiverse countries. It occupies about 2% of the world's land area, but is home to nearly 10% of the world's plants and 7% of reptiles, birds and mammals<sup>70</sup>. However, it has been recognised that human activities are having an increasing – and largely negative – impact on the integrity of the ecosystems that provide essential resources and services for human wellbeing and economic activities (see Map 23). The results of the 2004 National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment (NSBA) show that 34% of terrestrial ecosystems are threatened, mainly in the fynbos, forest and grassland biomes. A total of 5% of terrestrial ecosystems are classified as critically endangered, 13% are endangered and 16% are vulnerable (see Map 23)<sup>71</sup>.



The health of terrestrial ecosystems determines their ability to provide ecosystem services such as water purification, prevention of erosion, carbon storage, supply of medicinal plants and pollination of commercial crops. A huge proportion of the South African population is dependent for their livelihoods on the country's rich biodiversity. It also provides the base on which much of the country's development is built. South Africa's biodiversity also provides an important basis for economic growth and development. This takes place in obvious ways, such as by providing a basis for the country's fishing industry, range lands that support commercial and subsistence farming, horticulture and agricultural industries based on indigenous species, the tourism industry, as well as for specific economic clusters such as the film industry, and commercial and non-commercial medicinal applications of indigenous resources. Keeping the biodiversity intact is also vital for ensuring ongoing provision of ecosystem services such as production of clean water through good catchment management, prevention of erosion, carbon storage (to counteract global warming) and clean air.





# Environment



#### Map 24: Priority areas for biodiversity conservation



Loss of biodiversity leads to ecosystem degradation and subsequent loss of important services, which tends to harm the rural poor more directly. (Poor people have limited assets and are more dependent on shared resources for their livelihoods, while the wealthy are buffered against loss of ecosystem services by being able to purchase basic necessities and scarce commodities.) Conserving biodiversity can therefore strengthen the economy and enhance social development.

To ensure the continued healthy functioning of terrestrial ecosystems, the country needs to:

- Minimise further loss of natural habitat in threatened ecosystems to protect ecosystem functioning, for example, by working with production sectors that are major land users (such as agriculture, infrastructure and property development, forestry and mining) to develop sector-specific wise practice guidelines.
- Identify key ecological corridors that provide links in the landscape and keep them in a natural state, to ensure ongoing functioning of ecosystems at the landscape scale.



 Prevent and manage the spread of alien invasive species, by focusing alien clearing efforts such as Working for Water and Working for Wetlands on areas where socio-economic needs coincide with areas of high biodiversity priority.

Map 24 indicates the priority areas for biodiversity conservation as identified for South Africa. This map represents the results of South Africa's first comprehensive spatial assessment of spatial priorities for conservation action, led by the South African Biodiversity Institute<sup>72</sup>. It has four components, dealing with terrestrial, freshwater, estuarine and marine environments.

It is important to note, firstly, that the priority areas provide an indication only, and that the boundaries of these priority areas are not cadastrally exact; and secondly, that this map does not imply that there is not important biodiversity in the rest of the country. These priority areas also serve to point out places where neighbouring provinces need to cooperate in managing significant biodiversity resources that cross provincial boundaries. Incorporation of spatial information on biodiversity priorities into the spatial plans of different spheres should be encouraged.

#### Map 25: Protected areas



66



#### Map 26: Water balance



## 2.5.4 Protected areas

To ensure the effective conservation of biodiversity, a system of formal protected areas was established. It currently consists of 403 protected areas covering more than 6.6 million hectares, which represents 5,4% of the land area of South Africa. Of these protected areas, 21<sup>73</sup> are national parks representing 53% of the total area under protection (see Map 25). Whilst the primary goal of a protected-areas system is to conserve biodiversity, the economic contribution of such a system cannot be underplayed. It is, for example, a tourism product that gives South Africa a globally competitive edge. With tourism being a national priority in terms of its potential to stimulate economic and job growth, there is certainly an economic basis and social imperative to conserve biological diversity through a protected area system. At the same time, the fishing industry, which has to be underpinned by sound marine ecosystems, contributes significantly to the country's Gross Domestic Product.

#### 2.5.5 Water availability

In addition to the overlap between the most densely settled human areas and the areas of greatest agricultural and forestry potential and biodiversity, the dominant pattern of settlement and economic activity in South Africa is largely out of line with water availability. Rising demand for water within the context of growing resource limits is likely to have farreaching and differential impacts on different parts of the country. Gauteng and large parts of the North West and Limpopo are highly dependent on water from catchments in the east of the country and Lesotho. The same applies in the case of the Cape Metro, the port cities of Port Elizabeth and East London, as well as the secondary inland cities of Bloemfontein and Kimberley.

When considering projections of future water-utilisation (see Map 26), parts of Mpumalanga, KwaZulu-Natal, Free State, the North West and Limpopo will face severe water deficits, both on low and high growth trajectories. These deficits are set to become especially acute in the case of the fast-growing residential areas in the Cape Metro and the Pietermaritzburg-Durban corridor, where higher growth rates are to be realised. Water-resource management and existing policy emphasis on water-resource protection, conservation, water-demand management and improved efficiency of use should be intensified.

#### 2.5.6 Climate change and its implications<sup>74</sup>

Climate change arising from global warming is likely to result in a mean temperature increase of 1.5 to 3 degrees Celsius in the next 70 to 100 years, with higher increases in inland areas and in winter months. For most of South Africa, but with some exceptions, future annual rainfall is projected to decrease on average by about 10%. One consequence is that irrigation water requirements will increase by 10% to 20%, while another is that runoff is projected to decrease, with a 10% reduction projected in the western half of South Africa by 2015.

Climate change is projected to have a severe effect on agriculture (i.e. a 10% reduction in cattle farming and a 10% to 20% reduction in maize farming in certain areas of the country), forestry and biodiversity (38% to 55% reduction of the areas covered by the current biomass). In addition to this, it is envisaged that this will result in related problems with increased pests and invasive plants, fire intensity (an anticipated increase of 10%) and health problems (increased water-borne and

vector-borne diseases) and possibly also other problems such as increased occurrence of strokes, skin rashes and cancers among the population. As a result of the changes in the prevalence of pests and diseases, the segment of the population at high risk of malaria is projected to quadruple by 2020 to 36 million, the total cost of which is expected to rise 0.1% from 0.2% of GDP by 2020.

Climate change is also set to cause significant damage to South Africa's seven existing terrestrial biomes. Projections have it that these will shrink by 40% and that 44% of plant and 80% of animal species will undergo a significant alteration to their geographic ranges. This, in turn, could mean an increased extinction risk for these species and a decline in ecosystem services. Added to these negative implications is a predicted rise in the frequency and scale of extreme floods, hailstorms and hurricanes. However, climate change is a global phenomenon and requires a concerted global effort and commitment. The best that individual countries like South Africa can do is be aware of the potential effects of climate change should global initiatives fail and be prepared to mitigate the effects<sup>75</sup>.

#### 2.5.7 Air quality

Declining air quality as a result of heavy industry, refineries, power stations, motor vehicles and households using coal as an energy source for cooking and heating, is having an extremely negative effect on human health. In the case of emissions from motor vehicles, it is predicted that in the absence of future controls, vehicle emissions will increase significantly, with various pollutants predicted to increase by 27% by 2007 and up to 44% by 2011, relative to base year 2002<sup>76</sup>.

There are a number of areas in which the recommended ambient air-quality standards are currently being exceeded<sup>77</sup>. These include the Vaal Triangle and Witbank/Middelburg (from power stations, steel industries and spontaneous combustion from abandoned coal mines), Rustenburg (from platinum and chromium mining), Durban's South Basin (from oil refining, paper and sugar mills), Richards Bay (from the aluminium smelter and sulphuric acid plant), and Cape Town in the Milnerton area (from oil refineries). With the promulgation of the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act (Act 39 of 2004), many of these areas

Environment

will be declared priority air-quality-management areas for immediate remedial and environmental management action.

#### **ENDNOTES**

- 37. While various definitions and accompanying indicators of poverty exist, the majority of these indicators enable a more nuanced understanding of poverty and they are not suitable for disaggregated and spatial representations of concentrations of poverty on a national base.
- 38. The poverty income used is based on the Bureau of Market Research's *Minimum Living Level* (BMR report no. 235 and later editions, *Minimum and Supplemented Living Levels in the Main and Other Selected Urban Areas of the RSA*, August 1996).
- 39. Based on 2004 data.
- 40. Magisterial District Analysis: Population Distribution. Based on 1996 and 2004 data, trend analysis and 2010 projections. Source: Rex data, *Global Insight*.
- 41. Magisterial District Analysis: Population Distribution. Based on 1996 and 2004 data, trend analysis and 2010 projections. Source: Rex data, *Global Insight*.
- 42. While there is considerable spatial difference between current levels of HIV-infection (see Map 1, Annexure F), the distribution is expected to 'even out' over time.
- 43. These calculations were made prior to boundary changes in 2005, which led to the number of districts and metropolitan areas being reduced from 53 to 52.
- 44. Only 19 municipalities are listed and not the customary 20 as elsewhere in this document, as only 19 municipalities experienced net in-migration.
- 45. Kok et al (2004).
- 46. Towards A Ten Year Review, PCAS, The Presidency, 2003.
- Leibrandt, Poswell, Naidoo, Welch and Woolard (2005); Simkins (2004); Van der Berg and Louw (2004) and UNDP (2003).
- 48. Van der Berg, Burger, Louw and Yu, 2005.
- 49. Department of Social Development, August 2005.
- Magisterial District Analysis: Poverty Gap. Based on 1996 and 2004 data, trend analysis and 2010 projections. Source: Rex data, *Global Insight*.
- 51. In Europe, the major agglomerated and large city and urbanised regions comprise 36% of the territorial space, but generate 82% of GDP (Stiller, S; 2003). In the USA, 50% of GDP is generated on 2% of the territory.
- 52. Ibid.
- 53. As indicated in Part One, GVA is used as composite indicator for economic activity. This was measured in terms of access to economic activity/GVA in terms of a proximity count of 60 km and 30 km.
- 54. Magisterial District Analysis: Total GVA. Based on 1996 and 2004 data, trend analysis and 2010 projections. Source: Rex data, *Global Insight*.
- 55. Ibid.
- 56. Ibid.
- 57. Ibid.
- 58. Tourism GVA currently only reflects the REX sectors of hotels and restaurants, as well as recreational, cultural and sporting activities. Even though tourism GVA will in future be more widely interpreted and adapted by National Treasury, it does not at this stage take into account all related activities in the industry.
- 59. The focus areas that have been prioritised through Phase 2 of DEAT's Global Competitiveness Project

have been identified using essentially two criteria, namely poverty gap and market potential.

- 60. Magisterial District Analysis: Tourism GVA. Based on 1996 and 2004 data, trend analysis and 2010 projections. Source: Rex data, *Global Insight*.
- 61. National Department of Transport (2001).
- 62. National Department of Transport (2001).
- 63. NSDP, (2003).
- 64. NSDP, (2003).
- 65. Estimates of National Expenditure (2005).
- 66. Oranje and Del Mistro, (1999).
- 67. The Cape Floral Region is, for example, a high contributor to the economy. Over 100 species of wildflowers and greens are harvested from fynbos for the ornamental industry. Other resources harvested include sour figs, honeybush tea and buchu for its essential oils used in flavouring, perfumery, medicine and brandy. Virtually all of its harvest is commercial, with a total contribution to the South African economy of some R74 million per year.
- 68. Van den Brink, (2006). Presentation made at the NSDP Workshop, Emperors Palace, Ekhuruleni, 6 October 2006.
- 69. Ibid.
- 70. DEAT (2004).
- 71. The status of terrestrial ecosystems is based on how much of each ecosystem's natural habitat remains intact. SANBI's new South African vegetation map was used to define terrestrial ecosystems. As more natural habitat is lost in an ecosystem (as a result of, for example, cultivation, forestry, urban development or mining), the functioning of the ecosystem begins to break down and species associated with the ecosystem are likely to be lost. A threatened ecosystem is less able than a healthy ecosystem to provide ecosystem services. The main limitations of the assessment of terrestrial ecosystem status are: (1) it underestimates how much natural habitat has been irreversibly lost (through cultivation, forestry, urban and industrial development, and mining) because it is based on the 1996 National Land Cover (the 2000 National Land Cover was not available at the time the NSBA was done); and (2) it does not take into account degradation of ecosystems through, for example, overgrazing and invasion by alien plants. These forms of degradation can be reversible (i.e. the ecosystem may be able to recover) if the cause of the degradation is addressed.
- 72. *The National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment* (NSBA) goes hand in hand with the *National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan*, led by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. The NSBA should inform the policies, plans and day-to-day activities of a wide range of stakeholders and sectors, both public and private.
- 73. In addition to these 21 national parks, Groenkloof has subsequently been declared a national park, but it is not yet indicated as such on the map.
- 74. Information and statistics in this section are from Schulze, R.E. (2005).
- 75. For more detail see DEAT (2005).
- 76. Scorgie et al (2004a).
- 77. DEAT (2005).



# **3 INTERPRETING THE SPACE ECONOMY**

This section provides an interpretation of the space economy using the reading of the spatial realities and the key dynamics and trends in Part Two, and provides some signals as to how government's social and economic objectives can be met.

#### 3.1 Introduction

The South African space economy, on a macroscale, illustrates a number of stark disparities and dualisms. The polarised nature of the space economy is manifested in three key dualisms. On a macroscale, this finds expression in two quite stark spatial arrangements and settlement patterns: (1) areas of medium-to-high economic potential with high population densities; and (2) areas with low economic potential and high population densities (particularly in the former Bantustans). Wrapped up and locked within these macro spatial phenomena is the micro manifestation of the dual space economy - the legacy of 'local apartheid' as manifest in the social and economic exclusion and deprivation in the former townships and informal settlements on the fringes of cities and towns. These stark dualisms, with their high levels of spatial fragmentation, economic exclusion and deprivation, pose a serious challenge to meeting government's economic development and social inclusion objectives. A key question in this regard is: What does the nature of the space economy mean for maximising potential for sustainable development, building a dynamic and competitive economy, and promoting equity, social and spatial cohesion?

The NSDP 2003 provided two key concepts in terms of which the national space economy could be described, made sense of and responded to; namely, poverty/need and economic development potential. In the analysis of the space economy in the NSDP 2006, these terms are again used, but this time taking into account the spatial dualisms described above, resulting in a national picture with the following overarching spatial categories:

1. Areas of national economic significance with high population densities and high numbers of people living below the minimum living level (MLL); and

2. Areas with low economic activity and low levels of demonstrated economic potential with high numbers of people living below the MLL.

These are broad categories and, admittedly, tremendous variation exists within each of the categories. Moreover, while these areas are also in many ways tightly interlinked – in some cases in very symbiotic, mutually beneficial ways through the flows of remittances and food products, and in others in highly parasitic relationships – they also function in some cases as if the other did not exist.

This is starkly apparent in the micro manifestation of the dual space economy referred to above, with respect to the marginalisation and exclusion in the former townships and informal settlements on the edges of cities and towns.

# Table 25: Summary of GVA generated and poverty concentrations in the areas of economic significance and certain proximity ranges, 2004 figures (see also Map 28)

Category	% of	% of	% of	% of SA
	national	people below	national	land
	population	MLL in SA	GVA	surface
26 economic core areas (see red and blue hatched areas on Map 25)	62.62%	53.21%	77.04%	27.15%
	29.3 million	12.5 million	R940 bn	12.7 million ha
Areas of economic significance extended into an accessibility radius of 60 km of where R1 billion of GVA is generated per annum (grey areas on Map 25)	84.46% 39.6 million	77.31% 18.2 million	95.59% R1 167 bn	31.24% 38 million ha



#### Map 27: Core economic areas



# 3.2 Centres/core areas of high economic potential and value, as well as high need

The analysis of the national space economy revealed the existence of 26 areas of national economic significance. As shown in Part Two, these areas that are within an economic accessibility proximity radius of 60 km from areas in which R1 billion of GVA was generated, generate 95.59% of national GVA, house 84% of all households in South Africa and are home to 77.31% of all people living below MLL in the country (see Table 25). These areas represent the economic core in which the bulk of the South African economic growth is generated and the largest numbers of the population are concentrated (see Map 27). Hence the policy objectives of promoting sustainable economic growth and alleviating poverty operate largely in the same space.



As shown in Table 26, while the 26 core areas and their immediate hinterland constitute the economic heartland of the country, they are also marked by: (1) high levels of poverty and large numbers of people living below the Minimum Living Level; (2) huge disparities in income and access to services, coupled with marginalisation and alienation; (3) disentanglement from the formal institutions of society and despair; and (4) a propensity to environmental degradation, resource inefficiencies, chaotic settlement patterns and 'short-termist' decision making and lifestyles.

The core economic areas are characterised by: (1) high levels of economic potential, as indicated by high GVA; (2) relatively diverse economic activities; (3) high concentrations of people; (4) formal and informal economic activity, generally differentiated and with a significant segment in the services sector; (5) relatively high levels of formal infrastructure provision; (6) good transport connections and a wide choice of transport modes and inter-modal connection facilities; (7) a wide range of education and health services and facilities; (8) high levels of institutional density, both formal and informal; (9) strong and/or growing linkages to the global community; (10) mostly well-







Table 26: Socio-economic statistics per area of national economic significance: Population, people living below MLL, GVA

Areas of national economic significance*	Population 2004	% of the national population	Number of people living below MLL	People living below MLL as % of national total	People living below MLL as % of total population of area	Total GVA (2004 current prices)	% of the national GVA in this sector	Area (ha)
Gauteng area	10 213 353	21.79	3 063 809	12.99	30.00	490 744 655	40.20	2 127 579
Cape Town-Worcester area	3 721 716	7.94	858 963	3.64	23.08	163 495 507	13.39	1 216 472
Durban-Pietermaritzburg area	4 413 552	9.42	1 890 637	8.02	42.84	54 446 520	4.46	965 931
Witbank-Secunda area	784 758	1.67	306 396	1.30	39.04	37 469 744	3.07	1 117 593
Port Elizabeth area	1 207 810	2.58	480 998	2.04	39.82	36 430 221	2.98	369 910
Rustenburg area	699 655	1.49	244 480	1.04	34.94	18 415 605	1.51	721 143
Richards Bay area	601 670	1.28	333 334	1.41	55.40	18 075 814	1.48	379 812
Bloemfontein area	693 674	1.48	278 878	1.18	40.20	13 191 447	1.08	483 919
East London area	924 197	1.97	527 563	2.24	57.08	11 817 841	0.97	415 980
Potchefstroom-Klerksdorp area	549 652	1.17	290 756	1.23	52.90	11 778 519	0.96	505 684
George-Mossel Bay area	353 433	0.75	77 670	0.33	21.98	11 092 286	0.91	705 769
Nelspruit-Bosbokrand area	674 925	1.44	358 819	1.52	53.16	9 260 182	0.76	360 588
Welkom-Kroonstad area	623 521	1.33	306 523	1.30	49.16	7 459 578	0.61	492 570
Kimberley area	241 726	0.52	106 411	0.45	44.02	6 545 526	0.54	223 947
Mafikeng-Lichtenburg area	324 249	0.69	192 285	0.82	59.30	6 378 218	0.52	444 121
Thohoyandou-Giyani area	737 084	1.57	500 875	2.12	67.95	5 833 019	0.48	333 959
Polokwane area	302 964	0.65	222 581	0.94	73.47	5 437 431	0.45	224 152
Newcastle area	424 109	0.90	234 916	1.00	55.39	5 386 913	0.44	224 777
Umtata area	423 260	0.90	311 670	1.32	73.64	4 611 628	0.38	271 509
Phalaborwa area	112 579	0.24	46 468	0.20	41.28	4 246 170	0.35	73 391
Thabazimbi area	41 110	0.09	11 619	0.05	28.26	4 152 555	0.34	75 392
Bethlehem-Harrismith-Phuthadithjaba area	476 447	1.02	300 634	1.27	63.10	3 754 672	0.31	282 537
Tzaneen area	420 361	0.90	271 413	1.15	64.57	3 208 898	0.26	223 680
Saldanha area	59 416	0.13	6 276	0.03	10.56	2 675 482	0.22	85 789
Upington area	122 252	0.26	45 215	0.19	36.99	2 327 693	0.19	230 126
Ladysmith area	198 014	0.42	114 122	0.48	57.63	2 277 061	0.19	165 713
Total	29 345 487.00	62.62	12 548 811	53.21	42.76	940 513 197	77.04	12 722 056
RSA Total	46 864 884.00	100.00	23 584 394	100.00	100.00	1 220 888 209	100.00	122 079 198

\* The areas listed in this Table are not administrative regions. These areas should be read as broader functional economic regions.

NSDP Spatial Profiles: GVA (2004 at current prices), Population and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190); Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: StatsSA (2001), as disaggregated and re-aggregated with Mesoframe Version 1.1.



capacitated local governments with access to relatively high tax bases, high and diverse skills base and job experience; and (11) a sense of hope and a strong belief that a better life is possible.

While there are similarities in the characteristics and challenges facing the core areas, they are not homogenous entities, reflecting different and diverse attributes. An analysis of the categories of economic potential in these areas illustrates their diverse functions and roles, as well as the more diverse nature of their economies. The characteristics in terms of contribution to GVA and the make-up of the economies of the core areas are shown in Map 29 and Table 30. The complex function and diverse economic bases of these areas present the opportunity to provide more options and a more secure environment for those depending on these areas for their investments and livelihoods. In particular, opportunities for the poor to diversify their incomes and to access a wider range of services and amenities are greatly enhanced.







Figure 12 shows that in five of the selected categories, that is, construction and infrastructure (part of labour-intensive mass-production goods), high-value differentiated goods, tourism, services and retail, and innovation and experimentation, the core areas account for over 85% of the share of national GVA for these categories. In terms of share of national GVA for mining and quarrying, and public service and administration, the core areas account for 83.9% and 83.4% respectively. Only in the sectors of agriculture, forestry and fishing, and labour-intensive manufacturing (part of labour-intensive mass-production goods), is the share of national GVA for these categories significantly low (39.3% and 43.7% respectively). Annexure F provides greater detail of these characteristics.



#### Figure 12: Contribution of the core economic areas to the national economy

In terms of spatial distribution, the densely populated core economic areas are largely concentrated in the northern and eastern part of the country – as suggested earlier on in this document, the division being the imaginary line that stretches from Kimberley in the north, to East London in the south, with some additional concentrations along the Western and Eastern Cape coastlines.



Based on the differential characteristics, five broad typologies can be discerned with respect to the core economic areas. Table 27 and Map 30 provide an indication of the four typologies and the economic characteristics associated with each typology.

#### Map 30: Core economic area typology of economic activity





# Table 27: Typology of economic activity: Areas of national economic significance (also see Map 30)

					_		
Characteristics	Areas of concentration	Typical challenges	Characteristics	Areas of concentration		Typical challenges	
Ту	ypology 1: Highly diversified ecor	nomic concentrations	Typology 3: Public and other service economy areas				
Economy: Diverse economy accounting for 58% of national GVA. High share of national GVA in all categories excluding agriculture and an exceptionally high GVA in services and retail People: Large population with a high percentage living below MLL	Gauteng area Cape Town-Worcester area Durban-Pietermaritzburg area	<ul> <li>Resource efficiency</li> <li>Severe environmental degradation and sprawl</li> <li>Collaboration, between metros (even in the same province)</li> <li>Ageing infrastructure</li> <li>Persisting and even growing high concentrations of severe poverty</li> <li>Inefficient public-transport systems</li> <li>Rapid in-migration and household for- mation, over-burdening infrastructure and swelling housing backlogs</li> </ul>	<b>Economy:</b> Undiversified eco-nomy, high in public services and administration, and high in services and retail <b>People:</b> High percentage of the population living below MLL (not so much in numbers as in percentage of the population) and a relatively large population	Kroonstad area Mafikeng-Lichtenburg area Thohoyandou-Giyani area Umtata area Bethlehem-Harrismith- Phuthatjithaba area	•	Resource efficiency Utilising the 'cash-in-circulation' and the economic base provided by the existing service sector to expand and diversify the local economy Growing the economy at least at 6% p.a. Making good use of the regional node function	
5		• Growing the economy beyond 6% p.a.	Typology -	4: Mass-produced and specialised	d ec	onomy concentrations	
	<ul> <li>Upgrading huge former townships into suburbs of the cities of which they are an integral part</li> <li>Ensuring participatory governance</li> <li>Competing demands between the need to sustain the economy in the former white areas and investment in former township areas</li> </ul>	Economy: Highly labour-inte Population: Generally, the pe living below MLL is in line w 4A: Economy: High GVA in mining	ensive ercentage of the population vith the national average Rustenburg area Welkom area Phalaborwa area	•	Expanding the economic activities to ensure the establishment of a more mature economy that can attract new investment and enable the expansion of existing activities Growing the economy at least at 6% p.a. Address resource efficiency and the		
Ту	pology 2: Diversified service eco	nomy concentrations	4B: Economy: Concentrated	Witbank-Secunda area	1	environmental degradation in several	
Economy: Reasonably diverse economy accounting for 7% of national GVA with high GVA in services and retail, as well as industrial activity People: Relatively large population and high per- centage living below MLL	Port Elizabeth metro area Bloemfontein and surrounds East London area George-Mossel Bay area Nelspruit-Bosbokrand area Kimberley area Polokwane area	<ul> <li>Resource efficiency</li> <li>Severe environmental degradation and sprawl</li> <li>Diversifying the economy</li> <li>Persisting and even growing high con- centrations of severe poverty</li> <li>Inefficient public transport systems</li> <li>Rapid in-migration and household for- mation, over-burdening infrastructure and swelling housing backlogs</li> <li>Growing the economy beyond 6% p.a.</li> <li>Upgrading huge former townships into suburbs of the cities of which they are an integral part</li> </ul>	in industrial and high-value differentiated goods 4C: <b>Economy:</b> High GVA in public services, services and retail, as well as con- struction and industrial or agriculture	Richards Bay and surrounds Newcastle area Potchefstroom-Klerksdorp area Thabazimbi area Tzaneen area Saldanha and surrounds Upington area Ladysmith area	of the provided of the provided of the provided the provided to the provided the pr	of these areas Finding creative ways of transforming the primarily single-economy areas and diversifying their economy in order to make the transition from, for example, a predominantly mining economy into 'new economies' that ca absorb the communities living there and sustain these areas Growing the economy at least at 6% p.a. Strengthening the economy to enable it to continue playing its role as a regional node	
		<ul> <li>Ensuring participatory governance</li> <li>Competing demands between the need to sustain the economy in the former white areas and investment in former township areas</li> </ul>	4D: Important mining enclaves not part of the 26 core areas, but are signif- icant hubs of mining activity	Ellisras area Sishen area	The R2 Iaro eco	ese areas do not generate more than billion in GVA per annum and have ge single-economy, mining-orientated no-mies	



In an analysis of areas of economic concentration, and specifically of the areas of national economic significance (Map 28 and Map 29), a belt of human settlement of very high intensity and density (at times more than 2 000 people per km<sup>2</sup>) interspersed with low-density ex-urban settlement, housing more than 14 million people (roughly 31% of the population) is discernable in the 'northern and eastern part' of the country. Included in this belt that stretches from Witbank/Middelburg and Secunda in Mpumalanga (in the east) through the 'Gauteng City Region' in the centre, and taking in Sasolburg in the northern Free State, to Rustenburg and Klerksdorp/Potchefstroom in the North West, is a highly diverse set of economic activities contributing more than 52% of the total GVA of the country. Other spaces that fit into this category include the Ethekwini and Nelson Mandela metros, secondary cities (such as Polokwane Nelspruit, Bloemfontein, Kimberley, Pietermaritzburg, Mmabatho, Stellenbosch, Umtata and East London), and large towns (such as Newcastle, Welkom, Kroonstad, King Williams' Town and Tzaneen), of which many are tied to the global economy through especially mineral extraction, high-value agricultural produce, and/or motor vehicle-related industries.

By virtue of the fact that the areas of economic concentration and accessibility (within a 60 km proximity of places where more than R1 billion in GVA is generated per annum) account for a significant proportion of the economy of the country and for a high concentration of all people below the MLL (approximately 12 million in the areas of national economic significance that rises to 18 million people when the areas within the 60 km proximity zone are also added to the number), they are crucial to promoting social cohesion and to building a dynamic and competitive economy.

However, in these 26 places and their surrounds, the best that economic growth can offer has as yet not materialised for all, and marginalisation and growing social exclusion are pervasive realities of everyday life. Located where they are – close, but still 'far away' in many regards, which means that they could go either way – they could become urban ghettos, with little hope of ever moving onto a higher socio-economic plateau, or they could become fully integrated, functional areas, well-connected and as part of the rest of the global economy as the metros and cities in which they are located.

As indicated by Principle 5, a key aspect to overcoming the spatial distortions of apartheid is through a focus on corridors and densification. To overcome metropolitan and town and city spatial distortions between where people live and where they work, greater emphasis should be given to medium-density settlement closer to the workplace and to improved transportation networks. Facilitating greater access by the poor and intensifying growth in the core areas by enhancing the place-based qualities of these areas is crucial.

The core areas play an important role in integrating South Africa into the global and regional economy. In order to generate and sustain economic growth rates above 6%, this role will have to be supported through appropriate investment in key infrastructure such as roads, railways, telecommunications and ports.



#### Map 31: High concentrations of people living below MLL



# 3.3 Areas with low economic activity, high population densities and high concentrations of per sons living below MLL

An analysis of the spatial concentrations of people living below MLL (see Map 31) illustrates that the highest concentrations of people living below MLL are concentrated in Southern Gauteng/ Sasolburg area, Durban/ Pietermaritzburg, as well as the Cape Town/ Stellenbosch area. Together with the northern parts of Gauteng, these areas alone account for approximately 23% of all people living below MLL in South Africa (5.5 million).

A more detailed analysis of the distribution of poverty illustrates that this geographic concentration of high numbers of people living below MLL occurs in 33 areas, 23 of which overlap significantly with the areas identified as core economic areas, while the remaining 10 areas are in areas with low economic accessibility (see Tables 28 and 30, and Map 31).



Table 28:Summary of population, MLL and GVA generated in concentrations of<br/>people below MLL, 2004 figures (also see Map 31)

Category	% of national population	% of people below MLL in SA	% of national GVA	% of SA land surface
33 areas with high concentra-	73.0%	67.52%	82%	10%
tions of people below MLL	34.1 million	15.9 million	R1 004 billion	12.8 million ha

Table 29: Summary of population concentrations of MLL and GVA in relation to eco-nomic accessibility, 2004 figures (also see Map 31)

Category	% of national population	% of people below MLL in SA	% of national GVA	% of SA land surface
Extent of MLL in areas with medium-high economic accessi- bility (within a radius of 60 km of where at least R1 billion of GVA is generated per annum)	84.46% 39.6 million	77.31% 18.2 million	95.59% R1 167 billion	31.24% 38 million ha
Concentrations of people below MLL in areas with low economic accessibility (not in a 60 km radius from spaces where R1 billion of GVA is generated per annum)	4.10% 1.9 million	6.52% 1.5 million	0.37% R4.6 billion	1.32% 1.6 million ha
Remainder of South Africa	11.44% 5.36 million	16.17% 3.8 million	4.04% R49.3 billion	67.44% 82.3 million ha

Whereas about 77.31% of all people living below MLL in South Africa are in close proximity to the core economic areas as shown in Table 29, some 6.5% of people living below MLL are concentrated in very dense settlements occupying about 1.3% of total land area with a GVA of about 0.4% of the national GVA. The remaining 11.44% of people below MLL (5.35 million) are dispersed over 67.4% of the country.

People in these areas have access to less than R1bn of annual GVA (Map 32, Table 29). Average per-capita GVA (based on NSDP Spatial Profiles, Mesoframe Version 1.1 data) at about R2 374 in these areas is only 9.1% of the national average per capita GVA of R26 051 (at constant 2004 prices), with little sign of improvement. This

suggests a local economic base that is extremely frail and inadequate to support the livelihood aspirations of the majority of the people in these areas. Economic activity is either survivalist or small-scale agricultural in nature and huge sections of the population depend on welfare transfers and grants as the main source of income. These areas are also experiencing high levels of out-migration towards towns and cities.

Areas characterised by high need and dispersed/low demonstrated economic potential comprise concentrations of people whose livelihoods are, to a large extent, closely interlinked with the state of the environment. They find themselves in places to which they were relegated through forced removal and/or arrested urbanisation. Economic activity is more localised and less diverse, often survivalist by nature, with a low monetary value in the market economy. Reasonably high densities largely rule out any prospect of conducting agriculture on a viable basis and of sustaining a decent quality of life.

This is further aggravated by: (1) weak links to the outside world; (2) lower concentrations of and generally unreliable infrastructure networks, worsened by lack of maintenance; (3) weak transport connections and roads; (4) limited access to quality educational and health facilities and services; (5) weak local governments with limited funds at their disposal and low levels of human capacity; (6) deep levels of poverty; (7) high child-mortality rates and a strong prevalence of patriarchal systems, which frustrate the equal development of men and women; and (8) high levels of out-movement by young people to places perceived to offer economic opportunities. However, strong social networks and bonds in these places often make the harsh realities of life more bearable.

Statistical evidence suggests a city- or townward migration from these areas, with significant out-migration and some in-migration. The in-migration may be a function of industrial collapse and mining closures causing people to 'return'. Overall though, these areas are witnessing a net out-migration.

In accordance with NSDP principles in localities with low economic potential, as in all other areas, government should provide basic services. Moreover, with regard to





Map 32: High concentrations of people living below MLL in relation to economic accessibility

macroplanning, government focus should be on providing social transfers, human resource development and labour market intelligence, which would enable people, if they chose to, to become more mobile and to migrate to localities that are more likely to provide sustainable employment or other economic opportunities.

In addition to this, important interventions that support and enhance livelihood will have to be identified and implemented. These may include (1) sound rural-development planning policies and programmes; (2) far more aggressive land- and agrarian-reform initiatives; and (3) significant expansion of agricultural extension services.

Where viable and practicable, functional linkages could be developed between various small nodes to create a critical mass and thereby create opportunities for the achievement of scale economies with respect to key services, as well as access to markets, skills and financial capital. This could lead to the development of a functionally linked polycentric network/grid of service nodes where communities can access key health, education, welfare, financial and other social services.



# Table 30: Areas with high concentrations of people living below the MLL

Areas of high concentration of people living below the minimum living level (MLL)*	People living below MLL in the area	% of national population living below MLL to area	Population 2004	% of national population living in area	Area_HA	% of national land area	National GVA 2004	% of national GVA generated in area	Unemployment	% of national unemployment in area	Household income	% of national household income gene- rated in area
MLL metro areas												
Southern Gauteng/Sasolburg area	2 105 661	8.93	7 202 637	15	944 596	1	355 034 914	29	1 718 029	19	158 033 708 934	29
Durban/Pietermarizburg area	1 912 925	8.11	4 384 796	9	958 097	1	143 782 089	12	987 453	11	56 902 321 375	11
Capetown/Stellenbosch area	718 171	3.05	3 032 971	6	211 124	0	137 585 042	11	456 104	5	67 850 286 227	13
Nothern Gauteng/Brits area	770 390	3.27	2 549 987	5	603 051	0	123 638 808	10	483 103	5	58 300 473 517	11
MLL in 60 km accessibility of R5 bn GVA												
Port Elizabeth/Uitenhage area	446 434	1.89	1 117 117	2	162 846	0	35 627 320	3	232 814	3	13 981 342 385	3
Middleburg/Evander area	172 492	0.73	486 485	1	272 656	0	34 101 225	3	90 219	1	7 218 292 192	1
Carletonville/Potchefsroom/Klerksdrop area	347 706	1.47	757 601	2	434 728	0	23 257 464	2	140 602	2	8 614 923 772	2
Rustenburg/Mogwase area	105 248	0.45	314 170	1	123 760	0	18 628 486	2	62 220	1	3 893 479 367	1
Bloemfontien/Thaba Nchu area	275 298	1.17	683 457	1	311 248	0	17 334 950	1	126 474	1	7 636 354 391	1
East London/Alice area	573 157	2.43	991 420	2	430 015	0	15 903 548	1	225 725	3	8 316 484 317	2
Eshowe/Richardsbay area	378 583	1.61	617 797	1	388 043	0	15 830 464	1	121 819	1	5 530 584 321	1
Welkom/Kroonstad area	284 589	1.12	587 879	1	312 355	0	10 469 256	1	112 474	1	4 671 435 553	1
Pholokwane/Lebowakgomo area	632 143	2.68	887 165	2	604 828	0	7 704 517	1	151 604	2	6 386 873 089	1
Kimberley area	93 330	0.4	222 043	0	113 814	0	6 063 398	0	36 811	0	2 673 188 364	0
Newcastle/Dundee area	243 091	1.03	425 845	1	128 419	0	4 211 267	0	96 048	1	2 256 280 115	0
MLL in 60 km accessibility of R1-R5 bn GVA												
Nelspruit/Bushbuckridge/Nkomazi area	847 248	3.59	1 363 447	3	665 726	1	8 724 161	1	217 562	2	5 421 804 161	1
Umtata/Butterworth area	941 851	3.99	1 156 732	2	951 938	1	6 527 193	1	194 138	2	5 005 218 157	1
Thoyandou area	727 862	3.09	1 061 616	2	529 605	0	6 279 133	1	194 085	2	4 546 625 447	1
Ixopo/Harding/Port Shepstone area	440 257	1.87	671 065	1	502 598	0	5 258 197	0	120 487	1	3 849 999 980	1
Tzaneen/Giyani area	507 455	2.15	793 419	2	513 109	0	4 987 275	0	137 559	2	3 393 228 678	1
Mafikeng/Lichtenburg/Delareyville area	217 450	0.92	313 359	1	306 712	0	4 406 946	0	68 832	1	2 412 557 798	0
Sekhukhune area	582 689	2.47	904 046	2	672 090	1	3 978 806	0	152 315	2	3 101 677 487	1
KwaMhlanga area	438 500	1.86	700 912	1	385 772	0	2 698 392	0	122 242	1	2 325 277 041	0
Bergville/Estcourt/Ladysmith area	195 748	0.83	305 320	1	232 481	0	2 618 986	0	68 533	1	2 190 808 769	0
Phuthadithaba area	237 575	1.01	364 265	1	96 108	0	1 899 901	0	75 861	1	1 329 955 795	0
Hartswater/Kuruman area	137 796	0.58	172 293	0	166 898	0	1 855 931	0	33 942	0	1 046 710 947	0
Queenstown area	52 566	0.22	90 977	0	97 847	0	1 244 379	0	21 550	0	797 956 468	0





#### Table 30: (continued)

Areas of high concentration of people living below the minimum living level (MLL)*	People living below MLL in the area	% of national population living below MLL to area	Population 2004	% of national population living in area	Area_HA	% of national land area	National GVA 2004	% of national GVA generated in area	Unemployment	% of national unemployment in area	Household income	% of national household income gene- rated in area
MLL with low economic accessibility (less than R1bn GVA in 60 km radius)												
Umzinyathi/Zululand area	523 965	2.22	701 814	1	636 134	1	1 810 236	0	131 328	1	2 326 387 392	0
Port St Johns/Mount Frere area	696 782	2.95	804 199	2	639 111	1	1 662 217	0	136 335	2	2 544 681 245	0
Eerstehoek area	100 045	0.42	139 957	0	115 220	0	471 262	0	19 754	0	373 183 483	0
Pongola/Umkanhyakude area	68 698	0.29	94 971	0	78 899	0	244 121	0	16 594	0	391 391 943	0
Matatiele/Mount Fletcher area	92 719	0.39	117 429	0	91 853	0	209 059	0	18 020	0	413 287 490	0
Lady Grey/Sterkspruit area	56 100	0.24	63 178	0	56 033	0	165 438	0	10 349	0	237 519 152	0
Total: Area high concentration MLL	15 924 521	67.52	34 080 369	73	12 755 715	10	1 004 214 383	82	6 780 985	76	453 974 299 352	84
Total: South Africa	23 584 395	100	46 864 884	100	122 079 199	100	1 220 888 209	100	8 930 803	100	540 837 757 085	100

\* The areas listed in this Table are not administrative regions. These areas should be read as broader functional economic regions.

NSDP Spatial Profiles: GVA (2004 at current prices), Population and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)); Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: StatsSA (2001), as disaggregated and re-aggregated with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

#### 3.4 Trends in migration, resource-use and ecological sustainability

Key to ensuring the sustainable future development of (1) areas of national significance in terms of their demonstrated economic potential and the number of people below Minimum Living Level, as well as (2) those areas identified as being home to large numbers of people below MLL and with limited demonstrated economic potential, is understanding and working with the internal dynamics and trends of places. This includes understanding aspects such as migration, the flows and interconnectedness of people and services between places, and ecological sustainability and long-term resource usage.

# 3.4.1 Migration trends and pressures on the areas with high concentrations of demonstrated economic potential <sup>78</sup>

From the various analyses, it is possible to identify three key migration trends that are at play in the country and are driving the current spatial dispensation and pop-

ulation dynamics. These are: a strong 'hollowing out' of the interior, including the drier western part of the Eastern Cape, the drier eastern part of the Western Cape, nearly the whole of the Northern Cape, the south-western part of the North West, and large sections of the Free State; a 'coastal and northern drift', with huge concentrations of people forming along the KwaZulu-Natal, Eastern Cape and Western Cape coasts; and a city- or townward shift, with huge numbers of people especially young people – from more rural areas, either in search of job opportunities, basic services, education and/or housing, or having been displaced from farms, making their way to cities and secondary towns, especially in Gauteng. Often, this movement first takes place to the nearest large town or city, or to a 'stand' along a major regional road to tap into the buying power of passing traffic and to gain a foothold in the urban, more cash-based economy, while still retaining a link to a rural economy. From this first stop, subsequent moves are planned and made to larger centres. In many cases, the intended move to a larger place is not completed; in others, this first move sets in motion a series of intricate movements, with a number of people and places providing shelter, food and company. Often the


migration is highly fruitful, seeing the migrant settling into the economy of the receiving locality and providing family members and acquaintances with remittances that make life more bearable 'back home'. In other cases, 'the movement to town' is a disastrous event, with the ill-prepared and inadequately skilled new migrant unable to find and keep a steady job in a very tight and sophisticated urban job market, often resulting in a migrant that becomes a nomad, scavenging whatever is available, often at high personal cost and becoming a servant/slave to others. In many cases, such migrants 'leave for town' with high hopes and with a sense of 'leaving behind the ties that bind', only to return home desperate, in many cases with a compromised health condition and dependent on the care of family who are themselves in most instances already highly stretched.

Evidence is showing that demographic changes associated with the growth in the number of households as a result of household splitting is a significant emerging trend. This trend, together with indications that many migrants retain their connection to the primary household and may therefore be temporary migrants, poses serious challenges for the delivery of housing and social services.



#### Map 33: Core economic areas and high concentrations of people living below MLL in relation to terrestrial ecosystem status



# 3.4.2 Growing pressures for resource efficiency and protection of natural resources

In the wake of (1) continued growth and industrialisation of the major urban conurbations; (2) climate change and its attendant challenges; (3) shrinking water supplies and the implications for aspects such as quality of and accessibility to water; (4) rising air pollution; (5) ecosystem degradation; (6) high fuel prices (with implications for transport costs because of commuting dependency and displaced settlements); and (7) the need to ensure proper wastemanagement, important questions are being raised about long-term natural resource-use (see Map 33).

Section 24 of the Constitution states that everyone has a right to legislative and other measures to "secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources, while promoting justifiable economic and social development".

Development plans, including spatial plans at all levels, will need to factor in sustainable resource-use as well as energy and water-resource management, so as to circumvent the potential negative social, economic and ecological



consequences of inefficient and unsustainable resource-use in the medium-to-long term. Sustainable resource-use approaches present opportunities for alternative energy usage such as gas and various biofuels, economic activities such as the treatment and recycling of waste, and protection of vital resources such as the shrinking water supplies and biodiversity.

Fortunately, various policy guidelines and strategies for managing our natural resources in a sustainable manner are now in place. However, these tend to be sectoral in nature and will need to be systematically integrated into the social and economic policies in a coherent and balanced way.

# 3.5 An overview of the space economy in relation to provinces, districts and metropolitan areas

Viewed from a district or metro scale, the analysis reveals high levels of concentration of economic activity, accompanied by high levels of population concentration and persons living below MLL in mainly metro and secondary cities. In contrast, a number of districts in the country have relatively low levels of economic activity and high numbers of persons living below MLL.

A detailed analysis per province is set out in Annexure E. This shows the GVA contribution per category of the district/metro to the national GVA and the contributions of the various categories within each of the district metro areas. It is evident that Gauteng contributes more to the national GVA than any other province and the City of Johannesburg is the largest contributor among the district and metro areas. Moreover, Gauteng dominates in all the categories. For example, about 47% of tourism GVA, 49% of services and retail GVA, and almost 53% of high-value differentiated goods GVA is generated in Gauteng.

In the same tables, the districts and metros are compared in terms of their population and the number of people below MLL against other districts and metros in the specific province, as well as relative to other districts and metros on the national scale. In the Eastern Cape, 75.8% of the population live below the MLL, while 93% of Alfred Nzo district municipality's residents can be considered poor and

OR Tambo DM has the largest provincial share (30.5%) of all people below MLL in the province. The provinces with the highest proportion of people living below MLL are KwaZulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape – 22.5% and 20.5% of all persons below MLL reside in these provinces respectively. Mpumalanga, Gauteng and Limpopo follow with 12.2%, 11.7% and 11.7%, respectively.

The categories of GVA generated in each of the district and metropolitan municipalities and trends in economic growth are set out on Map 34 (for high economic base district and metropolitan municipalities) and Map 35 (for low economic base district and metropolitan municipalities).



#### Map 34: Medium-to-high base areas: Composition and growth of economic activity

Maps 34 and 35 illustrate the vastly different economic growth rates of districts between 1996 and 2004. Map 34 shows growth in regions of medium and high economic base, while map 35 provides an overview of growth in the low economic base. In a description of this data in the Industrial Development Regional Strategy (2006), the Department of Trade and Industry, this is done in order to counteract the effect that a relatively minor investment in a region with very little economic activity may have in reflecting the region as being one of high growth. "A medium or high economic growth district was defined as contributing more than 0.05% of the national GVA in 1996, while low-base districts contributed less than 0.05%.



In 1996, the medium and high base areas represented 93.93% of national GVA which increased slightly to 94.65% by 2004. Consequently, the share of the low base districts which represented 6.07% of national GVA in 1996 fell to 5.35% in 2004. The maps also indicate the sectoral composition of the economies of each district and metropolitan municipal area, with tertiary and secondary industries dominating in the major metropoles while primary industdes play a much greater role in the economies of outlying districts.



#### Map 35: Low-base areas: Composition and growth of economic activity



#### 3.6 Conclusion

The polarisation in the national space economy with its high levels of spatial fragmentation, economic exclusion and deprivation poses a serious challenge to government's social-inclusion and economic-growth objectives. The key question this raises is whether government should take the current dualistic spatial dispensation as a given, or whether it has to, and is able to, successfully intervene and transform it. The impact of the NSDP is clear: government's policy objectives of accelerating growth and addressing poverty operate in the same space. Hence, the focus on people and on localities with demonstrated economic potential addresses the majority of the population.

Further, it should be noted that even if the response of government is passive, migration towards areas of high economic potential is expected to continue unabated and national settlement patterns will continue to be configured and reconfigured constantly; often in highly undesirable and unsustainable ways, leading to the marginalisation of the poor, fortified gated communities for the rich, and inefficient fragmentation and sprawl. Hence, a passive response is not an option. Clearly, government, committed as it is to social and economic inclusion, has to consider which settlement patterns and space economies are more conducive to the achievement of its goals and intervene appropriately to reconfigure the spatial dispensation of the country in line with its objectives of democratic nation-building and social and economic inclusion. The NSDP provides a spatial vision and framework to steer detailed policies and investment decisions towards the achievement of common national objectives.

NSDP 2003 described government's national spatial-development vision as follows:

South Africa will become a nation in which investment in infrastructure and development programmes support government's growth and development objectives by:

- focusing economic growth and employment creation in areas where this is most effective and sustainable;
- supporting restructuring where feasible to ensure greater competitiveness;

- fostering development on the basis of local potential; and
- ensuring that development institutions are able to provide basic needs throughout the country.

NSDP 2006 advances this vision by providing a systematic overview and framework for understanding and interpreting the national space economy.

To embed the vision, specific actions on the part of all three spheres of government are necessary:

- For district and metro IDPs to become local expressions of the plans of all three spheres, deeper cooperation and collaboration will be required in planning for these spaces. Programmatic responses and investment decisions, be they in the area of skills development, grant allocation, housing provision or infrastructure investment, should be underpinned by the approach and principles of the NSDP.
- In accordance with the NSDP-development approach and normative principles, and the 2004 Harmonisation and Alignment proposals, spatial perspectives contextualising the NSDP, and communicating key spatial challenges and desired responses need to be developed at provincial and district/metro levels to inform PGDS and municipal IDPs.

The Harmonisation and Alignment proposals and recent statements by the President's Coordinating Council suggest a key role for metropolitan and district municipalities (the latter in close collaboration with the local municipalities in their areas of jurisdiction) in promoting coordinated government action. It is within the ambit of this understanding that district and metropolitan municipalities will have to respond to the following challenges:

- To ensure the maintenance and exploration of innovative ways of growing the areas of existing economic-development potential together with the general management of these areas based on the premise of sustainable human settlements, and to identify and maximise new economic potential in the district and metro areas.
- To develop creative and appropriate responses to deal with economies in decline, together with the two other spheres of government. In this regard, it is important to note that a number of towns and cities, even though their GVA is still rela-



tively high, are experiencing decline, largely as a result of downturn in key economic sectors. It is especially in those sectors, such as the mining sector and the industrial areas of Gauteng, and to some extent the former textile industries in Pietermaritzburg and Cape Town, which historically provided jobs supporting large numbers of poorer households, that the schisms and fractures are appearing.

- To decisively deal with poverty, social and economic exclusion, and spatial fragmentation. In addition in those areas constituting the core of the South African economy, existing economic activities in these predominantly metro spaces need not only be maintained, but opportunities created for their significant expansion, ensuring a viable national and local tax base, and buoyant job growth and provision of services in the high-need areas.
- To explore and address the implication of natural-resource potential and use for growing the economy and addressing poverty.
- To seek out new areas of comparitive advantage, and identify and develop clusters of specialisation in collaboration with especially the provincial and national departments of trade and industry, labour and economic affairs. Whereas the current focus on clusters essentially lies with the national Department of Trade and Industry, Treasury and StatsSA; international literature suggests that it is most successful when it has a significant local input and drive. It is in the intricate local networks, which often only the local people are aware of, that the prospect of establishing regional and local clusters lies. Districts and metros can, therefore, serve as important building blocks and as pivotal sites on which to build an understanding of the nature and distribution of regional potential across the country. This does not mean that municipalities will be 'going it alone', but rather will collaborate with other spheres and agencies of government.

The NSDP should thus be used as the basis for dialogue between all spheres of government, departments and institutions, on what the varied social, economic, environmental and population dynamics and trends mean; for deciding where to focus infrastructure investment and development spending; and to guide relations between all spheres of government and organs of state to optimise intergovern-

mental impact of public-sector investment within specific spatial localities, particularly at the district and metro levels.

For this to happen, all in government must understand the NSDP as both a policy directive in terms of its methodology and as an indicative tool in terms of its content.

That is:

- The principles and methodology of the NSDP should inform the development plans, policies and programmes of all spheres and agencies of government as a matter of policy.
- The details of economic potential and demographic patterns in localities should be the subject of ongoing dialogue among state and non-state actors.
- Districts and metropolitan areas should be positioned as the geographical units for building an understanding of the nature and distribution of potential and demographic patterns across the country.

#### ENDNOTE

78. This section was produced from a one-day work session on migration trends hosted by the Presidency, dplg, GTZ and Department of Housing, with key demographers and experts in South Africa from institutions such as the DBSA, CSIR, HSRC, universities and StatsSA.



# ANNEXURE A

# THE DATA ANALYSIS AND MAPPING METHODOLOGIES

#### Spatial development planning instruments

#### 1. Introduction

This annexure consists of the following five parts:

- (1) Introduction;
- (2) Background to the development of the methodologies and platforms;
- (3) Overview of the Geo-Spatial Analysis Platform (Mesoframe Version 1.1, 31 May 2006) and NSDP Spatial Profiles;
- (4) Overview of the Mesoframe Version 1.1; and
- (5) Data and Methodologies for developing the NSDP Spatial Profiles.

The NSDP Spatial Profiles are provided in the NSDP document, as well as Annexures E and F, in the form of maps and tables.

#### 2. Background

This appendix provides an overview of the data sources and methodologies that were used as part of the NSDP review process to develop the NSDP Spatial Profiles. The NSDP Spatial Profiles have been developed through a process involving:

- The defining of a common spatial data referencing framework ("geoframe");
- The production of disaggregated estimates of the spatial distribution of economic activity; and
- Estimates of the population within given distance ranges of specified nodes or core regions (i.e. estimate their accessibility to these regions).

Most of the methodologies that were used for the above were developed in a CSIR RandD project aimed at establishing a platform for Collaborative Spatial Analysis and Modelling (referred to as CoSAMP), as well as in collaboration with the dti in the form of *Geo-economic Mapping Framework for South Africa.* 

As indicated in the following table, the outputs of three interrelated projects were assembled in terms of two main products.

#### Table 1

Supporting project	Main projects and commissioning agencies	Main products assembled on this CD	Funding and project management
Collaborative Spatial Analysis and Modelling Platform [CoSAMP]	<i>Review and Updating of the NSDP,</i> commissioned by the Presidency: Policy Coordination and Advice Services	Geospatial Analysis Platform, incorporating the SA Mesoframe (Version 1.1)	Funding agency: GTZ Project manager:
(funded and executed by CSIR) Project manager:			Mr. Hassen Mohamed
Mr Andries Naudé	<i>Geo-economic Mapping</i> <i>Framework for South Africa</i> commissioned (in terms of CSIR-dti Bilateral Framework) by the dti: Strategic Competitiveness Unit	NSDP Spatial Profiles	Funding agency: the dti Project manager: Mr. Nkhangwe Ramashia

The decision to assemble this as a combined set of products emerged from the deliberations of several inter-governmental reference groups (convened by the Presidency and the dti during 2005) and was ratified during a trilateral meeting between the dti, the dplg and The Presidency in December 2005.

# 3. Geo-Spatial Analysis Platform (Mesoframe Version 1.1, 31 May 2006) and NSDP Spatial Profiles

#### General purpose: In support of more robust spatial analysis

Amongst others, the dplg's Intergovernmental IDP Hearings (2005) and The Presidency's project in support of Provincial Growth and Development Strategies (PGDSs) (2006) illustrated the widespread needs of all three spheres of government and specifically district and metropolitan municipalities for:

- a common analysis and data set;
- methods for comparable, comparative, cross-border and dynamic analysis;
- capacity to perform robust spatial analysis; and
- mutual understanding of dynamics, trends and attributes of functional regions and joint areas of impact.

The requirement for better data and enhanced capabilities to develop robust spatial indicators, maps and models especially relates to the following:

- economic and other human activities;
- the demand generated by these activities for public, semi-public and private goods and services, including demand for built environment and ecosystem services; and
- development potentials, constraints and impacts.

Given the requirement to undertake integrated planning and develop sustainable local economies and service delivery systems within "wall-to wall" local and district municipalities, as well as to align the NSDP, PGDSs and IDPs, there are particularly serious gaps with spatial analysis: a) at the meso-level (medium scale) of analysis b) outside built-up urban areas and c) with regard to economic activity information.

#### Project specific purposes

The NSDP Spatial Profiles and the Mesoframe Version 1.1 were developed in response to specific requirements derived from:

- the dti's endeavour to develop a Regional Industrial Development Strategy (RIDS); and
- The Presidency's endeavour to review and update the National Spatial Development Perspective (NSDP).

At the core of both of these projects is the need for an improved basis to map South Africa's space economy. The Government's Economic Cluster also listed this as a key priority in its 2005 programme of action. Another specific requirement was to improve the capability to assess spatial linkages, interactions and the (cross-cutting) regions that might be formed as a result of these linkages and interactions.

#### **Collaboration gaps and barriers**

Despite widespread appreciation of the needs and requirements as outlined above, and the inherent logic of a collaborative approach to address them, there are still numerous "collaboration gaps and barriers". This includes softer (and more institutional) barriers ranging from the familiar organisational silos to factors such as inadequate geospatial knowledge management and poorly linked geospatial resources and processes, leading to duplication and resource wastage on spatial data assembly, pre-processing and other operations that could potentially be shared, or significantly streamlined. It also includes hard, technical barriers such as the ongoing bandwidth constraints and associated difficulties of transmitting geospatial data.

#### Addressing the gaps

Following on the research and development work undertaken as part of a CSIR project aimed at establishing a platform for Collaborative Spatial Analysis and Modelling (referred to as CoSAMP), the NSDP Spatial Profiles and Geospatial Analysis Platform: Mesoframe Version 1.1 have been expressly designed to overcome some of the above collaboration barriers and gaps, as well as the general gap between macro and micro-scale analyses. This is done by providing:

- a common spatial data and analysis platform the Geospatial Analysis Platform; and
- a data set developed on the above platform to support comparable and crossborder spatial analysis and profiles developed for the Update and Review of the NSDP, 2006.

#### The Geospatial Analysis Platform

The core product or platform for addressing these gaps is the Geospatial Analysis Platform (GAP) which, in turn, is strongly based on the SA Mesoframe – a meso-scale demarcation of South Africa into a "grid" of approximately 50 km<sup>2</sup> "meso-zones", nested within municipalities and other significant geo-economic and historical area demarcations (such as the former homeland boundaries).

The GAP also consists of:

- Spatial analysis conventions;
- A spatial data assembly and analysis workbench which is essentially a customised package of CSIR's CoSAMP and related tools and services.

#### The NSDP Spatial Analysis Profiles

The initial NSDP was prepared through an interactive process in which the outcomes of expert research, commissioned as part of the project, statistics and maps representing settlement and economic patterns and trends and discussions with officials and politicians throughout South Africa were combined in a spatial narrative of the current reality and a set of normative principles.

From the outset of the preparation of the NSDP it was stated that the information used and reflected in the NSDP would be subject to constant review and update as new data became available and as information from PGDSs and IDPs provided more nuanced and richer reflections on the subject material as covered in the perspective. The release of the 2001-Census data provided one such opportunity, as did the increasing sophistication of IDPs and access to more detailed economic data. At the same time a number of developments in the political economy of the country also suggested that a reconsideration of the perspective. These include insights gained from the Ten Year *Review*; such as the increase in the pace of household formation, growing concerns by government on the persistence and even deepening of the dualistic nature of the South African economy, a more favourable macroeconomic position; the agreement in government on the strategic role of district and metropolitan municipalities' IDPs in consolidating and reflecting government's development planning focus, and a recognition on the part of government that accelerating growth to levels of 6% and more require well-targeted and efficiently implemented policy changes and development initiatives.

In preparing the NSDP 2005-2006 it was hence not simply a case of updating maps, but also a far more elaborate exercise of doing justice to the needs of the State as reflected in Government's Programme of Action and facilitating greater coordination of

government planning as per the Harmonisation and Alignment Report. Essentially this implied a more robust analysis of the spatial data, so as to facilitate a mutual understanding and strategic responses between the three spheres of government (as well as other role players) in areas of joint impact, regarding points/places of current and future strategic economic importance and environmental threat/pressure. This resulted in a process in which new data and information was accessed from a wide variety of sources, including Stats-SA, government departments and private sector data-brokers, and captured in GIS-databases; numerous brainstorming and work-sessions were held with representatives from government departments and provinces and municipalities, and parastatals, such as DBSA, the HSRC and the CSIR. This resulted in an updated data set in support of the revised NSDP document. It is foreseen that the updated NSDP 2006 will only be published after the July 2006 Cabinet Lekgotla. The NSDP 2006 will summarise and make sense of the current spatial reality through the provision of a snapshot of some recent demographic, settlement, environmental, economic and government investment trends, which include an overview of:

- Human settlement trends/dynamics and resulting settlement patterns;
- The national space economy and key trends and challenges in this regard;
- The state of the national resource base and potential threats given current spatial trends; and
- Patterns of infrastructure and development spending.

In the interim – in support of collaborative and cooperative intergovernmental interactions and regional development, and to enhance alignment between the NSDP, PGDSs and IDP, <u>a few draft snapshots of socio-economic spatial profiles</u> (as generated for the update of the NSDP and in most cases assembled from the Mesoframe Version 1.1) are disseminated in the interim. See NSDP Profiles for inter alia with draft analysis of population distribution, distribution of persons under minimum living level, distribution of economic activity, NSDP and SIC economic sectors. The analysis is graphically presented on national and provincial maps and supported by tables with a municipal, district, provincial and national data breakdown. A more extensive and adapted set of data will be disseminated with the publication of the NSDP 2006.

Again, as in 2003, it is the view of the Presidency that the development of the NSDP is an ongoing process of elaboration, refinement, revision and amendment that takes into account the dynamic nature of the space economy, settlement processes and government responses in a Developmental State. This does not result in any once-off data set or document, but rather an evolving perspective that is linked to a system of continual spatial monitoring and amendment. Different spheres of government have different strategic objectives, and naturally differing scales of spatial perspective (that is, national, provincial and local), it is expected that the "Framework for Application of the NSDP" and the supporting District Application Pilot Project (over time) will contribute to a process of dialogue between spheres and assist in generating an informed and mutual understanding of the space economy and the nation's spatial priorities.

#### **Restrictions and qualifications**

It should be noted that the data and other outputs in the NSDP Spatial Profiles should be used with careful consideration of the following:

- Confidentiality and statistical confidence-level constraints on the dissemination of detailed data – e.g. about the value of economic activity in a specific sub-sector and meso-zone.
- Known differences in the municipal and district level GVA trend estimates produced by the DBSA (using one method of disaggregation) and the CSIR's 2004 GVA estimates (aggregated to municipal and district levels from the meso-zones, using a different method of disaggregation).

#### Releases, maintenance and deployment options

The Geospatial Analysis Platform and NSDP Spatial Profiles have been released in a restricted format on 31 May 2006. It is likely that several of the restrictions could be removed in the near future and that another release will be published – most likely via the Web. The update of the Geospatial Analysis Platform and NSDP Spatial profiles will be informed by and depend on the feedback that is obtained from provincial and local stakeholders on this edition. In the interim, some effort will nevertheless be expended on the formulation of technical deployment and business model options, referring here specifically to a web/electronic interface and allied analysis support services.

#### Possible future deployment as part of LGNet

Acknowledging the lead that the DBSA, together with SITA, CSIR and other role players have taken to establish LGNet (a network of internet portals and websites, customised for the municipal sphere of government) one obvious option would be to deploy an updated GAP and set of NSDP Spatial Profiles as part of this network. If this is done in a manner that will ensure standards-compliant linkages to the IDP Nerve Centre as well as relevant provincial and municipal websites and portals, a number of obvious advantages will be gained. Besides providing a multi-directional channel for the publishing and sharing of geospatial data, its will also facilitate: i) periodic, automatic or semi-automatic electronic updating of key indicators, and ii) the discovery and use of web-based spatial analysis services.

#### 4. Mesoframe: A meso-scale geospatial analysis framework for South Africa

#### General problem and conventional approaches

Internationally, a number of approaches have been developed to overcome the problem of non-coterminous spatial analysis units. According to Eagleson et al (2002), this is typically the result of different organisational imperatives, resulting in the demarcation of independent or only partly overlapping administrative, statistical, planning and political boundaries (see diagram).

The most pragmatic approach is simply to provide, share and analyse data in terms of official or commonly used spatial referencing units such as the South Africa's Place

Name Classification or the UK's Postal Codes. But the varying sizes of the analysis units defined by these territorial demarcations tend to cause arbitrary zone-size distortions of geo-statistical indicators and comparisons. (see description of "Gordonia problem" in Section 1 of the GAP Accompanying Notes). Another approach that is increasingly used in high bandwidth contexts is to store and exchange data in terms of high resolution "continuous grids".



Figure 1: Current situation

#### Formulation and use of standard spatial analysis geoframes

Given a low bandwidth environment, which makes it very time-consuming to re-process and interpolate heterogeneous data based on non-coterminous boundary units, a preferred approach is to develop and promote common use of one or a few standard spatial analysis "geoframes".

Instead of having to deal with a variety of geographically incompatible data sources and referencing systems, wide endorsement and use of the same geoframes can significantly enhance the ease of data sharing as well as the speed of internet-based data transfer and collaborative (or distributed) spatial analysis and modelling.

#### Project to develop the Mesoframe

Following on RandD work and insights developed as part of the CoSAMP project<sup>1</sup>, and working via several inter-governmental reference groups (convened by the Presidency and the dti), the CSIR was commissioned by the dti to develop a common Geoeconomic Mapping Framework for South Africa. Based on stakeholder interactions during the course of the project (involving, *inter alia*, Statistics South Africa, the dplg and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Collaborative Spatial Analysis and Modelling Platform – See Section 4.

forms of land tenure and rural settlement patterns (strongly correlated with the old homeland boundaries) and map layers indicating mountains, gorges and other types of areas that are sparsely populated, and/or functioning as major interaction barriers. The result of this process was referred to as the Macro Framework.

- Functional urban areas consisting of one or more 50km2 zones were defined around all significant, non-metropolitan central places (town and cities). Eleven categories of non-metropolitan central places were defined, (with Bloemfontein as the highest) and used as a basis to determine the number of functional urban area zones (FUA zones) to be demarcated for each central place.
- A combined layer of macroframe areas and FUA zones were created for each province.
- The total surface of each macro-frame area was determined and divided by 50km2 to determine the number of meso-zones that each should contain.
- A customised point allocation tool was used to allocate the required number of zones (per macroframe) and a Thiessen polygon tool was used to draw Thiessen polygons based on the distribution of points (see Figure 2).

# **Figure 2: Example of functional urban areas and Thiessen polygons** (Thaba Chweu Local Municipality)



A slightly different approach was followed to define meso-zones within the metropolitan areas. In the case of Cape Town and the Gauteng metropolitan areas, combinations of transport analysis zones were used. In the case of Ethekwini, the meso-zones were defined as combinations or parts of Metropolitan Planning Units.

#### Description of the Mesoframe: Version 1.1

The result of this process is a demarcation of South Africa into a grid of approximately 50 km<sup>2</sup> meso-zones, nested within municipalities and other significant geo-economic and historical area demarcations (such as the former homeland boundaries). Figure 3 shows how the meso-zones are nested into magisterial districts. The meso-zones also nest within municipal and other boundaries, making it a very useful framework for the disaggregation and re-aggregation of information from the one area demarcation to the other.



#### Figure 3: South African Mesoframe

As explained more fully in Section 3 of the GAP Accompanying Notes, all except the sparsely populated meso-zones (with fewer than 2.5 persons per km<sup>2</sup>) are linked to a road network and associated distance or travel timetables. This makes it possible to calculate various quantity measures for surrounding or linked areas (some of which might be part of an adjoining administrative area).

#### Potential uses

Subject to refinement, an adaptation based on stakeholder feedback, this geoframe has the potential of becoming common geo-referencing framework for the assembly and sharing of development and demand information within the national, provincial and municipal spheres of government. It is linked to a road network-based distance matrix for South Africa as well as various geo-spatial assembly and analysis tools which together, provide capabilities such as:

- Disaggregating large area data and assembling this together with small area, field and point data (e.g. town data);
- Estimating quantities of economic and other human activities within each mesozone as well as within specified distance or travel time ranges;

- Producing a range of accessibility and related measures (including functional urbanisation measures based on measured distances to the nearest central place of a specified category); and
- Mapping and analysing derived demands for services, including the demand for ecosystem services.

#### 5. NSDP Spatial Profiles: Overview of data and methodologies

#### Acknowledgements, disclaimers and restrictions

Table A1 indicates the main data sources for all the maps and tabular data included in this report. All of these sources are gratefully acknowledged.

Given the paucity of published or available economic statistics for any areas smaller than a magisterial district or municipality and the associated need to use a variety of "proxy data" and indirect estimation techniques, the following important general disclaimer is made:

Neither the CSIR, nor the other providers of source data, can provide any guarantees on the accuracy or the statistical confidence levels of the disaggregated economic data and mapped patterns shown in the various maps in this report.

This disclaimer can be partly qualified with reference to ongoing work being undertaken as part of the CoSAMP project to provide a stronger statistical foundation for these types of estimates and the fact that CSIR has been commissioned by the DTI to source additional data sources, interact with provincial stakeholders and re-estimate the spatial distribution of economic activity (all of which forms part of a project with the following title: "A Geo-Economic Mapping Framework, Data and Profiles in Support of Aligned Inter-Departmental and Provincial/Local Economic Planning").

Source	Data	Source	Data
Global Insight Southern Africa: Ricon (Pty) Ltd.	Regional Economic Explorer, Version 190, Version 2.0: Source of: - Magisterial district economic data (2004) - Persons below Minimum Living Level	South African Demarcation Board Department of Environmental Affairs andTourism	Municipal and Administrative Boundaries (2005) ENPAT/TOURPAT tourism attractions (DEAT 2001)
DBSA	Information on municipal economic trends (1996-2004)	Statistics South Africa	Small Area Layer with population density from Census 2001

Table	2:	<b>Overview</b>	of	principal	data	sources
-------	----	-----------------	----	-----------	------	---------

CSIR	<ul> <li>Road Network of South Africa</li> <li>Functional urban areas</li> <li>Sparsely populated areas</li> <li>South African National Land Cover Database</li> <li>Sawmills and pulpmills in South Africa, CSIR Environmentek (captured in 2004)</li> </ul>	M. Geyer, 2005. University of North West	Central Place Index (weighted index of central place facilities.
Chief Directorate Surveys and Mapping	Road Network - (1:50 000 map series)	MapStudio	South African Cities and Towns (1999)
ESRI Digital Chart of the World	Southern African Countries, Towns and Road Network (1992)		

#### Background on the shortcomings of large area statistical profiles

Despite a general need for the mapping and profiling of the South African spatial economy at various scales and in terms of different area demarcations, the basic spatial units for the collection and reporting of economic statistics (i.e. magisterial districts and municipalities) only allow for the calculation of large (administrative) area statistical profiles.

The resulting "large area statistical profiles" tend to create a misleading picture of the underlying patterns. Large areas typically contain sub-areas or local clusters that are distinctly different in terms of variables such as land cover, population density and predominant economic activity. Related problems of large area statistics are that they tend to:

- Hide atypical or dissimilar "local pockets", such as the existence of a specialised economic activity zone within a traditional industrial area;
- Misrepresent the "real" spatial origins of observed conditions, such as an apparently high level of economic prosperity in a peri-urban area which might be entirely due to so-called spill-over from the urban core; and/or
- Give a wrong impression of relative scales or magnitudes, such as when the percentage unemployment in a large, very sparsely populated area is mapped and compared with that in a small, highly populated area.

Besides the high level of aggregation, an additional problem of the magisterial district information is the extremely varying sizes of these districts, which cause a number of distortions such as those shown in Figure 4.



#### Figure 4: Results and shortcomings of magisterial district level indicator mapping

Typical distortions of maps and spatial indicators based on the magisterial district information

- Extremely varying district sizes (e.g. Gordonia compared to Wynberg) has a distorting influence on the perceived spatial distribution of economic activity
- In many of the larger districts (such as Gordonia) there are extreme internal variations (heterogeneity) that has to be considered
- Very small districts (such as Wynberg) are too small too see and – because of their small size not classed as an area of significance (in this case for production of mass-produced goods)

#### Overview of methods used

Faced with the types of analysis scale and comparability problems outlined above, a seemingly obvious solution is to disaggregate all the information in the form of the Mesoframe Version 1.1 as outlined above.

But if this is done without also obtaining and using other information or indicators on the spatial distribution of activities, this would mean that the total economic activity in, for example, a district would simply be equally spread across all the mesoframes that make up that district. Intra-district variations (see the Gordonia-example in Figure 4 above) would still not be reflected. The Mesoframe used for the spatial data profiling, contains a combination of economic, land cover, demographic and basic "framework data" such as the location and size of towns.

#### Main process

Figure 5 indicates the explicit use of proxy spatial distribution indicators as part of the dis-aggregation process. This refers, for example, to the choice of agricultural land cover information, which is a specific type of surface data, as a good approximation of the spatial distribution of agricultural economic activity within an area. This is then used to

estimate the relative proportions of the area total (e.g. the total agricultural GVA in the district) that should be allocated to individual mesoframe cells<sup>3</sup>.

A variety of GIS (Geographic Information System) routines are used in this exercise (including vector-to-grid conversions), but the exact technical details are not of importance. It is more important to discuss the interim result, which Figure 5 shows to be a "combined grid".



#### Figure 5: Mapping Process

Supporting processes of preparatory and/or specialised nature



\*\* The final part of the main process (Stage 4) was not attempted – but could still be implemented as part of related and/or follow up initiatives (see Section A1)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> This methodology is still being refined in a number of ways, for example, to use statistical methods to select and give weights to a combination of spatial distribution indicators.

#### South African National Land-Cover Database

The National Land-Cover Project (NLC) is the first standardised land-cover database produced for the whole of South Africa, Swaziland and Lesotho. The land-cover database was mapped from a series of 1:250 000 scale precision-corrected satellite images. The 49 broad-level thematic land-cover classes in the database can be adapted to suit individual user requirements. For more information on the classification scheme visit the following website: http://www.csir.co.za/websource/ptl0002/docs/sac/ nlc\_report\_2004.html

# Statistics South Africa "Small Area Layer" with population density from Census 2001

This product is based on a "Small Area Layer" (SAL) that was created by combining all EAs with a population of less than 500 with adjacent EAs within the same sub-place. The final SAL consists of 56 255 polygons. Apart from the SAL the product also contains all the higher levels of geography.

#### ENPAT/TOURPAT tourism attractions (DEAT 2001)

This data source provides an indication of areas of particular importance along both known and unknown routes. It includes aspects such as hiking routes, mountain bike routes, equestrian routes or larger regional routes as well as areas of regional importance such as the Lowveld with its focus on wildlife viewing, or other areas such as the Karoo.

#### Surveyor General Road Network

This product contains digital topographical information captured from the 1:50 000 map series. All feature type classes excluding streets were used to calculate a road density index. Please refer to http://w3sli.wcape.gov.za/ for more information.

#### Hierarchy of towns of South Africa (Mapstudio)

All feature classes indicating point location and administrative function of towns in South Africa (1999). The CSIR did name changes of selected towns in the preparation of the NSDP 2005.

#### Location of Sawmills in SA (CSIR NRE)

This product provides the location of sawmills and pulpmills in South Africa and was prepared by the CSIR Environmentek in 2004. This layer was used to enhance the location of wood product manufacturing in South Africa.

#### Global Insight Regional Economic Focus (REF)

This document provides accurate and up-to-date economic, marketing and development information on all detailed economic sectors for each magisterial district and province in South Africa. The REF draws together many different sources of sub-national economic information from Statistics South Africa, government departments, development agencies, Regional Services Councils, private research houses and Global Insight's own data. These data components are reworked to ensure that they are internally consistent and add up to the national totals. All indicators are then updated to the current period using Global Insight's suite of forecasting models including the macroeconomic model, industry model and income distribution forecasting model.

#### Economic Data Categories

The NSDP 2003 proposed the description of the South African space economy in terms of six categories of economic potential (see Table 3 below). The NSDP 2006 utilises the same categories and provides more detail on the category of labour-intensive mass-produced goods. These categories of economic potential have been developed to identify areas of economic significance and enable comparison between areas, highlight key characteristics of the space economy and to identify requirements to ensure the maintenance and growing of the areas of demonstrated economic significance. This analysis can be supported and enhanced through detailed cluster analysis. For the purpose of this CD, the analysis of the NSDP sector categories has also been extended to include an analysis of the normal SIC Code sector classification. Table 3 provides an overview of the detail of the sectors and the hex national relate to each other.

Category	Description
Innovation and experimentation	Research and development and the application of novel technologies
Production: High value,	All forms of production that focus on local and/or global niche markets
differentiated goods (not strongly	such as manufacturing, and some specialised agricultural or natural
dependent on labour costs)	resource- based products.
Production: Labour-intensive, mass-produced goods (more dependent on labour costs and/or natural resource exploitation)	These industries primarily made up of iron and steel producers, and large-scale commercial agricultural and mining activities, are highly dependent on proximity or good, cheap transport linkages to the huge volumes of natural resources that they use in their production processes, as well as the availability of large pools of unskilled and semi-skilled labour.
Public services and administration	These activities tend to take place in larger towns and cities with
	significant public sector employment and consumption, supporting private sector activities, such as retail and private sector services.
Retail and private sector services	Retail, catering and personal services, whether formal or informal, are
	major components of any economy and large employers of skilled and
	semi-skilled workers in advanced economies. Such activities flourish in
	diverse settlements with large populations.
Tourism	Key components of tourism include the need for a tourist-attraction
	(e.g. eco-scenery, cultural, heritage), good transport routes, safety
	and, in many instances, high-quality medical services, restaurants,
	retail outlets and hotels.

#### Table 3: NSDP Categories of economic potential

Standard Industrial Classification SECTORS	DETAIL SECTOR BREAKDOWN	NSDP SECTORS
1 Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing	11 Agriculture and hunting and 13 Fishing	Labour Intensive mass produced goods
	12 Forestry and logging	
2 MINING AND QUARRYING	2 MINING AND QUARRYING	
5 Construction	5 Construction	
4 Electricity, gas and water supply	4 Electricity, gas and water supply	
3 Manufacturing	Food, beverages and tobacco products	
	Textiles, clothing and leather goods	
	Wood and wood products	
	Fuel, petroleum, chemical and rubber products	
	Furniture and other items NEC and recycling	
	Other non-metallic mineral products	
	Metal products, machinery and household appliances	
	Electrical machinery and apparatus	High value differentiated goods
	Electronic, sound/vision, medical and other appliances	
	Transport equipment	
7 Transport, storage and communication	Land and Water transport	
	Air transport and transport supporting activities	
	Post and telecommunication	
6 Wholesale and retail trade	Wholesale and commission trade	
	Retail trade and repairs of goods	Services and retail
	Sale and repairs of motor vehicles, sale of fuel	
	Hotels and restaurants	Tourism
8 Financial intermediation, insurance, real estate and business services	85 Renting of machinery and equipment	
	88 Other business activities	

## Table 4: SIC and NSDP sector description

Standard Industrial Classification SECTORS	DETAIL SECTOR BREAKDOWN	NSDP SECTORS
	86 Computer and related activities	
	87 Research and development	Innovation and Experimentation
9 Community, social and personal services	96 Recreational, cultural and sporting activities	
	99 Other service activities	
	Public administration and defence activities	
	Education	
	Health and social work	
		Public services and administration
	94 Other community, social and personal service activities	
	95 Activities of membership organisations	

#### **RSA Mesoframe Datafields, Description and Sources**

The datafields, descriptors and sources used in the RSA Mesoframe version 1.1 is attached as Table 5.

Table 5: RSA Mesoframe version 1.	<b>Datafields Description and sources</b>
-----------------------------------	---

GIS_code	Description
ID	Meso-zone unique ID
CAT_B	CatB Local Municipality code (Municipal Demarcation Board) 2005
TYPE_	CatB Local Municipality type (Municipal Demarcation Board) 2005
PROVINCE	Provincial code (Municipal Demarcation Board) 2005
DISTRICT	District Municipality code (Municipal Demarcation Board) 2005
MUNICNAME	CatB Local Municipality name (Municipal Demarcation Board) 2005
DCNAME	CatB Local Municipality name (Municipal Demarcation Board) 2005
WARDID	Election wards 2001 (StasSA SA Explorer version 3)
EXHOMELAND	Old Provinces and homelands (DWAF - Enpat 2001)
MD_CODE	Magisterial District Code 2001 (StasSA SA Explorer version 3)
MD_NAME	Magisterial District Name 2001 (StasSA SA Explorer version 3)
CATNUM	Water catchment number (DWAF - Enpat 2001)
CATCHMNT	Water catchment name (DWAF - Enpat 2001)
QUARTERN	Quarternary catchment number (DWAF - Enpat 2001)
TERTIARY	Tertiary catchment number (DWAF - Enpat 2001)
SECONDARY	Secondary catchment number (DWAF - Enpat 2001)
PRIMARY	Primary catchment number (DWAF - Enpat 2001)

FUA_TYPE	Functional Urban Area Type (CSIR 2006)
FUA_AREA	Functional Urban Area coverage (CSIR 2006)
CNTRL_PLCE	Central place name (University of North West with CSIR additions) 2006
RESERV_NAM	Nature Reserve name (DWAF - Enpat 2001)
RESERV_TYP	Nature Reserve authority type (DWAF - Enpat 2001)
M_LAPA	Mountainous low activity and population areas (CSIR 2006)
IRRIGATION	Broad high intensity irrigated agricultural areas (CSIR 2006)
LAPA	Low activity and population areas (CSIR 2006)
HECTARES	Size of meso-zone in Hectares (CSIR 2006)
UNEMPLOY	Unemployment per meso-zone (Census 2001 aggregated by CSIR)
POP2001	Total population per meso-zone (Census 2001 aggregated by CSIR)
	Persons living under the minimum living level per meso-zone (Global Insight and
MLL	Census 2001 disaggregated by CSIR)
HH INC	Total annual household employment per meso-zone (Census 2001 aggregated by CSIR)
	Population density per hectare per meso-zone (Census 2001 aggregated by
POPDENS	CSIR)

#### Economic activity and spatial data:

The data sources, spatial distribution indicators and spatial allocation methods are set out in Table 6 on the next page.

#### References

Eagleson S., Escobar F., Williamson I. 2002. Hierarchical spatial reasoning theory and GIS technology applied to the automated delineation of administrative boundaries. **Computers, Environment and Urban Systems**. Vol 26;185–200. http://www.sli.unimelb.edu.au/research/publications/IPW/ipw\_paper36.pdf

#### Table 6: Spatial data allocation

Main and subsidiary economic activities (statistics per magisterial district sourced from Global Insight)		Chosen type of spatial distribution indicator	Spatial distribution data layers (within each magisterial district)		Spatial allocation method:	
Economic activity	Code			Source		
Mining and quarrying (including sub surface mining)		Mining and quarrying	Land cover data on mines and quarries: a) underground/subsurface mining		Area proportional data partitioning	
21 Mining of coal and lignite	SGD2105	areas	b) surface-based mining		(Limited description of	
23 Mining of gold and uranium ore	SGD2305		c) mine tailings, waste dumps		type of commodity)	
24 Mining of metal ores	SGD2405	-				
25 Other mining and quarrying	SGD2505					
Agriculture and fish farming		Areas with	Land cover data on cultivated land:		Intensity of	
11 Agriculture and hunting	SGD1105	agriculture	a) Permanent, commercial,		activities in	
13 Fishing, operation of fish farms	SGD1305	activity	<ul> <li>b) Temporary, commercial, irrigated/dryland</li> <li>c) Temporary, subsistence, irrigated</li> </ul>		combination with area proportional data partitioning (Basically a weighting based on intensity of farming production)	
Forestry						
12 Forestry and logging	SGD1205	Forestry areas	<ul> <li>Land cover data on:</li> <li>a) Plantations (Eucalyptus spp Pine spp Acacia spp Acacia spp Other/mixed spp clearfelled)</li> <li>b) Forest (indigenous)</li> <li>c) Forest and Woodland</li> </ul>		Area proportional data partitioning (Can be improved on basis of type of trees)	
32 Wood and wood products	SGD3205	Towns and Locations of large sawmills	Hierarchy of towns of South Africa (North West University)		Allocation based on only intensity of activities	
			Location of Sawmills in SA (CSIR Environmentek)			

Main and subsidiary economic activities (statistics per magisterial district sourced from Global Insight)		Chosen type of spatial distribution indicator	Spatial distribution data layers (within each magisterial district)	Allocation method:	
Manufacturing		Location of	Land cover data on urban/built-up	Intensity of	
30 Food, beverages and tobacco products	SGD3005	industrial areas and sites	industrial areas: a) Heavy industrial/transport	activities in combination with	
31 Textiles, clothing and leather goods	SGD3105		b) Light industrial/transport	area proportional data partitioning	
33 Fuel, petroleum, chemical and rubber products	SGD3305		Hierarchy of towns of South Africa (North West University)	(Land cover proportional in combination with	
34 Other non-metallic mineral products	SGD3405			hierarchy of towns)	
35 Metal products, machinery and household appliances	SGD3505				
36 Electrical machinery and apparatus	SGD3605				
37 Electronic, sound/vision, medical and other appliances	SGD3705				
38 Transport equipment	SGD3805	-			
39 Furniture and other items NEC and recycling	SGD3905				
41 Electricity, gas, steam and hot water supply	SGD4105				
Nodal economic activities		Hierarchy of economic	Hierarchy of towns of South Africa (North West University)		
61 Wholesale and commission trade	SGD6105	activity in cities			
62 Retail trade and repairs of goods	SGD6205	and towns			
63 Sale and repairs of motor vehicles, sale of fuel	SGD6305				
81 Finance and Insurance	SGD8105				
84 Real estate activities	SGD8405	1			

			-		
Main and subsidiary economic activities (statistics per magisterial district sourced from Global Insight)					
Population-serving activities		Population	Statistics South Africa Small Area Layer with population density from Census 2001	Allocation based on only intensity of activities	
42 Collection, purification and distribution of water	SGD4205	density			
50 Construction	SGD5005				
88 Other business activities	SGD8805	-			
91 Public administration and defence activities	SGD9105				
92 Education	SGD9205				
93 Health and social work	SGD9305				
99 Other service activities	SGD9905				
Transport-related economic activity		Density of Road Network and Location of Airports	Surveyor General Road Network (density calculation on 16 km grid)	Weighted density of roads per grid cell	
71 Land and Water transport	SGD7105				
73 Air transport and transport services	SGD7305				
75 Post and telecommunication	SGD7505	]			
Tourism		Towns and areas with high tourism activity	Hierarchy of towns of South Africa ((North West University)	Intensity of activities in combination with area proportional data partitioning (Land cover proportional in combination with hierarchy of towns)	
64 Hotels and restaurants	SGD6405		Enpat tourism attractions (DEAT 2001)		

# **ANNEXURE B**

# A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL SPATIAL-DEVELOPMENT PLANNING INSTRUMENTS AND DEBATES

The field of regional spatial development planning is not new. What is, however, new are the economic, social, spatial and institutional conditions in which the "instruments of the trade" are used/deployed. In order to define the state of the field – to get a sense of what exists and what is used by/in other countries and continents; a typology of such models was drawn up from both literature and practice. The intention of course being to put these instruments to use in an African context in such a way that they ensure the achievement of the set objectives within set parameters and in full recognition of the requirements and conditions on the ground<sup>1</sup>. Six such types are discussed below.

#### 1: Indicative "Spatial Development Perspectives" and "Reports"

These are planning documents that typically provide (1) a rigorous multi-dimensional analysis of the space economy<sup>2</sup> of a specific administrative area, followed by (2) the governing body's normative reading of the analysis in terms of the challenges and potentials the space economy presents in meeting its set development objectives for that area. This is then in most cases followed by the governing body's principle-led response to this situation, including its view as to how the territory could be developed and used in a more rational/planned and focused way. Such reports/perspectives typically contain a few carefully phrased, powerful position statements and/or normative principles that specify what should be adhered to in all the planning exercises with spatial implications in the area in which the statements/principles apply. Substantial room for creativity/interpretation is allowed in planning and decision-making in the various tiers/levels of government bound by these principles/statements. The reports generally also provide an arena for debate in which different views as to how the space economy of a territory should be developed, steered and/or managed. In most cases it also enables the resolution of differences in this regard in an open and transparent way.

As a rule the reports/perspectives are indicative by nature. They represent a first order, high-level statement of the development of a particular area over a 20 to 30 year timeframe. Even though they may be prepared in terms of legislation, the reports/perspectives are in most cases non-statutory<sup>3</sup>. Notwithstanding this, the guiding principles in the report may, however, have the power of law, and may be tied to funding from for instance central government departments or supranational

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> It is assumed that it is possible to learn from similar examples in the international arena and to use these in a "pick, mix and match" way to construct a whole in which the various parts assist each other and jointly achieve the set objectives.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This concept refers to the actual and relative geographical spread/location of economic activities in a particular area. Depending on the linkages between entities that are linked in a functional economic chain or wider grouping, such a spatial arrangement could be more or less (1) efficient and (2) able to ensure equitable access to livelihood and wealth-creating economic activities and potentials.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> In the case of the ESDP acceptance of the perspective is based on the voluntary cooperation of member states.

funding organisations<sup>4</sup>. Due to the indicative (often interpreted as "weak or unnecessary") nature of these mechanisms the guiding principles are in many instances ignored by lower levels of government that have to prioritise, allocate resources and implement their plans in accordance with them. This response may of course be the result of a "higher level of government" deciding to prepare a perspective without sufficient involvement from the other tiers/spheres of government, or a misplaced belief that the higher level knows what the situation on the ground is with regards to issues such as need/poverty and development potential. It could also be as a result of an unwillingness to accept the fundamental nature of planning - the need to ration over time and space, which invariably means that some places will be targeted for certain kinds of infrastructure investment, and others not<sup>5</sup>.

A vexing question in the preparation of the European Spatial Development Perspective (ESDP) and subsequent thinking on planning at the European scale has been that of ensuring greater equity between citizens of the European Union<sup>6</sup>. Views as to how this can be achieved differ, with some writers arguing for a "watering-can"<sup>7</sup> approach, i.e. investing equally in space, while others have argued for focused investment in certain places, so as to ensure the creation/sustenance of places that can compete globally<sup>8</sup>. In much the same vein European policy makers and planners have been toiling with the question as to how much investment is required and for how long "to take places that are currently lagging behind to a level of global competitiveness", and whether this is a wise form of scarce resource allocation<sup>9</sup>. Another angle to this debate has come from those who have argued that the overt focus in the ESDP on economic and social concerns has led to "space" and "the environment" being overlooked<sup>10</sup>.

Another area that has caught the attention of a number of writers on the ESDP has been that of definitions, maps, diagrams and mapping, and the power of these images in framing, shaping and organising attention<sup>11</sup>. Williams, for instance, refers to the preparation of maps and cartographic presentations in the preparation of the ESDP as having "bedevilled the whole ESDP process"<sup>12</sup>.

Generally Perspectives have proven to be very useful at building links between planners in different countries and in building learning networks. In the case of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> This is in a broad sense the way in which the INTERREG-funds in the European Union are structured (see Faludi and Waterhout (2002).

Strong politicians and the assurance that this kind of rationing will not be at the cost of meeting all the inhabitants of a territory's basic needs are crucial to keep perspectives that propose rationing in such a way, (politically) alive.

See Niebuhr and Stiller (2003); Kunzmann (1998); Faludi and Waterhout (2002) and Faludi (2000).

This term is taken from an article in the Economist (20-26<sup>th</sup> August 2005) on the recovery of Germany.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See Niebuhr and Stiller (2003); Faludi (2000); Kunzmann (1998); Albrechts et al (2003) and Hague (2003). According to Faludi (2000) the ESDP views the core (the pentagon) as an area in which further growth could lead to diseconomies and also a negative force on cohesion. Hence the ESDP sees reduction of differences not in redistribution of income, but in developing "dynamic zones of global economic integration" in the hinterland (i.e. "throughout the territory of the EU"). The assumption is that it will decrease disparities between core and periphery.

See Niebuhr and Stiller (2003).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See Richardson and Jensen (2000).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> See Faludi and Waterhout (2002); Faludi (2000); Albrechts et al (2003); Oranje (2002) and Richardson (2000).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Williams (2000).

EU it has been argued that the European Spatial Development Perspective has provided European planners with a shared technical vocabulary and an imperative to imagine possibilities that transcend the borders of countries<sup>13</sup>. According to Hague the preparation and adoption of the ESDP was also the key impetus to the preparation of national spatial strategies in Ireland and Wales and the trigger for a debate on the need for such a plan for the UK as a whole<sup>14</sup>.

**Examples** of such perspectives include the *Fifth Report on Physical Planning* (The Netherlands)<sup>15</sup>; the *National Planning Report* (Denmark)<sup>16</sup>; the *European Spatial Development Perspective*<sup>17</sup>; and the *West Africa Long-Term Development Perspective*<sup>18</sup>.

#### 2: Spatial Visions, Explorations and Scenarios<sup>19</sup>

These are texts that are meant to "open" the minds of those involved in planning and decision-making in and for an area to potentially novel ways of using space in that area. The discourse in these documents typically remains on a strategic level, proposing broad strategic directions for action, but can also contain proposals for specific projects that could achieve a set of desired outcomes. As is in the case of the Perspectives/Reports, the indicative nature of this mechanism often results in it being ignored, dismissed or brushed aside by governing bodies that do not see the value it potentially holds for the "serious business" of making investments and spending in space. In addition to this, these documents often lack statistics and hard facts, which adds to them not getting the serious attention they deserve. In order to counter this, a balance between the softer and the harder sides of probing futures may be useful.

**Examples** include the Vision and Strategies around the Baltic Sea 2010 Plus (Europe)<sup>20</sup>; Norvision: A Spatial Vision for the North Sea Region (Europe)<sup>21</sup> and The Netherlands 2030 – Discussion Report/Scenarios: An Exploration of Spatial Perspectives<sup>22</sup>.

#### 3: Planning Policy Guidelines/Guidance

These are detailed expositions on specific topics of national or trans-national importance, which have to be adhered to in all planning exercises in a particular territory. While such guidelines are typically not legally binding, deviations or requests for deviation from the guidelines need to be explained. Funding may also be made conditional to acting within the parameters as provided by the guidelines. As is the case with the other instruments, these guidelines face the challenge of being ignored by other tiers/spheres/levels of government. In addition to this, higher levels of government may not be informed as to what the key areas are in which guidance is required and/or sought "from below" and may end up producing guidelines on issues which are not of value. Such higher levels of government may also end up

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Murray (2004), and Richardson and Jensen (2000).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Hague (2003).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> See VROM (2001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Minister for Environment and Energy (2000).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> European Union (1997) and Oranje (1999).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Cour and Serge (1998).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> See Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (1998:11).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> Committee for Spatial Development in the Baltic Sea Region (1998).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Danish Spatial Planning Department (2000) and PLANCO Consulting (2000).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> See Zonneveld (2005).

producing guidelines that are out of touch with the situation on the ground, or are unworkable in practice.

**Examples** include *Planning Policy Guidance Notes in England and Wales*<sup>23</sup> and *National Planning Policy Guidelines in Scotland*<sup>24</sup>.

#### 4: Spatial Development Frameworks and Spatial Strategies

These frameworks/strategies provide a broad grid/frame consisting of objectives, directives and guidelines within which all public and, in most cases, also private sector actors have to do their planning so as to achieve certain desired social, environmental, political and economical outcomes. In order to ensure sustainable development and prevent delays and high costs further down the line in the form of environmental impact assessments, it has become standard practice to factor Strategic Environmental Impact Assessments into the preparation of such frameworks/strategies in the EU<sup>25</sup>.

Frameworks and strategies typically do not propose or envisage a large degree of direct investment/construction by the agency that is responsible for preparing the framework/strategy and monitoring activities by others for consistency with the plan. Implementation is in most cases left to the other/lower tiers/levels/spheres of government. In contrast to the positive ideals of these instruments, the desire to integrate, coordinate and align the actions of various public and private actors may lead to a situation where this becomes an aim in itself, resulting in a "one size fits all"-approach and in a focus on procedures that stifle the creativity of the other levels/tiers/spheres of government.

**Examples** include the *Irish National Spatial Strategy*<sup>26</sup>; the *Wales Spatial Plan – Pathway to Sustainable Development*<sup>27</sup>; a proposed *National Spatial Plan/Framework for Australia*<sup>28</sup> and a proposed *National Spatial Planning Framework for the United Kingdom*<sup>29</sup>.

#### 5: Spatial Development Plans

These plans typically do not deal with a specific sector, but with crosscutting issues and themes, and the ways in which spatial arrangements can be arranged or changed in order to achieve improvements in the specified issues and themes. In contrast to Spatial Development Frameworks these plans typically specify when and where what is going to be built, invested and spent by whom, *not only* what *should* preferably be built/invested/spent when building, investing and/or spending is embarked upon. The agent preparing the plan also usually undertakes to implement a large part – generally the key/strategic components – of what the plan proposes. As such these plans run the risk of taking on a blueprint-nature and curtailing creativity in the lower levels of planning<sup>30</sup>. This may be especially wasteful and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> See DETR (1999) and Rydin (1993).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> See Tewdwr-Jones (undated).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> See Anon (undated).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> Department of the Environment and Local Government, Ireland (2000; 2001a; 2001b; 2001c; 2001d; 2001e and 2001f) and Mawhinney (2001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> National Assembly for Wales (2001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> Gleeson (2001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> See Royal Town Planning Institute (2000a and 2000b), Shaw (1999) and Tewdwr-Jones (undated).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> In some cases such a blueprint nature is exactly what is desired to ensure delivery on specific times and in exact forms/formats.

frustrating in contexts where sufficient planning capacity exists in lower levels of government to interpret and give local meaning to a/the plan, and where central government bureaucrats, far away from the scene of the action, embark on such planning exercises.

**Examples** include the *National Physical Development Plan* (Mauritius)<sup>31</sup>; the *National Spatial Plan* (Estonia)<sup>32</sup>; the *National Physical Development Plan* (Qatar)<sup>33</sup> and the *National Plan of Spatial Development* (Belarus)<sup>34</sup>.

#### 6: Development Nodes/Corridors

These instruments consist of a set of carefully planned and programmed actions that are meant to achieve a clearly defined set of developmental outcomes within a set timeframe in a carefully specified area/region that has been identified as of strategic importance for the future development of a wider area/region. Typically public sector investment is used to lever in private sector investment with the aim of unlocking the latent development potential in an area in the form of a node or a corridor. These initiatives can be very costly exercises that lever in no or very little private sector investment and end up merely gobbling up (scarce) funds in (detailed) plan preparation, environmental impact assessments and infrastructure investment, which could have been put to much better use in addressing basic needs. The tendency also exists for such plans to be prepared by a small group of technocrats in a specific level/sphere of government without involvement of other stakeholders in other levels of government, or the private sector. Often the main beneficiaries in such nodes turn out to be multinationals and their imported labour, with very little spin-offs for the local population. In cases where local labour is used it has often been marred by accusations of exploitation and unfair labour practices<sup>35</sup>.

**Examples** include the *Spatial Development Initiatives* (South Africa)<sup>36</sup> and the *SADC Spatial Development Initiatives/Regional Development Corridors*<sup>37</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Mauritius Ministry of the Environment (1997).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> Raagmaa (1996).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> ArabNet-Qatar (undated) and Louis Berger Group (2001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> See Oranje and Bierman (2002).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> This has often been the accusation levelled at "enterprise/export-processing/tax free zones" in general, but especially so in Asia (see Oranje and Del Misro, 1999). The same concerns were also expressed regarding the Department of Trade and Industry's *Industrial Development Zones*, as part of the South African national government's Spatial Development Initiatives (SDIs) (see Oranje and del Mistro, 1999).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> See Oranje and del Mistro (1999).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> Jourdan *et al* (1997).

# **ANNNEXURE C**

# A REFLECTION ON SPATIAL ENGINEERING BY THE APARTHEID GOVERNMENT IN THE NATIONAL PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (1975)

In 1970 a committee of the Prime Minister's Planning Advisory Council was given the task to investigate, report on and make recommendations to the Minister of Planning on the relationships between various levels of government in terms of physical planning (Republic of South Africa, 1970). In the exposition of the background to the brief it was plainly stated that "(t)he concept of the policy of separate development, more industrial decentralisation and the development of border industries as its logical extension, makes the existence of a national physical development plan a necessity" (Republic of South Africa, 1970:9). It was said by one of the then senior planners in the Department that the Planning Advisory Council wanted to make this recommendation somewhere and had asked the Minister to give them an assignment in which they could do so, hence the study. The need/desire for a national plan was repeated in the recommendations with a long list of requirements on the proposed nature of such a plan and what it should contain/indicate. Included were inter alia the recommendations that the plan should indicate "socio-economic and development or planning regions", all the areas zoned for the various race groups in terms of the Group Areas Act, the location of the "Bantu homelands" and the macro-infrastructure (road, rail, air, harbours, etc.)<sup>38</sup>. It was foreseen that the plan would provide information to both the public and private sector as to what the "... immediate and future plans of the government were with regards to the physical development of the country ..." (Republic of South Africa, 1970:17). It was also proposed that the plan should be flexible and only be approved on a region-by-region base.

Out of this report came the announcement by the then State President in January 1971 that such a national plan was to be drafted which would indicate "... where the various population groups will live, work and enjoy their leisure" (Department of Planning and the Environment, 1975:7; bold as italics in original text). This led to the publication of the National Physical Development Plan in 1975 in which the country was divided up into 38 planning regions and the four metropolitan areas (Department of Planning and the Environment, 1975:9)<sup>39</sup>. The "Bantu homelands" were excluded from the Plan as the Apartheid government saw them as independent states in the making over which South Africa had no jurisdiction (Department of Planning and the Environment, 1975:7-9). The plan also included six *Development Axes* running between the metropolitan and proposed metropolitan areas with existing and proposed harbours and/or major centres of mining and/or industrial activities or just "the interior" (Department of Planning and the Environment, 1975:17). In an interview with the town planner responsible for the plan it was indicated that these axes were not part of the concept at the outset. According to him they were added later on,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> It is important to note that two of the members of the Committee, Dr Danie Page and Mr Ron Pistorius, leading town and regional planners at the time, were keen proponents of the idea of regional planning (Meyer, 1996 and Harrison and Mabin, 1997). Dr Page was especially known for his work on the demarcation of regions, which he had developed into the proverbial "exact science" and which would incidentally come in very handy in the demarcation of Apartheid's "Bantu homelands" (see Page, 1982). It would thus not be out of place to suggest that they were the architects, or at least key supporters of the region-based proposals.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Rhetoric would have it that the demarcation was done "very scientifically" (Department of Planning and the Environment, 1975). A personal interview with an official in the department at the time has it that junior planners with pens and drafting tables were often the actual desk-top architects.

purely as an afterthought, with no studies having been done at that time, or without the use of any theoretical base or precedent. As for their status, some of them were already in existence, others were common sense lines, or conceptual assumptions and some were just wishful thinking or based on an inflated belief in South Africa's strategic importance to "the West". It is said that one of them especially, the axes in the Northern Cape was based on such an inflated assumption. It was believed that it would become a transport corridor in which the wealth of minerals in the area would be carted to Saldanah Bay harbour. From here they would be exported to the "rest of the free world" to assist in the struggle against the "evil Russian Aggressor" (see Department of Planning and the Environment, 1975:17). This would never come to fruition, largely; it is said, as a result of the unwillingness of the government-owned steel manufacturer, ISCOR, to allow the ISCOR-owned railway line in the corridor to be used by others.

The frame with its swaths of "Development Axes" became a very well-known one among planning students and practitioners alike, arguably more so for its corridors than for its regional proposals that did not really make much of a visual statement. As for the plan itself, it was incidentally never taken to Cabinet for approval. The primary reasons apparently being twofold. *Firstly* the fear of a negative response from voters located in areas which were not to be boosted. *Secondly*, the "fact" that the then Minister of the Department was a political lightweight who firstly did not have the clout to see the plan through Parliament and, secondly, held a tightly contested seat, which could easily be lost were he to make a "wrong move".

# ANNEXURE D

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE JANUARY 2005 HARMONISING AND ALIGNMENT REPORT

#### Background

One of the major challenges that has frustrated government in its quest to (1) provide basic services to all its people, (2) progressively improve the quality of life and life chances of all South Africans and (3) eradicate the dualistic nature of the South African economy has been the effective integration, coordination and alignment of the actions of its three constituting spheres. Over the last decade this intention has found expression in a range of Acts, policies, strategies, development planning instruments, integration mechanisms and structures aimed at ensuring that intergovernmental (1) priority setting, (2) resource allocation and (3) implementation takes place in a programmatic, integrated, effective, efficient and sustainable way.

Despite all these efforts intergovernmental integration and coordination has remained a distant ideal, resulting in the desired developmental outcomes only partially been realised. This, in turn, has resulted in the continuation of the inequalities, inefficiencies and wastage of the apartheid space economy, seriously compromising the daily liveability and long-term sustainability of our settlements.

Over the last five years the gaps in intergovernmental integration, co-ordination and alignment, as well as the underlying reasons and challenges for this state of affairs, have been explored in a number of studies, assessments and projects<sup>40</sup>, as well as in research commissioned for the Ten Year Review<sup>41</sup>. This has led to the realisation that merely focusing on integration and coordination procedures will not have the desired results. Increasingly so a consensus-position is developing, which holds that coordinated government priority setting, resource allocation and implementation requires (1) alignment of strategic development priorities and approaches in all planning and budgeting processes, (2) a shared agreement on the nature and characteristics of the space economy, and (3) strategic principles for infrastructure investment and development spending.

#### **Project Introduction**

In line herewith, Cabinet and the President in his *State of the Nation* address in May of this year expressed the need to complete the process of harmonising the National Spatial Development Perspective (NSDP), the Provincial Growth and Development Strategies (PGDS) and the municipal Integrated Development Plans (IDPs). The responsibility for giving effect to this decision was given to the Policy Unit in the Presidency. In accordance with this brief the unit set up an intergovernmental project team, comprising of National Treasury and the Departments of Provincial and Local Government Land Affairs and Trade and Industry to guide and oversee the project. A key activity of the project entailed the hosting of consultative workshops in each province to arrive at a mutual and shared understanding of the (1) role of the NSDP in facilitating alignment and (2) the processes by which the IDPs, PGDS and the NSDP could be linked.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> See Oranje et al (2003), Rauch (2002), van Huyssteen and Oranje (2004), and Gwagwa (2004)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> See Presidency (2003).
#### Improving the performance of the State through alignment and harmonisation

Understanding the policy implications of the trends (increase in number of households, growth in economically active, socio-economic dualism, social consequences of changes) as evidenced in the social transition over the last decade is important in shaping the actions of government over the next decade.

Improving the performance of the state in addressing poverty, ensuring economic growth and eradicating the dualistic nature of the South African economy, requires (1) that we build a developmental state capable of directing the growth and development trajectory of the country for the benefit of all, but especially the poor, and (2) alignment of government action in a structured and systematic way among the spheres of government and between the spheres and other organs of the state to achieve common objectives and maximise development impact. Alignment and harmonisation implies greater consistency and synergy in the implementation of government policies.

As argued in the *Ten Year Review*, such harmonisation and alignment entails that all three spheres of government will (1) act in a focused and decisive way, (2) demonstrate the will to make tough trade-offs and choices, (3) implement consistent strategies, and (4)provide leadership, collaborate and build partnerships with each other, the private sector and civil society.

Given that all actions by government take place in each of the 53 district and metropolitan municipal areas, aligned intergovernmental state action in each of these areas will require shared prioritisation, joint resource allocation; and targeted/focussed implementation. Harmonisation and alignment of state action across the 53 impact zones is crucial if government is serious about meeting its developmental objectives. Alignment of this nature is, however, not simply a technical process, but rooted in a shared and common platform.

# The NSDP as common platform for infrastructure investment and development spending

A local and international exploration of alternatives and leading practice examples in South Africa suggests that such harmonisation and alignment can best be achieved by putting in place a common platform of principles for infrastructure investment and development spending that have to be adhered to by all spheres of government in their planning, decision-making and implementation activities. The National Spatial Development Perspective (NSDP), which was developed between 1999 and 2003 and approved by Cabinet in January of the latter year in response to the ineffectiveness of government action in addressing the spatial inefficiencies and inequities of apartheid, provides such a platform in that it makes provision for (1) a district-based national perspective on the distribution of, and relationship between poverty and development potential; and (2) a set of guiding principles for infrastructure investment and development spending in each of government's 53 impact zones. The normative principles and guidelines embodied in the national spatial development perspective provide the central organising concept for facilitating alignment and serve as the mechanism and basic platform for better coordination and alignment of government programmes.

# Ensure that all government's development planning activities are conducted in accordance with the NSDP

The unfolding intergovernmental development planning framework in which the NSDP is located consists of instruments, mechanisms, systems and structures that enable prioritisation, resource allocation and implementation in and between the three spheres and various sectors in government. Within this context, the strategic coordinating development planning instruments in the three spheres (and between the various sectors) are (1) the Medium Term Strategic Framework (MTSF) in the national sphere; (2) the Provincial Growth and Development Strategies (PGDSs) in the provincial sphere; and (3) the Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) in the local sphere.

While harmonised and aligned governance requires that all development-planning activities have to be conducted in accordance with the normative principles provided by the NSDP it is, however, evident from various projects and assessments that this does as yet not take place. Based on recent provincial consultations, numerous studies and assessments, it is proposed that the strategic co-ordinating development planning instruments, as well as the other instruments, mechanisms, systems and structures in the intergovernmental landscape, are grounded in the common platform provided by the NSDP. The spatial perspective thus becomes the centre of alignment and coordination, facilitating discussions on the development potential of the space economy and serving as a frame of reference for guiding government actions.

This would be ensured through:

- 1. A **national level potential analysis and prioritisation** managed by the Presidency. This task includes integrating across the clusters and managing alignment between national policies/priorities and provincial policies/priorities.
- 2. A province-wide agreement and shared understanding in each of the nine provinces on (1) the provincial space economy and the relation between poverty and development potential in that province and for the respective district and metro areas in the province, and (2) the role of the principles for infrastructure investment and development spending on provincial, national and municipal planning, resource allocation and implementation.
- The development of Provincial Growth and Development Strategies (PGDSs) that are based on the province-wide agreement and shared understanding, which also provides guidance and coordination for provincial and national sector plans and departmental strategies and municipal plans.
- 4. A district and metropolitan wide agreement and shared understanding of (1) the district space economy and the relation between poverty and development potential in the district, as well as local municipal areas in the district; and (2) the roles and responsibilities for infrastructure investment and development spending, which provides the base of the District and Metropolitan IDPs and provincial, national and municipal planning, agreements and intergovernmental protocols on resource allocation and implementation.
- 5. The **development and implementation of a district and province-based intergovernmental** Mutual Assessment Framework, which will provide a mechanism for monitoring, evaluating and reporting on the agreed outputs and impacts, as well as the instruments, processes and agreements to ensure them in the different spheres, sectors and agencies.

The **implementation** of the above interventions requires minor amendments to the Municipal Systems Act, 2000; deepening exposure and use of the NSDP, and capacity building of officials and councillors on the intergovernmental development planning framework and its components.

#### In Conclusion

An overarching framework and spatial guidelines clearly spelling out the spatial priorities of government is critical to focus government action and provide the platform for alignment and coordination. The NSDP essentially provides a framework to discuss/deliberate the future development of the national space economy and recommends mechanisms to bring about optimum alignment between infrastructure investment and development programmes within localities.

Prioritisation and resource allocation by the three spheres of government is aligned in the preparation and review of PGDSs and IDPs through:

- Reaching agreement on the spatial location of development potential and need/poverty in provinces and district/metropolitan municipalities;
- Aligning infrastructure investment and development spending in the 47 district and 6 metropolitan municipalities in accordance with the NSDP principles in this regard; and
- Mutually monitoring and assessing government development planning and implementation.

### ANNEXURE E

## DISTRICT AND METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY SPECIFIC STATISTICS

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES FREE STATE PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES FREE STATE PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES GAUTENG PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES GAUTENG PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES KWAZULU NATAL PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES KWAZULU NATAL PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES LIMPOPO PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES LIMPOPO PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES MPUMALANGA PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES MPUMALANGA PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES NORTH WEST PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES NORTH WEST PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILE	ES: EASTERN CAPE PRO	VINCE: Socio-E	conomic Att	ributes			0/ . (			0/(				0( - ( O) (	
				0/ of		Dooplo under	% Of Dopuplation			% Of				% of GVA °	% of GVA
			Total	% OI Provincial	% of Notional	Minimum	Popupiation	% of Population	Linom	onemploy od in	% of		Total G\/A ("1000)	(2004 (	2004
			Dopulation	Provincial	% Of National			% of Population	ollern-	Drovince	70 UI	Total Hausshald	(2004 ourront	current t	prices) in
		Total Hostoros	(2001)	(2001)	(2001)		(2004)		(2001)	(2001)			(2004 current	Province	
Alfred Nzo District municipality	Matatiele Local Municipality	10tal Hectales //35.230	10/ 577	(2001)	(2001)	(2004) 188.07 <sup>,</sup>	(2004) 1 3.09	0.80	(2001)	2001)	0.40	756 020 357	A64 059	0.59	0.04
Amed N20 District municipality	Imzimyubu Local Municipality	250 644	197,962	3.14	1 0.44	178 62	7 377	0.00	34 772	2.02	0.40	672 109 384	343 336	0.55	0.04
Alfred Nzo District municipality	Total	685 874	392 539	6.22	0.41	367 598	3 775	1.56	70 224	5.60	0.00	1 428 138 741	807 395	1.03	0.00
Amatole District municipality	Amahlathi Local Municipality	426.901	140.213	2.22	2 0.31	113.18	2.39	0.48	31.641	2.52	0.35	732,735,772	914,286	1.16	0.07
, indicio Biotriot manicipality	Buffalo City Local Municipality	252.726	708,779	11.24	4 1.58	437.50	) 9.22	1.86	186.574	14.87	2.09	7.633.031.970	14,730,296	18.71	1.21
	Great Kei Local Municipality	173.599	44.431	0.70	0.10	27.448	3 0.58	0.12	8.685	0.69	0.10	284.821.011	517.059	0.66	0.04
	Mbhashe Local Municipality	305,009	256,395	4.06	6 0.57	244,822	2 5.16	1.04	41,256	3.29	0.46	798,122,046	536,010	0.68	0.04
	Mnguma Local Municipality	329,953	286,707	4.54	4 0.64	257,17	1 5.42	1.09	50,461	4.02	0.57	1,172,900,489	1,588,480	2.02	0.13
	Nggushwa Local Municipality	224,091	84,627	1.34	4 0.19	81,528	3 1.72	. 0.35	21,928	1.75	0.25	281,853,611	599,434	0.76	0.05
	Nkonkobe Local Municipality	372,412	128,858	2.04	4 0.29	116,743	3 2.46	0.50	32,278	2.57	0.36	644,477,608	1,033,910	1.31	0.08
	Nxuba Local Municipality	273,192	25,003	0.40	0.06	20,587	7 0.43	0.09	6,009	0.48	0.07	7 151,901,074	197,689	0.25	0.02
Amatole District municipality To	otal	2,357,882	1,675,013	26.55	5 3.72	1,298,980	27.38	5.51	378,832	30.18	4.24	11,699,843,583	20,117,165	25.55	1.65
Cacadu District municipality	Baviaans Local Municipality	772,706	15,213	0.24	4 0.03	6,85	1 0.14	0.03	2,281	0.18	0.03	3 138,161,335	233,163	0.30	0.02
	Blue Crane Route Local Munic	983,557	35,550	0.56	6 0.08	21,65	7 0.46	0.09	7,417	0.59	0.08	3 271,955,361	520,342	0.66	0.04
	Camdeboo Local Municipality	722,993	43,584	0.69	9 0.10	17,849	9 0.38	0.08	7,434	0.59	0.08	3 382,091,598	810,954	1.03	0.07
	ECDMA10	1,328,029	7,839	0.12	2 0.02	3,65	1 0.08	0.02	930	0.07	0.01	112,501,626	267,586	0.34	0.02
	Ikwezi Local Municipality	445,314	10,629	0.17	7 0.02	6,737	7 0.14	0.03	1,971	0.16	0.02	92,174,784	167,586	0.21	0.01
	Kouga Local Municipality	241,941	70,429	1.12	2 0.16	23,548	3 0.50	0.10	9,108	0.73	0.10	956,227,416	1,451,013	1.84	0.12
	Kou-Kamma Local Municipality	/ 357,371	34,619	0.55	5 0.08	8,15	1 0.17	0.03	3,882	2 0.31	0.04	325,087,622	910,519	1.16	0.07
	Makana Local Municipality	437,562	75,199	1.19	9 0.17	41,40	1 0.87	0.18	16,868	3 1.34	0.19	748,269,522	1,616,119	2.05	0.13
	Ndlambe Local Municipality	184,064	54,751	0.87	0.12	33,479	9 0.71	0.14	10,873	0.87	0.12	638,933,734	691,028	0.88	0.06
Considur District coursisis slitur Ta	Sunday's River Valley Local Mi	L 350,791	40,375	0.64	+ 0.09	26,18	0.55	0.11	6,940	0.55	0.08	293,204,660	703,335	0.89	0.06
Cacadu District municipality To		5,824,328	388,187	0.10	0.80	189,500	3 3.98	0.80	67,702	· 5.39	0.76	0,908,007,008	7,371,040	9.36	0.60
Chris Hani District municipality	ECDIVIATS Emplohloni Local Municipality	255 000	125 594	1.00		126.22	2 2 66	0.00	10.022	0.00	0.00	9,000,020	521 271	0.01	0.00
	Engcobo Local Municipality	225 852	1/0 266	2.37	7 0.20	1/5 050	3 2.00	0.04	24 843	1.09	0.22	128 520 / 85	350 772	0.00	0.04
	Inkwanca Local Municipality	358 424	20 340	0.32	0.00	145,050	S 0.36	0.02	4 188	1.30	0.20	136 588 680	256 770	0.45	0.03
	Intsika Vethu Local Municipality	304 143	176 371	2.80	0.00	169.600	3 3 58	0.07	27 593	2 20	0.31	610 151 491	539 763	0.00	0.02
	Inxuba Yethemba Local Munici	i 1 158 845	60,519	0.96	5 0.00 5 0.13	32 780	0.00	0.12	12 21(	0.97	0.014	512 505 363	964 896	1 23	0.04
	Lukanii Local Municipality	425.926	184.206	2.92	2 0.41	112.29	7 2.37	0.48	40.639	3.24	0.46	1.188.850.835	2.098.999	2.67	0.17
	Sakhisizwe Local Municipality	225.081	62.810	1.00	0.14	58.53	1 1.23	0.25	11.431	0.91	0.13	266,799,468	278.501	0.35	0.02
	Tsolwana Local Municipality	602,467	32,773	0.52	2 0.07	31,608	3 0.67	0.13	6,115	0.49	0.07	159,633,151	193,073	0.25	0.02
DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN MU	JNICIPALITY	3,669,476	811,961	12.87	7 1.81	693,256	6 14.61	2.94	146,958	3 11.71	1.65	3,660,020,610	5,208,558	6.62	0.43
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan M	/Invelson Mandela Metropolitan M	195,890	1,014,220	16.08	3 2.25	448,43	7 9.45	i 1.90	233,891	18.64	2.62	14,072,461,446	35,920,784	45.62	2.94
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan M	/unicipality Total	195,890	1,014,220	16.08	3 2.25	448,437	7 9.45	5 1.90	233,891	18.64	2.62	14,072,461,446	35,920,784	45.62	2.94
O.R.Tambo District municipality	y King Sabata Dalindyebo Local	302,733	417,724	6.62	2 0.93	323,442	2 6.82	1.37	76,590	6.10	0.86	2,450,442,426	4,122,789	5.24	0.34
	Mbizana Local Municipality	241,672	247,114	3.92	2 0.55	5 218,470	) 4.61	0.93	41,819	3.33	0.47	783,808,897	600,751	0.76	0.05
	Mhlontlo Local Municipality	282,614	204,724	3.25	5 0.46	5 174,943	3 3.69	0.74	33,301	2.65	0.37	605,449,969	618,450	0.79	0.05
	Ntabankulu Local Municipality	145,572	135,371	2.15	5 0.30	127,162	2 2.68	0.54	25,575	5 2.04	0.29	359,326,431	207,164	0.26	0.02
	Nyandeni Local Municipality	247,401	275,018	4.36	6 0.61	255,764	4 5.39	1.08	48,129	3.83	0.54	871,208,573	965,644	1.23	0.08
	Port St Johns Local Municipalit	1 129,120	146,458	2.32	2 0.33	127,65	1 2.69	0.54	24,839	1.98	0.28	560,500,242	350,611	0.45	0.03
	Qaukeni Local Municipality	247,683	256,486	4.07	7 0.57	236,058	3 4.98	1.00	48,004	3.82	0.54	746,075,610	631,968	0.80	0.05
O.R.Tambo District municipality	y Total	1,596,795	1,682,895	26.68	3 3.74	1,463,49	1 30.85	6.21	298,257	23.76	3.34	6,376,812,146	7,497,377	9.52	0.61
Ukhahlamba District municipali	ty Elundini Local Municipality	506,444	138,409	2.19	9 0.31	109,01	1 2.30	0.46	23,794	1.90	0.27	507,202,365	328,885	0.42	0.03
	Gariep Local Municipality	891,106	31,365	0.50	0.07	22,830	5 0.48	0.10	5,721	0.46	0.06	230,310,922	455,005	0.58	0.04
	Songu Local Municipality	430,764	30,864	0.58	o 0.08	24,3/	J U.51	0.10	0,201	0.49	0.07	300,015,713	392,927	0.75	0.05
Likhahlamha District musicipali	ty Total	2 566 265	242 592	Z.17	0.30	120,00	7 Z.07	0.54	23,302	. 1.8/	0.20	1 500 790 400	437,230	0.00	0.04
EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE		2,000,200	6 308-308	5.43 100-00	14.02	4 744 00	+ 5.90 3 100-00	20.12	1 255.08/	4.72	14.04	42 795 664 381	78 736 974	∠.30 100.00	0.15 6.45
South Africa Total		122,079.198	44,977.826	100.00	100.00	23,584.39	5	100.00	8,930.803	100.00	100.00	540,837,757.085	1,220,888.209	100.00	100.00

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: W	ESTERN CA	APE PROVINCE	Socio-econon	nic Attribut	es										
							% Of	0/ -4		0/ -4					
	10041			0/ -6	0/ -4	Deselstonden	Popupiatio	)% Of Demulation		% Of	0/ -4			04 -6 014	
			Total	% UI	% UI	Minimum	Mulia	Population	Linemployme	onempioy	% UI		Total CV/A	% OIGVA	0/ of C)/A
		Total Lipstores	Deputation	Provincial	Deputation				Unemployme	eu in Drouinee		Total Llaussheld Income	(1000)	III Drovince	% OI GVA
MUNICIPALIT f	ALIT I Recordo Riv		Population 01 020	Population 1 01					11.	Province 0.79			(1000)	Province	0.15
Cape Winelands District Municipa	Broode Val	200 /38	01,930	1.01	0.10	10,700	3.22	0.00	4,942	0.70	0.00	920,290,123	5,000,880	0.93	0.15
	Drakonstoi	153 765	143,330	1.21	0.32	40.232	3.22	0.14	23 303	2.47	0.10	2 076 320 125	6 050 505	2.03	0.42
	Stellenhos	83 173	120 330	2.65	0.43	17 072	1 71	0.17	10 965	1 72	0.20	2,970,029,120	6 540 241	3.02	0.54
		1 076 278	6 562	0.14	0.27	1 388	0.13	0.00	96	0.02	0.12	61 876 274	526 864	0.40	0.04
	Witzenberg	285 125	83 432	1.84	0.01	16 231	1 54	0.07	6 975	1 00	0.00	843 066 339	2 192 213	1 14	0.04
Cape Winelands District Municipa	ality Total	2 230 947	632 246	13.95	1 41	128 473	12.22	0.54	62 042	9.74	0.69	9 181 878 629	23 088 754	12 02	1.89
Central Karoo District municipality	/ Beaufort W	1.633.010	36,955	0.82	0.08	11.600	1.10	0.05	6.429	1.01	0.07	421,947,243	631,389	0.33	0.05
	Laingsburg	878,449	6.648	0.15	0.01	1,901	0.18	0.01	857	0.13	0.01	78,756,769	118.839	0.06	0.01
	Prince Albe	815.291	10.253	0.23	0.02	3.263	0.31	0.01	1.593	0.25	0.02	85.234.522	120.321	0.06	0.01
	WCDMA05	558,651	6,138	0.14	0.01	2,730	0.26	0.01	917	0.14	0.01	37,232,682	175,247	0.09	0.01
Central Karoo District municipality	/ Total	3,885,401	59,994	1.32	0.13	19,494	1.85	0.08	9,796	1.54	0.11	623,171,215	1,045,796	0.54	0.09
City of Cape Town Metropolitan M	/ICity of Cap	244,729	2,898,908	63.95	6.45	718,254	68.31	3.05	458,357	71.94	5.13	67,089,105,178	137,148,900	71.38	11.23
City of Cape Town Metropolitan M	Iunicipality T	244,729	2,898,908	63.95	6.45	718,254	68.31	3.05	458,357	71.94	5.13	67,089,105,178	137,148,900	71.38	11.23
Eden District municipality	Bitou Local	99,186	29,250	0.65	0.07	4,841	0.46	6 0.02	4,230	0.66	0.05	589,006,265	1,023,498	0.53	0.08
	George Lo	107,159	135,695	2.99	0.30	22,083	2.10	0.09	19,876	3.12	0.22	2,349,635,458	4,676,098	2.43	0.38
	Hessequa	573,354	44,380	0.98	0.10	10,185	0.97	0.04	3,331	0.52	0.04	646,723,635	1,009,979	0.53	0.08
	Kannaland	475,807	23,836	0.53	0.05	7,103	0.68	0.03	1,780	0.28	0.02	190,549,938	542,902	0.28	0.04
	Knysna Loo	105,886	51,457	1.14	0.11	8,513	0.81	0.04	7,821	1.23	0.09	838,487,360	1,616,938	0.84	0.13
	Mossel Bay	201,083	71,251	1.57	0.16	16,466	1.57	0.07	9,376	1.47	0.10	1,259,385,783	2,292,447	1.19	0.19
	Oudtshoor	353,705	85,104	1.88	0.19	25,731	2.45	5 0.11	13,139	2.06	0.15	841,062,931	2,377,686	1.24	0.19
	WCDMA04	416,932	14,727	0.32	0.03	4,548	0.43	0.02	1,315	0.21	0.01	99,748,949	313,027	0.16	0.03
Eden District municipality Total		2,333,112	455,699	10.05	i 1.01	99,470	9.46	6 0.42	60,868	9.55	0.68	6,814,600,318	13,852,574	7.21	1.13
Overberg District municipality	Cape Agul	284,140	26,754	0.59	0.06	6,090	0.58	0.03	1,993	0.31	0.02	450,482,033	934,332	0.49	0.08
	Overstrand	170,750	54,658	1.21	0.12	8,559	0.81	0.04	6,649	1.04	0.07	1,174,029,593	1,931,797	1.01	0.16
	Swellendar	299,887	27,807	0.61	0.06	7,810	0.74	0.03	2,377	0.37	0.03	346,235,561	1,336,590	0.70	0.11
	Theewater	324,844	93,893	2.07	0.21	16,809	1.60	) 0.07	9,743	1.53	0.11	1,055,184,835	2,283,898	1.19	0.19
	WCDMA03	60,849	247	0.01	0.00	5/	0.01	0.00	8	0.00	0.00	6,240,050	28,439	0.01	0.00
Overberg District municipality 1 of	a	1,140,471	203,359	4.49	0.45	39,326	3.74	0.17	20,770	3.26	0.23	3,032,172,072	6,515,055	3.39	0.53
west Coast District municipality	Bergrivier I	440,705	46,296	1.02	0.10	6,963	0.66	0.03	2,761	0.43	0.03	646,008,099	1,484,346	0.77	0.12
	Cederberg	733,049	39,622	0.07	0.08	0,019	0.02	0.04	2,412	0.30	0.03	400,095,490	1,220,029	0.64	0.10
	Reldershe	176 501	50,160	1.11	0.11	10,000	1.01	0.05	4,542	1.27	0.05	1 90,930,420	1,341,379	0.70	0.11
	Saluanna e	176,591	72,261	1.54	0.10	0,200	0.00	0.03	0,734	1.37	0.10	1,233,110,024	2,766,794	1.45	0.23
	Swartland	309,227	12,201	1.58	0.10	12,900	0.10	0.06	0,317	0.99	0.07	1,190,770,322	3,341,006	1.74	0.27
West Coast District municipality	Total	3 110 261	4,282	6.09	0.01	1,009	0.10	0.00	25 336	3.09	0.01	40,314,753	305,400 10 /80 756	5.46	0.03
Western Cape Total	Uldi	12 9/15 022	4 532 766	100.00	10.03	40,499	4.42	. 0.20	637 169	100.00	7.12	91 108 /66 332	10,409,750	100.00	15 74
South Africa Total		122,945,022	4,332,700	100.00	10.00	23 584 205	100.00	100.00	8 930 803	100.00	100.00	540 837 757 085	1 220 888 200	100.00	100.00
		122,013,190	44,577,020		100.00	20,004,090		100.00	0,330,003		100.00	340,037,737,003	1,220,000,209		100.00

NSDP Spatial Profiles:

GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1. Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

Static         Static<	NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: NORTH	H WEST PROVINCE Socio-econo	mic Attributes					9/ of	9/ of							
DB STRICT RET NOT DULT AND CONTRACT AND TABLE AND					% of			76 UI	76 UI		% of	% of				
NUMBER         COLL, MUNCIPALITY         Total Household Pacing Program         Total Household Pacing Program         In Province         In Res.         Decrement         Decre	DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN				Provincial	% of National	People under Minimum	under MI I	under MIL in			/ Unemployed			% of GVA %	% of GVA
Beginste Bariert munopality         Kgelengriver Local Munopality         397.311         38.46         1.14         0.08         9.357         0.50         0.04         6.489         0.97         0.07         301.105.501         4.483.421         5.46         0.33           Local Munopality         Moretele Local Municipality         137.365         1162.330         5.70         0.41         97.216         5.22         0.41         44.796         6.67         0.50         77.2450.722         1,162.996         1,162.996         1,162.996         1,162.996         1,162.996         1,162.996         1,162.996         1,162.996         1,162.996         226.045.98         30.56         226.045.98         30.56         226.045.98         30.56         227.22         228.165         392.4         256         105.63.06         31.71.75         1.68.3         0.56         2.71         1.009.944         1.29         0.56         2.71         1.009.944         1.29         0.56         2.71         1.009.944         1.29         0.56         2.71         1.009.944         1.29         0.56         2.71         0.50         1.66         40.069         5.77         0.45         816.155.071         1.009.944         1.29         0.77         1.66         3.66         32.2	MUNICIPALITY	LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	Total Hectares	Total Population	Population	Population	Living Level	in province	RSA	Unemployment	in Province	in RSA	Total Household Income	Total GVA (1000)	in Province in	n RSA
Local Municipality of Matchengt         383,982         366,373         10.81         0.77         170,142         9.14         0.72         78,489         11.68         0.85         3.047,664,063         9.31,17.45         10.31         0.77           Moreacle Local Municipality Moreacle Local Municipality Moreacle Local Municipality Moreacle Local Municipality Matchengt         337,923         128,839         5,70         0.61         197,255         6,68         0.64         55,057         6,26         0.62         1,444,662,644         3,506,76         4,27         0.62         1,644,662,644         3,506,76         4,12         0.62         2,21         3,566,75         6,26         0.62         1,444,662,644         3,506,76         4,27         2,66         2,31         3,66,73         1,162         0,88         5,016,52,071         1,099,944         1,20         0,56         2,31         0,00         5,71         1,109,954         1,101,97         1,13         0,10         2,228         2,86         0,101         1,52,55         2,24         0,10         1,56,417         1,001,777         1,18         0,00         1,51         8,334         1,33         0,10         2,27,38,914         59,169         0,70         0,50           Morepolative municipality main         1,354,4172	Bojanala District municipality	Kgetlengrivier Local Municipality	397,311	36,465	1.1	4 0.08	9,35	7 0.5	0 0.04	4 6,48	9 0.9	7 0.0	7 301,105,501	4,643,42	1 5.45	0.38
Local Municipality of Madberg         383 382         346,373         10.81         0.77         17.14         9.14         0.72         77.468         11.88         0.88         3,047.064,063         9.31,745         10.90         0.77           Morretele Local Municipality Signata District municipality Total         137.035         122.85         5.70         0.03         150.557         6.02         0.44         47.06         6.55         0.55         752.50.722         1.68.02.04         3.50.476         3.50.476         0.55         750.557         6.58         0.44         753.50         71.66         0.88         5.018.52.4         0.25         44.672.15         5.68         0.41         10.321         6.61         0.68         5.018.52.4         0.26         44.67.15         0.24         44.67.15         0.44         6.78.54         0.41         6.73.52         2.25         25.56         0.44         6.78.5         0.41         6.51.52         0.21         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964         1.09.964 </th <th></th>																
Moretele Local Municipally Moretele Local Municipally Beparina District municipally Municip		Local Municipality of Madibeng	383,962	2 346,373	10.8	1 0.77	170,14	2 9.1	4 0.72	2 78,49	11.6	8 0.8	3,047,064,063	9,311,74	5 10.93	0.76
Moses Kotare Local Municipality         571,900         230,332         7.46         0.53         190,537         8.08         0.64         55,507         8.26         0.62         1.444,662,644         3.508,470         4.12         0.25           Bigerials District municipality Total         Greater Taury Local         383,429         1193,645         37.24         2.66         51.067         28.52         225         28.560         39.24         2.85         39.24         2.85         39.24         2.85         39.24         2.85         39.24         2.85         39.24         2.85         39.24         2.85         39.24         2.85         39.24         2.85         39.24         2.85         39.24         2.85         39.25         2.75         0.65         31.52         0.25         2.75         0.45         816,125,071         1.099,94         1.8         0.06         0.06         0.06         0.06         0.06         0.07         0.06         0.07         0.08         0.07         0.07         0.07         0.07         0.07         0.08         0.07         0.08         0.07         0.08         0.07         0.08         0.07         0.08         0.07         0.08         0.08         0.07         0.08 <th< th=""><th></th><th>Moretele Local Municipality</th><th>137,935</th><th>5 182,830</th><th>5.7</th><th>0.41</th><th>97,21</th><th>6 5.2</th><th>2 0.41</th><th>44,79</th><th>6 6.6</th><th>7 0.50</th><th>752,550,722</th><th>1,162,99</th><th>5 1.36</th><th>0.10</th></th<>		Moretele Local Municipality	137,935	5 182,830	5.7	0.41	97,21	6 5.2	2 0.41	44,79	6 6.6	7 0.50	752,550,722	1,162,99	5 1.36	0.10
Rustmoniphily Data         342,311         338,845         12,13         0.86         558         0.44         73.80         11.66         0.88         5.016,524,002         20,045,218         22,05         22,05         22,056,003         24,047,218         22,05         22,05         22,05         22,05         22,056,003         24,047,218         24,027,218         24,05         22,05         22,05         22,05         20,050,031         44,047,218         42,05         24,05         22,05         20,05         20,050,031         44,047,03         41,000,05         21,05         22,05         20,05         20,01		Moses Kotane Local Municipality	571,908	3 239,132	7.4	6 0.53	150,53	7 8.0	8 0.64	55,50	07 8.2	6 0.63	2 1,444,662,644	3,508,47	6 4.12	0.29
Beginaria District municipality         Creater Taurg Local         10:83:40:93         11:82:40:13         22:45         23:45         23:57         10:07.77         11:8         00:05           Leaver-Fernance Local         Minicipality         3:61:49         0.15         6:39:41         13:3         0.10         22:73:61:3         20:81:44         42:40         42:00         42:73:80:78         42:00         44:01:74         44:01:74         44:01:74         44:01:74         44:01:74         44:01:74         44:01:74         44:00		Rustenburg Local Municipality	342,311	388,845	12.1	3 0.86	103,81	6 5.5	8 0.44	78,36	0 11.6	6 0.8	5,018,524,002	26,045,49	3 30.56	2.13
Bephrima District municipality Municipality Kagisano Local Municipality Kagisano Local Municipality Kagisano Local Municipality Municipality         1,13,5,412         9,92,3         2,78         0,20         73,229         3,33         0,31         15,726         2,34         0,18         51,4964,065         1,001,777         1,18         0,00          Lewa-Teemane Local Municipality         361,494         46,593         1,52         0,11         35,307         1,90         0,15         8,834         1,33         0,10         227,36,43         599,169         0,70         0,06           Marnus Local Municipality         361,494         46,593         1,52         0,11         35,307         1,90         0,15         8,934         1,33         0,10         247,388,914         599,169         0,70         0,00           Bephrima District municipality         124/4         40,017,42         434,975         1,37         0,97         338,233         18,17         1,43         84,937         1,24         0,95         24,27,306,078         4,782,672         55         1,033         3,04         2,02         2,47         0,31         999,951,563         3,14,033         3,09         2,2         2,27         0,31         999,951,563         3,44,033         3,09         2,2         2,47	Bojanala District municipality Total		1,833,429	9 1,193,645	37.2	4 2.65	531,06	7 28.5	2 2.25	263,65	0 39.2	4 2.9	5 10,563,906,931	44,672,13	5 52.42	3.66
Kagisan Local Municipality Letwar-Fermane Local Municipality Mamusa Local Municipality         133, 412         89,223         2.78         0.20         73,229         3.93         0.31         15,726         2.34         0.16         514,984,650         1,00,777         1.18         0.00           Letwar-Fermane Local Municipality Mamusa Local Municipality         361,484         46,533         1.52         0.11         35,37         1.90         0.15         8,534         1.33         0.10         247,388,914         599,169         0.70         0.00           Mamusa Local Municipality         12,47,320         11,667         0.03         0.660         0.52         0.04         1,373         0.20         0.02         282,730,613         208,344         0.24         0.03           Bophrima District municipality         725,846         58,076         1.81         0.33         98,171         1.43         84,937         12.64         0.95         24,2730,507,86         4,740,272         5.61         0.33           Certral District municipality         0180,041 Local Municipality         464,621         104,466         3.26         0.23         1.71         0.53         5.91,03         8.80         0.66         22,472,03,07,8         4,98,93         1.98         0.98         1.98<	Bophirima District municipality	Greater Taung Local Municipality	563,543	3 182,362	5.6	9 0.41	160,39	1 8.6	1 0.68	3 40,08	9 5.9	7 0.4	5 816,125,071	1,099,96	4 1.29	0.09
Lekwa Teemane Local Muricipality Manusa Local Municipality         368,120         45,060         1.41         0.10         22,993         1.23         0.10         8,531         1.27         0.10         267,464,450         706,663         0.83         0.00           Manusa Local Municipality Malopo Local Municipality         361,484         48,593         1.52         0.11         35,307         1.90         0.15         8,934         1.33         0.10         247,386,901         208,736,13         208,344         0.24         0.00         94,736,913         208,344         0.24         0.00         94,873         1.01         208,351         1.77         0.10         247,386,901         1.66,756         1.37         0.11         1.66,756         1.37         0.11         1.66,758         1.37         0.11         1.66,758         1.37         0.11         1.66,758         1.37         0.11         1.66,758         1.37         0.13         3.66,53         0.42         2.68,032         4.17         0.31         2.64,459         1.46,833         3.68         0.22         2.67,05         4.62,23,00,78         4.782,6705         4.89         0.23         1.015,458         1.01         0.03         1.12,273         6.03         0.43         3.035         4.47		Kagisano Local Municipality	1,135,412	2 89,223	2.7	B 0.20	73,22	9 3.9	3 0.31	15,72	6 2.3	4 0.18	3 514,964,055	5 1,001,77	7 1.18	0.08
Mamusa Local Municipality         361,494         46,593         1.52         0.11         35,307         1.90         0.15         8,934         1.33         0.10         247,380,914         599,160         0.70         0.00           Molop Local Municipality         7,25,864         560,76         1.81         0.13         36,653         1.97         0.16         10,284         1.53         0.12         488,61,974         1,166,756         1.37         0.17           Central District municipality Total         4,01,742         434,975         13,77         0.97         333,23         18,17         1.43         849,37         1.24         0.98         4,72,78,73         0.17         4,78         6,78         3,79         0.16         0.33         98,171         1.43         84,97         1.33         0.01         1,72,78         6,73         0.42         2,80,32         4,17         0.31         99,951,596         3,140,333         3,69         0.25         2,87,05,61         3,33         3,69         0.25         2,87,05,61         0.33         4,80         0.31         1,12,273         6,03         0.48         3,095         4,47         0,44,955         1,11         0.00         2,82,61         0,11         1,116,75         1,1		Lekwa-Teemane Local Municipality	368,120	45,060	1.4	1 0.10	22,99	3 1.2	3 0.10	) 8,53	1.2	7 0.10	267,464,450	706,66	3 0.83	0.06
Modep Local Municipality         1.247.320         11.661         0.36         0.03         9.660         0.52         0.04         1.373         0.20         0.02         9.273.0613         209.344         0.24         0.03           Bedpliniza District municipality         725.864         58.076         1.37         0.17         0.16         1.028         1.33         0.12         9.448.68.1974         1.168.756         1.37         0.13           Central District municipality         Ditsolota Local Municipality         646.487         1.47,530         4.61         0.33         9.9171         5.33         0.42         28.032         4.17         0.31         39.951.596         3.18,10.833         39.020         0.66         2.247,005.078         4.252,075         4.99         0.33           Markeng Local Municipality         456,621         104.466         3.26         0.23         51.881         2.79         0.22         2.2079         3.29         0.25         529,574,020         944.375         1.11         0.00           Tswaip Local Municipality         456,621         104.466         3.26         0.23         51.881         2.79         0.22         2.20,79         3.29         0.25         529,574.020         944.375         1.11		Mamusa Local Municipality	361,484	48,593	1.5	2 0.11	35,30	7 1.9	0 0.15	5 8,93	1.3	3 0.10	247,388,914	599,16	9 0.70	0.05
Nakedi Local Municipality         725,864         58,076         1.81         0.13         36,653         1.97         0.16         10,284         1.53         0.12         488,631,974         1,166,756         1.37         0.13           Bophirima District municipality         Ditsobotta Local Municipality         646,487         147,630         4.61         0.33         99,171         5.33         0.42         28,032         4.17         0.31         999,951,596         3,140,833         3.69         0.26           Central District municipality         146,6487         147,630         4.61         0.33         99,171         5.33         0.42         28,032         4.17         0.31         999,951,596         3,140,833         3.69         0.26           Ramotsbree Molia Local Municipality         366,624         114,466         3.26         0.23         51,861         2.79         0.22         2.079         3.29         0.25         259,574,020         944,375         1.11         0.00           Tswaing Local Municipality         456,624         114,456         3.57         0.25         166,322         8.93         0.71         17,777         2.65         0.20         521,364,208         13,319,750         1.55         0.11		Molopo Local Municipality	1,247,320	0 11,661	0.3	6 0.03	9,66	0.5	2 0.04	1,37	3 0.2	0 0.02	2 92,730,613	3 208,34	4 0.24	0.02
Bephrina District municipality Total       4,401,742       44,47,75       13,57       0.97       338,233       18,17       1.43       84,997       12,64       0.95       2,427,205,078       4,782,672       5,61       0.33         Central District municipality       Distoket Local Municipality       646,467       144,763       4,61       0.33       99,171       5,33       0.42       28,032       4,17       0.31       999,951,966       3,140,833       0.5       4.99       0.33         Ramotshere Mulcipality       646,467       719,275       137,688       4.30       0.31       112,273       6.03       0.48       30,035       4.47       0.34       612,901,623       1,015,483       1,19       0.00         Ramotshere Mulcipality       456,661       104,466       3.26       0.23       51,881       2.79       0.22       22,079       3.29       0.25       259,574,020       944,375       1.11       0.06         Tevanip Local Municipality       456,621       104,466       3.26       0.23       51,811       2.79       0.22       2.02       2.93       0.15       34,41,817       1.05       0.15       0.15       0.15       0.15       0.15       0.15       0.15       0.16       0.15		Naledi Local Municipality	725,864	4 58,076	i 1.8	1 0.13	36,65	3 1.9	7 0.16	5 10,28	1.5	3 0.12	2 488,631,974	1,166,75	5 1.37	0.10
Central District municipality         Ditsobotal Local Municipality         646,487         714,733         4.61         0.33         99,171         5.33         0.42         28,002         4.17         0.31         999,951,596         3,140,833         3.69         0.28           Markispality         Markispality         368,97         260,111         8.12         0.58         125,021         6.71         0.48         30,035         4.47         0.34         612,901,623         1,015,433         1.19         0.08           Municipality         A56,621         104,465         3.26         0.23         51,881         2.79         0.22         22,079         3.29         0.25         525,574,020         944,375         1.11         0.06           Central District municipality         456,621         104,465         3.26         0.23         166,322         8.93         0.71         17,778         2.65         0.20         521,364,208         1,319,750         1.55         0.15         0.15         0.21         1.97,7036         1.56         0.20         521,364,208         1,319,750         1.55         0.47         0.32         0.21         1.93,37,74,610         9.28,085         1.69,1673,146         1.52         0.78         0.75         0.	Bophirima District municipality Total		4,401,742	2 434,975	13.5	7 0.97	338,23	3 18.1	7 1.43	84,93	12.6	4 0.9	5 2,427,305,078	4,782,672	2 5.61	0.39
Mafikeng Local Municipality         369,837         260,111         8.12         0.58         125,021         6.71         0.53         59,103         8.80         0.66         2,247,023,370         4,252,705         4,99         0.32           Ramotshere Moiloa Local         719,275         137,688         4.30         0.31         112,273         6.03         0.48         30,035         4.47         0.34         612,901,623         1015,483         1.9         0.06           Municipality         456,621         104,466         3.26         0.23         51,881         2.79         0.22         22,079         3.29         0.25         521,364,208         1,315,750         1.55         0.11           Central District municipality         596,624         144,456         3.57         0.25         166,322         8.93         0.71         17,787         2.65         0.23         521,364,208         1,315,750         1.55         0.11           Central District municipality         Maduassi Hills Local Municipality         464,305         69,594         2.17         0.15         4.89         0.23         53,736,744,41         0.678,450         0.72         0.072           Matiosana Local Municipality         464,305         59,947         11.21 <th>Central District municipality</th> <th>Ditsobotla Local Municipality</th> <th>646,487</th> <th>7 147,630</th> <th>4.6</th> <th>1 0.33</th> <th>99,17</th> <th>1 5.3</th> <th>3 0.42</th> <th>2 28,03</th> <th>2 4.1</th> <th>7 0.3</th> <th>1 999,951,596</th> <th>3,140,83</th> <th>3 3.69</th> <th>0.26</th>	Central District municipality	Ditsobotla Local Municipality	646,487	7 147,630	4.6	1 0.33	99,17	1 5.3	3 0.42	2 28,03	2 4.1	7 0.3	1 999,951,596	3,140,83	3 3.69	0.26
Ramotshere Molioa Local Municipality Ratiou Local Municipality Ratiou Local Municipality         719,275         137,688         4.30         0.31         112,273         6.03         0.48         30,035         4.47         0.34         612,901,623         1,015,483         1.19         0.06           Municipality Ratiou Local Municipality         456,621         104,466         3.26         0.23         51,881         2.79         0.22         22,079         3.29         0.25         259,574,020         944,375         1.11         0.06           Tswaing Local Municipality         596,624         114,456         3.57         0.25         166,322         8.93         0.71         17,787         2.65         0.20         521,364,208         1.319,750         1.55         0.15         0.87           Southern District municipality Total         2,788,845         764,351         23.85         1.70         54,688         29.79         2.35         157,036         23.37         1.65         3.94,221,672         615,551         0.72         0.05           Matlosana Local Municipality         356,146         359,427         11.21         0.80         220,572         11.85         0.94         77,796         11.58         0.87         3,736,744,610         9,282,085         10		Mafikeng Local Municipality	369,837	7 260,111	8.1	2 0.58	125,02	1 6.7	1 0.53	3 59,10	3 8.8	0 0.66	5 2,247,023,370	4,252,70	5 4.99	0.35
Ratiou Local Municipality Tswaing Local Municipality         456, 621         104,466         3.26         0.23         51,881         2.79         0.22         22,079         3.29         0.25         258,574,020         944,375         1.11         50         50           Central District municipality Total         2,788,845         764,351         23.85         1.70         554,668         29.79         2.35         157,036         23.37         1.76         4,640,814,817         10,673,146         12.52         0.87           Southern District municipality         Maquassi Hills Local Municipality         356,146         359,427         11.27         0.15         48,942         2.63         0.21         12,974         1.93         0.15         394,221,672         615,851         0.72         0.08           Maratosana Local Municipality         356,146         359,427         11.21         0.80         28,275         11.85         0.94         77,766         1.85         0.46         0.49         3,376,744,610         9,282,085         11,617,85         0.92         11,617,85         1.80         0.92         11,91         0.38         3,376,744,610         9,282,085         11,81         0.92         11,91         0.38         3,376,744,810         9,282,085         <		Ramotshere Moiloa Local Municipality	719,275	5 137,688	4.3	0 0.31	112,273	3 6.0	3 0.48	3 30,03	15 4.4	7 0.34	4 612,901,623	3 1,015,48	3 1.19	0.08
Tswaing Local Municipality         596,624         114,456         3.57         0.25         166,322         9.33         0.71         17,787         2.65         0.20         521,364,208         1,319,750         1.55         0.15           Central District municipality Total         2,788,845         764,351         23.85         1.70         556,668         29.79         2.35         157,036         2.65         0.20         521,364,208         1,319,750         1.55         0.15           Southern District municipality Matosana Local Municipality Merafong City Local Municipality Merafong City Local Municipality         356,146         359,427         11.21         0.80         220,572         11.85         0.94         77,796         11.58         0.87         3,736,744,610         9,282,085         10.89         0.76           Matosana Local Municipality Merafong City Local Municipality         356,146         359,427         11.21         0.80         220,572         11.85         0.94         77,796         11.58         0.87         3,736,744,610         9,282,085         10.89         0.76           Merafong City Local Municipality Ventersforp Local Municipality         267,349         128,615         4.01         0.29         51,915         2.79         0.22         24,757         3.88		Ratlou Local Municipality	456,621	1 104,466	3.2	6 0.23	51,88	1 2.7	9 0.22	2 22,07	9 3.2	9 0.2	5 259,574,020	944,37	5 1.11	0.08
Central District municipality Total         2,788,845         764,351         23.85         1.70         554,668         29.79         2.35         157,036         23.37         1.76         4,640,814,817         10,673,146         12.52         0.87           Southern District municipality Matosana Local Municipality Meratong City Local Municipality Meratong City Local Municipality Meratong City Local Municipality Meratong City Local Municipality         36,16         359,427         11.21         0.80         220,572         11.85         0.94         77,796         11.85         0.87         3,736,423,828         11,611,427         13.63         0.95           Potchefstroom Local Municipality Meratong City Local Municipality         267,349         128,615         4.01         0.29         51,915         2.79         0.22         24,757         3.68         0.28         1,691,679,488         2,932,638         3.44         0.24           Ventersdorp Local Municipality Ventersdorp Local Municipality         376,405         43,244         1.35         0.10         27,298         1.47         0.12         7,312         1.09         0.08         233,907,687         648,484         0.76         0.05           Southern District municipality Total         362,050.83         10.00         27,298         1.47         0.12         7,312		Tswaing Local Municipality	596,624	4 114,456	3.5	7 0.25	166,32	2 8.9	3 0.71	17,78	7 2.6	5 0.20	521,364,208	3 1,319,75	0 1.55	0.11
Southern District municipality       Maquassi Hills Local Municipality       464,305       69,594       2.17       0.15       48,942       2.63       0.21       12,974       1.93       0.15       394,221,672       615,851       0.72       0.05         Matiosana Local Municipality       356,146       359,427       11.21       0.80       220,572       11.85       0.94       77,796       11.58       0.87       3,736,744,610       9,282,085       10.89       0.72         Matiosana Local Municipality       366,146       359,427       11.21       0.80       220,572       11.85       0.94       77,796       11.58       0.87       3,736,744,610       9,282,085       10.89       0.72         Potchefstroom Local Municipality       267,349       128,615       4.01       0.29       51,915       2.79       0.22       24,757       3.68       0.28       1,691,679,488       2,932,638       3.44       0.24         Ventersdorp Local Municipality       376,405       43,244       1.35       0.10       27,298       1.47       0.12       7,312       1.09       0.08       233,907,687       648,484       0.76       0.00         Southern District municipality Total       1,627,260       812,068       25,34       1.8	Central District municipality Total		2,788,845	5 764,351	23.8	5 1.70	554,66	B 29.7	9 2.35	5 157,03	6 23.3	7 1.70	6 4,640,814,817	10,673,14	6 12.52	0.87
Matiosana Local Municipality Meratong City Local Municipality Meratong City Local Municipality       356,146 163,055       359,427 211,18       11.21 6.59       0.80 0.47       220,572 89,275       11.85 4.79       0.94 0.38       77,796 43,397       11.58 6.46       0.87 0.49       3,736,744,610 3,376,423,828       9,282,085 11,611,427       10.89 13.63       0.76         Potchefstroom Local Municipality Ventersdorp Local Municipality       267,349       128,615       4.01       0.29       51,915       2.79       0.22       24,757       3.68       0.28       1,691,679,488       2,932,638       3.44       0.24         Ventersdorp Local Municipality Ventersdorp Local Municipality       376,405       43,244       1.35       0.10       27,298       1.47       0.12       7,312       1.09       0.08       233,907,687       648,484       0.76       0.05         Southern District municipality Total       1,627,260       812,068       25.34       1.81       438,001       23.52       1.86       166,236       24.74       1.86       9,432,977,285       25,090,484       29.44       2.06         North West Total       106,651,275       3,205,039       100.00       7.43       1,861,970       100.00       7.89       674,859       100.00       7.52       27,065,04,111       85,218,437	Southern District municipality	Maquassi Hills Local Municipality	464,305	5 69,594	2.1	7 0.15	48,94	2 2.6	3 0.21	12,97	4 1.9	3 0.1	5 394,221,672	615,85	0.72	0.05
Merafong City Local Municipality       163,055       211,188       6.59       0.47       89,275       4.79       0.38       43,397       6.46       0.49       3,376,423,828       11,611,427       13.63       0.95         Potchefstroom Local Municipality       267,349       128,615       4.01       0.29       51,915       2.79       0.22       24,757       3.68       0.28       1,691,679,488       2,932,638       3.44       0.24         Ventersdorp Local Municipality       376,405       43,244       1.35       0.10       27,298       1.47       0.12       7,312       1.09       0.08       233,907,687       648,484       0.76       0.05         Southen District municipality Total       16,627,600       812,068       25.34       1.81       438,001       23.52       1.86       166,236       24.74       1.86       9,432,977,285       25,090,484       29.44       20.45         North West Total       10,651,275       3,205,033       100.00       7.43       1,651,970       100.00       7.85       671,855       100.00       7.52       27,065,04,111       85,251,84,37       100.00       6,98       3,930,803       100.00       540,837,757,085       1,220,888,209       100.00       6,98       3,930,803		Matlosana Local Municipality	356,146	359,427	11.2	1 0.80	220,57	2 11.8	5 0.94	4 77,79	6 11.5	8 0.8	7 3,736,744,610	9,282,08	5 10.89	0.76
Potchefstroom Local Municipality         267,349         128,615         4.01         0.29         51,915         2.79         0.22         24,757         3.68         0.28         1,691,679,488         2,932,638         3.44         0.24           Ventersdorp Local Municipality         376,405         43,244         1.35         0.10         27,298         1.47         0.12         7,312         1.09         0.08         233,907,687         648,484         0.76         0.00           Southern District municipality Total         1627,260         812,068         25.34         1.81         438,001         23.52         1.86         166,236         24.74         1.86         9,432,977,285         25,004,84         29.44         20.45           North West Total         10,0651,275         3,205,039         100.00         7,313         1,861,970         100.00         7,582         27,065,004,111         85,218,437         100.00         6,98         6,98,803         100.00         540,837,757,085         1,220,888,209         100.00         100.00         23,584,335         100.00         8,93,803         100.00         540,837,757,085         1,220,888,209         100.00		Merafong City Local Municipality	163,055	5 211,188	6.5	9 0.47	89,27	5 4.7	9 0.38	3 43,39	07 6.4	6 0.49	3,376,423,828	3 11,611,42	7 13.63	0.95
Ventersdorp Local Municipality         376,405         43,244         1.35         0.10         27,298         1.47         0.12         7,312         1.09         0.88         233,907,687         648,484         0.76         0.05           Southern District municipality Total         1,627,260         812,068         25.34         1.81         438,001         23.52         1.86         166,236         24.74         1.86         9,432,977,285         25,090,484         29.44         20.65           North West Total         10,651,275         3,205,039         100.00         7.13         1,861,970         100.00         7.89         671,859         100.00         7.52         27,065,094,111         85,218,437         100.00         6.98           South Africa Total         122,079,198         44,977,826         100.00         23,584,395         100.00         8,930,803         100.00         540,837,757,085         1,220,888,209         100.00		Potchefstroom Local Municipality	267,349	128,615	4.0	1 0.29	51,91	5 2.7	9 0.22	2 24,75	67 3.6	8 0.2	1,691,679,488	2,932,63	3 3.44	0.24
Southern District municipality Total         1,627,260         812,068         25.34         1.81         438,001         23.52         1.86         166,236         24.74         1.86         9,432,977,285         25,090,484         29.44         2.06           North West Total         10,651,275         3,205,039         100.00         7.13         1,861,970         100.00         7.89         674,859         100.00         7.52         27,065,004,111         85,218,437         100.00         6.98           South Africa Total         122,079,198         44,977,826         100.00         23,584,395         100.00         8,930,803         100.00         540,837,757,085         1,220,888,209         100.00		Ventersdorp Local Municipality	376,405	5 43,244	1.3	5 0.10	27,29	B 1.4	7 0.12	2 7,31	2 1.0	9 0.08	3 233,907,687	648,48	4 0.76	0.05
North West Total         10,651,275         3,205,039         100.00         7.13         1,861,970         100.00         7.89         671,859         100.00         7.52         27,065,004,111         85,218,437         100.00         6.96           South Africa Total         122,079,198         44,977,826         100.00         23,584,395         100.00         8,930,803         100.00         540,837,757,085         1,220,888,209         100.00	Southern District municipality Total		1,627,260	812,068	25.3	4 1.81	438,00	1 23.5	2 1.86	6 166,23	6 24.7	4 1.86	9,432,977,285	5 25,090,48	4 29.44	2.06
South Africa Total         122,079,198         44,977,826         100.00         23,584,395         100.00         8,930,803         100.00         540,837,757,085         1,220,888,209         100.00	North West Total		10,651,275	5 3,205,039	100.0	0 7.13	1,861,97	0 100.0	0 7.89	671,85	9 100.0	0 7.5	2 27,065,004,111	85,218,43	7 100.00	6.98
	South Africa Total		122,079,198	44,977,826		100.00	23,584,39	5	100.00	8,930,80	3	100.00	540,837,757,085	1,220,888,209	)	100.00

NSDP Spatial Profiles: GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1. Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

NSDP SPAITAL PROFILES: LIN	MPOPO PROVINCE Socio-economi	ic Attributes													
							% of	% of							
							Popuplati	Populatio		% of					
				% of		People under	on under	n under		Unemploy	% of			% of GVA	
DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN			Total	Provincial	% of National	Minimum	MLL in	MLL in	Unemployme	ed in	Unemploy	Total Household		in	% of GVA
MUNICIPALITY	LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	Total Hectares	Population	Population	Population	Living Level	province	RSA	nt	Province	ed in RSA	Income	Total GVA (1000)	Province	in RSA
Capricorn District municipality	Aganang Local Municipality	187,100	148,660	2.96	0.33	114,799	3.34	0.49	9 24,263	3 2.68	8 0.27	410,614,278	619,477	1.24	0.05
	Blouberg Local Municipality	454,059	161,653	3.22	0.36	5 148,244	4.31	0.63	3 23,443	3 2.59	0.26	456,582,077	866,423	1.73	0.07
	Lepele-Nkumpi Local Municipality	346,344	229,222	4.56	0.51	188,610	5.49	0.80	) 41,554	4.59	0.47	1,096,743,646	1,362,335	2.72	0.11
	Molemole Local Municipality	334,733	111,086	2.21	0.25	5 79,847	2.32	2 0.34	4 16,765	5 1.85	5 0.19	440,302,098	871,160	1.74	0.07
	Polokwane Local Municipality	376,598	511,484	10.19	1.14	343,604	9.99	1.46	5 93,815	5 10.35	5 1.05	4,734,839,085	6,154,837	12.30	0.50
Capricorn District municipality To	otal	1,698,833	1,162,105	23.14	2.58	875,105	25.45	5 3.7 <sup>.</sup>	1 199,840	) 22.06	6 2.24	7,139,081,185	9,874,231	19.74	0.81
Greater Sekhukhune District Mu	n Fetakgomo Local Municipality	110,748	93,782	1.87	0.21	61,567	1.79	0.20	6 16,251	1.79	0.18	286,943,312	332,720	0.67	0.03
	Greater Groblersdal Local Municipa	al 371,333	221,771	4.42	0.49	173,773	5.05	6 0.74	4 37,618	3 4.15	5 0.42	854,817,505	1,732,760	3.46	0.14
	Greater Marble Hall Local Municipa	l 190,980	121,894	2.43	0.27	93,465	2.72	0.40	0 21,194	2.34	0.24	429,144,872	785,849	1.57	0.06
	Greater Tubatse Local Municipality	459,898	270,340	5.38	0.60	164,507	4.79	0.70	52,137	5.75	6 0.58	943,457,942	1,964,399	3.93	0.16
	Makhuduthamaga Local Municipalit	ty 209,662	262,029	5.22	0.58	191,941	5.58	8 0.8 <sup>.</sup>	1 50,471	5.57	0.57	709,531,608	958,114	1.92	0.08
Greater Sekhukhune District Mu	nicipality Total	1,342,621	969,816	19.31	2.16	685,253	19.93	3 2.9	1 177,671	19.61	1.99	3,223,895,239	5,773,843	11.54	0.47
Mopani District municipality	Ba-Phalaborwa Local Municipality	300,425	131,143	2.61	0.29	54,264	1.58	0.23	3 26,617	2.94	0.30	1,295,871,206	4,560,880	9.12	0.37
	Greater Giyani Local Municipality	298,507	242,100	4.82	0.54	129,017	3.75	0.5	5 47,635	5 5.26	6 0.53	1,095,990,131	1,448,852	2.90	0.12
	Greater Letaba Local Municipality	189,088	219,446	4.37	0.49	131,537	3.83	0.56	5 34,707	3.83	0.39	803,540,489	1,120,241	2.24	0.09
	Greater Tzaneen Local Municipality	324,259	377,629	7.52	0.84	294,571	8.57	1.2	5 72,281	7.98	8 0.81	1,937,020,605	3,288,810	6.57	0.27
	Maruleng Local Municipality	324,430	96,059	1.91	0.21	60,897	' 1.77	0.26	5 18,470	) 2.04	0.21	413,223,925	823,077	1.65	0.07
	NPDMA33	1,011,821	1,032	0.02	0.00	) 215	0.01	0.00	) 37	0.00	0.00	23,115,218	463,443	0.93	0.04
Mopani District municipality Tota	I	2,448,531	1,067,409	21.26	2.37	670,500	19.50	) 2.84	4 199,747	22.05	5 2.24	5,568,761,574	11,705,302	23.40	0.96
Vhembe District municipality	Makhado Local Municipality	852,750	497,060	9.90	1.11	317,364	9.23	1.3	5 92,359	10.19	1.03	2,745,831,346	3,402,232	6.80	0.28
	Musina Local Municipality	757,684	39,366	0.78	0.09	21,470	0.62	2 0.09	9 6,046	6 0.67	0.07	301,008,824	698,522	1.40	0.06
	Mutale Local Municipality	234,591	83,665	1.67	0.19	70,112	2.04	0.30	0 17,059	9 1.88	8 0.19	337,466,101	449,468	0.90	0.04
	Thulamela Local Municipality	289,870	583,879	11.63	1.30	455,745	13.26	5 1.93	3 117,843	3 13.01	1.32	2,669,555,782	4,151,909	8.30	0.34
Vhembe District municipality Tota	al	2,134,894	1,203,969	23.98	2.68	864,691	25.15	3.6	7 233,307	25.75	5 2.61	6,053,862,052	8,702,132	17.40	0.71
Waterberg District municipality	Bela-Bela Local Municipality	337,596	52,582	1.05	0.12	18,764	0.55	0.08	3 8,346	6 0.92	2 0.09	433,496,270	1,369,650	2.74	0.11
	Lephalale Local Municipality	1,960,142	96,724	1.93	0.22	51,334	1.49	0.22	2 11,357	1.25	6 0.13	797,119,434	2,698,935	5.40	0.22
	Modimolle Local Municipality	622,786	72,783	1.45	0.16	5 27,420	0.80	0.12	2 9,991	1.10	0.11	583,938,686	1,081,508	2.16	0.09
	Mogalakwena Local Municipality	616,605	300,031	5.97	0.67	215,259	6.26	6 0.9 <sup>.</sup>	1 52,837	5.83	0.59	1,591,238,726	1,537,114	3.07	0.13
	Mookgopong Local Municipality	427,068	31,296	0.62	0.07	9,380	0.27	0.04	4 3,634	0.40	0.04	304,304,349	1,239,522	2.48	0.10
	Thabazimbi Local Municipality	986,224	64,738	1.29	0.14	20,198	0.59	0.09	9 9,263	3 1.02	2 0.10	931,442,558	6,041,210	12.08	0.49
Waterberg District municipality T	otal	4,950,421	618,154	12.31	1.37	342,355	9.96	5 1.4	5 95,428	10.53	1.07	4,641,540,023	13,967,938	27.92	1.14
Limpopo Province Total		12,575,300	5,021,454	100.00	11.16	3,437,904	100.00	14.58	905,993	100.00	10.14	26,627,140,073	50,023,447	100.00	4.10
South Africa Total		122,079,197.61	44,977,826.04		100.00	23,584,394.86		100.00	8,930,803.00	)	100.00	540,837,757,084.54	1,220,888,208.88		100.00

NSDP Spatial Profiles:

GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1. Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

#### NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes

							% of	% of							
				% of	% of		Popuplation	Population		% of	% of				
DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN				Provincial	National	People under Minimum	under MLL	under MLL		Unemployed	Unemploy	Total Household		% of GVA %	of GVA
MUNICIPALITY	LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	Total Hectares	Total Population	Population	Population	Living Level	in province	in RSA	Unemployment	in Province	ed in RSA	Income	Total GVA (1000)	in Province in	RSA
Frances Baard District municipality	Dikgatlong Local Municipality	237,749,22	35,860,30	3.60	0.08	29,790.80	5.25	0.13	7.424.00	4.41	0.08	209.579.104.17	558,449,59	2.40	0.05
	Magareng Local Municipality	155,480,80	22,709,41	2.28	0.05	18,560,47	3.27	0.08	4,496,00	2.67	0.05	147,775,169,37	167.568.75	0.72	0.01
	NCDMA09	688,800.98	5,220.15	0.52	0.01	4,047.32	0.71	0.02	368.00	0.22	0.00	44,048,158.65	269,412.83	1.16	0.02
	Phokwane Local Municipality	82,077.97	61,534.76	6.17	0.14	47,320.42	8.34	0.20	10,547.00	6.27	0.12	480,291,534.39	994,514.37	4.27	0.08
	Sol Plaatjie Local Municipality	187,709.93	202,944.71	20.35	0.45	99,441.65	17.53	0.42	39,260.00	23.33	0.44	2,732,032,079.87	6,295,848.04	27.04	0.52
Frances Baard District municipality Tota	al	1,351,818.89	328,269.33	32.92	0.73	199,160.66	35.11	0.84	62,095.00	36.89	0.70	3,613,726,046.45	8,285,793.57	35.59	0.68
Kgalagadi District Municipality	Gamagara Local Municipality	261,942.14	23,476.60	2.35	0.05	9,080.40	1.60	0.04	3,206.00	1.90	0.04	392,138,554.85	1,717,942.56	7.38	0.14
	Ga-Segonyana Local Municipali	449,163.31	70,552.53	7.08	0.16	55,834.57	9.84	0.24	13,638.00	8.10	0.15	441,806,686.39	824,016.49	3.54	0.07
	Moshaweng Local Municipality	947,741.38	92,399.14	9.27	0.21	86,193.03	15.20	0.37	16,127.00	9.58	0.18	248,158,319.91	391,466.42	1.68	0.03
	NCDMA45	1,069,462.06	6,234.46	0.63	0.01	2,355.31	0.42	0.01	612.00	0.36	0.01	111,469,033.80	1,398,437.51	6.01	0.11
Kgalagadi District Municipality Total		2,728,308.88	192,662.73	19.32	0.43	153,463.31	27.06	0.65	33,583.00	19.95	0.38	1,193,572,594.95	4,331,862.99	18.61	0.35
Namakwa District municipality	Hantam Local Municipality	2,796,789.83	19,515.68	1.96	0.04	7,054.83	1.24	0.03	1,730.00	1.03	0.02	232,352,851.80	547,753.52	2.35	0.04
,	Kamiesberg Local Municipality	1,174,245.17	10,825.30	1.09	0.02	3,267.36	0.58	0.01	2,024.00	1.20	0.02	260,079,875.18	440,233.48	1.89	0.04
,	Karoo Hoogland Local Municipa	2,939,678.64	10,737.65	1.08	0.02	4,426.32	0.78	0.02	1,313.00	0.78	0.01	108,359,355.60	425,167.24	1.83	0.03
,	KhFi-Ma Local Municipality	833,191.74	11,316.82	1.14	0.03	3,385.32	0.60	0.01	1,643.00	0.98	0.02	118,280,995.67	133,185.97	0.57	0.01
,	Nama Khoi Local Municipality	1,502,523.94	45,036.14	4.52	0.10	13,454.71	2.37	0.06	7,170.00	4.26	0.08	552,779,319.95	827,983.23	3.56	0.07
,	NCDMA06	2,476,420.21	819.31	0.08	0.00	298.66	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,639,747.65	49,555.92	0.21	0.00
	Richtersveld Local Municipality	960,783.97	10,040.34	1.01	0.02	3,024.54	0.53	0.01	1,899.00	1.13	0.02	117,647,130.10	378,845.38	1.63	0.03
Namakwa District municipality Total		12,683,633.50	108,291.24	10.86	0.24	34,911.74	6.16	0.15	15,779.00	9.37	0.18	1,407,139,275.95	2,802,724.74	12.04	0.23
Pixley ka Seme District municipality	Emthanjeni Local Municipality	1,139,018.58	35,438.00	3.55	0.08	18,417.89	3.25	0.08	6,894.00	4.10	0.08	337,732,636.52	694,050.71	2.98	0.06
ļ	Kareeberg Local Municipality	1,770,197.25	9,355.70	0.94	0.02	5,432.56	0.96	0.02	1,509.00	0.90	0.02	94,142,107.25	213,653.47	0.92	0.02
ļ	NCDMA07	1,568,737.61	3,193.80	0.32	0.01	1,634.99	0.29	0.01	248.00	0.15	0.00	38,428,275.42	76,626.97	0.33	0.01
1	Renosterberg Local Municipality	552,714.60	9,090.54	0.91	0.02	5,615.67	0.99	0.02	1,992.00	1.18	0.02	77,836,235.84	141,750.02	0.61	0.01
,	Siyancuma Local Municipality	1,002,410.40	35,894.13	3.60	0.08	22,559.46	3.98	0.10	5,052.00	3.00	0.06	277,141,606.68	601,376.20	2.58	0.05
,	Siyathemba Local Municipality	820,868.43	17,496.65	1.75	0.04	9,373.84	1.65	0.04	3,158.00	1.88	0.04	165,559,073.69	345,689.50	1.48	0.03
	Thembelihle Local Municipality	698,007.07	13,715.62	1.38	0.03	3,843.26	0.68	0.02	1,984.00	1.18	0.02	186,488,481.81	177,387.44	0.76	0.01
	Ubuntu Local Municipality	2,038,924.47	16,479.94	1.65	0.04	10,787.03	1.90	0.05	2,596.00	1.54	0.03	137,149,690.39	320,340.05	1.38	0.03
	Umsobomvu Local Municipality	681,852.69	23,746.29	2.38	0.05	20,399.61	3.60	0.09	5,049.00	3.00	0.06	144,018,494.08	247,322.15	1.06	0.02
Pixley ka Seme District municipality 1 of	tal	10,272,731.08	164,410.67	16.49	0.37	98,064.31	17.29	0.42	28,482.00	16.92	0.32	1,458,496,601.68	2,818,196.52	12.10	0.23
Siyanda District municipality	!Kai! Garib Local Municipality	744,574.29	56,374.13	5.65	0.13	22,189.04	3.91	0.09	5,967.00	3.55	0.07	471,761,010.84	1,248,028.80	5.36	0.10
	!Kheis Local Municipality	643,580.70	17,168.11	1.72	0.04	7,221.25	1.27	0.03	1,815.00	1.08	0.02	127,859,090.28	319,170.35	1.37	0.03
,	//Khara Hais Local Municipality	344,434.38	75,230.78	7.55	0.17	30,850.40	5.44	0.13	12,941.00	7.69	0.14	800,380,614.66	1,422,753.54	6.11	0.12
	Kgatelopele Local Municipality	247,792.57	14,526.99	1.46	0.03	5,659.18	1.00	0.02	2,164.00	1.29	0.02	247,163,854.99	846,897.86	3.64	0.07
	NORMANN	1,173,003.23	6,981.53	0.70	0.02	2,853.05	0.50	0.01	1,197.00	0.71	0.01	37,589,458.82	65,607.25	0.28	0.01
	NCDMA08	6,510,338.97	9,337.17	0.94	0.02	3,534.88	0.62	0.01	65.00	0.04	0.00	117,757,659.23	237,498.70	1.02	0.02
Ciucando District municipality Total	i sanisabane Local Municipality	588,714.27	23,775.08	2.38	0.05	9,289.31	1.64	0.04	4,226.00	2.51	0.05	224,770,802.43	902,979.42	3.88	0.07
Northern Cape Total		37 288 030 77	203,393.79	20.40	0.45	81,597.11	14.39	0.35	28,375.00	10.86	1_00	2,027,282,491.25	23 281 512 70	21.66	0.41
South Africa Total		122 070 107 61	337,027.76	100.00	100.00	22 584 204 86	100.00	2.40	8 020 802 00	100.00	100.00	5,700,217,010.20	1 220,201,313.78	100.00	100.00
NSDB Spatial Profiles:		122,019,197.01	44,511,020.04		100.00	23,304,394.00		100.00	0,930,003.00		100.00	340,037,737,004.34	1,220,000,200.00		100.00

NSDF Spatial Profiles: GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1. Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILE: MPUM	ALANGA PROVINCE: Socio-Econo	mic Attributes													
							% of	% of							
				% of	% of	People unde	Popuplation	Population		% of Unen	n⋅% of Uner	n-		% of GVA	
DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN			Total	Provincial	National	Minimum	under MLL	under MLL		ployed in	ployed in	Total Household		in	% of GVA
MUNICIPALITY	LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	Total Hectares	Population	Population	Population	Living Level	in province	in RSA	Unem-ployment	Province	RSA	Income	Total GVA(1000)	Province	in RSA
Ehlanzeni District municipality	Bushbuckridge Local Municipality	258,959	499,728	14.80	) 1.11	375,646	i 17.99	9 1.59	9 97,575	5 15.3	4 1.0	3 1,760,851,495	5 2,807,389	3.32	0.23
	Mbombela Local Municipality	341,176	477,391	14.14	1.06	6 267,694	i 12.82	2 1.14	4 83,958	3 13.20	0.9	4 4,269,657,912	2 9,998,899	11.83	0.82
	MPDMA32	1,118,932	3,253	0.10	0.01	1,207	, 0.0£	6 0.01	1 147	0.02	2 0.0	J 59,147,718	3 540,762	0.64	0.04
	Nkomazi Local Municipality	324,037	335,253	9.93	3 0.75	5 268,110	12.84	4 1.14	4 53,170	) 8.3	6 0.6	J 1,367,704,502	2 1,565,384	1.85	0.13
	Thaba Chweu Local Municipality	571,906	81,997	2.43	3 0.18	37,567	' 1.80	0.16	5 11,998	3 1.8	9 0.1	3 815,628,621	I 2,024,286	2.40	0.17
	Umjindi Local Municipality	174,536	54,028	1.60	0.12	2 22,854	÷ 1.09	9 0.10	7,877	7 1.24	4 0.0	9 520,892,163	3 1,425,003	1.69	0.12
Ehlanzeni District municipality Tot	al	2,789,547	1,451,651	42.98	3.23	973,079	46.60	0 4.13	3 254,725	5 40.0	5 2.8	5 8,793,882,410	) 18,361,723	21.73	1.50
Gert Sibande District municipality	Albert Luthuli Local Municipality	555,939	188,864	5.59	0.42	2 159,528	3 7.64	4 0.68	3 31,517	4.9	6 0.3	5 822,163,456	3 1,225,580	1.45	0.10
	Dipaleseng Local Municipality	261,720	38,296	i 1.13	3 0.09	) 31,84°	1.52	2 0.14	4 8,016	6 1.20	6 0.0	9 185,155,723	3 634,869	0.75	0.05
	Govan Mbeki Local Municipality	295,470	223,158	6.61	I 0.50	102,287	4.90	0.43	3 49,128	3 7.72	2 0.5	5 3,115,704,748	3 18,341,106	21.70	1.50
	Lekwa Local Municipality	458,519	103,656	3.07	7 0.23	3 58,948	3 2.82	2 0.25	5 18,12′	2.8	5 0.2	J 961,911,944	4 2,695,754	3.19	0.22
	Mkhondo Local Municipality	488,216	143,441	4.25	5 0.32	2 80,540	3.86	6 0.34	4 26,516	6 4.1	7 0.3	J 743,010,159	€ 1,109,921	1.31	0.09
	Msukaligwa Local Municipality	601,566	124,525	3.69	0.28	67,720	3.24	4 0.29	9 22,868	3 3.60	0.2	3 973,950,375	5 2,332,853	2.76	0.19
	Pixley Ka Seme Local Municipality	522,723	80,569	2.39	9 0.18	3 56,034	÷ 2.68	3 0.24	4 15,730	) 2.4	7 0.1	3 383,760,842	2 1,074,700	1.27	0.09
Gert Sibande District municipality	Total	3,184,154	902,509	26.72	2 2.01	556,897	26.67	7 2.36	6 171,896	3 27.0	3 1.9	2 7,185,657,248	3 27,414,784	32.44	2.25
Nkangala District municipality	Delmas Local Municipality	156,806	56,956	1.69	0.13	30,146	۶ 1.44	4 0.13	3 11,760	) 1.8	5 0.1	3 468,213,284	4 1,710,553	2.02	0.14
	Dr JS Moroka Local Municipality	141,655	244,119	7.23	3 0.54	190,934 <sup>1</sup>	÷ 9.14	4 0.81	1 52,496	8.2	5 0.5	9 927,402,145	5 910,165	1.08	0.07
	Emalahleni Local Municipality	267,790	278,209	8.24	4 0.62	96,327	4.61	1 0.41	1 57,55 <sup>-</sup>	9.0	5 0.6	4 3,998,042,365	5 18,168,776	21.50	1.49
	Highlands Local Municipality	473,559	43,191	1.28	3 0.10	) 21,870	1.05	5 0.09	9 6,366	5 1.00	0.0	7 358,746,371	I 932,562	1.10	0.08
	Steve Tshwete Local Municipality	397,645	142,975	4.23	3 0.32	2 60,693	J 2.91	1 0.26	6 26,470	) 4.10	6 0.3	J 2,082,900,250	) 15,447,374	18.28	1.27
	Thembisile Local Municipality	238,470	257,711	7.63	3 0.57	7 158,217	7.58	3 0.67	7 54,772	2 8.6	1 0.6	1 1,056,522,629	€ 1,561,366	1.85	0.13
Nkangala District municipality Tot	al	1,675,924	1,023,162	30.30	) 2.27	558,187	26.73	3 2.37	7 209,415	5 32.9	3 2.3	4 8,891,827,044	4 38,730,796	45.83	3.17
Mpumalanga Total		7,649,625	3,377,321	100.00	) 7.51	2,088,163	100.00	0 8.85	636,036	6 100.0	0 7.1	2 24,871,366,702	2 84,507,303	100.00	6.92
South Africa Total		122,079,198	44,977,826	i	100.00	23,584,395	<u> </u>	100.00	0 8,930,803	3	100.0	J 540,837,757,085	i 1,220,888,209		100.00
NODD On a fiel Due file a s															

NSDP Spatial Profiles:

GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1. Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILE: KWAZULU	INATAL PROVINCE: Socio-Economic Attribu	utes													
							% of								
				% of		People under	Popuplatio	% of Population		% of Linem	_				
DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN				Provincial <sup>o</sup>	% of National	Minimum Living	MLL in	under MLL in		ploved in	% of Unem-			% of GVA %	of GVA
MUNICIPALITY	LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	Total Hectares	Total Population	Population I	Population	Level	province	RSA	Unem-ployment	Province	ployed in RSA	Total Household Income	Total GVA(1000)	in Province in	RSA
Amajuba District municipality	Dannhauser Local Municipality	151,591	104,146	1.08	0.2	3 91,083	3 1.66	6 0.39	22,886	5 1.15	0.20	6 307,484,766	629,177	0.34	0.05
	Newcastle Local Municipality	185,528	332,502	3.46	0.7	4 166,752	2 3.04	4 0.71	78,413	3.94	0.8	8 2,308,061,417	5,082,740	2.71	0.42
Amojuko Distrist munisipolitu Total	Utrecht Local Municipality	353,932	32,655	0.34	0.0	7 22,626	5 0.41	0.10	) 6,733	0.34	0.08	8 163,638,456	389,958	0.21	0.03
eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality	eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality	228 602	3 099,303	4.00	6.8	1 0/6 053	I 5.11 3 10.0F	5 4.4	1 697 351	35.01	7.8	1 2,779,104,035	122 116 536	65.13	10.00
eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality Tota	al	228,602	3,099,213	32.23	6.8	9 1,046,053	3 19.05	5 4.44	4 697,351	35.01	7.8	1 44,948,366,009	122,116,536	65.13	10.00
iLembe District municipality	eNdondakusuka Local Municipality	58,226	128,638	1.34	0.2	83,657	7 1.52	2 0.35	5 26,490	) 1.33	3 0.30	0 649,384,368	1,078,249	0.58	0.09
	KwaDukuza Local Municipality	63,316	158,448	1.65	0.3	5 80,585	5 1.47	7 0.34	4 26,774	1.34	L 0.30	0 1,823,804,470	3,608,781	1.92	0.30
	Maphumulo Local Municipality	89,591	120,830	1.26	0.2	7 109,851	1 2.00	0.47	20,896	5 1.05	5 0.23	3 299,142,694	173,491	0.09	0.01
It such a District source is allow Tated	Ndwedwe Local Municipality	115,802	153,572	1.60	0.3	4 131,768	3 2.40	0.56	31,789	1.60	0.30	6 421,119,398	475,088	0.25	0.04
Sisonke District municipality	Greater Kokstad Local Municipality	326,935	56 674	5.84	1.2	3 20.263	0.35	7 0.00	105,945	0.52	1.1	9 3,193,450,930 4 580,673,867	7 5,335,610	2.85	0.44
disonice District municipality	Ingwe Local Municipality	199.128	108.080	1.12	0.2	4 92.291	1 1.68	3 0.39	19.213	0.96	0.2	2 287,453,435	320,116	0.17	0.03
	Kwa Sani Local Municipality	121,282	15,575	0.16	0.0	3 15,616	5 0.28	3 0.07	2,202	0.11	0.0	2 102,592,485	129,870	0.07	0.01
	KZDMA43	120,341	846	0.01	0.0	0 871	1 0.02	2 0.00	) 65	5 0.00	0.00	0 8,375,631	8,687	0.00	0.00
	Ubuhlebezwe Local Municipality	160,410	102,462	1.07	0.2	3 72,895	5 1.33	3 0.31	19,022	2 0.95	5 0.2 <sup>-</sup>	1 411,052,038	369,829	0.20	0.03
	Umzimkhulu Local Municipality	243,547	175,037	1.82	0.3	9 162,965	5 2.97	7 0.69	29,234	1.47	0.3	3 507,089,005	582,523	0.31	0.05
Sisonke District municipality Total	Esingeleni Leogl Musicipality	1,112,691	458,674	4.//	1.0	2 364,901	1 6.65	0.15	82,598	4.15	0.92	2 1,897,236,461	1,833,722	0.98	0.15
Ogu District municipality	Hibiscus Coast Local Municipality	83 902	217 335	2.26	0.1	30,10	209	0.10	40.951	2.06	0.1	6 2 078 121 252	2 853 050	1 1 52	0.02
	Umdoni Local Municipality	23.811	62.591	0.65	0.1	44.181	1 0.80	0.19	12,733	0.64	0.14	4 611.123.028	775.063	0.41	0.06
	UMuziwabantu Local Municipality	108,948	92,618	0.96	0.2	61,999	9 1.13	3 0.26	5 14,640	0.73	3 0.16	6 288,721,311	239,246	0.13	0.02
	Umzumbe Local Municipality	125,887	194,461	2.02	0.4	3 130,068	3 2.37	7 0.55	5 35,754	1.79	0.40	0 551,756,822	928,279	0.50	0.08
an estate the state of the	Vulamehlo Local Municipality	97,340	83,695	0.87	0.1	56,338	3 1.03	3 0.24	17,651	0.89	0.20	0 296,004,089	660,157	0.35	0.05
Ugu District municipality Total	Impondia Local Municipality	504,693	705,539	7.34	1.5	7 443,365	0.07	1.88	3 131,983	6.63	s 1.40	8 3,969,269,350	5,709,100	3.05	0.47
Oligungunulovu District municipality	KZDMA22	16 824	27	0.00	0.0	20,002	s 0.01	0.12	) (470	s 0.02	0.0	0 73 578	2 387	0.00	0.01
	Mkhambathini Local Municipality	91.544	59.357	0.62	0.1	3 34.831	1 0.63	3 0.15	5 10.933	0.55	0.1	2 333.580.443	1.733.729	0.92	0.14
	Mooi Mpofana Local Municipality	165,154	36,571	0.38	0.0	3 20,373	3 0.37	7 0.09	8,223	0.41	0.0	9 290,449,422	267,462	0.14	0.02
	Richmond Local Municipality	123,130	63,232	0.66	0.1	4 45,094	4 0.82	2 0.19	11,931	0.60	0.13	3 379,410,855	478,414	0.26	0.04
	The Msunduzi Local Municipality	63,385	555,554	5.78	1.2	4 288,810	5.26	6 1.22	130,962	6.57	1.4	7 6,498,586,518	11,039,508	5.89	0.90
	uMngeni Local Municipality	156,652	75,711	0.79	0.1	7 32,945	5 0.60	0.14	14,074	0.71	0.16	6 1,268,251,931	1,496,207	0.80	0.12
I Maunaundlovu District municipality To	uvisnwatni Locai Municipality	181,801	108,854	9.70	2.0	+ 82,220 7 532,350	3 1.50	0.3	202384	0.99	0.2	Z 544,254,294 Z 9,407,204,518	1,857,024	0.99	0.15
Umkhanvakude District municipality	Hlabisa Local Municipality	141.728	175.827	1.83	0.3	159.592	2 2.91	0.68	34.010	1.71	0.3	B 520,937,124	390,190	0.21	0.03
	Jozini Local Municipality	305,626	183,109	1.90	0.4	1 138,220	2.52	2 0.59	31,371	1.57	0.3	5 565,706,515	415,709	0.22	0.03
	KZDMA27	420,547	11,875	0.12	0.0	3 9,337	7 0.17	7 0.04	1 2,749	0.14	L 0.03	3 59,211,226	216,872	0.12	0.02
	Mtubatuba Local Municipality	49,648	34,087	0.35	0.0	30,135	5 0.55	5 0.13	6,900	0.35	5 0.08	8 312,331,761	239,650	0.13	0.02
	The Big Five False Bay Local Municipality	106,080	30,188	0.31	0.0	7 20,375	5 0.37	0.09	5,277	0.26	5 0.00	6 143,465,437	155,315	0.08	0.01
Limkhanyakuda District municipality Tot	Umniabuyalingana Local Municipality	1 295 525	575 270	1.40	0.3	104,131	1 1.90	0.44	27,554	5.41	0.3	1 371,808,492	290,753	0.16	0.02
Umzinvathi District municipality	Endumeni Local Municipality	161.023	51.464	0.54	0.1	1 32.928	3 0.60	0.14	11.389	0.57	0.1	3 541.103.716	555.205	0.30	0.05
,	Msinga Local Municipality	250,114	168,498	1.75	0.3	7 113,296	5 2.06	6 0.48	3 29,242	1.47	0.3	3 423,409,178	234,155	0.12	0.02
	Nquthu Local Municipality	196,181	168,458	1.75	0.3	7 124,032	2 2.26	6 0.53	3 32,811	1.65	0.3	7 519,930,127	485,059	0.26	0.04
	Umvoti Local Municipality	251,553	93,248	0.97	0.2	1 83,441	1 1.52	2 0.35	5 15,024	0.75	5 0.11	7 516,227,589	508,641	0.27	0.04
Umzinyathi District municipality Total	Free and block the descentible the set block states the	858,871	481,667	5.01	1.0	7 353,698	3 6.44	1 1.50	88,466	6 4.44	0.99	9 2,000,670,610	1,783,060	0.95	0.15
Uthukela District municipality	Emnambithi-Ladysmith Local Municipality	296,482	226,739	2.30	0.5	7 70 070	5 2.18 1 / P	3 0.51 S 0.3/	49,054	E 2.40	0.5	0 1,605,726,790	2,410,217	1.29	0.20
	Indaka Local Municipality	99.154	113,914	1.18	0.2	5 71.829	9 1.31	0.3	22,407	1.12	0.2	5 215,290,639	254.456	0.14	0.02
	KZDMA23	93,656	704	0.01	0.0	543	3 0.01	0.00	67	0.00	0.00	0 7,157,798	20,365	0.01	0.00
	Okhahlamba Local Municipality	347,548	138,073	1.44	0.3	1 119,469	9 2.18	3 0.51	28,824	1.45	5 0.33	2 488,982,071	584,201	0.31	0.05
	Umtshezi Local Municipality	213,030	59,527	0.62	0.1	3 39,756	6 0.72	2 0.17	14,379	0.72	2 0.16	6 532,394,934	323,678	0.17	0.03
Uthukela District municipality Total		1,132,610	659,518	6.86	1.4	7 431,322	2 7.85	5 1.83	3 141,524	7.10	) 1.58	8 3,123,739,750	3,902,275	2.08	0.32
Uthungulu District municipality	Mbonambi Local Municipality	120,897	107,488	1.12	0.2	43,241	0.75	0.18	3 22,14	1.11	0.2	5 488,359,724	4,036,129	2.15	0.33
	Nkandla Local Municipality	182 759	134 077	1.39	0.1	1 131 182	2 2 30	0.10	25 996	1 31	0.0	9 446 906 075	162 227	0.03	0.01
	Ntambanana Local Municipality	108.275	84.957	0.88	0.1	47.310	0.86	6 0.20	15.330	0.77	0.1	7 315.295.322	424.702	0.23	0.03
	uMhlathuze Local Municipality	79,419	289,386	3.01	0.6	4 147,488	3 2.69	0.63	57,873	2.91	0.6	5 4,093,864,933	12,460,283	6.65	1.02
	uMlalazi Local Municipality	221,394	222,094	2.31	0.4	9 148,311	1 2.70	0.63	40,999	2.06	6 0.46	6 1,009,504,668	2,014,456	5 1.07	0.16
Uthungulu District municipality Total		821,340	888,645	9.24	1.9	3 552,778	3 10.07	7 2.34	171,079	8.59	1.92	2 6,585,283,124	19,189,862	10.24	1.57
∠uiuiand District municipality	Abaqulusi Local Municipality	418,462	191,955	2.00	0.4	3 139,175	2.53	s 0.59	43,080	2.16	0.4	988,026,605	1,037,406	0.55	0.08
	Nondoma Local Municipality	194,270	02,320	2.07	0.1	00,072 1 162 613	- 1.07 3, 2.04	0.2	) 10,4/0 ) 25,760	0.83 1.90	0.10	0 330,033,452 0 582,802,650	238,853	0.13	0.02
	Ulundi Local Municipality	325.073	190,792	1.98	0.4	2 176.433	3 3.21	0.0	36.917	1.85	0.4	1 854,002,648	648.715	0.35	0.05
	UPhongolo Local Municipality	323,920	120,486	1.25	0.2	7 81,717	7 1.49	0.35	5 22,478	1.13	3 0.2	5 542,693,721	393,090	0.21	0.03
Zululand District municipality Total		1,479,941	784,733	8.16	1.7	4 618,611	1 11.27	2.62	154,722	2 7.77	1.73	3 3,304,449,085	2,781,952	1.48	0.23
KwaZulu Natal Total		9,435,639	9,617,083	100.00	21.3	5,491,199	9 100.00	) 23.28	1,991,950	100.00	22.30	0 83,182,315,030	187,486,020	100.00	15.36
South Africa Total		122,079,198	44,977,826		10	23,584,395	5	100	8,930,803		10	540,837,757,085	1,220,888,209		100

 South Artical Total
 122,073,196
 44,977,620
 100
 23,364,393
 100
 6,950,603

 NSDP Spatial Profiles:
 GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (1901) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

 Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILE: GAUTENO	Socio-economic Attributes														
		Total Hectares	Total Population	% of Provincia	I % of National I	People under Minimum Living	% of Popuplation under MLL in	% of Population	Inem-ployment	% of Unemploy ed in Province	y % of Unemploye	B Total Household Income	Total GVA (1000)	% of GVA in %	6 of GVA
	EGOVE MONON VENT	1 otal 1 lootal oo	rotari opulation	ropulation	r opulation - E	2010.	province		nom pioymone	11011100	dantost	1 otar nouseniola mosme	10101 0111(1000)	11011100	
City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	179,464	4 3,479,72	.3 37.80	) 7.74	865,5	3 32.5	51 3.67	849,54	44 40.5	j4 9.5	1 90,721,886,154	221,376,293	48.16	18.13
City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality Total		179,464	4 3,479,72	.3 37.80	) 7.74	865,5	3 32.	51 3.67	849,54	44 40.5	i4 9.5	1 90,721,886,154	221,376,293	48.16	18.13
City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	218,316	5 1,987,54	19 21.59	ə 4.42	515,5	37 19.2	.36 2.19	370,3€	36 17.6	37 4.1	5 53,735,847,154	112,293,409	24.43	9.20
City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality Total		218,316	6 1,987,54	9 21.59	4.42	515,5	57 19 <i>.</i> ′	36 2.19	370,36	6 17.6	57 4.1	5 53,735,847,154	112,293,409	24.43	9.20
Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality	Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality	183,023	3 2,123,27	6 23.06	o 4.72	589,4	9 22.1	14 2.50	503,54	42 24.0	)3 5.6	4 46,508,953,247	86,392,597	18.79	7.08
Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality Total		183,027	3 2,123,27	6 23.0F	\$ 4.72	589,4	9 22.	.14 2.50	503,54	42 24.0	J3 5.6	4 46,508,953,247	86,392,597	18.79	7.08
Metsweding District Municipality	Kungwini Local Municipality	214,223	3 104,68	3 1.14	4 0.23	44,2	i8 1.(	66 0.19	18,04	45 0.8	36 0.2	0 1,648,203,322	1,291,327	0.28	0.11
	Nokeng tsa Taemane Local Municipality	201,750	J 59,21	6 0.64	4 0.13	36,1	)1 1.5	36 0.15	10,0€	j2 0.4	48 0.1	1 1,028,419,975	3,535,004	0.77	0.29
Metsweding District Municipality Total		415,973	3 163,89	9 1.78	3 0.36	80,3	i9 3.(	02 0.34	28,10	J7 1.3	4 0.3	1 2,676,623,297	4,826,330	1.05	0.40
Sedibeng District municipality	Emfuleni Local Municipality	98,929	3 808,99	5 8.79	€ 1.80	404,0	′1 15.′	18 1.71	215,10	J4 10.2	26 2.4	1 8,729,687,377	15,138,934	3.29	1.24
	Lesedi Local Municipality	150,834	4 75,34	2 0.82	2 0.17	49,6	j4 1.8	86 0.21	15,75	0.7 أذ	/5 0.1/	8 931,569,150	2,088,782	0.45	0.17
	Midvaal Local Municipality	171,487	/ 78,65	6 0.85	<u>0.17</u>	22,06	,4 0.8	83 0.09	10,95	0.5 از	j2 0.1	2 1,554,743,452	4,564,643	0.99	0.37
Sedibeng District municipality Total		421,250	) 962,99	3 10.46	s 2.14	475,7	/9 17.8	87 2.02	241,80	J6 11.5	4 2.7	1 11,215,999,980	21,792,359	4.74	1.78
West Rand District Municipality	GTDMA48	24,272	2 5,84	.2 0.06	i 0.01	1,29	/4 0.0	J5 0.01	61	·8 0.0	J3 0.0	1 86,422,431	209,438	0.05	0.02
	Mogale City Local Municipality	109,704	4 255,62	.2 2.78	3 0.57	55,0	5 2.0	J7 0.23	50,61	7 2.4	12 0.5	7 4,725,317,489	6,747,315	1.47	0.55
	Randfontein Local Municipality	42,803	3 120,61	8 1.31	0.27	49,46	/6 1.8	36 0.21	25,57	6 1.2	2 0.2	.9 1,875,788,874	3,165,838	0.69	0.26
	Westonaria Local Municipality	59,629	106,96	.5 1.16	i 0.24	29,96	7 1.1	13 0.13	25,53	35 1.2°	2 0.2	9 1,559,284,018	2,868,493	0.62	0.23
West Rand District Municipality Total		236,409	489,04	8 5.31	1.09	135,7/	2 5.1	10 0.58	102,34	<i>i</i> 6 4.8	8 1.1	5 8,246,812,811	12,991,084	2.83	1.06
Gauteng Total		1,654,435	9,206,48	7 100.00	20.47	2,662,4	9 100.0	00 11.29	2,095,71	1 100.0	0 23.4	7 213,106,122,643	459,672,073	100.00	37.65
South Africa Total		122,079,198	8 44,977,82	6	100.00	23,584,3	15	100.00	8,930,80	)3	100.0	0 540,837,757,085	1,220,888,209		100.00

NSDP Spatial Profiles: GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Py) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (1901) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1. Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILE: FREE STATE F	PROVINCE: Socio-Economic Attributes														
							% of	% of							
				% of		People under	Popuplation	Population		% of Unem-	% of Unerr	)-			
DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN				Provincial	% of National	Minimum Living	under MLL in	under MLL in		ployed in	ployed in			% of GVA %	of GVA
MUNICIPALITY	LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	Total Hectares	Total Population	Population	Population	Level	province	RSA	Unem-ployment	Province	RSA	Total Household Income	Total GVA (1000)	in Province in	RSA
Lejweleputswa District municipality	Masilonyana Local Municipality	679,609	64,58	2.3	8 0.14	55,831	3.3	2 0.24	13,86	3 2.4	14 0	.16 413,879,48	3 1,479,675	5 2.47	0.12
	Matjhabeng Local Municipality	515,547	409,14	3 15.0	9 0.91	255,977	15.2	4 1.09	100,79	4 17.7	72 1	.13 3,891,456,32	3 9,243,41	15.45	0.76
	Nala Local Municipality	412,879	98,18	4 3.6	2 0.22	69,396	6 4.1	3 0.29	22,01	8 3.8	37 0	.25 499,179,30	2 958,322	2 1.60	0.08
	Tokologo Local Municipality	932,586	32,27	5 1.1	9 0.07	22,979	1.3	7 0.10	) 5,09	6 0.9	90 0	.06 294,520,81	2 417,507	0.70	0.03
	Tswelopele Local Municipality	652,408	53,75	4 1.9	8 0.12	46,203	2.7	5 0.20	9,34	7 1.6	64 0	.10 212,921,62	2 759,064	1.27	0.06
Lejweleputswa District municipality Total		3,193,028	657,95	2 24.2	6 1.46	450,386	26.8	1 1.91	151,11	8 26.5	57 1	.69 5,311,957,54	7 12,857,979	21.49	1.05
Motheo District municipality	Mangaung Local Municipality	628,399	647,66	3 23.8	8 1.44	280,598	16.7	0 1.19	129,79	7 22.8	32 1	.45 7,752,751,56	3 18,310,086	30.61	1.50
	Mantsopa Local Municipality	429,059	55,25	1 2.0	4 0.12	40,631	2.4	2 0.17	9,97	4 1.7	75 0	.11 380,310,61	683,21	5 1.14	0.06
	Naledi Local Municipality	342,406	27,48	4 1.0	1 0.06	21,359	1.2	7 0.09	4,82	4 0.8	35 0	.05 199,165,87	3 215,970	0.36	0.02
Motheo District municipality Total		1,399,864	730,40	2 26.9	3 1.62	342,588	20.3	9 1.45	5 144,59	5 25.4	13 1	.62 8,332,228,05	5 19,209,27	32.11	1.57
Northern Free State District municipality	Mafube Local Municipality	460,377	58,36	1 2.1	5 0.13	44,388	3 2.6	4 0.19	10,98	3 1.9	93 0	.12 300,080,73	618,75	5 1.03	0.05
	Metsimaholo Local Municipality	171,708	116,20	5 4.2	8 0.26	36,831	2.1	9 0.16	3 23,49	0 4.1	3 0	.26 1,535,380,80	1 13,149,692	2 21.98	1.08
	Moqhaka Local Municipality	792,456	167,59	3 6.1	8 0.37	106,776	6.3	6 0.45	5 34,19	9 6.0	01 0	.38 1,395,636,30	3,810,97	6.37	0.31
	Ngwathe Local Municipality	705,506	118,54	4 4.3	7 0.26	91,714	5.4	6 0.39	24,85	6 4.3	37 0	.28 721,508,12	3 1,428,670	2.39	0.12
Northern Free State District municipality To	tal	2,130,046	460,70	3 16.9	9 1.02	279,709	16.6	5 1.19	93,52	8 16.4	15 1	.05 3,952,605,97	5 19,008,094	1 31.77	1.56
Thabo Mofutsanyane District municipality	Dihlabeng Local Municipality	473,898	128,09	3 4.7	2 0.28	70,597	4.2	0 0.30	25,89	1 4.5	5 0	.29 1,021,007,53	1 2,046,012	2 3.42	0.17
	FSDMA19	6,104	17	1 0.0	1 0.00	89	0.0	1 0.00	) 1	5 0.0	0 0	.00 1,682,23	7 9,446	6 0.02	0.00
	Maluti a Phofung Local Municipality	441,761	363,39	9 13.4	0 0.81	270,041	16.0	7 1.14	86,89	3 15.2	28 0	.97 1,814,331,12	3 2,503,09	4.18	0.21
	Nketoana Local Municipality	561,112	61,92	3 2.2	8 0.14	54,421	3.2	4 0.23	3 11,50	0 2.0	02 0	.13 292,161,04	5 735,394	1.23	0.06
	Phumelela Local Municipality	755,045	50,54	5 1.8	6 0.11	40,779	2.4	3 0.17	7,94	7 1.4	0 0	.09 221,449,28	375,238	3 0.63	0.03
	Setsoto Local Municipality	596,636	123,27	1 4.5	4 0.27	91,910	5.4	7 0.39	24,55	9 4.3	32 0	.27 577,418,96	5 1,279,296	5 2.14	0.10
Thabo Mofutsanyane District municipality T	otal	2,834,556	727,40	3 26.8	2 1.62	527,837	31.4	2 2.24	156,80	5 27.5	57 1	.76 3,928,050,18	6,948,47	7 11.62	0.57
Xhariep District municipality	Kopanong Local Municipality	1,524,830	55,50	1 2.0	5 0.12	31,026	5 1.8	5 0.13	9,96	6 1.7	75 O	.11 385,128,40	7 745,65	7 1.25	0.06
	Letsemeng Local Municipality	1,022,538	43,41	4 1.6	0 0.10	21,418	1.2	7 0.09	6,64	0 1.1	7 0	.07 303,767,51	663,62	5 1.11	0.05
	Mohokare Local Municipality	877,597	36,87	5 1.3	6 0.08	27,041	1.6	1 0.11	6,03	5 1.0	06 0	.07 167,723,12	388,50	0.65	0.03
Xhariep District municipality Total		3,424,966	135,79	1 5.0	1 0.30	79,485	5 4.7	3 0.34	22,64	1 3.9	98 0	.25 856,619,03	7 1,797,788	3 3.01	0.15
FREE STATE TOTAL		12,982,460	2,712,25	1 100.0	0 6.03	1,680,005	5 100.0	0 7.12	568,68	7 100.0	0 6	.37 22,381,460,80	2 59,821,609	9 100.00	4.90
South Africa Total		122,079,198	44,977,82	6	100.00	23,584,395	5	100.00	8,930,80	3	100	.00 540,837,757,08	5 1,220,888,209	)	100.00

South Artice Total NSDP Spatial Profiles: GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1. Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

### **NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: PROVINCIAL TABLES**

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES FREE STATE PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES FREE STATE PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES GAUTENG PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES GAUTENG PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES KWAZULU NATAL PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES KWAZULU NATAL PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES LIMPOPO PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES LIMPOPO PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES MPUMALANGA PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES MPUMALANGA PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES NORTH WEST PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES NORTH WEST PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE Sector GVA Breakdown 2004.pdf NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE Socio-economic Attributes.pdf

		AGRICULTURE,	% OF THE	% OF THE		% OF THE	% OF THE	MANUFACTURIN
DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN		FORESTRY	PROV GVA IN					G- LABOUR
MUNICIPALITY	LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA(2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	(2004)
Alfred Nzo District municipality	Matatiele Local Municipality	43835.2649	1.08	0.11	1626.005986	1.25	0.00	16311.4208
	Umzimvubu Local Municipality	20035.0588	0.49	0.05	2311.900221	1.78	0.00	7218.049607
Alfred Nzo District municipality Tot	al	63870.3237	1.57	0.15	3937.906207	3.03	0.00	23529.4704
Amatole District municipality	Amahlathi Local Municipality	80257.2378	1.98	0.19	12202.13609	9.39	0.01	82481.31678
	Buffalo City Local Municipality	168190.006	4.15	0.41	29472.14688	22.68	0.03	1815827.721
	Great Kei Local Municipality	69489.0065	1.71	0.17	1249.770107	0.96	0.00	23270.48035
	Mbhashe Local Municipality	58098.3127	1.43	0.14	3006.511142	2.31	0.00	3392.40253
	Mnquma Local Municipality	49495.6946	1.22	0.12	2841.540527	2.19	0.00	208932.5456
	Ngqushwa Local Municipality	56205.5799	1.39	0.14	116.1015892	0.09	0.00	61239.03274
	Nkonkobe Local Municipality	75316.0934	1.86	0.18	628.7240986	0.48	0.00	48181.17519
	Nxuba Local Municipality	60888.7289	1.50	0.15	0	0.00	0.00	5152.858523
Amatole District municipality Total		617940.66	15.24	1.50	49516.93043	38.11	0.06	2248477.532
Cacadu District municipality	Baviaans Local Municipality	104998.01	2.59	0.25	0	0.00	0.00	3045.324375
	Blue Crane Route Local Municipa	171195.988	4.22	0.41	0	0.00	0.00	45492
	Camdeboo Local Municipality	127677.679	3.15	0.31	0	0.00	0.00	21276.20795
	ECDMA10	96912.2857	2.39	0.23	0	0.00	0.00	1533.343997
	Ikwezi Local Municipality	55794.9928	1.38	0.14	0	0.00	0.00	4394.6722
	Kouga Local Municipality	175254.509	4.32	0.42	323.7392392	0.25	0.00	137469.6638
	Kou-Kamma Local Municipality	374662.435	9.24	0.91	0	0.00	0.00	90750.16682
	Makana Local Municipality	222691.634	5.49	0.54	3.538549446	0.00	0.00	119432.754
	Ndlambe Local Municipality	143731.124	3.54	0.35	0	0.00	0.00	54258.48975
	Sunday's River Valley Local Mun	331542.434	8.18	0.80	1853.560898	1.43	0.00	27493.03668
Cacadu District municipality Total		1804461.09	44.49	4.37	2180.838687	1.68	0.00	505145.6596
Chris Hani District municipality	ECDMA13	782.877418	0.02	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0
	Emalahleni Local Municipality	19443.903	0.48	0.05	719.5180953	0.55	0.00	20478.82997
	Engcobo Local Municipality	49582.6341	1.22	0.12	0.653587874	0.00	0.00	9503.454175
	Inkwanca Local Municipality	77974.5878	1.92	0.19	0	0.00	0.00	15117.09349
	Intsika Yethu Local Municipality	78422.0183	1.93	0.19	3.328514094	0.00	0.00	8670.125047
	Inxuba Yethemba Local Municipa	206433.542	5.09	0.50	4954.838248	3.81	0.01	37552.01579

### NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE Sector GVA brakedown (2004 current prices)

		Lukanji Local Municipality	65027.6588	1.60	0.16	352.8380912	0.27	0.00	175129.1609
		Sakhisizwe Local Municipality	14314.3254	0.35	0.03	0	0.00	0.00	6563.963408
		Tsolwana Local Municipality	94697.4845	2.34	0.23	0.508090045	0.00	0.00	931.9288462
	Chris Hani District municipality To	tal	606679.032	14.96	1.47	6031.684627	4.64	0.01	273946.5716
	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Mur	ni Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Mu	95831.6029	2.36	0.23	52883.12493	40.70	0.06	5513009.061
	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Mur	nicipality Total	95831.6029	2.36	0.23	52883.12493	40.70	0.06	5513009.061
	O.R.Tambo District municipality	King Sabata Dalindyebo Local M	192461.555	4.75	0.47	527.2459892	0.41	0.00	128789.5524
		Mbizana Local Municipality	56579.635	1.40	0.14	7869.304084	6.06	0.01	18981.04987
		Mhlontlo Local Municipality	79542.9771	1.96	0.19	0	0.00	0.00	24834.08159
		Ntabankulu Local Municipality	19588.5637	0.48	0.05	6978.58753	5.37	0.01	4837.543693
		Nyandeni Local Municipality	35004.8076	0.86	0.08	2.447903543	0.00	0.00	44658.84364
		Port St Johns Local Municipality	18406.4287	0.45	0.04	0	0.00	0.00	14002.0037
		Qaukeni Local Municipality	75007.428	1.85	0.18	18.29296763	0.01	0.00	58001.6383
	O.R.Tambo District municipality T	otal	476591.395	11.75	1.15	15395.87847	11.85	0.02	294104.7132
	Ukhahlamba District municipality	Elundini Local Municipality	34765.1087	0.86	0.08	0	0.00	0.00	29019.34319
		Gariep Local Municipality	200386.052	4.94	0.48	0	0.00	0.00	12644.00122
		Maletswai Local Municipality	98804.0263	2.44	0.24	0	0.00	0.00	147548.3258
		Senqu Local Municipality	56174.951	1.39	0.14	0	0.00	0.00	11345.42452
	Ukhahlamba District municipality	Total	390130.138	9.62	0.94	0	0.00	0.00	200557.0947
EC	Total		4055504.24	100.00	9.82	129946.3634	100.00	0.15	9058770.103
Gr	and Total		41317264.7		100.00	87041882.72		100.00	150896759.1

NSDP Spatial Profiles: GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (1

#### NSDP SECTOR CLASSIFICATION

% OF THE	% OF THE	CONSTRUCTION	% OF THE	% OF THE		% OF THE	% OF THE		% OF THE	% OF THE	PUBLIC
IN THIS	GVA IN THIS		IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	GOODS GVA	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	SERVICES AND		GVA IN THIS	
SECTOR	SECTOR	E GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	(2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	(2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)
0.18	0.01	27751.61394	0.47	0.02	6734.31743	0.06	0.00	141137.3857	0.60	0.03	219834.6927
0.08	0.00	11808.88103	0.20	0.01	2650.88188	0.02	0.00	72029.11756	0.31	0.02	223519.0804
0.26	0.02	39560.49497	0.67	0.03	9385.19931	0.08	0.01	213166.5033	0.90	0.05	443353.7731
0.91	0.05	44692.92342	0.76	0.04	49593.5007	0.43	0.03	210355.7643	0.89	0.05	395761.9173
20.04	1.20	1212012.945	20.48	0.96	1910945.106	16.56	1.27	4908143.511	20.83	1.19	4363457.807
0.26	0.02	40886.42038	0.69	0.03	37661.36875	0.33	0.02	120017.7445	0.51	0.03	137385.149
0.04	0.00	18515.55667	0.31	0.01	16807.13064	0.15	0.01	118019.5205	0.50	0.03	308974.6002
2.31	0.14	67769.12183	1.15	0.05	102628.4668	0.89	0.07	497926.7522	2.11	0.12	633897.9784
0.68	0.04	23582.22604	0.40	0.02	27188.55367	0.24	0.02	104245.7308	0.44	0.03	304176.7191
0.53	0.03	42350.01254	0.72	0.03	60119.56046	0.52	0.04	204708.0392	0.87	0.05	571358.1851
0.06	0.00	3897.523557	0.07	0.00	1406.316566	0.01	0.00	35052.1379	0.15	0.01	89437.59744
24.82	1.49	1453706.729	24.57	1.15	2206350.003	19.13	1.46	6198469.2	26.31	1.50	6804449.953
0.03	0.00	5492.34334	0.09	0.00	13533.8294	0.12	0.01	32102.46636	0.14	0.01	68084.66361
0.50	0.03	16209.39059	0.27	0.01	30410.83174	0.26	0.02	100699.0822	0.43	0.02	145565.1257
0.23	0.01	46877.67593	0.79	0.04	52142.46104	0.45	0.03	229990.4046	0.98	0.06	316860.3318
0.02	0.00	19456.22252	0.33	0.02	10907.60639	0.09	0.01	68970.24968	0.29	0.02	58767.65485
0.05	0.00	1502.673322	0.03	0.00	53419.96709	0.46	0.04	15679.49156	0.07	0.00	33103.32701
1.52	0.09	175003.1334	2.96	0.14	77356.63477	0.67	0.05	539371.3277	2.29	0.13	292415.6657
1.00	0.06	73270.30536	1.24	0.06	50358.93679	0.44	0.03	201273.7596	0.85	0.05	90393.77584
1.32	0.08	102926.4969	1.74	0.08	67827.76383	0.59	0.04	392742.2278	1.67	0.09	675536.4379
0.60	0.04	50756.80603	0.86	0.04	49852.89153	0.43	0.03	241375.0493	1.02	0.06	122800.7554
0.30	0.02	41762.95252	0.71	0.03	47609.8217	0.41	0.03	127170.8181	0.54	0.03	116601.9205
5.58	0.33	533257.9999	9.01	0.42	453420.7443	3.93	0.30	1949374.877	8.27	0.47	1920129.658
0.00	0.00	150.8294576	0.00	0.00	43.82585193	0.00	0.00	1263.875745	0.01	0.00	2096.18899
0.23	0.01	19425.47325	0.33	0.02	26453.67316	0.23	0.02	123187.2252	0.52	0.03	310167.5746
0.10	0.01	16978.58673	0.29	0.01	5828.096026	0.05	0.00	102583.7124	0.44	0.02	162039.7341
0.17	0.01	14409.82895	0.24	0.01	31670.17268	0.27	0.02	76108.19703	0.32	0.02	39450.03209
0.10	0.01	33845.40258	0.57	0.03	15482.33312	0.13	0.01	159441.9912	0.68	0.04	233001.5606
0.41	0.02	76690.24485	1.30	0.06	27965.69422	0.24	0.02	179890.1896	0.76	0.04	397073.4387

1.93	0.12	185257.8437	3.13	0.15	115122.6131	1.00	0.08	753541.514	3.20	0.18	775320.504
0.07	0.00	9997.214299	0.17	0.01	11535.02024	0.10	0.01	89202.72603	0.38	0.02	140638.6561
0.01	0.00	6627.861085	0.11	0.01	5793.631608	0.05	0.00	23604.34466	0.10	0.01	60460.75828
3.02	0.18	363383.2849	6.14	0.29	239895.06	2.08	0.16	1508823.776	6.40	0.36	2120248.447
60.86	3.65	3102795.823	52.44	2.46	8318863.534	72.11	5.51	10680997.97	45.34	2.58	7272101.891
60.86	3.65	3102795.823	52.44	2.46	8318863.534	72.11	5.51	10680997.97	45.34	2.58	7272101.891
1.42	0.09	208137.846	3.52	0.17	158940.5445	1.38	0.11	1632843.976	6.93	0.39	1667103.694
0.21	0.01	25448.20889	0.43	0.02	3817.80248	0.03	0.00	177544.5456	0.75	0.04	219616.973
0.27	0.02	25365.60895	0.43	0.02	7479.94451	0.06	0.00	128428.365	0.55	0.03	326905.2678
0.05	0.00	9981.446005	0.17	0.01	6070.356354	0.05	0.00	50699.69221	0.22	0.01	104765.537
0.49	0.03	39636.66403	0.67	0.03	46724.96571	0.41	0.03	363679.8343	1.54	0.09	421961.287
0.15	0.01	11312.87946	0.19	0.01	21296.83913	0.18	0.01	104787.242	0.44	0.03	174899.8778
0.64	0.04	30392.06186	0.51	0.02	6121.793076	0.05	0.00	203371.4223	0.86	0.05	243549.6809
3.25	0.19	350274.7152	5.92	0.28	250452.2458	2.17	0.17	2661355.078	11.30	0.64	3158802.318
0.32	0.02	16638.79305	0.28	0.01	2333.124965	0.02	0.00	69656.05184	0.30	0.02	167664.8616
0.14	0.01	17171.30813	0.29	0.01	16201.41844	0.14	0.01	64719.40073	0.27	0.02	137518.0619
1.63	0.10	21899.51865	0.37	0.02	29808.21816	0.26	0.02	99999.58089	0.42	0.02	192473.6142
0.13	0.01	18214.23333	0.31	0.01	9591.901396	0.08	0.01	110981.8679	0.47	0.03	222402.8912
2.21	0.13	73923.85316	1.25	0.06	57934.66296	0.50	0.04	345356.9013	1.47	0.08	720059.4289
100.00	6.00	5916902.901	100.00	4.70	11536301.45	100.00	7.64	23557544.31	100.00	5.69	22439145.47
	100.00	125877261		100.00	150944990.9		100.00	414085503.2		100.00	216561218.5

190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

								TOTAL GVA (2004 current prices)			
% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	TOURISM GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	INNOVATION AND EXPERIMEN TATION GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	Total GVA (2004 CURRENT PRICES)	% OF THE TOT PROV GVA	% OF THE TOTAL NATIONAL GVA	
0.98	0.10	6693.81001	0.34	0.02	346.71	537.32	243.14	464059.1341	0.59	0.04	
1.00	0.10	3732.871608	0.19	0.01	346.71	537.32	243.14	343335.6378	0.44	0.03	
1.98	0.20	10426.68162	0.52	0.03	20.37253	31.57	14.29	807394.7719	1.03	0.07	
1.76	0.18	38594.96372	1.93	0.12	20.37253	31.57	14.29	914286.4702	1.16	0.07	
19.45	2.01	312052.3103	15.64	0.95	256.3752	397.32	179.79	14730296.29	18.71	1.21	
0.61	0.06	86870.92699	4.35	0.27	256.3752	397.32	179.79	517059.4031	0.66	0.04	
1.38	0.14	9179.730812	0.46	0.03	10194.73	15799.53	7149.33	536009.6103	0.68	0.04	
2.82	0.29	24807.24638	1.24	0.08	10194.73	15799.53	7149.33	1588480.032	2.02	0.13	
1.36	0.14	22459.427	1.13	0.07	245.3207	380.19	172.04	599434.4081	0.76	0.05	
2.55	0.26	31102.18463	1.56	0.10	245.3207	380.19	172.04	1033909.645	1.31	0.08	
0.40	0.04	1759.057823	0.09	0.01	95.40242	147.85	66.90	197689.3216	0.25	0.02	
30.32	3.14	526825.8477	26.40	1.61	95.40242	147.85	66.90	20117165.18	25.55	1.65	
0.30	0.03	5886.259613	0.30	0.02	4.4241	6.86	3.10	233163.2697	0.30	0.02	
0.65	0.07	10513.37185	0.53	0.03	4.4241	6.86	3.10	520342.1651	0.66	0.04	
1.41	0.15	15883.75185	0.80	0.05	31.73372	49.18	22.25	810953.8324	1.03	0.07	
0.26	0.03	10942.78535	0.55	0.03	31.73372	49.18	22.25	267585.5509	0.34	0.02	
0.15	0.02	3690.796521	0.18	0.01	66.80387	103.53	46.85	167586.3979	0.21	0.01	
1.30	0.14	52952.1445	2.65	0.16	66.80387	103.53	46.85	1451012.752	1.84	0.12	
0.40	0.04	29567.3607	1.48	0.09	28.20921	43.72	19.78	910518.6393	1.16	0.07	
3.01	0.31	33624.21037	1.69	0.10	28.20921	43.72	19.78	1616118.806	2.05	0.13	
0.55	0.06	28114.35738	1.41	0.09	68.06653	105.49	47.73	691028.2577	0.88	0.06	
0.52	0.05	9218.305494	0.46	0.03	68.06653	105.49	47.73	703335.4976	0.89	0.06	
8.56	0.89	200393.3436	10.04	0.61	228.5367	354.18	160.27	7371645.168	9.36	0.60	
0.01	0.00	169.2319485	0.01	0.00	228.5367	354.18	160.27	4511.25351	0.01	0.00	
1.38	0.14	1328.434063	0.07	0.00	0.477491	0.74	0.33	521271.4353	0.66	0.04	
0.72	0.07	4227.280588	0.21	0.01	0.477491	0.74	0.33	350772.3609	0.45	0.03	
0.18	0.02	2032.117115	0.10	0.01	8.106184	12.56	5.68	256770.1354	0.33	0.02	
1.04	0.11	10349.13366	0.52	0.03	8.106184	12.56	5.68	539762.855	0.69	0.04	
1.77	0.18	33942.59583	1.70	0.10	546.962	847.67	383.57	964896.4718	1.23	0.08	

3.46	0.36	28352.0358	1.42	0.09	546.962	847.67	383.57	2098999.43	2.67	0.17	
0.63	0.06	6236.712865	0.31	0.02	393.9122	610.47	276.24	278500.8339	0.35	0.02	
0.27	0.03	907.1615845	0.05	0.00	<u>393.9122</u>	610.47	276.24	193073.3476	0.25	0.02	
9.45	0.98	87544.70346	4.39	0.27	5007.65	7760.72	3511.75	5208558.123	6.62	0.43	
32.41	3.36	860583.8058	43.13	2.63	5007.65	7760.72	3511.75	35920783.7	45.62	2.94	
32.41	3.36	860583.8058	43.13	2.63	865.9342	1342.00	607.26	35920783.7	45.62	2.94	
7.43	0.77	128977.0904	6.46	0.39	865.9342	1342.00	607.26	4122789.155	5.24	0.34	
0.98	0.10	90828.73678	4.55	0.28	241.8991	374.89	169.64	600750.7813	0.76	0.05	
1.46	0.15	25805.81297	1.29	0.08	241.8991	374.89	169.64	618449.9531	0.79	0.05	
0.47	0.05	4205.505601	0.21	0.01	895.2617	1387.45	627.83	207163.8018	0.26	0.02	
1.88	0.19	12780.2689	0.64	0.04	895.2617	1387.45	627.83	965644.0518	1.23	0.08	
0.78	0.08	5870.153441	0.29	0.02	1333.743	2067.00	935.32	350610.8248	0.45	0.03	
1.09	0.11	15302.85278	0.77	0.05	1333.743	2067.00	935.32	631968.1359	0.80	0.05	
14.08	1.46	283770.4208	14.22	0.87	203.741	315.75	142.88	7497376.704	9.52	0.61	
0.75	0.08	8775.876323	0.44	0.03	203.741	315.75	142.88	328884.8934	0.42	0.03	
0.61	0.06	6296.578171	0.32	0.02	134.6226	208.63	94.41	455004.8868	0.58	0.04	
0.86	0.09	2190.282601	0.11	0.01	134.6226	208.63	94.41	592927.3076	0.75	0.05	
0.99	0.10	8451.36645	0.42	0.03	15.84508	24.56	11.11	437230.3964	0.56	0.04	
3.21	0.33	25714.10355	1.29	0.08	15.84508	24.56	11.11	1814047.484	2.30	0.15	
100.00	10.36	1995258.907	100.00	6.10	64.52557	100.00	45.25	78736971.13	100.00	6.45	
	100.00	32704702.16		100.00	142.5971		100.00	1220888209		100.00	

			AGRICULTU	
			RE,	
			FORESTRY	% OF THE
				PROV GVA
	DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY		GVA (2004)	SECTOR
	Leiweleputswa District municipality	Masilonyana Local Municipality	130910.5	2 54
		Matihabeng Local Municipality	213614.2	4.14
		Nala Local Municipality	324459.7	6.29
		Tokologo Local Municipality	90946.5	1.76
		Tswelopele Local Municipality	490398 4	9.50
	Leiweleputswa District municipality To	otal	1250329	24.23
	Motheo District municipality	Mangaung Local Municipality	568654.1	11.02
		Mantsopa Local Municipality	275676.7	5.34
		Naledi Local Municipality	54965.15	1.07
	Motheo District municipality Total		899295.9	17.43
	Northern Free State District municipal	li Mafube Local Municipality	210493.2	4.08
	·	Metsimaholo Local Municipality	150129.5	2.91
		Moqhaka Local Municipality	407446.9	7.89
		Ngwathe Local Municipality	308188.3	5.97
	Northern Free State District municipal	lity Total	1076258	20.85
	Thabo Mofutsanyane District municipa	Dihlabeng Local Municipality	429604.2	8.32
		FSDMA19	115.9462	0.00
		Maluti a Phofung Local Municipality	107273.2	2.08
		Nketoana Local Municipality	369858.5	7.17
		Phumelela Local Municipality	138265.5	2.68
		Setsoto Local Municipality	387961.6	7.52
	Thabo Mofutsanyane District municipa	ality Total	1433079	27.77
	Xhariep District municipality	Kopanong Local Municipality	211231.6	4.09
		Letsemeng Local Municipality	163130.7	3.16
		Mohokare Local Municipality	127533.3	2.47
	Xhariep District municipality Total		501895.6	9.73
FS <sup>-</sup>	Total		5160858	100.00
Gra	nd Total		41317265	

#### NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: FREE STATE PROVINCE Sector GVA brakedown (2004 current r

NSDP Spatial Profiles:

GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: F

orices)

% OF THE	MINING	% OF THE	% OF THE	MANUFACTURI	% OF THE	% OF THE	CONSTRUCTIO	% OF THE
NATIONAL	AND	PROV GVA	NATIONAL	NG- LABOUR	PROV GVA	NATIONAL	N AND	PROV GVA
GVA IN THIS	QUARTING	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	GVA (2004)	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	DE GVA (2004)	IN THIS
0.32	955808 5	15 55	1 10	11054 5449	0.11	0.01	46605 1244	0.84
0.52	3882796	63.18	4 46	325353 97	3 16	0.01	574582 5217	10.35
0.02	62234 53	1 01	0 0 07	28248 9416	0.10	0.22	74207 67719	1 34
0.73	104677 4	1.01	0.07	16836 05/8	0.27	0.02	38032 838//	0.70
1 10	26/1 051	0.04	0.12	12006 6/35	0.10	0.01	17668 32138	0.70
3.03	5008158	81 49	5.75	394491 055	3.83	0.01	751996 4831	13 55
1.38	36300.4	0.59	0.10	938164 937	9.10	0.20	1892204 847	34.08
0.67	00000.1	0.00	0.01	15798 9556	0.15	0.02	32476 49459	0 59
0.07	0.636185	0.00	0.00	16286 7509	0.16	0.01	23358 81058	0.00
2 18	36301.04	0.59	0.00	970250 643	9.41	0.64	1948040 152	35.09
0.51	3030 189	0.05	0.00	47306 974	0.46	0.03	28468 17221	0.51
0.36	107250.9	1 75	0.00	7979860 27	77 42	5 29	1769502 336	31.87
0.99	881476.6	14.34	1 01	259684 847	2.52	0.17	260964 1079	4 70
0.75	8050.207	0.13	0.01	98915,5869	0.96	0.07	139191,3844	2.51
2.60	999807.9	16.27	1.15	8385767.68	81.36	5.56	2198126.001	39.60
1.04	1611.819	0.03	0.00	156710.893	1.52	0.10	107753.3323	1.94
0.00	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	41.00189333	0.00
0.26	14789.68	0.24	0.02	162705.6	1.58	0.11	255702.8984	4.61
0.90	190.8189	0.00	0.00	24229.8078	0.24	0.02	31787.61712	0.57
0.33	0	0.00	0.00	19299.7964	0.19	0.01	29262,13173	0.53
0.94	0	0.00	0.00	67059.8871	0.65	0.04	83223.99875	1.50
3.47	16592.32	0.27	0.02	430005.985	4.17	0.28	507770.9801	9.15
0.51	456.2332	0.01	0.00	10600.3886	0.10	0.01	81773.6719	1.47
0.39	84515.7	1.38	0.10	75465.1882	0.73	0.05	50088.83665	0.90
0.31	0	0.00	0.00	40487.4758	0.39	0.03	13646.38965	0.25
1.21	84971.93	1.38	0.10	126553.053	1.23	0.08	145508.8982	2.62
12.49	6145831	100.00	7.06	10307068.4	100.00	6.83	5551442.514	100.00
100.00	87041883		100.00	150896759		100.00	125877261	

Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGA

#### **NSDP SECTOR CLASSIFICATION**

% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	HIGH VALUE DIFFERENTIAT ED GOODS GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	SERVICES AND RETAIL GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	PUBLIC SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATI ON GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR
0.04	29611.48	0.83	0.02	122146.986	0.89	0.03	163115.9195	1.16
0.46	384981.388	10.84	0.26	1925735.93	14.03	0.47	1771309.175	12.61
0.06	67319.8562	1.90	0.04	203790.368	1.48	0.05	160901.9448	1.15
0.03	18649.7778	0.53	0.01	66844.9355	0.49	0.02	74783.96762	0.53
0.01	30216.9849	0.85	0.02	93500.9291	0.68	0.02	107673.3612	0.77
0.60	530779.487	14.95	0.35	2412019.15	17.57	0.58	2277784.368	16.21
1.50	1460477.17	41.13	0.97	6509336.28	47.41	1.57	6348758.211	45.19
0.03	13093.6973	0.37	0.01	131103.326	0.95	0.03	206747.1982	1.47
0.02	8995.95519	0.25	0.01	45665.1751	0.33	0.01	65384.99183	0.47
1.55	1482566.83	41.75	0.98	6686104.78	48.70	1.61	6620890.401	47.12
0.02	12353.4637	0.35	0.01	162808.529	1.19	0.04	138389.5688	0.98
1.41	980872.573	27.62	0.65	1424707.58	10.38	0.34	613340.6564	4.37
0.21	98878.1005	2.78	0.07	785445.203	5.72	0.19	1027052.049	7.31
0.11	61699.8737	1.74	0.04	364183.673	2.65	0.09	378764.3522	2.70
1.75	1153804.01	32.49	0.76	2737144.98	19.94	0.66	2157546.626	15.36
0.09	88910.5963	2.50	0.06	539144.833	3.93	0.13	682589.4976	4.86
0.00	18.3724469	0.00	0.00	288.480783	0.00	0.00	378.4449171	0.00
0.20	58359.5207	1.64	0.04	579142.602	4.22	0.14	1239713.351	8.82
0.03	35205.865	0.99	0.02	97829.6076	0.71	0.02	166489.9015	1.18
0.02	18502.659	0.52	0.01	58045.2085	0.42	0.01	97531.99945	0.69
0.07	54878.8353	1.55	0.04	309141.281	2.25	0.07	346197.1464	2.46
0.40	255875.849	7.21	0.17	1583592.01	11.53	0.38	2532900.341	18.03
0.06	43124.5877	1.21	0.03	141561.663	1.03	0.03	237912.5956	1.69
0.04	73135.2084	2.06	0.05	94976.4962	0.69	0.02	110242.8528	0.78
0.01	11878.3229	0.33	0.01	73269.4599	0.53	0.02	113075.1809	0.80
0.12	128138.119	3.61	0.08	309807.619	2.26	0.07	461230.6292	3.28
4.41	3551164.29	100.00	2.35	13728668.5	100.00	3.32	14050352.37	100.00
100.00	150944991		100.00	414085503		100.00	216561218.5	

TED with Mesoframe Version 1.1

#### TOTAL GVA (2004 curre

% OF THE NATIONAL		% OF THE PROV GVA	% OF THE NATIONAL	INNOVATIO N AND EXPERIMEN	% OF THE PROV GVA	% OF THE NATIONAL	Total GVA (2004	% OF THE
GVA IN THIS	TOURISM	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS		IN THIS	GVA IN THIS		TOT PROV
SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR 1 EQ	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	PRICES)	GVA
0.00	20290.07	1.30	0.06	04.32337	95.23	40.20	14/90/4.02	2.47 15.45
0.02	26964 10	12.00	0.49	07.09013	129.71	61.04	9243410.04	15.45
0.07	50004.19	2.00	0.11	190 6961	129.71	126 71	900022.002	1.00
0.03	2019.000	0.43	0.02	100.0001	200.00	120.71	41/00/.404	0.70
1.05	3040.042	17.65	0.01	129 7946	200.00	120.71	12957079 0	21.40
1.00	ZZ7440.7	17.03	1.65	130.7040	204.02	97.33	12037970.9	21.49
2.93	0007 601	41.93	1.00	130.7040	204.02	97.33	692214 029	30.01
0.10	1295 204	0.63	0.02	23710.09	35000.96	10032.09	003214.930	1.14
0.03	1200.394 540724 1	0.10	0.00	237 10.09	30000.96	10032.09	210909.09	0.30
3.00	15904 02	42.00	1.00	221.0372	320.20	155.01	19209270.3 619755 414	32.11
0.00	112150 7	1.23	0.05	221.0372	320.20	102.01	121/0601 7	1.03
0.20	00260 64	0.70	0.33	145.0707	214.90	102.10	2910076 62	21.90
0.47	60101 02	0.00	0.27	26 56074	214.90	102.10	1429660.90	0.37
1.00	296424.2	0.00	0.21	26 56074	52.97	25.05	10009002 6	2.39
0.22	200434.3	22.23	0.00	05 10002	140.25	20.00	19006093.0	2.42
0.32	30021.1	3.01	0.12	95.10093	140.55	66.60		3.4Z
0.00	84007.76	0.07	0.03	95.10093	140.55	927.09	2502001 27	0.02
0.57	04007.70	0.52	0.20	1194.933	1763.40	927.90	725204.11	4.10
0.08	14245 46	0.73	0.03	25 40061	52.24	24 92	275229 252	1.23
0.05	20/21 62	1.11	0.04	35.40001	52.24	24.03	1270205.05	0.03
1 17	185568.0	2.37	0.09	202 9657	200 53	1/2 3/	60/8/77 28	2.14
0.11	18004 58	14.40	0.07	202.9057	299.53	142.34	745657.065	1.02
0.11	1105/ 06	0.03	0.00	12 2155	299.00	8 57	663624 753	1.25
0.05	8504 /18	0.93	0.04	12.2155	18.03	8.57	388506 506	0.65
0.03	30/53 06	3.06	0.03	67 76065	100.00	17.52	1707788 /1	3.01
6.49	1288628	100.00	3.0/	67 76065	100.00	47.52	59821608.7	100.00
100.00	32704702	100.00	100.00	142,5971	100.00	100.00	1220888209	100.00

ent prie	ces)	
% OF T	ΉE	
TOTAL		
NATIO	IAL	
GVA	0.40	
	0.12	
	0.76	
	0.08	
	0.03	
	1.05	Ĺ
	1.05	
	0.06	
	0.00	
	1.57	ľ
	0.05	
	1.08	
	0.31	
	0.12	
	1.56	
	0.17	
	0.00	
	0.21	
	0.06	
	0.03	
	0.10	
	0.57	
	0.06	
	0.05	
	0.03	
	0.15	
10	4.90	
	0.00	

#### NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: GAUTENG PROVINCE Sector GVA brakedown (2004 current prices)

DISTRICT/	METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY	LOCAL MUNICIPALITY
City of Jo	phannesburg Metropolitan Municipality	City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality
City of Jo	phannesburg Metropolitan Municipality T	otal
City of T	shwane Metropolitan Municipality	City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality
City of T	shwane Metropolitan Municipality Total	
Ekurhule	ni Metropolitan Municipality	Ekurhuleni Metropolitan Municipality
Ekurhule	ni Metropolitan Municipality Total	
Metswed	ling District Municipality	Kungwini Local Municipality
		Nokeng tsa Taemane Local Municipality
Metswed	ling District Municipality Total	
Sedibeng	g District municipality	Emfuleni Local Municipality
		Lesedi Local Municipality
		Midvaal Local Municipality
Sedibeng	g District municipality Total	
West Ra	nd District Municipality	GTDMA48
		Mogale City Local Municipality
		Randfontein Local Municipality
		Westonaria Local Municipality
West Ra	nd District Municipality Total	
GT Total		

### Grand Total

NSDP Spatial Profiles:

GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ri

AGRICULTU								
FORESTRY	% OF THE	% OF THE	MINING	% OF THE	% OF THE	MANUFACTURIN	% OF THE	% OF THE
AND	PROV GVA	NATIONAL	AND	PROV GVA	NATIONAL	G- LABOUR	PROV GVA	NATIONAL
FISHING	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	QUARYING	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	INTENSIVE GVA	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS
GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA(2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	(2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR
321332.2	14.70	0.78	3216582	35.93	3.70	24893073.45	52.36	16.50
321332.2	14.70	0.78	3216582	35.93	3.70	24893073.45	52.36	16.50
388703.5	17.79	0.94	379737.5	4.24	0.44	7202321.392	15.15	4.77
388703.5	17.79	0.94	379737.5	4.24	0.44	7202321.392	15.15	4.77
392599.1	17.96	0.95	2250267	25.14	2.59	12003646.1	25.25	7.95
392599.1	17.96	0.95	2250267	25.14	2.59	12003646.1	25.25	7.95
170042.4	7.78	0.41	57402.54	0.64	0.07	73689.91836	0.16	0.05
80856.38	3.70	0.20	240505.4	2.69	0.28	318993.0434	0.67	0.21
250898.8	11.48	0.61	297908	3.33	0.34	392682.9617	0.83	0.26
81468.73	3.73	0.20	42537.8	0.48	0.05	1118500.735	2.35	0.74
117059.1	5.36	0.28	117998.9	1.32	0.14	261310.3239	0.55	0.17
288670.9	13.21	0.70	40371.3	0.45	0.05	283283.6218	0.60	0.19
487198.6	22.29	1.18	200908	2.24	0.23	1663094.681	3.50	1.10
28622.5	1.31	0.07	618.1643	0.01	0.00	17293.82246	0.04	0.01
220695.6	10.10	0.53	232034.6	2.59	0.27	723135.5331	1.52	0.48
47572.59	2.18	0.12	398181.2	4.45	0.46	572248.2699	1.20	0.38
47937.16	2.19	0.12	1975712	22.07	2.27	73818.14046	0.16	0.05
344827.8	15.78	0.83	2606546	29.12	2.99	1386495.766	2.92	0.92
2185560	100.00	5.29	8951948	100.00	10.28	47541314.35	100.00	31.51
41317265		100.00	87041883		100.00	150896759.1		100.00

icon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGA

#### **NSDP SECTOR CLASSIFICATION**

CONSTRUCTI							
ON AND	% OF THE	% OF THE	HIGH VALUE	% OF THE	% OF THE		% OF THE
INFRASTRUCT	PROV GVA	NATIONAL	DIFFERENTIAT	PROV GVA	NATIONAL	SERVICES AND	PROV GVA
URE GVA	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	ED GOODS	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	RETAIL GVA	IN THIS
(2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	(2004)	SECTOR
24248606.1	49.13	19.26	25840900.2	35.20	17.12	106413977.3	54.93
24248606.1	49.13	19.26	25840900.2	35.20	17.12	106413977.3	54.93
10442789.5	21.16	8.30	21957571.2	29.91	14.55	42958413.66	22.18
10442789.5	21.16	8.30	21957571.2	29.91	14.55	42958413.66	22.18
10598548.9	21.47	8.42	16256986.8	22.15	10.77	32781387.67	16.92
10598548.9	21.47	8.42	16256986.8	22.15	10.77	32781387.67	16.92
96427.9688	0.20	0.08	113325.695	0.15	0.08	481509.3864	0.25
319300.303	0.65	0.25	680392.424	0.93	0.45	1009082.855	0.52
415728.272	0.84	0.33	793718.118	1.08	0.53	1490592.242	0.77
1727835.08	3.50	1.37	5814671.19	7.92	3.85	3800731.643	1.96
268803.435	0.54	0.21	334876.571	0.46	0.22	588383.6194	0.30
691662.165	1.40	0.55	981877.689	1.34	0.65	1529355.989	0.79
2688300.68	5.45	2.14	7131425.45	9.72	4.72	5918471.252	3.06
22015.6884	0.04	0.02	30474.2707	0.04	0.02	58714.72524	0.03
576254.697	1.17	0.46	871954.628	1.19	0.58	2664305.916	1.38
245546.357	0.50	0.20	427833.103	0.58	0.28	1041477.02	0.54
117365.749	0.24	0.09	94748.7233	0.13	0.06	382728.1734	0.20
961182.491	1.95	0.76	1425010.73	1.94	0.94	4147225.834	2.14
49355155.9	100.00	39.21	73405612.5	100.00	48.63	193710068	100.00
125877261		100.00	150944991		100.00	414085503.2	

TED with Mesoframe Version 1.1

% OF THE NATIONAL	PUBLIC SERVICES AND	% OF THE PROV GVA	% OF THE NATIONAL	TOUDIEM	% OF THE PROV GVA	% OF THE NATIONAL	INNOVATIO N AND EXPERIMEN	% OF THE PROV GVA
SECTOR	ON GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR
25.70	27858263.94	40.22	12.86	8113385	56.43	24.81	82.64805	5.92
25.70	27858263.94	40.22	12.86	8113385	56.43	24.81	82.64805	5.92
10.37	25548908.89	36.89	11.80	3213406	22.35	9.83	49.66899	3.56
10.37	25548908.89	36.89	11.80	3213406	22.35	9.83	49.66899	3.56
7.92	9819035.207	14.18	4.53	2125324	14.78	6.50	29.79671	2.13
7.92	9819035.207	14.18	4.53	2125324	14.78	6.50	29.79671	2.13
0.12	277527.6634	0.40	0.13	19704.21	0.14	0.06	47597.39	3408.04
0.24	738300.3948	1.07	0.34	144433	1.00	0.44	859.2139	61.52
0.36	1015828.058	1.47	0.47	164137.2	1.14	0.50	859.2139	61.52
0.92	2255987.999	3.26	1.04	283757.1	1.97	0.87	0.482623	0.03
0.14	325586.0924	0.47	0.15	72155.74	0.50	0.22	0.482623	0.03
0.37	594792.9835	0.86	0.27	149707.9	1.04	0.46	91.72839	6.57
1.43	3176367.075	4.59	1.47	505620.7	3.52	1.55	91.72839	6.57
0.01	39731.38911	0.06	0.02	11747.35	0.08	0.04	114.7916	8.22
0.64	1269891.511	1.83	0.59	179718.5	1.25	0.55	114.7916	8.22
0.25	395956.9992	0.57	0.18	32035.25	0.22	0.10	101.2946	7.25
0.09	141960.0101	0.20	0.07	33334.52	0.23	0.10	101.2946	7.25
1.00	1847539.909	2.67	0.85	256835.6	1.79	0.79	1396.62	100.00
46.78	69265943.08	100.00	31.98	14378708	100.00	43.97	1396.62	100.00
100.00	216561218.5		100.00	32704702		100.00	142.5971	

% OF THE	Total GVA		% OF THE	
NATIONAL	(2004	% OF THE	TOTAL	
GVA IN THIS	CURRENT	TOT PROV	NATIONAL	
SECTOR EZ OC	PRICES)	GVA 49.46	GVA 10.12	
57.90	2213/0293	40.10	10.13	
57.90	221376293	40.10	10.13	
34.83	112293409	24.43	9.20	
34.83	112293409	24.43	9.20	
20.90	86392597.2	18.79	7.08	
20.90	86392597.2	18.79	7.08	
33378.93	1291326.81	0.28	0.11	
602.55	3535003.51	0.77	0.29	
602.55	4826330.32	1.05	0.40	
0.34	15138933.6	3.29	1.24	
0.34	2088782.38	0.45	0.17	
64.33	4564643.08	0.99	0.37	
64.33	21792359.1	4.74	1.78	
80.50	209437.974	0.05	0.02	
80.50	6747314.96	1.47	0.55	
71.04	3165838.26	0.69	0.26	
71.04	2868492.86	0.62	0.23	
979.42	12991084.1	2.83	1.06	
979.42	459672073	100.00	37.65	
100.00	1220888209		100.00	

TOTAL GVA (2004 current prices)

	AGRICULTU RE, FORESTRY AND FISHING GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOP
Amajuba District municipality Dannhausar Local Municipality	28527.24	0.72
Anajuba District municipality Danninauser Eucar Municipality	5/150 2	1.01
Utrocht Local Municipality	55129 50	1.01
Amajuba District municipality Total	1/7806 1	2.77
aThakwini Matropolitan Municipality	147000.1	2.11
eThekwini Metropolitan Municipality Total	440213.9	8.35
il embe District municipality eNdondakusuka Local Municipality	80602.6	1.51
KwaDukuza Local Municipality	208802.3	3 01
Maphumulo Local Municipality	200052.0	0.59
Ndwedwe Local Municipality	162410 9	3.04
il embe District municipality Total	/83351.5	9.04
Sisonke District municipality Greater Kokstad Local Municipality	109234.8	2.05
Indive Local Municipality	81550 70	1.53
Kwa Sani Local Municipality	29484 71	0.55
KZDMA43	1234 858	0.00
I bublebezwe Local Municipality	71316 38	1 34
Umzimkhulu Local Municipality	165524.6	3 10
Sisonke District municipality Total	458346 1	8.58
Ugu District municipality Ezingoleni Local Municipality	44930.86	0.84
Hibiscus Coast Local Municipality	100686.2	1 89
Limdoni Local Municipality	65380 12	1.00
LIMuziwabantu Local Municipality	21301 23	0.40
	80427.04	1 51
Vulameblo Local Municipality	108868 1	2 04
Ligu District municipality Total	421593.6	7 89
UMgungundlovu District municipali Impendle Local Municipality	50350 16	0.94
KZDMA22	258 4616	0.00
Mkhambathini Local Municipality	995062.9	18.63
Mooi Moofana Local Municipality	71013 78	1.33
Richmond Local Municipality	210417 1	3.94
The Msunduzi Local Municipality	145357.4	2.72
uMngeni Local Municipality	122879.8	2.30
uMshwathi Local Municipality	444937.3	8.33
UMgungundlovu District municipality Total	2040277	38.20
Umkhanyakude District municipalit Hlabisa Local Municipality	32465.58	0.61
Jozini Local Municipality	43348.56	0.81
KZDMA27	24769.32	0.46
Mtubatuba Local Municipality	19193.23	0.36
The Big Five False Bay Local Municipali	26603.47	0.50
Umhlabuyalingana Local Municipality	32652.35	0.61
Umkhanyakude District municipality Total	179032.5	3.35
Umzinyathi District municipality Endumeni Local Municipality	63438.26	1.19
Msinga Local Municipality	27703.58	0.52
Nguthu Local Municipality	156859.5	2.94
Umvoti Local Municipality	66655.5	1.25
Umzinyathi District municipality Total	314656.8	5.89
Uthukela District municipality Emnambithi-Ladysmith Local Municipalit	y 34172.3	0.64

### NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: KWAZULU NATAL PROVINCE Sector GVA brakedowi

	Imbabazane Local Municipality	16450.13	0.31
	Indaka Local Municipality	13764.5	0.26
	KZDMA23	1277.41	0.02
	Okhahlamba Local Municipality	176226.6	3.30
	Umtshezi Local Municipality	20824.62	0.39
Uthukela District municipality Tota		262715.5	4.92
Uthungulu District municipality	Mbonambi Local Municipality	46686.25	0.87
	Mthonjaneni Local Municipality	13071.65	0.24
	Nkandla Local Municipality	33011.42	0.62
	Ntambanana Local Municipality	35741.49	0.67
	uMhlathuze Local Municipality	50297.18	0.94
	uMlalazi Local Municipality	142543.3	2.67
Uthungulu District municipality Tot	al	321351.3	6.02
Zululand District municipality	Abaqulusi Local Municipality	71278	1.33
	eDumbe Local Municipality	29217.55	0.55
	Nongoma Local Municipality	51713.11	0.97
	Ulundi Local Municipality	24185.05	0.45
	UPhongolo Local Municipality	89213.49	1.67
Zululand District municipality Total		265607.2	4.97
KZ Total		5340951	100.00
Grand Total		41317265	

**NSDP Spatial Profiles:** GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: R

### n (2004 current prices)

% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MINING AND QUARYING GVA(2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MANUFACTU RING- LABOUR INTENSIVE GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	CONSTRUCTI ON AND INFRASTRUCT URE GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR
0.09	93974.55	6.47	0.11	14479.179	0.04	0.01	61803.561	0.28
0.13	22822.72	1.57	0.03	410447.96	1.15	0.27	512143.728	2.31
0.13	26065.27	1.80	0.03	2607.5626	0.01	0.00	73486.2347	0.33
0.36	142862.5	9.84	0.16	427534.7	1.19	0.28	647433.524	2.91
1.08	107537.1	7.41	0.12	23685989	66.19	15.70	15653400.1	70.45
1.08	107537.1	7.41	0.12	23685989	66.19	15.70	15653400.1	70.45
0.20	7905.566	0.54	0.01	368554.49	1.03	0.24	73698.5176	0.33
0.51	3.995756	0.00	0.00	1687989.6	4.72	1.12	223943.31	1.01
80.0	0	0.00	0.00	4660.3953	0.01	0.00	12652.3438	0.06
0.39	105.7037	0.01	0.00	37666.739	0.11	0.02	43917.3916	0.20
1.17	8015.266	0.55	0.01	2098871.2	5.87	1.39	354211.563	1.59
0.26	0	0.00	0.00	16921.083	0.05	0.01	32450.6688	0.15
0.20	954.0935	0.07	0.00	22328.998	0.06	0.01	23540.2714	0.11
0.07	0	0.00	0.00	25874.475	0.07	0.02	9457.95342	0.04
0.00	0	0.00	0.00	111.81299	0.00	0.00	617.136197	0.00
0.17	11.52054	0.00	0.00	74092.91	0.21	0.05	30790.2384	0.14
0.40	4362.712	0.30	0.01	20089.273	0.06	0.01	14195.5193	0.06
1.11	5328.326	0.37	0.01	159418.55	0.45	0.11	111051.788	0.50
0.11	5363.675	0.37	0.01	11893.612	0.03	0.01	24112.5815	0.11
0.24	55572.69	3.83	0.06	38/3/4.64	1.08	0.26	233851.276	1.05
0.16	0	0.00	0.00	343954.79	0.96	0.23	32248.6444	0.15
0.05	601.1913	0.04	0.00	44/36.111	0.13	0.03	28146.3137	0.13
0.19	619.1828	0.04	0.00	284639.58	0.80	0.19	67948.4549	0.31
0.26	431.0009	0.03	0.00	210143.71	0.59	0.14	30948.631	0.14
1.02	62587.74	4.31	0.07	1282742.4	3.58	0.85	417255.902	1.88
0.12	58.28727	0.00	0.00	2911.4456	0.01	0.00	8450.87567	0.04
0.00		0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	273.95162	0.00
2.41	517.9574	0.04	0.00	138207.91	0.39	0.09	129982.051	0.59
0.17	400.0040	0.03	0.00	19/11.300	0.06	0.01	20300.042	0.12
0.51	1934.576	0.13	0.00	21022.714	0.06	0.01	32007.7801	0.15
0.30	0/00.443	0.01	0.01	1431399.3	4.00	0.95	113/0/4.//	5.12
1.00	12050.25	0.10	0.00	224546.90	0.45	0.11	134143.309	0.60
1.00	26221.11	0.09	0.01	2100005 5	5.97	1.22	1610172 7	7.20
4.94	540 5319	0.04	0.03	2100095.5	0.01	1.39	47247 7762	0.21
0.00	14706 85	1 01	0.00	22354 720	0.01	0.00	25652 /338	0.21
0.10	4455 208	0.31	0.02	8033 7023	0.00	0.01	17855 5166	0.12
0.00	1614 522	0.31	0.01	31662 403	0.02	0.01	28000 6137	0.00
0.03	230 8003	0.11	0.00	9866 6866	0.03	0.02	18028 1051	0.13
0.00	10/0 137	0.02	0.00	1301 1810	0.03	0.01	16800 8777	0.08
0.00	22606 14	1.56	0.00	76634 766	0.00	0.00	15368/ 322	0.00
0.43	6974 404	0.48	0.03	52029 163	0.21	0.03	54500 5510	0.09
0.13	4620 006	0.40	0.01	5075 6534	0.13	0.00	23041 2276	0.20
0.38	2231 555	0.02	0.01	9987 2087	0.01	0.00	28991 0048	0.10
0.00	2451 99	0.10	0.00	86264 021	0.00	0.01	42328 7435	0.10
0.76	16278.95	1 12	0.00	153356.05	0.43	0.00	148861 528	0.10
0.08	11433.1	0.79	0.01	441988.91	1.24	0.29	459129.941	2.07

0.04	164.1045	0.01	0.00	110122.08	0.31	0.07	18804.5072	0.08
0.03	4.127812	0.00	0.00	1829.7652	0.01	0.00	32318.5752	0.15
0.00	57.40533	0.00	0.00	133.74634	0.00	0.00	3067.7667	0.01
0.43	112.3625	0.01	0.00	56106.721	0.16	0.04	127150.73	0.57
0.05	555.5891	0.04	0.00	78738.122	0.22	0.05	18567.1013	0.08
0.64	12326.69	0.85	0.01	688919.35	1.93	0.46	659038.622	2.97
0.11	574765.6	39.60	0.66	946267.16	2.64	0.63	495941.202	2.23
0.03	942.217	0.06	0.00	13877.821	0.04	0.01	11391.6012	0.05
0.08	0	0.00	0.00	2087.5735	0.01	0.00	6566.13249	0.03
0.09	33143.25	2.28	0.04	20521.297	0.06	0.01	58901.8245	0.27
0.12	259992.8	17.91	0.30	3291779.2	9.20	2.18	1527012.23	6.87
0.34	38055.16	2.62	0.04	641173.82	1.79	0.42	139987.965	0.63
0.78	906899	62.48	1.04	4915706.8	13.74	3.26	2239800.96	10.08
0.17	95465.75	6.58	0.11	91299.971	0.26	0.06	95488.6799	0.43
0.07	3173.517	0.22	0.00	28105.149	0.08	0.02	35630.1581	0.16
0.13	4955.649	0.34	0.01	19283.025	0.05	0.01	31612.7493	0.14
0.06	28485.92	1.96	0.03	11954.869	0.03	0.01	18832.5978	0.08
0.22	8678.678	0.60	0.01	45814.193	0.13	0.03	33015.2209	0.15
0.64	140759.5	9.70	0.16	196457.21	0.55	0.13	214579.406	0.97
12.93	1451432	100.00	1.67	35785725	100.00	23.72	22218491.5	100.00
100.00	87041883		100.00	150896759		100.00	125877261	

Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREG

#### **NSDP SECTOR CLASSIFICATION**

							PUBLIC SERVICES	
% OF THE	HIGH VALUE	% OF THE	% OF THE		% OF THE	% OF THE	AND	% OF THE
NATIONAL	DIFFERENTIA	PROV GVA	NATIONAL	SERVICES	PROV GVA	NATIONAL		PROV GVA
SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	(2004)	SECTOR
0.05	78787 5409	0.29	0.05	108979.86	0.19	0.03	204503 53	0.61
0.41	1555643.83	5.78	1.03	1214037.6	2.12	0.29	1231242.4	3.68
0.06	11278,8191	0.04	0.01	87422.876	0.15	0.02	128508.16	0.38
0.51	1645710.19	6.12	1.09	1410440.3	2.46	0.34	1564254.1	4.67
12.44	16753052.4	62.29	11.10	42566905	74.26	10.28	19456473	58.10
12.44	16753052.4	62.29	11.10	42566905	74.26	10.28	19456473	58.10
0.06	119769.11	0.45	0.08	171043.33	0.30	0.04	246596.82	0.74
0.18	222268.827	0.83	0.15	787228.41	1.37	0.19	379573.47	1.13
0.01	2479.31675	0.01	0.00	33385.226	0.06	0.01	86596.517	0.26
0.03	12370.749	0.05	0.01	88283.794	0.15	0.02	121172.87	0.36
0.28	356888.002	1.33	0.24	1079940.8	1.88	0.26	833939.67	2.49
0.03	5162.1645	0.02	0.00	170688.95	0.30	0.04	84203.027	0.25
0.02	2930.61035	0.01	0.00	47082.29	0.08	0.01	128873.99	0.38
0.01	5365.92073	0.02	0.00	29668.101	0.05	0.01	15052.637	0.04
0.00	368.20659	0.00	0.00	2295.7644	0.00	0.00	2368.1344	0.01
0.02	6032.47909	0.02	0.00	78776.96	0.14	0.02	102124.26	0.30
0.01	4132.61469	0.02	0.00	80160.401	0.14	0.02	282843.03	0.84
0.09	23991.9959	0.09	0.02	408672.47	0.71	0.10	615465.08	1.84
0.02	14626.9412	0.05	0.01	69081.821	0.12	0.02	55865.619	0.17
0.19	341456.305	1.27	0.23	1069042.8	1.86	0.26	503568.41	1.50
0.03	76031.4081	0.28	0.05	138841.55	0.24	0.03	96241.902	0.29
0.02	4930.98948	0.02	0.00	73944.137	0.13	0.02	64063.044	0.19
0.05	77323.7229	0.29	0.05	169350.85	0.30	0.04	231571.87	0.69
0.02	51781.4435	0.19	0.03	99584.173	0.17	0.02	146924.52	0.44
0.33	566150.81	2.11	0.38	1619845.3	2.83	0.39	1098235.4	3.28
0.01	5635.67604	0.02	0.00	17979.189	0.03	0.00	54569.907	0.16
0.00	46.5815334	0.00	0.00	857.16417	0.00	0.00	945.19596	0.00
0.10	46822.3098	0.17	0.03	176579.26	0.31	0.04	160092.48	0.48
0.02	24749.1155	0.09	0.02	56641.459	0.10	0.01	52149.783	0.16
0.03	10870.8281	0.04	0.01	78706.278	0.14	0.02	116288.18	0.35
0.90	1258178.38	4.68	0.83	3642712.6	6.35	0.88	3138990.8	9.37
0.11	100181.708	0.37	0.07	485189.92	0.85	0.12	405252.12	1.21
0.12	83511.7848	0.31	0.06	429476.89	0.75	0.10	359475.1	1.07
1.29	1529996.38	5.69	1.01	4888142.7	8.53	1.18	4287763.6	12.80
0.04	13426.848	0.05	0.01	68512.01	0.12	0.02	221325.33	0.66
0.02	5586.15175	0.02	0.00	103600.82	0.18	0.03	191710.44	0.57
0.01	4075.0395	0.02	0.00	40142.328	0.07	0.01	71990.899	0.21
0.02	22616.3653	0.08	0.01	43758.346	0.08	0.01	60544.938	0.18
0.01	2528.80575	0.01	0.00	30863.247	0.05	0.01	50102.713	0.15
0.01	250.433658	0.00	0.00	69163.482	0.12	0.02	146869.7	0.44
0.12	48483.6439	0.18	0.03	356040.23	0.62	0.09	742544.02	2.22
0.04	58482.7038	0.22	0.04	168832.63	0.29	0.04	138970.05	0.42
0.02	4894.66515	0.02	0.00	39435.148	0.07	0.01	122784.93	0.37
0.02	273.674225	0.00	0.00	53038.158	0.09	0.01	227045.82	0.68
0.03	12588.4761	0.05	0.01	123803.99	0.22	0.03	159834.66	0.48
0.12	76239.5193	0.28	0.05	385109.93	0.67	0.09	648635.46	1.94
0.36	250750.742	0.93	0.17	634605.13	1.11	0.15	537778.17	1.61

0.01	10505.3007	0.04	0.01	37589.153	0.07	0.01	108712.1	0.32
0.03	9790.58686	0.04	0.01	55726.422	0.10	0.01	140915.79	0.42
0.00	65.8481477	0.00	0.00	2150.442	0.00	0.00	7016.2285	0.02
0.10	10847.5903	0.04	0.01	52561.404	0.09	0.01	143727.71	0.43
0.01	6766.82776	0.03	0.00	87909.878	0.15	0.02	106335.68	0.32
0.52	288726.896	1.07	0.19	870542.43	1.52	0.21	1044485.7	3.12
0.39	1178146.79	4.38	0.78	445615.21	0.78	0.11	308563.33	0.92
0.01	3555.64635	0.01	0.00	16893.048	0.03	0.00	30809.822	0.09
0.01	715.045877	0.00	0.00	12206.772	0.02	0.00	103525.16	0.31
0.05	30779.6258	0.11	0.02	120453.37	0.21	0.03	124323.04	0.37
1.21	4036198.28	15.01	2.67	2200329.9	3.84	0.53	991569.09	2.96
0.11	261981.144	0.97	0.17	291064.22	0.51	0.07	458240.93	1.37
1.78	5511376.53	20.49	3.65	3086562.5	5.38	0.75	2017031.4	6.02
0.08	71702.5829	0.27	0.05	226433.45	0.40	0.05	379712.84	1.13
0.03	9224.82147	0.03	0.01	45754.12	0.08	0.01	74451.047	0.22
0.03	571.384453	0.00	0.00	147689.62	0.26	0.04	203773.92	0.61
0.01	10980.3451	0.04	0.01	98286.399	0.17	0.02	442467.39	1.32
0.03	1062.03486	0.00	0.00	132708.16	0.23	0.03	77334.215	0.23
0.17	93541.1688	0.35	0.06	650871.75	1.14	0.16	1177739.4	3.52
17.65	26894157.6	100.00	17.82	57323073	100.00	13.84	33486567	100.00
100.00	150944991		100.00	414085503		100.00	216561219	

GATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1
## TOTAL GVA (2

% OF THE		% OF THE	% OF THE	N AND	% OF THE	% OF THE	
NATIONAL		PROV GVA	NATIONAL	EXPERIMEN	PROV GVA	NATIONAL	Total GVA (2004
<b>GVA IN THIS</b>	TOURISM	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	TATION	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	CURRENT
SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	PRICES)
0.09	27899.51	0.58	0.09	15838.65	6093.21	11107.27	629176.9256
0.57	78915.07	1.64	0.24	15838.65	6093.21	11107.27	5082740.158
0.06	5316.081	0.11	0.02	230.991	88.86	161.99	389958.0988
0.72	112130.7	2.33	0.34	230.991	88.86	161.99	6101875.182
8.98	3310756	68.87	10.12	122.9158	47.29	86.20	122116536.4
8.98	3310756	68.87	10.12	122.9158	47.29	86.20	122116536.4
0.11	9711.976	0.20	0.03	3914.732	1506.02	2745.31	1078248.954
0.18	97123.16	2.02	0.30	3914.732	1506.02	2745.31	3608781.282
0.04	2166.396	0.05	0.01	10868.26	4181.08	7621.65	173491.3294
0.06	8946.293	0.19	0.03	10868.26	4181.08	7621.65	475088.009
0.39	117947.8	2.45	0.36	22.04932	8.48	15.46	5335609.574
0.04	3902.721	0.08	0.01	22.04932	8.48	15.46	422697.1661
0.06	12766.34	0.27	0.04	1660.124	638.66	1164.21	320115.7155
0.01	14671.04	0.31	0.04	1660.124	638.66	1164.21	129869.6127
0.00	1671.875	0.03	0.01	294.8785	113.44	206.79	8686.791239
0.05	6524.207	0.14	0.02	294.8785	113.44	206.79	369829.3301
0.13	11091.63	0.23	0.03	27.02463	10.40	18.95	582522.9674
0.28	50627.81	1.05	0.15	27.02463	10.40	18.95	1833721.583
0.03	27323.12	0.57	0.08	574.5976	221.05	402.95	253305.2903
0.23	158880.8	3.31	0.49	574.5976	221.05	402.95	2853050.17
0.04	22152.56	0.46	0.07	398.5502	153.32	279.49	775063.3667
0.03	1502.769	0.03	0.00	398.5502	153.32	279.49	239245.8966
0.11	16063.01	0.33	0.05	85.62746	32.94	60.05	928279.1189
0.07	11308.92	0.24	0.03	85.62746	32.94	60.05	660156.578
0.51	237231.2	4.94	0.73	351.4871	135.22	246.49	5709100.421
0.03	8802.629	0.18	0.03	351.4871	135.22	246.49	148807.2473
0.00	0	0.00	0.00	315.4085	121.34	221.19	2387.121654
0.07	85743.37	1.78	0.26	315.4085	121.34	221.19	1733728.928
0.02	16012.49	0.33	0.05	326.2604	125.51	228.80	267462.2079
0.05	6419.454	0.13	0.02	326.2604	125.51	228.80	478414.368
1.45	265227.2	5.52	0.81	37595.69	14463.26	26364.97	11039507.56
0.19	83296.12	1.73	0.25	470173.3	180878.22	329721.43	1496207.421
0.17	51347.85	1.07	0.16	470173.3	180878.22	329721.43	1857024.461
1.98	516849.1	10.75	1.58	201557	77540.08	141347.17	17023539.32
0.10	3188.788	0.07	0.01	201557	77540.08	141347.17	390189.6833
0.09	8169.836	0.17	0.02	164803	63400.61	115572.45	415708.7456
0.03	45396.56	0.94	0.14	164803	63400.61	115572.45	216871.6483
0.03	32149.01	0.67	0.10	13443.37	5171.74	9427.51	239650.4843
0.02	16961.35	0.35	0.05	13443.37	5171.74	9427.51	155315.2033
0.07	22186.29	0.46	0.07	220.0716	84.66	154.33	290753.4002
0.34	128051.8	2.66	0.39	220.0716	84.66	154.33	1708489.165
0.06	11717.28	0.24	0.04	1697.025	652.85	1190.08	555204.99
0.06	6546.128	0.14	0.02	1697.025	652.85	1190.08	234155.1545
0.10	6597.476	0.14	0.02	2608.609	1003.55	1829.36	485058.7332
0.07	14495.43	0.30	0.04	2608.609	1003.55	1829.36	508641.1635
0.30	39356.32	0.82	0.12	4920.593	1892.98	3450.70	1783060.041
0.25	38705.52	0.81	0.12	4920.593	1892.98	3450.70	2410216.55

	0.05	6900.053	0.14	0.02	9324.044	3587.01	6538.73	309359.2645
	0.07	4.435329	0.00	0.00	9324.044	3587.01	6538.73	254455.8368
	0.00	6587.454	0.14	0.02	3139.698	1207.86	2201.80	20365.00575
	0.07	17221.21	0.36	0.05	3139.698	1207.86	2201.80	584200.5999
	0.05	3732.582	0.08	0.01	4987.472	1918.71	3497.60	323677.7048
I	0.48	73151.26	1.52	0.22	4987.472	1918.71	3497.60	3902274.961
	0.14	38365.45	0.80	0.12	888.709	341.89	623.23	4036129.256
	0.01	1508.552	0.03	0.00	888.709	341.89	623.23	92064.02585
	0.05	4093.818	0.09	0.01	877762.9	337680.15	615554.38	162227.3246
	0.06	388.7424	0.01	0.00	402.5136	154.85	282.27	424702.2403
	0.46	94584.93	1.97	0.29	402.5136	154.85	282.27	12460282.78
	0.21	40787.26	0.85	0.12	221.9536	85.39	155.65	2014455.943
I	0.93	179728.8	3.74	0.55	221.9536	85.39	155.65	19189861.57
	0.18	5622.167	0.12	0.02	49.22089	18.94	34.52	1037405.951
	0.03	13247.52	0.28	0.04	49.22089	18.94	34.52	238853.1012
	0.09	4051.463	0.08	0.01	1652.725	635.81	1159.02	463888.0201
	0.20	13130.88	0.27	0.04	1652.725	635.81	1159.02	648714.8152
	0.04	5116.786	0.11	0.02	366.5536	141.02	257.06	393090.1937
	0.54	41168.82	0.86	0.13	366.5536	141.02	257.06	 2781952.082
	15.46	4806999	100.00	14.70	259.9392	100.00	182.29	187486020.3
Γ	100.00	32704702		100.00	142.5971		100.00	1220888209

004 curren	it prices)	
% OF THE	TOTAL	
TOT PROV	NATIONAL	
GVA	GVA	
0.34	0.05	
2.71	0.42	
0.21	0.03	
3.25	0.50	
65.13	10.00	
65.13	10.00	
0.58	0.09	
1 92	0.30	
0.09	0.00	
0.00	0.01	
2.85	0.04	
0.23	0.44	
0.23	0.03	
0.17	0.03	
0.07	0.01	
0.00	0.00	
0.20	0.03	
0.31	0.05	
0.96	0.15	
0.14	0.02	
1.52	0.23	
0.41	0.06	
0.13	0.02	
0.50	0.08	
0.35	0.05	
3.05	0.47	
0.08	0.01	
0.00	0.00	
0.92	0.14	
0.14	0.02	
0.26	0.04	
5.89	0.90	
0.80	0.12	
0.99	0.15	
9.08	1.39	
0.21	0.03	
0.22	0.03	
0.12	0.02	
0.13	0.02	
0.08	0.01	
0.16	0.02	
0.91	0.14	
0.30	0.05	
0.12	0.02	
0.26	0.04	
0.27	0.04	
0.95	0.15	
1.29	0.20	

o ( <del>-</del>	~ ~ ~	
0.17	0.03	
0.14	0.02	
0.01	0.00	
0.31	0.05	
0.17	0.03	
2.08	0.32	
2.15	0.33	
0.05	0.01	
0.09	0.01	
0.23	0.03	
6.65	1.02	
1.07	0.16	
10.24	1.57	
0.55	0.08	
0.13	0.02	
0.25	0.04	
0.35	0.05	
0.21	0.03	
1.48	0.23	
100.00	15.36	
	100 00	

			AGRICULTU RE, FORESTRY	% OF THE
DISTRIC	T/METROPOLITAN		AND FISHING	IN THIS
MUNICI	PALITY	LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	GVA (2004)	SECTOR
Capric	orn District municipality	Aganang Local Municipality	26355.44	0.86
		Blouberg Local Municipality	71513.29	2.33
		Lepele-Nkumpi Local Municipality	65197.73	2.13
		Molemole Local Municipality	201197.5	6.56
		Polokwane Local Municipality	98424.88	3.21
Capric	orn District municipality Tot	tal	462688.9	15.09
Greate	r Sekhukhune District Mun	Fetakgomo Local Municipality	8377.197	0.27
		Greater Groblersdal Local Municipality	135284.8	4.41
		Greater Marble Hall Local Municipality	111738.1	3.64
		Greater Tubatse Local Municipality	22379.9	0.73
		Makhuduthamaga Local Municipality	45849.08	1.50
Greate	r Sekhukhune District Mun	icipality Total	323629	10.55
Mopan	i District municipality	Ba-Phalaborwa Local Municipality	63359.36	2.07
		Greater Giyani Local Municipality	82477.27	2.69
		Greater Letaba Local Municipality	173255.3	5.65
		Greater Tzaneen Local Municipality	402497.3	13.12
		Maruleng Local Municipality	137645.9	4.49
		NPDMA33	3018.804	0.10
Mopan	i District municipality Total		862253.9	28.12
Vhemb	e District municipality	Makhado Local Municipality	265208.3	8.65
		Musina Local Municipality	100566.2	3.28
		Mutale Local Municipality	48938.78	1.60
		Thulamela Local Municipality	142873.9	4.66
Vhemb	e District municipality Tota	l	557587.2	18.18
Watert	berg District municipality	Bela-Bela Local Municipality	107572.4	3.51
		Lephalale Local Municipality	128965.4	4.21
		Modimolle Local Municipality	128088.1	4.18
		Mogalakwena Local Municipality	64506.91	2.10
		Mookgopong Local Municipality	274458.8	8.95
		Thabazimbi Local Municipality	156907	5.12
Watert	perg District municipality To	otal	860498.6	28.06
NP Total			3066658	100.00
<b>Grand Total</b>			41317265	

# NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: LIMPOPO PROVINCE Sector GVA brakedown (2004 c

NSDP Spatial Profiles:

GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: R

# urrent prices)

% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MINING AND QUARYING GVA(2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MANUFACTURIN G- LABOUR INTENSIVE GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	CONSTRUCTIO N AND INFRASTRUCT URE GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR
0.06	2966.565	0.03	0.00	27678.89409	1.41	0.02	69150.6517	1.31
0.17	13238.44	0.12	0.02	5605.18383	0.29	0.00	72852.7286	1.38
0.16	96945.72	0.86	0.11	80084.62051	4.08	0.05	97229.2197	1.84
0.49	38137.01	0.34	0.04	9985.033227	0.51	0.01	101069.113	1.91
0.24	61728.69	0.55	0.07	324802.2643	16.53	0.22	678203.52	12.84
1.12	213016.4	1.89	0.24	448155.996	22.81	0.30	1018505.23	19.29
0.02	83174.99	0.74	0.10	2392.83203	0.12	0.00	26860.8225	0.51
0.33	358664.9	3.18	0.41	83910.11186	4.27	0.06	108273.785	2.05
0.27	12906.01	0.11	0.01	40699.82743	2.07	0.03	80168.1477	1.52
0.05	964057	8.55	1.11	49610.64942	2.52	0.03	119003.422	2.25
0.11	48756.52	0.43	0.06	52047.55723	2.65	0.03	62011.1507	1.17
0.78	1467559	13.02	1.69	228660.978	11.64	0.15	396317.328	7.50
0.15	3213632	28.51	3.69	10285.75067	0.52	0.01	281156.499	5.32
0.20	2780.816	0.02	0.00	78535.39571	4.00	0.05	153941.543	2.91
0.42	69054.92	0.61	0.08	15190.2776	0.77	0.01	120980.995	2.29
0.97	89331.52	0.79	0.10	229430.8389	11.68	0.15	309322.199	5.86
0.33	127028.2	1.13	0.15	24575.16255	1.25	0.02	76841.8019	1.46
0.01	269106.9	2.39	0.31	14589.97059	0.74	0.01	15994.7425	0.30
2.09	3770934	33.45	4.33	372607.3961	18.96	0.25	958237.78	18.14
0.64	49413.98	0.44	0.06	204201.0968	10.39	0.14	408094.784	7.73
0.24	219540.3	1.95	0.25	7077.967214	0.36	0.00	49448.7686	0.94
0.12	10743.35	0.10	0.01	5932.738912	0.30	0.00	50442.6857	0.96
0.35	145228.7	1.29	0.17	195834.3432	9.97	0.13	319163.107	6.04
1.35	424926.3	3.77	0.49	413046.1462	21.02	0.27	827149.346	15.66
0.26	5107.709	0.05	0.01	55284.44023	2.81	0.04	254630.433	4.82
0.31	650755.2	5.77	0.75	31530.07574	1.60	0.02	1098711.72	20.80
0.31	46109.22	0.41	0.05	74468.91993	3.79	0.05	114941.403	2.18
0.16	203110.3	1.80	0.23	42099.19225	2.14	0.03	144580.674	2.74
0.66	188423.2	1.67	0.22	165751.4244	8.44	0.11	159036.487	3.01
0.38	4301913	38.17	4.94	133186.0978	6.78	0.09	308998.211	5.85
2.08	5395418	47.87	6.20	502320.1503	25.57	0.33	2080898.93	39.40
7.42	11271855	100.00	12.95	1964790.666	100.00	1.30	5281108.61	100.00
100.00	87041883		100.00	150896759.1		100.00	125877261	

licon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATI

### **NSDP SECTOR CLASSIFICATION**

% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	HIGH VALUE DIFFERENTIAT ED GOODS GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	SERVICES AND RETAIL GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	PUBLIC SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATIO N GVA (2004)
0.05	17680.0134	0.89	0.01	127951.7341	1.15	0.03	330391.2481
0.06	25206.2144	1.26	0.02	220281.1186	1.98	0.05	439195.6079
0.08	27665.0055	1.38	0.02	301664.8057	2.72	0.07	597277.153
0.08	25873.2896	1.30	0.02	200706.1595	1.81	0.05	282414.3009
0.54	416597.866	20.85	0.28	2181015.103	19.63	0.53	2263522.509
0.81	513022.389	25.68	0.34	3031618.921	27.29	0.73	3912800.818
0.02	2855.44069	0.14	0.00	84620.68978	0.76	0.02	113106.668
0.09	132516.299	6.63	0.09	432250.1119	3.89	0.10	426246.8117
0.06	18987.0194	0.95	0.01	253572.1365	2.28	0.06	259826.1265
0.09	80512.1807	4.03	0.05	319461.8961	2.88	0.08	337814.8615
0.05	29404.6369	1.47	0.02	304947.7443	2.75	0.07	391676.7795
0.31	264275.576	13.23	0.18	1394852.579	12.56	0.34	1528671.247
0.22	20097.8363	1.01	0.01	435815.8766	3.92	0.11	522266.3526
0.12	26821.2237	1.34	0.02	344247.5875	3.10	0.08	745713.8262
0.10	27455.2785	1.37	0.02	289738.4881	2.61	0.07	409887.1631
0.25	135662.136	6.79	0.09	879812.8933	7.92	0.21	1156131.807
0.06	28530.5915	1.43	0.02	137689.2383	1.24	0.03	261774.4939
0.01	12190.8894	0.61	0.01	42870.19186	0.39	0.01	69615.59766
0.76	250757.956	12.55	0.17	2130174.276	19.18	0.51	3165389.241
0.32	156279.881	7.82	0.10	1023289.066	9.21	0.25	1214246.951
0.04	15778.5429	0.79	0.01	126055.0039	1.13	0.03	160353.3837
0.04	4565.35812	0.23	0.00	62825.95923	0.57	0.02	254239.1044
0.25	194429.621	9.73	0.13	838265.3516	7.55	0.20	2185283.96
0.66	371053.403	18.57	0.25	2050435.381	18.46	0.50	3814123.399
0.20	93739.84	4.69	0.06	518848.5009	4.67	0.13	254984.5951
0.87	72594.9843	3.63	0.05	328669.0448	2.96	0.08	349890.7899
0.09	89405.8547	4.48	0.06	329485.4897	2.97	0.08	262038.1193
0.11	36048.9636	1.80	0.02	429104.4164	3.86	0.10	578826.55
0.13	87344.4603	4.37	0.06	197210.3649	1.78	0.05	155161.6349
0.25	219418.182	10.98	0.15	698146.6792	6.28	0.17	208907.7174
1.65	598552.285	29.96	0.40	2501464.496	22.52	0.60	1809809.407
4.20	1997661.61	100.00	1.32	11108545.65	100.00	2.68	14230794.11
100.00	150944991		100.00	414085503.2		100.00	216561218.5

ED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

								/
PROV GVA	NATIONAL		% OF THE PROV GVA	NATIONAL	EXPERIMEN	% OF THE PROV GVA	NATIONAL	
IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	TOURISM	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	TATION GVA	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	
SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	(2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	
2.32	0.15	17079.65	1.58	0.05	147.4665	43.97	103.41	
3.09	0.20	18339.92	1.70	0.06	147.4665	43.97	103.41	
4.20	0.28	95521.39	8.84	0.29	120.936	36.06	84.81	
1.98	0.13	11501.11	1.06	0.04	120.936	36.06	84.81	
15.91	1.05	126292.7	11.68	0.39	10980.56	3273.77	7700.40	
27.50	1.81	268734.8	24.86	0.82	10980.56	3273.77	7700.40	
0.79	0.05	11205.81	1.04	0.03	160.3734	47.81	112.47	
3.00	0.20	55158.88	5.10	0.17	160.3734	47.81	112.47	
1.83	0.12	7714.592	0.71	0.02	<u>391.3616</u>	116.68	274.45	
2.37	0.16	71177.78	6.58	0.22	<u>391.3616</u>	116.68	274.45	
2.75	0.18	23095.1	2.14	0.07	212.3927	63.32	148.95	
10.74	0.71	168352.2	15.57	0.51	212.3927	63.32	148.95	
3.67	0.24	13758.56	1.27	0.04	389.9448	116.26	273.46	
5.24	0.34	13640.38	1.26	0.04	389.9448	116.26	273.46	
2.88	0.19	14065.24	1.30	0.04	8519.177	2539.93	5974.30	
8.12	0.53	84563.7	7.82	0.26	8519.177	2539.93	5974.30	
1.84	0.12	28574.69	2.64	0.09	622.0982	185.47	436.26	
0.49	0.03	35971.02	3.33	0.11	622.0982	185.47	436.26	
22.24	1.46	190573.6	17.63	0.58	1651.731	492.45	1158.32	
8.53	0.56	79874.62	7.39	0.24	1651.731	492.45	1158.32	
1.13	0.07	19456.79	1.80	0.06	1088.373	324.49	763.25	
1.79	0.12	11593.48	1.07	0.04	1088.373	324.49	763.25	
15.36	1.01	129424	11.97	0.40	247.2996	73.73	173.43	
26.80	1.76	240348.9	22.23	0.73	247.2996	73.73	173.43	
1.79	0.12	78738.88	7.28	0.24	20.10916	6.00	14.10	
2.46	0.16	37131.62	3.43	0.11	20.10916	6.00	14.10	
1.84	0.12	36261.92	3.35	0.11	218.3563	65.10	153.13	
4.07	0.27	38147.3	3.53	0.12	218.3563	65.10	153.13	
1.09	0.07	11699.36	1.08	0.04	123.212	. 36.73	86.41	
1.47	0.10	11003.03	1.02	0.03	123.212	. 36.73	86.41	
12.72	0.84	212982.1	19.70	0.65	335.4105	100.00	235.22	
100.00	6.57	1080992	100.00	3.31	335.4105	100.00	235.22	
	100.00	32704702		100.00	142.5971		100.00	

## TOTAL GVA (2004 current prices)

		% OF THE	
Total GVA (2004	% OF THE	TOTAL	
CURRENT	TOT PROV	NATIONAL	
PRICES)	GVA	GVA	
619476.9013	1.24	0.05	
866422.971	1.73	0.07	
1362334.688	2.72	0.11	
871160.1206	1.74	0.07	
6154836.815	12.30	0.50	
9874231.496	19.74	0.81	
332719.9418	0.67	0.03	
1732760.117	3.46	0.14	
785849.4289	1.57	0.06	
1964398.799	3.93	0.16	
958114.3235	1.92	0.08	
5773842.61	11.54	0.47	
4560879.883	9.12	0.37	
1448851.568	2.90	0.12	
1120240.773	2.24	0.09	
3288809.541	6.57	0.27	
823076.7252	1.65	0.07	
463443.2394	0.93	0.04	
11705301.73	23.40	0.96	
3402232.324	6.80	0.28	
698522.2078	1.40	0.06	
449468.4972	0.90	0.04	
4151909.424	8.30	0.34	
8702132.453	17.40	0.71	
1369649.512	2.74	0.11	
2698935.335	5.40	0.22	
1081507.5	2.16	0.09	
1537114.259	3.07	0.13	
1239521.728	2.48	0.10	
6041209.967	12.08	0.49	
13967938.3	27.92	1.14	
50023446.59	100.00	4.10	
1220888209		100.00	

			AGRICULTU	
			KE,	
	DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN		FISHING	IN THIS
	MUNICIPALITY	LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	GVA (2004)	SECTOR
MP	Ehlanzeni District municipality	Bushbuckridge Local Municipality	143239.6	3.63
		Mbombela Local Municipality	321113.8	8.15
		MPDMA32	27419.57	0.70
		Nkomazi Local Municipality	201332.1	5.11
		Thaba Chweu Local Municipality	387556.6	9.83
		Umjindi Local Municipality	92002.4	2.33
	Ehlanzeni District municipality 7	1172664	29.75	
	Gert Sibande District municipali	223121.7	5.66	
		Dipaleseng Local Municipality	178124.2	4.52
		Govan Mbeki Local Municipality	178500	4.53
		Lekwa Local Municipality	447105.2	11.34
		Mkhondo Local Municipality	129174.4	3.28
		Msukaligwa Local Municipality	227740.2	5.78
		Pixley Ka Seme Local Municipality	259097.9	6.57
	Gert Sibande District municipali	ity Total	1642864	41.68
	Nkangala District municipality	Delmas Local Municipality	353038.4	8.96
		Dr JS Moroka Local Municipality	48529.93	1.23
		Emalahleni Local Municipality	109422.2	2.78
		Highlands Local Municipality	127653.6	3.24
		Steve Tshwete Local Municipality	452381.6	11.48
		Thembisile Local Municipality	34921.75	0.89
	Nkangala District municipality T	otal	1125948	28.57
MP 7	Total		3941475	100.00
Gran	id Total		41317265	

## NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: MPUMALANGA PROVINCE Sector GVA brakedow

**NSDP Spatial Profiles:** 

GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insig

# n (2004 current prices)

% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MINING AND QUARYING GVA(2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MANUFACTU RING- LABOUR INTENSIVE GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	CONSTRUCTI ON AND INFRASTRUC TURE GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR
0.35	25638.82	0.14	0.03	147111.5	0.91	0.10	295775.23	2.40
0.78	129360.9	0.70	0.15	1880689.1	11.62	1.25	1084802.4	8.82
0.07	196290.6	1.06	0.23	16904.227	0.10	0.01	36905.373	0.30
0.49	105493.8	0.57	0.12	139301.12	0.86	0.09	171629.48	1.40
0.94	247066.9	1.33	0.28	419020.36	2.59	0.28	168944.65	1.37
0.22	60884.57	0.33	0.07	657511.69	4.06	0.44	108806.56	0.88
2.84	764735.6	4.12	0.88	3260538	20.14	2.16	1866863.7	15.18
0.54	117776.1	0.63	0.14	64245.596	0.40	0.04	155716.56	1.27
0.43	140.1511	0.00	0.00	23966.131	0.15	0.02	133923.87	1.09
0.43	4186523	22.56	4.81	10969645	67.77	7.27	642631.27	5.22
1.08	173435.3	0.93	0.20	107693.01	0.67	0.07	1146799.2	9.32
0.31	86670.37	0.47	0.10	213661.33	1.32	0.14	109426.51	0.89
0.55	242351.2	1.31	0.28	69395.893	0.43	0.05	380976.94	3.10
0.63	25084.22	0.14	0.03	16966.69	0.10	0.01	417231.74	3.39
3.98	4831980	26.04	5.55	11465574	70.84	7.60	2986706.1	24.28
0.85	235722.2	1.27	0.27	51073.858	0.32	0.03	470699.84	3.83
0.12	1885.235	0.01	0.00	51915.912	0.32	0.03	212302.94	1.73
0.26	8598580	46.34	9.88	266115.23	1.64	0.18	4434329.1	36.05
0.31	277087	1.49	0.32	42391.945	0.26	0.03	108654.83	0.88
1.09	3793818	20.45	4.36	897996.18	5.55	0.60	2057306.4	16.72
0.08	51465.95	0.28	0.06	149866.3	0.93	0.10	164020.8	1.33
2.73	12958559	69.84	14.89	1459359.4	9.02	0.97	7447313.9	60.54
9.54	18555275	100.00	21.32	16185471	100.00	10.73	12300884	100.00
100.00	87041883		100.00	150896759		100.00	125877261	

ht: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGC

	NSDP SECT	OR CLASS	SIFICATION					
							PUBLIC SERVICES	
% OF THE	HIGH VALUE	% OF THE	% OF THE	0501/050	% OF THE	% OF THE	AND	% OF THE
NATIONAL GVA IN THIS	DIFFERENTIA	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	SERVICES	IN THIS			
SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	(2004)	SECTOR
0.23	80435.417	0.79	0.05	956480.68	7.14	0.23	1107878.64	12.34
0.86	1027586.4	10.11	0.68	3509119.48	26.19	0.85	1831728.43	20.40
0.03	10766.579	0.11	0.01	87756.742	0.65	0.02	85291.1751	0.95
0.14	46261.764	0.46	0.03	438671.285	3.27	0.11	438521.244	4.88
0.13	254145.64	2.50	0.17	304130.394	2.27	0.07	200679.247	2.24
0.09	104905.8	1.03	0.07	249180.387	1.86	0.06	140513.984	1.56
1.48	1524101.6	15.00	1.01	5545338.97	41.38	1.34	3804612.72	42.37
0.12	10795.283	0.11	0.01	326766.69	2.44	0.08	287664.617	3.20
0.11	16285.517	0.16	0.01	197686.13	1.48	0.05	76092.1309	0.85
0.51	525262.33	5.17	0.35	1130714.24	8.44	0.27	583354.281	6.50
0.91	81053.372	0.80	0.05	373868.86	2.79	0.09	325032.57	3.62
0.09	36146.199	0.36	0.02	315426.132	2.35	0.08	199384.394	2.22
0.30	175882.9	1.73	0.12	759855.497	5.67	0.18	429926.735	4.79
0.33	21961.793	0.22	0.01	195794.036	1.46	0.05	130253.81	1.45
2.37	867387.4	8.54	0.57	3300111.59	24.63	0.80	2031708.54	22.63
0.37	99500.904	0.98	0.07	309612.349	2.31	0.07	162496.638	1.81
0.17	13380.364	0.13	0.01	188448.709	1.41	0.05	370778.079	4.13
3.52	1531390.3	15.07	1.01	2071238.22	15.46	0.50	1119643.08	12.47
0.09	116034.74	1.14	0.08	90353.6216	0.67	0.02	121907.717	1.36
1.63	5923660.9	58.29	3.92	1382827.28	10.32	0.33	907412.303	10.11
0.13	86213.953	0.85	0.06	512358.031	3.82	0.12	460343.758	5.13
5.92	7770181.1	76.47	5.15	4554838.21	33.99	1.10	3142581.57	35.00
9.77	10161670	100.00	6.73	13400288.8	100.00	3.24	8978902.83	100.00
100.00	150944991		100.00	414085503		100.00	216561219	

GREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1

## TOTAL GVA (2

				INNOVATIO			
% OF THE		% OF THE	% OF THE	N AND	% OF THE	% OF THE	
NATIONAL		PROV GVA	NATIONAL	EXPERIMEN	PROV GVA	NATIONAL	Total GVA (2004
GVA IN THIS	TOURISM	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	TATION	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	CURRENT
SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	PRICES)
0.51	49350.16	5.13	0.15	259.9392	88.18	182.29	2807388.668
0.85	208858.8	21.73	0.64	136210.3	46207.83	95521.07	9998898.98
0.04	79312.98	8.25	0.24	136210.3	46207.83	95521.07	540761.9423
0.20	23512.74	2.45	0.07	107.0596	36.32	75.08	1565383.873
0.09	42398.87	4.41	0.13	107.0596	36.32	75.08	2024285.806
0.06	10712.05	1.11	0.03	133.7934	45.39	93.83	1425003.357
1.76	414145.6	43.08	1.27	133.7934	45.39	93.83	18361722.63
0.13	39122.86	4.07	0.12	2617	887.79	1835.24	1225580.157
0.04	8578.095	0.89	0.03	2617	887.79	1835.24	634869.3884
0.27	121640	12.65	0.37	66.75867	22.65	46.82	18341106.47
0.15	40262.28	4.19	0.12	66.75867	22.65	46.82	2695754.019
0.09	19756.9	2.06	0.06	111.8354	37.94	78.43	1109920.76
0.20	45353.4	4.72	0.14	111.8354	37.94	78.43	2332853.201
0.06	8061.467	0.84	0.02	49.07791	16.65	34.42	1074699.924
0.94	282775	29.41	0.86	49.07791	16.65	34.42	27414783.92
0.08	27302.99	2.84	0.08	101.6319	34.48	71.27	1710553.117
0.17	22697.21	2.36	0.07	101.6319	34.48	71.27	910164.8357
0.52	35191.1	3.66	0.11	88.33823	29.97	61.95	18168775.83
0.06	48319.07	5.03	0.15	88.33823	29.97	61.95	932562.2691
0.42	29118.49	3.03	0.09	578.9231	196.39	405.99	15447374.2
0.21	101797.7	10.59	0.31	578,9231	196.39	405.99	1561365.71
1.45	264426.6	27.51	0.81	294,7776	100.00	206.72	 38730795.96
4.15	961347.2	100.00	2.94	294.7776	100.00	206.72	84507302.51
100.00	32704702		100.00	142 5971		100.00	1220888209

#### 2004 current prices) % OF THE % OF THE TOTAL TOT PROV NATIONAL GVA GVA 3.32 0.23 11.83 0.82 0.64 0.04 1.85 0.13 2.40 0.17 1.69 0.12 21.73 1.50 1.45 0.10 0.75 0.05 21.70 1.50 3.19 0.22 1.31 0.09 2.76 0.19 1.27 0.09 32.44 2.25 2.02 0.14 1.08 0.07 21.50 1.49 1.10 0.08 18.28 1.27 1.85 0.13 45.83 3.17 100.00 6.92 100.00

			AGRICULTU RE,	
			FORESTRY AND FISHING	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS
NC	Eranaca Baard District municipality	Dikastlong Loool Municipality	GVA (2004)	2 40
NC	Frances Baard District municipality	Magarong Local Municipality	20975 97	2.40
			29075.07	2.00
		Redware Local Municipality	105005 3	2.90
		Sol Plaatije Local Municipality	68350.68	0.08
	Frances Baard District municipality To		456004 8	1/ 00
	Kaalagadi District Municipality	Gamagara Local Municipality	25048 35	0.82
	Ngalagadi District Municipality	Ga-Segonyana Local Municipality	89646.26	2 92
		Moshaweng Local Municipality	36036 62	1 20
		NCDMA45	13404 98	0.44
	Koalagadi District Municipality Total	Nobilititio	165036.2	5.38
	Namakwa District municipality	Hantam Local Municipality	149743.4	4 88
		Kamiesberg Local Municipality	65044 07	2 12
		Karoo Hoogland Local Municipality	230479.2	7.51
		Kh <sup>C</sup> i-Ma Local Municipality	26309.73	0.86
		Nama Khoi Local Municipality	13448.73	0.44
		NCDMA06	15234.32	0.50
		Richtersveld Local Municipality	8920.456	0.29
	Namakwa District municipality Total		509179.8	16.60
	Pixley ka Seme District municipality	Emthanjeni Local Municipality	66931.76	2.18
	, , ,	Kareeberg Local Municipality	76524.34	2.49
		NCDMA07	37460.04	1.22
		Renosterberg Local Municipality	23848.66	0.78
		Siyancuma Local Municipality	211965.3	6.91
		Sivathemba Local Municipality	157038.2	5.12
		Thembelihle Local Municipality	79025.35	2.58
		Ubuntu Local Municipality	159565.9	5.20
		Umsobomvu Local Municipality	61848.57	2.02
	Pixley ka Seme District municipality T	otal	874208	28.49
	Siyanda District municipality	!Kai! Garib Local Municipality	508319.4	16.57
		!Kheis Local Municipality	139703.4	4.55
		//Khara Hais Local Municipality	199737.7	6.51
		Kgatelopele Local Municipality	112656.4	3.67
		Mier Local Municipality	0	0.00
		NCDMA08	45521.58	1.48
		Tsantsabane Local Municipality	56667.59	1.85
	Siyanda District municipality Total		1062606	34.63
NC T	otal		3068025	100.00
Gran	d Total		41317265	

## NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE Sector GVA brakedov

**NSDP Spatial Profiles:** GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight:

# vn (2004 current prices)

% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MINING AND QUARYING GVA(2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MANUFACTURI NG- LABOUR INTENSIVE GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	CONSTRUCTIO N AND INFRASTRUCT URE GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR
0.18	154862.4	3.08	0.18	14694.19087	2.28	0.01	68312.22438	3.52
0.07	17092.56	0.34	0.02	1089.251199	0.17	0.00	24769.66555	1.28
0.22	54376.6	1.08	0.06	714.5452184	0.11	0.00	28903.5937	1.49
0.47	2745.791	0.05	0.00	42180.08519	6.54	0.03	131843.5506	6.80
0.17	553115.7	10.99	0.64	195367.3115	30.27	0.13	625135.5573	32.26
1.11	782193.1	15.55	0.90	254045.3839	39.36	0.17	878964.5915	45.35
0.06	1272731	25.30	1.46	8166.84968	1.27	0.01	73361.34808	3.79
0.22	180088.6	3.58	0.21	43012.10208	6.66	0.03	39189.23292	2.02
0.09	74390.69	1.48	0.09	3922.665442	0.61	0.00	27612.25932	1.42
0.03	1207083	23.99	1.39	711.980129	0.11	0.00	30785.6311	1.59
0.40	2734294	54.35	3.14	55813.59733	8.65	0.04	170948.4714	8.82
0.36	388.4963	0.01	0.00	13978.9762	2.17	0.01	19480.53887	1.01
0.16	65044.55	1.29	0.07	2017.452534	0.31	0.00	59534.57944	3.07
0.56	0	0.00	0.00	4084.169083	0.63	0.00	6067.662582	0.31
0.06	779.4327	0.02	0.00	509.7139282	0.08	0.00	12297.54688	0.63
0.03	103263.2	2.05	0.12	19310.40872	2.99	0.01	92491.48413	4.77
0.04	4329.468	0.09	0.00	430.4622189	0.07	0.00	2803.505933	0.14
0.02	210296.8	4.18	0.24	3630.478806	0.56	0.00	23259.28196	1.20
1.23	384101.9	7.63	0.44	43961.66149	6.81	0.03	215934.5998	11.14
0.16	766.3672	0.02	0.00	13076.59412	2.03	0.01	102841.1421	5.31
0.19	360.2722	0.01	0.00	1893.581058	0.29	0.00	5122.359954	0.26
0.09	675.5909	0.01	0.00	2667.702927	0.41	0.00	2743.903101	0.14
0.06	0	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0.00	76627.11138	3.95
0.51	53567.34	1.06	0.06	32688.6161	5.06	0.02	33487.13064	1.73
0.38	635.0692	0.01	0.00	5265.112225	0.82	0.00	38858.69512	2.01
0.19	68.17191	0.00	0.00	6949.304244	1.08	0.00	7939.890059	0.41
0.39	1378.796	0.03	0.00	8099.444978	1.25	0.01	6966.99095	0.36
0.15	0	0.00	0.00	1257	0.19	0.00	25458.533	1.31
2.12	57451.61	1.14	0.07	71897.35565	11.14	0.05	300045.7563	15.48
1.23	2087.308	0.04	0.00	54723.99998	8.48	0.04	105618.516	5.45
0.34	1145.413	0.02	0.00	8703.75583	1.35	0.01	29541.26816	1.52
0.48	1016.005	0.02	0.00	137936.3221	21.37	0.09	116169.4837	5.99
0.27	486737.5	9.67	0.56	3294.778048	0.51	0.00	50348.94518	2.60
0.00	964.3912	0.02	0.00	4518.956275	0.70	0.00	5629.437895	0.29
0.11	50450.42	1.00	0.06	2672.877705	0.41	0.00	14308.17757	0.74
0.14	530720.5	10.55	0.61	7856.591209	1.22	0.01	50569.53953	2.61
2.57	1073122	21.33	1.23	219707.2811	34.04	0.15	372185.368	19.20
7.43	5031162	100.00	5.78	645425.2795	100.00	0.43	19 <mark>38078.787</mark>	100.00
100.00	87041883		100.00	150896759.1		100.00	125877261	

Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGA

#### **NSDP SECTOR CLASSIFICATION**

% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	HIGH VALUE DIFFERENTIA TED GOODS GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	SERVICES AND RETAIL GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	PUBLIC SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATIO N GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR
0.05	93595.424	6.61	0.06	60450.0028	1.09	0.01	88066.66135	1.71
0.02	6064.3091	0.43	0.00	34134.8452	0.61	0.01	52297.79769	1.02
0.02	16175.259	1.14	0.01	31720.1593	0.57	0.01	39587.69915	0.77
0.10	40831.598	2.88	0.03	349055.187	6.28	0.08	210260.3358	4.08
0.50	537793.28	37.99	0.36	2084773.8	37.49	0.50	2048640.761	39.78
0.70	694459.87	49.05	0.46	2560133.99	46.04	0.62	2438853.256	47.35
0.06	73702.736	5.21	0.05	117741.774	2.12	0.03	144325.4243	2.80
0.03	39053.317	2.76	0.03	224999.638	4.05	0.05	194320.5055	3.77
0.02	7323.215	0.52	0.00	63044.3292	1.13	0.02	170950.1037	3.32
0.02	21457.234	1.52	0.01	80460.4232	1.45	0.02	39232.85795	0.76
0.14	141536.5	10.00	0.09	486246.164	8.74	0.12	548828.8915	10.66
0.02	28014.26	1.98	0.02	252622.979	4.54	0.06	77238.1399	1.50
0.05	23881.793	1.69	0.02	127206.225	2.29	0.03	83810.96242	1.63
0.00	27928.264	1.97	0.02	99464.3056	1.79	0.02	55284.79373	1.07
0.01	9160.08	0.65	0.01	41348.317	0.74	0.01	38946.31532	0.76
0.07	67770.936	4.79	0.04	270650.568	4.87	0.07	234526.7154	4.55
0.00	2183.3712	0.15	0.00	15558.8571	0.28	0.00	7336.037125	0.14
0.02	14433.102	1.02	0.01	57914.9495	1.04	0.01	51464.52647	1.00
0.17	173371.81	12.25	0.11	864766.201	15.55	0.21	548607.4903	10.65
0.08	54248.072	3.83	0.04	184103.101	3.31	0.04	255292.4233	4.96
0.00	9490.2655	0.67	0.01	54316.8489	0.98	0.01	48049.0416	0.93
0.00	3248.4956	0.23	0.00	16128.7687	0.29	0.00	11701.17552	0.23
0.06	5064.9657	0.36	0.00	15319.8703	0.28	0.00	18457.86208	0.36
0.03	28758.764	2.03	0.02	105255.946	1.89	0.03	127322.2731	2.47
0.03	17141.405	1.21	0.01	56925.8789	1.02	0.01	65377.2281	1.27
0.01	21732.235	1.54	0.01	29405.9204	0.53	0.01	27511.1236	0.53
0.01	20601.566	1.46	0.01	46512.5731	0.84	0.01	71764.88491	1.39
0.02	1297.1746	0.09	0.00	42152.692	0.76	0.01	104478.4402	2.03
0.24	161582.94	11.41	0.11	550121.599	9.89	0.13	729954.4525	14.17
0.08	44286.49	3.13	0.03	278793.034	5.01	0.07	208748.5918	4.05
0.02	10928.353	0.77	0.01	66550.2403	1.20	0.02	58910.95937	1.14
0.09	70420.953	4.97	0.05	543932.396	9.78	0.13	341710.9536	6.63
0.04	36640.9	2.59	0.02	63210.5465	1.14	0.02	87030.5402	1.69
0.00	2857.4488	0.20	0.00	25486.1613	0.46	0.01	23878.0339	0.46
0.01	13308.312	0.94	0.01	55925.9859	1.01	0.01	47139.21518	0.92
0.04	66298.254	4.68	0.04	65902.4771	1.19	0.02	116871.2573	2.27
0.30	244740.71	17.29	0.16	1099800.84	19.78	0.27	884289.5514	17.17
1.54	1415691.8	100.00	0.94	5561068.8	100.00	1.34	5150533.641	100.00
100.00	150944991		100.00	414085503		100.00	216561218.5	

ATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1

T	<u>^</u> -			0	1	Α.
	U	IA	L	G	V	А

NATIONAL		PROV GVA	NATIONAL	EXPERIMEN	PROV GVA	NATIONAL	Total GVA (20	004
GVA IN THIS	TOURISM	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	TATION	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	CURRENT	
SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	PRICES)	
0.04	4592.642	0.99	0.01	1758.213	713.85	1232.99	558449.58	67
0.02	2199.413	0.48	0.01	1758.213	713.85	1232.99	167568.75	13
0.02	8863.967	1.92	0.03	5.766733	2.34	4.04	269412.82	99
0.10	21324.73	4.61	0.07	5.766733	2.34	4.04	994514.36	95
0.95	178768.6	38.66	0.55	8.704972	3.53	6.10	6295848.03	35
1.13	215749.4	46.66	0.66	8.704972	3.53	6.10	8285793.5	73
0.07	2660.046	0.58	0.01	153.0671	62.15	107.34	1717942.	56
0.09	13246.32	2.86	0.04	153.0671	62.15	107.34	824016.49	07
0.08	7215.652	1.56	0.02	19.00374	7.72	13.33	391466.423	38
0.02	5108.2	1.10	0.02	19.00374	7.72	13.33	1398437.	51
0.25	28230.22	6.10	0.09	105.3723	42.78	73.90	4331862.98	85
0.04	5992.961	1.30	0.02	105.3723	42.78	73.90	547753.52	07
0.04	13551.25	2.93	0.04	1778.302	722.00	1247.08	440233.479	91
0.03	1788.306	0.39	0.01	1778.302	722.00	1247.08	425167.24	49
0.02	3794.212	0.82	0.01	720.7319	292.62	505.43	133185.96	63
0.11	26218.53	5.67	0.08	720.7319	292.62	505.43	827983.22	92
0.00	1661.834	0.36	0.01	366.7999	148.92	257.23	49555.923	26
0.02	8860.965	1.92	0.03	366.7999	148.92	257.23	378845.37	85
0.25	61868.06	13.38	0.19	52.82552	21.45	37.05	2802724.74	42
0.12	16479.54	3.56	0.05	52.82552	21.45	37.05	694050.70	97
0.02	17882.67	3.87	0.05	13.67066	5.55	9.59	213653.472	22
0.01	1996.174	0.43	0.01	13.67066	5.55	9.59	76626.9712	27
0.01	2416.896	0.52	0.01	102.055	41.44	/1.5/	141/50.01	98
0.06	8270.655	1.79	0.03	102.055	41.44	/1.5/	601376.204	44
0.03	4410.433	0.95	0.01	213.6023	86.72	149.79	345689.49	89
0.01	4737.988	1.02	0.01	213.6023	86.72	149.79	177387.43	95
0.03	53/1.8/6	1.16	0.02	3336.641	1354.70	2339.91	320340.054	47
0.05	10729.13	2.32	0.03	3336.641	1354.70	2339.91	24/322.14	96
0.34	72295.37	15.63	0.22	21.39681	8.69	15.01	2818196.	52
0.10	44883.73	9.71	0.14	21.39681	8.69	15.01	1248028.8	04
0.03	3561.591	0.77	0.01	237.0902	96.26	166.27	319170.38	5/
0.16	10693.31	2.31	0.03	237.0902	96.26	166.27	1422753.54	44
0.04	08/7.2/2	1.49	0.02	34.37293	13.96	24.10	846897.85	30
0.01	2219.513	0.48	0.01	34.37293	13.96	24.10	65607.254	10
0.02	7090,748	1.74	0.02	449.5951	102.54	315.29	237498.69	00 27
0.05	94204 4	10.00	0.02	449.5951	102.54	315.29	902979.42	57 07
0.41	04291.4	10.23	0.26	240.3000	100.00	172.72	5042935.	91 70
2.38	20704700	100.00	100.00	240.3006	100.00	100.00	23281313.	19
100.00	32704702		100.00	142.5971		100.00	12200002	09

#### (2004 current prices) % OF THE % OF THE TOTAL TOT PROV NATIONAL GVA GVA 2.40 0.05 0.72 0.01 1.16 0.02 4.27 0.08 27.04 0.52 35.59 0.68 7.38 0.14 3.54 0.07 1.68 0.03 6.01 0.11 18.61 0.35 2.35 0.04 1.89 0.04 0.03 1.83 0.57 0.01 3.56 0.07 0.21 0.00 1.63 0.03 12.04 0.23 2.98 0.06 0.92 0.02 0.33 0.01 0.61 0.01 2.58 0.05 1.48 0.03 0.76 0.01 1.38 0.03 1.06 0.02 12.10 0.23 5.36 0.10 1.37 0.03 6.11 0.12 3.64 0.07 0.28 0.01

1.02

3.88

21.66

100.00

0.02

0.07

0.41

1.91 100.00

	DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY	LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	AGRICULTU RE, FORESTRY AND FISHING GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR
NW	Bojanala District municipality	Kgetlengrivier Local Municipality	202967.3	4.23
		Local Municipality of Madibeng	336164.1	7.00
		Moretele Local Municipality	10125.72	0.21
		Moses Kotane Local Municipality	117019.3	2.44
		Rustenburg Local Municipality	134538.5	2.80
	Bojanala District municipality Total		800814.9	16.68
	Bophirima District municipality	Greater Taung Local Municipality	128283	2.67
		Kagisano Local Municipality	581896.8	12.12
		Lekwa-Teemane Local Municipality	138084.6	2.88
		Mamusa Local Municipality	185333	3.86
		Molopo Local Municipality	139534.3	2.91
		Naledi Local Municipality	344959.8	7.18
	Bophirima District municipality Tota		1518092	31.61
	Central District municipality	Ditsobotla Local Municipality	445758.2	9.28
		Mafikeng Local Municipality	115489.8	2.40
		Ramotshere Moiloa Local Municipality	110821.9	2.31
		Ratlou Local Municipality	146786.5	3.06
		Tswaing Local Municipality	551434.9	11.48
	Central District municipality Total		1370291	28.54
	Southern District municipality	Maquassi Hills Local Municipality	168283.4	3.50
		Matlosana Local Municipality	175331.6	3.65
		Merafong City Local Municipality	188224.6	3.92
		Potchefstroom Local Municipality	236834.7	4.93
		Ventersdorp Local Municipality	344237	7.17
	Southern District municipality Tota		1112911	23.18
NW	Total		4802109	100.00
Grar	nd Total		41317265	

## NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: NORTH WEST PROVINCE Sector GVA brakedown (20

NSDP Spatial Profiles:

GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ri

# 04 current prices)

% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MINING AND QUARYING GVA(2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MANUFACTURI NG- LABOUR INTENSIVE GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	CONSTRUCTI ON AND INFRASTRUCT URE GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR
0.49	3135590	9.06	3.60	257360.634	5.98	0.17	276268.052	4.96
0.81	2837981	8.20	3.26	1047512.11	24.32	0.69	705355.084	12.68
0.02	356.2164	0.00	0.00	131917.011	3.06	0.09	165092.025	2.97
0.28	963803.1	2.78	1.11	133749.947	3.11	0.09	272910.566	4.90
0.33	15846791	45.79	18.21	1003735.38	23.31	0.67	1636754.99	29.41
1.94	22784521	65.84	26.18	2574275.07	59.78	1.71	3056380.72	54.93
0.31	27941	0.08	0.03	56520.4047	1.31	0.04	112319.596	2.02
1.41	9827.082	0.03	0.01	8050.97385	0.19	0.01	69009.9019	1.24
0.33	13796.95	0.04	0.02	54761.4518	1.27	0.04	101934.261	1.83
0.45	5215.026	0.02	0.01	9484.11793	0.22	0.01	35665.312	0.64
0.34	3832.133	0.01	0.00	478.237036	0.01	0.00	9353.76709	0.17
0.83	4347.944	0.01	0.00	55449.1268	1.29	0.04	73805.9824	1.33
3.67	64960.14	0.19	0.07	184744.312	4.29	0.12	402088.82	7.23
1.08	211246.1	0.61	0.24	219039.225	5.09	0.15	263713.457	4.74
0.28	18925.93	0.05	0.02	280367.641	6.51	0.19	402734.598	7.24
0.27	13097.42	0.04	0.02	30333.1303	0.70	0.02	77668.4891	1.40
0.36	2442.29	0.01	0.00	10071.9003	0.23	0.01	95518.5386	1.72
1.33	2980.57	0.01	0.00	44402.3738	1.03	0.03	69829.2154	1.25
3.32	248692.3	0.72	0.29	584214.271	13.57	0.39	909464.298	16.34
0.41	23512.17	0.07	0.03	76861.3016	1.78	0.05	45334.7264	0.81
0.42	3236260	9.35	3.72	362156.812	8.41	0.24	656017.671	11.79
0.46	8018667	23.17	9.21	185588.511	4.31	0.12	264299.692	4.75
0.57	206873.4	0.60	0.24	253697.998	5.89	0.17	188856.595	3.39
0.83	24811.75	0.07	0.03	84976.182	1.97	0.06	41997.8123	0.75
2.69	11510124	33.26	13.22	963280.805	22.37	0.64	1196506.5	21.50
11.62	34608297	100.00	39.76	4306514.46	100.00	2.85	5564440.33	100.00
100.00	87041883		100.00	150896759		100.00	125877261	

icon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGAT

#### **NSDP SECTOR CLASSIFICATION**

% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	HIGH VALUE DIFFERENTIA TED GOODS GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	SERVICES AND RETAIL GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	PUBLIC SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATIO N GVA (2004)
0.22	224592.17	4.37	0.15	372606.1114	2.32	0.09	123359.9928
0.56	927518.37	18.04	0.61	1513321.168	9.40	0.37	1611161.138
0.13	83559.071	1.63	0.06	344833.9035	2.14	0.08	367553.4782
0.22	116745.49	2.27	0.08	613767.0897	3.81	0.15	685621.8847
1.30	1179010.9	22.93	0.78	4720098.877	29.33	1.14	1249398.828
2.43	2531426	49.23	1.68	7564627.15	47.00	1.83	4037095.321
0.09	44874.857	0.87	0.03	249503.6318	1.55	0.06	440029.2313
0.05	32284.033	0.63	0.02	95796.20339	0.60	0.02	204826.23
0.08	35156.202	0.68	0.02	182813.5665	1.14	0.04	163912.5852
0.03	41959.46	0.82	0.03	181748.4976	1.13	0.04	121988.7359
0.01	3711.0872	0.07	0.00	11072.63433	0.07	0.00	35309.13826
0.06	50144.86	0.98	0.03	366607.0262	2.28	0.09	239492.4992
0.32	208130.5	4.05	0.14	1087541.56	6.76	0.26	1205558.42
0.21	855718.29	16.64	0.57	563804.3005	3.50	0.14	513321.4283
0.32	328419.22	6.39	0.22	1292381.149	8.03	0.31	1682107.119
0.06	71358.022	1.39	0.05	259859.3617	1.61	0.06	425799.0081
0.08	38917.467	0.76	0.03	138221.2869	0.86	0.03	406026.1332
0.06	54834.201	1.07	0.04	186595.405	1.16	0.05	376609.7182
0.72	1349247.2	26.24	0.89	2440861.503	15.17	0.59	3403863.407
0.04	25172.408	0.49	0.02	137645.9614	0.86	0.03	121490.8322
0.52	464113.21	9.03	0.31	2347529.936	14.59	0.57	1836891.316
0.21	313428.95	6.10	0.21	1639428.533	10.19	0.40	909757.2146
0.15	235230.1	4.57	0.16	816882.9189	5.08	0.20	890266.8307
0.03	14956.595	0.29	0.01	60345.13899	0.37	0.01	73861.05918
0.95	1052901.3	20.48	0.70	5001832.488	31.08	1.21	3832267.253
4.42	<u>5</u> 141704.9	100.00	3.41	16094862.7	100.00	3.89	12478784.4
100.00	150944991		100.00	414085503.2		100.00	216561218.5

ED with Mesoframe Version 1.1

% OF THE PROV GVA	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS	TOURISM	% OF THE PROV GVA	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS	INNOVATIO N AND EXPERIMEN	% OF THE PROV GVA	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS
SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR
0.99	0.06	49810.8	2.28	0.15	147.4135	2.61	103.38
12.91	0.74	330003.3	15.08	1.01	147.4135	2.61	103.38
2.95	0.17	59175.84	2.70	0.18	144.5023	2.56	101.34
5.49	0.32	603753.2	27.59	1.85	144.5023	2.56	101.34
10.01	0.58	264212.2	12.08	0.81	166.0645	2.94	116.46
32.35	1.86	1306955	59.73	4.00	166.0645	2.94	116.46
3.53	0.20	40168.54	1.84	0.12	178622.7	3167.24	125263.88
1.64	0.09	0	0.00	0.00	370.778	6.57	260.02
1.31	0.08	15070.65	0.69	0.05	370.778	6.57	260.02
0.98	0.06	17489.97	0.80	0.05	1478.639	26.22	1036.93
0.28	0.02	5040.714	0.23	0.02	1478.639	26.22	1036.93
1.92	0.11	31644.79	1.45	0.10	1105.876	19.61	775.52
9.66	0.56	109414.7	5.00	0.33	1105.876	19.61	775.52
4.11	0.24	67471.44	3.08	0.21	73.14873	1.30	51.30
13.48	0.78	129862.6	5.94	0.40	73.14873	1.30	51.30
3.41	0.20	26388.39	1.21	0.08	226.4548	4.02	158.81
3.25	0.19	106134	4.85	0.32	226.4548	4.02	158.81
3.02	0.17	32677.98	1.49	0.10	2866.39	50.83	2010.13
27.28	1.57	362534.4	16.57	1.11	2866.39	50.83	2010.13
0.97	0.06	17460.1	0.80	0.05	2836.672	50.30	1989.29
14.72	0.85	199206.6	9.10	0.61	2836.672	50.30	1989.29
7.29	0.42	87250.81	3.99	0.27	159.7007	2.83	111.99
7.13	0.41	101996.5	4.66	0.31	159.7007	2.83	111.99
0.59	0.03	3241.226	0.15	0.01	504.2214	8.94	353.60
30.71	1.77	409155.2	18.70	1.25	504.2214	8.94	353.60
100.00	5.76	2188060	100.00	6.69	5639.688	100.00	3954.98
	100.00	32704702		100.00	142.5971		100.00

## TOTAL GVA (2004 current prices)

		% OF THE	
Total GVA (2004	% OF THE	TOTAL	
	CVA	CVA	
A642420 927	5 /5	0.29	
03117/5 107	10 03	0.30	
1162005 006	10.95	0.70	
2509475 622	1.30	0.10	
3000470.032	4.12	0.29	
20040498.30	30.56	2.13	
44672135.02	52.42	3.66	
1099963.602	1.29	0.09	
1001//6.565	1.18	0.08	
706662.6493	0.83	0.06	
599168.7167	0.70	0.05	
208344.1308	0.24	0.02	
1166756.158	1.37	0.10	
4782671.821	5.61	0.39	
3140832.816	3.69	0.26	
4252704.948	4.99	0.35	
1015482.778	1.19	0.08	
944374.9938	1.11	0.08	
1319750.129	1.55	0.11	
10673145.67	12.52	0.87	
615850.9947	0.72	0.05	
9282084.664	10.89	0.76	
11611426.91	13.63	0.95	
2932637.864	3.44	0.24	
648483.877	0.76	0.05	
25090484.31	29.44	2.06	
85218436.82	100.00	6.98	
1220888209		100.00	

	DISTRICT/METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY		AGRICULTU RE, FORESTRY AND FISHING GVA (2004)
	Cape Winelands District Municipality	Breede River/Winelands Local Municipality	473969 4
		Breede Valley Local Municipality	1378298
		Drakenstein Local Municipality	466023
		Stellenbosch Local Municipality	288123.8
		WCDMA02	309412.8
		Witzenberg Local Municipality	564492.4
	Cape Winelands District Municipality Tot	al	3480320
	Central Karoo District municipality	Beaufort West Local Municipality	108726
		Laingsburg Local Municipality	33888 71
		Prince Albert Local Municipality	42786 11
		WCDMA05	30675.55
	Central Karoo District municipality Total		216076.3
	City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipa	a City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipality	1174804
	City of Cape Town Metropolitan Municipa	ality Total	1174804
	Eden District municipality	Bitou Local Municipality	40208.22
		George Local Municipality	36455.79
		Hessegua Local Municipality	204907.4
		Kannaland Local Municipality	225878.9
		Knysna Local Municipality	34138.16
		Mossel Bay Local Municipality	70417.86
		Oudtshoorn Local Municipality	495255.3
		WCDMA04	124696.5
	Eden District municipality Total		1231958
	Overberg District municipality	Cape Agulhas Local Municipality	237619.3
	0 1 2	Overstrand Local Municipality	84957.64
		Swellendam Local Municipality	180192.8
		Theewaterskloof Local Municipality	772261.3
		WCDMA03	3584.413
	Overberg District municipality Total		1278615
	West Coast District municipality	Bergrivier Local Municipality	373218.5
		Cederberg Local Municipality	548917.4
		Matzikama Local Municipality	335169.9
		Saldanha Bay Local Municipality	182246.5
		Swartland Local Municipality	766282.9
		WCDMA01	108515.2
	West Coast District municipality Total		2314351
WC	C Total		9696125
Gra	and Total		41317265

### NSDP SPATIAL PROFILES: WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE Sector GVA brakedown (2004 current r

NSDP Spatial Profiles:

GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight:

orices)

% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MINING AND QUARYING GVA(2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	MANUFACTUR ING- LABOUR INTENSIVE GVA (2004)	% OF THE PROV GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	CONSTRUCTI ON AND INFRASTRUCT URE GVA (2004)
4.89	1.15	6156.066	0.69	0.01	242099.432	0.96	0.16	137839.614
14.21	3.34	17769.15	1.98	0.02	583162.101	2.32	0.39	313394.897
4.81	1.13	1084.799	0.12	0.00	1280635.19	5.10	0.85	652042.203
2.97	0.70	16370.03	1.83	0.02	1284022.36	5.12	0.85	434443.974
3.19	0.75	2505.301	0.28	0.00	16976.1551	0.07	0.01	31606.1316
5.82	1.37	0	0.00	0.00	441371.068	1.76	0.29	150556.615
35.89	8.42	43885.35	4.90	0.05	3848266.31	15.33	2.55	1719883.43
1.12	0.26	13.09383	0.00	0.00	8217.06762	0.03	0.01	115133.29
0.35	0.08	4.102459	0.00	0.00	2958.31471	0.01	0.00	10952.7828
0.44	0.10	3.040979	0.00	0.00	254.432521	0.00	0.00	11751.7134
0.32	0.07	0	0.00	0.00	5358.335	0.02	0.00	18543.7109
2.23	0.52	20.23726	0.00	0.00	16788.1499	0.07	0.01	156381.497
12.12	2.84	530207.9	59.17	0.61	16056976.6	63.97	10.64	12684486.7
12.12	2.84	530207.9	59.17	0.61	16056976.6	63.97	10.64	12684486.7
0.41	0.10	0	0.00	0.00	101794.662	0.41	0.07	102896.402
0.38	0.09	796.8267	0.09	0.00	831787.344	3.31	0.55	524830.795
2.11	0.50	1253.147	0.14	0.00	36711.8162	0.15	0.02	148356.823
2.33	0.55	1109.272	0.12	0.00	43185.3277	0.17	0.03	22035.0671
0.35	0.08	3.511802	0.00	0.00	228956.144	0.91	0.15	178902.673
0.73	0.17	37114.7	4.14	0.04	578633.887	2.31	0.38	270920.646
5.11	1.20	2556.371	0.29	0.00	236909.534	0.94	0.16	130182.745
1.29	0.30	588.9826	0.07	0.00	12351.0067	0.05	0.01	18920.1204
12.71	2.98	43422.81	4.85	0.05	2070329.72	8.25	1.37	1397045.27
2.45	0.58	267.0571	0.03	0.00	29446.2161	0.12	0.02	93611.6469
0.88	0.21	2760.359	0.31	0.00	389164.525	1.55	0.26	181154.904
1.86	0.44	1669.617	0.19	0.00	575256.666	2.29	0.38	141933.87
7.96	1.87	11220.25	1.25	0.01	273901.663	1.09	0.18	241329.978
0.04	0.01	14.43464	0.00	0.00	1545.0681	0.01	0.00	3487.76514
13.19	3.09	15931.72	1.78	0.02	1269314.14	5.06	0.84	661518.163
3.85	0.90	1406.213	0.16	0.00	217951.48	0.87	0.14	111036.711
5.66	1.33	45323.19	5.06	0.05	128090.176	0.51	0.08	54649.0674
3.46	0.81	44588.75	4.98	0.05	141394.15	0.56	0.09	124067.417
1.88	0.44	82799.59	9.24	0.10	577194.886	2.30	0.38	532438.02
7.90	1.85	21025.71	2.35	0.02	768874.582	3.06	0.51	286591.449
1.12	0.26	67524.84	7.54	0.08	6499.47973	0.03	0.00	22659.0719
23.87	5.60	262668.3	29.31	0.30	1840004.75	1.33	1.22	1131441.74
100.00	100.00	87041883	100.00	100.00	150896759	100.00	100.00	125877261

Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREG

	1	NSDP SECTO	OR CLASSI	FICATION				
								PUBLIC
								SERVICES
% OF THE	% OF THE	HIGH VALUE		% OF THE	SERVICES	% OF THE	% OF THE	
IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	FD GOODS	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS		IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	ION GVA
SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	(2004)
0.78	0.11	128738.28	0.76	0.09	425354.628	0.53	0.10	326755.75
1.77	0.25	272942.323	1.62	0.18	1268578.68	1.59	0.31	1180526.5
3.67	0.52	490444.668	2.91	0.32	2205115.77	2.77	0.53	1600306
2.45	0.35	355660.845	2.11	0.24	2378082.28	2.99	0.57	1499744
0.18	0.03	15076.9261	0.09	0.01	72217.8307	0.09	0.02	49615.916
0.85	0.12	58491.9215	0.35	0.04	597981.213	0.75	0.14	331987.86
9.69	1.37	1321354.96	7.85	0.88	6947330.41	8.73	1.68	4988936.1
0.65	0.09	25878.3304	0.15	0.02	195583.361	0.25	0.05	155630.98
0.06	0.01	12066.1592	0.07	0.01	34324.2345	0.04	0.01	18709.012
0.07	0.01	207.968477	0.00	0.00	25805.0786	0.03	0.01	35148.355
0.10	0.01	10491.2804	0.06	0.01	56461.3011	0.07	0.01	44263.089
0.88	0.12	48643.7384	0.29	0.03	312173.975	0.39	0.08	253751.44
71.46	10.08	12740912.7	75.65	8.44	63355676.6	79.59	15.30	26524884
71.46	10.08	12740912.7	75.65	8.44	63355676.6	79.59	15.30	26524884
0.58	0.08	48387.7771	0.29	0.03	536526.6	0.67	0.13	141153.64
2.96	0.42	445738.98	2.65	0.30	1902297.76	2.39	0.46	780118.22
0.84	0.12	50639.8796	0.30	0.03	327718.832	0.41	0.08	209817.45
0.12	0.02	32523.62	0.19	0.02	111845.856	0.14	0.03	91309.299
1.01	0.14	92662.4803	0.55	0.06	752146.186	0.94	0.18	217574.28
1.53	0.22	157261.959	0.93	0.10	753072.069	0.95	0.18	339312.69
0.73	0.10	129940.81	0.77	0.09	631921.317	0.79	0.15	683964.78
0.11	0.02	22612.4795	0.13	0.01	55496.9047	0.07	0.01	61013.204
7.87	1.11	979767.984	5.82	0.65	5071025.52	6.37	1.22	2524263.6
0.53	0.07	76346.1768	0.45	0.05	331689.569	0.42	0.08	134635.33
1.02	0.14	318897.653	1.89	0.21	632934.189	0.80	0.15	247932.15
0.80	0.11	20471.009	0.12	0.01	255550.407	0.32	0.06	139662.64
1.36	0.19	107382.586	0.64	0.07	487466.967	0.61	0.12	346256.19
0.02	0.00	3600.62292	0.02	0.00	10601.4989	0.01	0.00	4223.0557
3.73	0.53	526698.048	3.13	0.35	1718242.63	2.16	0.41	872709.37
0.63	0.09	182048.752	1.08	0.12	362300.974	0.46	0.09	206601.58
0.31	0.04	60464.0507	0.36	0.04	255573.317	0.32	0.06	122637.46
0.70	0.10	67627.0641	0.40	0.04	410659.194	0.52	0.10	187253.78
3.00	0.42	263608.37	1.57	0.17	588873.939	0.74	0.14	495798.21
1.61	0.23	643431.128	3.82	0.43	534566.288	0.67	0.13	269892.32
0.13	0.02	6469.7919	0.04	0.00	44960.4866	0.06	0.01	33467.704
6.37	0.90	1223649.16	1.27	0.81	2196934.2	2.76	0.53	1315651.1
100.00	14.10	16841026.6	100.00	100.00	79601383.4	100.00	19.22	36480196
	100.00	150944991		100.00	414085503		100.00	210001219

GATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1

					INNOVATIO			
% OF THE	% OF THE		% OF THE	% OF THE	N AND	% OF THE	% OF THE	
IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	TOURISM	IN THIS	GVA IN THIS		IN THIS	GVA IN THIS	
SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	GVA (2004)	SECTOR	SECTOR	
0.90	0.15	37592.83	0.68	0.11	5639.688	3954.98	3954.98	
3.24	0.55	82687.9	1.49	0.25	274.5164	192.51	192.51	
4.39	0.74	251150.5	4.53	0.77	274.5164	192.51	192.51	
4.11	0.69	276114.1	4.98	0.84	114.6647	80.41	80.41	
0.14	0.02	29299.03	0.53	0.09	114.6647	80.41	80.41	
0.91	0.15	45569.52	0.82	0.14	1370.41	961.04	961.04	
13.68	2.30	722413.9	13.03	2.21	1370.41	961.04	961.04	
0.43	0.07	21745.98	0.39	0.07	660.3571	463.09	463.09	
0.05	0.01	5891.687	0.11	0.02	660.3571	463.09	463.09	
0.10	0.02	4180.279	0.08	0.01	248.2429	174.09	174.09	
0.12	0.02	9362.393	0.17	0.03	248.2429	174.09	174.09	
0.70	0.12	41180.34	0.74	0.13	2852.785	2000.59	2000.59	
72.71	12.25	3886792	70.13	11.88	2852.785	2000.59	2000.59	
72.71	12.25	3886792	70.13	11.88	343.1946	240.67	240.67	
0.39	0.07	51487.05	0.93	0.16	343.1946	240.67	240.67	
2.14	0.36	148235.3	2.67	0.45	377.4513	264.70	264.70	
0.58	0.10	30413.08	0.55	0.09	377.4513	264.70	264.70	
0.25	0.04	14614.22	0.26	0.04	485.9135	340.76	340.76	
0.60	0.10	111072.7	2.00	0.34	485.9135	340.76	340.76	
0.93	0.16	84085.59	1.52	0.26	21989.1	15420.44	15420.44	
1.87	0.32	65190.81	1.18	0.20	567.7454	398.15	398.15	
0.17	0.03	17272.06	0.31	0.05	567.7454	398.15	398.15	
6.92	1.17	522370.8	9.43	1.60	125.4239	87.96	87.96	
0.37	0.06	30193.06	0.54	0.09	125.4239	87.96	87.96	
0.68	0.11	72689.91	1.31	0.22	1136.433	796.95	796.95	
0.38	0.06	21771.36	0.39	0.07	1136.433	796.95	796.95	
0.95	0.16	43478.12	0.78	0.13	130.48	91.50	91.50	
0.01	0.00	1365.767	0.02	0.00	130.48	91.50	91.50	
2.39	0.40	169498.2	3.06	0.52	311.7157	218.60	218.60	
0.57	0.10	29111.82	0.53	0.09	311.7157	218.60	218.60	
0.34	0.06	12611.1	0.23	0.04	205.0246	143.78	143.78	
0.51	0.09	29648.56	0.53	0.09	205.0246	143.78	143.78	
1.36	0.23	64243.84	1.16	0.20	460.466	322.91	322.91	
0.74	0.12	49180.62	0.89	0.15	460.466	322.91	322.91	
0.09	0.02	15223.76	0.27	0.05	293.8174	206.05	206.05	
3.61	0.61	200019.7	3.61	0.61	293.8174	206.05	206.05	
100.00	16.85	5542275	100.00	16.95	142.5971	100.00	100.00	
	100.00	32704702		100.00	142.5971		100.00	

## TOTAL GVA (2004 current prices)

Total G	VA		% OF THE	
(2004		% OF THE	TOTAL	
CURRE	N I		NATIONAL	
1779	051 62	GVA 0.02	GVA 0.15	
5000	000 71	0.93	0.13	
5055	505 12	2.03	0.42	
6540	240 00	3.02	0.57	
5269	64 406	3.40 0.27	0.34	
2102	213 05	1 1 /	0.04	
2192	2753 0	12.02	1 80	
6313	88 949	0.33	0.05	
1188	38 835	0.00	0.05	
1203	20 789	0.06	0.01	
1752	47 495	0.00	0.01	
1045	796 07	0.54	0.09	
137	148900	71.38	11.23	
137	148900	71.38	11.23	
1023	498.12	0.53	0.08	
4676	097.78	2.43	0.38	
1009	978.79	0.53	0.08	
5429	02.246	0.28	0.04	
1616	937.63	0.84	0.13	
2292	447.39	1.19	0.19	
2377	685.84	1.24	0.19	
3130	26.678	0.16	0.03	
1385	2574.5	7.21	1.13	
9343	31.972	0.49	0.08	
1931	796.75	1.01	0.16	
1336	590.24	0.70	0.11	
2283	897.57	1.19	0.19	
2843	8.8013	0.01	0.00	
6515	055.34	3.39	0.53	
1484	345.96	0.77	0.12	
1228	828.73	0.64	0.10	
134	1378.7	0.70	0.11	
2788	793.88	1.45	0.23	
3341	008.48	1.74	0.27	
3054	00.374	0.16	0.03	
1048	9756.1	5.46	0.86	
192	140836	100.00	15.74	
12208	888209		100.00	

**ANNEXURE F** 

STATISTICS FOR ECONOMIC CORE AREAS AND AREAS WITH HIGHEST CONCENTRATION OF PEOPLE LIVING BELOW MLL IN SA

	AGRICULTUR FI	E, FORESTRY SHING	Y AND	MINING A		IG		JRING-LABO ENSIVE	UR	CONSTR INFRAS	UCTION AND	
Areas of National Economic Significance	GVA (2004)	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE TOT GVA FOR AREA	GVA (2004)	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE TOT GVA FOR AREA	GVA (2004)	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE TOT GVA FOR AREA	GVA (2004)	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE TOT GVA FOR AREA
Gauteng	2 638 756.94	6.39	0.54	17 810 333.10	20.46	3.63	20.00	0.00	0.00	52 072 124.37	41.37	10.61
Cape Town_Worcester	4 362 539.95	10.56	2.67	590 323.97	0.68	0.36	21.00	0.00	0.00	14 768 077.11	11.73	9.03
Durban_Pietermaritzburg	2 791 243.44	6.76	5.13	193 937.73	0.22	0.36	28 630 745.27	18.97	52.59	17 812 388.76	14.15	32.72
Witbank_Secunda	1 060 898.17	2.57	2.83	16 728 343.62	19.22	44.64	12 245 028.29	8.11	32.68	8 231 219.31	6.54	21.97
Port Elizabeth	338 974.50	0.82	0.93	54 381.88	0.06	0.15	5 640 870.65	3.74	15.48	3 272 563.61	2.60	8.98
Rustenburg	400 383.03	0.97	2.17	20 688 841.86	23.77	112.34	2 004 203.29	1.33	10.88	2 296 379.11	1.82	12.47
Richards Bay	254 590.20	0.62	1.41	891 848.31	1.02	4.93	4 846 338.62	3.21	26.81	2 158 242.04	1.71	11.94
Bloemfontein	438 956.53	1.06	3.33	33 218.97	0.04	0.25	936 092.84	0.62	7.10	1 852 005.40	1.47	14.04
East London	216 982.03	0.53	1.84	31 699.47	0.04	0.27	1 895 555.24	1.26	16.04	1 269 015.64	1.01	10.74
Potchefstroom_Klerksdorp	329 766.46	0.80	2.80	4 276 288.34	4.91	36.31	746 912.03	0.49	6.34	873 840.18	0.69	7.42
George_Mossel Bay	614 361.10	1.49	5.54	31 950.13	0.04	0.29	1 986 238.53	1.32	17.91	1 201 058.34	0.95	10.83
Nelspruit_Bosbokrand	353 260.82	0.85	3.81	163 636.82	0.19	1.77	2 652 986.70	1.76	28.65	1 252 993.40	1.00	13.53
Welkom_Kroonstad	230 334.60	0.56	3.09	4 049 030.11	4.65	54.28	422 339.88	0.28	5.66	727 104.69	0.58	9.75
Kimberley	80 225.38	0.19	1.23	664 789.16	0.76	10.16	207 707.53	0.14	3.17	667 637.57	0.53	10.20
Mafikeng_Lichtenburg	227 893.84	0.55	3.57	38 089.93	0.04	0.60	486 940.50	0.32	7.63	591 086.09	0.47	9.27
Thohoyandou_Giyani	246 063.52	0.60	4.22	158 235.56	0.18	2.71	404 597.94	0.27	6.94	545 173.63	0.43	9.35
Polokwane	63 123.89	0.15	1.16	44 265.52	0.05	0.81	318 431.07	0.21	5.86	617 068.48	0.49	11.35
Newcastle	55 103.40	0.13	1.02	27 768.69	0.03	0.52	411 585.95	0.27	7.64	538 640.06	0.43	10.00
Umtata	206 037.50	0.50	4.47	496.27	0.00	0.01	169 808.45	0.11	3.68	230 140.47	0.18	4.99
Phalaborwa	678.81	0.00	0.02	3 177 189.44	3.65	74.82	9 862.45	0.01	0.23	245 597.31	0.20	5.78
Thabazimbi	19 637.03	0.05	0.47	3 167 145.40	3.64	76.27	111 979.06	0.07	2.70	194 888.67	0.15	4.69
Bethlehem_Harrismith_ Phuthadithjaba	263 994.36	0.64	7.03	14 856.65	0.02	0.40	296 976.48	0.20	7.91	313 237.78	0.25	8.34
Tzaneen	342 242.47	0.83	10.67	134 790.59	0.15	4.20	229 782.08	0.15	7.16	303 726.54	0.24	9.47
Saldanha	102 606.28	0.25	3.84	78 617.66	0.09	2.94	651 353.23	0.43	24.35	470 684.14	0.37	17.59
Upington	563 645.93	1.36	24.21	2 776.49	0.00	0.12	190 169.98	0.13	8.17	196 535.57	0.16	8.44
Ladysmith	16 552.14	0.04	0.73	1 796.89	0.00	0.08	438 433.73	0.29	19.25	435 446.62	0.35	19.12
TOTAL	16 218 852.32	39.25	1.72	73 054 652.54	83.93	7.77	65 934 980.80	43.70	7.01	113 136 874.88	89.88	12.03
RSA TOTAL	41 317 264.68	100.00	3.38	87 041 882.72	100.00	7.13	150 896 759.11	100.00	12.36	125 877 261.04	100.00	10.31

Table 1: Areas of National Economic Significance: GVA per NSDP Sector: Labour-Intensive Mass-Produced Goods

**NSDP Spatial Profiles:** GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1. Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

	HIGH VALUE I G	DIFFERENTIA DODS	ATED	SERVICES	S AND RETAI	L	PUBLIC SI ADMIN	ERVICES AN	D	то	URISM		INNOV/ EXPERI	ATION AND	
Areas of National Economic Significance	GVA (2004)	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE TOT GVA FOR AREA	GVA (2004)	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE TOT GVA FOR AREA	GVA (2004)	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE TOT GVA FOR AREA	GVA (2004)	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE TOT GVA FOR AREA	GVA (2004)	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	% OF THE TOT GVA FOR AREA
Gauteng	75 258 669.24	49.86	15.34	198 392 010.81	47.91	40.43	72 418 880.15	33.44	14.76	14 894 612.47	45.54	3.04	895 935.55	61.42	0.18
Cape Town_Worcester	14 926 628.72	9.89	9.13	71 094 450.70	17.17	43.48	31 803 332.00	14.69	19.45	4 614 826.38	14.11	2.82	212 017.83	14.54	0.13
Durban_Pietermaritzburg	19 019 510.11	12.60	34.93	49 563 177.03	11.97	91.03	24 892 973.93	11.49	45.72	4 057 534.93	12.41	7.45	155 709.86	10.68	0.29
Witbank_Secunda	8 096 741.66	5.36	21.61	4 957 788.14	1.20	13.23	2 903 575.26	1.34	7.75	213 733.78	0.65	0.57	9 191.92	0.63	0.02
Port Elizabeth	8 409 421.52	5.57	23.08	11 238 257.07	2.71	30.85	7 586 601.19	3.50	20.83	904 229.19	2.76	2.48	24 444.87	1.68	0.07
Rustenburg	1 986 552.98	1.32	10.79	5 973 147.01	1.44	32.44	2 158 395.39	1.00	11.72	908 827.09	2.78	4.94	13 492.18	0.92	0.07
Richards Bay	5 407 954.32	3.58	29.92	2 952 627.93	0.71	16.33	1 728 986.91	0.80	9.57	163 995.52	0.50	0.91	11 021.80	0.76	0.06
Bloemfontein	1 450 793.50	0.96	11.00	6 482 892.06	1.57	49.14	6 315 682.97	2.92	47.88	550 363.16	1.68	4.17	15 808.90	1.08	0.12
East London	1 985 175.98	1.32	16.80	5 195 604.47	1.25	43.96	4 803 707.59	2.22	40.65	415 731.53	1.27	3.52	10 685.17	0.73	0.09
Potchefstroom_Klerksdorp	690 936.64	0.46	5.87	3 237 046.73	0.78	27.48	2 760 281.10	1.27	23.43	269 778.23	0.82	2.29	6 597.69	0.45	0.06
George_Mossel Bay	874 695.28	0.58	7.89	4 530 445.20	1.09	40.84	2 137 615.61	0.99	19.27	429 826.69	1.31	3.88	11 650.16	0.80	0.11
Nelspruit_Bosbokrand	1 209 949.67	0.80	13.07	3 846 325.12	0.93	41.54	2 128 314.19	0.98	22.98	164 798.18	0.50	1.78	6 254.19	0.43	0.07
Welkom_Kroonstad	446 411.81	0.30	5.98	2 447 995.17	0.59	32.82	2 560 196.89	1.18	34.32	203 675.27	0.62	2.73	5 198.34	0.36	0.07
Kimberley	587 192.26	0.39	8.97	2 109 295.86	0.51	32.23	2 051 644.82	0.95	31.34	173 086.05	0.53	2.64	3 947.49	0.27	0.06
Mafikeng_Lichtenburg	1 133 948.19	0.75	17.78	1 728 478.28	0.42	27.10	1 994 966.23	0.92	31.28	173 839.42	0.53	2.73	2 976.09	0.20	0.05
Thohoyandou_Giyani	297 673.06	0.20	5.10	1 510 633.69	0.36	25.90	2 528 537.41	1.17	43.35	139 659.79	0.43	2.39	2 444.76	0.17	0.04
Polokwane	401 640.00	0.27	7.39	2 037 768.35	0.49	37.48	1 862 028.08	0.86	34.24	89 222.72	0.27	1.64	3 883.51	0.27	0.07
Newcastle	1 592 671.85	1.06	29.57	1 284 202.23	0.31	23.84	1 402 960.12	0.65	26.04	70 487.01	0.22	1.31	3 494.47	0.24	0.06
Umtata	185 633.39	0.12	4.03	1 871 797.17	0.45	40.59	1 803 756.39	0.83	39.11	138 145.69	0.42	3.00	5 813.21	0.40	0.13
Phalaborwa	16 718.94	0.01	0.39	375 268.23	0.09	8.84	408 986.91	0.19	9.63	11 468.62	0.04	0.27	399.48	0.03	0.01
Thabazimbi	179 027.44	0.12	4.31	367 807.07	0.09	8.86	104 232.28	0.05	2.51	6 334.55	0.02	0.15	1 504.11	0.10	0.04
Bethlehem_Harrismith_ Phuthadithjaba	124 189.33	0.08	3.31	992 858.19	0.24	26.44	1 712 524.09	0.79	45.61	33 972.78	0.10	0.90	2 062.41	0.14	0.05
Tzaneen	136 928.62	0.09	4.27	872 258.15	0.21	27.18	1 117 925.23	0.52	34.84	69 082.56	0.21	2.15	2 162.23	0.15	0.07
Saldanha	302 016.21	0.20	11.29	586 021.23	0.14	21.90	426 861.76	0.20	15.95	55 710.21	0.17	2.08	1 612.28	0.11	0.06
Upington	101 112.49	0.07	4.34	742 307.47	0.18	31.89	484 966.67	0.22	20.83	44 628.50	0.14	1.92	1 550.67	0.11	0.07
Ladysmith	241 757.81	0.16	10.62	615 323.96	0.15	27.02	517 763.65	0.24	22.74	8 382.24	0.03	0.37	1 604.78	0.11	0.07
TOTAL	145 063 951.03	96.10	15.42	385 005 787.30	92.98	40.94	180 615 696.82	83.40	19.20	28 805 952.55	88.08	3.06	1 411 463.93	96.77	0.15
RSA TOTAL	150 944 990.86	100.00	12.36	414 085 503.23	100.00	33.92	216 561 218.54	100.00	17.74	32 704 702.16	100.00	2.68	1 458 626.54	100.00	0.12

 Table 2: Areas of National Economic Significance: GVA per NSDP Sector: High Value Differentiated Goods, Services and Retail, Public Services and Administration, Tourism, Innovation and Experimentation.

#### **NSDP Spatial Profiles:**

GVA (2004 at current prices) and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

Areas of National Economic Significance	POPULATION 2004	% OF THE NATIONAL Population	Nr of People living under MLL	People living under MLL as % of National Tot	living under MLL as % of Total Population of area	Total GVA (2004 CURRENT PRICES)	% OF THE NATIONAL GVA IN THIS SECTOR	AREA HA
Gauteng	10 213 353.00	21.79	3 063 809.14	12.99	30.00	490 744 655.72	40.20	2 127 579.67
Cape Town_Worcester	3 721 716.00	7.94	858 963.10	3.64	23.08	163 495 507.09	13.39	1 216 472.38
Durban_Pietermaritzburg	4 413 552.00	9.42	1 890 637.98	8.02	42.84	54 446 520.14	4.46	965 931.53
Witbank_Secunda	784 758.00	1.67	306 396.11	1.30	39.04	37 469 744.48	3.07	1 117 593.06
Port Elizabeth	1 207 810.00	2.58	480 998.42	2.04	39.82	36 430 221.93	2.98	369 910.23
Rustenburg	699 655.00	1.49	244 480.84	1.04	34.94	18 415 605.65	1.51	721 143.16
Richards Bay	601 670.00	1.28	333 334.55	1.41	55.40	18 075 814.34	1.48	379 812.86
Bloemfontein	693 674.00	1.48	278 878.40	1.18	40.20	13 191 447.41	1.08	483 919.60
East London	924 197.00	1.97	527 563.24	2.24	57.08	11 817 841.04	0.97	415 980.75
Potchefstroom_Klerksdorp	549 652.00	1.17	290 756.76	1.23	52.90	11 778 519.07	0.96	505 684.92
George_Mossel Bay	353 433.00	0.75	77 670.10	0.33	21.98	11 092 286.76	0.91	705 769.15
Nelspruit_Bosbokrand	674 925.00	1.44	358 819.74	1.52	53.16	9 260 182.32	0.76	360 588.05
Welkom_Kroonstad	623 521.00	1.33	306 523.96	1.30	49.16	7 459 578.28	0.61	492 570.52
Kimberley	241 726.00	0.52	106 411.90	0.45	44.02	6 545 526.11	0.54	223 947.78
Mafikeng_Lichtenburg	324 249.00	0.69	192 285.42	0.82	59.30	6 378 218.56	0.52	444 121.78
Thohoyandou_Giyani	737 084.00	1.57	500 875.79	2.12	67.95	5 833 019.37	0.48	333 959.98
Polokwane	302 964.00	0.65	222 581.19	0.94	73.47	5 437 431.62	0.45	224 152.86
Newcastle	424 109.00	0.90	234 916.53	1.00	55.39	5 386 913.78	0.44	224 777.87
Umtata	423 260.00	0.90	311 670.61	1.32	73.64	4 611 628.55	0.38	271 509.51
Phalaborwa	112 579.00	0.24	46 468.58	0.20	41.28	4 246 170.19	0.35	73 391.41
Thabazimbi	41 110.00	0.09	11 619.15	0.05	28.26	4 152 555.61	0.34	75 392.23
Bethlehem_Harrismith_								
Phuthadithjaba	476 447.00	1.02	300 634.60	1.27	63.10	3 754 672.06	0.31	282 537.46
Tzaneen	420 361.00	0.90	271 413.34	1.15	64.57	3 208 898.47	0.26	223 680.05
Saldanha	59 416.00	0.13	6 276.94	0.03	10.56	2 675 482.99	0.22	85 789.60
Upington	122 252.00	0.26	45 215.96	0.19	36.99	2 327 693.76	0.19	230 126.86
Ladysmith	198 014.00	0.42	114 122.11	0.48	57.63	2 277 061.83	0.19	165 713.57
TOTAL	29 345 487.00	62.62	12 548 811.52	53.21	42.76	940 513 197.13	77.04	12 722 056.84
RSA TOTAL	46 864 884.00	100.00	23 584 394.86	100.00		1 220 888 209	100.00	122 079 198.80

Table 3: Socio-Economic Statistics per Area of National Economic Significance: Population, People living under MLL, GVA.

**NSDP Spatial Profiles:** GVA (2004 at current prices), Population and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1. Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

AREAS OF HIGH CONCENTRATION OF PEOPLE LIVING UNDER THE MINIMUM LIVING LEVEL (MLL)	People Living Under MLL in the area	% of Nat Pop living below MLL in area	POPULATION 2004	% of Nat Pop living in area	AREA_HA	% of Nat Land Area	NATIONAL GVA (2004)	% of Nat GVA generated in area	UNEMPLOYME NT	% of Nat Unemplo yment in area	HOUSEHOLD INCOME	% of National Household Income generated in area
MLL Metros												
Southern Gauteng/Sasolburg	2 105 661	8.93	7 202 637	15	944 596	1	355 034 914	29	1 718 029	19	158 033 708 934	. 29
Durban/Pietermaritzburg	1 912 925	8.11	4 384 796	9	958 097	1	143 782 089	12	987 453	11	56 902 321 375	, 11
Capetown/Stellenbosch	718 171	3.05	3 032 971	6	211 124	0	137 585 042	11	456 104	5	67 850 286 227	13
Northern Gauteng/Brits	770 390	3.27	2 549 987	5	603 051	0	123 638 808	10	483 103	5	58 300 473 517	11
MLL in 60km accessibility of R5 bn GVA												
Port Elizabeth/Uitenhage	446 434	1.89	1 117 117	2	162 846	0	35 627 320	3	232 814	. 3	13 981 342 385	3
Middelburg/Evander	172 492	0.73	486 485	1	272 656	0	34 101 225	3	90 219	1	7 218 292 192	1
Carletonville/Potchefstroom/Klerksdorp	347 706	1.47	757 601	2	434 728	0	23 257 464	2	140 602	2 2	8 614 923 772	2
Rustenburg/Mogwase	105 248	0.45	314 170	1	123 760	0	18 628 486	2	62 220	1	3 893 479 367	1
Bloemfontein/Thaba Nchu	275 298	1.17	683 457	1	311 248	0	17 334 950	1	126 474	1	7 636 354 391	1
East London/Alice	573 157	2.43	991 420	2	430 015	0	15 903 548	1	225 725	3	8 316 484 317	2
Eshowe/Richardsbay	378 583	1.61	617 797	1	388 043	0	15 830 464	1	121 819	1	5 530 584 321	1
Welkom/Kroonstad	284 589	1.21	587 879	1	312 355	0	10 469 256	1	112 474	1	4 671 435 553	1
Pholokwane/Lebowakgomo	632 143	2.68	887 165	2	604 828	0	7 704 517	1	151 604	2	6 386 873 089	1
Kimberley	93 330	0.40	222 043	0	113 814	0	6 063 398	0	36 811	0	2 673 188 364	0
Newcastle/Dundee	243 091	1.03	425 845	1	128 419	0	4 211 267	0	96 048	1	2 256 280 115	0
MLL in 60km accessibility to R1-R5bn G	/A					•				•		
Nelspruit/Bushbuckridge/Nkomazi	847 248	3.59	1 363 447	3	665 726	1	8 724 161	1	217 562	2	5 421 804 161	1
Umtata/Butterworth	941 851	3.99	1 156 732	2	951 938	1	6 527 193	1	194 138	2	5 005 218 157	1
Thoyandou	727 862	3.09	1 061 616	2	529 605	0	6 279 133	1	194 085	2	4 546 625 447	1
Ixopo/Harding/Port Shepstone	440 257	1.87	671 065	1	502 598	0	5 258 197	0	120 487	1	3 849 999 980	1
Tzaneen/Giyani	507 455	2.15	793 419	2	531 109	0	4 987 275	0	137 559	2	3 393 228 678	i 1
Mafikeng/Lichtenburg/Delareyville	217 450	0.92	313 359	1	306 712	0	4 406 946	0	68 832	1	2 412 557 798	i 0
Sekhukhune	582 689	2.47	904 046	2	672 090	1	3 978 806	0	152 315	2	3 101 677 487	1
KwaMhlanga	438 500	1.86	700 912	1	385 772	0	2 698 392	0	122 242	1	2 325 277 041	0
Bergville/Estcourt/Ladysmith	195 748	0.83	305 320	1	232 481	0	2 618 986	0	68 533	1	2 190 808 769	0
Phutadithaba	237 575	1.01	364 265	1	96 108	0	1 899 901	0	75 861	1	1 329 955 795	0
Hartswater/Kuruman	137 796	0.58	172 293	0	166 898	0	1 855 931	0	33 942	0	1 046 710 947	0
Queenstown	52 566	0.22	90 977	0	97 847	0	1 244 379	0	21 550	0	797 956 468	i 0
MLL with low economic accessibility (les	s than R1bn GV	A in 60km radiu	is)	-							-	
Umzinyathi/Zululand	523 965	2.22	701 814	1	636 134	1	1 810 236	0	131 328	1	2 326 387 392	0
Port St Johns/Mount Frere	696 782	2.95	804 199	2	639 111	1	1 662 217	0	136 335	2	2 544 681 245	0
Eerstehoek	100 045	0.42	139 957	0	115 220	0	471 262	0	19 754	. 0	373 183 483	0
Pongola/Umkanhyakude	68 698	0.29	94 971	0	78 899	0	244 121	0	16 594	0	391 391 943	0
Matatiele/Mount Fletcher	92 719	0.39	117 429	0	91 853	0	209 059	0	18 020	0	413 287 490	0
Lady Grey/Sterkspruit	56 100	0.24	63 178	0	56 033	0	165 438	0	10 349	0	237 519 152	0
TOTAL: Areas high concentration MLL	15 924 521	67.52	34 080 369	73	12 755 715	10	1 004 214 383	82	6 780 985	76	453 974 299 352	. 84
TOTAL: SOUTH AFRICA	23 584 395	100.00	46 864 884	100	122 079 199	100	1 220 888 209	100	8 930 803	100	540 837 757 085	100

Table 4: Socio-Economic Statistics per Area of National Economic Significance: Population, MLL, Household Income, etc.

NSDP Spatial Profiles: GVA (2004 at current prices), Population and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1. Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.

#RFF1	100.00	00 208 026 8	26 051 24	100.00	540 837 757 084 54	RSA TOTAI
64.69	73.98	6 607 034.00	32 049.67	85.51	462 475 642 819.39	TOTAL
0.46	0.53	47 190.00	11 499.50	0.29	1 556 121 106.93	Ladysmith
0.16	0.18	16 357.00	19 040.13	0.20	1 100 326 868.22	Upington
0.09	0.10	8 856.00	45 029.67	0.22	1 177 051 495.15	Saldanha
0.68	0.77	69 193.00	7 633.67	0.37	1 997 434 673.00	Tzaneen
0.98	1.12	99 951.00	7 880.57	0.47	2 553 472 721.75	Phuthadithjaba
						Bethlehem_Harrismith_
0.07	0.08	7 156.00	101 010.84	0.09	503 117 713.69	Thabazimbi
0.23	0.26	23 426.00	37 717.25	0.22	1 167 508 479.31	Phalaborwa
0.77	0.88	78 459.00	10 895.50	0.44	2 380 645 701.25	Umtata
0.93	1.07	95 414.00	12 701.72	0.45	2 457 014 071.72	Newcastle
0.62	0.71	63 652.00	17 947.45	0.79	4 259 457 114.38	Polokwane
1.32	1.51	134 410.00	7 913.64	0.79	4 255 845 594.01	Thohoyandou_Giyani
0.76	0.86	77 187.00	19 670.74	0.56	3 032 395 272.25	Mafikeng_Lichtenburg
0.39	0.45	39 830.00	27 078.29	0.51	2 780 116 588.59	Kimberley
1.17	1.33	119 011.00	11 963.64	0.90	4 893 607 576.01	Welkom_Kroonstad
1.04	1.19	106 555.00	13 720.31	0.93	5 019 089 612.35	Nelspruit_Bosbokrand
0.53	0.60	54 005.00	31 384.41	1.09	5 879 330 944.92	George_Mossel Bay
1.07	1.22	109 139.00	21 429.05	1.03	5 581 743 460.56	Potchefstroom_Klerksdorp
2.09	2.39	213 102.00	12 787.14	1.49	8 040 647 146.01	East London
1.25	1.43	127 608.00	19 016.78	1.43	7 728 570 040.19	Bloemfontein
1.20	1.37	122 349.00	30 042.74	1.07	5 771 030 452.50	Richards Bay
1.31	1.50	133 671.00	26 320.98	1.41	7 646 217 815.75	Rustenburg
2.40	2.75	245 495.00	30 162.21	2.78	15 016 322 680.96	Port Elizabeth
1.45	1.66	147 867.00	47 746.88	1.86	10 059 619 022.69	Witbank_Secunda
9.84	11.25	1 004 512.00	12 336.21	10.89	58 917 300 359.44	Durban_Pietermaritzburg
5.22	5.97	532 969.00	43 930.14	14.47	78 248 608 067.13	Cape Town_Worcester
22.30	25.50	2 277 690.00	48 049.32	40.76	220 453 048 240.63	Gauteng
Unemploym ent as % of Tot Pop of area	Unemploym ent as % of National Tot	Nr of People Unemployed	GVARand Per Capita	Household income as % of National Tot	Total Household_Income (Rand/annum)	Areas of National Economic Significance

Table 5: Socio-Economic Statistics Household Income, Unemployment. 5: Socio-Economic Statistics per Area of National Economic Significance:

**NSDP Spatial Profiles:** GVA (2004 at current prices), Population and Minimum Living Level (2004) from original SOURCE: Global Insight: Ricon (Pty) Ltd. Regional Economic Explorer Version 2.0C (190)) as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1. Unemployment, Population and Household Income (2001) from original SOURCE: STATS SA (2001), as DISAGGREGATED AND RE-AGGREGATED with Mesoframe Version 1.1.