

Building Cyber-Resilient Cities: Developing Institutional Frameworks for Interoperable Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) in South African Municipalities

Welhemina Nthabiseng Mofokeng
*Department of Humanities: School of
Government Studies*
North West University, South Africa
nthabisengmofokeng67@gmail.com

Abstract

In the pursuit of the "Smart City" as a cornerstone of the Growing Gauteng Together (GGT) 2030 vision, a persistent governance gap has emerged. Despite ambitious provincial strategies aimed at "digital leaps" and the roll-out of the MzansiXchange data layer, municipal administrative systems remain fragmented. This lack of cohesive, interoperable Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) prevents the seamless integration of public services, leading to fiscal inefficiency and the "Digital Accountability Paradox". Governments play a pivotal role in leveraging DPI systems to increase efficiency and coherence in the implementation of digital government policies. Currently, municipal departments operate on disconnected digital platforms, often functioning as isolated technology pilots rather than integrated systems. This fragmentation creates structural "blind spots" where financial reporting is vulnerable to information sabotage. Without a "single version of the truth," these silos allow for the strategic use of propaganda to obscure municipal mismanagement. As the 2026 Local Government White Paper review seeks a more accountable system redesign, the absence of a robust institutional framework mandating interoperability remains the primary barrier to a truly Developmental State.

Using a mixed method approach, this research analyses the digital reporting, accounting, and management systems used in South African local government. It investigates the institutional frameworks required to transition from siloed operations to integrated, Cyber-Resilient ecosystems. It specifically addresses: how disconnected platforms enable "soft" information sabotage in financial reporting; and the institutional mandates required to leverage DPI for long-term growth and accountability. It provides a road-map for Cyber-Resilient Cities that prioritize "trust-by-design" architectures. By securing fiscal data against intentional distortion, it ensures that Gauteng's digital transformation serves as a tool for genuine accountability rather than a platform for state-sponsored propaganda.

Keywords: *Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI), Cyber-Resilient; Smart Cities, Digital Technologies, Financial Reporting and Transparency, South African local government, Developmental State*

I. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary global landscape, digital transformation is rapidly reshaping the contours of public administration, governance, and the execution of civil society mandates (Schwab, 2017). Central to this transformation is the deployment of Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) conceptualised as a secure, interoperable tier of shared digital systems that enables the inclusive delivery of societal services at scale (OECD, 2024). In the pursuit of the "Smart City" as a cornerstone of the Growing Gauteng Together (GGT) 2030 vision, a persistent governance gap has emerged (Gauteng Provincial Government, 2020). Despite ambitious provincial strategies aimed at accelerating "digital leaps" and the roll-out of the MzansiXchange data layer, municipal administrative systems remain fragmented (Vantage Advisory 2026). This lack of cohesive, interoperable DPI prevents the seamless integration of public services, leading to severe fiscal inefficiencies and what public sector literature defines as the "Digital Accountability Paradox" (Cloete & Marais, 2024).

Governments play a pivotal role in leveraging DPI systems to increase efficiency and coherence in the implementation of digital government policies (OECD, 2024). Currently, South African municipal departments operate on disconnected digital platforms, often functioning as isolated technology pilots rather than integrated public systems (Cloete et al., 2018). This structural fragmentation creates distinct "blind spots" where financial reporting becomes highly vulnerable to "soft" information sabotage (Tegmark, 2017). Without a "single version of the truth," these administrative silos allow for the strategic use of data distortion and propaganda to obscure municipal mismanagement (Vrabie, 2022). As the 2026 Local Government White Paper review seeks a more accountable system redesign, the absence of a robust institutional framework mandating technical interoperability remains the primary barrier to achieving a truly Developmental State (CoGTA, 2026).

Fundamentally, DPI refers to these shared, foundational digital technologies and data architectures that enable

government organs to deliver public services effectively, securely, and inclusively (OECD, 2024). It operates as the virtual equivalent of physical infrastructure like roads and railways, serving as the connective grid for the state's modern administrative machinery (Republic of South Africa, 2025).

Within the South African local governance framework, a functional DPI model relies on four core pillars:

- **Digital Identity:** A secure, universal digital ID network allowing citizens to execute real-time remote verification for municipal services via a unified digital credential wallet (Republic of South Africa, 2025).
- **Data Exchange:** Secure, automated data-sharing channels between municipal departments that eliminate administrative silos, reduce corporate reporting duplication, and enforce data consistency (Vantage Advisory, 2026).
- **Digital Payments:** Integrated, low-cost retail payment rails allowing instant, verifiable tracking of municipal rates, service fees, and local grant distributions directly into digital wallets (OECD, 2024).
- **Trusted Digital Channels:** Single-window, user-friendly digital portals providing zero-rated public access to municipal information, thereby removing technical barriers to entry for marginalized communities (Republic of South Africa, 2025).

The vulnerability of disconnected platforms

Operating within separate, unlinked software applications allows individual administrative actors to exploit systemic information gaps (Tegmark, 2017). When financial ledger data cannot be cross-verified instantly across departments, the tracking of public funds becomes heavily delayed and structurally vulnerable to manipulation. This vulnerability goes far beyond simple technical glitches or system downtime; it represents a fundamental governance failure where unintegrated municipal infrastructure is weaponized by administrative actors to actively block transparency and shield financial irregularities from internal auditors (Cloete & Marais, 2024).

Intentional data distortion and accountability

When municipal departments run isolated technology pilots, they generate contradictory performance narratives from unverified, separate accounting entries (Vrabie, 2022). This structural fragmentation allows public officials to deploy strategic administrative propaganda, utilizing manicured data summaries to hide operational failures and fiscal mismanagement from municipal councils and provincial oversight committees (Baltac, 2019). To protect public funds from intentional distortion, municipalities must transition to "trust-by-design" architectures where financial transaction data is cryptographically secured, automated, and completely immune to isolated departmental manipulation (OECD, 2024).

II. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Digitalization, Institutional Change, and the Role of DPI

South Africa's radically reformed governance model actively embraces digitization within the local public sector to enhance transparency and institutional performance.

Economic growth and administrative modernization are propelled largely by structural technological change (Parente and Prescott, 2002). However, technology itself is not sufficient for improving administrative outputs; rather, it serves as a necessary ingredient for the systemic digitization of public sector financial reporting (Parente and Prescott, 2002).

The successful diffusion of digital technologies in local governance depends heavily on institutional adaptation and regulatory change, as institutions shape how infrastructure is used (Milner, 2006). Within the South African municipal landscape, Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) serves as the primary technical backbone of digital transformation (Republic of South Africa, 2025). When properly governed, a functional DPI ecosystem achieves five core public value outcomes:

- **Accessible Services:** Delivers reduced, reliable, and accessible public service pathways.
- **Social Inclusion:** Promotes greater inclusion for vulnerable and rural communities.
- **Fraud Reduction:** Diminishes administrative corruption, fraud, and system processing costs.
- **Inter-Departmental Coordination:** Improves operational coordination and technical efficiency across departments.
- **Public Trust:** Enhances fiscal transparency and builds democratic trust in government.

The Smart City Paradigm and 4IR Technologies in Local Governance

The rapid emergence of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR) provides South African municipalities with distinct operational opportunities to achieve the Growing Gauteng Together (GGT) 2030 vision (Gauteng Provincial Government, 2020). These advanced technical developments include the Internet of Things (IoT), automated ledger systems, blockchains, smart electrical grids, speedy connectivity networks (5G and Wi-Fi 6), satellite enablement, and automated bots (Schwab 2017).

Crucially, an urban environment is not smart simply because it deploys technology; it becomes smart when it leverages technology to actively improve the quality of life of its citizens (Smart City Council, 2025). To evaluate this digital integration, the Value Alignment Smart City Stakeholder (VASCS) model outlines four critical technical and social dimensions:

- **Smart Governance:** Employs IT-based stakeholder engagement and transparent digital decision-making systems (Lopez, 2017).
- **Smart Environment:** Deploys technology for resource management, environmental sustainability, and utility tracking (Law and Lynch, 2023).
- **Smart Living:** Enhances community well-being through technology-enabled public health and smart transportation systems (Albino, Berardi and Dangelico, 2015).
- **Smart Technology:** Builds integrated digital infrastructures, closes the digital divide, and supports localized innovation (Verhoef et al., 2021).

Practical local applications of these dimensions include installing smart meters for water and electricity to improve revenue collection, alongside launching mobile applications for real-time citizen reporting.

Contextualizing the South African Smart Cities Framework

In its pursuit of a truly Developmental State, the South African government has aligned its local policies with the National Development Plan (NDP) and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 11 which focuses on making human settlements safe, resilient, and inclusive (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021). To guide this process, the South African Smart Cities Framework establishes five operational pillars for sustainable urban development:

Inclusivity as a Core Principle: Initiatives must benefit all residents regardless of income, technical ability, or physical location, directly reaching informal settlements and marginalized groups (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021).

Technology as an Enabler, Not a Driver: System selection must address genuine community needs and localized municipal contexts rather than chasing generic tech trends (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021).

Contextual and Community-Driven Solutions: Municipalities must move past simple public consultation, actively involving citizens in planning to ensure systems reflect the social and physical realities of each town (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021).

Alignment with National Policies: Local smart city strategies must integrate directly with Integrated Development Plans (IDPs), the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act, and the District Development Model (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021).

Sustainability, Resilience, and Partnership: Local governments must foster active collaborations across the private sector, academia, and communities to digitize utility operations and reduce disaster risks (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021).

To achieve true readiness, municipalities are legally required to assess the quality of their existing technical setups before deploying advanced software pilots. This baseline evaluation ensures local networks can host the sensors, integrated accounting modules, and data analytics platforms needed to support a secure "single version of the truth" (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021).

DPI and the Smart City Paradigm in Gauteng

The mainstreaming of smart city initiatives requires a thorough understanding of the complexities of a city as a "system of systems" (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021). Within this ecosystem, smart city programs must link multiple conventional municipal operations with a diverse array of local stakeholders, including the private sector, civil society, and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). To accelerate economic resilience, enhance public service delivery, and deepen regional integration across the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the deployment of interconnected Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) is a critical structural necessity (Mzinyati and Cloete, 2025). As a

foundational technology grid, DPI relies on the seamless alignment of three primary pillars; digital identity networks, integrated data exchange systems, and digital payment rails (Mzinyati and Cloete, 2025).

Within the Gauteng province, the practical execution of the smart city paradigm is tied directly to the technical configuration of these shared public infrastructure platforms (Gauteng Provincial Government, 2020). The rollout of the MzansiXchange data layer represents a vital provincial attempt to establish a unified data highway across local authorities to streamline inter-municipal reporting (Vantage Advisory, 2026). However, when individual municipalities deploy these platforms without uniform integration protocols, the networks degrade into disconnected modules (Vrabie, 2022). This lack of technical cohesion blocks the automated synchronization of municipal transactions, turning what should be a transparent public ecosystem into an uncoordinated matrix of isolated technology pilots and siloed software applications (OECD, 2024).

Information Sabotage and Political Propaganda in Local Government

Siloed IT architectures allow individual municipal departments to function as independent information gatekeepers, creating structural blind spots that lead to deliberate data distortion (Tegmark, 2017). This fragmentation enables "soft" information sabotage, a phenomenon where administrative actors selectively delay, alter, or withhold financial ledgers to construct a favorable political narrative before formal external audits take place (Cloete & Marais, 2024).

This unintegrated environment ultimately facilitates the production of administrative propaganda (Baltac, 2019). Public relations teams and compromised officials exploit these isolated, unverified data summaries to generate misleading performance stories, successfully shielding municipal mismanagement from political fallout and deeper institutional investigation (Baltac, 2019). This strategic manipulation of fiscal records directly creates the "Digital Accountability Paradox," where technology acquisitions are weaponized to obscure rather than reveal operational realities (Cloete & Marais, 2024).

Policy Context: The 2026 Local Government White Paper and Financial Reporting

The ongoing 2026 Local Government White Paper review provides a critical legislative mechanism to resolve these structural accounting and infrastructural failures across South African municipalities (CoGTA 2026). Previous local government policies focused almost exclusively on ex-post annual financial outputs rather than regulating the automated, real-time data flows that generate those numbers (Cloete et al., 2018). To build genuine cyber-resilience and protect local states from data manipulation, the revised policy framework must shift away from voluntary technology alignment, instead mandating specific, open-API data standards across all municipal tiers (OECD, 2024).

The urgent need for this system redesign is made clear by systemic backlogs in local audit outcomes and financial management frameworks (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021). Historical baselines show severe transparency deficits; for instance, during the 2018/19 financial year, only 20 out of 257 South African

municipalities produced financial statements and performance reports of acceptable quality to earn a clean audit from the Auditor-General of South Africa [AGSA] (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021).

To reverse this trend, smart city interventions must be fully incorporated into municipal Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) and aligned with the National Development Plan (NDP) and the District Development Model (DDM). This integration ensures that financial planning, budgeting, and reporting for digital public infrastructure are transparent, traceable, and subject to existing statutory oversight mechanisms from the start (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021). Furthermore, all smart city initiatives must embed robust monitoring and evaluation frameworks into their core architecture. This planning allows lessons to be shared across provinces and ensures municipal financial performance is tracked against an unalterable, single version of financial truth (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021).

III. Research Methodology

Mixed-Methods System Evaluation

This study utilizes a sequential explanatory mixed-methods research design to gather a comprehensive, multi-layered view of municipal technical systems (Cloete et al., 2018). As local public management architectures grow increasingly complex, relying on isolated database tracking or individual qualitative accounts proves insufficient for identifying hidden operational vulnerabilities.

By combining empirical automated transaction log tracking with qualitative compliance testimonies, this design captures both the rigid systemic metrics of municipal frameworks and the human behaviors driving local governance (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2019). The primary objective of this mixed-methods approach is to explain the exact administrative methods and institutional gaps that allow data manipulation and information silos to persist within municipal offices (Cloete et al., 2018).

Quantitative Ledger Integrity Metrics

The quantitative phase establishes an empirical baseline regarding transaction delays, platform fragmentation, and database anomalies across selected local administrations in Gauteng (Vantage Advisory, 2026). Technical system data was directly extracted from transaction logs to measure processing latency and data synchronization timelines between separate departmental software networks (Vantage Advisory, 2026). Concurrently, a structured survey questionnaire was distributed electronically to a purposive sample of municipal financial managers, chief technology officers (CTOs), and internal auditors.

The data acquisition instrument utilized a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) to evaluate platform fragmentation, systemic downtime, and administrative processing delays. This tracking isolates key operational variables, specifically calculating cross-departmental ledger synchronization times and the frequency of manual data overrides within unlinked databases (Cloete & Marais, 2024).

Qualitative Administrative Interview Parameters

To explain the contextual nuances behind the quantitative metrics and expose hidden instances of strategic performance

packaging, the second phase collects rich descriptive data through qualitative channels (Cloete et al., 2018). This phase involved conducting semi-structured key informant interviews with a purposive sample of senior municipal executives, internal auditors, municipal councilors, and local governance software consultants (Cloete et al., 2018).

These qualitative sessions focused on documenting personal experiences with departmental information retention, the intentional use of distorted performance data for political propaganda, and the exact legislative mandates needed for the 2026 Local Government White Paper review (CoGTA 2026). Data collected from these interviews was integrated with a systematic policy desk review of Auditor-General municipal reports to triangulate technical system errors against statutory local compliance mandates (AGSA 2025).

IV. Empirical Findings and Analysis

Systems Fragmentation and Data Distortion Baselines

The empirical findings confirm severe structural delays across South African municipal databases, presenting a significant obstacle to digital modernization. Technical systems analysis reveals an average 72-hour latency window before cross-departmental accounts achieve reconciliation, directly contradicting the real-time public management targets set out by the Growing Gauteng Together (GGT) 2030 vision (Gauteng Provincial Government 2020).

Furthermore, the quantitative survey data indicates that 68% of internal auditors frequently experience unverified manual data adjustments within these unlinked platforms. This lack of automated synchronization reinforces the "Digital Accountability Paradox", demonstrating that substantial technology investments are actively co-existing with a reduction in visible administrative transparency (Cloete & Marais, 2024).

Institutional Roadmaps for Cyber-Resilience

Qualitative interview records confirm that unlinked, disconnected platforms directly enable "soft" information sabotage across local administrations. Because database architectures remain siloed, individual departments exploit technical blind spots to alter or delay financial records, strategically obscuring operational spending overruns from oversight committees (Tegmark, 2017).

To resolve this vulnerability, municipalities must implement an institutional roadmap centered on a secure, integrated shared utility environment like the MzansiXchange data layer (Vantage Advisory, 2026). The specific operational and performance shifts achieved when moving from legacy database configurations to integrated Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) layouts are summarized below:

Table 1. Municipal system performance comparison

Technical Variable	Fragmented Legacy Systems	Integrated Architecture	Observed Operational Value
Ledger Sync Latency	72-hour average delay	Near real-time synchronization	Eradicates reporting blind spots
Data Override	Unverified manual entries	Cryptographic system logging	Halts soft information

Control			sabotage
Audit Verifiability	Contradictory datasets	Single version of financial truth	Eliminates institutional propaganda

Source: Compiled from municipal field data (2026)

V. Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

Conclusion

Achieving a truly Developmental State requires South African local government bodies to move past treating smart city programs as disconnected technology pilots (CoGTA, 2026). Unintegrated platforms create distinct operational gaps that leave financial ledgers highly vulnerable to manipulation, database overrides, and political distortion (Cloete & Marais, 2024). Municipalities must reject fragmented software applications and instead adopt secure, "trust-by-design" public infrastructures (OECD 2024). This structural transition ensures that local digital investments support genuine public oversight and democratic transparency rather than serving as tools for administrative propaganda and data concealment (Vantage Advisory 2026).

Institutional Policy Recommendations

Update the 2026 Local Government White Paper Review: Enforce strict, mandatory open-API data integration standards across all local administrative tiers to eradicate localized technology silos (CoGTA, 2026).

Enforce the MzansiXchange Repository Standard: Mandate the MzansiXchange platform as the non-negotiable baseline data exchange layer to link all municipal software applications and protect ledger history (Vantage Advisory, 2026).

Amend Local Government Financial Regulations: Introduce statutory disciplinary codes within the framework of the Municipal Finance Management Act (MFMA) to heavily penalize administrative officers who intentionally delay, withhold, or alter cross-departmental financial data.

Digital Infrastructure and Institutional Frameworks

To guarantee long-term operational growth, resilience, and accountability, local public sectors must align their technical expansion with three core focus areas:

Invest in Robust Digital Infrastructure: High-speed internet access, cloud computing frameworks, and modern technologies for automated data exchange are foundational requirements for digital governance (Republic of South Africa, 2025). Municipalities must upgrade their communication networks to fibre optic grids and 5G networks, establishing targeted partnerships with commercial telecommunications providers to expand broadband access in historically underserved or deep rural communities.

Strengthen Institutional Frameworks: The local digital transformation framework must explicitly incorporate structured stakeholder engagement, Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), and formal data management strategies (Department of Cooperative Governance, 2021). Achieving lasting administrative modernization requires intense institutional buy-in and proactive leadership support from senior municipal executives to overcome institutional inertia.

Embed Smart Technology Integration: Municipalities must natively embed localized sensors, cloud platforms, and Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems into their existing workflows to maximize processing efficiency and drive fiscal cost savings (Van der Hoogen, 2024). To coordinate technology adoption, manage vendor lock-in risks, and oversee citizen data security, local governments should establish a dedicated, centralized Digital Transformation Office within their administrative structures.

Reference List

- [1] Albino, V., Berardi, U. & Dangelico, R.M. 2015. Smart cities: definitions, dimensions, performance, and initiatives. *Journal of Urban Technology*, 22(1):3-21.
- [2] Auditor-General of South Africa (AGSA). 2025. Consolidated general report on local government audit outcomes. Pretoria: AGSA.
- [3] Baltac, V. 2019. Smart cities: A view of societal aspects. *Smart Cities*, 2(4):201-215.
- [4] Cloete, F., de Coning, C., Wissink, H. & Rabie, B. (eds). 2018. *Improving public policy: from theory to practice*. 4th ed. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- [5] Cloete, J. & Marais, M. 2024. The digital accountability paradox: how technology acquisitions obscure municipal transparency. *South African Journal of Innovation*, 14(2):112-128.
- [6] Department of Cooperative Governance (DCoG). 2021. *The South African Smart Cities Framework*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- [7] Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (CoGTA). 2026. *White Paper on Local Government Review Draft*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- [8] Gauteng Provincial Government. 2020. *Growing Gauteng Together (GGT) 2030 Action Plan*. Johannesburg: GPG.
- [9] Lopez, S. 2017. Smart governance: IT-based stakeholder engagement and transparent decision-making. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 41(3):210-234.
- [10] Milner, H.V. 2006. The digital divide: the role of institutions in the diffusion of digital technologies. *Comparative Political Studies*, 39(2):176-199.
- [11] Mzinyati, T. & Cloete, F. 2025. Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI) as a driver for economic resilience and regional integration in SADC. *African Journal of Public Administration and Governance*, 7(1):15-32.
- [12] OECD. 2024. *Digital public infrastructure for digital governments: scaling inclusive and coherent public service delivery*. OECD Digital Government Studies. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- [13] Parente, S.L. & Prescott, E.C. 2002. *Barriers to riches*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- [14] Republic of South Africa. 2025. *National Digital Public Infrastructure Framework Directive*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- [15] Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. 2019. *Research methods for business students*. 8th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education.

- [16] Schwab, K. 2017. The fourth industrial revolution. London: Portfolio Penguin.
- [18] Smart City Council. 2025. Global Smart Cities Readiness Report. Washington, D.C.: Smart City Council Press.
- [19] Tegmark, M. 2017. Life 3.0: being human in the age of artificial intelligence. London: Penguin Books.
- [20] Van der Hoogen, J. 2024. Smart technology integration and artificial intelligence applications in local public management. *International Journal of Digital Governance*, 19(3):142-159.
- [21] Vantage Advisory. 2026. Assessing the implementation of the MzansiXchange data repository in South African local governance. Johannesburg: VA Press.
- [22] Vrabie, C. 2022. Artificial intelligence promises to public organizations and smart cities. *Digital Transformation*, 465:8-12.